

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1982

Religious Activity and Time Use of 149 Utah Husbands

Gayleen Wayman Thalman
Utah State University

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



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

Recommended Citation

Thalman, Gayleen Wayman, "Religious Activity and Time Use of 149 Utah Husbands" (1982). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2311.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2311>

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.



RELIGIOUS ACTIVITY AND TIME USE

OF 149 UTAH HUSBANDS

by

Gayleen Wayman Thalman

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

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Home Economics and Consumer Education

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The influence and guidance of many people motivated me as I wrote this thesis. My major professor, Jane McCullough, was instrumental in the accomplishment of this project. Her thorough understanding of both the time use data and the thesis process was invaluable to me. Her always-constructive criticisms, professional supervision and pleasant demeanor made my thesis experience a lesson in ethical research practices and gave me an opportunity to work with and learn from a delightful personality.

I appreciated Alison Thorne's enthusiasm for my ideas and her willingness to take every opportunity to encourage me. Ann Austin was supportive as both a committee member and a friend. I appreciated each opportunity to exchange ideas with her "like mind," and to be stimulated by our lively conversations.

I am grateful for my parents' examples as I was growing up--my father's determination and sense of organization, and the role model of a successful working mother during a time when it wasn't fashionable.

My husband, Jim, was a constant source of support. He did my household work, as well as his own, in order to accommodate my schedule, altering his time to make mine more meaningful. He was a willing sounding-board for my ideas, and showed abundant patience with my many conspicuous absences--both physical and mental.

Gayleen Wayman Thalman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT.	viii
INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	1
Purpose of the Study	3
Conceptual Framework	3
Theoretical Definitions.	4
Operational Definitions.	5
Hypotheses	6
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	8
Traditional Division of Labor	8
Anthropological Evidence and Division of Labor by Sex	10
Economics and Traditional Socialization in America	11
Current Socialization Patterns	13
Male Participation in Household Tasks	14
Support for Male Household Task Performance.	21
Effects of Religion on Household Task Performance by Males.	24
The L.D.S. Church and Male Participation in Domestic Roles	25
Summary.	29
METHODS	30
Study Design	30
Sample	31
Instruments.	32
Data Collection.	34
Scoring of Responses	37
Statistical Analysis	38
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	41
Sample Description	41

	Page
Husbands' Household Work Time	48
Hypotheses	51
Further Analysis	74
CONCLUSIONS	79
Summary	79
Implications	81
Limitations.	88
Recommendations.	91
REFERENCES	93
APPENDICES	98

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Church Activity Level	43
2. Age of Husbands	43
3. Educational Level of Husbands	44
4. Occupation of Husbands.	45
5. Husbands' Hours of Employment	46
6. Occupation of Wives	47
7. Wives' Hours of Employment.	48
8. Household Income	49
9. Husbands' Time Spent Doing Household Work	50
10. Husbands' Mean Minutes Per Day in Household Tasks	51
11. Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Food Preparation by Husbands' Level of Religious Activity	53
12. Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Food Preparation.	54
13. Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Dishwashing by Husbands' Level of Religious Activity.	55
14. Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Dishwashing.	56
15. Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Housecleaning by Husbands' Level of Religious Activity.	57
16. Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Housecleaning	58
17. Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Maintenance of Home, Yard, Car and Pets by Husbands' Level of Religious Activity	59

Table	Page
18. Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Maintenance of Home, Yard, Car and Pets	60
19. Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Physical Care of Household Members by Husbands' Level of Religious Activity	61
20. Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Physical Care of Household Members	62
21. Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Non-physical Care of Household Members by Husbands' Level of Religious Activity	63
22. Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Non-physical Care of Household Members	64
23. Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Traditional and Non-traditional Household Work by Husbands' Level of Religious Activity	65
24. Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Traditional and Non-traditional Household Work	66
25. Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Social and Recreational Activities by Husbands' Level of Religious Activity.	67
26. Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Social and Recreational Activities.	68
27. Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Organization Participation by Husbands' Level of Religious Activity	69
28. Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Organization Participation	70
29. Summary of Correlation Statistics for Relationships Between Organization Participation Time and Household Work Time	74
30. Multiple Regression Analysis for Husbands' Household Work Time on Weekend Days	77

Table	Page
31. Multiple Regression Analysis for Husbands' Household Work Time on Weekdays	78
32. Summary of Hypotheses	82

ABSTRACT

Religious Activity and Time Use
of 149 Utah Husbands

by

Gayleen Wayman Thalman, Master of Science
Utah State University, 1982Major Professor: Jane McCullough
Department: Home Economics and Consumer Education

The purpose of this study was to analyze 149 Utah L.D.S. husband/fathers' time spent in various activities by their level of religious activity, and to relate their organization participation time to their household work time. Data for this study came from the Utah portion of the "Interstate Comparison of Urban/Rural Families' Time Use." This study used a sub-sample of the original Utah sample. Data used were collected through church affiliation and activity questionnaires and time diaries.

Level of religious activity in the L.D.S. Church was considered along with husbands' time allocated to organization participation, social and recreational activities, and household work. Household work tasks included food preparation, dishwashing, housecleaning, maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, physical care of household members, and non-physical care of household members. Statistical

tests used were analysis of variance, correlation and multiple regression analysis.

Findings revealed that level of religious activity did not significantly affect the time respondents allocated to either household work or to social and recreational activities. It did significantly affect their organization participation time. The more active respondents were in the L.D.S. Church, the more time they allocated to organization participation.

Organization participation time significantly affected the time respondents allocated to maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, and to all household work. As organization participation time decreased, time in these two areas significantly increased.

Variations in husbands' household work time were not significantly explained by any of the following variables: age of younger child, level of religious activity, hours of wife's paid employment, hours of husband's paid employment, husband's social and recreational time, husband's organization participation time, annual household income, rural or urban residence, or whether husband's household task performance time was measured on a weekend day or a weekday.

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Hook and Paolucci (1970, p. 316) define the family 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." Ideally, the purpose of a family is to provide a positive and nurturing environment for its members, while sharing resources and living space (Osborne, 1979).

In order for families to function, certain household tasks must be accomplished. Traditionally, task allocation has been determined by sex, with wives assuming the major responsibility for tasks performed within the household, and husbands performing tasks outside the household. Although some authors have suggested a "natural" division of labor by sex (Parsons & Bales, 1955; Tavris & Offir, 1977), anthropologists have disputed these arguments by observing sex role variations in cultures around the world (Friedl, 1975; Hammond & Jablow, 1976; Weitzman, 1979).

Traditional sex role socialization in this country has been influenced by economic conditions and social customs (Tilly & Scott, 1978). Socialization is a powerful determinant of an individual's ideas about sex roles and feelings of self-worth in a society (Angrist, 1969).

Currently, young men and women in America are socialized for sex-appropriate behaviors (Aneshensel & Rosen, 1980). Women grow up expecting to perform the majority of household and childcare tasks; while men expect to spend the majority of their time in the provider role (Tognoli, 1979).

Researchers have consistently found that women spend more time in household and childcare task performance than do men (Vanek, 1974; Walker & Woods, 1976; Sanik, 1979). Some studies have attempted to determine what influences the amount of time a husband spends in activities other than paid employment (Holmstrom, 1972; Nickols & Metzen, 1978; Lovingood & Firebaugh, 1978). It has been generally concluded that values and expectations are probable related factors.

Pleck (1977) suggests that if husbands are to assume more responsibility for household tasks, they must feel supported in these roles. Although most husbands spend more time in paid-work activities than in household task performance, family and social supports may greatly influence husbands' non-work time use (Lein, 1979; Berger, 1979; Wheeler & Arvey, 1981).

Nye (1976) looked at religious activity as a possible explanation for differences in the amount of time husbands spend in home and family activities. A religious ideology could be one of the social supports referred to in the preceding paragraph. Specifically, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (L.D.S. or Mormon Church) advocates an active role in the home for males (McKay, 1969). Overall, L.D.S. philosophy adheres to a traditional division of labor by sex, women at home and men in the workplace; however, the home and family

are considered to be "the most important thing in the life of an L.D.S. husband/father" (Tanner, 1973, p. 92). The emphasis on home and family by the L.D.S. Church suggests a social support for increased household activity by active L.D.S. males.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to analyze 149 Utah L.D.S. husband/fathers' time spent in various activities by their level of religious activity, and to relate their organization participation time to their household work time.

Conceptual Framework

Homes are the central units of any society; and as such, must be managed effectively to maintain the orderly functioning of that society. Home management was defined by Ella Cushman as "using what you have to get what you want" (cited in Schlater, 1976, p. 93). The purpose of home management then is to use available resources to achieve goals.

Goals can be thought of as desired future outcomes, and can range from important long-term goals to mundane, everyday goals.

Resources can be considered in two contexts, human or material. Examples of human resources are talents, intelligence, and skills; while material resources include such things as money and goods.

The classification of time as a resource is difficult; family resource management specialists have debated its place as both a human and material resource. Whether it belongs in either category

does not affect its importance in goal achievement for all people. Time is the only resource which is distributed equally to everyone, regardless of individual differences.

As life becomes more complex in the United States, few people feel they have an adequate amount of time to accomplish their goals. The decisions they make about the allocation of their time are, to some extent, indicative of their values (McCullough, 1980).

Needs and wants often compete for available resources. In a household, resource use is determined to a great extent by family goals. A common goal of most families is the orderly functioning of their household. Certain tasks must be accomplished in order for this to occur; food must be prepared, standards of cleanliness must be determined and maintained, and family members must receive care. These are basic "food, clothing and shelter" necessities. Although there are many resources necessary to accomplish these goals, time is an obvious factor in their achievement.

The time family members allocate to household tasks is an important area of concern in family management research. Understanding the factors which affect how families as a whole or specific family members allocate their resources can serve as a basis for identifying needed changes in laws and policies that affect families (McCullough, 1980).

Theoretical Definitions

Allocation: The assigning of tasks or activities.

Family: "A group of two or more persons related by blood, marriage,

or adoption and residing together" (American Home Economics Association, 1978).

Household: One or more persons who reside together, share resources, share responsibility for decisions, often have similar values and goals, and similar commitments to one another over time (Hook & Paolucci, 1970).

Household Tasks: "Activities performed in individual households that result in goods and services that enable a family to function as a unit" (Walker & Woods, 1976, p. 1).

Traditional: Conforming to society's customs and practices.

Non-traditional: Not conforming to society's customs and practices.

Traditional division of household tasks: Indoor household tasks assigned to women and outdoor household tasks assigned to men (Lopata, 1971).

Non-traditional division of household tasks: Indoor and outdoor household tasks not assigned primarily on the basis of sex.

Operational Definitions

Allocation of household tasks: The amount of time actually recorded in the household task categories of the time diary.

Family: Two-parent/two-child Utah household where the father is a member of the L.D.S. Church.

Husband: L.D.S. father in two-parent/two-child Utah household.

Household work time: Mean minutes per day spent in food preparation, dishwashing, housecleaning, maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, physical and non-physical care of household members as recorded on the time diary (see Appendix D).

Organization participation time (OPT): Mean minutes per day spent in religious activities, civic and political organizations, and clubs as recorded on the time diary (see Appendix D).

Social and recreational activity time: Mean minutes per day spent in non-paid-work activities for the purpose of leisure and/or relaxation as recorded on the time diary (see Appendix D).

Time diary: "A log of activities that individuals keep over a specified period, usually a full 24-hour day" (Robinson, 1977a, p. 6).

Traditional division of labor: In this study, traditional female tasks included food preparation, dishwashing, housecleaning, physical and non-physical care of household members; traditional male tasks included maintenance of home, yard, car and pets.

Non-traditional division of labor: Men participating in food preparation, dishwashing, housecleaning, physical and non-physical care of household members; women participating in maintenance of home, yard, car and pets.

Religious activity code (RAC): The perceived level of religious activity of L.D.S. husbands, as indicated on the Church Affiliation and Activity Questionnaire; a code of one (1) indicated inactive or not very active, two (2) indicated active, and three (3) indicated very active.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are proposed:

1. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to food preparation by husbands' level of religious activity (RAC).
2. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to dishwashing by husbands' RAC.
3. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to housecleaning by husbands' RAC.
4. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to maintenance of home, yard, car and pets by husbands' RAC.
5. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to physical care of household members by husbands' RAC.
6. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to non-physical care of household members by husbands' RAC.

7. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to traditional and non-traditional household work by husbands' RAC.

8. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to social and recreational activities by husbands' RAC.

9. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to organization participation by husbands' RAC.

10. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' organization participation time (OPT) and the amount of time spent in food preparation.

11. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in dishwashing.

12. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in housecleaning.

13. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in maintenance of home, yard, car and pets.

14. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in physical care of household members.

15. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in non-physical care of household members.

16. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in traditional and non-traditional household work.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Traditional Division of Labor

Age and sex are the two most universal criteria used to determine division of labor in any culture (Friedl, 1975). While age seems an obvious standard, because extremely young or old members of a culture may not have the experience and/or strength to perform certain tasks, sex is a more ambiguous determinant of labor division.

In every society, in every country, people have assumed that males and females are different not merely in basic anatomy, but in elusive qualities of spirit, soul, and ability. They are not supposed to do the same things, think the same way, or share the same dreams and desires (Tavris & Offir, 1977, p. 2).

Traditionally in all cultures, women have performed tasks directly associated with the home and childcare. "Nowhere in the world is the rearing of children primarily the responsibility of men" (Brown, 1970, p. 1075). Men have traditionally performed tasks associated with the larger society. Friedl (1975) suggests that universally, men are engaged in political and religious "ritual" activities, while women are involved in these activities only in a secular or "lay" capacity.

There seems to be no inherent reason for women's relegation to household and childcare tasks; nor for men's predominance in the social sphere (Hammond & Jablow, 1976). However, tradition has had a powerful influence in this regard; "women at home and men in

society" seems to be the norm in most cultures and is usually taken for granted (Carling, 1982).

There are authors who argue that it would be impossible for men and women to reverse their traditional roles (Tavris & Offir, 1977). Physical strength is often cited as a determinant of sex roles; the assumption being that strength is needed for those roles performed outside the home. Since most men are physically stronger than most women, this argument places men in roles outside the domestic sphere (Friedl, 1975).

Another argument used to justify the traditional division of labor by sex is that it is women who bear children and lactate (Friedl, 1975). This argument assumes that women must stay at home to be close to their nursing young in order to assure their successful growth and development; subsequently, while they are at home, they then "naturally" do the other things that need to be done around the house.

Other authors have argued that women are inherently better at dealing with expressive or emotional issues, whereas men are inherently better at dealing with instrumental or pragmatic issues (Parsons & Bales, 1955). This argument assumes that household tasks and family interactions are predominantly, if not totally expressive, while social tasks are predominantly, if not totally instrumental.

All of these arguments have been used to explain or justify a natural division of labor for men and women.

Anthropological Evidence and Division of Labor by Sex

Anthropologists provide the strongest evidence opposing a natural division of labor between men and women. Friedl (1975) suggests that an economic and social custom theory might be used to better explain division of labor on the basis of sex.

Margaret Mead's early studies of men and women in New Guinea are often used to refute the theories regarding the inherent emotionality of women and instrumentality of men. Mead found that the Arapesh culture socialized its men into the expressive role, while women grew up learning the instrumental roles of the culture. This is an example of a complete reversal of the traditional roles assumed by men and women in American culture. Mead further found that both men and women in the Tchambuli culture were taught to be submissive and emotional, stereotypic female traits in American culture, while both men and women in the Mundugamor culture were taught to be aggressive and unfeeling, stereotypic male qualities in American culture (Weitzman, 1979). Mead's findings tend to dispute a natural predisposition for human beings to behave consistently in one way or another.

Friedl (1975) suggests that usually childbirth and lactation are regulated by tribal custom in order to maintain economic balance in a group. If mothers' work in the fields is necessary to insure group survival, wet nurses and babysitters are provided to fill the child-care roles. This would suggest that it is the expected role of women that determines their childbearing/care activities, rather than these activities determining the role they occupy in their culture (Friedl, 1975).

The argument of male strength as a determinant of male roles has also been disputed by anthropologists. Hammond and Jablow (1976) suggest that few activities actually require brute strength. Even in hunting and gathering societies where one might suspect that bringing home the kill would require great strength, this does not seem to be the case.

Large game animals are tracked by groups of men. Cooperation is necessary if success is to be achieved. Once an animal is located, members of the hunting party take turns chasing it until, after many hours, the animal is exhausted and can be easily killed (Friedl, 1975). Endurance is the quality necessary for hunting large game, not sheer physical strength. Ironically, in a purely biological sense, women have a greater capacity for endurance than do men (Friedl, 1975).

In hunting and gathering societies, social customs regarding meat exchange by males become the determining factor in the division of labor by sex, not physical strength (Friedl, 1975).

Much of what anthropologists have learned from investigating other cultures has been used to argue against the traditional division of labor by sex in American culture. However, disputing natural differences is ineffective given the power of socialization and tradition.

Economics and Traditional Socialization in America

Prior to industrialization in this country, the home was economically independent. Although male/female roles were dichotomized, men and women were equally valued as contributors to the

household production processes (Manning, 1979). Generally, raw products were produced on the land and brought into the home to be processed. Men tended crops and raised animals, while women refined animal products and crops into usable commodities for the family (Tilly & Scott, 1978).

After industrialization, much of the refining was done in factories, not in homes. The family was no longer self-sufficient. Money became necessary as a means of exchange for goods and services. The roles of husbands and wives in middle class families became further dichotomized as men left home for the marketplace and women kept the home fires burning (Tilly & Scott, 1978).

Socialization, in a formal sense, is the teaching of those behaviors that are appropriate for successful functioning in one's society. Since gender is an easy distinction to make, it serves as a basis for behaviors and expectations (Angrist, 1969). Boys are taught that certain behaviors are expected of them and that these are different from those expected of girls.

Since the marketplace was considered to be "no place for a lady" (Tilly & Scott, 1978, p. 17), boys were taught to function there, and girls were taught to function in the home. Proper expectations were based on a strict dichotomization of male/female roles.

Socialization is a powerful influence in the lives of individuals. It is the means by which we assure our worth in a society (Angrist, 1969). In other words, if individuals live up to a society's expectations of them, they will be of value to that society.

Current Socialization Patterns

The influence of traditional sex roles is evident in current socialization patterns. Weitzman (1979) suggests that a culture's ideology experiences a slow rate of change in comparison to a culture's technology and its social patterns. Technological changes can occur relatively rapidly, followed by social adjustments; but traditional beliefs represent individual values and customs and these are less likely to be quickly altered by new technology (Hammond & Jablow, 1976).

Currently in the United States, the majority of young men and women are being socialized to perform according to sex-appropriate behavior. Angrist (1969) suggests that this type of socialization restricts the options of men and women. She further implies that this type of strict blueprint is not practical in dealing with an ever-changing society. Angrist (1969, p. 222) concludes that in reality, "people manage to juggle, avoid, manipulate, interpret the scope of their roles" in order to function in society, and yet, they manage to adhere to a mental concept of what their ideal role should be.

Aneshensel and Rosen (1980) analyzed questionnaire data that were obtained from 32,000 11th and 12th grade students from three New York cities. They wanted to ascertain sex differences in occupational expectations and the assumption of domestic roles. Four variables were measured: (1) status expectations, (2) domestic expectations, (3) sex-role attitudes, and (4) background variables.

Aneshensel and Rosen concluded from these data that for males, a pattern of domestic and occupational role integration is taken for

granted. Most males expected to marry, have families and participate in the labor force. However, most females expected participation in the labor force to be secondary to their domestic role responsibilities. For these females, domestic and occupational role expectations were not integrated.

Tognoli (1979) suggests that sex-role socialization alienates males from the domestic sphere at an early age. Males learn to function away from home; this is seen as preparation for the world of work (Weitzman, 1979). Males come to value the material rewards which they receive for their participation in the workplace; pay-checks, promotions and pension benefits come to be expected. Thomas (1966) asserts that males in American culture receive their self-esteem through the achievement of material rewards. Oakley (1974) expands this idea to suggest that men have a feeling of ambivalence toward domestic roles. Tognoli (1979) feels men may even feel a disdain for domestic roles. Within the traditional definition of the male role, men see no material rewards for their participation in the domestic sphere. Consequently, they do not feel sufficiently valued in these roles.

Male Participation in Household Tasks

Time Diary Research

Research has consistently concluded that women spend more time in household task performance than do men. Vanek (1974) reviewed historical time-budget data for the period from 1920-1970. She was investigating whether or not men's and women's domestic task performance time had been altered with the changes which had taken place

over that 50-year time span. Initially, she hypothesized that as increasing numbers of women entered the labor force, men would assume more responsibility for domestic tasks.

Vanek concluded that husbands did not share the responsibilities of household work. Husbands consistently averaged 1.6 hours per day in household work whether or not their wives were employed.

Subsequent studies have offered slight variations in Vanek's 1974 findings. Nickols (1976) studied longitudinal time use data gathered by the Survey Research Center, University of Michigan from 1968-1973. The sample included 1,156 healthy, intact families with both spouses under the age of 65. Nickols found that traditional sex roles were reflected in the study, but she did note some changes in husbands' time use over the six-year period.

During the first three years of the study, 330 husbands reported they spent time doing housework; by 1973, 399 husbands were contributing to housework. During the six years of the study, husbands' hours per day spent in housework increased slightly, from 1.9 in 1968 to 2.4 in 1973.

In a journal article by Nickols and Metzen (1978), some other aspects of this same longitudinal data were reported. Multiple regression analysis was used to determine the impact of differing factors related to the time husbands and wives spent in housework. Nickols and Metzen reported that when wives' hourly earnings were higher, husbands contributed more to housework. This implies that it is wife's salary, not her employment status, that affects husband's domestic task participation. Nickols and Metzen also reported that

as family size increased, husbands' household task performance decreased, a negative relationship.

In 1976, Walker and Woods reported on time use data that had been obtained in 1967-68 from 1,296 husband/wife families in Syracuse, New York. Data were collected from wives through the use of two, 24-hour time diaries and a questionnaire. Domestic tasks included in the study were management, marketing, clothing, family and house care, and food preparation.

All household members contributed a total of 10.5 hours per day to domestic tasks. Of that time, husbands contributed 14%, approximately one hour and 30 minutes, if their wives were not employed. They contributed approximately one hour and 55 minutes, or 18% of the total time, if their wives were employed (Walker & Woods, 1976).

In a progress report on a 1975 time use study conducted by the University of Michigan Survey Research Center, Robinson (1977a) found that male and female respondents reported a total of 20.5 hours per week in household cleaning and childcare activities. This was nearly five hours less than the 25.4 hours reported in a similar study conducted in 1965. There was an overall decrease of 20% in both activities, with the bulk of that decrease in the area of household cleaning.

Although women assumed responsibility for the bulk of household work, relatively few wives said they wanted their husbands to help more with household chores, "and the demand was not that much greater among employed women than among housewives" (Robinson, 1977a, p. 184).

Later in 1977, Robinson (1977b) again compared these same two data sets. He found that women reported less time in household cleaning and childcare activities in 1975 than in 1965, while men reported increased time in both areas over the ten-year period. Robinson concluded that employed, married men spent 9.0 hours per week in household cleaning and childcare tasks in 1965, compared to 9.7 hours per week in 1975, an increase of approximately 42 minutes per week over a ten-year period.

In 1977, time diaries and questionnaires were used to gather data in 11 states for follow-up research to the 1976 Walker and Woods study. Sanik (1979) compared the 1967 New York data with the 1977 data and found that husbands spent 30 minutes more per day in household tasks in 1977 than in 1967, 2.2 hours compared to 1.7 hours. Sanik also concluded that the husbands studied in the 1977 research had significantly increased their time spent in the non-physical care of family members, compared to those surveyed in 1967.

In 1981, Sanik again compared the 1967 data with the 1977 data, altering her method of analysis. Sanik stratified her sample data based on the age of the younger child and weighted each stratum to conform to the population of two-parent/two-child households in Syracuse, New York. The effect of weighting the data eliminated the significant increase in non-physical care of family members by husbands which Sanik had found in her 1977 analysis (Sanik, 1981).

Berk and Berk (1979) utilized time diaries to study the dynamics of household task contributions by husbands and wives. Their sample included 750 households from cities with populations

of over 50,000. Wives completed a time diary for one weekday, and husbands completed a "retrospect" diary by recalling a previous day's activities. Berk and Berk's study is unique in that their diaries not only included the time spent in various activities, but also the part of the day when the activities occurred.

The researchers concluded that the employment status of a wife had virtually no effect on husband's household task performance during the morning hours of the day. Husbands were most likely to participate in household tasks during the evening. The majority of those husbands who participated in household tasks during the evening were married to women who left for work shortly after the evening meal.

Berk and Berk suggested that it was the time of day that a wife was employed, rather than the employment status itself, which determined whether husbands were more or less likely to participate in household tasks.

A study of husbands' and wives' time use was conducted in Utah by McCullough (1980). Data were collected from 210 two-parent/two-child families through the use of time diaries. McCullough concluded that husbands averaged one hour and 47 minutes per day in household tasks, with the bulk of that time being spent in maintenance of home, yard, car and pets.

Questionnaire Research

Lopata (1971) interviewed 205 housewives in the Chicago area and found that these women assumed major responsibility for stereotypical female domestic tasks including cooking, cleaning, laundry,

and childcare. These women reported that their husbands confined their domestic participation to money matters and bills.

Holmstrom (1972) interviewed 20 professional couples in an effort to determine their household labor patterns. It was determined that hired help usually assumed a share of the wife's traditional task responsibilities. Husbands emptied the trash and did heavy yardwork, and wives cooked dinner and shopped for groceries. Financial tasks were randomly allocated.

The majority of wives were satisfied with current task allocation patterns. Husbands felt that their household task performance was a physical necessity, that it was the only way for tasks to be achieved (Holmstrom, 1972).

Oakley (1974) collected questionnaire data from 40 London housewives between the ages of 20 and 30. The women were asked to rank their husband's participation in housework and childcare, as low, medium, or high. Fifteen percent of the sample responded that husband's share of total amount of housework participation deserved a high ranking, while 25% responded that husband's childcare participation ranked high. Sixty percent of husbands received a low ranking in housework participation and 45% received a low ranking in childcare participation.

Berk (1976) utilized observation and survey methods to investigate household task performance in Evanston, Illinois. Her sample consisted of 329 homemakers who were asked who "generally" did household tasks.

Berk concluded that husbands' major contributions to household tasks were in the area of outside errands, with 54% of husbands accepting the major responsibility for this task. Berk further concluded that wives did more than half of what are traditionally considered to be male tasks, emptying the garbage, going to the gas station, handling financial matters, and paying bills.

As part of a research project on family roles, Nye (1976) surveyed 210 couples in Yakima County, Washington. Separately, husbands and wives completed identical questionnaires which asked about housekeeper role performance. Seventy percent of the husbands felt they should share the performance of household tasks; however, only 56% reported that they actually did share the tasks.

Lovingood and Firebaugh (1978) collected data from 100 couples in four Ohio towns. These couples had recently had their first child. Each member of the couple was asked to respond to 25 identical questions. The purpose of the study was to determine who made and implemented decisions regarding household task performance.

The study concluded that household tasks were divided along traditional lines, with each spouse perceiving him/herself as having more responsibility than did the other spouse. Lovingood and Firebaugh (1978) generally concluded that wives were more responsible than husbands for decision implementation.

In 1981, Wheeler and Arvey used a questionnaire to investigate the division of labor between husbands and wives. Their sample consisted of 68 husband/wife families in a Southeastern city.

The study concluded that liking of household tasks was highly related to assumption of responsibility for the task by both men and women. The husband's attitudes toward women and his educational level were positively related to assumption of non-traditional household tasks. Husband's age and number of years married were positively related to assumption of traditional tasks. Spouses seemed to assume responsibility for non-traditional tasks with consent or expectation of the other spouse (Wheeler & Arvey, 1981).

Support for Male Household Task Performance

As early as 1938, Lawrence K. Frank commented,

As women are sharing with men in the world's work outside the home, the men must learn to share in homemaking and childrearing, not as chores but as occasions for intimacy, the giving and receiving of affection and enjoyment of life together (Frank, 1938, p. 6).

Recent research supports Frank's earlier contention. Pleck (1979) suggests that there is a new "changing roles" perspective available to men with regard to family work. Pleck foresees the possibility of husbands' greater involvement in family work, whereas the traditional male role perspective serves to eliminate any chance for male involvement in the domestic sphere. Pleck concludes that attitudinal changes on the part of husbands will lead to greater male participation in domestic roles. He also sees family and public support for such changes as imperative if males are to take a more active role in family work.

Wheeler and Arvey (1981) also suggest that positive and negative sanctions likely affect whether or not males participate in

domestic tasks. If males feel supported in their household task participation, they are likely to be more active in the domestic sphere.

Lein (1979) conducted intensive interviews with 25 dual-career, Boston-area families in an attempt to understand why husbands weren't participating in domestic tasks in the same proportions as their wives were participating in the labor force. Lein concluded that because husbands' social supports differed from those of their wives, husbands obtained little moral support or logistical help in performing tasks around the house. Lein's research implies that men's social supports for household task performance are deficient. "Men and women tend to experience community reaction and the reaction of the larger society as a pressure against change in the allocation of responsibility and tasks among family members" (Lein, 1979, p. 494).

Berger (1979, p. 642) suggests that "men espousing 'new' family roles, like all human beings standing outside the old social forms and striving to create new ones, need support."

Tognoli (1979) says that we have socialized men away from the home for too long. He suggests that as women participate more actively in the marketplace, men are desiring greater participation in the domestic sphere. If men are to feel rewarded for their participation in family tasks, they must be encouraged to participate in them (Tognoli, 1979).

One of the few attempts to measure expectations in marriage was made in 1950 by Robert Ort. Although the study is dated and methodologically faulty, Ort was able to suggest that expectations

play a significant part in determining behavior in marriage. Ort determined that satisfaction in marriage was a function of playing the role expected for the self, and being encouraged in that role by the expectations of the spouse. Ort's findings imply that husbands who desire participation in household tasks and are supported in that participation by their wives, will be encouraged to continue participating (Ort, 1950).

Lovingood and Firebaugh (1978) measured patterns of household task performance by husbands and wives. Their findings were reported in the previous section of this review of literature; however, they reached one additional conclusion which is pertinent here. They suggest that certain other variables, in addition to socioeconomic variables, might explain why husbands do or do not participate in household tasks. They state that "task performance roles vary as a result of role formation processes" and that these probably influence the "methods by which families allocate human resources to all activities in which family members are involved" (p. 31).

Clark, Nye and Gecas (1978) used a multivariate analysis of survey data from a sample of 390 Seattle couples to measure whether or not husband's paid-work involvement affected participation and/or competence in various marital roles including housekeeper, therapeutic, sexual, and recreation. This study concluded that only the recreation role was significantly reduced by husband's paid-work time. Clark, et al. (1978) suggested that role priorities and expectations are the probable determinants of non-work time use.

Pleck (1977) reviewed the psychology of both traditional and new sex roles and concluded that if men are employed outside the home, they will most likely be limited in the amount of time they spend in household tasks. However, he further concluded that men can learn to participate in the domestic domain, if they are socialized to expect such behaviors of themselves. He suggests that supports for household task performance are needed if men are to acquire such self-expectations.

Effects of Religion on Household Task Performance by Males

There are few data available which have explored the impact of religion on household task performance. However, Nye (1976) suggests that religious affiliation is a variable worth consideration when measuring role performance by husbands and wives.

Miller (1979) studied the attitudes of 210 Utah husbands and wives toward household task allocation. As part of this study, religious activity was considered. Miller found that those husbands and wives who considered themselves to be active in a religion were significantly more traditional in their allocation of household tasks than those who were inactive.

Nye (1976, p. 97) suggests that "religious preference is unrelated to either the norm of role-sharing or enactment of the housekeeper role, but religious participation is related to both." Nye concludes that both men and women who never attend church are likely to adhere to a strong traditional view of role segregation. Nye found a linear relationship between church attendance and household

task performance among men; as church attendance increased, men were more likely to share in the housekeeper role.

The L.D.S. Church and Male Participation in Domestic Roles

The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (L.D.S. or Mormon Church) delineates sex roles along traditional lines. L.D.S. ideology encourages women to spent their time in the homemaker/parent role and assumes men will bear the brunt of responsibility for the breadwinner role (McKay, 1969). This sex-role definition does not, however, imply that husbands are to leave home and family responsibilities solely to the wife.

Olsen (1960) suggests that cultural pressures are significant determinants of the division of labor in households. American culture traditionally has allocated family and household maintenance tasks to women and provider tasks to men. The L.D.S. doctrine advocates traditional sex-role performance, but encourages men to spend their non-work time in home and family roles.

The Mormon home is described as the center of family interaction and religious activity in the lives of L.D.S. faithful (McConkie, 1966). L.D.S. marriages are seen as eternal. Only those husbands and wives who adhere to religious doctrines will be worthy of eternal marriages (McConkie, 1966). Home and family activities are considered to be high priority items according to L.D.S. philosophy (Maxwell, 1972). Family life is perceived as "a constant challenge, not a periodic performance" (Maxwell, 1972, p. 7).

Mormon families are encouraged to participate in family related activities: family reunions (McConkie, 1966); family home evening meetings once a week (Christiansen, 1972); genealogical research for tracing deceased family members (McConkie, 1966); care and upkeep of one's home and yard, and preparation of a year's food supply to ensure family survival in case of war or disaster (Flinders & Flinders, 1973).

Fatherhood is considered to be a valued privilege in the L.D.S. faith. Tanner (1973, p. 92) told L.D.S. men, "The father must realize always that the family is the most important thing in his life. He should never neglect his family."

Mormon husbands and wives are taught to establish "intelligent and well-ordered homes" (Flinders & Flinders, 1973, p. 22). "No other success can compensate for failure in the home" (McKay, 1969, p. 3). Mormon parents are told to share childcare and childrearing responsibilities. "Parents cannot, without regrettable consequences, shirk this responsibility" (Christiansen, 1972, p. 54). It is assumed that children will "learn parenthood as a natural result of living in a home administered by conscientious parents. . . that the functions of living and learning are natural to the home" (Flinders & Flinders, 1973, p. 25).

L.D.S. fathers are consistently asked by their leaders to take an active role in the rearing of children (Perry, 1977). "The father must consistently plan activities with [the children], and make sure that he does share and does have a responsibility in rearing them" (Bradford, 1951, p. 12).

L.D.S. families are told to manage their resources responsibly. They are taught to work together as a family unit and to "set aside sufficient time for family needs" (Perry, 1981, p. 87). "All family members are encouraged to increase homemaking skills and to complete home and car maintenance and repairs whenever feasible," with the ulterior motive of saving money by being more self-sufficient (Perry, 1981, p. 87).

The current leader of the Mormon Church, Spencer Kimball, instructed Priesthood holders, males, 12 years and older, that the Church should never take them away from their home and family responsibilities. "The Church does not and must not seek to displace the family" (Kimball, 1981, p. 45).

In L.D.S. philosophy, there is a strong emphasis on the home and family responsibilities of men. This suggests that men should be involved in all aspects of family life and that their positions within the Church should not interfere with their home and family obligations.

Burr, Ahern and Knowles (1977) studied 1,056 college students at Brigham Young University, owned and operated by the L.D.S. Church, in order to examine the effects of the L.D.S. culture on power relative to resources in marriage relationships. Prior to this study, resources had been found to be the main determinant of power in marriage relationships.

Burr, et al.'s sample was intentionally biased. Ninety-three percent of the students studied were L.D.S. The researchers concluded that the subcultural influence of the L.D.S. religion was

stronger in determining power relationships, than was the amount of resources available to either spouse. This suggested the strong influence of a normative structure in this biased sample.

Berger (1979, p. 643) concluded that "few men espousing new family roles have contact with other men who will support them in their new roles and who will discuss with them the issues that arise as a consequence of these new roles." Active L.D.S. men meet once a week in Priesthood Meetings to receive instructions in the fulfillment of their religious functions. They have an opportunity to discuss issues and problems with one another and to exchange experiences in a supportive atmosphere (McConkie, 1966; Melchizedek Priesthood Personal Study Guide, 1982).

Tognoli (1979, p. 605) suggests that one possible way to encourage male participation in home and family roles is to "keep alive the meaning of home." Home and family are of central importance in L.D.S. doctrine; religion is a way of life for active Mormons rather than merely a once-a-week activity. L.D.S. philosophy is comparable to the Jewish faith as a religion which permeates family living patterns as well as defining deity worship.

Angrist (1969) suggests that individuals will manage to alter their roles in accordance with their self-perceptions, priorities, and self-expectations. The Mormon Church's emphasis on home and family would likely influence the self-perceptions, priorities, and self-expectations of active members of the L.D.S. Church and have an influence on how they perform their roles within the family.

Summary

The literature suggests that there is nothing inherent in a traditional division of labor by sex; however, socialization is a powerful influence in determining who does what in a society.

Clark, Nye and Gecas (1978) suggest that roles compete for scarce time. If a husband's primary role is that of provider, his secondary roles will compete for his non-work time. "Since the resource of time is finite, more time allocated to one domain of productive activity necessarily limits the time allocated to another" (Nickols & Metzen, 1978, p. 95). A husband's priorities become a primary determinant of his non-work time use (Clark, et al., 1978).

If men are to take a more active role in domestic tasks, research suggests they must feel supported for their participation in the household. The Mormon Church offers strong reinforcement for men who participate in home and family activities. One might logically conclude that Mormon men who are highly active in their religion, supposedly those who would follow doctrine closely, would spend more time in household and family activities than L.D.S. men who are less active in their church.

METHODS

Study Design

The data for this study was a subset of the data collected in conjunction with Utah's participation in an eleven-state, family time use study, "An Interstate Comparison of Urban/Rural Families' Time Use." Dr. Kathryn Walker of Cornell University organized the study in 1976. Data collection began in 1977 and extended through 1979.

National Data

Collection of data in Utah was done from May 1977 through July 1978. The project was financed by the Utah Agricultural Experiment Station. Utah participated in the study along with California, Connecticut, Louisiana, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon, Texas, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

Data collection was standardized for all 11 states; however, states were given the option of adding additional questionnaires to the original study. Coding of data was identical in all states in order to facilitate interstate exchange and use of information.

Current Study Data

Selected data from that gathered in Utah was analyzed to relate the religious activity level of males to time allocation in eight specific activities: food preparation, dishwashing, housecleaning, maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, physical care of household

members, non-physical care of household members, organization participation, and social and recreational activities. Organization participation time was also related to household work time.

Church membership and level of religious activity were assessed through the use of a Church Affiliation and Activity Questionnaire.

Sample

National Sample

The Utah sample consisted of 210 two-parent/two-child families from three Utah counties. It is possible that these families had consisted of more than two children or that additional children were born after the study was conducted, but only two children were living at home during the time data were collected. One hundred and five families were from Iron and Washington Counties, considered to be rural areas of the state; and 105 families were from Salt Lake County, which is a densely populated area along the Wasatch Front, the most urbanized area in the state.

Names of the families were randomly drawn from population lists and verified for current addresses and phone numbers in the telephone book. This procedure eliminated families who were not listed in telephone directories, and thus may have biased the sample in that regard. Also, some of the families in the rural areas were contacted directly rather than being drawn at random because of the difficulty in locating a sufficient number of two-parent/two-child families in these areas of the state. The urban sample was more nearly a random sample than was the rural.

The families were stratified according to the age of the younger child. Five levels of stratification were designated as follows:

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.

Current Study Sample

For this study, a subset of the original sample was used. The subjects were the husbands who declared membership and a perceived level of activity in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (L.D.S. or Mormon Church). The sub-sample of the original sample consisted of 149 men.

Instruments

Two instruments were used to gather data for the national study, a time diary (see Appendix A) and an information questionnaire (see Appendix B). These were developed and pretested at Cornell University under the direction of Dr. Kathryn Walker. A questionnaire asking for church affiliation and level of religious activity was included in the information gathered from Utah respondents (see Appendix C).

Time Diary

A time diary is a log of the daily activities of an individual recorded over a specific period of time, usually 24 hours (Szalai, 1972).

"Confidence in collection of data. . . is increased if it is the respondent, rather than a coder, who decides how an activity should be recorded" (Walker, 1979, p. 10). Recording information about time within a short period of its use reduces the possibility of recall biases and exaggeration of socially accepted activities (Robinson, 1977b). Berk (1976) suggests that time diaries provide a way for a researcher to track a respondent without being present.

Reliability. The reliability of time diaries has been substantiated by the congruency found between "yesterday" estimates and "tomorrow" records of time use. Robinson (1977a) cites a .85 correlation (Yule's y) between the two types of time diaries, which indicates that this method of gathering time use data is highly reliable.

Robinson also reports that a systematic relationship was found between diary entries of participation in an activity and estimates of yearly participation in that activity.

Validity. Robinson (1977a & 1977b) cites three approaches used to assess the validity of time diaries. The first approach involved subjects wearing beepers which alerted them at random times during the day. When the beeper sounded, respondents were to record exactly what they were doing. The second method was to have respondents record as much detail as possible for a random hour during the same day that they were keeping a time diary. The third approach was observation through the use of television cameras.

Robinson concluded that despite some discrepancies at the individual level, the overall aggregate activity patterns suggested

by the three approaches used to assess validity were quite similar to those obtained with a time diary.

The time diary used in this study (see Appendix A) was divided horizontally into ten-minute intervals, representing a 24-hour period, and vertically into 18 categories of possible time use.

Church Affiliation and Activity Questionnaire

The Church Affiliation and Activity Questionnaire (see Appendix C) was used to collect data regarding church membership and perceived level of religious activity. It asked, (a) do you belong to a church; (b) if yes, which church do you belong to; and (c) about how active are you?

One benefit of asking study participants to respond directly to a perceived level of religious activity is that "what a person perceives represents reality to him or her" (Wheeler & Arvey, 1981, p. 18). W. I. Thomas (1966) suggests that individual behaviors are usually motivated by self-perceptions. For this reason, a direct-response questionnaire was chosen over some other measure of religious activity such as number of church meetings attended.

Data Collection

Professional interviewers were used to collect the data. A video tape developed at Cornell University was used to train interviewers in all 11 states, the purpose being standardized training. Four interviewers were hired to gather data in the state of Utah, two each for the rural and urban areas.

Walker and Woods (1976) suggest that personal interviews are effective in gathering time use data. Interviews have the potential for obtaining the desired number of completed diaries; they provide an opportunity for the interviewer to explain the purpose of the study and answer any questions; and they are a means of giving clear directions concerning the time diary (Walker & Woods, 1976).

Interviewers contacted the households drawn in the random sample by telephone to determine their eligibility and willingness to participate. Families were considered eligible for the study if their households consisted of two parents and two children living at home. Interviews were conducted over a one-year period and on varying days of the week in the hope of accounting for seasonal and daily variations in time use patterns.

After a family's eligibility for the study was confirmed, an appointment was arranged between the interviewer and the homemaker in each home. In the Utah study, all homemakers were women. The first interview was used to explain the instruments and to help the homemaker complete a time diary by recalling the preceding day's time use. The interviewer then left copies of each questionnaire and a second time diary to be completed by the homemaker the following day. A Church Affiliation and Activity Questionnaire was to be completed by each spouse independently.

Jacobsen and Moore (1981) suggest that much research has been biased in the past by asking one spouse to record information about the other spouse. Researchers assume this information is accurate and do not take into account the power of differing perceptions by

individuals about the behaviors of others. For this reason, the homemakers were asked to check the accuracy of the time diaries with the spouse and children. One other safeguard exists in this type of information recording; accounts were made of actual activities, as opposed to a record of a more abstract phenomenon, such as thoughts or feelings.

Berk (1980) suggests that wives are usually the recorders of time diary information because it is usually the wife who is most aware of the time use patterns of all family members. When both spouses have been asked to record information in time diaries, researchers have often found considerable differences between the two reports. This has routinely been defined as a methodological problem.

Berk concludes that researchers often debate the pros and cons of both kinds of reporting. While some conclude that there is a need to enhance spousal agreement through reliance on more detailed survey items, others argue that the "issue of spousal discrepancies reflects the multifaceted nature of family realities and perceptions" (Berk, 1980, p. 192).

If one can assume that homemakers followed instructions by asking their spouses to confirm the time use reports, one can also assume that some type of reasonable consensus was reached as to the reality of the reports.

The interviewer returned on the third day to collect the diaries and questionnaires and to answer any questions the family members may have had regarding the study. The diaries and questionnaires were then forwarded to the researcher at Utah State University for checking, coding, and analysis.

Scoring of Responses

The responses computed for each respondent included (1) their perceived level of religious activity (RAC) and (2) the actual amount of time contributed to household tasks, organization participation, and social and recreational activities as measured by the time diary.

The measure of respondents' level of religious activity in the L.D.S. Church was taken from question three of the Church Affiliation and Activity Questionnaire. The question asked, "About how active are you?" A code of one (1) indicated inactive or not very active; two (2), active; and three (3), very active.

The time diary was the basis for computing how much time was allocated to various tasks by the respondents. The total amount of time spent accomplishing tasks was computed for each 24-hour period recorded. For all analyses, time spent in the categories under consideration was an average of the recall day and the record day. "The average of day 1 and day 2 for households of specified compositions represents a more valid measure of time use by depicting 2/7 of a week rather than 1/7 of a week" (Sanik, 1979, p. 210).

For this study, time allocated to eight activities was considered. Household activities included food preparation, dishwashing, house-cleaning, maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, and physical and non-physical care of household members. The time allocated to organization participation and to social and recreational activities was also considered.

The amount of time allocated to household tasks was analyzed in two ways; (1) the average amount of time spent in each household task

for the two-day period (2) the average total amount of time spent in all six household tasks.

Statistical Analysis

Three statistical measures were used to analyze the data for this study: analysis of variance, correlation and multiple regression. For all analyses, the significance level was set at .05.

An analysis of variance (ANOVA) is used to test "whether the differences among sample means are large enough to imply that the corresponding population means are different" (Ott, 1977, p. 354). It is a commonly used test for count data. It measures any significant difference between group means and where that difference lies. Differences between the sample means are judged statistically significant by comparing them to the variation within the samples.

In this study, ANOVA was used to analyze hypotheses 1-9. Respondents were grouped according to their level of religious activity. Mean minutes allocated to household tasks, social and recreational activities, and organization participation were compared between and within groups.

Correlation is a measure of linear relationship; it refers to the degree to which two variables move uniformly with respect to one another (Weinburg & Schumaker, 1974). Correlation makes no assumptions regarding cause/effect relationships. The correlation coefficient is a measure of the strength and direction of linear relationships between variables. Strength is measured from -1.0 to 1.0; the closer to an absolute value of 1, the stronger the relationship.

The direction of the relationship can be positive or negative. A positive relationship occurs when either an increase or decrease in the independent variable is accompanied by a corresponding increase or decrease in the dependent variable. A negative relationship occurs when the independent and dependent variables vary in opposite directions.

The correlation coefficient used in this study was The Pearson Product Moment Coefficient. This test is considered appropriate for interval or ratio data. An interval or ratio variable is present when a unit of measurement exists; a zero point on the scale corresponds to an absence of the variable being measured. Any real number may result from the act of measurement, and differences between scores reflect on the differences in the amount of the characteristic possessed (Glass & Stanley, 1970). The time diary measures fit the requirements for use of The Pearson Product Moment Coefficient.

Correlation was used to analyze hypotheses 10-16. The independent variable was time spent in organization participation and the dependent variable was the amount of time spent in household activities.

"Multiple regression has been called a general method of data analysis when there is one dependent variable" (Kerlinger, 1979, p. 173). It is a multivariate or "many variables" approach to statistical analysis, which is important in science because "it has become common knowledge among . . . scientists that almost any phenomenon has many determinants and not just one or two" (Kerlinger, 1979, p. 159).

Multiple regression analysis allows the researcher to talk about the amount of variance in a dependent variable due to or accounted for by other variables. Through the use of a statistical equation, multiple regression parcels out the effect some independent variables share on a dependent variable, as well as the unique effect of any single independent variable on a dependent variable. The equation determines these combined and separate effects and weights each independent variable to conform to reality as predicted by the researcher (Kerlinger, 1979).

Ideally, the use and interpretation of multiple regression analysis express the magnitude of the relation between, on the one hand, the best possible combination of all the independent variables and, on the other hand, the dependent variable. "Multiple regression analysis always yields an index of the maximum amount of variance of Y accounted for by all the X's" (Kerlinger, 1979, p. 171).

In this study, Y or the dependent variable was all time allocated to household work by the L.D.S. husbands sampled. Nine X's or independent variables were considered including age of younger child, level of religious activity, wife's hours of paid employment, husband's hours of paid employment, husband's social and recreational time, husband's organization participation time, annual household income, whether husband's household task performance time was measured on a weekday or a weekend day, and whether the respondents were from a rural or urban area of the state.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sample Description

A sub-sample of Utah's sample for the "Interstate Comparison of Urban/Rural Families' Time Use" study was used in this research. The original sample consisted of 210 two-parent/two-child households in Utah. One hundred and five households were located in rural areas of the state, and 105 in an urban area. The sample for the current study consisted of the 149 husbands from these households who were members of The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (L.D.S. or Mormon Church).

The sample used in this research did not constitute a random sample of either all Utah households, or all Utah L.D.S. households, but several similarities between Utah's population and the sample used in the current research were found.

The Utah population, as of the 1980 U.S. Census, was 1,461,037 (U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1980a). Of that total, approximately 1,026,000, or 70% of Utah residents belonged to the L.D.S. Church (Cahill, 1982). Four-person households generally represent Utah families. The average household size in Utah is 3.20 persons, while the average family size in Utah is 3.67 persons (U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1980b). The average Mormon household in Utah contains 4.6 people (Mims, 1982).

Of the 149 men studied, 82 (55%) were from Iron and Washington counties, rural areas of the state, and 67 (45%) were from Salt Lake County, the most urbanized area in the state. According to the 1980 Census, approximately 84% of the total Utah population live in urban areas and 16% live in rural areas of the state (U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1980b). Although the geographical distribution of the sample was not representative of the total Utah population, it was indicative of Utah's L.D.S. population. Slightly more than half of Utah's L.D.S. population live in rural, as opposed to urban areas of the state (Cahill, 1982).

Demographic data which describe the sample used in the current study will be reported, particularly information which might be useful in understanding the research results.

Church Activity

Respondents were asked to state their level of activity in the L.D.S. Church. More than 40% of the respondents identified themselves as "very active" in the Church (Table 1), while the remainder of respondents were almost equally divided between "inactive or not very active" and "active." "Statistics show that less than half (of Utah Mormons), about 40-45%, are active members" (Mims, 1982, p. 6B).

Church Membership of Spouse

The majority of respondents were married to women who were also members of the Mormon Church. Of the 149 husbands, 142 had wives who belonged to the L.D.S. Church and two men had wives who were not members. Five wives did not state a religious affiliation.

Table 1
Church Activity Level

	Number	Percent
Inactive or not very active	40	26.8
Active	44	29.6
Very active	65	43.6
TOTAL	149	100.0

Age

Respondents ranged in age from 22 to 57. There are no figures available to the general public on the ages of Utah's L.D.S. males; however, the 1980 U.S. Census for Utah found that approximately 22% of the total Utah population was males in the age range from 22 to 59 (U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1980a). The mean age for respondents was 33.78 years with a standard deviation of 8.43 years (Table 2).

Table 2
Age of Husbands

	Number	Percent	Cum. Percent
22-29	53	35.5	35.5
30-39	54	36.3	71.8
40-49	27	18.2	90.0
50-57	8	5.3	95.3
Missing	7	4.7	100.0
TOTAL	149	100.0	100.0

Education

The educational levels of respondents ranged from grade school through doctorates and professional degrees (Table 3). Approximately 95% (142) of the husbands had completed high school. The 1980 U.S. Census data for Utah states that 80.3% of Utah residents over the age of 25 are high school graduates (U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1980b).

Table 3
Educational Level of Husbands

	Number	Percent	Cum. Percent
Grade School (1-8)	2	1.3	1.3
Partial High School (9-11)	5	3.4	4.7
High School Diploma	42	28.2	32.9
Vocational or Technical Training	5	3.4	36.3
Partial College, no degree	43	28.9	65.2
Associate's Degree	3	2.0	67.2
Bachelor's Degree	34	22.7	89.9
Master's Degree	8	5.4	95.3
Doctorate	2	1.3	96.6
Professional Degree	5	3.4	100.0
TOTAL	149	100.0	100.0

Employment

All but two of the husbands reported an occupation. More than 45% of the men were craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers or professional, technical, and kindred workers. The occupations which employed the fewest men were clerical and service (Table 4).

Table 4
Occupation of Husbands

	Number	Percent	Cum. Percent
Service workers	6	4.0	4.0
Laborers	10	6.8	10.8
Operatives	21	14.1	24.9
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	35	23.5	48.4
Clerical	2	1.3	49.7
Sales workers	19	12.8	62.5
Managers, administrators	19	12.8	75.3
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	35	23.5	98.8
Full-time homemakers	0	0	98.8
Full-time student or disabled	2	1.2	100.0
TOTAL	149	100.0	100.0

Participants were asked to record in the questionnaire the usual number of hours worked for pay each week. Husbands averaged 45.1 hours of paid work each week with a standard deviation of 9.78 hours

per week (Table 5). According to the 1980 U.S. Census data for Utah, 85% of Utah males over the age of 16 and in the labor force in 1979 usually worked 35 or more hours per week (U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1980b).

Table 5
Husbands' Hours of Employment

	Number	Percent	Cum. Percent
15-29	1	.7	.7
30-44	86	57.7	58.4
45+	58	38.9	97.3
No hours given	4	2.7	100.0
TOTAL	149	100.0	100.0

Sixty percent of the respondents' wives reported that they were full-time homemakers, while approximately 40% reported being employed outside the home. Approximately 34-39% of all L.D.S. married women throughout the world are employed outside the home (Cahill, 1982). In the current study, working wives tended to be employed in the traditional female occupations of clerical workers, sales workers, or service workers (Table 6).

When asked to record the usual number of hours worked for pay each week, working wives reported an average of 21.9 hours of employment per week, with a standard deviation of 12.94 hours per week (Table 7). The 1980 U.S. Census for Utah found that 40% of Utah

females over the age of 16 and in the labor force in 1979 usually worked 35 hours or less per week (U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1980b).

Table 6
Occupation of Wives

	Number	Percent	Cum. Percent
Service workers	12	8.1	8.1
Laborers	0	0	8.1
Operatives	3	2.0	10.1
Craftsmen, foremen, and kindred workers	2	1.3	11.4
Clerical	19	12.8	24.2
Sales workers	14	9.4	33.6
Managers, administrators	2	1.3	34.9
Professional, technical, and kindred workers	7	4.7	39.6
Full-time homemakers	90	60.4	100.0
TOTAL	149	100.0	100.0

Household Income

The respondents were asked to indicate their total household income, before taxes, for the previous 12 months. The reported incomes ranged from under \$5,999 to over \$50,000. The median income for the households studied was in the \$15,000-\$19,999 range (Table 8). This is in line with the 1980 U.S. Census data for Utah which reported the median annual household income for Utah as \$17,713

Table 7
Wives' Hours of Employment

	Number	Percent	Cum. Percent
1-35	44	29.5	29.5
35+	15	10.1	39.6
Full-time homemakers	90	60.4	100.0
TOTAL	149	100.0	100.0

(U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1980b). The mean annual household income for the state was \$20,649 and the annual per capita income was \$6,418 (U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1980b).

Husbands' Household Work Time

In this study, household work included time spent in food preparation, dishwashing, housecleaning, maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, and physical and non-physical care of household members.

The Utah husbands studied allocated an average of 74.8 minutes, or one hour and 15 minutes per day to the six household tasks. Total time spent in household task performance varied from no time at all to five or more hours per day. Ten of the 149 husbands allocated no time to household tasks, while four of the 149 husbands spent five or more hours per day doing household work. Table 9 summarizes husbands' household work time.

Of the six household tasks considered, husbands allocated the greatest amount of time to maintenance of home, yard, car and pets,

Table 8
Household Income

	Number	Percent	Cum. Percent
Under \$5,999	3	2.1	2.1
\$6,000-\$7,499	5	3.4	5.5
\$7,500-\$9,999	15	10.1	15.6
\$10,000-\$11,999	18	12.1	27.7
\$12,000-\$14,999	29	19.5	47.2
\$15,000-\$19,999	38	25.5	72.7
\$20,000-\$24,999	20	13.4	86.1
\$25,000-\$49,999	16	10.7	96.8
\$50,000 and over	2	1.2	98.0
Don't know, not given	3	2.0	100.0
TOTAL	149	100.0	100.0

Table 9
Husbands' Time Spent Doing Household Work

Time per day	Number	Percent
0	10	6.6
1 min.-59 min.	66	44.3
1 hr.-1 hr. 59 min.	32	21.5
2 hrs.-2 hrs. 59 min.	19	12.8
3 hrs.-3 hrs. 59 min.	14	9.4
4 hrs.-4 hrs. 59 min.	4	2.7
5 hrs.-5 hrs. 59 min.	4	2.7
TOTAL	149	100.0

averaging 38.3 minutes per day. The husbands studied allocated the least amount of time to dishwashing and housecleaning. Table 10 summarizes husbands' household task performance time.

These results resemble previous time diary studies of husbands' household work time. Although prior studies have defined household work in various ways, it has been generally concluded that husbands spend approximately one to two hours per day doing housework. Vanek (1974) found that husbands averaged 1.6 hours per day in household work. Nickols (1976), who analyzed longitudinal data, reported a slight change in husbands' household work time over a six-year period, from 1.9 hours per day in 1968 to 2.4 hours per day in 1973. Walker and Woods (1976) reported husbands' daily contribution to housework as approximately one hour and 45 minutes.

Table 10
Husbands' Mean Minutes Per Day in
Household Tasks

Task	Minutes per day	
	Mean	S.D.*
Food Preparation	4.7	8.77
Dishwashing	2.2	6.26
Housecleaning	2.8	12.82
Maintenance of home, yard, car and pets	38.3	64.69
Physical care of household members	11.2	22.17
Non-physical care of household members	15.7	26.96
TOTAL household work time	74.8	76.05

*Large standard deviations are characteristic of time use studies.

Robinson (1977b) reported husbands' household work time as approximately 1.4 hours per day; and Sanik (1979) found that husbands allocated approximately 2.2 hours per day to household task performance. The results of the current study seem to support past conclusions that husbands average approximately one to two hours per day in household task performance.

Hypotheses

For all statistical analyses the level of significance was set at .05. Analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to analyze the first

nine hypotheses which compared mean minutes allocated daily to various activities by three groups. The three groups were defined based on respondents' level of religious activity. Activities included household tasks, social and recreational activities, and organization participation. Operational definitions for all activities are in Appendix D.

No research could be found which related actual perceived level of religious activity to time use patterns based on time diary studies. For this reason it is difficult to compare the findings of this study with other research data.

Hypotheses 1-9

1. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to food preparation by husbands' level of religious activity (RAC).

For this study, respondents were divided into three groups based on their level of religious activity. Forty men indicated they were inactive or not very active in the L.D.S. Church, 44 men were active, and 65 men were very active.

Food preparation was defined as "all tasks relating to the preparation of food for meals, snacks, and future use, including time spent setting the table and serving the food" (Appendix D).

There were no significant differences in the amount of time spent in food preparation by the groups of husbands. Table 11 summarizes the data.

The calculated F value for the analysis was .428. The probability of that F value occurring by chance was .6527; therefore the hypothesis was rejected. There was not a statistically significant

Table 11
Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Food Preparation
by Husbands' Level of Religious Activity

	N	Mean Minutes	S.D.
Inactive or not very active	40	4.5	9.22
Active	44	3.9	7.18
Very active	65	5.4	9.50

Table 12
 Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of
 Religious Activity and Mean Minutes
 Per Day Spent in Food Preparation

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between groups	2	66.3304	33.1652	0.428	0.6527
Within Groups	146	11315.2961	77.5020		
TOTAL	148	11381.6270			

difference in food preparation time by level of religious activity (Table 12).

2. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to dishwashing by husbands' RAC.

Dishwashing was defined as "washing and drying dishes, loading and unloading dishwasher or dish-drainer, after-meal cleanup of table, leftovers, kitchen equipment and refuse" (Appendix D).

Dishwashing was the household task in which respondents spent the least amount of time, an average of 2.2 minutes per day for all husbands (Table 13).

Table 13
Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Dishwashing by
Husbands' Level of Religious Activity

	N	Mean Minutes	S.D.
Inactive or not very active	40	3.0	6.36
Active	44	1.4	3.94
Very active	65	2.2	7.39

There were no significant differences in the mean minutes per day spent in dishwashing by the three groups of men. The calculated F value for the ANOVA was .713 with the probability of that value occurring by chance being .4918, which is substantially larger than .05. The hypothesis was rejected (Table 14).

3. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to housecleaning by husbands' RAC.

Table 14
 Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of
 Religious Activity and Mean Minutes
 Per Day Spent in Dishwashing

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between groups	2	56.1084	28.0542	0.713	0.4918
Within groups	146	5744.1429	39.3434		
TOTAL	148	5800.2515			

Housecleaning was defined as "any regular or periodic cleaning of house and appliances, including such tasks as: mopping, vacuuming, sweeping, dusting, waxing, washing windows or walls, cleaning the refrigerator or freezer, making beds, and putting rooms in order" (Appendix D).

Husbands spent an average of 2.8 minutes per day doing housecleaning activities. Table 15 implies a directional pattern between religious activity and housecleaning; the less religiously active husbands were, the more time they spent in housecleaning tasks. However, the minutes spent by all groups were so few that any conclusions drawn would be meaningless.

Table 15
Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Housecleaning by
Husbands' Level of Religious Activity

	N	Mean Minutes	S.D.
Inactive or not very active	40	4.4	21.63
Active	44	3.2	9.49
Very active	65	1.5	5.57

The F value calculated for the ANOVA was .657 and the F probability was .5201, greater than .05. The hypothesis was rejected (Table 16).

4. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to maintenance of home, yard, car and pets by husbands' RAC.

Maintenance of home, yard, car and pets was defined in four parts: "(1) any repair and upkeep of house, appliances, and furnishings, (2) daily and periodic care of outside areas, (3) maintenance and care of

Table 16
 Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of
 Religious Activity and Mean Minutes
 Per Day Spent in Housecleaning

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between groups	2	216.7406	108.3703	0.657	0.5201
Within groups	146	24097.7194	165.0529		
TOTAL	148	24314.4590			

family motor vehicles, (4) feeding and care of house pets, including trips to kennel or veterinarian" (Appendix D).

Despite the fact that all respondents allocated most of their household work time to this category, an average of 38.3 minutes per day, no significant differences were found when comparing mean minutes spent in this task by husbands' level of religious activity (Table 17).

Table 17
Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Maintenance
of Home, Yard, Car and Pets by Husbands'
Level of Religious Activity

	N	Mean Minutes	S.D.
Inactive or not very active	40	31.8	50.38
Active	44	46.4	63.35
Very active	65	36.9	73.22

The calculated F value was .558. The probability of that F value occurring by chance was .5735, greater than .05; therefore, the hypothesis was rejected (Table 18).

5. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to physical care of household members by husbands' RAC.

Physical care of household members was defined as "all activities related to physical care of household members other than self, such as bathing, feeding, dressing and other personal care; first aid or bedside care; taking household members to doctor, dentist, barber" (Appendix D).

Table 18
 Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious
 Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in
 Maintenance of Home, Yard, Car and Pets

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between groups	2	4699.2373	2349.6187	0.558	0.5735
Within groups	146	614680.1797	4210.1382		
TOTAL	148	619379.4375			

Husbands' amount of time spent in physical care of household members increased as their level of religious activity increased, but not at a statistically significant level (Table 19). Very active L.D.S. husbands allocated twice as much time per day to the physical care of household members as did inactive or not very active Mormon husbands, but the calculated F value for all groups was 1.537 with a probability of .2185, which indicates that the difference in time allocated to physical care of household members by level of religious activity was not statistically significant. The hypothesis was rejected (Table 20).

Table 19
Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Physical Care of
Household Members by Husbands' Level
of Religious Activity

	N	Mean Minutes	S.D.
Inactive or not very active	40	7.0	14.03
Active	44	9.9	20.70
Very active	65	14.5	26.55

6. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to non-physical care of household members by husbands' RAC.

Non-physical care of household members was defined as "all activities related to the social and educational development of household members, such as playing with children, teaching, talking, helping children with homework, reading aloud, chauffeuring and/or

Table 20
 Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious
 Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in
 Physical Care of Household Members

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between groups	2	1499.2827	749.6414	1.537	0.2185
Within groups	146	71219.7427	487.8065		
TOTAL	148	72719.0234			

accompanying children to social and educational activities, attending functions involving your child" (Appendix D).

Although respondents spent more time in non-physical care of household members than they did in physical care of household members, there was not a statistically significant difference in time allocated to non-physical care of household members by husbands' level of religious activity (Table 21). The calculated F value was 1.181 with a probability of .3098. The hypothesis was rejected (Table 22).

Table 21
Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Non-physical Care
of Household Members by Husbands' Level
of Religious Activity

	N	Mean Minutes	S.D.
Inactive or not very active	40	10.8	23.25
Active	44	19.8	32.08
Very active	65	15.9	25.17

7. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to traditional and non-traditional household work by husbands' RAC.

Traditional and non-traditional household work included time spent in food preparation, dishwashing, housecleaning, maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, and physical and non-physical care of household members.

Table 22
 Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious
 Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in
 Non-physical Care of Household Members

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between groups	2	1713.0442	856.5221	1.181	0.3098
Within groups	146	105869.8457	725.1359		
TOTAL	148	107582.8906			

Those husbands who were active in the L.D.S. Church allocated more time to household work than either inactive or not very active husbands or very active husbands, but the differences between the three groups were not statistically significant (Table 23). The calculated F value for the ANOVA was .988 with a probability of .3748. The hypothesis was rejected (Table 24).

Table 23
Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Traditional and
Non-traditional Household Work by Husbands'
Level of Religious Activity

	N	Mean Minutes	S.D.
Inactive or not very active	40	61.4	62.72
Active	44	84.5	70.00
Very active	65	76.5	86.65

8. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to social and recreational activities by husbands' RAC.

Social and recreational activities were defined as "reading; watching TV; listening to music; 'going out'; participating in a sport, hobby or craft; taking a class for personal interest; talking or corresponding with friends or relatives; physical activity for pleasure; entertaining at home or being entertained away from home; playing games, musical instruments, etc." (Appendix D).

The respondents averaged 223.7 minutes per day in social and recreational activities, with a standard deviation of 127.55

Table 24
 Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious
 Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in
 Traditional and Non-traditional
 Household Work

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between groups	2	11432.6218	5716.3110	0.988	0.3748
Within groups	146	844634.3906	5785.1670		
TOTAL	148	856067.0000			

minutes per day (Table 25). Very active L.D.S. husbands spent about 20 more minutes per day in social and recreational activities than did inactive or not very active, or active husbands; however, no statistically significant patterns emerged. The calculated F value was .397 with a probability of .6727. Based on these statistics, the hypothesis was rejected (Table 26).

Table 25
Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Social and
Recreational Activities by Husbands'
Level of Religious Activity

	N	Mean Minutes	S.D.
Inactive or not very active	40	216.3	110.75
Active	44	214.7	111.05
Very active	65	234.3	147.18

9. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to organization participation by husbands' RAC.

Organization participation was defined as "attending and participating in religious activities and services, civic and political organizations, and other clubs and organizations" (Appendix D).

As was expected, there was a statistically significant difference between husbands' level of religious activity and their organization participation time, since the definition of organization participation included attendance and participation in religious activities (Table 27).

Table 26
 Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious
 Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in
 Social and Recreational Activities

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between groups	2	13040.2866	6520.1431	0.397	0.6727
Within groups	146	2394866.5938	16403.1953		
TOTAL	148	2407907.0000			

Table 27
 Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in Organization
 Participation by Husbands' Level
 of Religious Activity

	N	Mean Minutes	S.D.
Inactive or not very active	40	6.7	16.65
Active	44	20.2	47.16
Very active	65	89.8	108.20

The average amount of time per day spent in organization participation by all respondents was 46.9 minutes with a standard deviation of 85.08 minutes. Since the organization participation time of very active L.D.S. husbands was nearly double the mean organization participation time for all L.D.S. husbands, it might be safe to assume that the very active L.D.S. husbands in this study spent a large share of their organization participation time in church participation rather than in civic, political or club participation.

The calculated F value for the ANOVA was 18.401 with a .000 probability. The hypothesis was accepted (Table 28).

Hypotheses 10-16

Pearson's Product Moment Correlation was used to analyze hypotheses 10 through 16. These hypotheses stated a linear relationship between minutes per day spent in organization participation and minutes per day allocated to six household tasks and to all household

Table 28
 Analysis of Variance of Husbands' Level of Religious
 Activity and Mean Minutes Per Day Spent in
 Organization Participation

Source	D.F.	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between groups	2	215680.8967	107840.4453	18.401	0.0000
Within groups	146	855654.3506	5860.6460		
TOTAL	148	1071335.2500			

work. Organization participation time was used to relate religious involvement to household work time.

There is little research which considers religion and household task performance by males. For this reason, comparisons of this study's findings and previous data are difficult. The results of hypotheses 10 through 16 are summarized in Table 29.

10. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' organization participation time (OPT) and the amount of time spent in food preparation.

There was not a linear relationship between husbands' organization participation time (OPT) and the amount of time they spent in food preparation. The Pearson's r was .07447 with a significance level of .18335. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

11. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in dishwashing.

A linear relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time they allocated to dishwashing was not established. The Pearson's r was .11082 with a significance level of .08924. The hypothesis was rejected.

12. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in housecleaning.

The hypothesis was rejected because there was not a linear relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of their time allocated to housecleaning. The Pearson's r for these two variables was -.00987 with a significance level of .45247.

13. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in maintenance of home, yard, car and pets.

The linear relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time they allocated to maintenance of home, yard, car and pets was significant, but weak. The Pearson's r was $-.20723$, indicating a weak relationship. The level of significance for this relationship was $.00561$ which is less than $.05$ and thus significant. The hypothesis was accepted.

Miller (1979) used this same Utah sample in her research, but included all men who listed a religion and grouped them as either inactive or active in their religion. Using an attitude questionnaire, not time use data, she found that husbands who considered themselves to be active in a religion were significantly more traditional in their household task performance than those who were inactive in a religion. Since maintenance of home, yard, car and pets is a traditionally male household task, it's interesting that the husbands in this study would increase a traditionally male household task as they decreased their religious activity. This finding conflicts with Miller's conclusions. However, given only 24 hours in a day, it would be difficult for men to allocate time to both organization participation and traditionally male household tasks, even though they may desire to do so. Also, organization participation in this study included participation in organizations other than church. Consequently, any conclusions drawn from the discrepancies between Miller's 1979 data and the current study should be drawn cautiously.

14. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in physical care of household members.

There was not a linear relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time they allocated to physical care of household members. The Pearson's r was $-.01142$ at a significance level of $.44505$. The hypothesis was rejected.

15. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in non-physical care of household members.

There was not a linear relationship between husbands' OPT and the time they spent in non-physical care of household members. The Pearson's r was $.04905$ at a significance level of $.27626$. Therefore the hypothesis was rejected.

16. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in traditional and non-traditional household work.

As was hypothesized, a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time they allocated to all household work emerged. The Pearson's r was $-.14616$ with a significance level of $.03765$, establishing a weak but statistically significant relationship. The hypothesis was accepted.

These findings differ from Nye's 1976 questionnaire research in which he found a positive and statistically significant relationship between husbands' household task performance and their religious participation. Nye found that husbands' household work increased as their religious participation increased, suggesting that husbands in Nye's research were scheduling time for both religious participation

Table 29
 Summary of Correlation Statistics for Relationships
 Between Organization Participation Time and
 Household Work Time

	Pearson's r	Significance Level*
Food preparation	.07447	.18335
Dishwashing	.11082	.08924
Housecleaning	-.00987	.45247
Maintenance of home, yard, car and pets	-.20723	.00561
Physical care of house- hold members	-.01142	.44505
Non-physical care of household members	.04905	.27626
TOTAL household work	-.14616	.03765

*alpha = .05

and household task performance. However, because Nye's research was based on questionnaire data, it's difficult to compare it with the current study. Another possible explanation for the discrepancy between the current research and Nye's 1976 study may be the fact that, in this study, organization participation included other activities besides religious participation.

Further Analysis

In an effort to better understand which variable or combination of variables had the greatest effect on the amount of time respondents

allocated to all household work, a multiple regression analysis was completed. Eight independent variables were considered, first, for household work time measured on a weekend day, and then reconsidered for household work time measured on a weekday. The eight independent variables included age of younger child, level of religious activity, wife's hours of paid employment, husband's hours of paid employment, husband's social and recreational time, husband's organization participation time, annual household income, and whether the respondents were from a rural or urban area of the state. Dummy variables were created for the three categorical variables considered, annual household income, level of religious activity, and rural or urban residence.

The level of significance for the analyses was set at .05. No statistically significant findings emerged from either multiple regression analysis.

Variance in husbands' household work time on weekend days explained in the regression analysis ranged from 11% with a standard error of 101.30%, to 28% with a standard error of 96.21%. A combination of four independent variables accounted for 28% of the variance in total household work time by husbands on weekend days. The four variables included level of religious activity, husband's social and recreational time, husband's hours of paid employment, and whether respondents were from a rural or urban area of the state.

Although these findings seem logical, in that most husbands' hours of paid employment might decrease on a weekend, making more time available for, in this case, social and recreational activities,

the explanation of variance by the combination of the four variables mentioned above, was not statistically significant. The calculated F value was 1.96172, but the critical F value was 2.62 (see Table 30).

Variance in husbands' household work time on weekdays explained by the regression analysis ranged from .01% with a standard error of 93%, to 20% with a standard error of 90%. The amount of variance in husbands' household work time on weekdays was difficult to account for using a multiple regression analysis. All eight variables under consideration combined to explain 20% of the variance in the dependent variable. It was difficult to recognize any variable or combination of variables which accounted for a substantial portion of the 20% of variance explained by the multiple regression analysis. On weekdays, variations in husbands' household work time were not significantly explained by the eight variables considered in the analysis. The calculated F value was 1.45194, but the critical F value was 1.75 (see Table 31).

Table 30
 Multiple Regression Analysis for Husbands'
 Household Work Time on Weekend Days

Analysis of Variance D.F.		Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F*	Critical F
Regression	5	90798.47768	18159.69554	1.96172	2.62
Residual	25	231425.71586	9257.02863		

Multiple R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error
0.53084	0.28179	0.13814	96.21345

*alpha = .05

Table 31
 Multiple Regression Analysis for Husbands'
 Household Work Time on Weekdays

Analysis of Variance D.F.		Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F*	Critical F
Regression	17	199460.34510	11732.99089	1.45194	1.75
Residual	100	308090.34982	8080.90350		

Multiple R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Standard Error
0.44493	0.19797	0.06162	89.89387

*alpha = .05

CONCLUSIONS

Summary

The purpose of the current study was to analyze 149 Utah L.D.S. husband/fathers' time spent in various activities by their perceived level of religious activity, and to relate their organization participation time to their household work time.

The philosophy of the L.D.S. Church strongly suggests that active, married, male members' first responsibility is to their homes and families (Tanner, 1973). It was assumed that self-perceptions of increased religious activity implied increased adherence to L.D.S. philosophy and consequently, a high level of religious activity would indicate increased involvement in home and family activities.

Analysis of variance was used to analyze the differences in mean minutes per day spent in various tasks by husbands' level of religious activity. Husbands were divided into three groups according to their perceived level of activity in the Mormon Church; "inactive or not very active," "active," and "very active."

There were no significant differences in the amounts of time husbands allocated to food preparation, dishwashing, housecleaning, maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, physical care of household members, non-physical care of household members, all household work or social and recreational activities, by their level of religious activity.

There was a significant difference in the amount of time husbands allocated to organization participation by their level of religious activity. Organization participation was a classification of time use which included participation in religious activities. As was hypothesized, husbands' time allocated to this activity increased significantly as their perceived level of religious activity increased.

The Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to analyze husbands' minutes per day spent in organization participation and their minutes per day spent in various household tasks and in all household work. It was assumed that organization participation time would reflect husbands' time spent in religious activities. Very active L.D.S. husbands averaged approximately twice as much time in organization participation as did all respondents.

It was hypothesized that time spent in organization participation would be negatively related to time spent in household work, which suggested that L.D.S. husbands who were active in religious functions would be unavailable to fulfill their home and family responsibilities, since there are only 24 hours in a day.

There were no significant relationships between husbands' organization participation time and the time they allocated to food preparation, dishwashing, housecleaning, physical care of household members, or non-physical care of household members. There were weak, negative, significant relationships between husbands' organization participation time and time allocated to maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, and to total household work. These results suggest that as husbands decreased their organization participation time they increased their

time allocated to maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, and to all household work (see Table 32).

Implications

Although only three statistically significant findings emerged from the current study, several implications can be suggested.

It's difficult to know how religious activity was perceived by the respondents. When subjects marked themselves as very active, they may have interpreted that to mean acceptance of religious ideology, increased participation in church activities, or both. It was assumed that increased activity in the L.D.S. religion would include increased adherence to the Mormon ideology, which strongly advocates an active role for husband/fathers in home and family obligations.

The study's first significant finding was that increased activity in the L.D.S. Church was related to increased organization participation, which included attendance and participation in religious activities. This suggested that respondents perceived their level of religious activity as involving increased time spent in religious services and functions.

The suggestion that each respondent may have perceived religious activity differently than every other respondent implies that each respondent may also perceive his religious ideology differently from other members of his church. Differing interpretations and perceptions of L.D.S. philosophy may greatly affect the ways in which L.D.S. members allocate their time. To some, home and family

Table 32
Summary of Hypotheses

Hypothesis	Statistical Treatment	Findings
1. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to food preparation by husbands' level of religious activity (RAC).	ANOVA	Rejected F = .428 sig. @ .6527
2. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to dishwashing by husbands' RAC.	ANOVA	Rejected F = .713 sig. @ .4918
3. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to housecleaning by husbands' RAC.	ANOVA	Rejected F = .657 sig. @ .5201
4. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to maintenance of home, yard, car and pets by husbands' RAC.	ANOVA	Rejected F = .558 sig. @ .5735

Table 32

Continued

Hypothesis	Statistical Treatment	Findings
5. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to physical care of household members by husbands' RAC.	ANOVA	Rejected F = 1.537 sig. @ .2185
6. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to non-physical care of household members by husbands' RAC.	ANOVA	Rejected F = 1.181 sig. @ .3098
7. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to traditional and non-traditional household work by husbands' RAC.	ANOVA	Rejected F = .988 sig. @ .3748
8. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to social and recreational activities by husbands' RAC.	ANOVA	Rejected F = .397 sig. @ .6727

Table 32

Continued

Hypothesis	Statistical Treatment	Findings
9. There will be a significant difference in the mean minutes allocated to organization participation by husbands' RAC.	ANOVA	Accepted F = 18.401 sig. @ .000
10. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' organization participation time (OPT) and the amount of time spent in food preparation.	Correlation	Rejected r = .07447 sig. @ .18335
11. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in dishwashing.	Correlation	Rejected r = .11082 sig. @ .08924
12. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in housecleaning.	Correlation	Rejected r = -.00987 sig. @ .45247

Table 32

Continued

Hypothesis	Statistical Treatment	Findings
13. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in maintenance of home, yard, car and pets.	Correlation	Accepted $r = -.20723$ sig. @ .00561
14. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in physical care of household members.	Correlation	Rejected $r = -.01142$ sig. @ .44505
15. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in non-physical care of household members.	Correlation	Rejected $r = .04905$ sig. @ .27626
16. There will be a negative relationship between husbands' OPT and the amount of time spent in traditional and non-traditional household work.	Correlation	Accepted $r = -.14616$ sig. @ .03765

responsibilities may be defined as providing adequate financial resources for one's spouse and children; while to others, it may mean literal assumption of household tasks and one-on-one involvement with family members. It may also mean representing the family in church activities and using the time left over to help at home.

It's difficult to understand individual perceptions and how they influence one's self-expectations, as well as their effect on what one thinks others expect of him or her.

A person's awareness of her or his . . . experience is very complex and subject to many variables and inconsistencies. Since perceptions are based on each individual's personal experiences and his or her interpretation of these experiences, the potential for disagreement and confusion is great (Halas & Matteson, 1978, p. 121).

The manner in which respondents perceived what was expected of them as husband/fathers, based on Mormon ideology, could have varied from individual to individual. Paolucci, Hall and Axinn (1977, p. 77) suggest,

Role expectations differ from person to person and from family to family. Some expectations stem from social agreement. Some are culturally ascribed patterns of behavior. Normative standards may differ from the individual's role concept--what the person considers to be appropriate behavior in a particular situation. The role concept may differ from actual behavior. Role acceptance, then depends on whether one is pleased to do what is expected, is indifferent, or is resentful.

This suggests that although L.D.S. men are being encouraged by their religious leaders to set home and family responsibilities as their number-one priority, the interpretations of this policy may be as varied as are individual members of the L.D.S. Church.

The second and third significant findings were closely related. There was an increase in time allocated to maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, and to all household work as organization participation time decreased. These findings probably reflect one another as about half of respondents' total household work time went to maintenance of home, yard, car and pets, 38.3 of 74.8 minutes.

These findings could suggest two things. It is possible that L.D.S. philosophy creates somewhat of a double-bind for its male members. They are asked to establish home and family responsibilities as their first priority, and yet very active male members, in this study, seemed to interpret increased religious activity as increased activity in organization participation which included religious participation. Since there are only 24 hours in a day, it makes sense that as L.D.S. men decrease time spent in one area, they can increase time spent in another area.

These findings might suggest that the very active men in this study were being asked by their religious leaders to do the impossible: to be in two places at the same time. The Mormon ideology advocates an active home life for its men, while at the same time, the Mormon reality has very active L.D.S. men allocating large amounts of time to organization participation, likely church services and functions.

The L.D.S. Church does not have a paid clergy, but relies on its membership to conduct its business and to maintain its operation (Cahill, 1982). For this reason, very active L.D.S. members are likely to devote time to the functioning of their church. It may be

that the L.D.S. men in this study desired to fulfill their home and family responsibilities, but there just weren't enough hours in the day. Although very active L.D.S. men may not interpret an active home life to mean participation in household work and care of family members, it is still difficult for them to be in two places at the same time.

One other conclusion which might be drawn from the second and third significant findings is that if L.D.S. men allocate time to household work, they are likely to allocate it to traditionally male household tasks, in this case, maintenance of home, yard, car and pets. In general, it has been found that when men allocate time to household work, they spend it in traditionally male housework tasks. In this way, L.D.S. respondents did not differ from men in general.

Both the second and third significant relationships were weak, making it difficult to draw any definite conclusions. However, there is some suggestion that the men in this study were willing to increase their household work time when their organization participation time decreased.

Limitations

There were four limitations in the current study which became evident as data were analyzed and discussed.

Family Size

In order for Utah to participate in the eleven-state time use study (p. 30), data collection had to be consistent with the methods used in the other ten states. Two-parent/two-child households were

determined to be representative of families nationally. Therefore, two-parent/two-child households were used in the Utah study.

The average household size in Utah is 3.20 persons; the average family size in Utah is 3.67 persons (U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1980b); and the average L.D.S. family size in Utah is 4.6 persons (Mims, 1982). Utah's birthrate is nearly twice the national average, making it unique among states. The crude birthrate for the nation, as of the 1980 Census, was 15.3 births per 1,000 women of childbearing age; while the crude birthrate for Utah, as of the 1980 Census, was 29.7 births per 1,000 women of childbearing age (U.S. Bureau of The Census, 1980a). The discrepancy between the national birthrate and Utah's birthrate is commonly attributed to the fact that the majority of Utah's population is Mormon and the Mormon Church has traditionally emphasized large families.

Since the current study dealt only with L.D.S. households in Utah, studying only four-person households was a limitation. Although the study may have compensated for this limitation in that households consisted of two parents and two children "at the time of the study," it is difficult to know for sure whether or not parents had limited their families to two children only, whether there were only two children still living at home at the time of the study, or whether more children have been born into the respondents' households since the study was conducted.

Organization Participation Time

The definition of organization participation as a possible classification of time use included "attending and participating in

religious activities and services, civic and political organizations, and other clubs and organizations." Since the definition included activities other than religious activities, mean minutes per day spent in organization participation may not have been truly representative of religious participation. Even though very active L.D.S. men averaged nearly twice as much time in organization participation as did all respondents, organization participation cannot be equated with religious participation.

Non-physical Care of Household Members

Some respondents may have included time allocated to the non-physical care of household members in their social and recreational activity time, or vice versa. Although the definition of social and recreational activities instructed respondents to include social and recreational involvement with their own children in time allocated to non-physical care of household members, it is difficult to know whether or not respondents followed the guidelines.

Confusing the minutes allocated to these two activities most likely would not significantly alter the study findings, but there is the possibility that at least some time allocated to social and recreational activities by respondents could have been spent in non-physical care of household members.

Religious Activity

Respondents' perceptions of religious activity have already been discussed in other sections of this thesis, but it is important to clarify the limitations which varying perceptions of religious activity may have imposed on the study.

Since religious activity was not defined for the respondents, they were free to define it as they wished. Perhaps the word, "activity" implied some sort of literal action, with regard to religion, rather than a reference to religious attitudes or life style. It's difficult to know without asking each respondent.

Perhaps a question asking, "How religious are you?" might have been a better indicator of respondents' religiosity level. It is possible that deeply religious people do not attend religious services, and that people who are not very religious attend regularly.

It was assumed that very active L.D.S. men would adhere closely to the L.D.S. philosophy regarding home and family responsibilities, as well as participate in religious services and functions, more than either inactive or not very active L.D.S. men, or active L.D.S. men. Although very active respondents did participate in organizations to a greater degree than either of the other groups of men, increased amounts of home and family work time by level of religious activity were not obvious. Perhaps a clear definition of religious activity would have altered these results.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the current study, it is recommended that similar studies be conducted, which examine religiosity and men's household work time. It is possible that religiosity affects the time which men allocate to household work.

It might prove effective in future research to include questionnaires which investigate husbands' perceptions of their religious ideologies and their self-expectations regarding those ideologies.

If the limitations of the current study were eliminated, the findings might adhere more closely to the stated hypotheses. It is possible that a random sample of all L.D.S. households, regardless of family size or state or residence, and more concise definitions of "organization participation," "social and recreational activities," and "religious activity" would alter some of the current research findings.

REFERENCES

- American Home Economics Association. Washington Dateline, September 11, 1978.
- Aneshensel, C. S., & Rosen, B. C. Domestic roles and sex differences in occupational expectations. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1980, 42, 121-131.
- Angrist, S. S. The study of sex roles. Journal of Social Issues, 1969, 25, 215-232.
- Berger, M. Men's new family roles--some implications for therapists. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 638-649.
- Berk, S. F. The division of household labor: patterns and determinants. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1976.
- Berk, S. F. Women and household labor. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1980.
- Berk, R. A., & Berk, S. F. Labor and leisure at home. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1979.
- Bradford, R. H. The latter day saint family in modern society. Salt Lake City, Utah: Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, 1951.
- Brown, J. K. A note on the division of labor by sex. American Anthropologist, 1970, 72, 1073-1078.
- Burr, W. R., Ahern, L., & Knowles, E. M. An empirical test of Rodman's theory of resources in cultural context. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1977, 39, 505-514.
- Cahill, J. Personal communication, May 18, 1982.
- Carling, R. Attitudes toward household task allocation related to time spent accomplishing household tasks. Unpublished masters thesis, Utah State University, 1982.
- Christiansen, E. L. Successful parenthood: a noteworthy accomplishment. The Ensign, July 1972, pp. 54-55.
- Clark, R. A., Nye, F. I., & Gecas, V. Husbands' work involvement and marital role performance. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1978, 40, 9-21.

- Flinders, N., & Flinders, J. A home is also a house. The Ensign, Nov. 1973, pp. 20-25.
- Frank, L. K. The philosophy of home management. Proceedings of Seventh International Management Congress, September 1938, 7, 1-7.
- Friedl, E. Women and men: an anthropologist's view. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Glass, G. V., & Stanley, J. C. Statistical methods in education and psychology. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1970.
- Halas, C., & Matteson, R. I've done so well-why do I feel so bad? New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc., 1978.
- Hammond, D., & Jablow, A. Women in cultures of the world. Menlo Park, California: Cummings Publishing Co., 1976.
- Holmstrom, L. L. The two-career family. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Schenkman Publishing Co., 1972.
- Hook, N. C., & Paolucci, B. The family as an ecosystem. Journal of Home Economics, 1970, 62(5), 315-318.
- Jacobsen, L., & Moore, S. Spouses as observers of the events in their relationship. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 1981, 49, 269-275.
- Kerlinger, F. N. Behavioral research: a conceptual approach. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.
- Kimball, S. W. Rendering services to others. The Ensign, May 1981, pp. 45-46.
- Lein, L. Male participation in home life: impact of social supports and breadwinner responsibility on the allocation of tasks. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 489-495.
- Lopata, H. Z. Occupation: housewife. New York: Oxford University Press, 1971.
- Lovingood, R. P., & Firebaugh, F. M. Household task performance roles of husbands and wives. Home Economics Research Journal, 1978, 7, 20-33.
- Manning, S. L. New perspectives on production in the home - the historical view. Paper presented at AHEA 1979 Pre-Convention Workshop, Family Economics - Home Management Section, St. Louis, Missouri, June 21-23, 1979.

- Maxwell, N. A. The value of home life. The Ensign, Feb. 1972, pp. 4-7.
- McConkie, B. Mormon doctrine. Salt Lake City, Utah: Bookcraft, 1966.
- McCullough, J. L. Contributions to household tasks by Utah husbands and wives. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1980.
- McKay, D. O. Structure of the home threatened by irresponsibility and divorce. The Improvement Era, June 1969, pp. 2-5.
- Melchizedek Priesthood Personal Study Guide. Salt Lake City, Utah: The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints, 1982.
- Miller, J. H. Tradition and household tasks. Unpublished masters thesis, Utah State University, 1979.
- Mims, B. Child abuse, neglect rise in Utah. The Salt Lake Tribune, June 1982, p. 6B.
- Nickols, S. Y. The dynamics of family time allocation to productive activity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia, 1976.
- Nickols, S. Y., & Metzen, E. J. Housework time of husband and wife. Home Economics Research Journal, 1978, 7, 85-97.
- Nye, F. I. Role structure and analysis of the family. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Oakley, A. The sociology of housework. New York: Random House, 1974.
- Olsen, M. E. Distribution of family responsibilities and social stratification. Marriage and Family Living, Feb. 1960, pp. 60-65.
- Ort, R. S. A study of role conflicts as related to happiness in marriage. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1950, 45, 691-699.
- Osborne, L. L. Contributions to household work by children in two-parent/two-child families in Utah. Unpublished masters thesis, Utah State University, 1979.
- Ott, L. An introduction to statistical methods and data analysis. North Scituate, Mass.: Duxbury Press, 1977.
- Paolucci, B., Hall, O. A., & Axinn, N. Family decision making: an ecosystem approach. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1977.

- Parsons, T., & Bales, R. F. Family socialization and interaction process. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1955.
- Perry, T. L. Father, your role, your responsibility. The Ensign, Nov. 1977, pp. 62-64.
- Perry, T. L. The need to teach personal and family preparedness. The Ensign, May 1981, pp. 87-89.
- Pleck, J. H. The psychology of sex roles: traditional and new views. In L. A. Cater, A. F. Scott, & W. Martyna (Eds.), Women and men: changing roles, relationships and perceptions. New York: Praeger, 1977.
- Pleck, J. H. Men's family work: three perspectives and some new data. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 481-488.
- Robinson, J. P. How Americans use time: a social-psychological analysis of everyday behavior. New York: Praeger, 1977a.
- Robinson, J. P. Changes in Americans' use of time: 1965-75, a progress report. Cleveland, Ohio: Communication Research Center, Cleveland State University, 1977b.
- Sanik, M. M. A two-fold comparison of time spent in household work in two-parent, two-child households: urban, New York State in 1967-68 and 1977: urban-rural, New York-Oregon in 1977. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Cornell University, 1979.
- Sanik, M. M. Division of household work: a decade comparison--1967-1977. Home Economics Research Journal, 1981, 10, 175-180.
- Schlater, J. D. The management process and its core components. Journal of Home Economics, 1976, 59(2), 93-98.
- Szalai, A. (Ed.) The use of time. Hague, Paris: Mouton, 1972.
- Tanner, N. E. Priesthood responsibilities. The Ensign, Nov. 1973, pp. 92-95.
- Tavris, D., & Offir, C. The longest war: sex differences in perspective. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1977.
- Thomas, W. I. On social organization and social personality; selected papers. Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1966.
- Tilly, L. A., & Scott, J. W. Women, work and family. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winslow, 1978.
- Tognoli, J. The flight from domestic space: men's roles in the household. The Family Coordinator, 1979, 28, 599-607.

- U.S. Bureau of The Census. 1980 census of population (1980 Census Advance Report, Series PHC80-V). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980a.
- U.S. Bureau of The Census. 1980 census of population and housing (1980 Census Supplementary Report, Series PHC80-S1-1). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1980b.
- Vanek, J. Time spent in housework. Scientific American, Nov. 1974, pp. 116-120.
- Walker, K. E. Time management and the value of nonmarket household production. Paper presented at AHEA Pre-Convention Workshop, Family Economics - Home Management Section, St. Louis, Missouri, June 21-23, 1979.
- 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.
- Weinburg, G. H., & Schumaker, J. A. Statistics: an intuitive approach. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole, 1974.
- Weitzman, L. J. Sex role socialization. In J. Freeman (Ed.), Women: a feminist perspective (2nd ed.). Palo Alto, California: Mayfield Publishing Co., 1979.
- Wheeler, C. L., & Arvey, R. D. Division of household labor in the family. Home Economics Research Journal, 1981, 10, 10-20.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Time Diary

		12 midnight		11 pm	
FOOD	Food Preparation				FOOD
	Dishwashing				
SHOPPING	Shopping				SHOPPING
	Housecleaning				
HOUSE	Maintenance of Home, Yard, Car, and Pets				HOUSE
	Care				
CLOTHING AND HOUSEHOLD LINENS	Construction				
	Physical Care				CLOTHING AND HOUSEHOLD LINENS
HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS	Nonphysical Care				HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS
	Management				
MANAGEMENT	School				MANAGEMENT
	Paid				
WORK (other than household)	Unpaid				WORK (other than household)
	Organization Participation				
NONWORK	Social and Recreational Activities				NONWORK
	Personal Care (or self)				
PERSONAL MAINTENANCE	Eating				PERSONAL MAINTENANCE
	Other				
OTHER					OTHER

Appendix B

Information Questionnaire

		HOUSEHOLD CODE																																																																																																				
		<table border="1" style="border-collapse: collapse; width: 100px; height: 100px;"> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td></tr> <tr><td>0</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>4</td><td>5</td><td>6</td><td>7</td><td>8</td><td>9</td></tr> </table>	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	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	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9																																																																																													
1	Do you rent 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? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> 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? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	6	How many partial bathrooms do you have? 0 1 2 3 4 5																																																																																																			
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 8 9																																																																																																					
10	How many drivers are in your household? 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	11	Do you have any household pets? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO																																																																																																			
12	What is approximate size of your refrigerator? 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 (12-19 cu. ft.) large (12-19 cu. ft.) extra large (19-31 cu. ft.) extra large (19-31 cu. ft.) not applicable not applicable																																																																																																					
13	Is your refrigerator(s) unit? a. Refrigerator 1 b. Refrigerator 2	14	Is your refrigerator/freezer a frost free model? a. Refrigerator 1 b. Refrigerator 2																																																																																																			
	1 door model? 1 door model? 2 door model? 2 door model? not applicable not applicable		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)? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO	17	IF 1 OR MORE FREEZERS, ASK How many of your free standing freezers are frost free? 0 1 2 3 4 5																																																																																																			
16	IF YES, is your freezer space small (less than 12 cu. ft.)? medium (12-19 cu. ft.)? large (19-31 cu. ft.)? not applicable																																																																																																					
TR	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
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

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

	CHILD I	CHILD II	CHILD III
2. What is the age and sex of the child?	M 12 13 14 F 15 16 17	M 12 13 14 F 15 16 17	M 12 13 14 F 15 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?	M 12 13 14 F 15 16 17	M 12 13 14 F 15 16 17	M 12 13 14 F 15 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	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	1	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	5	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
2	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	2	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	5	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
3	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	3	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	6	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
4	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	4	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	6	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

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

	HOMEMAKER	ADULT II	ADULT III
1 Did you have more than one paid job last week? (IF NO, GO TO Q 9)	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO
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?

Appendix C

Church Affiliation and

Activity Questionnaire

Household Code _____

Name _____

1. Do you belong to a church? _____yes

_____no

2. If yes, which church do you belong to?

3. About how active are you? _____inactive or not very active

_____active

_____very active

Appendix D

Definitions of Activities

ACTIVITY DICTIONARY

NEW YORK STATE COLLEGE OF HUMAN ECOLOGY
Cornell University, Ithaca, New York

Use-of-time Research Project
Definitions of Activities

FOOD

1. Food Preparation

All tasks relating to the preparation of food for meals, snacks, and future use.

Include time spent setting the table and serving the food.

2. Dishwashing

In addition to washing and drying dishes, loading and unloading dishwasher or dishdrainer.
Include after-meal cleanup of table, leftovers, kitchen equipment and refuse.

HOUSE

3. Housecleaning

Any regular or periodic cleaning of house and appliances, including such tasks as:

Mopping, vacuuming, sweeping, dusting, waxing
Washing windows or walls
Cleaning the oven; defrosting and cleaning the refrigerator or freezer
Making beds and putting rooms in order

4. Maintenance of Home, Yard, Car and Pets

Any repair and upkeep of home, appliances, and furnishings such as:

Painting, papering, redecorating, carpentry

Repairing equipment, plumbing, furniture
 Putting up storm windows or screens
 Taking out garbage and trash
 Care of houseplants, flower arranging

Daily and periodic care of outside areas such as:

Yard, garden
 Sidewalks, driveways, patios, outside porches
 Garage, tool shed, other outside areas
 Swimming pool

Maintenance and care of family motor vehicles (car, truck, van, motorcycle, snowmobile, boat)

Washing, waxing
 Changing oil, rotating tires and other maintenance and repair work
 Taking motor vehicle to service station, garage, or car wash

Feeding and care of house pets. Also include trips to kennel or veterinarian.

HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS

5. Physical Care

All activities related to physical care of household members other than self such as:

Bathing, feeding, dressing and other personal care
 First aid or bedside care
 Taking household members to doctor, dentist, barber

6. Non-physical Care

All activities related to the social and educational development of household members such as:

Playing with children
 Teaching, talking, helping children with homework
 Reading aloud
 Chauffering and/or accompanying children to social and educational activities
 Attending functions involving your child

NONWORK

7. Organization Participation

Attending and participating in:

Religious activities and services

Civic and political organizations
Other clubs and organizations

8. Social and Recreational Activities

Reading (other than required for school or work)
Watching TV
Listening to radio, stereo, etc.
"Going out" to movies, car shows, museums, sporting
events, concerts, etc.
Participating in any sport, hobby or craft
Taking a class or lesson for personal interest
Walking, cycling, boating, "taking a ride," training
animals
Talking with friends or relatives, either in person or
by telephone
Entertaining at home or being entertained away from home
Writing letters, or cards to friends, relatives
Playing games, musical instruments, etc. (If adult is
playing with child include such activities under non-
physical care.)