

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

---

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

---

5-1993

## Single Mothers: The Impact of Work on Home and the Impact of Home on Work

Lenore I. Rasmussen Robbins  
*Utah State University*

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



Part of the [Education Commons](#)

---

### Recommended Citation

Rasmussen Robbins, Lenore I., "Single Mothers: The Impact of Work on Home and the Impact of Home on Work" (1993). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 4195.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/4195>

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



SINGLE MOTHERS: THE IMPACT OF WORK ON  
HOME AND THE IMPACT OF HOME ON WORK

by

Lenore I. Rasmussen Robbins

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

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Occupational and  
Adult Education

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY  
Logan, Utah

1993

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The distance from Cedar City to Logan has made the completing of this dissertation most frustrating at times. I am so deeply appreciative of the kindness and patience shown to me by my committee members, especially to Joan for the warm encouragement that kept me going when it seemed impossible.

Thank you Dad and Mom, Woodrow and Carolyn Rasmussen, for the dream that this could be done.

Thanks to my children, Laralyn for allowing me the time and space to complete this task and, oh yes, for "raising yourself" in the meantime; and Dani, Lane, and Woody who always knew I could do it.

For love, patience, and acceptance a special thank you to my husband, Burt Robbins, and for allowing me my "compulsive behaviors."

Lenore I. Rasmussen Robbins

## CONTENTS

|  | Page |
|--|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .                | ii   |
| LIST OF TABLES . . . . .                 | v    |
| ABSTRACT . . . . .                       | vii  |
| CHAPTER                                  |      |
| I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND . . . . . | 1    |
| Problem Statement . . . . .              | 4    |
| Purpose and Objectives . . . . .         | 4    |
| Research Questions . . . . .             | 5    |
| II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE . . . . .   | 6    |
| Changes in Family Structure . . . . .    | 6    |
| Working Women . . . . .                  | 7    |
| Single Parents . . . . .                 | 8    |
| Family Satisfaction and                  |      |
| Work Performance . . . . .               | 10   |
| Family Satisfaction . . . . .            | 12   |
| Work Satisfaction . . . . .              | 13   |
| Theoretical Perspectives . . . . .       | 14   |
| Summary . . . . .                        | 17   |
| III. PROCEDURES . . . . .                | 18   |
| Population . . . . .                     | 18   |
| Design and Instrumentation . . . . .     | 19   |
| Data Analysis . . . . .                  | 21   |
| IV. FINDINGS . . . . .                   | 23   |
| Data and Analysis . . . . .              | 23   |
| Profile of Respondents . . . . .         | 24   |
| Situations in Home Causing Stress        |      |
| in Home Life . . . . .                   | 26   |
| Home and Family Factors and              |      |
| Satisfaction with Home Life . . . . .    | 28   |
| Factor Analysis of Home and Family       |      |
| Factors with Home Satisfaction . . . . . | 30   |
| Multiple Regression of Home and          |      |
| Family Factors with Home                 |      |
| Satisfaction . . . . .                   | 30   |



|   |    |
|---|----|
| Home and Family Factors and<br>Satisfaction with Work . . . . .                             | 32 |
| Factor Analysis of Home and Family<br>Factors with Satisfaction<br>with Work . . . . .      | 34 |
| Multiple Regression of Home and<br>Family Factors with Satisfaction<br>with Work . . . . .  | 34 |
| Work Factors and Satisfaction with<br>Home Life . . . . .                                   | 37 |
| Factor Analysis of Work Factors<br>Influencing Satisfaction with<br>Home Life . . . . .     | 39 |
| Multiple Regression of Work Factors<br>Influencing Satisfaction with<br>Home Life . . . . . | 39 |
| Work Factors and Satisfaction with Work   | 41 |
| Factor Analysis of Work<br>Factors Influencing Satisfaction<br>with Work . . . . .          | 43 |
| Multiple Regression of Work Factors<br>with Satisfaction with Work . .                      | 43 |
| Difficulty In Combining Work<br>and Family . . . . .  | 45 |
| Analysis of Variance and Correlations .   | 46 |
| Discussion of Findings in Support of<br>Related Theories . . . . .                          | 47 |
| Human Ecosystem Theory . . . . .  | 47 |
| Satisfaction with Life Theory . .   | 47 |
| Role Theory . . . . .   | 48 |
| Consistency of Findings with Theories .   | 48 |
| V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .  | 50 |
| Summary and Discussion . . . . .  | 50 |
| Factor Analysis . . . . .   | 53 |
| Stepwise Multiple Regression . . .  | 54 |
| Analysis of Variance and<br>Spearman's Correlation<br>Coefficient . . . . .                 | 56 |
| Implications and Recommendations for<br>Further Study . . . . .                             | 57 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| LITERATURE CITED . . . . .  | 60 |
| APPENDICES . . . . .  | 63 |
| Appendix A. Work, Home, and Family<br>Questionnaire . . . . .                     | 64 |
| Appendix B. Introductory Letters Sent to<br>Potential Respondents . . . . .       | 72 |
| Appendix C. Human Subject Consent Form Given<br>with Each Questionnaire . . . . . | 74 |
| CURRICULUM VITAE . . . . .  | 76 |

## LIST OF TABLES

| Table  | Page |
|--|------|
| 1. Profile of Respondents . . . . .  | 25   |
| 2. Frequency of Situations Causing Stress in Home Life . . . . .   | 27   |
| 3. Rank by Mean Scores of Home and Family Factors and Degree of Satisfaction with Home Life . . . . .  | 29   |
| 4. Factor Analysis of Home and Family Factors Reported to Influence Satisfaction with Home Life . . . . .  | 31   |
| 5. Multiple Regression Analysis of Home and Family Factors That Explain Satisfaction with Home Life . . . . .  | 32   |
| 6. Mean Scores of Home and Family Factors and Their Effect on Work Performance . . . . .   | 33   |
| 7. Factor Analysis of Home and Family Factors Reported to Influence Satisfaction with Work . . . . .   | 35   |
| 8. Multiple Regression Analysis of Home and Family Factors That Explain Satisfaction with Work . . . . .   | 36   |
| 9. Rank by Mean Scores of Work Factors on Satisfaction with Home Life . . . . .  | 38   |
| 10. Factor Analysis of Work Factors Reported to Influence Satisfaction with Home Life . . . . .  | 40   |
| 11. Multiple Regression Analysis of Work Factors That Explain Satisfaction of Home Life . . . . .  | 41   |
| 12. Rank by Mean Scores of Work Factors on Satisfaction with Work . . . . .  | 42   |
| 13. Factor Analysis of Work Factors Reported to Influence Satisfaction with Work . . . . .   | 44   |
| 14. Multiple Regression Analysis of Work Factors That Explain Satisfaction with Work . . . . .   | 45   |
| 15. Spearman Correlation Coefficients of Education, Perception of Enough Income, Home Life Satisfaction, and Work Satisfaction with Income . . . . . | 47   |

ABSTRACT

Single Mothers: The Impact of Work on  
Home and the Impact of Home on Work

by

Lenore I. Rasmussen Robbins, Doctor of Philosophy  
Utah State University, 1993

Major Professor: Dr. Joan McFadden  
Program: Occupational and Adult Education

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationships between family/home satisfaction and job satisfaction of single working mothers with at least one child under the age of 18 living at home. The principal objectives were to identify the stressful situations in the lives of working single mothers and the factors that contributed to home satisfaction and work satisfaction. Data were gathered by survey questionnaire from single working mothers presently living in Iron County, Utah. Factor analysis was used to reduce data into home satisfaction and work satisfaction factors that were analyzed by multiple regression to determine the variance they explain. Stepwise multiple regression identified 1) family interaction, 2) income, housing, and health, and 3) family diet and money management as the home and family factors that predict satisfaction with home life. This multiple regression

identified 1) family interaction, 2) time commitments, 3) income, housing, and health, 4) family and community support, and 5) family diet and money management as the home and family factors that can predict satisfaction with work. The work factors that can predict home life satisfaction were found to be 1) work schedule, 2) work environment, and 3) salary and advancement. Work factors that predict satisfaction with work were 1) breaks and control, 2) schedule and salary, and 3) commuting and friends at work. Working single mothers identified single parenting, financial problems, major changes in work or family, and problems with children as the situations causing stress in their lives. A statistically significant relationship was found with income and 1) education, 2) perception of enough income, 3) satisfaction with home life, and 4) work satisfaction.

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

Balancing work and family roles has become a key personal and family issue for American society (Burge & Culver, 1989). The effects of the changing American family structure on the work place and on the home are increasingly being recognized by employees and family studies specialists as the magnitude of these family structure changes become apparent. The literature indicates that some of the most significant differences between traditional two-parent families and single-parent families are that single-parent families experience reduced income and/or poverty, lack of support system, lower self-esteem, reduced personal satisfaction, and increased time pressures (Besharov, 1992; McLanahan & Booth, 1989; Richards, 1989).

Role strain, conflict, and stress are often the result of an individual's attempt to balance work and family. Role strain as conceptualized by Voydanoff and Donnelly (1989) is the individual's appraisal of the level of conflict between roles and of the degree of overload experienced from attempting to meet multiple role demands.

Causes of conflict and stress are associated with long, irregular, rigid working hours, travel away from home, and "spillover" of fatigue, preoccupation, and irritability from work to family (Pleck, 1985). An example of spillover from family to work was found by Voydanoff and Donnelly (1989) to be the stress of caring for elderly relatives.

The focus of this study is on the single mother family because there is evidence that these families face a greater variety of hardship stressors than do the two-parent families (Burden, 1986; McLanahan & Booth, 1989; Quinn & Allen, 1989; Richards, 1989; Rubin, 1976).

Besharov (1992) stated that because these never-married mothers are 10 years younger on the average than the divorced mothers, they tend to have less education and lower incomes. A greater percentage of the never-married mothers will be welfare recipients, stay on welfare longer, and receive less child support than the older divorced mothers. These findings would indicate a need to begin vocational classes in the early years in high school. Educators, especially those concerned with family resource management, can help families improve current job skills or develop new skills aimed at securing better-paying jobs. Policy makers and educators must recognize that early childhood intervention through education is less expensive than teen pregnancy and long-term public assistance (Schuchardt & Guadagno, 1991).

Because the working single-parent lifestyle is becoming more common, demands for information on parenting and requests for single-parent programs are expected to multiply. Instruction using traditional curriculum developed by the home economics teacher to promote improved management of resources such as time, money, and energy,

plus parenting skills, can be expected to assist the individual as she copes with the responsibilities of being a single working mother. Investigation of the impact of changing lifestyles is expected to provide evidence of the need for support for single-parent women. These findings will assist vocational home economics educators in defining their programs for potential clients.

The importance of such programs was recognized in 1984 when the Carl D. Perkin's Vocational Education Act (Perkins, 1984) mandated emphasis on preparation for combining work and family roles. This Act calls for program development and improvement of instruction and curricula related to managing home and work responsibilities and understanding the impact of new technology on home, life, and work. Understanding the needs of the single-parent population is critical for the single-parent women who must combine work and family roles. Information received from this study will assist educators in designing and preparing instruction for use with these single-parent women. The children in the single-parent family will benefit as their mother learns important parenting techniques, ways to improve her financial situation, and to manage her time.

Some studies have been conducted in Texas (Felstehausen, Glosson, & Couch, 1986) with an employed, married female population, and in New England (Burden, 1986) with a single-parent (male and female) population.



### Problem Statement

No studies have been found in the literature that examine the single working mothers in Utah. The problem is the lack of information about the impact of work on home and home on work of single mothers in Utah.

### Purpose and Objectives

The effect job satisfaction has on home life and, conversely, the impact home life has on job performance has come to the attention of the public in the past 10 years. However, few studies focus on problems of single-parent families.

The principal objectives for this project were to:

1. Identify the stressful situations in the lives of working single mothers.
2. Identify the stress level of single working mothers with their home life.
3. Identify the home and family factors that contributed to home satisfaction of working single mothers.
4. Identify the home and family factors that contributed to work satisfaction of working single mothers.
5. Identify the satisfaction level of working single mothers with their home life.
6. Identify the work factors that contributed to home satisfaction of working single mothers.

7. Identify the work factors that contributed to the work satisfaction of working single mothers.

#### Research Questions

Major research questions examined in the study were:

1. What are the stressful situations in the lives of working single mothers?

2. How stressful is the home life of working single mothers?

3. What are the home and family factors that contribute to home satisfaction of working single mothers?

4. What are the home and family factors that contribute to work satisfaction of working single mothers?

5. How satisfied are working single mothers with their home life?

6. What are the work factors that contribute to satisfaction with work of working single mothers?

7. What are the work factors that contribute to the satisfaction of home life of the working single mothers?

These questions guided this study in assessing relationships between family/home satisfaction and job satisfaction in single-mother families.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Work and family are both valued in American society. With the increasing numbers of working women and single-parent families, questions of how individuals perceived work demands influencing family and family demands influencing work are of interest and concern. How conflicting demands caused stress that may arise from the exhausting lives they lead is of interest and concern. The central issue addressed in this study was work satisfaction and home satisfaction and the single working mother.

#### Changes in Family Structure

The traditional American family with a working husband, a homemaker wife, and two or more children now makes up only 7% of the nation's families (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991). Mother-only families are on the increase according to the 1990 Bureau of Census Report. If the trend continues, about 60% of all children born after 1980 will be raised by a mother who is divorced, separated, unwed, or widowed (Besharov, 1992).

Annual average growth rates of real earnings declined since the 1960s. Menaghan and Parcel (1990) cited the huge baby boom entrance into the labor force in the 1970s and loss of permanent jobs in manufacturing, mining, and construction in the 1980s as the reasons for this decline.

These authors also suggested that the resultant inability of a man to support unemployed women and children caused women to enter the job market.

Employment in the 1970s not only offered women a nonfamily identity as well as the potential for economic independence but was also no longer looked upon negatively (Moen, 1991). The most striking change in the 1980s (Menaghan & Parcel, 1990) was the employment of mothers of babies and preschoolers. Working married women with children had risen to 54% by 1986 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1987).

#### Working Women

Even though data in Schuchardt and Guadagno's study (1991) found single mothers were more likely to have a college education than mothers in two-parent families, they also found that college educated single-mother families were unable to break out of the poverty bracket. They surmised that this could be due to the fact that women working full time earn only about 70% of the median earnings for men. Nationwide, after one year of divorce, a woman's standard of living decreases by 73%, while a man's standard increases by 42% (Olsen, 1988).

Data taken from Schuchardt and Guadagno (1991) showed that the average before-tax income in 1987 for the two-parent one-earner families was \$15,920. This amount was

just \$4,309 above the 1987 poverty threshold for a family of four. Two-parent two-earner families' average before-tax income was not much higher at \$16,327. Single-mother families' average before-tax income was lowest at \$13,380. Ninety-six percent of the income in two-parent families came from wage and salary earnings (Menaghan & Parcel, 1990). In contrast, 63% of single-mothers families' income was derived from earnings, 23% from public assistance, and 14% from Social Security or Railroad Retirement and other sources, including alimony and child support.

#### Single Parents

Single-parent families are a major trend in today's emerging family structures. In the past, the majority of single-parents were widows supported either by Social Security benefits or by public welfare (Moen, 1991.) Today most single-parents are divorced or have never married. Exter (1990) forecasted that by the year 2000 families headed by women should reach 126 million, up 13% from 1990. Eighty percent of these families will include children younger than age 18. The great majority (72%) are in the labor force (Besharov, 1992).

Since World War II, women have had increased opportunities for employment, but women's economic status has actually declined over the past 20 years. This decline

is due in large part to the increasing numbers of single mother heads-of-household (Burden, 1986).

The major issue, as seen by Schuchardt and Guadagno (1991), facing single-parents and their children in the United States today is poverty. Olsen's (1988) statistics found this true for Utah as well. In 1987 the poverty threshold was \$11,611 for a family of four, \$9,646 for a family of three, and \$7,397 for a family of two. According to Schuchardt and Guadagno, 8% of all two-parent families in the U.S. are living in poverty compared to 40% of the white single-mother families who are living in poverty. Olsen's report of the 1980 census in Utah shows 33% of the women heads-of-household living in poverty and 50% of the children living in families with women heads-of-household are living in poverty. Nationwide, after one year of divorce, a woman's standard of living decreases by 73%, while a man's standard increases by 42%. In Utah, income of female family heads of households in 1976 was 46% of that of male family heads. It is interesting that women with four years of college have a median income equivalent to that of males with only an eighth grade education (Olsen, 1988). Pearce in 1978 labeled this trend the "feminization of poverty." The importance of employment becomes evident. Problems single-parents experience, in association with having to go to work, include the lack of support in managing the home and children (Burden, 1986). Stresses cited by Good,

Gentry, and Sisler (1990) are role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload.

The groups which express the greatest amount of stress in handling multiple responsibilities of job and home are single female parents, married female parents, and married male parents in that order. Googin and Burden (1987) explained that employed mothers were more vulnerable to reduced levels of physical and emotional well-being because they bear a disproportionate share of family responsibilities. The single-parent mother has increased pressure to be proficient in both home and work and to do so with less support than her married cohorts.

#### Family Satisfaction and Work Performance

Burge and Culver (1989) reported that family and work satisfaction studies have evolved from the theory that work and home are separate entities. They term this thinking as "obsolete." They developed a model showing spillover from one area to another that could be either negative or positive. Most research, however, has focused on how family life adapted to the workplace, rather than the reverse. The need to examine the effects of home on work as well as to study the many complex relationships among elements of work and the family is now recognized.

Renshaw (1976) was one of the first to document the interactive nature of work and family. His findings



demonstrated a strong relationship between a satisfying family life and high levels of job satisfaction.

On the negative side, Pleck (cited in Duxbury & Higgins, 1991, p. 62) in his studies on work-family conflict explained the relationship this way: "psychological involvement in a role acts primarily as a sensitizier to interference effects, making the individual more aware of problems within that role. This awareness, in turn, increases perceived role conflict."

Research in the past has tended to deal with conflict and the disruption caused in home and at work. Duxbury and Higgins (1991) feel that is a mistake and that the research needs to consider the spillover and consider the coping mechanisms to assist one in dealing with responsibilities in both arenas of one's life. The concern for work-family conflict is that such conflict as a source of stress, according to Duxbury and Higgins (1991) has been correlated with the following dysfunctional negative consequences: increased health risks, poorer performance of the parenting role, decreased productivity, tardiness, absenteeism, turnover, poor morale, reduced life satisfaction, and lower mental health.

Single-parent mothers were found by Burden (1986) to suffer the most strain between family life satisfaction and job satisfaction. Lower salaries and longer working hours at combined job and home responsibilities contribute to more



job and family role strain with lower levels of physical and emotional well-being. According to Olsen's (1988) study completed for the Utah Division of Family Services, the child care crisis in Utah families is a hidden crisis due in part to the unique demographics of the state. Fifty-nine percent of the women in Utah are in the labor force compared to 54% nationwide; Utah has the highest percentage of children between the ages of 6-13 in the United States and 20% of these children have mothers in the labor force; 55% of these children have no relative to care for them; and the families' average income for 1986 was \$10,981 compared to \$14,641 elsewhere in the United States.

#### Family Satisfaction

Two important domains of existence, the family and the workplace, come into conflict as single mothers struggle to live well in both contexts. Repetti (1987) studied the relationship of social environment at work, individual psychological well-being, and family life with bank employees. His results support the proposition that work and family life are related.

From Walker and Walker (1980) there is evidence that mothers not employed outside their homes had slightly higher levels of anxiety than the employed subjects. However, in studying gender differences in life satisfaction, Duxbury and Higgins (1991) found with added responsibility at home

and lack of emotional and domestic support their single subjects reported lower life satisfaction.

Harrison and Minor (1982), who studied only working women, 13 single and 27 married nonprofessional black working mothers (with 1-5 children under age 18 years living at home), found a significant interaction between marital status and coping strategy in their effect on satisfaction with the mother role. There was a significant difference between single and married subjects in level of satisfaction with the worker role. Single subjects were more satisfied than their married counterparts.

The low-income single mothers in the Olson and Banyard study (1993) who were working reported more stressful events but experienced less distress in relation to these events than mothers who remained at home full-time. Why women perceive that they cope effectively despite high levels of life stress is an area much neglected by research on single parenting.

#### Work Satisfaction

An individual's identity and satisfaction is related to his/her work, according to Way (1990). Satisfaction is determined by aspirations, interpersonal comparisons, and individual goals and philosophy of serving others.

In comparison with the housewife, Rubin (1976) found that most of the single-parent subjects in her study of the

American working class families were satisfied with work. They seemed to like doing a good job, but they also liked relief from housework and child care. They were pleased to earn money and feel as though they had some control over their life. Burden (1986) made the assumption that the single-parent maintains her high level of performance at work and at home at the expense of her own physical and emotional well-being.

#### Theoretical Perspectives

The conceptual framework guiding this research is tied to three theoretical perspectives: the human ecosystem theory, satisfaction theory, and role theory. Each of these theoretical perspectives may have a relationship to the other when utilized to study work and family conflicts in the identified population.

The concept of the human ecosystem theory has appeared in recent literature and is described by Way (1990):

Ecological systems theory suggests that, in order to understand the processes of human development, it is necessary to consider the interactions within and between the environments in which people live, both the immediate settings and the formal and informal social contexts within which they are embedded. (p. 68)

This theory is applicable to this study because the immediate settings are the work and home environments; and the formal and informal social contexts include self and other interactions at work, in other social settings, and at home.

Satisfaction of life theory is a very personal psychological experience and may differ at different stages of the life cycle. Campbell, Converse, and Rodgers (1976) theorize that overall satisfaction in any relevant domain of life experience depends on (a) the personal relevance of specific attributes of the objective reality and (b) the standards of comparison used to evaluate the worth of the perceived relevant attributes of the reality. The illustration given by Way (1990), who also described satisfaction theory, is:

Assume the objective reality is your job. The perceived attribute that is most relevant to your personal satisfaction may be the nature of the work such as how much autonomy you have, how much pay you receive, your social relationships on the job, or the physical characteristics of the workplace. The standard of comparison might be your aspiration (the level of work you hope to attain eventually), expectation (what you actually expect will be attained), reference group levels (the situation of other close friends and associates), personal needs (for example, to feel secure or comfortable in your work), or personal values (such as importance of serving others or building an inheritance for your children). (p. 67)

The quality of life that one lives is basic to defining satisfaction of life, thus the satisfaction of life theory suggests an individual's satisfaction is related to his/her current job in relation to his/her goals, needs, expectations, values, and peers' accomplishments.

Role theory serves as a valuable conceptual framework for understanding how an individual functions in relation to other variables such as health, housing, income, child care

arrangements, work status, and work schedules in the work and home environment. Role theory attempts to explain how social structure influences behavior. Each role set delimits beliefs and attitudes about what the focal person should or should not do as part of a role. These role sets are designated as role expectations (Good et al., 1990). Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, and Snoek (1964) described roles as the boundary between individuals and the organization, consisting of expectations at the individual and organizational levels.

The role set describes the expected behavior of a group or an individual. Role conflict occurs when the organization's expectations are different than the expectations of the family or the individual.

Role conflict refers to the stress felt when an employee perceives incompatible demands from two or more role sets or partners and cannot simultaneously satisfy those demands (Churchill, Ford, & Walker, 1976). In addition, work-family conflict, a type of role conflict, is encountered by people for whom a variety of demands cause time constraints. The single mother especially feels the strain of competing demands from work and the family.

Two conceptualizations in the area of work-family conflict address the manifestation of the source of conflict. The two processes, which purport to explain the intercorrelation of the life and work domains, have been

described by Good et al. (1990). These processes are termed the "compensatory" process and the "spillover" process.

The compensatory process assumes an inverse association between what occurs at work and what occurs in non-work (home) roles. Individuals with disappointments in one sphere of life tend to compensate in another sphere. The spillover process asserts a fundamental similarity between what occurs in the work environment and what transpires elsewhere. Attitudes or behaviors from one domain generalize in a ripple-like manner to others. (p. 325)

Because women have traditionally taken on most of the responsibility at home, family life has been found to have a significant influence on their work behavior.

Family life may make demands on work that the work role must accommodate, just as work may require adjustments in family life (Felstehausen et al., 1986). The literature clearly implicates the reciprocal influence of the two roles.

#### Summary

Clearly there is evidence that single-parent mothers experience stress from their work and family responsibilities. Research suggests this stress is due in part to increased responsibilities and reduced income. Yet there is evidence that single-parent mothers experience satisfaction from work. According to Olsen (1988), the Utah population includes more working women, more young children, and lower average incomes than the rest of the United States.

## CHAPTER III

## PROCEDURES

This chapter describes the population used in this study. The methods used to analyze the data will be identified.

## Population

The target population for this study was all single working mothers presently living in Iron County, Utah, with at least one child under the age of 18 living at home. This population was for purposes of convenience and the professional responsibility of the researcher. The researcher was responsible for designing programs to assist this population with information to enable them to address the challenges of combining the work and family responsibilities.

Effort was made to identify these individuals through the following means:

1. All churches (names obtained from the Chamber of Commerce), government and other family social service agencies, and the University departments working with single women were contacted and given copies of the questionnaire to be handed out to working single mothers within their organization.



2. An invitation to respond to the survey was included in the local newspaper and the newsletter of Iron County Extension Home Economist.

3. Names were volunteered by neighbors, friends, and business persons.

#### Design and Instrumentation

The data were gathered by survey questionnaire due to time and money restraints. One advantage to the questionnaire over the personal survey method was that more people could be contacted. To ensure a bigger rate of return, women attending programs or classes were allowed time to fill the questionnaire out on the spot and those given out by church leaders included a self-addressed stamped envelope for ease in returning it.

The questionnaire was coded by number only to ensure anonymity. Due to the Privacy Act names and addresses of respondents was not available to provide accurate information on the rate of return.

The instrument used was developed at Texas Tech University (Felstehausen et al., 1986). Pilot studies with this instrument were done at three sites in Lubbock, Texas, with members of a church group, a singles group, and a small company. Using the pilot data, a reliability of .95 to .98 was established for the instrument (Felstehausen et al.,



1986). Reliability was calculated using Cronbach's Coefficients Alphas.

This instrument included family and work satisfaction scales and inventories and is conceptually grouped into four major sections: personal and family data, stress factors, work hours and scheduling (labeled work factors), and conditions relating to work and family environments (labeled home and family factors). The self-report format includes a semantic differential scale after each item for the respondent to indicate, for example, if the situation caused stress. If the checked response was "yes," the respondents then indicated the amount of stress on a Likert scale from 1 to 7 where 1 equaled "not stressful at all" and 7 equaled "very stressful."

In addition to individual factors, respondents were asked to give an overall rating of satisfaction with their home and family life and an overall satisfaction rating with their work. Likewise, they were asked to report the overall effect of their work on the quality of their home life. Finally, a global question ("How difficult is it for you to combine work and family responsibilities?") is included as a summary item. Respondents replied on a Likert-type scale from 1 to 7 where 1 equaled "not difficult" and 7 equaled "very difficult."

### Data Analysis

Summary statistics and analyses used to answer the research questions were calculated through use of the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSSX). The data were submitted to the following analyses:

1. Frequency counts and percentages were tabulated to describe the population.

2. Exploratory factor analysis was used to reduce data into three or four underlying home satisfaction and work satisfaction factors that were analyzed to determine the variables that were highly correlated.

3. These new factors were entered into a multiple regression to determine the variance explained by the factors (treated as independent variables). A stepwise regression procedure was used in order to determine the linear combination of independent variables that will best predict work and home satisfaction.

4. Where significance was identified through analysis of variance, Spearman correlation coefficient was used to establish the strength of the correlation.

In summary, the population for this study was limited to single working mothers, living in Iron County, Utah, with at least one child under the age of 18 living at home. Frequency counts, factor analysis, multiple regression, analysis of variance, and Spearman's correlation coefficient were the statistics selected to analyze the data collected

in this study. The significance level was established at .05.

## CHAPTER IV

### FINDINGS

The data were analyzed using the statistical procedures selected for this study. The results of the analyses have been presented in this chapter.

#### Data and Analysis

Data were collected from working single mothers (N=59) in Iron County, Utah. Respondents met all of the following criteria: working, single, and mothers with at least one child under the age of 18 living at home. Every effort (as described in the design of the study) was made to collect data from the entire population in Iron County who met the criteria. Due to the Privacy Act a list of names was not allowed to be given out by the churches and governmental agencies. They chose instead to personally hand the questionnaires out to individuals. Because of this restriction it was difficult to obtain an accurate accounting of potential respondents.

The 1990 census lists Iron County as having 359 female-headed households with children but does not indicate how many of these women are working. This makes it difficult to estimate how many single working mothers there actually are in Iron County. But 100 copies of the questionnaire were made and handed out. Of the 86 returned 27 were eliminated because the respondents did not meet the criteria of being

single, working, and with one child under 18 living at home. It is assumed that fourteen questionnaires were not returned making this an acceptable return rate of 86%.

### Profile of Respondents

Frequency counts and percentages were tabulated to describe the population (Table 1). All of the respondents were working single mothers, and as a group they had an average of 2.3 children (137).

The average age of respondents was 42 years (in 1992). The youngest respondent was 21 years old and the oldest was 53 years old. Of the 59 respondents, 97% (57) were Caucasian, with 1 American Indian, and 1 Hispanic.

Regarding the educational level of respondents, most respondents indicated they had more than grade 12 education. Twelve (20.3%) had graduate or professional education beyond the bachelor's degree, 13 (22.0%) had a bachelor's degree, and 23 (39.0%) had some education or job training after high school. Four (6.8%) failed to respond to this question.

Respondents worked an average of 33 hours a week, producing an average income of between \$10,000 to \$15,000. Sixty percent (33) of the respondents had an annual income of less than \$14,999. Eight (13.6%) had an annual income of less than \$5,000, 7 (11.9%) from \$5,000 - \$7,499, 15 (25.4%) from \$10,000 - \$14,999, 22 (37.3%) had an annual income from \$15,000 and \$34,999, and 2 (3.4%) had incomes from \$35,000-

Table 1

Profile of Respondents

| Variable   | Number   | Percentage<br>Total Respondents |       |
|--|----------|---------------------------------|-------|
| Ethnic group:  |          |                                 |       |
| White  | 57       | 96.9                            |       |
| American Indian                                      | 1        | 1.7                             |       |
| Hispanic   | <u>1</u> | <u>1.7</u>                      |       |
| Total:   | 59*      | 100%                            |       |
| Highest Level of Education:                          |          |                                 |       |
| Grades 1-8   | 0        | .0                              |       |
| Grades 9-11  | 0        | .0                              |       |
| High school diploma or GED                           | 7        | 11.9                            |       |
| Some education or job<br>training after high school  | 23       | 39.0                            |       |
| Bachelor's degree                                    | 13       | 22.0                            |       |
| Graduate or Professional Ed.                         | 12       | 20.3                            |       |
| Missing values                                       | <u>4</u> | <u>6.8</u>                      |       |
| Total:   | 59       | 100%                            |       |
| Family Total Income:                                 |          |                                 |       |
| Less than \$5,000                                    | 8        | 13.6                            |       |
| \$ 5,000-\$ 7,499                                    | 7        | 11.9                            |       |
| \$ 7,500-\$ 9,999                                    | 3        | 5.1                             |       |
| \$10,000-\$14,999                                    | 15       | 25.4                            |       |
| \$15,000-\$19,999                                    | 9        | 15.3                            |       |
| \$20,000-\$24,999                                    | 2        | 3.4                             |       |
| \$25,000-\$34,999                                    | 11       | 18.6                            |       |
| \$35,000-\$49,999                                    | 2        | 3.4                             |       |
| \$50,000 or more                                     | 0        | .0                              |       |
| Missing Values                                       | <u>2</u> | <u>3.4</u>                      |       |
| Total:   | 59       | 100%                            |       |
| Adequate income:                                     |          |                                 |       |
| Not at all adequate                                  | 16       | 27.1                            |       |
| Can meet necessities only                            | 18       | 30.5                            |       |
| Can afford some things<br>wanted but not all         | 22       | 37.3                            |       |
| Can afford about everything<br>wanted                | 2        | 3.4                             |       |
| Can afford everything wanted<br>and still save money | <u>1</u> | <u>1.7</u>                      |       |
| Total:   | 59       | 100%                            |       |
|  | Range    | Mean                            | S.D.  |
| Average Hours worked                                 | 3-77     | 32.78                           | 16.65 |
| Average Age of respondent                            | 21-53    | 42 years                        | 15.37 |
| Average number of children                           | 1-9      | 2.3                             | -     |

\*n=59

\$49,999. None of the respondents had an annual income of \$50,000 or more. Two failed to respond.

The question was asked, "To what extent do you think your family's income is enough for you to live on?" Sixteen (27.1%) mothers responded that their income was not at all adequate; 18 (30.5%) said they could meet only necessities with their income; 22 (37.3%) mothers said they could afford some of the things wanted but not all; 2 (3.4%) could afford about everything they wanted, and 1 (1.7%) mother said she could save money.

#### Situations in Home Causing Stress in Home Life

Respondents were asked to indicate whether any of the 12 situations identified in the questionnaire and listed in Table 2 caused stress in their lives by checking yes or no. If their response was yes, they were requested to indicate the level of stress on a Likert scale from 1 to 7 where 1 equaled "not stressful at all" and 7 equaled "very stressful."

Frequency counts and percentages were tabulated to describe the situations causing the most stress in their lives (Table 2). Fifty-eight (98.3%) of the respondents indicated that single parenting was stressful; 48 (81.4%) said that financial problems caused stress; 37 (62.7%) responded that major change in work or family was a stressor, and 35 (59.3%) indicated that problems with

children caused stress. Fourteen (23.7%) indicated frequently ill family members, 9 (15.3%) seriously or chronically ill family members, 9 (15.3%) recent loss of family member, 7 (11.9%) handicapped family member, 7 (11.9%) chronic unemployment, and 2 (3.4%) that disabled family members caused stress in their lives.

Table 2

Frequency of Situations Causing Stress in Home Life

| Situation                                  | Mean | S.D. | Yes | No |
|--|------|------|-----|----|
| Seriously or chronically ill family member | .88  | 2.14 | 9   | 50 |
| Frequently ill family member or members    | 1.34 | 2.45 | 14  | 45 |
| Disabled family members                    | .24  | 1.19 | 2   | 57 |
| Handicapped family member                  | .66  | 1.80 | 7   | 52 |
| Recent loss of family member               | .83  | 2.01 | 9   | 50 |
| Major change in work or family member      | 3.56 | 2.84 | 37  | 22 |
| Single parenting                           | 5.51 | 1.24 | 58  | 1  |
| Problems with children                     | 3.31 | 2.85 | 35  | 24 |
| Chronic unemployment                       | .68  | 2.00 | 7   | 52 |
| Financial problems                         | 4.92 | 2.51 | 48  | 11 |

Respondents were then given the opportunity to list "other" situations causing stress in their lives and then to



indicate the amount of stress each caused. The following situations were listed by a total of 23 respondents: full time school (listed by 2 respondents), pregnant daughter (1), car (2), living space (1), teens (1), aging parents (1), loneliness (1), E.R.A. (1), church (1), divorce problems (7), low pay (1), social (2), boy friend (1), and incest (1). In all but two cases, those responding indicated that the amount of stress was very stressful.

#### Home and Family Factors and Satisfaction with Home Life

Respondents indicated, from a list of 28 home and family factors, those factors that applied to them and then rated their degree of satisfaction with their home life on a Likert scale of 1 to 7 where 1 equaled "not stressful at all" and 7 equaled "very stressful." Table 3 shows the summary of the questions in order of most satisfied to least satisfied. Respondents were generally satisfied with their home and family life as indicated by the low mean scores. They were most satisfied with child care arrangements (mean of 1.44), family members personal habits (1.51), emotional support from [ex-]spouse (1.63), emotional support from friends (2.24), and health of family members (2.41). As indicated by their high mean scores they were least satisfied with amount of recreation/free time (5.10), amount of time for self (5.07), total family income (4.95),

division of household duties (4.73), and family schedule (4.41). When asked the summary question, "How satisfied are you with your home life?" the mean answer was in the middle of the range at 3.24.

Table 3

Rank by Mean Scores of Home and Family Factors and Degree of Satisfaction With Home Life

| Variables   | N <sup>a</sup> | Mean <sup>b</sup> | S.D. |
|---|----------------|-------------------|------|
| Child Care arrangements   | 26             | 1.44              | 1.99 |
| Family members personal habits (smoking, drinking, drugs, etc.) | 38             | 1.51              | 1.67 |
| Emotional support from (ex-)spouse                              | 15             | 1.63              | 2.91 |
| Emotional support from friends                                  | 57             | 2.24              | 1.41 |
| Health of family members  | 56             | 2.41              | 1.70 |
| Division of parenting responsibility                            | 29             | 2.56              | 2.91 |
| Emotional support from relatives                                | 58             | 2.61              | 1.69 |
| Amount family members express affection                         | 26             | 2.66              | 1.76 |
| Children's school performance                                   | 56             | 2.66              | 1.80 |
| Emotional support from church                                   | 53             | 2.86              | 1.93 |
| Emotional support from children                                 | 26             | 2.90              | 1.74 |
| Services from community resources                               | 45             | 2.93              | 2.13 |
| Personal health   | 56             | 2.80              | 1.91 |
| Communications among family members                             | 58             | 3.17              | 1.72 |
| Method of handling money  | 57             | 3.22              | 1.61 |
| Quality of family's daily diet                                  | 56             | 3.29              | 1.77 |
| Family's ability to resolve conflict                            | 57             | 3.31              | 1.79 |
| Family togetherness   | 57             | 3.32              | 1.71 |
| Children's behavior   | 52             | 3.42              | 1.61 |
| Household equipment   | 56             | 3.42              | 1.65 |
| Housing   | 57             | 3.53              | 1.85 |
| Time together as a family                                       | 53             | 4.15              | 1.82 |
| Sense of control over life events                               | 57             | 4.31              | 1.61 |
| Family schedule   | 38             | 4.41              | 1.61 |
| Division of household duties                                    | 56             | 4.73              | 2.05 |
| Total family income   | 58             | 4.95              | 1.63 |
| Amount of time for self   | 56             | 5.07              | 1.65 |
| Amount of recreation/free time                                  | 54             | 5.10              | 1.51 |
| Summary question: "How satisfied are you with your home life?"  | 58             | 3.24              | 1.54 |

<sup>a</sup>Number responding indicating that this item applied to them.

<sup>b</sup>From a Likert scale with 1 being most satisfied to 7 being least satisfied.

Factor Analysis of Home and  
Family Factors with Home  
Satisfaction

Through factor analysis a search for clusters of variables that are correlated with each other was conducted. Six factors emerged that combined explained 61.3% of the total variance (Table 4). Upon inspection of the loadings, the variables clustering in factors 1 through 6 were given the following names: 1) family interaction, 2) time commitments, 3) health, housing, and income, 4) family support, 5) family diet and money management, and 6) community support.

Multiple Regression of Home  
and Family Factors with Home  
Satisfaction

New variables created by the factor analysis were analyzed using stepwise multiple regression to assess whether a linear model of home and family factors could be formed that would explain a significant amount of the satisfaction with home life. Table 5 shows the results of this analysis in which factors 1 (family interaction), 3 (income, housing, and health), and 5 (family diet and money management) could be expected to explain satisfaction with home life ( $F=30.77$ ). These three new factors explained 63% of the total variance ( $R^2 = .63$ ).

Table 4

Factor Analysis of Home and Family Factors Reported to  
Influence Satisfaction with Home Life

| Factor | Eigenvalue | Percent of Variance |  |  |  |  |  | Cum. Pct. |
|--------|------------|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|-----------|
| 1      | 6.95       | 24.8                |  |  |  |  |  | 24.8      |
| 2      | 2.73       | 9.8                 |  |  |  |  |  | 34.6      |
| 3      | 2.45       | 8.7                 |  |  |  |  |  | 43.3      |
| 4      | 1.81       | 6.5                 |  |  |  |  |  | 49.8      |
| 5      | 1.69       | 6.0                 |  |  |  |  |  | 55.8      |
| 6      | 1.53       | 5.5                 |  |  |  |  |  | 61.3      |

  

| Rotated factor matrix                   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Family's ability to resolve conflict    | .79 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Communication among family members      | .76 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Children's behavior                     | .75 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Family's togetherness                   | .69 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Amount family members express affection | .66 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Child's school performance              | .64 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Emotional support from children         | .63 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Sense of control over life events       | .55 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Amount of recreation/free time          |     | .84 |     |     |     |     |
| Amount of time to self                  |     | .81 |     |     |     |     |
| Family schedules                        |     | .69 |     |     |     |     |
| Time together as a family               |     | .69 |     |     |     |     |
| Division of household duties            |     | .52 |     |     |     |     |
| Personal health                         |     |     | .85 |     |     |     |
| Health of family members                |     |     | .85 |     |     |     |
| Housing                                 |     |     | .55 |     |     |     |
| Total family income                     |     |     | .48 |     |     |     |
| Emotional support from [ex-]spouse      |     |     |     | .80 |     |     |
| Division of parenting responsibilities  |     |     |     | .71 |     |     |
| Services from community resources       |     |     |     | .56 |     |     |
| Quality of family's daily diet          |     |     |     |     | .78 |     |
| Method of handling money                |     |     |     |     | .73 |     |
| Emotional support from church           |     |     |     |     |     | .81 |
| Emotional support from friends          |     |     |     |     |     | .72 |

Table 5

Multiple Regression Analysis of Home and Family Factors That Explain Satisfaction with Home Life

| Factor     | Variable                    | B    | SE B | BETA | T     | Signif. T |
|------------|-----------------------------|------|------|------|-------|-----------|
| 1          | Family Interaction          | .97  | .13  | .63  | 7.64  | .00       |
| 2          | Income, Housing health      | .64  | .13  | .42  | 5.05  | .00       |
| 3          | Family diet and money mgmt. | .37  | .13  | .24  | 2.92  | .01       |
| (Constant) |                             | 3.24 | .13  |      | 25.82 | .00       |

$$R^2 = .63$$

Home and Family Factors and  
Satisfaction with Work

The list of 28 home and family factors was given to respondents. From those factors that applied to them they indicated what effect each had on their work performance on a Likert scale from 1 to 7 where 1 equaled "very positive" and 7 equaled "very negative." The mean scores and a summary of the responses to these questions are found in Table 6. Low mean scores indicate factors having the most positive effect on respondents' work performance. These factors were emotional support from [ex]spouse (mean score of 1.39), child care arrangements (1.42), family

Table 6

Mean Scores of Home and Family Factors and Their Effect on  
Work Performance

| Factors  | N  | Means <sup>a</sup> | S.D. |
|--|----|--------------------|------|
| Emotional support from [ex-]spouse   | 15 | 1.39               | 2.55 |
| Child care arrangements  | 25 | 1.42               | 2.02 |
| Family members' personal habits (smoking, drinking, drug use)                    | 38 | 1.64               | 1.68 |
| Emotional support from friends   | 55 | 2.24               | 1.47 |
| Emotional support from relatives   | 56 | 2.59               | 1.63 |
| Division of parenting responsibilities   | 30 | 2.63               | 2.86 |
| Health of family members   | 54 | 2.68               | 1.79 |
| Emotional support from church  | 51 | 2.75               | 1.78 |
| Children's school performance  | 53 | 2.81               | 1.90 |
| Amount family members express affection  | 55 | 2.83               | 1.70 |
| Emotional support from children  | 54 | 2.85               | 1.84 |
| Services from community resources  | 44 | 2.93               | 2.15 |
| Personal health  | 53 | 2.98               | 1.98 |
| Children's behavior  | 56 | 3.22               | 1.75 |
| Communication among family members   | 57 | 3.29               | 1.69 |
| Family togetherness  | 56 | 3.34               | 1.67 |
| Quality of family's daily diet   | 54 | 3.34               | 1.72 |
| Family's ability to resolve conflict   | 56 | 3.51               | 1.51 |
| Method of handling money   | 56 | 3.51               | 1.51 |
| Household equipment  | 54 | 3.54               | 1.43 |
| Housing  | 55 | 3.58               | 1.67 |
| Time together as a family  | 58 | 3.93               | 1.74 |
| Total family income  | 56 | 3.98               | 1.59 |
| Family schedule  | 55 | 4.05               | 1.73 |
| Sense of control over life events  | 57 | 4.07               | 1.72 |
| Division of household duties   | 55 | 4.31               | 1.89 |
| Amount of recreation/free time   | 58 | 4.56               | 1.61 |
| Amount of time for self  | 58 | 4.56               | 1.57 |
| Summary: "What effect do you think your home life has on your work performance?" | 58 | 3.44               | 1.61 |

<sup>a</sup>The range was from 1 being "very positive" to 7 being "very negative."

members' personal habits (1.64), emotional support from friends (2.24), and emotional support from relatives (2.59). Factors that negatively affected work performance were amount of time to self (4.56), amount of recreation/free time (4.56), division of household duties (4.31), sense of control over life events (4.07), and family schedule (4.05). When asked overall, "What effect do you think your home life has on your work performance?" respondents answered with a neutral mean of 3.44.

#### Factor Analysis of Home and Family Factors with Satisfaction with Work

Factor analysis was performed to find the related variables forming clusters. Seven factors emerged, explaining 70.6% of the total variance (Table 7). These new factors were identified as 1) family interaction, 2) housing, health, and income, 3) time commitments, 4) family and community support, 5) family diet and money management, 6) child care and family drug and alcohol abuse, and 7) family communication.

#### Multiple Regression with Home and Family Factors with Satisfaction with Work

Using stepwise multiple regression, new variables created by factor analysis were analyzed. A linear model of home and family factors explained a significant amount of

Table 7

Factor Analysis of Home and Family Factors Reported to  
Influence Satisfaction with Work

| Factor | Eigenvalue | Percent of Variance | Cum. Pct. |
|--------|------------|---------------------|-----------|
| 1      | 8.71       | 31.1                | 31.1      |
| 2      | 2.51       | 9.0                 | 40.1      |
| 3      | 2.29       | 8.2                 | 48.3      |
| 4      | 1.99       | 7.1                 | 55.4      |
| 5      | 1.72       | 6.1                 | 61.5      |
| 6      | 1.42       | 5.1                 | 66.6      |
| 7      | 1.11       | 4.0                 | 70.5      |

  

| Rotated Factor Matrix   | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   | 7   |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Children's behavior   | .76 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Family togetherness   | .76 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Children's school performance                                     | .72 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Family's ability to resolve conflict                              | .68 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Sense of control over life events                                 | .64 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Emotional support from relatives                                  | .46 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| Housing   |     | .82 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Household equipment   |     | .74 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Health of family members  |     | .73 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Personal health   |     | .72 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Total family income   |     | .71 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Emotional support from children                                   |     | .59 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Emotional support from friends                                    |     | .50 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Amount of time for self   |     |     | .86 |     |     |     |     |
| Amount of recreation/free time                                    |     |     | .79 |     |     |     |     |
| Time together as a family   |     |     | .77 |     |     |     |     |
| Division of household duties                                      |     |     | .55 |     |     |     |     |
| Family schedule   |     |     | .53 |     |     |     |     |
| Division of parenting responsibilities                            |     |     |     | .80 |     |     |     |
| Emotional support from [ex-]spouse                                |     |     |     | .69 |     |     |     |
| Emotional support from church                                     |     |     |     | .64 |     |     |     |
| Services from community resources                                 |     |     |     | .61 |     |     |     |
| Quality of family's daily diet                                    |     |     |     |     | .75 |     |     |
| Method of handling money  |     |     |     |     | .61 |     |     |
| Child care arrangements   |     |     |     |     |     | .81 |     |
| Family members personal habits<br>(Smoking, drinking, drugs etc.) |     |     |     |     |     | .56 |     |
| Amount family members express affection                           |     |     |     |     |     |     | .68 |
| Communications among family members                               |     |     |     |     |     |     | .62 |



the satisfaction with work. The results of this analysis showed that factors 1 (family interaction), 3 (time commitments), 2 (housing, health, income), 4 (family and community support), and 5 (family diet and money management) could be expected to explain satisfaction with work ( $F=6.50$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p<.001$ ) (see Table 8). These factors explained 38% of the total variance ( $R^2 = .38$ ).

Table 8

Multiple Regression Analysis of Home and Family Factors That Explain Satisfaction with Work

| Factor     | Variable                     | B    | SE B | Beta | T     | Sign. T |
|------------|------------------------------|------|------|------|-------|---------|
| 1          | Family Interaction           | .59  | .17  | .37  | 3.37  | .00     |
| 3          | Time Commitments             | -.42 | .17  | -.26 | -2.43 | .02     |
| 2          | Housing, Health and Income   | .41  | .17  | .26  | 2.37  | .02     |
| 4          | Family and Community Support | .41  | .17  | .25  | 2.35  | .02     |
| 5          | Family Diet and Money Mgmt.  | .35  | .17  |      | 2.02  | .05     |
| (Constant) |                              | 3.44 | .17  |      | 19.92 | .00     |

$$R^2 = .38$$

### Work Factors and Satisfaction with Home Life

From a list of 22 work factors, respondents were asked to indicate factors which applied to them and then rate what effect each factor had on the quality of their home life on a Likert scale of 1 to 7 where 1 equaled "very positive" and 7 equaled "very negative." The mean scores of respondents' answers are summarized in Table 9. The respondents indicated the work factors having the most positive effect on their home life satisfaction were meal and break time (mean of 2.39), amount of commuting time (2.42), friends at work (2.49), opportunity to work independently (2.56), and amount of control over how you do your job (2.69). The five work factors having the most negative effect on their home life satisfaction were salary or pay (4.37), number of hours worked per week (4.00), work schedule (3.90), amount of energy required on the job (3.75), and opportunities for advancement (3.63). The mean of the responses to the summary question "What effect do you think your work has on your satisfaction of your home life?" was just above the mid point at 3.51, indicating a slightly negative effect.

Table 9

Rank by Mean Scores of Work Factors on Satisfaction with  
Home Life

| Factor  | N <sup>a</sup> | Mean <sup>b</sup> | S.D. |
|---|----------------|-------------------|------|
| Meal and break time   | 49             | 2.39              | 1.77 |
| Amount of commuting time  | 53             | 2.42              | 1.90 |
| Friendships at work   | 57             | 2.49              | 4.58 |
| Opportunity to work independently   | 56             | 2.56              | 1.71 |
| Amount of control over how<br>you do your job   | 57             | 2.70              | 1.59 |
| Parking arrangements  | 50             | 2.76              | 1.79 |
| Variety of work tasks   | 57             | 2.78              | 1.50 |
| Support of supervisor/management  | 55             | 2.85              | 1.83 |
| Work status   | 55             | 2.90              | 1.73 |
| Challenge of the job  | 58             | 2.95              | 1.47 |
| Fringe benefits   | 47             | 3.05              | 2.32 |
| Likelihood of transfer  | 44             | 3.15              | 2.08 |
| Flexibility of work schedule  | 57             | 3.20              | 1.83 |
| Job security  | 57             | 3.20              | 1.83 |
| Working conditions/<br>physical environment   | 58             | 3.32              | 1.62 |
| Work policies and regulations   | 54             | 3.34              | 1.94 |
| Work expectations   | 57             | 3.58              | 1.80 |
| Opportunities for advancement   | 56             | 3.63              | 1.94 |
| Amount of energy required<br>on the job   | 57             | 3.75              | 1.77 |
| Work schedule   | 57             | 3.90              | 1.95 |
| Number of hours worked per week   | 58             | 4.00              | 1.74 |
| Salary or pay   | 55             | 4.37              | 1.92 |
| Summary: "What effect do you<br>think your work has on your<br>satisfaction of your home life?" | 53             | 3.51              | 1.60 |

<sup>a</sup>Range of scores was from 1 "very positive" to 7  
 "very negative."

Factor Analysis of Work  
Factors Influencing Satisfaction  
with Home Life

Factor analysis was performed to find the clusters of work variables that were correlated with home life variables. Table 10 identifies these six factors as: 1) work environment (37.3% of the variance), 2) salary and advancement (9.0%), 3) breaks and parking (7.9), 4) benefits and security (6.3%), 5) commuting and friends at work (4.9%), and 6) work schedule (4.6%)

Multiple Regression of Work  
Factors Influencing Satisfaction  
with Home Life

New variables created by factor analysis were analyzed using stepwise multiple regression. A linear model of work factors was formed that would explain a significant amount of satisfaction with home life. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 11. Factors entering the equation were 6 (work schedule), 1 (work environment), 2 (salary and advancement). These three factors could be expected to predict satisfaction with home life ( $F=13.02$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p<.000$ ) and explained 42% ( $R^2=.42$ ) of the total variance.

Table 10

Factor Analysis of Work Factors Reported to Influence  
Satisfaction with Home Life

| Factor | Eigenvalue | Percent of Variance | Cum.Pct. |
|--------|------------|---------------------|----------|
| 1      | 8.21       | 37.3                | 37.3     |
| 2      | 1.98       | 9.0                 | 46.3     |
| 3      | 1.74       | 7.9                 | 54.2     |
| 4      | 1.38       | 6.3                 | 60.5     |
| 5      | 1.09       | 4.9                 | 65.4     |
| 6      | 1.00       | 4.6                 | 70.0     |

  

| Rotated factor matrix                         | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Challenge of the job                          | .71 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Working conditions/physical environment       | .69 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Flexibility of work schedule                  | .63 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Work expectations                             | .62 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Variety of work tasks                         | .58 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Likelihood of transfer                        | .57 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Amount of control over how you<br>do your job | .48 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Opportunity to work independently             | .47 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Amount of energy required to do the job       | .45 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Work status                                   | .41 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Salary or pay                                 |     | .83 |     |     |     |     |
| Opportunities for advancement                 |     | .66 |     |     |     |     |
| Support of supervisor/management              |     | .58 |     |     |     |     |
| Meal and break time                           |     |     | .80 |     |     |     |
| Parking arrangements                          |     |     | .68 |     |     |     |
| Fringe benefits                               |     |     |     | .84 |     |     |
| Job security                                  |     |     |     | .72 |     |     |
| Work policies and regulations                 |     |     |     | .52 |     |     |
| Amount of commuting time                      |     |     |     |     | .89 |     |
| Friendships at work                           |     |     |     |     | .70 |     |
| Number of hours worked per week               |     |     |     |     |     | .87 |
| Work schedule                                 |     |     |     |     |     | .83 |

Table 11

Multiple Regression Analysis of Work Factors That Explain  
Satisfaction of Home Life

| Factor     | Variable               | B    | SE B | Beta | T     | Sign.<br>T |
|------------|------------------------|------|------|------|-------|------------|
| 6          | Work Schedule          | .63  | .17  | .40  | 3.82  | .00        |
| 1          | Work environment       | .61  | .17  | .38  | 3.69  | .00        |
| 2          | Salary and Advancement | .54  | .17  | .34  | 3.28  | .00        |
| (Constant) |                        | 3.51 | .16  |      | 21.43 | .00        |

$R^2 = .42$

### Work Factors and Satisfaction with Work

Respondents were asked to identify, from the list of 22 work factors, the factors that applied to them and then rate what effect each had on their satisfaction with work on a Likert scale of 1 to 7 where 1 equaled "very satisfied" and 7 equaled "very dissatisfied." The summary of mean scores of respondents' answers to these questions is found in Table 12. The five factors with the lowest mean score illustrating satisfaction with these work factors were amount of commuting time (2.03), friends at work (2.08), opportunity to work independently (2.31), variety of work tasks (2.36), and parking arrangements (2.49). The five

Table 12

Rank by Mean Scores of Work Factors and Satisfaction with Work

| Factors  | N <sup>a</sup> | Mean <sup>b</sup> | S.D. |
|--|----------------|-------------------|------|
| Amount of commuting time                         | 53             | 2.03              | 1.81 |
| Friendships at work                              | 58             | 2.09              | 1.29 |
| Opportunity to work independently                | 57             | 2.31              | 1.65 |
| Variety of work tasks                            | 58             | 2.36              | 1.40 |
| Parking arrangements                             | 49             | 2.49              | 2.00 |
| Amount of control over how you do your job       | 58             | 2.51              | 1.70 |
| Meal and break time                              | 51             | 2.53              | 2.04 |
| Challenge of the job                             | 30             | 2.53              | 1.44 |
| Support of supervisor/management                 | 56             | 2.78              | 1.93 |
| Work status                                      | 56             | 2.85              | 1.93 |
| Flexibility of work schedule                     | 58             | 2.90              | 1.73 |
| Working conditions/physical environment          | 47             | 2.92              | 1.68 |
| Likelihood of transfer                           | 44             | 3.05              | 2.16 |
| Work policies and regulations                    | 55             | 3.25              | 2.07 |
| Job security                                     | 43             | 3.27              | 1.89 |
| Fringe benefits                                  | 49             | 3.27              | 2.42 |
| Amount of energy required on the job             | 58             | 3.39              | 1.94 |
| Work expectations                                | 58             | 3.46              | 1.81 |
| Work schedule                                    | 58             | 3.48              | 1.86 |
| Number of hours worked per week                  | 51             | 3.81              | 1.87 |
| Opportunities for advancement                    | 57             | 3.83              | 2.10 |
| Salary or pay                                    | 56             | 4.53              | 1.99 |
| Summary: "How satisfied are you with your work?" | 48             | 3.15              | 1.73 |

<sup>a</sup>Number of respondents indicating that this item applied to them.

<sup>b</sup>Range of scores was from 1 "Very satisfied" to 7 "very dissatisfied."

work factors with the higher mean scores were salary or pay (4.53), opportunities for advancement (3.83), number of hours worked per week (3.81), work schedule (3.47), and work expectations (3.46). The higher mean scores showed these work factors to be the factors with which the respondents were least satisfied.

The mean for the summary question "How satisfied are you with your work?" was 3.15, showing a below mid-point of satisfaction.

#### Factor Analysis of Work Factors Influencing Satisfaction with Work

Factor analysis was performed to find the clusters of variables that were all correlated with each other. Six factors emerged, explaining 72.1% of the total variance (Table 13). The factors identified were 1) work environment, 2) schedule and salary, 3) breaks and control, 4) commuting and friends at work, 5) benefits and security, and 6) transfer and working conditions.

#### Multiple Regression of Work Factors with Satisfaction with Work

To assess whether a linear model of work factors could be formed by these new variables created by factor analysis, which would explain a significant amount of the satisfaction with work, stepwise multiple regression was used. The results of this analysis, summarized in Table 14, showed



Table 13

Factor Analysis of Work Factors Reported to Influence  
Satisfaction with Work

| Factor<br>Cum. Pct. | Eigenvalue | Percent of<br>Variance |
|---------------------|------------|------------------------|
| 1                   | 8.48       | 38.5                   |
| 2                   | 2.24       | 48.7                   |
| 3                   | 1.60       | 56.0                   |
| 4                   | 1.46       | 62.6                   |
| 5                   | 1.06       | 67.4                   |
| 6                   | 1.02       | 72.1                   |

  

| Rotated factor matrix                      | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 6   |
|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|
| Challenge of the job                       | .84 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Variety of work tasks                      | .83 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Work expectations                          | .78 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Opportunities for advancement              | .77 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Opportunity to work independently          | .76 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Support of supervisor/management           | .53 |     |     |     |     |     |
| Number of hours worked per week            |     | .89 |     |     |     |     |
| Work schedule                              |     | .71 |     |     |     |     |
| Flexibility of work schedule               |     | .62 |     |     |     |     |
| Amount of energy required on the job       |     | .61 |     |     |     |     |
| Salary or pay                              |     | .47 |     |     |     |     |
| Meal and break time                        |     |     | .87 |     |     |     |
| Amount of control over how you do your job |     |     | .58 |     |     |     |
| Work status                                |     |     | .47 |     |     |     |
| Amount of commuting time                   |     |     |     | .86 |     |     |
| Parking arrangements                       |     |     |     | .67 |     |     |
| Friendships at work                        |     |     |     | .55 |     |     |
| Fringe benefits                            |     |     |     |     | .77 |     |
| Job security                               |     |     |     |     | .71 |     |
| Work policies and regulations              |     |     |     |     | .53 |     |
| Likelihood of transfer                     |     |     |     |     |     | .78 |
| Working conditions/physical environment    |     |     |     |     |     | .64 |

Table 14

Multiple Regression Analysis of Work Factors That Explain Satisfaction with Work

| Factor     | Variable                       | B    | SE B | Beta | T     | Sign. T |
|------------|--------------------------------|------|------|------|-------|---------|
| 3          | Breaks and Control             | .66  | .18  | .38  | 3.6   | .00     |
| 2          | Schedule and Salary            | .62  | .18  | .36  | 3.43  | .00     |
| 4          | Communting and Friends at Work | .60  | .18  | .35  | 3.29  | .00     |
| (Constant) |                                | 3.15 | .18  |      | 17.52 | .00     |

$$R^2 = .40$$

that factors 3 (breaks and control), 2 (schedule and salary), and 4 (communting and friends at work), could be expected to explain satisfaction with work ( $F=11.95$ ,  $df=1$ ,  $p<.000$ ). Forty percent of the total variance was explained by these three factors ( $R^2 = .40$ ).

#### Difficulty in Combining Work and Family

An overall question was then asked, "How difficult is it for you to combine work and family?" Range of scores was from 1 "not difficult" to 7 "very difficult." The mean response was 4.31 ( $N=54$ ,  $S.D.=1.90$ ), indicating that it was difficult to combine work and family.

### Analysis of Variance and Correlations

Analysis of variance was used to test observed differences between income levels and the following variables: education, number of children in home, number of young (birth to 6 years old) children in the home, satisfaction with income, age of respondent, satisfaction with home life, and satisfaction with work.

There was no significant difference at the .05 level in total number of children, young children, satisfaction with income, or respondents' age by income.

There was a significant difference in satisfaction with home life by income.

Because some of the variables were nonparametric, Spearman correlation coefficient was used to measure the correlation between education, perception of enough income, home life satisfaction, and work satisfaction with income. The test showed significant correlation (at the .05 level) between all four of these variables with income (Table 15). The higher the income the more education the respondents had received; the higher was their perception that they had enough income; the more satisfied they were with their home life; and the more satisfied they were with their work.

Table 15

Spearman Correlation Coefficients of Education, Perception  
of Enough Income, Home Life Satisfaction, and Work  
Satisfaction with Income

| Dependent Variables         | N  | Coef. | Significance |
|-----------------------------|----|-------|--------------|
| Education                   | 54 | .328  | .008*        |
| Perception of Enough Income | 57 | .525  | .000*        |
| Satisfaction with Home Life | 56 | .270  | .022*        |
| Work Satisfaction           | 57 | .333  | .006*        |

Income Independent Variable, \*Significant at the .05 level

Discussion of Findings in Support  
of Related Theories

Human Ecosystem Theory

The immediate settings used in this study are the work and home environments. Multiple regression results and correlation coefficients resulting from data analyses indicated that home and family factors are significantly related to home life satisfaction as well as work satisfaction. Similar analyses also indicated that work factors are related significantly to satisfaction of home life and satisfaction of work.

Satisfaction with Life Theory

Campbell et al. (1976) suggested that overall satisfaction in any relevant domain of life experience

depends on actual personal experiences and perceived impact of these experiences. In support of the satisfaction theory, home and family factors and work factors were determined through multiple regression analysis to predict satisfaction of home life and satisfaction with work in this study.

### Role Theory

This theory provides a conceptual framework to explain how individuals function in one aspect of their life in relation to other aspects or variables in their life, such as health, income, child care, work status, and home environment. According to this theory, expectations associated with work and family roles can lead to role overload and can exert pressures in one area that interfere with performance in the other area (Duxbury & Higgins, 1991).

Results of the multiple regression analyses showed that home and family factors are related to satisfaction with home life and work performance. Additional multiple regression analyses determined that work factors were related to satisfaction with work and satisfaction with home life.

### Consistency of Findings with Theories

The findings were shown to be consistent with the three theoretical perspectives examined in this study. Using the

results of the analyses of data, the researcher concluded that the findings in this study confirmed the ecosystem theory, the satisfaction with life theory, and the role theory.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A summary of the study is presented in this chapter, with discussion of the findings. Implications and recommendations for further study are also included.

#### Summary and Discussion

The purpose of this study was to assess the relationships between family/home satisfaction and job satisfaction of working single mothers in Iron County, Utah. Data for this study were collected by questionnaire using the survey method. A total of 59 persons responded to the survey and returned it by mail or in person.

The profile of the respondents included 3.4% minority women, which is representative of the minority population according to the 1990 census for Iron County. All respondents had at least a high school education with 49% having college degrees. This may be higher than anticipated for a rural Utah county but may be explained by the presence of a University in the county.

The average number of children per family in this study was 2.3, with the range being from 1 to 9. The average number of children in the Texas research was lower (Felstehausen et al., 1986) with 1.08 children per family. But the average number of children in the single mother families in Schuchardt and Guadagno studies (1991) was

higher with 3.3 children. Because of the predominate religion in Southern Utah it was anticipated that families would be larger and they were. The average size family in this study was higher than both the national average household of 2.63 and the Utah average household of 3.15 (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1990 Census). The figures for households headed by single mothers were unavailable.

In this study the average family annual income was in the category of between \$10,000 to \$15,000. This amount is just above the 1987 poverty level of \$9,696. Thirty percent of the respondents reported income at or below the poverty level for the average family of 3 (mother and 2 children in this study). This is slightly lower than the 33% single mother families in Utah who are below poverty level and the 40% of the single mother families in the U.S. who are below the poverty level (Olsen, 1988).

Several of the questionnaires were answered by women teaching at the University or in administrative positions elsewhere in Iron County. This may have accounted for the larger than anticipated percentage (22%) of the respondents reporting annual incomes at or above \$25,000.

When respondents were asked to indicate their perception of the adequacy of their income, 31% said they could only meet necessities and 42% said their income allowed them to afford more than just necessities. The



remaining 27% reported that their incomes were not at all adequate.

Respondents reported working between 3 and 77 hours per week with the mean hours worked per week being 33 hours. Some respondents were students and some were working more than one job, which may explain the variance in the work week.

The average age of the respondents was 42 years. Age ranged from 21 to 53. This researcher was unable to determine from the 1990 census data if this age is representative of the average single mother in Iron County. There are likely some single mothers under the age of 21 but they may not be working or heads of households; or they may not have responded to this questionnaire. The average age for the respondents in the Texas study (Felstehausen et al., 1986) was 37.6 (S.D. = 10.8 years) and of the single parents in Burden's study (1986) it was 37 (S.D. not reported) for the married women, 34 years for the single women, and 42 for the single fathers.

Working single mothers identified (in order of most frequent response) single parenting, financial problems, major changes in work or family, and problems with children as the situations causing stress in their lives. This finding confirmed one hypothesis of this researcher and was consistent with results reported in similar studies.

### Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was conducted on 28 home and family variables and 22 work variables. Analyses were conducted to identify clusters of variables that were related to home satisfaction and work satisfaction.

The analyses in this study determined that the following six home and family factors related to satisfaction with home life (listed in order of variance explained):

1. family interaction;
2. time commitments;
3. health, housing, and income;
4. family support;
5. family diet and money management; and
6. community support.

Home and family factors related to satisfaction with work were (listed in order of variance explained):

1. family interaction;
2. housing, health, and income;
3. time commitments;
4. family and community support;
5. family diet and money management;
6. child care and family drug and alcohol abuse; and
7. family communication.

Listed in order of the variance explained are the work factors that related to satisfaction with home life:

1. work environment;
2. salary and advancement;
3. breaks and parking;
4. benefits and security;
5. commuting and friends at work; and
6. work schedule.

Work factors related to satisfaction with work were identified as (listed in order of variance explained):

1. work environment
2. schedule and salary;
3. break and control;
4. commuting and friends at work;
5. benefits and security; and
6. transfer and work conditions.

In reviewing the results of the factor analyses, it was concluded that the home and family variables related to home and those related to work clustered into similar factors. Likewise, work variables that affected home and family or work clustered into similar factors, as evidenced from the lists reported in the preceding paragraphs.

#### Stepwise Multiple Regression

A subsequent series of regression analyses were conducted to find which of the new factors could predict satisfaction with home life and work satisfaction.

Findings indicate that home and family factors accounting for 63% of the variance ( $R^2=.63$ ) in predicting satisfaction with home life were:

1. family interaction;
2. income, housing, and health; and
3. family diet and money management.

Home and family factors that entered the regression equation and explained 38% ( $R^2=.38$ ) of the variance in predicting satisfaction with work were:

1. family interaction;
2. time commitments;
3. housing, health, and income;
4. family and community support; and
5. family diet and money management.

Forty-two percent of the variance ( $R^2 = .42$ ) in satisfaction with home life could be accounted for in the following work factors:

1. work schedule;
2. work environment; and
3. salary and advancement.

The work factors that could explain 40% of the variance ( $R^2 = .40$ ) in predicting satisfaction with work were:

1. breaks and control;
2. schedule and salary; and
3. commuting and friends at work.

The regression analyses suggested that work environment, work conditions, salary, security, schedule, commuting, control, and friends at work were factors associated with greater satisfaction with work. Family interaction, time, money management, housing, health, income, family and community support, and family diet were factors associated with satisfaction at home and at work.

Analysis of Variance and  
Spearman's Correlation  
Coefficient

Spearman correlation statistical analysis was conducted. A statistically significant relationship was found with income and 1) education ( $F=.008$ ), 2) perception of enough income ( $F=.000$ ), 3) satisfaction with home life ( $F=.022$ ), and 4) work satisfaction ( $F=.006$ ). Those with the higher incomes had the most education, held the perception that they had enough income, were more satisfied with home life, and had more work satisfaction.

Variables also analyzed for relationship with home and/or work satisfaction in the analysis of variance were children in the household, young children in the household, and age of respondent. None of these variables were significant in the analyses. This was not consistent with research reported in the literature, which reported that children and age associated with satisfaction.

Although this study found problems with children were one of the variables most frequently identified as

situations causing stress in home life, children were not identified either in the factor analysis or the analysis of variance as significantly relating to satisfaction in home or work. However, it could be expected that reducing or, where possible, eliminating these situations would reduce stress.

Consistent with other research, findings in this study suggest that income is correlated with education and perception of enough income to meet family needs. Income is also correlated with satisfaction with home life and work satisfaction.

#### Implications and Recommendations for Further Study

Implications of this study point to the importance of making educational programs available for lower income and lesser educated, single working mothers. These programs should include parenting and employment skills, time and financial management, health and nutritional information, and ways to cope with change. The importance of friends at work and family interactions was reinforced in this study. It would be important to make socializing with peers a strong component of these programs.

This study used a population of convenience from Iron County in southern Utah. The findings may not be generalizable to the general population of working single mothers. In order to better serve the needs of working

single mothers in Utah, a similar statewide study needs to be conducted.

Other questions could be asked the respondent to better understand why some mothers were coping more ably than others. Suggestions for questions that could be asked include: Are there people who contribute to your support, emotionally, financially, or in other ways? Who is your immediate support system? Are you presently in a relationship? Are you now or have you ever been in therapy? What is the nature of the time, money, energy, and emotional support exchange in your relationships? Are you on welfare? What are your coping mechanisms? Have you ever been married? Answers to these questions would enable the selection and presentation of curriculum better targeted to the needs of the clients.

Additional areas of research could be addressed by surveying single mothers not working; making comparisons of the difference in the stress level of mothers who have male children as compared to mothers with female children; and considering the influence of age of woman or age of children on selected stressors. Research comparing married women, with and without children, working and not working, with single mothers would provide additional insight into their similarities and differences.

In addition, a statewide study of working married mothers with children would enable a comparison of needs of

single working mothers with the needs of married working mothers. Such a study would enable the researcher to determine the differences when a spouse is present.

Alternatively, a similar statewide study of all single women would allow the researcher to compare stressors between never married and divorced women, with and without children, employed and unemployed, and different income levels.

Additional research would provide more complete data on single and married women with and without children, both working and not working. These data would enable the researcher to more precisely analyze relationships between satisfaction of home and family and satisfaction with work.



## LITERATURE CITED

- Besharov, D. J. (1992, September/October). Not all single mothers are created equal. The American Enterprise, pp. 13-17.
- Burden, D. S. (1986). Single parents and the work setting: The impact of multiple job and homelife responsibilities. Family Relations, 36, 37-43.
- Burge, P. L., & Culver, S. M. (1989). The reciprocal relationship between work and home satisfaction for home economics teachers. Home Economics Research Journal, 17(4), 337-350.
- Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., & Rodgers, W. L. (1976). The quality of American life. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Churchill, G. A., Jr., Ford, N. M., & Walker, O. C., Jr. (1976). Organizational climate and job satisfaction in the sales force. Journal of Marketing Research, 13, 323-332.
- Duxbury, L. E., & Higgins, C. A. (1991). Gender differences in work-family conflicts. Journal of Applied Psychology, 76(1), 60-74.
- Exter, T. (1990, March). Demographic forecasts. American Demographics, p. 63.
- Felstehausen, G., Glosson, L. R., & Couch, A. S. (1986). A study to determine the relationship between the workplace and the home. Final report. Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 376-890)
- Good, L. K., Gentry, J. W., & Sisler, G. F. (1990). Work-Family conflict and retail managers' job attitudes. Home Economics Research Journal, 18(4), 323-335.
- Googin, B., & Burden, D. (1987, July-August). Vulnerability of working parents: Balancing work and home roles. National Association of Social Workers, Inc. pp. 295-300.

- Harrison, A. O., & Minor, J. H. (1982). Interrole conflict, coping strategies, and role satisfaction among single and married employed mothers. Psychology of Women Quarterly, 6(3), 354-360.
- Kahn, R. L., Wolfe, D. M., Quinn, R. P., & Snoek, J. D. (1964). Organizational stress: Studies in role conflict and ambiguity. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- McLanahan, S., & Booth, K. (1989). Mother-only families: Problems, prospects, and politics. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51, 557-580.
- Menaghan, E. G., & Parcel, T. L. (1990). Parental employment and family life: Research in the 1980s. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52, 1079-1098.
- Moen, P. (1991). Transitions in mid-life: Women's work and family roles in the 1970s. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 53, 135-150.
- Olsen, M. L. (1988). Data on children, women and families in Utah and the nation. Statistics prepared for the Division of Family Services, Salt Lake City, Utah.
- Olson, S. L., & Banyard, V. (1993). Stop the world so I can get off for a while: Sources of daily stress in the lives of low-income single mothers of young children. Family Relations, 42, 50-56.
- Pearce, D. (1978). The feminization of poverty: Women, work and welfare. Urban and Social Change Review, 11(1-2), 28-36.
- Perkins, C. D. (1984, October 19). Act PL 98-524. Vocational Education Act.
- Pleck, J. (1985). Working wives/working husbands. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Quinn, P., & Allen, K. R. (1989). Facing challenges and making compromises: How single mothers endure. Family Relations, 38, 390-395.
- Renshaw, J. R. (1976). An exploration of the dynamics of the overlapping world of work and family. Family Process, 15, 143-165.
- Repetti, R. L. (1987). Linkages between work and family roles. Applied Social Psychology Annual, 7, 98-127.

- Richards, L. N. (1989). The precarious survival and hard-won satisfactions of white single-parent families. Family Relations, 38, 396-403.
- Rubin, L. B. (1976). Worlds of pain/life in the working-class family. New York: Basics Books, Inc.
- Schuchardt, J., & Guadagno, M. A. N., (1991). A comparison of lower middle income two-parent and single-mother families. Home Economics Review, 4(2), 9-17.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census. (1987). Statistical Abstract of the United States; 1986 (107th ed.). Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- U. S. Bureau of the Census of Population and Housing. (1990). Iron County Utah. Summary tape file 1A. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Voydanoff, P., & Donnelly, B. W., (1989). Work and family roles and psychological distress. Journal of Marriage and the Family 51, 923-932.
- Walker, L. S., & Walker, J. L. (1980). Trait anxiety in mothers: Differences associated with employment status, family size and age of children. Psychological Reports, 47(1), 295-299.
- Way, W. (1990). Quality of life and ecological systems; Frameworks for examining work-family relationships. Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education, 8(1), 64-74.

## APPENDICES

Appendix A. Work, Home, and Family Questionnaire

## WORK, HOME, AND FAMILY QUESTIONNAIRE

DIRECTIONS Place an X in the appropriate blank. Write a response when necessary

1. I am:  
     \_\_\_\_(1) male  
     \_\_\_\_(2) female
2. My ethnic group is:  
     \_\_\_\_(1) American Indian  
     \_\_\_\_(2) Alaskan Native  
     \_\_\_\_(3) Asian  
     \_\_\_\_(4) Pacific Islander  
     \_\_\_\_(5) Black, not Hispanic  
     \_\_\_\_(6) Hispanic  
     \_\_\_\_(7) White, not Hispanic
3. My current marital status is:  
     \_\_\_\_(1) Never married  
     \_\_\_\_(2) married  
     \_\_\_\_(3) separated  
     \_\_\_\_(4) divorced  
     \_\_\_\_(5) widowed  
     \_\_\_\_(6) other
4. My highest level of education is:  
     \_\_\_\_(1) grades 1-8  
     \_\_\_\_(2) grades 9-11  
     \_\_\_\_(3) high school diploma or GED  
     \_\_\_\_(4) some education or job training after high school  
     \_\_\_\_(5) bachelor's degree (four year college or university)  
     \_\_\_\_(6) graduate or professional education
5. My family's total income per year is:  
     \_\_\_\_(1) less than \$5,000  
     \_\_\_\_(2) \$5,000 to \$7,499  
     \_\_\_\_(3) \$7,500 to \$9,999  
     \_\_\_\_(4) \$10,000 to \$14,999  
     \_\_\_\_(5) \$15,000 to \$19,999  
     \_\_\_\_(6) \$20,000 to \$24,999  
     \_\_\_\_(7) \$25,000 to \$34,999  
     \_\_\_\_(8) \$35,000 to \$49,999  
     \_\_\_\_(9) \$50,000 or more
6. To what extent do you think your family's income is enough for you to live on?  
     \_\_\_\_(1) not at all adequate  
     \_\_\_\_(2) can meet necessities only  
     \_\_\_\_(3) can afford some of the things wanted but not all  
     \_\_\_\_(4) can afford about everything wanted  
     \_\_\_\_(5) can afford about everything wanted and still save money
7. What city or town do you live in or closest to? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Do you live inside the city or town limits? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ no \_\_\_\_\_  
 In what county do you live? \_\_\_\_\_
8. Are there children 18 years and under living in your household? yes \_\_\_\_\_ no \_\_\_\_\_
9. Do any members of your household receive child care services during work hours?  
 yes \_\_\_\_\_ no \_\_\_\_\_  
 If YES, how many children in each age group receive child care services?
- | Number of Children | Age Group     |
|--------------------|---------------|
| _____              | 0 - 5 years   |
| _____              | 6 - 12 years  |
| _____              | 13 - 18 years |
10. Do any members of your household receive adult care services? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_  
 If YES, how many members receive adult care services? \_\_\_\_\_

11. Please list all persons who live in your household. Identify as self, friend, son, daughter, mother, etc.

| PERSON | RELATIONSHIP TO YOU | YEAR BORN |
|--------|---------------------|-----------|
| (1)    | Self                |           |
| (2)    |                     |           |
| (3)    |                     |           |
| (4)    |                     |           |
| (5)    |                     |           |
| (6)    |                     |           |
| (7)    |                     |           |
| (8)    |                     |           |
| (9)    |                     |           |
| (10)   |                     |           |

12. Certain situations can make our lives stressful. Indicate whether the following situations are present in your home by placing an X in the YES/NO column. For items checked YES, indicate the degree of stress that the situation causes in your life by placing an X on the line.

| YES | NO  | Is this situation present in your life?       | If YES, how much stress does it cause? |         |                |
|-----|-----|---|--|---------|----------------|
| ( ) | ( ) | 1. seriously or chronically ill family member | not stressful at all                   | Neutral | very stressful |
| ( ) | ( ) | 2. frequently ill family member or members    | not stressful at all                   | Neutral | very stressful |
| ( ) | ( ) | 3. disabled family member                     | not stressful at all                   | Neutral | very stressful |
| ( ) | ( ) | 4. handicapped family member                  | not stressful at all                   | Neutral | very stressful |
| ( ) | ( ) | 5. recent loss of family member               | not stressful at all                   | Neutral | very stressful |
| ( ) | ( ) | 6. major change in work or family             | not stressful at all                   | Neutral | very stressful |
| ( ) | ( ) | 7. single parenting                           | not stressful at all                   | Neutral | very stressful |
| ( ) | ( ) | 8. problems with children                     | not stressful at all                   | Neutral | very stressful |
| ( ) | ( ) | 9. legal difficulties                         | not stressful at all                   | Neutral | very stressful |

YES NO Is this situation present in your life? If YES, how much stress does it cause?

- ( ) ( ) 10. chronic unemployment not stressful Neutral very  
at all : : : : : stressful
- ( ) ( ) 11. financial problems not stressful Neutral very  
at all : : : : : stressful
- ( ) ( ) 12. other(s) Please list: not stressful Neutral very  
( ) ( ) \_\_\_\_\_ at all : : : : : stressful  
( ) ( ) \_\_\_\_\_ at all : : : : : stressful

13. If you answered YES to one or more items in Question 12 please answer the following:

Overall, how stressful is your home life  
because of the situation(s)?

not stressful Neutral : very  
at all : : : : : stressful

14. Please complete the following information about both main job and second job (if any) for each employed person living in your home.

| PERSON              |                         | MAIN JOB                       |                                 |   | SECOND JOB/SCHOOL               |                                 |                                |                                 |
|---------------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Relationship to you | Job title (Be specific) | Number of days worked per week | Number of hours worked per week | Starting time & ending time of work day* (write & circle) | Works second job? (Be specific) | If yes, Job Title (Be specific) | Number of days worked per week | Number of hours worked per week |
| Self                |                         | days                           | hrs.                            | am pm to am pm  | yes no                          |                                 | days                           | hrs.                            |
|                     |                         | days                           | hrs.                            | am pm to am pm  | yes no                          |                                 | days                           | hrs.                            |
|                     |                         | days                           | hrs.                            | am pm to am pm  | yes no                          |                                 | days                           | hrs.                            |
|                     |                         | days                           | hrs.                            | am pm to am pm  | yes no                          |                                 | days                           | hrs.                            |
|                     |                         | days                           | hrs.                            | am pm to am pm  | yes no                          |                                 | days                           | hrs.                            |
|                     |                         | days                           | hrs.                            | am pm to am pm  | yes no                          |                                 | days                           | hrs.                            |

\*Examples: 8 am to 5 pm, 11 pm to 7 am or varies



WORK  
FACTORS

N.A. \*

QUESTION 1:  
How satisfied are you with  
your work?QUESTION 2:  
What effect do you think it has  
on the quality of your home life?

|  |                   |         |                      |                  |         |                  |
|--|-------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|
| support of supervisor/<br>management             | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| opportunity to work<br>independently             | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| amount of<br>control over how<br>you do your job | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| variety of<br>work tasks                         | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| opportunities<br>for advancement                 | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| challenge of the job                             | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| likelihood of<br>transfer                        | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| work expectations                                | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |

Overall, how satisfied are you with your work?

Very                      Neutral                      Very  
satisfied                      dissatisfied                      dissatisfied

Overall, what effect do you think your work has on the quality of your home life?

Very                      Neutral                      Very  
Positive                      Negative                      Negative

How difficult is it for you to combine work and family responsibilities?

Not difficult                      Neutral                      Very  
at all                      difficult                      difficult

\*NA: Not applicable

-----

If you would like to receive a summary of this study please complete the information below.

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

## DIRECTIONS

Respond to each home and family factor that applies to you by placing an X on the appropriate line below each question.  
(1) How satisfied are you with your home life? and (2) What effect do you think it has on your work performance? ANSWER BOTH QUESTIONS

If the home and family factor does NOT apply to you, place an X ONLY in the Not Applicable column

## EXAMPLE

## HOME &amp; FAMILY FACTORS

QUESTION 1:  
How satisfied are you with your home life?

QUESTION 2:  
What effect do you think it has on your work performance?

Amount of time for self N.A. \* Very satisfied : : : : : X : : : : : Very dissatisfied Very Positive X : : : : : Neutral : : : : : Very Negative

## HOME &amp; FAMILY FACTORS

N.A. \*

QUESTION 1:  
How satisfied are you with your home life?

QUESTION 2:  
What effect do you think it has on your work performance?

|                                   |                |                   |                             |               |                   |                         |
|-----------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------|-------------------|-------------------------|
| total family income               | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| housing                           | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| household equipment               | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| health of family members          | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| personal health                   | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| emotional support from spouse     | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| emotional support from children   | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| emotional support from relatives  | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| emotional support from friends    | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| emotional support from church     | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| services from community resources | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| child care arrangements           | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| children's behavior               | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| children's school performance     | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |
| family schedule                   | Very satisfied | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | : : : : : Neutral | : : : : : Very Negative |

\*NA: Not applicable

HOME & FAMILY  
FACTORS

N.A. \*

QUESTION 1:  
How satisfied are you with  
your home life?QUESTION 2:  
What effect do you think it has  
on your work performance?

|  |                   |         |                      |                  |         |                  |
|--|-------------------|---------|----------------------|------------------|---------|------------------|
| time together<br>as a family   | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| amount of recreation/<br>free time                                       | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| amount of time<br>for self   | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| division of<br>household duties<br>(home maintenance/<br>housekeeping)   | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| division of parenting<br>responsibilities                                | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| communication<br>among family<br>members                                 | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| family's ability<br>to resolve conflict                                  | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| family<br>togetherness   | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| amount family members<br>express affection                               | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| sense of control<br>over life events                                     | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| family members' personal<br>habits (smoking, drinking,<br>drug use etc.) | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| quality of family's<br>daily diet  | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |
| method of<br>handling money  | Very<br>satisfied | Neutral | Very<br>dissatisfied | Very<br>Positive | Neutral | Very<br>Negative |

Overall, how satisfied are you with your home life?

Very                      Neutral                      Very  
satisfied                      dissatisfied

Overall, what effect do you think your home life has on your work performance?

Very                      Neutral                      Very  
Positive                      Negative

\*NA: Not applicable

## DIRECTIONS

Respond to each work factor that applies to you by placing an X on the appropriate line below each question.  
 (1) How satisfied are you with your work? and (2) What effect do you think it has on the quality of your home life? ANSWER BOTH QUESTIONS

If the work factor does NOT apply to you, place an X ONLY in the Not Applicable column

## EXAMPLE

| WORK FACTORS         | QUESTION 1:<br>How satisfied are you with your work? |                |         |                   |               | QUESTION 2:<br>What effect do you think it has on the quality of your home life? |               |   |   |       |
|----------------------|--|----------------|---------|-------------------|---------------|--|---------------|---|---|-------|
|                      | N.A.   | Very satisfied | Neutral | Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | Neutral  | Very Negative |   |   |       |
| challenge of the job | —  | —              | — X —   | —                 | —             | —  | —             | — | — | — X — |

| WORK FACTORS                            | N.A. | QUESTION 1:<br>How satisfied are you with your work? |         |                   |               |         | QUESTION 2:<br>What effect do you think it has on the quality of your home life? |   |   |   |   |
|---|------|--|---------|-------------------|---------------|---------|--|---|---|---|---|
|   |      | Very satisfied                                       | Neutral | Very dissatisfied | Very Positive | Neutral | Very Negative  |   |   |   |   |
| salary or pay                           | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| number of hours worked per week         | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| work schedule                           | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| flexibility of work schedule            | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| fringe benefits                         | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| working conditions/physical environment | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| job security                            | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| work policies and regulations           | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| meal and break time                     | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| parking arrangements                    | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| amount of commuting time                | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| work status                             | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| amount of energy required on the job    | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |
| friendships at work                     | —    | —  | —       | —                 | —             | —       | —  | — | — | — | — |

\*NA: Not applicable

Appendix B. Introductory Letters Sent to  
Potential Respondents

July 10, 1990

Dear Friend,

One of the major changes in the American family is that of single parent families. These changes are causing increased pressure on the mothers to be proficient in both areas of home and work with little or no support networks.

As a graduate student and as a single parent mother I am interested in collecting data to determine the effects a single parent mother's home and family responsibilities have on performance and satisfaction at the work place and the effect her work life has on her home life. I would also like to identify coping skills and needs as she manages her dual role as wage earner and head of household.

If you are a single mother trying to balance your work life and home life and would be interested in being a part of this valuable study please send the enclosed postage paid card to me. I will be in touch with you with information on how you can be of assistance with this project. Please note that your complete anonymity will be protected throughout the study.

Thank you.

Lenore I. Rasmussen  
Graduate Student  
Home Economics Education

Joan McFaddin, Ph.D.  
Major Professor and Advisor  
Utah State University

Appendix C. Human Subject Consent Form Given  
With Each Questionnaire

## CURRICULUM VITAE

Lenore Rasmussen Robbins  
(March 29, 1993)

## CAREER OBJECTIVE:

Presently Assistant Extension Professor, Utah State University working in Davis County.

## EDUCATION:

BS Home Economics Composite Degree Utah State University, Logan, Utah. (6/78) GPA: 3.63 (4.0=A)  
MS Degree in Home Economics Education from Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah. (4/84) GPA 3. (4.0=A)  
PhD Occupational and Adult Education, Emphasis in Supervision/Administration from Utah State University, Logan, Utah. (expected 6/93) Grad GPA 3.

## CAREER:

Present assignment is in Davis County as Assistant Extension Professor, Utah State University Cooperative Extension Service. (7/90-Present)

Duties include providing individuals, groups, organizations, or firms with Extension 4-Y educational opportunities related to their needs. Maintaining a favorable image of Extension and Utah State University. Planning and coordinating Extension 4-H programs with community leaders. Assisting and organizing 4-H councils, clubs, and special interest groups. Recruiting and training individuals to assume leadership responsibilities. Keeping up to date in subject matter and teaching methods for youth and adults. Performing needs assessments. Determining interest and desires of individuals, families, organizations, and communities. Conducting evaluations to determine program impacts. Timely program reports and accomplishments to University and Extension and administrators, and county officials. Assistant Professor, Home Economics Department Chair, Teacher Educator at Southern Utah University, Cedar City, Utah. Taught all home economics courses pertaining to teacher education plus all the clothing courses, interior design class, family relation class, parenting class, and



supervised student teachers. (1984-90) Home Economics teacher Star Valley Junior/Senior High, Lincoln District, Afton, Wy. Taught the foods, clothing, survival courses, and supervised FHA. (1983-84) Instructor Home Economics Department at Dixie College, St. George, Utah. Taught clothing, interior design, personal finance, and housing courses. (1982-83) Home Economics teacher Dugway Junior/Senior High, Tooele District, Dugway, Utah. Taught the foods, clothing, parenting, survival courses and 1 english class as well as organized a new FHA club and sponsored the Jr. Class. (1979-82)

#### AWARDS AND HONORS:

Who's Who in the West  
Phi Upsilon Omicron Honor Society

#### EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS AND MEDIA:

News Paper Columns: A weekly news article appears in the Iron County Advocate. Every other week the articles are under the column, Extension Outreach and the articles pertain to home making topics such as: food safety, relationships, consumerism, parenting, etc. Included are new items received in the office and a calendar of upcoming events with suggestions for programs that Extension could assist with. The other weeks the articles pertain to 4-H and appear in the 4-H Corner. Youth contribution is the main emphasis in these articles. Each week a program will be highlighted and when possible the article will be written by the youth who have participated in the activity. A photo will accompany the article and the youth will be credited as the author. Circulation for the Advocate is 2,500.

Radio: Appeared on the local program It's a Class Act. My assistant and I were interviewed for the Women's Financial Information Program that we were organizing. They continue to be a good source of advertising for Extension programs.

Newsletters: A newsletter, published every other month, is sent to the 575 residents of Iron County. Each letter has a theme, depending on the month, and an effort is made to include articles dealing with consumer, nutrition (canning, food safety etc.), family relations, parenting. There is also a calendar of upcoming events and a list of new materials received in the Extension office.

Workshop materials: A handout entitled "Budgeting Rich On Any Income" was given to Extension Home Economists present at the UAEHE retreat held in May in Provo.

#### GRANTS, CONTRACTS, AND FUND DEVELOPMENT:

"Trust" Child Abuse Prevention program provided to all schools in Iron County. Funded by: Social Services Children's Trust Fund. (1988-89, 1989-90)  
 Carl Perkin's Grant for Consumer and Homemaking.  
 Provides In-Service for all of Southern Utah Home Economics Teachers. (1988-89, 1989-90, 1990-91).

#### PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION MEMBERSHIP AND PARTICIPATION:

National Association Extension Home Economics (NAEHE, UAEHE) Membership Committee, 1993-94  
 American Home Economics Association (AHEA, UHEA) Nominating Committee, Chair 1991-92, Co-Chair 1990-91, Public Relations Co-Chair, 1987-89  
 Utah Association Extension 4-H Workers (UAE4-HW)  
 Adult Leader School: "Storyboarding: A Management Tool." Presented at the yearly conference held in Logan, Utah, October 12, 1992.  
 "Creative Conflict." Presented with Margaret Campbell at the yearly conference in Logan, Utah, October 8, 1991.  
 Leadermete: "Teen Leader Involvement in 4-H Summer Camp". Presentation at the state leadermete held in Price, Utah, March 1992.  
 Utah Home Education Association: "Creative Thinking." Presentation given in two sessions of their state conference at Cedar City, Utah, October 10, 1992.  
 Southwest Mental Health and Drug Abuse Prevention "Teaching Children Decision Making Skills." Yearly training for the teachers in southern Utah's elementary and high schools in Cedar City, Utah, November 12, 1992.  
 "Storyboarding: A Management Tool." Presentation given to a staff meeting with their specialists in the South West District held in Cedar City, Utah, December 5, 1992.  
 Southern Utah University Head Start Health  
 "Creative Conflict." Workshop presenter with FCL members, Margaret Campbell and Trina Gray, for the regional fall conference in Cedar City, August 1991.  
 American Vocational Association (AVA, UAVHET) Public Relations Chair, 1982-83  
 Delta Kappa Gamma "Professionalism." Keynote speaker for the State Convention Salt Lake City, Utah, 1987.

Women In Business Committee (WIBCO) "Communication For Better Relationships". Presentation given Cedar City, 1991.

"Critical Thinking." Presentation given Cedar City, 1990.

"Self Concept and the Business Woman", Presentation given Cedar City 1985.

Served on the State Advisory Committee for Vocational Home Economics Education in Utah, 1988-1990.

Served on the Evaluation Team for the National Science Foundation, 1987-88.