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Abstract

Women’s roles in the work force have increased, however, women’s positions in the household have not changed greatly (Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994). While paid work research has focused significantly on the qualities of roles, household work research has not (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). As the few existing instruments that do measure the quality of household work roles lack psychometric evidence (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007), a new instrument assessing all aspects of the quality of household work roles and possessing evidence of validity and reliability is required. The first step in the instrument development process is the identification and definition of relevant constructs. Thus, the main purpose of the study was to identify household work themes. Four focus groups of triple role women were performed with a total of 20 participants. A snowball sampling technique was used to recruit participants. Thematic analysis of the transcripts identified eight themes: No End Result, Scheduling, Time Constraints, Psychological Strain, Equality in Work, Value, Money, and Reward. The results found women to enjoy certain aspects of household work, but that they lead busy and hectic lifestyles. The themes created in the study were placed into a table of specifications this is to guide future instrument development research in which items can be included for each of these eight themes.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Beginning in the 1950s and continuing into the 1980s, women progressively increased their role in the labour force (Waldman, 1985). During the 1970s, women began to attend universities at increasing rates and began obtaining higher education (Rusoff, 1987). As women increased their skills, they also began to attain more professional positions in the work force such as secretarial and clerical employment. However, as women began to play a greater role in the work force, their roles at home did not change significantly (Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994). By 2005, 58% of women were a part of the labour force (Sauve, 2005). However as women became more dominant in the work force, they soon began to struggle with the combination of having a family and working outside of the home (Hochschild, 1989). Hochschild (1989) termed the struggle women were having between work and family as a “second shift.” The “second shift,” was in reference to the situation where many women worked all day in paid positions only to return home to their family in the evening, a second unpaid position (Hochschild, 1989).

Although household work is simply defined as unpaid work that is conducted to uphold a household, there are varying interpretations (Shelton & John, 1996). Household work definitions may include activities such as child care, cooking, and cleaning. Other definitions even specify typical “female” and “male” oriented tasks (Hakim, 2004; Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994). For example, typical female tasks would include cooking and cleaning, while typical male tasks would consist of paying bills (Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994). Not all definitions of unpaid work or household work include physical tasks. Some definitions involve the concept of emotional work (Stewart & Joyce, 1999).
A topic of particular interest in the area of household work has been the division of labour. Women have initially taken on the role of looking after household duties, however, as women become more visible in the work force, women believe men should increase their presence in the household (Hochschild, 1989). Ferree (1991) examined the division of labour amongst 382 couples and found that women completed the majority of the household duties. Although men have improved their participation in household activities, women still outperform males (Blair & Lichter, 1991). With the division of household work comes the question, how are the duties distributed? Blair and Johnson (1992) as well as Lennon and Rosenfield (1994) found that women do not find the splitting of household duties to be fair as they complete more of the household duties than their husbands. Hiller (1984) referred to the division of labour as that of paid work amongst partners and the division of family work which includes dividing the responsibilities for child care and household work. Time availability (if one spouse places more time into paid work they will do less hours of household work) and gender role ideology (the type of support provided defines the individual) theories are possible explanations as to why the divisions of household tasks are unfair (Kamo, 1988; Blair & Lichter, 1991).

Household work or labour is typically measured by asking participants how many hours they perform household duties using surveys, questionnaires, or time-diary formats (Harvey, 1993). Time diaries may be ineffective as individuals tend to forget to record the information from their day, limiting their validity and reliability (Bonke, 2005). On the other hand, survey and questionnaire instruments are difficult to design and need to possess evidence of validity and reliability (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). To ensure instruments are valid and reliable, certain steps should be taken in their design and development (Clark & Watson, 1995; Oppenheim, 1966).
The first step in developing an instrument is to identify and define the construct to be studied (Clark & Watson, 1995; Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006). Constructs can be identified through a review of the published journal articles in the area of study (Clark & Watson, 1995; Cohen & Swerdlik, 1999). Focus groups and interviews can also be used to attain more information on a particular construct (Morgan, 1997). Once a construct is well defined, the next step is to generate items relating to the subject (DeVellis, 2003). Item writing can be a difficult task, but it can be improved by using a table of specifications (Osterlind, 2006). The table of specifications indicates what subject areas items need to be developed for. As all evidence of validity is currently theorized to be evidence of construct validity (Messick, 1989), evidence of content, construct, criterion-related, predictive, and concurrent validity are all essential to scale development (Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006; Salkind, 2006). Without this evidence, the construct under investigation may not be measured accurately (Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006; Salkind, 2006). Content validity is of particular importance as it ensures the material of the test is appropriate (Thorndike, 2005). Reliability is also required as unreliable measurements lead to inaccurate results (Fishman & Galguera, 2003). Reliability of measurement is usually tested through the use of test-retest reliability and internal consistency (Salkind, 2006; Fishman & Galguera, 2003).

Household work measures initially calculated quantity, specifically the amount of time spent in a role and the number of roles women have. More recently, there has been a focus on the quality of the roles women fulfill (Barnett and Hyde, 2001). However, there is a lack of research performed on the qualities of household work which may be due to women’s changing roles or the lack of valid and reliable measures (Walters, McDonough, & Strohschein, 2002;
Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). For example, many of the current quality of role measures do not include enough items to measure the construct in question and none of the studies utilized an expert panel of judges to examine their items (Lombardi & Ulbrich, 1997; Walters et al., 1996; Bird & Ross, 1993; Lennon, 1994; DeVellis, 2003). In addition, studies conducted by Lombardi and Ulbrich (1997), Lennon (1994), and Bird and Ross (1993) did not utilize measures with a suitable level of reliability. The appropriate level for reliability is 0.70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Without a valid and reliable instrument to measure the quality of household roles, the interpretation of the results may be inaccurate.

**Statement of the Problem**

Women have increased their role in the work force but have, at the same time, maintained their presence in family life. This second shift potentially creates a conflict in roles for women (Hochschild, 1989; Goode, 1960). Household work measures typically assess quantitative information such as the amount of time one performs household work, but these instruments tend to be narrow in scope and flawed (Bonke, 2005). Even the current household work measures that are used to measure the quality of women’s roles lack psychometric evidence (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). Thus, a large gap in the household labour research exists (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007) and a new instrument possessing evidence of construct representation, validity and reliability is needed to measure the qualities of women’s household work roles. By investigating and attaining an accurate measure of the quality of women’s household work roles, a more accurate description of the health consequences of these roles can be provided.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the current study was to identify how women construct meaning out of
household work, by listening to women share their experiences, understandings, and the values they place on household work. A series of focus groups was conducted with women who are employed, partnered, and have a dependent child in order to assess women’s perceptions of household work. As the current instruments used to measure the quality of household work roles lack psychometric evidence (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007), the present study’s secondary purpose was to identify specific themes women associate with household work. Such themes could then be used as part of the initial stages of the instrument development process to create a psychometrically sound measure of the quality of household work.

Research Questions

There was no main research question to the current study however, it was embedded in the purpose of the study, to explore women’s perceptions and understandings of the quality of household work. More specifically, research questions were delivered to participants in the focus groups to help guide discussion. Janzen and Hellsten (2007)’s first research questions were to attain a broader understanding of the definition of family work, see Appendix A: What does family work involve? The second set of research questions posed to participants involved the division of household labour: How is family work divided up within your household? (see Appendix A for further questions). Lastly, the remainder of the questions involved asking participants about their dislikes and likes of household work.
Definitions

A description is provided below for unknown or technical terms that are used in the study.

**Constructs**- A definition provided to a concept that is difficult to describe (Thorndike, 2005; Salkind, 2006). Constructs are created through the use of psychological theories, past research, and behaviours (Smith, Fischer, & Fister, 2003).

**Emotional Work**- Involves tasks that may not be seen or acknowledged (i.e. supporting one’s spouse or child; Erickson, 1993; 2005)

**Focus Groups**- A researcher and a group of participants talk amongst each other, revealing different ideas and perceptions related to a particular topic (Gall, Gall, & Borg, 2007).

**Household work/labour**- Any work, in which no compensation is provided, that will maintain a family and a home (Shelton & John, 1996). Also may include typically male perceived tasks involving car maintenance and finances, or typical female duties involving shopping and cleaning (Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994). The household work definition in this study includes typical household work activities performed by women such as cooking and cleaning, but also includes emotional work (Erickson, 2005).

**Labour Force** - The labour force is a term given to those involved in paid employment which does not include unpaid or any household work (Psacharopoulos & Tzannatos, 1989).

**Paid work**- Any work that provides monetary funds (Goodnow & Bowes, 1994).

**Phenomenology**- The study of understanding and lived experiences (DeMarrais, 2004). It is the breakdown and analysis of individuals’ experiences in which meanings and themes are created (Creswell, 1998).
Reliability - The constancy of a test or instrument; participant’s results should be consistent over time (Fishman & Galguera, 2003).

Rural Area - A location with a population of 1000 individuals, near a centre with 400 people per kilometer (Statistics Canada, 2005).

Thematic Analysis - Analytical tool used to produce themes and patterns in qualitative research (Joffe & Yardley, 2004; Boyatzis, 1998).

Time Diaries - A measurement tool where participants record household hours they have performed (Harvey, 1993).

Triple Role Women - Women who are employed full time, partnered, and have a dependent child (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007).

Validity - The measurement tool calculates what it is supposed to (Salkind, 2006). It also makes sure that the researcher’s conclusions from the results are accurate. Without validity, the results gathered from the instrument may be inaccurate (Clark & Watson, 1995).
Chapter Two

*Literature Review*

Women have progressively increased their roles within the paid labour force, however, their positions within the household have remained nearly the same (Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994). With their increasing presence in paid work and their roles at home, women struggle with maintaining every aspect of their lives (Hochschild, 1989). These women are known as triple role women and are employed, partnered, mothers (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). Research performed on paid work has focused greatly on the psychosocial qualities of work roles as opposed to the quantity of positions (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). However, very little research has examined the psychosocial qualities of household work. Household work research has primarily focused on the number of hours one performs housework, the division of labour, whether or not the division of labour is equal or fair (Barnett & Shen, 1997). Of the current instruments that measure qualities of household work and paid work, many of them lack psychometric evidence (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). Due to the lack of research on the psychosocial qualities of household work and the problems inherent in the measures that do exist, this chapter will provide a brief review of the historical background of women in the workforce and an overview of household work. In order to place this specific study within the context of instrument development, the chapter concludes with a review of the instrument development process including an overview of reliability and validity.
History of Women and the Labour Force

Statistics

Following the end of World War II, there was a surge of women entering into the labour force (Shank, 1988). From the 1950s to 1984, women increased their placement in the workforce from 34% to 54% (Waldman, 1985). There was a large number of women in the 20 to 24 age range in the work force in the 1960s. However, by the time these women fit the 25 to 29 age bracket (the peak period for women to start raising children), women began to work less (Shank, 1988).

The 1970s ushered in another change. Women began entering universities and receiving degrees in higher education, at a much faster rate than men (Rusoff, 1987). By 1982, 51% of the students enrolled in universities were women. With increasing knowledge, women began entering the workforce with a stronger force. Women 25 years of age and above made up 53.9% of the labour force in 1982 and by 2004, 77% of women between 25 and 54 years old were employed (Rusoff, 1987; Statistics Canada, 2006). Women were attaining clerical, managerial, and professional positions in the labour market, propelling women’s stature in the paid work force from 42% in the 1970’s to 58% in 2005 (Sauve, 2005). The average number of hours women put into paid work increased from 1986 to 2005 (Marshall, 2006). Women performed 3.3 hours on average a day of paid work and 2.8 hours of household work in 1986, compared to 4.4 hours of paid work and 2.4 hours of household work in 2005 (Marshall, 2006). Men were also found to have increased their hours in their paid work from 1986 to 2005. Approximately 6 hours of paid work were performed by men in 1986, but that increased to 6.3 hours in 2005 (Marshall, 2006). As for unpaid work, men’s participation slightly increased from 1 hour in
1986 to an average of 1.4 hours in 2005. Even though women have increased their positions in
the work force, women are less likely to be hired for a position than men, within every province
in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2006).

Of the women constituting the workforce, approximately 25% of them are single and
have never been married (Waldman, 1985). However, the largest proportion of women in the
workforce is women who are married, composing 56% of the female labour market. Some of
these women also have children of the preschool age. Even though married women with
children have increased their presence within the labour market, they are still the dominant
caretakers of the home and family (Rusoff, 1987). However, this situation may be changing
slightly as men have begun to increase their participation in daily household work activities from
54% to 71% (Marshall, 2006).

*The Second Shift*

Hochschild (1989) observed 50 couples in the 1970s who were struggling with work,
family, and modernization. Data was also gathered on couples raising children under the age of
six (Hochschild, 1989). Hochschild observed the behaviors and routines of the families on
weeknights, weekends, and special occasions. The major topic that Hochschild proposed to the
families was the question of who performs the household duties. The women being observed
were married, employed, and were all raising children at the same time i.e., triple role women
(Hochschild, 1989). These women were representatives of the 56% of married women in the
labour market (Waldman, 1985).

The women considered themselves to be torn between their family and their work, as
they were extremely busy trying to perform every job (Hochschild, 1989). One woman proposed
the term “second shift” to represent the issues married, working women have to struggle with. This term was accepted by both the wives and husbands. However, this term was not to be interpreted as family as a job, as the woman believed the family portion of her life to be the most important. Hochschild’s definition of “second shift” represents women on duty at work who have a “second shift” when they arrive at home (Hochschild, 1989).

Women have increased their participation in the labour force, but still have a deep interest in their home, regardless of how much their husbands participate (Hochschild, 1989). Overall, women still believe the home is their responsibility and this includes child care, scheduling appointments, and other activities pertaining to the home. Since women have entered the work force, everything has increased in the domains of work and family life. Women feel more strain has been added to their lives as there is very little time left at the end of the day. Women attempt to meet these challenges by multi-tasking which tends to create more tension while men tend to only execute one task at a time (Hochschild, 1989).

*Household Work*

There are many different definitions used to encapsulate exactly what housework, household work, or unpaid work involves (Shelton & John, 1996). Eichler and Albanese (2007) define household work as encompassing all physical, mental, emotional, and spiritual tasks used to uphold one’s daily activities and household. Numerous studies on household work have included child care and domestic work such as cooking, cleaning, and gardening (Hakim, 2004). Others believe the definition of household work is dependent on individual households and the historical time frame being examined such that there is no one clear definition for everyone (DeVault, 1991). Due to the changing nature of society with women working and having an
increased income, women are now able to purchase prepared food as opposed to cooking from scratch (DeVault, 1991). In the past, household work would include duties such as washing, ironing, and cooking but some women can now hire services to perform these duties. These conveniences are likely responsible for the decreased amount of time individuals spend on household work in the past 20 years: 2.7 hours per day in 1986 to 2.5 hours per day in 2005 (Marshall, 2006).

While others believe the definition of household work is evolving into an entirely different definition, the most common definition of household work is seen as unpaid work performed in order to maintain a family and a home (Shelton & John 1996). This definition, although commonly used, does not describe any of the details involved in the work that is performed. Prior research has identified two different branches of household duties (Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994). Household work is made of typical “female” tasks that may include activities such as cooking, cleaning, and shopping while typical “male” responsibilities may include financial management and car maintenance.

Existing definitions of household work also differ as some definitions include invisible work while other definitions do not. Invisible work is considered to be tasks that are performed but not acknowledged (Erickson, 1993; 2005). Another term used for this type of work is emotional work. Emotional or invisible work may include child care (Stewart & Joyce, 1999). Supporting a spouse or child emotionally, being therapeutic, and being expressive are all included in the definition of emotional work (Erickson, 2005). The household work definition used in this study includes typical household work activities such as cooking and cleaning, but also includes emotional work.
Altschuler (2004) studied the meaning and importance women aged 55-84 years placed on household work. The majority of the women in the sample worked outside of the home. Participants took part in a semi-structured interview and were asked to indicate what aspects of their everyday activities they considered to be work. Twenty-five percent of the participants considered their unpaid responsibilities to be work, 20% also agreed that their unpaid duties were work, however, this percentage did not include emotional labour. In contrast, 25% of the participants claimed that if their work was in anyway relaxing or enjoyable it was not considered to be work. Lastly, 30% of the women did not view the unpaid labour they performed to be work (Altschuler, 2004). Hochschild’s (1989) findings of the “second shift” were also identified as many women agreed that they were always on duty both at work and at home. The women refused to label their family responsibilities as “work” because it was an interest to them and they believed such responsibilities contributed to their life overall. The participants involved in Altschuler’s (2004) study acknowledged that certain household activities that felt like work were due to them having to perform those activities throughout their lifespan. Age was also considered to be a factor. Once the women reached a certain age, household work was not considered to be important when thinking about what is significant in life (Altschuler, 2004).

Research within the area of household work focuses strongly on women who range in age from 25-54 years old. This age bracket is commonly used because by that age women have usually begun working, they have completed their education, and are not yet ready to retire (Shank, 1988). In 2004, 77% of Canadian women aged 25 to 44 years old and 76% of women aged 44 to 54 years old were employed (Statistics Canada, 2006). In comparison, the percentage of employed younger or older women was reduced: 58% of 15 to 24 year old women and 56% of
women aged 54 to 65 years old were employed (Statistics Canada, 2006).

Lazaro, Molto, and Sanchez (2004) explored the daily activities of individuals aged 16 years of age and older. Activities included unpaid care and the hours spent performing those duties. Age was a factor in time spent performing unpaid care. There was a positive effect for those 30 to 44 years of age. However, there was a negative effect for individuals aged 19 to 29 years and those 45 to 64 years old indicating that those who are middle aged tend to perform more unpaid care. Research with younger individuals usually includes information on the number of hours children participate in household activities (Punch, 2001).

Household work can include a variety of activities such as, cooking, cleaning, emotional work, or typical “male” and “female” perceived tasks such as car maintenance and cooking (Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994), but who performs these household tasks and is it fair or equal (Hakim, 2004; Erickson, 1993)?

Division of Household Work

Women have increased their presence within the workforce; however, their role within the home has not changed dramatically (Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994). Household work or the home and family have been viewed as a woman’s responsibility (Hochschild, 1989). As women have become busier, women have anticipated that their partners will help with the workload at home. However, significant differences can be found when contrasting daily contributions of household work between males and females (Marshall, 2006). Males have increased their participation from 40% to 59%, while women’s input has decreased from 88% to 85%. Ferree (1991) investigated the division of household labour amongst dual earning families; those families where both partners work. Three hundred and eighty-two couples were interviewed by
telephone and asked to determine what tasks they perform and how much time went into those activities. The majority of the couples had a child under the age of 18 and some had preschool aged children. On average, women were found to execute 33 hours of paid work and 22 hours of household work per week. Wives guessed that their husbands worked 48 hours outside of the home while only completing 12 hours of work around the home (Ferree, 1991). The male participants also thought they had busier schedules than their wives. In this situation, even though there were two partners, household work was still predominantly completed by the wife. As Ferree (1991) explained, women were largely in charge of conducting household work. Of the research that explores the division of household labour focuses mainly on heterosexual and not homosexual couples.

Coverman and Sheley (1986) explored males’ contributions to household work and childcare from 1965 to 1975. The data was gathered from a United States Multinational Time Use study in which information was collected from households including households with one employed adult. The 1965 sample consisted of 541 men, in 1975, 371 men were included. No statistically significant differences in male participation in the home were found between 1965 and 1975 but men were found to have decreased their household work within the decade (Coverman & Sheley, 1986).

As men spend more hours in their paid workplace, both child care and household work hours decrease (Brines, 1993). Data was gathered from a sample of married African American and Caucasian Americans 18 years of age and older. Results indicated that as husbands’ hours of paid work decreased, there was an increase in their performance of household tasks. Similar findings were collected by Kamo (1988), however, the relationship between income and spouses’
effect on household work was explored instead of the hours spent in paid work. The sample was collected from the American Couple Survey performed in 1977 which was based on married couples in their 30s. The couples indicated the number of hours they performed certain activities and who was actively involved. Income was found to have an effect, as the more money the husband made the less he performed household activities. Wives were also found to make less money therefore predicting they do more of the household work (Kamo, 1988). When the wife worked full time hours, the income factor no longer had an effect on household hours. It is believed that it is not necessarily the income of the husband that affects his choice to perform household duties, but his willingness to make household duties an equal partnership (Kamo, 1988).

Household work has been defined as having male and female tasks. Blair and Lichter (1991) inspected how much time couples spent on household chores that were typically considered male and/or female duties. The study based its information on the 1988 National Survey of Families and Households. Participants consisted of 13, 017 individuals all aged 19 years of age and older and 3, 109 married participants. Consistent with prior research, females were found to contribute twice the amount of total household labour than males. Men were found to spend 14 hours per week on household activities, however, of these hours, 31% included activities that were outside the home (Blair & Lichter, 1991). Females, on the other hand, performed chores within the home. For example, 29% of the women made meals, 17% cleaned dishes, and 23% cleaned the house. Spouses were less likely to perform typical gender activities if the woman worked more than 40 hours outside of the home. However, if the couple had children, partners were more likely to take on their traditional roles (Blair & Lichter, 1991).
The division of household labour has also been found to be an international phenomenon occurring in and outside of North America. Calasanti and Bailey (1991) researched the differences in the division of household labour both in Sweden and the United States. Personal interviews were conducted with 1760 participants from the United States and 1145 from Sweden. Participants included married individuals who were employed for at least 21 hours a week. Participants were asked to give a rough estimate (i.e. percentage), of how often they would perform certain household activities. Swedish men were found to have more egalitarian attitudes toward household work than U. S. men, as they also were active in roles such as cooking and cleaning (Calasanti & Bailey, 1991). Swedish women also had a more egalitarian mindset; they were found to perform less grocery shopping and cooking than U. S. women. Even though Swedish men and women appeared to have egalitarian mindsets, there was still a division of household labour based on gender, despite the fact that Sweden has legislated for a fair division of household activities.

*Fairness in the Division of Household Work*

It is evident that women are largely responsible for household activities, even though they have significantly increased their placement within the labour force. Blair and Johnson (1992) sought to answer the question of whether or not women perceived the division of labour to be fair. Seven hundred and seventy-eight individuals participated in the study in which they were asked to record how many hours per week their spouse contributed to household labour. Women who worked outside the home still performed 31.6 hours in household work per week while husbands performed only 15.3 hours. If women were unemployed, they performed 42 hours of household work while 13 hours were performed by the men of the house (Blair & Johnson,
Regardless of employment status, women performed the majority of the household work (Blair & Johnson, 1992). Women’s perceptions of the division of household labour were strongly related to the amount of hours men spent performing typical “female” perceived duties (Blair & Johnson, 1992). Appreciation for the amount of work women did around the household was also related to the division of labour. If the men were more appreciative, women were more likely to believe the division of labour to be fair. However, the division of labour is evening out. In 1986, women performed 2.2 more hours of household work per day than their male partners (Marshall, 2006). In 2005, the number of hours had decreased to 1.3 hours more per day than their partner.

Lennon and Rosenfield (1994) also found women believe the division of household labour to be unfair. Their sample included 3,374 individuals including employed, married couples ranging in age from 18 to 65 years. Men were found to have contributed 18.2 hours a week in household work while the women performed 33.2 hours. One third of the women believed the division of labour to be unfair to them and 4.3% of the males claimed similar inequality. Women who claimed to have happier marriages believed that their division of household labour was fair (Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994).

Both Blair and Johnson (1992) and Lennon and Rosenfield (1994) stated that the divisions of household work is fair or unfair based upon the number of hours one places into household work. Blair and Johnson (1992) specifically focused on the number of hours one places into household work but is dependent upon the number of hours placed into paid work. However, fairness in the division of labour cannot be decided solely upon the number of hours one places into household work, whether or not partners split the hours equally. Hiller (1984)
defined the division of household work into two different categories, that of labour and family work. The division of labour is based on the hours placed in paid work, but for family work it was based on shared responsibilities. Hiller (1984) also proposed there to be 14 other possible variables that may decide the division of labour, including: income (of wife and husband), defining traditional roles, commitment in the marriage, time availability, etc. From the perspectives of Blair and Johnson (1992) and Lennon and Rosenfield (1994) the division of labour is based upon equal hours of work however, Hiller bases division upon many other factors including those of equality and equity.

**Explaining Division of Household Labour**

Women openly admit they feel the division of household labour is unfair, but continue to conduct the majority of the tasks. There are two major theories that try to explain why there is a division of labour in society: time availability and gender role ideology (Blair & Lichter, 1991).

**Time Availability**

The time availability theory believes that a division of household labour occurs because of the availability shown by family members (Kamo, 1988). It is believed that if family members spend more hours at their workplace they will perform fewer hours on household work; this is applicable to both spouses (Coltrane, 2000). As explained earlier, Kamo (1988) conducted a study investigating the division of household labour. Results showed that husbands will perform more domestic duties if they work less hours at their paid position. If the wife is performing more hours at her paid position, husbands would contribute more to the household (Kamo, 1988).
Gender Role Ideology

The other theory used to explain why we see a division in household labour is gender role ideology. Gender role ideology states that how women and men provide support for their families is how they will define themselves (Blair & Lichter, 1991; Thompson & Walker, 1989). Husbands and wives choose gender divided work to confirm their identity and to associate that role with their gender (Coltrane, 2000). Women and men may perform gender identifying tasks to help reaffirm who they are.

Individuals are socialized to conform to a particular gender type starting at very early ages (Raag & Rackliff, 1998). Raag and Rackliff (1998) investigated gender-typed roles amongst preschoolers using gender specific toys; the sample consisted of 28 female and 33 male preschoolers. The boys and girls were provided with gender typed toys and asked if their parents would consider it to be “good,” “bad,” or “it does not matter” that they play with a particular toy. The majority of the preschoolers believed their parents would say that playing with a gender-typed toy would either be “good” or “it does not matter”; very few preschoolers indicated that a parent would consider gender typed play to be “bad” (Raag & Rackliff, 1998). From these findings, it is clear that from a very early age children already understand which toys their parents think are appropriate based upon gender.

Gender ideology helps individuals to define what role it is they want to be a part of, either within the labour force or the home (Hochschild, 1989). Women can decide if they want to stay at home or work, either sphere is available, but it will also determine how much power one attains in their marriage. Hochschild (1989) illustrated three ideologies in marriage: traditional, transitional, and egalitarian, all of which determined a woman’s role and the power she will
have. Traditional ideologies focus more on the woman taking responsibilities for the home while the husband focuses on work, giving less power to the woman. Egalitarians want everything to be equal including the hours placed into work and the power they have in their relationships. Transitional ideologies are a medium in between both ideologies (Hochschild, 1989).

**Role Strain**

Many issues have surfaced regarding household work including its division and what it entails, however, women’s health and its relationship to the “second shift” has not been addressed (Hochschild, 1989). Women sometimes take on the responsibility of having a triple role (women who are employed, partnered, and have a dependent child); being a mother, taking care of a home, and working at a paid position all of which are bound to take a toll on an individual’s health. In today’s society, there are certain expectations that individuals are supposed to adhere to (Goode, 1960).

Goode (1960) role strain theory states that the different roles individuals place themselves into will sometimes conflict. One may try to please himself in one area; however, doing so will lead to dissatisfaction in another area. With increasing demands and expectations to meet role demands, this will eventually lead to role strain. However, if an individual becomes bogged down with too many roles there are ways to reduce conflict (Goode, 1960). Compartmentalization is one way in which role strain can be reduced, allowing individuals to focus on roles that need to be immediately attended to, ignoring all other tasks until the urgent role is taken care of. Another strategy to diminish role strain is extension. If an individual is involved in too many roles and activities, this provides an excuse for not fulfilling his duties (Goode, 1960). Family life may encapsulate many roles as women are mothers, wives, the ones
who take care of the home, and who also work a full time paid position. Women are now experiencing the problem of having too many roles which may eventually lead to strain. However, families may also be a saving grace as they can offer advice to maintain and lessen the burdens one may feel by taking on many multiple roles (Goode, 1960).

Household Work Measures

Defining household work is a difficult task as it may include emotional labour, child care (Erickson, 2005) or specific “male” and “female” oriented tasks such as car maintenance and cooking (Lennon & Rosenfield, 1994). With such diverse definitions of household work, it is difficult to create an instrument to measure all the dimensions of household work. Choosing a measure depends on the question being asked.

Household work sometimes involves the use of time data collection methodology which may include any of the following: direct observation, random event sampling using beeper devices, recording activity in journals, lists, or logs, and lastly the use of a time diary (Harvey, 1993). Normally, these methodologies are used for studies that encompass an entire year and include a sample of approximately 2,000 randomly assigned participants (Harvey, 1993).

Time Diaries

Researchers use time diaries to obtain detailed information on the number of hours individuals spend on household labour (Shelton & John, 1996). Participants record their activity made throughout the 24 hour day; researchers usually ask participants to monitor their activity for a span of two days (Harvey, 1993). Time diaries provide researchers with information on participants’ routines and the time they spend on activities; every moment of an individual’s day is recorded (Bonke, 2005). Those who record the information may only include one individual
while other studies involve all of the family members. Bird and Fremont (1991) gathered information for their household work and health study through the use of time diaries. Participants were asked to record their time spent during a 24 hour period and it was found that the time that was recorded on household work had a negative effect on health. Time diaries are believed to be a good choice to record household work because household work involves shorter periods of work and may be more difficult to record using a questionnaire.

As common as time diaries are for measuring household work, they are not without their flaws. One flaw is that the recordings of time spent on household duties tend to differ and there is no consistency involved with the recorders (Shelton & John, 1996). Time diaries also do not provide a general pattern or routine of the activities performed throughout the day (Shelton & John, 1996). The major limitation to using time diaries is the fact that individuals forget to record their information; other measures now include beepers that signal individuals as to when they are to record their information (Juster & Stafford, 1991). Time diaries are also not a valid measure as a 24 hour diary may not capture what a normal day of activities would be, it may be more or less, especially on different days (Marini & Shelton, 1993). One study shows that time diaries are not always a reliable measure of time spent on household activities. Bonke (2005) found that participants indicated performing more paid work on the questionnaires they were provided with than the time diaries they completed; the hours did not coincide with what was recorded in the time diaries.

**Questionnaires and Surveys**

Questionnaires and surveys are another effective measure of household work. Surveys
and questionnaires are sometimes a more difficult method to use as there are questions that are
difficult, often retrospective questions regarding time and hours spent performing household
activities (Juster & Stafford, 1991).

However, within household research, questionnaires or surveys are sometimes paired
with time diaries in order to get a wider variety of information (Bonke, 2005). Both Bonke and
Meiner and Olson’s (1987) studies used time diaries alongside questionnaires in order to
calculate how many hours of household and paid work are performed by either both genders or
just women in general. Bonke (2005) used time-use surveys and time-diaries with 2,741
participants to investigate the number of household and paid hours individuals actually perform.
Diaries were gathered and contained information on paid and unpaid work hours, recordings
were made in 10 minute intervals that continued through the week and into the weekends. The
objective of Meiner and Olson’s (1987) study was to compare the time spent on household work
between farm women and women in urban centres who did not live on a farm. The time use
diaries were given to participants to record for 2 days and participants were to record information
in 5 minute intervals for the entire 24 hour days.

Time diaries and questionnaire/survey methods have flaws. Both methods are susceptible
to self-report bias. Similarly, the reliability and validity of findings from surveys and diaries may
be problematic. The lack of reliability in assessing time use is evident from Bonke’s (2005)
results in which participants’ hours did not match when comparing questionnaire and time diary
information. Participants recorded fewer hours of household work when using a questionnaire as
opposed to a time diary.
In order to obtain time data a researcher must use a measurement instrument. Measurement is an important part to some research as it provides researchers with a certain type of information about their particular topic of study (Thorndike, 2005). However, measurement instruments must have evidence of validity and reliability to appropriately measure the subject under investigation. To achieve evidence of validity and reliability for a specific instrument, specific steps should be followed (Oppenheim, 1966).

Instrument Construction

Research relies heavily on the methodology and measures used to gather data, therefore having a reliable and valid measurement instrument is essential (Clark & Watson, 1995). If a measurement tool is not reliable or valid, the conclusions made will be based on inaccurate interpretations from inaccurate data. Results will be erroneous and insignificant (Clark & Watson, 1995; Salkind, 2006). Researchers often cannot directly measure a person or object, especially if the construct under consideration is psychological in nature. As a result, researchers try to carefully define the attribute being examined (Thorndike, 2005). Difficulties do arise when trying to define an attribute in a specific and clear manner. Once researchers have a distinct definition of the characteristic they want to explore, it is then expressed in quantitative terms, providing a more efficient and accurate communication tool (Thorndike, 2005). Attention must be made when generating test items in order to obtain an accurate measure (Osterlind, 2006).

Measurement tools can include tests, questionnaires, and surveys, all of which assess a particular topic related to the researcher’s study (Clark & Watson, 1995). Researchers who develop tests or questionnaires usually follow a specific sequence of events to ensure the items
that make up the instrument have validity and reliability evidence (Oppenheim, 1966; see Table 1). Depending on the type of test and its users, there may be different steps taken when assembling the instrument (Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006).

Table 1.

**Steps in Instrument Construction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps in Questionnaire Design</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Step</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approaching Participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sequence of Questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response of questions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test Construction Steps**

Regardless of the type of test, the initial phase of test construction tends to be exploratory in nature (Oppenheim, 1966). During this phase, literature searches for published articles of research in the subject area are used to provide evidence to enhance item writing (Cohen & Swerdlik, 1999). Pilot studies may also be conducted to collect data from participants. Participants are usually asked particular questions related to the subject matter. The responses to these questions would then be used to create more relevant items. Test construction steps
include determining the topic of measurement, creation of items, having an expert panel judge the items created, and providing a sample of new items. Eventually, the valid items will be formed into a reliable tool (DeVellis, 2003).

The preliminary step in instrument construction occurs when the researcher clearly defines a construct or latent variable he/she wants to measure (Clark & Watson, 1995; Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006). A construct is an abstract definition provided to a cognitive process (Thorndike, 2005; Osterlind, 2006). For example, it is hard to designate a single definition to aggression, but by describing sub-constructs such as physical violence, social interaction, etc, this helps provide meaning to aggression (Salkind, 2006). Constructs can be derived from psychological theories, prior research studies, or observation of behaviors (Smith, Fischer, & Fister, 2003). Researchers may view prior research in their study area in order to observe the different approaches used to define a construct (Clark & Watson, 1995). This review of literature should not be a specific search, but rather a broad search including all aspects, definitions, and concepts related to the construct. Reviewing previous research provides information on what to avoid, include, improve or maybe not improve as well as what is needed to develop a new and reliable measurement tool (Clark & Watson, 1995).

Supplementary methods such as focus groups may also be used in order to generate new ideas for a construct that the researcher may not have already thought about (Morgan, 1997). Data gathered from focus groups can be used to develop themes and to create definitions for constructs. Focus groups allow the researcher to hear the perceptions and experiences of everyday individuals (DeVellis, 2003). Moreover, researchers are able to learn from participants, eventually enhancing the quality of test or instrument items (Krueger & Casey, 1995).
New constructs can be created to reflect the participants’ ideas or to examine whether or not existing constructs will make sense to the targeted audience. Focus groups are also a useful research tool as they may lead to more quantitative research (Cohen & Swerdlik, 1999). By initially defining the construct to be measured, this allows researchers to have a better idea of where the measure is being directed (DeVellis, 2003).

Once a researcher has established the construct he wants to measure, the next step is to produce test items related to the subject (DeVellis, 2003). Formulating test items is complicated as writers have to keep in mind the content of the test, its format, and the suitable amount of items needed for the measure (Cohen, Montague, Nathanson, & Swerdlik, 1988; Thorndike, 2005). Test developers have to decide whether to use supply response items which allow examinees to give their own answer, or select response items that provide participants a variety of different answers they can choose from (Thorndike, 2005). The decision of what response items to include is dependent on what the researchers are looking to measure.

Item writing is difficult, that is why test designers use a table of item specifications (Osterlind, 2006). This table includes a list of terms and their definitions to which items have to be developed for. The table is a visual aid for test designers, indicating what topics should be observed and whether or not there are enough topic areas being covered (Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006). Items are then developed to fit the areas specified within the table. Test designers also use item pools to help them develop the final items for their measure (Cohen et al., 1988). Tentative items are included in the item pool, usually consisting of 50% more items than are actually needed so that designers can select which ones they want to include on the test.
Validity

What exactly is validity and why is it so important? Validity ensures the instrument measures what it is supposed to measure and the inferences you make from the results of a measure are appropriate (Salkind, 2006). If there is a lack of validity evidence, the instrument may not be measuring what it is designed to, providing the researcher with results they cannot use (Clark & Watson, 1995).

There are many different types of validity evidence such as content, construct, criterion-related, predictive, and concurrent validity (Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006). Content validity is concerned with the instrument material. For example: Are there a variety of answers? Does the material span a large range? Is the content of the instrument relevant, representative, and appropriate (Thorndike, 2005)? Construct validity on the other hand does not examine the material, but investigates whether or not the instrument is measuring the construct being studied (Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006).

While content and construct validity examine the form and the material contained within the instrument, criterion-related, concurrent, and predictive validity are focused on the instrument scores and the differences among external groups (Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006). Criterion-related validity observes and compares scores from the newly designed instrument to criterion scores which are often other instruments with known evidence of validity. This comparison provides researchers with information about the participants’ standing on the measure or their ability (Salkind, 2006; Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006). Predictive validity is similar to criterion-validity as it also uses criterion scores (Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006). However, instead of comparing participants’ scores on the new instrument to criterion scores,
predictive validity uses the new scores to predict criterion scores, or participants’ future abilities (Salkind, 2006). If there are multiple groups completing the instrument, concurrent validity is assessed (Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006). Concurrent validity observes if there is a difference between the scores of multiple groups. Validity is an essential part to instrument construction and without it instruments would not have meaning.

Reliability

A high-quality instrument must be valid, but instruments also need to be reliable (Salkind, 2006). Reliability indicates the stability or consistency of scores: scores on an instrument should be consistent over time, form, and within a scale. If the scores are not similar then the instrument may be unreliable (Fishman & Galguera, 2003). There are four main ways to explore a test’s reliability: (1) test-retest reliability; (2) parallel forms reliability; (3) split-half reliability; and (4) internal consistency reliability (Fishman & Galguera, 2003; Salkind, 2006). Internal consistency, in the form of Cronbach’s alpha, is the most common form of reliability used with instruments. Estimating the internal consistency of a test is performed by observing the variances of the participants’ test scores and the individual items (Thorndike, 2005).

Qualities of Household Work Scales

The measures used for household work do not emphasize the qualities of household work. In contrast, instruments designed to assess paid work commonly refer to the quality of work roles and its relation to health (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). Research by Karasek et al (1998) on employed work began to focus on the quality of work as a measure, and more specifically, the autonomy and satisfaction one experiences in his/her job instead of centering on wages and hours (Karasek et al., 1998). Research has shown that work quality is much more important than the
numerical measures of work. For example, working longer hours is not perceived as negative if the work is satisfying to the worker (Barnett & Hyde, 2001). Baruch and Barnett (1987) examined the relationship between the number of social roles women have and their psychological performance. The women participants were found to be happier the more roles they had. Baruch and Barnett (1987) also found that the quantity of roles does not determine well-being, however, it is the experience that comes from one’s role.

Although there has been a large emphasis placed on the qualities of employed work and the link they have to health, very little is known about the qualities of household work (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). Walters, McDonough, and Strohschein (2002) gathered data from 20,000 households, measuring distress, paid work conditions, and the household structure. Family structure such as marital status had a large effect on women’s health, more so than men. The authors commented that research on women’s health is scarcely investigated, especially the differences between males and females. In the study, only slight distinctions were made between males and females in paid work, household work, and resources. However, the lack of research on the health of women may be due to difficulty in distinguishing gender from their social and material lives. In addition, women’s roles are also continuously changing. The lack of research in this area may also be due to a lack of valid and reliable tests that measure psychosocial qualities of household work (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007).

Current Quality of Household Work Measures

Lennon (1994) investigated what characteristics make up work and how these may effect the psychological well-being of housewives and employed wives. Participants who were employed women, men, and housewives ranging in age from 25 to 54 were asked to partake in a
telephone interview. Only the information from the working wives and housewives were compared. Six different categories were used to measure work: autonomy (more control over how they work), time pressure, responsibility, interruptions, physical effort, and routine (Lennon, 1994). Housewives were found to have different scores than the employed women. The characteristic that differed the most was autonomy. Housewives were found to have more autonomy as well as more interruptions, physical demands and routine (Lennon, 1994). Employed wives were found to have more responsibility and time pressure placed on them. The work conditions did not significantly effect the psychological wellbeing of either the housewives or working women, however, it is possible that those with higher routine jobs may have higher levels of depression (Lennon, 1994).

Walters et al. (1996) performed research similar to Lennon (1994) by investigating the link between the health of nurses and the characteristics of their work and outside of their work. Emphasis was placed on the workers’ job concerns, the reward they may receive at work, control, work hours, and how satisfied they are with work. Both paid and unpaid work was found to have an effect on the nurses’ health (Walters et al., 1996). For paid workers, if there was too much work overload or the work itself was a risk to their health, the nurses reported more health problems. Work performed at home was found to be linked to more health problems if individuals had to care for a dependent adult, felt time pressure, and were not contributing enough to their family (Walters et al., 1996). However, work can reduce the likelihood of health problems when work provides a challenge and is satisfying.

Bird and Ross (1993) also compared the qualities of work between men and women who were employed or performed unpaid work (household or volunteer work). Individuals were
randomly recruited to participate in a telephone survey. Each participant was posed different
questions pertaining to six qualities: lack of pay, autonomy, routine work, extrinsic symbolic
rewards, and fulfillment (Bird & Ross, 1993). Participants who performed household work were
found to have more autonomy and also be thanked more often than those in employed work.
However, paid work provided individuals with more positive qualities such as recognition and
fulfillment (Bird & Ross, 1993).

Schooler, Miller, Miller, and Richtand (1984) investigated the psychological
consequences of both household work and paid work amongst men and women. Five hundred
and fifty-five married couples were involved in the study. Schooler et al (1984) found that
household work involved more routine and heavy work than paid work. Paid work involved
more time pressure and having more responsibility.

Womens’ paid and unpaid work possesses different qualities that also have different
effects on psychological performance (Lombardi & Ulbrich, 1997). Lombardi and Ulbrich
(1997) examined employed women and homemakers to understand if their psychological
functioning would differ based on the characteristics of their positions. The data used in this
study was collected from the American Changing Lives Survey. Homemakers were found to
have more decision latitude (ability to make decisions) and fewer physical or psychological
demands than women who are employed. Employed women with decision latitude would have
more mastery than homemakers. However, physically demanding jobs increased depression
amongst employed women in comparison to homemakers. Depressed and anxious moods for
employed women and homemakers were linked to different pathways. Mastery was found to be
linked to depression regardless of the employment statuses of the women. Golding (1990) also found that women are more likely to develop depression due to household strain, an indirect result of performing household work.

Work demands, either physical or not, can take a significant toll on an individual’s psychological health (Reisine & Fifield, 1995). Reisine & Fifield (1995) found employed women felt distress due to conflicting work demands while time constraints were a large problem amongst unpaid work. As has been found among many studies linking the qualities of work (paid and unpaid) with psychological and physical health (Lennon, 1994; Lombardi & Ulbrich, 1997; Walters et al., 1996), Reisine & Fifield also found paid and unpaid work to have a relationship with depressive symptoms. Women who have more autonomy at home and in their workplace, have been found to possess less depressive signs.

In the research that has been performed on the qualities of household work, one quality, autonomy, has continuously been linked to positive outcomes (Bird & Ross, 1993; Kibria, Barnett, Baruch, Marshall, & Pleck, 1990). Similar to Bird and Ross (1993), Kibria et al. (1990) found that household work was rewarding because of the independence in your work environment. Participants expressed that their household work was rewarding because others would be given enjoyment and that they could set their own work standards. Paid work also had positive qualities such as the feeling of accomplishment and having proficiency (Kibria et al., 1990). The qualities of household work have an important link to psychological well-being however, if a woman is employed, there is a smaller psychological effect. If there is a beneficial work environment this may decrease any distress experienced from performing household work.
Problems with Quality of Household Work Measures

The lack of research being performed on the qualities of household work is due to the lack of a valid and reliable measure (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). Currently, there are seven studies that have developed instruments to measure the qualities of household work (see Table 2). None of the instruments measuring qualities of household work follow the processes suggested by DeVellis (2003) or meet the majority of the steps in the scale development process.
### Table 2.

**Reliability and Validity Evidence in Current Measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Variables Measured</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Evidence of Reliability and Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bird &amp; Ross et al.</td>
<td>Lack of Pay</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Displayed evidence of reliability through Cronbach's Alpha; however only for certain variables. Some evidence of content validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routinization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition for work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being Thanked</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work Fulfillment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibility over tasks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golding et al. (1990)</td>
<td>Number of duties performed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Evidence of reliability through Cronbach's Alpha and some content validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of hours spent on housework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Having too much housework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housework Interferes with Other activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kibria et al. (1990)</td>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Evidence of test-retest reliability, Cronbach's Alpha, and some content validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distress</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Pressure</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Responsibilities outside of one's control</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Evidence of reliability through Cronbach's Alpha and some content validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interruptions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Physical Effort</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mastery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lombardi &amp; Ulbrich</td>
<td>Decision Latitude</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Some evidence of reliability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1997)</td>
<td>Physical Demands</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Psychological Demands</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Complex Work</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schooler et al. (1984)</td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No evidence of reliability, but there is some content validity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Independence</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pressure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Challenge</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Time Pressure</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dislikes of Housework</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walters et al., 1996</td>
<td>Control Over Income</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reliability evidence through the use of Cronbach's Alpha. Content validity and use of a pilot study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Control over Budget</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lack of Setting Goals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the studies involving these instruments did complete an initial phase of instrument construction. They reviewed and identified past literature to identify the specific construct they wanted to measure (Smith, Fischer, & Fister, 2003). However, there were differences in the
constructs being measured. As was mentioned previously, household work has various definitions, some of the studies differed in their definition of household work. For example, Walters et al. (1996) mentioned the care of elderly parents while Golding (1990) did not include childcare.

Once a construct is developed, items should then be created. None of the studies in question described their initial item pool. Lombardi and Ulbrich (1997), Walters et al. (1996), Bird and Ross (1993), and Schooler et al (1984) also did not utilize enough items (i.e., the number of items for each construct ranged from 1 to 10 in these studies (see Table 2) to appropriately measure the construct there must be an adequate amount of items). For example, Lombardi and Ulbrich (1997) included anxiety in their measure, but the anxiety subscale was assessed by only two items. Bird and Ross (1993) measured the majority of their constructs, including Routinization and Recognition for Work, with only one item. Of the items that were created, Walters et al. (1996), Bird and Ross (1993), and Lennon (1994) violated item writing guidelines (e.g., some items were double barreled). Once items are created, in order to obtain evidence of content validity, an expert panel should be employed to critique the items and rate their relevancy and representativeness (DeVellis, 2003). None of the studies included an expert panel in their scale development process.

Reliability and validity are very important to scale development, without them a test may not accurately measure what it is supposed to (Clark & Watson, 1995). The internal consistency reliability of subscales should be at least 0.70 (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). The reliability coefficients in Lombardi and Ulbrich (1997), Lennon (1994) and Bird and Ross (1993) were quite low (For example, Lennon (1994), the construct autonomy had a reliability coefficient of
0.56 for the housework items), therefore, the items they have included may not be correctly measuring the constructs. Schooler et al. (1984) mentioned reliability, however, no numerical coefficients were provided as evidence. Another method to ensure items are consistently measuring what they are supposed to is through test-retest reliability, however, only Kibria et al. (1990) provided evidence of stability reliability.

Current Study and Purpose

There is currently no psychometrically strong instrument to measure the qualities of household work (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). Research on household work originally measured quantity, such as the number of roles women have and time spent performing household work however, these measures have their flaws (Harvey 1993; Bonke 2005). Following the research shift in paid work to the study of the quality of paid work and how it affects individuals’ health (Hibbard & Pope, 1991), research on household work is beginning to focus on the psychosocial qualities of household work.

The objective of the current study was to investigate what family work or household work means to everyday partnered, employed, mothers in order to identify what psychosocial themes women relate to household work. More specifically, the current study investigated how triple role women construct meaning out of household work. The present study completed the initial state of instrument construction where the construct of interest is developed and defined (Clark & Watson, 1995). Literature reviews in combination with other sources of information such as data collected from focus groups can provide researchers with more information on the topic of interest (Morgan, 1997). Results of the research will be presented in a table of specifications.
The table of specifications can then be used to guide item writing and the accumulation of content validity evidence for a psychometrically strong instrument (Osterlind, 2006; Aiken & Groth-Marnat, 2006).
Chapter Three

Methodology

This chapter describes the research design, methods, and analysis used in the current study. A phenomenological qualitative research method was used in the present study in order to obtain meaning from the participants’ experiences (DeMarrais, 2004). Focus groups were the selected method for obtaining the data. Female participants who were employed, partnered, and had a dependent child were chosen through snowball sampling to participate in the focus groups relating to household work. Information on the criteria for participants, materials, and the procedure of the actual study is also explained. The chapter concludes with a detailed explanation of the data analysis, in which thematic analysis was used.

Research Design and Method

The current study used qualitative research conducted through an inductive approach. An inductive approach to research does not employ former theories or results, but uses the data gathered to form a larger understanding of the topic at issue (Dew, 2007). One specific inductive methodology, phenomenology, also guided the current study. Phenomenology searches for understanding, not through prior theories or studies, but by lived experiences (DeMarrais, 2004). Information and meaning comes from the individuals involved in the study (Berg, 2001).

Phenomenology was chosen for the current study because the purpose was to understand and create meaning of household work based on the perspectives of triple role women. Although prior research studies, such as Karasek et al.’s (1998) study, utilized questionnaires in order to assess certain themes related to household work, a concept such as household work is extremely difficult to fully understand through the use of questionnaires alone. Meaning and themes should
be represented by lived experiences. In order to develop an appropriate instrument assessing household work, it is important to attempt to understand household work as it applies to triple role women. Without this initial stage of instrument development, the constructs created for the subsequent instrument could be inaccurate leading to an invalid measure (DeVellis, 2003).

The method used to gather information on the household work construct was performed through the use of focus groups. Focus groups are commonly used in test construction (Morgan, 1997) as they allow individuals to describe their feelings and experiences (DeVellis, 2003). It is recommended that focus groups run between 90 to 120 minutes with approximately 8 to 10 participants (Greenbaum, 2003). Following the completion of the focus groups, the results were examined for saturation (Krueger & Casey, 2000). Saturation is a term used within focus group research to illustrate a point when no new information is being retained. Saturation occurs when the ideas participants provide in different focus groups are the same and no longer supply researchers with any new ideas (Krueger & Casey, 2000). Typically, three to four focus groups are the recommended number of focus groups needed in order to attain saturation.

**Participants**

Four focus groups were conducted for this study. Each focus group ranged in length of time from 45 minutes to 60 minute long sessions. The focus groups were conducted in different locations. Two focus groups were conducted on the University of Saskatchewan campus, within the Faculty of Medicine (Department of Community Health and Epidemiology) and the College of Education. The other focus groups were conducted within the Saskatoon community and the rural area of Loreburn, Saskatchewan. Each focus group contained a different number of participants: eight, four, five, and three individuals respectively participated in the four different
focus groups. The information obtained from the focus groups was analyzed across the groups for patterns and similarities. Following the fourth focus group, the current study achieved a saturation point, indicating no more focus groups were needed.

Twenty women who were employed, partnered, and had a dependent child participated in the current study. The criteria participants had to meet in order to partake was to be an employed, partnered, woman ranging in age from 25-50 with a dependent child. However, in retrospect, one participant was identified who did not meet all of the criteria. The decision was made to include the participant’s data in the study because the woman was employed and partnered and had a dependent child in her home in the past.

Recruitment of participants to this study began in early January 2008. Recruitment was conducted through the distribution of posters to community centres, libraries, and other public places throughout the city of Saskatoon. Due to difficulty recruiting participants, recruitment was altered to include a snowball sampling technique. Most participants involved in the current study were enrolled through this method. The researcher contacted individuals fitting the criteria of the study to participate and asked them to recommend other individuals who were also suitable for the study. The recommended individuals then also contacted others they knew that were appropriate for the present study. Some of the participants who took part in the study had a personal relationship with the researcher. Some of the participants were past friends of the researcher, however, other participants were friends of friends and therefore were not as close to the researcher. Participants did not receive any financial payment for their participation, but participants had their name entered into a draw for a chance to win a $100 gift card from The Great Canadian Superstore.
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There was no harm to the participants in this study as the topic of discussion was not psychologically harmful. Participants were verbally informed they could withdraw from the study at any time, without loss or penalty, for any reason. Participants were also asked to read over the consent form and if they agreed to participate they signed the form. Participants were also verbally debriefed following the study in which they were explained the purpose of the study and how they may contact the researcher if they had any further questions in the future. Participants were also provided with a debriefing form at the end. Confidentiality was difficult to control because there were many participants involved in the discussion. Although the researcher explained the importance of maintaining the confidentiality of the group, the researcher was unable to control for this once each focus group was complete. This study was approved by the University of Saskatchewan’s Biomedical Research Ethics Board (Bio-REB). As for relational ethics, participants were provided with juice and snacks at the beginning of the focus group in order to make the environment inviting. The researcher made sure all of the participants were comfortable with one another and described fully what the study would involve, that their responses were being tape recorded, but at any time if they felt uncomfortable they could ask for the recorder to be turned off. The environment in which the focus groups were run was a more inviting atmosphere because of the snowball sampling technique. Many of the women knew the researcher and/or knew other participants which provided a higher comfort level for participants ensuring their responses would remain confidential and that they were not going to be judged for their opinions.

Situational ethics did occur in the present study as the researcher had to quickly decide whether or not to include a participant who did not fit the study criteria. Due to the snowball
sampling technique, participants were asked to bring other participants along to the focus groups who fit the study criteria. However, within one focus group the researcher did not realize that one of the participants was older than the age category specified for the study. The researcher decided to keep this participant’s information.

**Materials**

The only material needed for the current study was the questions that were posed to participants in the focus groups (see Appendix A). There were approximately five questions relating to time, satisfaction, and health, all of which are related to household work. Five questions were deemed adequate for the focus groups and participants were able to discuss the questions thoroughly and provided sufficient feedback relating to the questions. The questions were formatted and based on the Karasek et al. (1998) study, Janzen and Hellsten (2007), and other relevant literature. A digital tape recorder was also used in the study to record each session.

**Procedure**

Participants were initially provided with consent forms to read and complete if they agreed to participate in the study. The researcher informed participants that they could withdraw at any time throughout the study, without penalty, and that they could request that the tape recorder be shut off at anytime if they felt uncomfortable. Participants were also asked to place their name on a piece of paper in order to have their names entered into a draw to win a $100 gift card from The Great Canadian Superstore. Once the consent forms were signed, participants were welcomed and thanked for their involvement and time. The researcher then provided the participants with information regarding what past research had been found in paid work,
household work and their effects on women’s health as well as the measures that are currently used. Participants were also told that there were no right or wrong answers to their responses and to rebound their ideas off of one another (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007). The researcher explained the types of questions that would be posed to them, indicating that there were three different portions of questions: (1) What is family work? (2) How is family work divided? and (3) The enjoyment of household work. Participants were then asked to introduce themselves to the group and this included either just their names and/or the number of kids they had. The initial question asked to participants was “What does family work involve?” If the participants did not initially answer, the researcher posed the question in a different way. The researcher’s position was to lead the focus group session and was to maintain the flow of the conversation. If there were empty pauses or participants did not know how to answer, the researcher would ask a question related to the material the participant provided. This was the only interaction the researcher had with the participants because the participants were to focus on each other and their ideas. Once all of the questions and sub-questions were asked the researcher completed the session. The tape recorder was stopped. Participants were debriefed, the researcher explained the purpose of the study, how the information would be used, and how the participants could get in contact with the researcher if they had future questions. The researcher provided time for the participants to ask questions and informed them that if they did not currently have any questions they may contact the researchers after the study through the information that was provided on the consent and debriefing forms (Appendix B). Participants were also told that a copy of the results could be provided to them by contacting the researcher at a later date. The focus groups ranged in time, from 45 minutes to 60 minutes. Some focus groups were shorter in length due to time
constraints as they were run during lunch hours and the participants needed to return to their place of work. Three of the focus groups had a note-taker (friends of the researcher) in the room to observe any unusual behaviours or particular themes that stood out within the groups’ discussions. The material documented by the note-takers was not used in the analysis or discussion.

Data Analysis

Following the focus group meetings, the recorded data was transcribed by the researcher. Once the data was transcribed, data analysis began. Typically, focus group information is analyzed through content analysis by interpreting participants’ meaning through the language being used (Wilkinson, 2003). Analysis can be as simple as comparing words: Are they similar or different? Do they create any patterns? (Krueger, 1998). The current study’s transcripts were analyzed using thematic analysis. The transcripts were not shared or viewed by any of the participants prior to or after the analysis.

The goal of phenomenological research is to identify the “essence” of an occurrence or life experience (Merriam & Associates, 2002). Within this research, an individual’s experiences are used to piece together a larger and more complex meaning. In order to not bias the research, researchers must not bring in their personal beliefs or experiences (Merriam & Associates, 2002). In order to find the “essence” of household work and to find psychosocial qualities of household work, thematic analysis was used to analyze the data and extract themes. Thematic analysis is an analytical tool that focuses mainly on qualitative aspects of the data (Joffe & Yardley, 2004). It is useful to researchers as it provides information on what others cannot see; it shows patterns and themes in the data gathered (Boyatzis, 1998). The main intent of using
thematic analysis is to analyze and pin point themes that occur in the qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Thematic analysis was chosen for this study as it does not rely on theories to identify themes. The essentialist method of thematic analysis was used for the present study as it focuses on participants’ life experiences and the meanings that can be drawn from them (Patton 1990). Since there were no specific research questions and/or theories used in this initial stage of instrument development, an inductive thematic analysis approach was used. This allowed the analysis to be “data-driven” and not put into a certain form based upon certain theories or questions.

In order to accomplish the goals of thematic analysis, which is to find patterns of meaning in the data, the researcher had to decide which methods would be used to analyze the data. Boyatzis (1998) believes researchers must decide which level of analysis (semantic or latent) will be used when identifying themes. A semantic level of analysis involves the observable information while latent does not rely on the visible information, but what underlies the current issue (Boyatzis, 1998). The researcher decided to extract themes from the transcribed data based on a semantic level (Braun & Clarke, 2006) where the researcher does not analyze anything outside of what the participants have said (Patton, 1990). The researcher followed five steps when using thematic analysis to analyze the transcribed data from the focus groups (Braun & Clarke, 2006). The analysis was a lengthy process in which great detail was given in each step. The initial phase began with the researcher getting acquainted with the data. Braun & Clarke (2006) recommended that researchers become thoroughly familiar with the data which may involve reading the data multiple times. The researcher transcribed all of the audio material produced from the focus groups for the current study. The transcription provided the researcher
with a detailed understanding of the data that was collected. Once the transcription process was complete, the researcher read over each document (there were four documents in total) individually to get a better grasp of the information produced in the separate groups. The researcher then read the transcripts over for a second time, but this time making notes of ideas and anything that intrigued the researcher.

The second step in thematic analysis includes the generation of codes and extracts of information from the transcribed material (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Once the researcher felt comfortable with the material, initial coding began. Coding entails the detection of common patterns of themes that the researcher sees in the data. Semantic analysis was used in the coding procedure. For the present study, the researcher went through each transcribed document, highlighting and taking notes on any data that formed patterns around a particular topic or subject of interest. Particular quotes or pieces of information that participants said were extracted from the transcribed reports and placed underneath relevant codes.

The third step in thematic analysis includes the generation of codes and extracts of information from the transcribed material (Braun & Clarke, 2006). By reviewing the codes already identified, it is believed that many may fit under a common category forming broader themes. The themes created may also have sub-themes. In the present study, the initial codes were listed and the researcher compared and contrasted all of the information to see which codes fit under a larger heading. Not all codes can be placed into a theme, and thus some codes are either discarded or placed into a miscellaneous category (Braun & Clarke, 2006). By discarding some codes this reduces down the information into relevant categories. By the end of the third phase researchers should have a set of themes with or without sub-themes and extracted material
to provide an example of the theme.

The fourth step in thematic analysis includes examining and evaluating the themes and sub-themes created in the third phase (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This is similar to stage three however, this step allows researchers to view which themes have enough information or quotes or be a theme, which themes do not have enough information and, which themes should be combined. Primarily, researchers examine the themes and quotes to see if there is an underlying pattern. If the themes do not fit under one main theme, the researcher must reevaluate, rework or create a new theme that may be better suited. Researchers must estimate whether or not the themes represent the information in the datasets or if there was any data in the documents that may have been overlooked. Lastly, once researchers are satisfied with the themes they have created from the data, the last step is refining and exemplifying what the themes mean (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Analysis and a write up is performed on each theme that identifies what each theme means and how it fits into the research questions being asked in the study. One should be able to define each theme with simply one or two sentences, if this is not possible revisions need to be performed on the themes.
Chapter Four

Results

The current study investigated employed, partnered mothers’ experiences with household work in order to explore what household work consists of and how participants feel about household work. Essentially, this study was to find the “essence” of household work (Braun & Clarke, 2006) and to identify the relevant themes so that future research could utilize the themes as subscales when developing items for an instrument. Participants’ responses to the questions posed at the focus groups were analyzed using thematic analysis following the recommendations of Braun and Clarke (2006). Within phenomenological data analysis, the researcher searches statements for themes and meaning (Creswell, 1998). To do so, the researcher declares his biases in order to observe the data without bias, this is called bracketing or, another term used is, epoche (Creswell, 1998). If the researcher identifies his bias upfront, the analysis then reflects the participants’ experiences and is not influenced by partiality (Field & Morse, 1985).

The Researcher

I, the researcher, may have biased the results when conducting and analyzing the focus group information based on who I am. I am a 24 year old woman who grew up in a small town in rural Saskatchewan. I am not married, nor do I have any children. The biases I have are that I am female, have a mother who was once a triple role woman, and I have knowledge from previous research that may also influence my opinions. The fact that I am a female may result in bias as I may understand or experienced more about the inequality of household work. This bias is likely not as strong as if I was married and had children. My mother was a stay at home mom, partnered, and had dependent children. Not until I was older did she return back to work. My
own experience with having a triple role woman as a role model may also result in bias.
Researching this topic also has provided background knowledge to previous research which may also have altered my decisions.

*The Process of Thematic Analysis*

Initially, I became familiar with the data by reading over the transcripts and making notes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Following this, preliminary codes were formed based on information that I found interesting (because it was talked about frequently throughout the groups or stood out due to the previous research I had performed), relevant to household work, or appeared fairly consistent amongst the participants. Associated data was then extracted from the transcribed material in the form of direct quotes from the participants in order to provide evidence for the codes. Although the codes could be considered possible themes, the codes were very broad, encompassed a lot of material under one specific term, and could be overlapping (Braun & Clarke, 2006). At the end of step two I had identified 33 codes or potential themes (See Table 3).
Table 3.

*Initial Codes Resulting From Step 2 Thematic Analysis of the Focus Groups*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Division of Labour:</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housekeeper:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Fair Between Spouses</td>
<td>Have one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Before Children</td>
<td>For Major Cleans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whoever is at Home</td>
<td>Affordability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality</td>
<td>If Hurt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Constraints</td>
<td>Make Things Easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Control</td>
<td>Teenagers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priorities</td>
<td>Younger Kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likes</td>
<td>Housework Provides a Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislikes</td>
<td>Guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress</td>
<td>Types of Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beyond Immediate Family</td>
<td>Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards</td>
<td>Self Blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of a Clean House</td>
<td>Work Easier to do Yourself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time For Self</td>
<td>Designating Duties/Activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Children's Responsibility in Household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Work</td>
<td>Cleaning Provides Physical Aspect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men/Children Don't See Things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That Need to be Done</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I then took the 33 possible themes and narrowed them down by using the codes and quotes from the transcripts. While looking through the various different codes, it was evident that some codes appeared to overlap and could be gathered together due to their similarities (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Such overlapping codes were combined and placed under a larger title theme (Braun & Clarke, 2006). For example, time control and time for self were combined under the theme *Time Constraints* because all of the codes reflected the same objective; women have no time. In contrast, a number of the themes contained sub-themes as well. For example, the initial codes of guilt, self-blame, and stress were once all separate, but they all had a
psychological component to them and so they were placed under the theme psychological strain. In order to better understand the themes developed in Step 3, a thematic map was created out of the original codes (see Figure 1).

Figure 1. Step 3: Creation of Themes.

The thematic map was a visual aid to me so I could understand which themes were appropriate, those that were not, and any themes that could be combined under another theme (Braun & Clarke, 2006). After I created the themes, I analyzed the data again to make sure nothing had been missed or overlooked (Braun & Clarke, 2006). First I reviewed the codes and quotes extracted from the transcripts. I revised the themes to ensure the codes that made up the larger themes had a similar pattern and flow and they accurately defined the theme (Braun & Clarke, 2006). I then reevaluated the themes and sub-themes shown in Figure 1 by rereading the
codes and quotes established for each theme. I then created a second thematic map describing the relationships between the proposed themes in step 3 (see Figure 2). For example, with respect to a particular theme such as *Time*, Figure 2 shows that *Reward* is related to *Time*, *Time* is related to *Psychological Strain*, *Scheduling* leads to *Psychological Strain*, *Help with Work* can result from the *Division of Work* and having *Help with Work* can be related to *Money*. In comparison, other potential sub-themes were eliminated for example, the sub-themes *Designating Duties*, *Kid’s Activities*, and *Priorities* because there was not enough evidence for their inclusion. By excluding such potential themes it is possible that more positive information regarding household work would be left out or other issues that may have influence over the other themes.
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*Figure 2. Step 4: Reviewing Themes and Their Connections*

The themes were also compared to the entire data set in order to identify whether the emergent themes created accurately and truly reflected the women’s experiences and thoughts.
The themes did change somewhat as I realized *Time* should not be broken down into sub-themes but should be a theme titled *Time Constraints*. Similarly, the sub-themes *Designating Duties*, *Kid’s Activities*, and *Priorities* were removed from the theme *Scheduling* because according to the women in the study, scheduling included the scheduling of family activities. The theme *Division of Work* was also transformed after I reviewed the entire dataset. *Equality in Work* appeared to define the concept better than *Division of Work* and *Children* and *Spouses* were beaded to the theme as sub-themes. *Equality in Work* in the current study is relating to the number of hours and duties a partner places into household work. Unlike Hiller (1984), the Equality in Work theme reflects equality more than equity in the present study. New themes were also added as I decided to include *No End Result* and *Value* after reviewing the data set. Results of the thematic analysis resulted in the identification of eight main themes: (1) *No End Result*; (2) *Scheduling*; (3) *Time Constraints*; (4) *Psychological Strain* (with sub-themes: *Stress*, *Self Blame*, and *Guilt*); (5) *Equality in Work* (with sub-themes: *Children* and *Spouses*); (6) *Value*; (7) *Money* (with sub-themes: *To Stay at Home* and *Housekeeper*); and (8) *Reward* (with sub-themes: *Physical* and *Verbal*).

*Exploring the Themes*

**No End Result**

For women, household work does not appear to have an end result, as once the house is clean it becomes dirty again when their family comes home. The time women spend on cleaning is perceived as continuous as the home never remains a certain way and frequently becomes dirty. Many women in Focus Group 1 and Focus Group 4 expressed that once they finished cleaning, the home does not stay clean and the cleaning has to be redone.
I think there’s a big switch when they started coming home after school by themselves. Because everyday you would come home, there was.. there was a whole trail, of exactly, you could follow exactly what they had done…..

(Focus Group #1, p. 11)

Similarly, a participant in the fourth focus group stated:

I just hate to do something and then having to redo it two seconds later. Yeah, it’s like I just folded that load of laundry and I have to do it because I have to get into my house and then one of the kids will take a thing and it flips off and it’s all on the ground.

(Focus Group #4, p. 17)

Another participant in Focus group #4 also expressed how a room can become dirty in a matter of minutes.

I’ll tell you something though, you come home and it’s just…. Oh it’s so nice when you walk in and then 15 minutes later… it.. it looks messy again…..

(Focus Group #4, p. 19)

One participant expressed a feeling of satisfaction when things are complete, but also knowing that no one will ruin it.

That’s very possible that, that it could be just that it’s actually something that has completion and you know it’s not going to be…. Something’s not going to ruin it in five minutes. (Focus Group #1, p. 35)

Having a clean house is very important to women as it provides them with a particular feeling. Women explained that they feel good and have a feeling of satisfaction when their house is clean.
If something’s really bad like if the carpet is really, really dirty and I get the vacuum out I, I too like the end, end product… it feels good after.

(Focus Group #1, p. 31)

and

It just feels good when you’re all done and you look around, but then the day to day clutter cleaning does not really, it’s not as satisfying to me, but having the whole house completely spotless, like makes me happy.

(Focus Group #4, p. 16)

Another participant received joy from performing and completing a large task

…or you get a room painted or something that you’ve been wanting to do for a while.

Like where you’re going to be able to sort of enjoy that and appreciate it. Like that’s satisfying, but, but, yet, but, it isn’t necessarily the process it’s more the product.

One participant in the third focus group (#3, p. 30) expressed her dismay at how quickly her work was for naught, “I like the look of a clean house, a clean room, but it seems like such a fleeting..” (Focus Group # 3, p. 30)

The theme No End Result shows that women are satisfied and happy when their household is clean. However, many of the women were dismayed that everyone around them does not keep the home in the same condition. By the women’s expressions, it sounds as though it is impossible to keep a room or household clean when one has a family. The positive feelings associated with a clean house are taken away by other members of the family, leading to frustration on the part of the woman and the perception that household work is continuous and never ending, never having an end result.
Scheduling

When women were asked the question of what they believe family work includes, the majority of them indicated that it involved scheduling children’s events, activities, appointments, etc. Others said they had to arrange and coordinate family gatherings such as anniversaries or holiday events for their family members. Some said such scheduling was an expectation of their role and responsibility as triple role women. Women are busy, as all the women in the study work full-time, and amongst their busy schedules they take the time to prepare and plan activities for their family. For example, “One thing that keeps me really hopping all the time is organizing everybody’s lives” (Focus Group #4, p. 2). This topic appeared in all four of the focus groups that were conducted.

I think that would take up a lot of your time really, have kids, like getting them to and from, like setting them up, booking them into stuff, first of all registering them, finding out when the date is. Registering them and then getting them to and from…..

(Focus Group #1, p. 4)

Another participant reiterated the idea of scheduling.

Yeah… Johnny had to be here and so and so has to go to school at 6 for two hours of football or, okay, football practice and the daughter has to go and the husband has to go to a Lion’s meeting…

(Focus Group #3, p. 2)

And

I think one of the biggest time. to go with the scheduling of activities and things is that when you are at activities you’re not in the home (Focus Group #1, p.6)
Another participant described the relationship of scheduling to the amount of time other family members’ activities take.

Yeah, I take one of my kids to hockey and it is a 3 to 4 hour affair, by the time you have to get there early, the game’s another hour and 45 minutes long, and then it’s another half hour for them to get undressed and home, so, it can take a fair chunk of the day

(Focus Group #2, p. 2)

Several women spoke about the expectation that is placed on them to do this type of work. For example, “I feel that if I do not organize our family get-togethers we would all just drift apart.” (Focus Group #3, p. 14). Similarly, “We take on their responsibilities then if they cannot do it, or we have to schedule time for them to get all of it done..” (Focus Group #3, p. 3). Another woman agreed, “Ensuring that music is practiced, homework is done, um, you know everything….,” (Focus Group #4, p. 3).

However, regardless of the time and effort that goes into scheduling children’s activities, participants find it to be enjoyable as they have time with their children.

I actually really like chauffeuring, I find that, I found that that, that’s been a really good place to connect with my kids because they usually… often I just have one of them with me and so that’s when we have the conversations about you know… (Focus Group #3, p. 16)

It is evident that triple role women schedule their families’ activities. The triple role women try to make sure everyone is going in the right direction and to the places they need to be. However, the work women do in scheduling activities for others in the family takes time out of their own schedules although, sometimes they do not mind performing or scheduling those
activities. There were positive aspects to the triple role women’s family duties such as being a mom.

For me, I do not think of like the emotional stuff and the to me, that is not work. Yeah, you know, that is just being a mom (Focus Group #2, p. 5)

And

Sitting down and listening to what is going on in their lives, when they want to tell you and trying to be supportive and helpful….. (Focus Group #1, p. 4)

Time Constraints

One of the dominant themes identified in the data was the concept of time, particularly the perceived lack of time. For example, “Yeah, that’s what happened to me a lot lately… you just do not have enough time to get it all done….” (Focus Group #4, p. 18). Women identified many aspects of their lives where they did not perceive having enough time to do household work. Women also stated that if they had more time, they may actually enjoy performing household work. For example, certain activities such as cooking were deemed to be un-enjoyable because of the time constraints. If the women had time to think and become creative with their meals, they enjoyed cooking. “A level of creativity and time, you know, like I mean…. then I’m taking the time and not trying to squeeze it in between anything else and so, I have more time to plan and I can go through cookbooks and pick recipes….” (Focus Group #4, p. 14).

The idea of time also appeared to be related to scheduling as the women took the time to help their families thereby taking time away from there own schedules. Time and scheduling were also related because of the time limits placed upon the family and the mother when coordinating and scheduling activities. “I do not mind doing any of the chores, I just find that
everything is on a time constraint like always rushing to do stuff” (Focus Group #2, p. 22).

Similarly, being on a tight schedule appears to have a negative effect on the women.

If I could do the stuff I wanted, when I wanted, in my own time, when I was in a good mood, then I would like it, but if I have to shop for groceries tonight, between 6 and 8 and I have a really long list, and it is busy in there then I hate it…

(Focus Group #2, p. 22)

The participants also said that due to the lack of time all around, they do not have enough time for themselves. For example, “I think if you had more time for yourself, like I mean if you could, then it would not be as bad….“ (Focus Group #2, p. 23). Participants expressed it is not the activities they are performing, but it is the time constraint that makes things difficult, “I don’t mind doing any of the chores, I just find that everything’s so on a time constraint like always rushing to do stuff” (Focus Group #1, p. 22) Women did not perceive spending time on emotional work for their families as negative as they believe this was a part of their role of being a mom. “It is work in the sense that it takes time to do, but it is like it is an unconditional thing that you know that you signed on for.” (Focus Groups #2, p. 5).

Another participant even expressed how she reduced her work hours in order to be more involved in her kids lives and that she was happy she did so.

Like that was the reason I cut back to part time, it wasn’t so I could do more housework, it was just to have more time with the kids, and even though sometimes, like the, you know, the emotional sort of, the counseling, listening, and all that is hard and, and it can cause me a lot of stress I still am really glad that I have that time because if I weren’t putting the time in on that I’d feel like I was really missing out. (Focus Group #1, p. 29).
Psychological Strain (Sub-themes: Stress, Self Blame, and Guilt)

The theme Psychological Strain is a very large and detailed concept in which there are three sub-themes: (1) Stress, (2) Self Blame, and (3) Guilt. The concept of Psychological strain is very important as the information found in the data provides insight into how triple role women may feel about their lives. Numerous women throughout the focus groups mentioned having a lot of stress and not being able to handle all of the things they are supposed to do. For example:

I think just the feeling it gives you, like I know if I have got, you know I have got to clean the toilets or the bathrooms and I have got to do this and you know everything just sort of builds up, then I am I feel stressed…

(Focus Group #2, p. 11)

Similarly,

Like, it is weird because you feel guilty, like I should be able to do everything, I should be able to work full time, be a mom, and clean my house up, but he could tell I was like loosing it…

(Focus Group #2, p. 9)

While others were so stressed they need to be disconnected from reality. For instance, “Most of the time I just feel like I need to zone out.. you know, from work and from the chaos of family and from worries and stuff like that, so” (Focus Group #4, p. 17).

Women who are partnered, employed mothers have many roles that may eventually take a toll on them. Participants believed they should not have to do all of the household work however, they blamed themselves for not delegating particular duties to their children or spouses.
He learned quite quickly how to wash things so that he could come home at 4 o’clock and wash his gym clothes if he had to be back to school at 7 and to want to be wearing them because I did not get home from work and I think that is one of the biggest mistakes a lot of mom’s make is the fact that um, that we do wait on them a little bit too much.

(Focus Group #3, p. 23)

Another mother agreed, “We are our own worst enemy actually” (Focus Group #3, p 28). Several of the women specified that they felt certain expectations on how to be a mother based upon how their own mothers were.

I grew up with a mom who did everything, she was the farm wife and raised six kids and so, um, we got spoiled in that regard. We did not have to do a lot of chores so I am stuck in this mindset where, okay, now Red you are not a stay at home farm wife, you work full time, but yet I do everything……

(Focus Group #2, p. 8)

However, the triple role women expressed that they had self-blame, but they did not challenge their partner to do more work in the household. Many of the women did not agree with the amount of work their husbands or children put into household work although, none of the triple role women confronted them about their activity levels, keeping this information within them and letting it manifest.

A lot of my fault because I could just go home and say look you’re doing Monday, Tuesday, you know (Focus Group #4, p. 10)

The triple role women do not like to nag and instead of confronting their partner or children it is easier to do it themselves.
And always nagging, like ok, you got to do this work then finally you just give up and …

(laughter) and give in as usual, yeah. (Focus Group #4, p. 13)

However, they felt if they do nag they are looked upon in a negative light. For example, “And you come across as a …. a bag” (Focus Group #4, p. 13).

As for the concept of guilt, this ranged from mothers being guilty for going to work, not being able to handle all of their duties, and for receiving help (either through a housekeeper or their spouse).

When you have got a smaller child and you are working, so you take the kid to daycare and then you come home and then the guilt hits and you have all that time, from the time you get home till the bedtime that you have to spend with them, because that is the only time you get with them…

(Focus Group #1, p. 12)

However, other women who’s husbands do help around the household also feel guilt that they do not do enough around the house.

Umm… I kind of feel, I feel a little guilty sometimes, when I come home and it’s spotless, and you know sometimes when I’m home and Ray comes home it’s not.

Equality in Work (Sub-themes: Children and Spouses)

The majority of the women in the study divulged that the division of household work in their families between their spouses was not fair as the triple role women performed more duties or placed more time and effort into household chores. Equity was brought into this theme, as the participants focused not only on equality of duties, but other factors such as the type of jobs their partner has or whoever is at home should do more work. The theme *Equality in Work* has two
sub-themes: (1) *Children* and (2) *Spouses*. Children were included as many of the participants indicated that their teenage children should be helping out more with chores.

For example,

> For me, if my kids would just see you know, if you all put together 15 minutes after supper, clean the table, do the dishes, get it done, then we would all be off doing whatever it is we want to do…

(Focus Group #2, p. 23)

Although, children were not the only ones neglecting to help the women, spouses were also involved. The division of household labour, especially equality between spouses, is an important issue as a lot of prior research in household work has focused on its division. Many of the women wished there was more equality, for example, “You wish that there was more of an equal division of sharing…. ” (Focus Group #2, p. 6)

And

> I think it is mostly I do, more than he does and I think it is unfair. I work all day and I come home from work and I do housework as soon as I get home and then I cook. He gets home, he eats supper, he reads the paper, ugh, it is not really fair.

(Focus Group #2, p. 18)

A participant from Focus Group # 3 also expressed similar feelings towards her spouse and the unequal division of household work.
Because I am leaving for work at ten to seven so I mean I leave my kitchen clean, I come home going, what happened… Who was here, and you know, just him, but every dish in the sink are on the counter. So, no it is not fair, even if he cooks it is not fair.

(Focus Group #3, p. 26)

Participants felt that it was not just the unequal division of hours placed into household work, but that they do not notice what needs to be done.

That’s what’s unfair, it’s not even necessarily the percentage or how much he works outside the home and I work outside the home, it’s, I see it needs to be done, I have to do it, but he doesn’t see that it needs to be done and he doesn’t know when the sheets are washed last or if they need to be done today, or tomorrow or on Friday…. (Focus Group #2, p. 18)

One participant expressed that their partner expressed that because of the type of job they have they should do less household work.

Yeah, like I guess the excuse my husband uses now that I am working full time as opposed to staying at home is that his job is physical. He’s a floor installer and I enjoy my job I work in a lab and it’s great… (Focus Group #2, p. 18)

While others believe division of household labour is dependent on which partner is at home.

I’ve had a change because I, I stayed home for ten years, so when I went back to work I still tried to do all of the things that I did when I was at home and work as well and then of course there’s not enough time for that. And then my husband decided to go back to school and so his schedule is much more flexible and.. then mine like obviously, because he’s not supposed to be at an office at a specific time so whereas I’m mainly supposed to
be…… so my husband has become much more involved in things going on around the house, just because he’s around the house more, so. (Focus Group #1, p. 25)

And

If I had continued to work full-time I would have felt more comfortable sort of … holding you know my husband to more of an equal share, but because I chose to cut back, in order to spend more time with the kids (Focus Group #1, p. 23)

The triple role women also said that as they are cleaning their homes, many said that their spouses or children were having fun doing things for themselves instead of helping them clean the house. The division of household work is unfair if other family members do not pitch in, but have fun instead.

On Saturday morning I get up and I think ugh, you know I have got to do laundry, I have to go to do these errands, I have got all this stuff to do, right? And you know, I look around the house and nobody else is doing anything like that, like you, they are, they are sitting there enjoying themselves…

(Focus Group #1, p. 23)

Also

I was mentally exhausted and now I still am, but I just keep going and where he is at that point now and he will just come in and lay on the couch and so yeah I think it is unfair I am doing all this stuff with respect to the house in the evenings and I look over and he is laying on the couch watching…

(Focus Group #2, p. 17)

The women believed that if their children and/or spouse helped out just a small amount it would
create more time for them. For example:

And if everyone worked at the same time…. It is 15 minutes and all five of us work
together and it is done rather than one person doing it for an hour while the other four
people are watching television.

(Focus Group #2, p. 24)

If the division of household labour was equally divided, or if men helped out more, women may
have more time and less stress. A number of women did have partners that were equal and, if
not, did more work than themselves, however, this number was quite low in comparison to those
who do the majority of the household work. Of interest was that the division of household work
for some families was dependent on who was home, if the husband was home he may do more
and vice versa, also that household work chores may be dependent on the type of job as well.

Value

As the above evidence has shown, there is not full equality when it comes to household
work. Women believe they are undervalued and their families do not give them enough
appreciation for what they do around the house as many women feel they are taken for granted.
For example, “Yeah, I mean it is all that invisible stuff that people take for granted because they
are not the ones doing it and they cannot see it.” (Focus Group #2, p. 4). Other women do not
feel taken for granted, but do not feel that they are appreciated for the work they do. For
instance, “I guess what gets to me is feeling like a lot of what I am doing is not visible and
therefore it is not taken into account; it is not appreciated” (Focus Group #1, p. 19).

Women did express that the lack of value they receive may be due to the fact that some
activities they perform are more invisible, as in the following.
You know, every now and again when I go home, because there is a lot of stuff you just do and it is just you are on the way to this, you pick up that on the way, nobody sees that. (Focus Group #1, p. 20)

And

They have no idea how long it has been since the sheets are washed and even if you just washed them they do not know, you know, it is just sort of... and .. you know like the same as kids, kids do not pay attention to when their sheets were washed.... (Focus Group #2, p. 19)

The triple role women expressed that they were sometimes taken for granted.

Yeah, I mean it is all that invisible stuff that people take for granted because they’re not the one’s doing it and they can’t see it. So, like the dusting, and the vacuuming, and washing walls, and..(Focus Group #2, p. 4)

Also

I guess what gets to me is feeling like a lot of what I’m doing is not visible and, and therefore it’s not taken into account, it’s not appreciated.. (Focus Group #1, p. 19)

Gratitude and appreciation of someone’s work can go a long way, therefore, if women were praised more often for the household work they perform perhaps the perceptions of equality in household work would change? Appreciation may also decrease the psychological strain in these triple role women because they know that someone notices what they are doing and cares. Value provides meaning and a sense of understanding as to why women perform such duties.

Money (sub-themes: To Stay at Home and To Hire a Housekeeper)

When women were asked what would make family work easier or more pleasurable,
numerous women said they would like to stay at home with their families and not have to work. Therefore, there are two sub-themes: (1) To Stay at Home and (2) Housekeeper. Women articulated that if they had the money, they would not work. For example, “That would help if the economy would be at the point where one of us could stay at home and we both did not have to work, that would be great!” (Focus Group #2, p. 24)

And

Not working a job (Focus Group #4, p. 18)

One participant was even contemplating reducing her work load to spend more time at home, for instance, “I do not know if anybody’s been put in my situation, but is reducing my work hours to be at home more…..” (Focus Group #2, p. 25).

Another question posed to participants was did they have a housekeeper to come and do their household work for them. If not, would they want one? A few women said they had housekeepers come into their homes to clean, but they still end up doing the majority of the cleaning, so it is not a large amount of help, “I used to. I stopped because it was causing such conflict in the house. Because the night before the woman came we had to clear the clutter away.” (Focus Group #1, p. 14-15) “She comes in every two weeks and it is more that, I still have to do all of the work, like I am still the one who keeps the house clean…..” (Focus Group #2, p. 8).

However, other women still would love to have a housekeeper, but cannot afford one, “I would have one now, if, if I felt like we… if it were affordable, but it does get fairly expensive.” (Focus Group #1, p. 17). Also, “I do not have any, but I have thought of it, but there never seems to be enough money to add that on.” (Focus Group #4, p. 6).
Money has a significant influence on the perceptions and feelings women have towards household work. Numerous women believe by having more money they could stay at home and be with their family or hire someone to clean up their homes, while others have had the money to hire a housekeeper, but are unsatisfied.

Reward (sub-themes Physical and Verbal)

Lastly, the final theme created in this study was that of Reward, with two sub-themes: (1) Physical and (2) Verbal. I posed a question to the women asking them what would make household work easier or more pleasurable. Many of them responded as is shown in the theme Money that they would like to stay at home or be able to afford a housekeeper. Some women believed having a physical reward would make household work more pleasurable, for example,

If we got a reward other than a clean house and a nutritious meal and clean sheets on the bed. If we got something out of it, you know, after we clean the bathroom and poof… we get a glass of wine or something.

(Focus Group #2, p. 24)

And

I think if you had more time for yourself, like I mean if you could, then it would not be as bad, you know you could think oh, I went and got my nails done or something, you know if you just had some sort of reward almost for everything you do.

(Focus Group #2, p. 23)

Also in response to the question about making household work more enjoyable, many women said even verbal recognition would make them feel more appreciated for example, “Just a thanks for getting supper or.. uh… you know, the living room looks really nice for a change.” (Focus
Similarly,

Well… if they said good job and they mean it without you asking them, without you saying honey, did you notice I cleaned the bathroom. Oh, yeah, thanks, you know, they will notice after, if they notice before you had to say did you notice, it might be good enough…

(Focus Group #2, p. 25)

And

It makes me feel good and it made her feel good that I made it just for her because they all have a different favourite pie and it made me feel good that she appreciated that I made the extra effort and made it for her.

(Focus Group #3, p. 34)

The theme *Reward* is a very important and interesting theme to have, as it provides information on what may reduce women’s psychological strains and may make them feel happier about performing household work. By providing rewards this may in counter have an affect on other areas of their lives such as their stress levels, guilt, and value, because they are cherished for the work they do.

*The “Story”*

The themes presented in this study can stand alone, but they also interconnect together to tell an underlying story about the lives of women in triple roles (See Figure 3 for the final themes).
The story being told is that women who are partnered, employed, and are mothers lead very busy and hectic lifestyles and that, when they do household work, they do not get any satisfaction. This is partly due to the never ending cycle of having to clean, and their families do not value, nor appreciate the work they do. Because their families do not value or recognize the work they accomplish in and outside the household, there is no equality in the work (based on number of duties performed and may be dependent on the partner’s job or who is at home, very few husbands share the household work with their partners and the mothers/wives resort to doing the majority of the work because they are afraid to nag, bottling their emotions inside because they do not want to be perceived negatively.

When women do not have this help from their children or spouses and they are planning everything for the family, this leaves them with no time for themselves and no time to do the everyday activities such as cooking. However, if more time was provided to them everyday chores like cooking would be more enjoyable. If there were less time constraints this would also
decrease the psychological strains women are facing. Women believe they have to be their mother, who did not work, but stayed at home, plus work full-time and keep an entirely spotless house. Unfortunately, this is all very hard to do. One participant remarked at the end of one of the focus groups that women have to be Super Women. Another participant referred to her energy levels as some unnatural super power as she is exhausted, but still tries to accomplish everything.

Focus groups were performed in urban and rural areas in order to understand if there are differences between triple role women by location. There were a few minor differences such as the household activities performed. Women in rural areas are hired to perform farm books. Time constraints are also higher in rural areas because when the women come into the city to shop for groceries they need to buy everything, due to the lack of nearby grocery stores in their areas. However, these are only minor differences and more focus groups performed in rural areas would be needed to state a large difference between urban and rural women.

The results of this study, the themes presented, show that women are exhausted trying to live up to the expectations put upon them. However, women would not mind and may enjoy household work and the activities related to it more if they felt they were being valued, appreciated, and respected. This could come in the form of a housekeeper to help them, having a chance to get their nails done or, simply, just a thank-you.

Summary of Results

The results have provided an abundance of detailed information regarding the feelings and perceptions triple role women have towards household work and their families. It is evident from the above material that triple role women live hectic lives with very little help from their
family members including their children and spouses. The main goal of this study was to identify themes relating to the quality of household work based on the perceptions of triple role women. Existing instruments that measure the qualities of household work lack psychometric properties and; therefore, a new valid and reliable measure is needed (Janzen & Hellsten, 2007).

The eight themes, (1) No End Result; (2) Scheduling; (3) Time Constraints; (4) Psychological Strain (with sub-themes: Stress, Self Blame, and Guilt); (5) Equality in Work (with sub-themes: Children and Spouses); (6) Value; (7) Money (with sub-themes: To Stay at Home and To Hire a Housekeeper); and (8) Reward (with sub-themes Physical and Verbal), have been placed into a table of specifications (see Table 4.)
Table 4.

Table of Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes &amp; Sub-themes</th>
<th>Definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No End Result</td>
<td>Discouragement from constant cleaning of the household for which there is no lasting outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling</td>
<td>The coordinating/planning of children and family activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time Constraints</td>
<td>Not having enough time to perform household duties (cooking, grocery shopping, etc) or have time for yourself. Emotional work is not considered to be negative even though it is time consuming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Strain</td>
<td>Having to perform many activities eventually leads to feeling overwhelmed, as though one cannot handle things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Stress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women feel large amounts of stress due to performing many activities without help. May want to relax and no be in reality.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Self-Blame</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Blame themselves for not designating household duties, asking for help, or living up to expectations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3) Guilt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feel guilt for leaving children to go to work, receiving help, and/or not being able to handle all of their roles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equality in Work</td>
<td>The division of household work between children and spouses. Women do the work while spouses and children have fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Spouse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The division of work contributed by women's spouses. Do they perform their fair share or have fun instead?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The division of work contributed by women's children. Do they offer or help with household chores?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value</td>
<td>The household work women perform is taken for granted or it is appreciated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>The ability to buy a housekeeper or to stay at home, to not have to go outside the home to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) To Stay at Home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If money was not an issue, women would rather stay at home with their families than work outside the home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Housekeeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If money was not an issue, women would hire a housekeeper to maintain their homes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reward</td>
<td>Household work can be pleasurable if there is a physical (i.e. glass of wine or time) or verbal (i.e. thanks) reward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1) Physical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A physical reward (i.e. a glass of wine or time to get one's nails done) would make household work easier or more enjoyable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) Verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A verbal reward (i.e. thank-you for cooking supper or the living room looks nice) makes performing household work easier and/or more enjoyable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A table of specifications provides researchers with a visual of what categories items should be developed for (Osterlind, 2006). The table of specifications created from the results of this study will provide future researchers, such as Janzen and Hellsten (2007), themes based on the quality of household work for which items can be developed.
Chapter Five

Discussion

The purpose of this chapter is to discuss the results found in Chapter 4. More specifically, the themes which emerged from this study are compared and contrasted to themes found in previous research on household and paid work. The results of this study are also linked to previous research on women’s well-being and multiple roles. The chapter concludes with an examination of the limitations of the study and ideas for future research.

Summary of Results

At the completion of the fourth focus group, the majority of the themes hit a level of saturation, with no new information received and no new themes emerging. Therefore, data collection was halted and no additional focus groups were conducted beyond the four. In the end, one focus group was conducted in a rural setting and three focus groups were run in an urban setting. There were minor differences found amongst the urban and rural focus group participants relating to the types of activities these women perform (rural women work on farm books) and the theme of Time Constraints (rural women must perform grocery shopping in a shorter time span). More focus groups would need to be performed in order to examine these urban/rural differences of household work and as such no further attempts were made to conduct additional rural focus groups at this time. Future research should examine the possibility of such differences.

Comparing the Present Results to Previous Research

The purpose of the current study was to identify themes which reflect the qualities of household work based on the perceptions of triple role women. Research suggests that qualities
of work, either paid or unpaid, involve specific characteristics (Hibbard & Pope, 1993). For example, in the realm of paid work, Karasek et al., (1998) identified five constructs: (1) Decision Latitude, (2) Psychological Demands, (3) Social Support, (4) Physical Demands, and (5) Job Security to measure the social and psychological aspects of work. There appears to be some similarities between the themes emerging from the current study of household work and those found in the Karasek et al. (1998) study on paid work. For example, Karasek et al. (1998) identified Psychological Demands as a characteristic of paid work. Psychological Strain (including the sub-themes of Guilt, Stress, and Self-blame), a similar theme to the Karasek et al. (1998) construct of Psychological Demands, emerged in this study. The Psychological Demand theme used in Karasek et al. (1998) involves how hard an individual works at their paid work and conflicts that may restrict workers from completing a task. The theme Psychological Strain in the current study involves stress from hectic scheduling, and being responsible for doing too many things around the household, guilt from leaving their child, and self blame for not designating duties to family members and instead bottle up their emotions because they do not want to be perceived negatively.

Another similarity between the two studies involves the construct Decision Latitude. Karasek et al. (1998) describe Decision Latitude as having the ability to make your own decisions in combination with low and high work demands. In the current study, many women mentioned having the inability to decide when they wanted to conduct household work, that they had no choice when to go grocery shopping, or no time to be creative when cooking meals. These experiences were labeled as Time Constraints. However, the basic idea is similar in the fact that there appears to be a continuum of autonomy for both paid and unpaid workers, which
varies depending on your place of work and other variables as well.

The women in the current study also expressed that they did not receive a lot of help from their children or spouses when performing household work, leading to an unequal division of labour within the household. However, the women did not challenge their partners or children and ask them to help out with the household duties, instead they figured it would be easier to do it themselves. The triple role women did not ask for help and instead this information may manifest inside them, but they would prefer this over having to nag at their husband or children. The women believed that if they nag they will be though of negatively and be termed a “bag”. It is also a possibility that the women feel they contribute the same amount of paid work as their partners, but still have to do household work as well leading to frustration. Karasek et al. (1998) identified a similar construct, Social Support, which appears to be similar to the current study’s theme of *Equality in Work*. Karasek et al. (1998) hypothesized that workers may have a better work environment and enjoy work more if they had support from their co-workers. Triple role women in this study said they would feel better (i.e. happier, less stressed) if they received more help with the household work.

The remaining two constructs produced in Karasek et al. (1998)’s study, Physical Demands and Job Security were the only two constructs that did not appear to match the themes identified in this study. The women in the current study did mention briefly that they liked household work because it was physical, “household work got them moving and exercising,” however, none of the triple role women discussed the physical toll household work has on them. Future research should ask women specifically about the physical toll of household work to find out if the construct is relevant to triple role women’s perceptions of household work. Job
Security did not appear to apply to household work.

There were many similarities between the current study’s themes and the constructs identified by Karasek et al. (1998) for paid work. Numerous connections were also made with studies performed on the qualities of household work. Table 5 provides a comparison of the themes emerging from this study and household work constructs measured by other studies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Themes/Variables Measured</th>
<th>Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Current Study | No End Results  
Time Constraints  
Equality in Work (Children & Spouses)  
Money (To Stay at Home & Housekeeper  
Scheduling  
Psychological Strain (Stress, Guilt, and Self-Blame)  
Value  
Reward (Physical & Verbal)  
Lack of Pay  
Autonomy | 20 female participants (25 to 50 years of age): Employed, partnered, and work full time |
| Bird & Ross (1993) | Routinization  
Recognition for work  
Being Thanked  
Work Fulfillment  
Responsibility over tasks  
Number of duties performed | 2,031 Employed men and women and homemakers |
| Golding (1990) | Number of hours spent on housework  
Having too much housework  
Housework Interferes with Other activities | 668 Mexican-American and 394 Non-Hispanic participants. |
| Kibria et al. (1990) | Reward  
Distress  
Autonomy  
Time Pressure | 403 Employed Women, 25 to 55 years of age |
| Lennon (1994) | Responsibilities outside of one's control  
Interruptions  
Physical Effort  
Routine  
Mastery | 300 Employed women, 302 Employed men, and 202 Homemakers |
| Lombardi & Ulbrich (1997) | Decision Latitude  
Physical Demands  
Psychological Demands  
Complex Work | 992 African American and Non-Hispanic Women aged 24 to 59 |
| Schooler et al. (1984) | Routine  
Independence  
Pressure  
Lack of Challenge  
Time Pressure  
Dislikes of Housework  
Control Over Income | 555 Married Couples |
| Walters et al., 1996 | Little Control over Budget  
Autonomy  
Lack of Setting Goals  
Rewards | 2288 Male and Female Nurses |
The construct, Lack of Pay (Bird & Ross; 1993), refers to the lack of money or raises a household worker receives or does not receive. This theme was also identified within the current study. Many women recognized that more money would make their lives more enjoyable either by allowing them to hire a housekeeper or to be able to stay at home with their families.

Autonomy was also identified in the current study where women reported frustration with their inability to perform activities when they wanted to, especially when it came time to perform activities such as cooking, scheduling, and going grocery shopping. Bird and Ross (1993) defined autonomy as a lack of supervision as opposed to a lack of time, which was the real issue in the present study. The women in the present study also found that there was no end result to their household work (e.g., as the cleaning was never finished), which is related to Bird and Ross’s (1993) construct of routine work as characterized by the number of different activities an individual performs in the household.

The Bird and Ross (1993) study also examined the variable of being thanked which was identified in the current study and labeled Reward (with sub-themes of physical and verbal; see Table 5 for comparisons of studies). Women stated that just a thank you would go a long way as it provided them with a good feeling. The women suggested that they would not mind performing the work they did if they knew it was recognized. The current study was also linked to the concepts of Reward and Work Fulfillment (Bird & Ross, 1993) as the women expressed that they would not mind household work as much if it were only appreciated more by their family. However, what must be taken into consideration is that the study by Bird and Ross (1993) involved 2031 employed men, women, and homemakers. The current study examined triple role women, no men, and no housewives.
Golding (1990) studied a sample of 668 Mexican-American and 394 Non-Hispanic married or co-habituating couples. Participants were asked about their employment statuses which included working, unemployed, keeping house, etc, however, only the variables of working and keeping house were analyzed. The themes of Equality in Work, No End Results, and Time Constraints identified in the current study are similar to the measures used by Golding (1990). Equality in Work in the current study referred to the amount of help children and spouses provided the triple role women in performing household work. The equality in work also referred to not only equality of hours, but the effort placed into household work that is dependent upon one’s job and whoever is staying at home. This theme is similar to the construct of Responsibility Over Tasks (Golding, 1990). However, the current study did not take into consideration the number of activities or hours of household work the women performed. Golding (1990)’s measure of Having too much Housework appears to be similar to the No End Results theme of the current study. The current study also found that women did not have enough time for themselves due to their family and household obligations, which could be deemed as Interfering with Other Activities (Golding, 1990). The differences in the definition of the constructs/themes could be due to the sample characteristics (e.g., sample size, ethnicity, culture, etc.) or perhaps due to the methodology used (e.g., focus group where participants were asked open ended questions versus survey methods using forced choice items developed to assess pre-constructed factors).

Kibria et al. (1990) measured the rewards and distresses of 403 employed women ranging in age from 25 to 55 years of age (see Table 3). The sample used by Kibria et al. (1990) was very similar in age to the sample used in the current study. The current study also identified the
rewards and distresses of household work through the themes \textit{Value}, \textit{Reward} (with sub-themes \textit{Physical and Verbal}), \textit{Psychological Strain} (with sub-themes \textit{Stress, Guilt, and Self-Blame}), and \textit{Time Constraints}.

Lennon (1994) examined the effects of paid work on the psychological well-being of 300 employed women and 202 Homemakers. The sample did include 302 employed men, however, this information was not relevant and was not included in the analysis. Unlike the current study, Lennon (1994) measured constructs of Autonomy and Time Pressure separately. The present study identified a lack of autonomy for triple role women due to time constraints, however, autonomy was not declared a theme. For example, for the women in this study, grocery shopping was restricted to certain days of the week, had to be accomplished between particular times of the day, and could only be for specific time lengths. The triple role women felt they could not leisurely shop for groceries, but would enjoy grocery shopping more, if they had the time. Routine was also measured by Lennon (1994), but the current study did not recognize routine as a specific theme, rather, it was embedded within \textit{No End Results} as household work was considered continuous.

Nine hundred and ninety-two African American and Non-Hispanic Women participated in a study by Lombardi and Ulbrich (1997). Lombardi and Ulbrich identified Decision Latitude as an important construct. In their study, Decision Latitude was described as women having little control over the performance of household work and the lack of variation inherent in this work. Having control over household work activities was present in the current study, but was categorized under \textit{Time Constraints}. The triple role women felt they did not have control over how much time or when household work activities could be performed. The construct
Psychological Demands was defined by Lombardi and Ulbrich (1997) as time to complete certain tasks and conflicts. The lack of time for activities and time constraints in general were included in the present study under *Psychological Strain*. However, *Psychological Strain* also involved personal issues such as *guilt* (over leaving their children to go to work), *self-blame*, and *stress* from hectic schedules.

Schooler et al. (1984) explored the psychological effects of paid work and household work amongst 555 married couples. Routinization was measured and was described as the number of different or same tasks that were repeated. Routine was considered in the current study, but was classified under *No End Result* rather than as a distinct theme. The triple role women were irritated that their houses never remained clean, creating a constant pattern, with no outcome. Schooler et al. also declared Pressure as a construct and described Pressure as time pressure, dirtiness, and being responsible for things you cannot control. In the present study, *Time Constraint* stood alone as a theme.

Lastly, Walters et al. (1996) measured paid and unpaid work of 2288 male and female nurses. Out of the eight variables measured, Time Pressure, Autonomy, and Rewards were found to have similarities to the themes identified in the current study. The present study considered *Time Pressure* to be a distinct theme, however, Walters et al. (1996) placed time pressure under overall demands. Autonomy was also identified in the current study, but, as previously mentioned, autonomy was placed under the theme *Time Constraints*. Triple role women’s lack of time to perform household activities, within certain time frames decreases their autonomy as they are ruled by time. Rewards was a common construct between Walters et al.
(1996) and this study. However, dislikes were identified in the current study, but due to a lack of consistent evidence (as every triple role woman disliked a different activity) specific dislikes were not considered to be separate themes.

At least two major themes from each of the studies mentioned in Table 5 were found to have similarities to the themes created in the existing study. Differences in the themes/constructs may be due to the samples used, including sample size, ethnicity, gender, and comparisons between paid and unpaid work. In comparison to the other studies, the current study contained 20 triple role women, while the other studies included men and women, different ethnicities, and hundreds, if not thousands of participants.

Barnett and Hyde (2001) established that it is the quality of roles, not the quantity that has an effect on well-being. The present study also is a strong predictor that quality is a better predictor of well-being than quantity. The triple role women expressed that if they had time, money, value, or some form of reward they would not mind performing household work. It is clear, women perform many roles; they are an employee, wife, and mother, all of which cause psychological distress. Household work has also been found to deteriorate physical health as the more one performs household work the more their health deteriorates (Bird & Fremont, 1991). The psychological distress and strain triple role women experience is not necessarily due to their many roles because if these women received more help from their partners or children they believed that their distress would decrease. Several women expressed the view that household work would be easier or more enjoyable if they received a physical or verbal reward or were valued for their work. Receiving a reward for performing household work may not only make women feel good, but it may protect them physically. Siegrist (1996) found that individuals who
receive little gain from their work may put them at risk for cardiovascular disease. Providing triple role women a reward may not only make them feel good, but it may even prevent health problems.

*Psychological Strain* is a very large theme, as several themes interconnect or directly influence the *Psychological Strain* women are experiencing. Barnett and Shen (1997) found that female tasks that have lower control as to when they can be performed are linked to higher psychological distress. The typically perceived female tasks such as cooking and buying groceries were seen to have more psychological distress for both men and women that performed them because they had little control over when they were accomplished, unlike typically perceived male tasks such as car or house maintenance in which you can choose when to do those activities. In the present study, this may be an indication as to why the women had psychological strain because of their low control jobs in the household. Psychological Strain can be avoidable if women received more help from their spouses or children, had more money and time, and/or received a physical or verbal reward. The current study also established that the division of household labour viewed by these triple role women was that the division of household labour may not be equally divided, but it is dependent on who stays at home, their job, etc.. However, Blair and Johnson (1992) found that if men were thankful for what their wives did around the house, the women were more likely to believe the division of household work to be fair. The triple role women in the present study also concluded that if they received a reward or gratitude they would not mind performing the household tasks.
Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. First, the researcher has an inherent bias as the age of the researcher is near the same age category of the participants. Bias may also have occurred because the researcher had access to and was knowledgeable about background information regarding the qualities of household work and possible similarities between paid and unpaid work. The researcher may have asked leading questions or probed only for certain aspects of information throughout the focus groups. The second limitation to the study is the selection of focus groups as a data collection methodology. The participants in the focus groups may have felt shy or embarrassed about their opinions, and therefore, did not communicate their true feelings. Focus group participants may also have been uncomfortable sharing their true feelings in front of others despite promises of confidentiality. Furthermore, focus group participants may have answered questions in a manner they deemed socially desirable. A third limitation was the sampling method used in the study. Due to difficulty recruiting participants, snowball sampling was used. The effect of the snowball sample meant that some women who participated had relationships with the researcher (friends or friends of friends) and others in the groups. These relationships may have created an atmosphere where the women were not able to be as honest as they wanted to be. The focus groups conducted in this study ranged in length from 45 minutes to 60 minutes which is a potential limitation. If the focus groups had been longer in length, it is possible that more information may have been provided. The small number of participants in some of the focus groups is also a limitation. The lack of demographic information collected could also be considered a limiting factor as there is no information on income or age, making comparisons to other studies more difficult and decreases the generalizability of the results.
However, as focus group research and thematic analysis fall within the basic qualitative frame, generalization at this stage of instrument development is not of great concern. Lastly, the recruitment of triple role women was very difficult as they are busy and have little time in their schedules. Due to the difficulty in recruitment, some women who had an association with the researcher participated in the current study and the information from one participant who did not fit the study criteria exactly was included in the final analysis.

*Future Research Directions*

The current study focused on triple role women ranging in age from 25 to 55. Although one focus group was conducted in a rural setting, additional focus groups should be conducted with this population in order to achieve saturation of themes from the rural perspective. Research should continue to investigate and compare the experiences of women within the 25 to 55 age range to women who are older and no longer have dependent children at home. Information from older women could shed light on the experiences of older women and what they would have changed, knowing what they know now. Another future direction of research could be the exploration of the qualities of household work in other women’s lives. For example, the women examined in this study were all middle to upper class and the majority appeared to be Euro-Canadian. It is important to examine the household work perceptions of women from all social classes and ethnicities. Another important population to examine would be the lives of single mothers. The current study focused on women who are partnered, employed, and who have a child, but it would also be interesting to investigate single women who are employed (or perhaps are full-time students) and have a child. An interesting future direction may also be to explore men’s opinions in household work. It would be very fascinating to understand what men have to
say about household work, do they feel the division of household work is fair, what types of activities do they perform around the house, and what would make them perform more household work. The current study only focused on heterosexual couples, another interesting future study would be to look at homosexual, same-sex couples.

Conclusion

The current study provided insights into what triple role women (employed, partnered, mothers) think and feel about household work. The eight themes presented in the current study are all intertwined to create a story. I believe the themes tell a story: women in triple roles lead very busy lives, with little time to themselves. They are considerate of their families, making sure they get to where they are supposed to, are fed, and are happy, but this leads to psychological strain and exhaustion on the part of the women. However, if women were provided with some help from their partner or children, had more money, or received gratitude for their work, this may lead to a better quality of work and thus a better quality of life.
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Appendix A

Focus Group Questions

- What does family work involve? What types of activities are you involved in that you would consider family work?
  - Do you perform family work beyond your immediate family (for extended family, friends, etc.)?
  - Do you get any paid assistance with your family work?

- How is family work divided up within your household? Who does the most work in your household? Do you get any paid assistance with your family work? Do you feel that the way family work is shared in your home is fair and why?

- People are often asked whether they like their job. Similarly, we would like to know whether you like or dislike the work you do at home.
  - Are there particular aspects of family work that you enjoy/find rewarding and why?
  - Are there particular aspects of family work that you dislike and why? What factors would make your family work easier/more enjoyable?

Questions were created by Dr. Bonnie Janzen and Dr. Laurie Hellsten (2007).
Appendix B

Title: Development and Validation of a Measure of Family Demands and Resources

Research Context: Recently, there has been a significant increase in women in the labour force however, their time spent on household work has only decreased slightly. Household work can include things such as cleaning and cooking, but also includes child care and emotional labour. Women today contend with demands from their full-time paid positions and their family life, creating a 24 hour work day. However, little is known about the potential health consequences of family work for women. One reason for this lack of knowledge is that there are currently no valid and reliable questionnaires available to measure the quality of family work. The purpose of this study is to develop a valid and reliable multidimensional measure of family work demands and resources for women. Women will be asked various questions in focus groups that will relate to their understanding and opinions of household work; participants’ view will be tape recorded.

Dissemination of Results: Data from this study will be used for the purposes of conference presentations, department research seminars, and peer-reviewed journal articles

Contact Information: Any questions regarding your rights as a participant may be addressed to the University of Saskatchewan Ethics Office (306) 966-2084. You may obtain a copy of the results of the study by contacting Dr. Bonnie Janzen at (306) 966-7841. Thank-you for participating in this study.
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