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ABSTRACT

Women who work from home full or part time, as entrepreneurs or employees, may experience social isolation. In order to alleviate this isolation and continue to reap the many benefits of working from home, homeworkers may need to develop substitutes for the social network of the traditional office. Through surveys and interviews, this study examines the behavior and attitudes of the members of a professional women's association. Then, it compares the social activities of traditional office workers and homeworkers to determine the extent of their social isolation and what steps, if any, homeworkers take to expand their social network.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Home is where the heart is. However, for professional women who work at home, combining home space and workplace creates new emotions, both positive and negative. Working alone from home can be lonely, liberating, enjoyable, frustrating and rewarding . . . the list is seemingly endless. Regardless of the quality of the experience, for some women, particularly those who have children at home, working from home may seem like the only option when a job is needed and/or desired.

Professional women benefit from teleworking or running home-based businesses in several important ways. Some women want to pursue full-time careers or earn part-time paychecks as they actively raise their children. Others find home the best place to build their businesses. Most look to home-based work as a way to gain more control over their work lives. However, working at home is not nirvana. Women must navigate a number of pitfalls, not the least of which is the potential for social isolation. This study works to expand our understanding of the work-at-home experience and prepares women, who are increasingly likely to work full or part time from home, to better manage the potential challenges of this work style.

The work-at-home trend is mushrooming across America. The evidence is in the numbers. First, the number of men and women who work from home has increased from 2.2 million in 1991 to 7 million in 1996 (FIND/SVP, 1997). According to The Wall Street Journal (Shellenbarger, 1998), one in eight households have at least one full-time home worker, either an employee or a business owner. Secondly, the media have also embraced the topic. Journalists,
scholars and consultants have written hundreds of articles on the topic. In January of 1998, the Business Periodicals Index listed 320 articles on telecommuting.

Several factors are driving this media explosion. First, exploring telecommuting and home-based businesses has intrinsic human interest because it provides a window into the work and personal lives of others. Further, the popular press sells publications by portraying working from home as a panacea to several of this decade’s challenges, including balancing work and family, reducing stress, and gaining control over one’s work life. Finally, businesses that benefit from the telecommuting/work-at-home trend, such as purveyors of telecommunications products and services, prompt the press coverage to create a market for their computers, fax machines, telephone service, and home office furniture.

Much of the literature appeals to corporate managers. Business journalists and consultants-turned-authors extol the virtues of telecommuting from a business perspective. Advantages to companies include a reduced need for expensive commercial office space and increases in employee productivity. Other benefits of teleworking programs (for which evidence is largely anecdotal) are that they improve employee recruitment and retention.

Popular and business magazines aim other articles directly at work-at-home candidates, including entrepreneur wannabes and stressed-out corporate employees with parenting responsibilities. Potential home workers read that starting home-based businesses or persuading their employers to let them work at home can increase their wealth and/or control over their lives. However, despite the fact that a large portion of one’s social network consists of current and former work associates (Marks, 1994), the consequences of working at home on an individual’s social network have not been fully explored. In fact, a handful of scholars and a few business writers see women’s participation in the work-at-home trend as a way to continue to
isolate women and perpetuate their second-rate ranking (Boris, 1988; Christensen, 1988; Kraut, 1988). The implication is that encouraging women to run part-time businesses at home or telecommute restricts women's success in the work world. Women, by working from home and emphasizing their child-rearing and housekeeping responsibilities, are run off the corporate fast track, leaving men to do the responsible, highly compensated work.

Women who work at home full or part time do live a different daily routine than those who work in a traditional office setting (Chevron & Primeau, 1996). Some studies report that significant percentages of homeworkers feel isolated (Huws, Podro, Gunnarsson, Weijers, Arvanitaki & Trova, 1996) while other research contradicts these results (AT&T National Survey of Teleworker Attitudes and Work Styles, 1997). Some authors suggest that the perception of isolation correlates with the frequency of homework (Kugelmass, 1995, pp. 74-75). This would mean that women who telecommute 1 or 2 days per week do not wrestle with isolation in the way 5 day-a-week home workers do.

Research Question

Do women who telecommute or run home-based businesses experience and recognize feelings of social isolation? If they do, do they actively reach out to expand their social network? This study explores these questions by examining and comparing social behavior and attitudes of 600 women. Some of them work at home and others work in conventional office settings; all belong to the New Jersey Business and Professional Women's Federation (BPW).
Subsidiary Questions

To determine if women who work at home actively seek out opportunities for social interaction, the study will explore the following questions:

Do BPW women who work at home belong to more formal clubs and organizations than BPW women who work in conventional office settings?

Does the Internet play a role in expanding social interaction?

How does the type and frequency of the work-at-home arrangement, the presence of children living at home, martial status and entrepreneurship affect the size of the social network?

If some women do feel isolated, do they believe that the other benefits of working from home outweigh the unpleasantness of isolation?

How does working at home affect their perception of their chances for business advancement or business success?

Need for the Study

The number of women adopting home-based work is increasing (FIND/SVP, 1997). New technology and the growth of women participating as professionals in the work force are both driving forces. Yet, there remains a gap in knowledge about how telecommuting and working at home affects women's social networks.

Business and scholarly publications give only passing nods to the phenomenon of social isolation. Most authors, based on anecdotes and an understandable logical progression, assume that telecommuters and people who work at home are socially isolated. Their common-sense conclusions are either: (a) people who work at home have less need for social contact than
people who work in the collegial atmosphere of an office; or (b) people who work at home experience loneliness.

Two previous studies have attempted to answer the question of social isolation by focusing on the personality characteristics of people who work at home (Ross, 1990; Sharp, 1988). These researchers hypothesized that telecommuters were well suited for working at home. Both Sharp (1988) and Ross (1990) expected telecommuters to score low on tests that assess the need for affiliation. Unexpectedly, both researchers found that telecommuters and home workers have the same need for affiliation as non-telecommuters. So the mystery remains: How do home workers, who reportedly interact with only 5 other people per day versus 11 for traditional workers (Chevron & Primeau, 1996), fulfill their human need for social interaction?

As a consultant who has developed and evaluated corporate telecommuting programs, the author believes that the result of this inquiry can enable sounder decisions about home-based work. In addition, current home workers can learn about how other women cope with the potential isolation of working at home.

Equally important, corporate managers who create and promote telecommuting programs might be able to use data from this study to help them to select telecommuting candidates and prepare them for success.

Objectives

This investigation will add to the body of knowledge about how women handle the potential for isolation that springs from working at home. One of the objectives of the study is to synthesize previous researchers' data on homework and social isolation. The second goal is to determine how BPW homeworkers handle the need for interaction as compared to those
members who work in conventional offices. Do their social needs go unmet, or do women who work at home reach out formally to expand their communication and social networks?

Definition of Terms

**Combination worker**: A person who splits their time between her home and employer's office.

**Employer only worker**: A person who works from her employer's office.

**Home-based business**: A business that is operated from the home of the owner.

**Home-based work**: Paid work done at home.

**Home only worker**: A person who works from her home office.

**Homework**: Income-generating activities performed at home by a person who is either self-employed or an employee of an organization.

**Isolation/Social isolation**: A lack of interaction with others leading to negative effects or feeling on the part of the homeworkers.

**Supplemental work**: Work done at home during an employee's off-hours for which the worker is not compensated. This is not considered homework for the purposes of this study.

**Telecommuter/teleworker**: An employee of an organization who substitutes working at home for working at the organization's offices one or more days per week.

**Virtual office worker**: An employee of an organization who performs most paid work in the field. Examples are outside salespeople and installation or repair people who do not report to the office.

**Working at home**: Engaging in income-generating activities at home.
Limitations

The scope of this study is limited by the author's selection of the BPW as the survey population. These women are not representative of all working women. BPW members are, by definition, professional rather than blue-collar workers. They reside in New Jersey. In addition, BPW members may have other attitudes, qualities or needs that differ from those of other American women. These differences may have driven their decisions to join the BPW. Therefore, the author will be unable to generalize the results to the entire female population.

There has been an explosion of media and academic attention to working at home. Consequently, time limitations prevent the author from obtaining and reading every source. The author considered limiting the review of the literature to a narrow period, but dismissed the idea as counterproductive. Researchers conducted some important studies and analyses in the early 1980s that should be included. It is possible that the author's search for relevant materials missed important sources that would affect the conclusions contained in the review of the literature or the design of the survey instrument. It is even more likely that during the gap from inception of this research to its publishing other researchers conducted useful studies, the results of which would have benefited this investigation.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

History of Homework and Women

Working at home is hardly a new phenomenon. Before the Industrial Revolution, people worked where they lived, on family farms or in blacksmith shops (Gray, Hodson & Gordon, 1993, pp. 17-19). The 19th century was the first time that large numbers of people left their homes to work at central locations.

Even the early days of the Industrial Revolution were driven by homework. Under the notorious piecework system, developed in England and exported to America by 1850, entire families made textile products or engaged in light assembly work. These workers, including children, worked long hours, and often could not make a living wage. Gray et al. (1993) described the practice in the U.K. and U.S. as follows:

The mills relied upon impoverished and insecure pools of 'outworkers' whose home and handlooms become a flexible production facility to be switched on or off as market forces dictated. ...The outworkers bought or rented their own machines, equivalent to teleworkers' investment in a personal computer and printer, and would learn new trades as the market dictated. ... When the work ran out, they starved. (p. 18)

Homeworkers made less and worked more hours than their factory counterparts who did similar work. Isolated in their own dwellings and competing against each other for work, homeworkers were difficult for the new labor unions to organize.
In the U.S., the practice of industrial homework by women continued well beyond the reform movements of the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Boris (1988) describes the plight of American women who juggled piecework for low pay along with childcare and other household responsibilities in the tenements of New York and Boston. Garment manufacturers employed single, widowed and married women for home sewing into the mid-twentieth century. Other industries used immigrants and black women for light assembly work at home through the 1930s. Gradually, led by New York’s legislature, states slowly outlawed these practices. National legislation -- most particularly the Fair Labor Standards Act -- and the need for women to participate fully in the labor force during the Second World War sounded the death knell for most industrial homework.

In the 1920s, clerical work emerged as another bastion of female homework. Women were hired to address envelopes from their homes (Boris, 1988). After many debates and several legislative flip-flops, officials exempted clerical work from the homework regulations of the 1930s and 1940s, deciding that clerical workers, unlike industrial workers, were independent contractors. Lawmakers supported this ruling, although clerical workers' relationships to production differed little from the relationships of industrial homeworkers (Boris, 1988, p. 24).

Homework's past, marked by low wages, child labor, long hours and hazardous working conditions, accounts for the reluctance of many unions to embrace teleworking (Gray et al., 1993; Kraut, 1987). Women's advocates are also concerned. Boris (1988) states:

The merger of home and workplace provides an alternative to the dominant organization of labor but does not challenge the place of the home in the economy, nor of women within the home. Neither will it provide a living wage for women and their children.
Instead, it encourages the view that women are only secondary earners who need not have jobs that pay better, and who only want to work a few hours a day (p. 26).

Kraut (1988) examined census and other data and determined that homeworkers who work primarily from home do indeed earn less than their counterparts who work in a conventional office. "In nine of seventeen occupations, homeworkers earned significantly less than on-site workers, and in none did they earn more "(p. 42). Moreover, some research suggests that women homeworkers are in low-paying processing jobs while men homeworkers have higher-paying, more prestigious jobs (Huws et al., 1996).

On the other hand, working from home does enable women (and men) to better balance the work and personal lives. Many employees are glad to trade some earning potential for the ability to parent more effectively (Huws, DeKorte & Robinson, 1990; Kraut, 1989). Using data from the 1980 U.S. Census, Kraut (1987) constructed a profile of the typical homeworker: Female; married, with a young child in a two-parent household; self-employed; and working part-time hours. This profile, which is consistent with Christensen's survey of 14,000 homeworkers during the 1980s, suggests that the typical homeworker is juggling child-care responsibilities and paid work.

The Rise of Teleworking

For economic and political reasons, the work and home environments are now separate worlds for the majority of American workers. However, this is slowly changing. For the first time in decades, the U.S. census showed a rise in the number of non-farm homeworkers, from 2.2 million in 1980 to 3.4 million in 1990 (Edwards & Field-Hendrey, 1996). The potential for this shift accelerates as the U.S. economy becomes increasingly service-based. Today, the
service sector employs 78 percent of all workers (Edwards & Field-Hendrey) and an even greater percentage of women. In New Jersey, Department of Labor statistics reveal that 82 percent of employees work in service businesses or for the government.

Other factors also support the rise of teleworking. With new communications technology, Jack Nilles, a transportation researcher, realized that technology could substitute for the commute to the office. This potentially solves several pressing environmental and social problems. In 1976, Nilles envisioned working from home as a way to manage the negative environmental effects of commuting, including excessive energy consumption and traffic congestion. The futurist Alvin Toffler, in his 1981 book, *The Third Wave*, saw every home as an electronic cottage. Teleworking, then, would allow individuals to refocus on their communities and create a better society (DiMartino & Wirth, 1990).

Although acknowledged as the grandfather of telecommuting, Jack Nilles did not invent white-collar homework. In past decades and even today, corporate employees take work home to finish on nights and weekends. This is termed "supplemental work"; some researchers count these millions among the ranks of teleworkers. Moreover, some workers, such as writers, artists and some accountants, traditionally have worked at home. (Working at home does not require newer technology such as a personal computer and a modem. A legal pad and pencil, and perhaps a telephone, sufficed for many homeworkers in 1950s and 1960s.)

Companies first developed pilot teleworking programs that included computer technology in the late 1970s and early 1980s. These pioneers wanted either to measure the benefits for themselves or to participate in the latest trend. Early adopters were companies that were looking to improve productivity, reduce office space requirements and real estate costs, and attract and retain employees (Nilles, 1994). Results were mixed. New York Telephone's pilot of
24 managers was deemed a huge success, showing productivity increases of 43 percent (DiMartino & Wirth, 1990). On the other end of the spectrum, supervisors who participated in a 1988 State of California pilot reported smaller improvements, ranging from three to five percent (DiMartino & Wirth, 1990).

To this day, firms find it difficult to reduce office space through teleworking programs. The average teleworker works from home an average of 1.6 days per week (Westfall, 1997, citing a 1992 survey by the United States Department of Transportation). With more than half of their time still spent at the employers' facilities, employees resist giving up or sharing their offices. Salespeople are a notable exception. Communication companies like AT&T and pharmaceutical firms gain both real estate savings and productivity increases by forcing sales representatives out of the office and into the field, where they are closer to the customers. This 5 day-per-week, mostly on-the-road existence is sometimes called "virtual office."

Teleworking exploded in the late 1980s and early 1990s, especially in southern California, in response to the federal government's air pollution control mandates (Gray et al., 1993). The trend continued to grow, in part driven by large communications companies, who saw in teleworking a business benefit: growth in the sales of communications services and equipment.

In the late 1990s, employees' stated desires for better work-life balance are coinciding with the lowest unemployment rate since the 1960s. Competition for labor and new technology is driving employers towards wider implementation of flexible work arrangements, such as telecommuting and compressed work schedules.
Individuals Seek to Work at Home

In her work as a consultant, the author has conducted surveys of thousands of New Jersey and New York employees. What is clear is that employees think they want to telework. More than half of the employees (and sometimes as many as 80 percent) state that they are very or somewhat interested in working at home. These employees' affirmative responses are based on what they have heard or seen in the media, not real-life experience or a full understanding of the day-to-day challenges of homeworkers, including self-management, isolation and career advancement. In these surveys, the stated preference for teleworking frequency is 2 days per week.

However, employers who do offer teleworking and other flexible work schedule programs are employers of choice. The many publications that create lists of "the 100 best employers" include offering flexible work arrangements among the criteria.

Entrepreneurship is a realistic alternative to a corporate career, especially today, with flat organizations and downsizing eating away at both promotion opportunities and job security. Under these conditions, the plunge into small business ownership offers many rewards and fewer drawbacks than in the past. Many successful small businesses first hatch as home-based enterprises. Women lead the charge: Since 1975, they have initiated new businesses at twice the rate of men (Minehan, 1998).

Studies that chart the effect of working at home on individuals vary based on a number of factors, not the least of which is the writer's point of view. Some scholarly authors and members of the press view the work-at-home trend as a way to empower women who want to have it all -- career, family and a personal life -- the chance to get it. Others, keeping in mind the Industrial Revolution and the history of oppression of women, believe that teleworking may be just another
way to keep women out of the drivers' seats in American business (Christensen, 1988; Huws et al., 1996).

Political beliefs aside, individuals are impacted by working at home. Primary benefits, experienced by both teleworkers and home-based business owners, include flexibility and autonomy. Working at home permits workers to schedule work and personal responsibilities in the way that makes the most sense for them. Homeworkers also can complete work assignments their own way, at their own pace, with minimal interference from coworkers or supervisors.

In addition to the social isolation that is the focus of this paper, corporate teleworkers may face a special set of challenges. Coworkers may believe that teleworkers slack off work when at home, or that teleworkers are allowed to work from home because they are the managers' favorites. Teleworkers can end up feeling uncomfortable around coworkers. Moreover, both managers and coworkers may leave teleworkers out of the loop on important communication that affects work. In addition, more than one corporate teleworker tells tales of being passed over for recognition and advancement at work because the manager forgets about her in a personification of the "out-of-sight, out-of-mind" syndrome. Savvy teleworkers can lessen or avoid these negative consequences by carefully managing communication with colleagues and managers (Nilles, 1994).

Future Trends

Most researchers agree that the telework and work-at-home trends will continue to grow into the next century. Judy and D'Amico (1997) state, "As telecommunications advances become even more integrated into the American economy, we believe that telecommuting will become increasingly attractive to employers and employees ... It will provide more flexible work
arrangements [to] white collar professionals, whose numbers ... are slated to grow rapidly" (p. 120).

The U.S. Department of Transportation predicts that the number of homeworkers will increase to 15 million by 2002 (Judy & D'Amico). Shellenbarger's (1998) synthesis of several forecasts indicates that by 2002, one in five households will have a full-time homeworker. She attributes this acceleration to three factors: (a) a tight labor market; (b) improvements in computer and communications technology; and (c) the desire of workers for better balance in their lives. More optimistic prognosticators envision even greater increases: FIND/SVP's latest forecast calls for 25 million telecommuters by 2002.

Kraut (1987) sounded an early note of caution: "... we should not expect a widespread adoption of telework simply because the technology allows it to happen. A more resistant barrier to the spread of telework is its incompatibility with the current work ethos" (p. 130). He describes the relative stability of office structure over time, citing the needs of the workers met by this arrangement. Conventional offices provide individuals with social interaction, social support, and help in effectively structuring their time. To shore up his argument, Kraut cites a 1961 publication by Goffman, who stated that as part of our culture's basic social arrangement, individuals work, sleep and play in different places and different times with different casts of participants. Telework blurs these organizational lines. In addition, mingling co-workers in the same workspace aids the business of employers: It provides for training and socializing of new employees into the work force and provides the informal communication network through which so much important information flows.

Kraut (1987) believes that these social issues would at least slow the adoption of telework. The trends in the decade since he wrote support his beliefs. Other researchers and
consultants recognize human resistance to change. Nilles (1994) exhorts managers to move past the need to see their subordinates in order to manage them; these management attitudes derail wider adoption of teleworking. Mokhtarian and Salomon (1994), proponents of teleworking because it reduces the number of commuters driving alone to work, acknowledge that the lack of social interaction reduces workers' demand for telework arrangements. That is not to say that Toffler's utopian telecommunities, in which many individuals work from home, will not become a reality in selected places in the future. It appears that working at home is here to stay and companies and individuals will continue to wrestle with the trade-offs intrinsic to this work style option.

Human Social Needs and the Work Environment

Historically, Americans have celebrated self-sufficiency and derided dependency (Schwartz & Olds, 1997). The quest for autonomy and freedom are woven into the pursuit of the American dream. This credo, combined with changes in traditional family structure and residential location patterns, severs individuals' identification as part of one or more communities. One result of the crusade for privacy — evidenced by private transportation, single-family homes and home offices — is that many more people spend more time alone. The percentage of American adults who are not married increased from 28 percent in 1970 to 40 percent in 1990. Moreover, 20 percent of the population relocates each year. In addition, Bowling's 1993 study of American social life (as cited in Schwartz & Olds, 1997) found that the Americans socialize much less with their neighbors than in the past.

However, despite these social trends, people still need people. Psychologists have documented that relating to other humans is an important component of psychological health.
(It's no accident that solitary confinement is the most severe punishment given to unruly prisoners.)

According to Schwartz and Olds (1997), social isolation produces loneliness. Loneliness can be debilitating, producing "not just unhappiness but poor health" (Schwartz & Olds, p. 95). Numerous medical studies document that people who live alone or whose social ties are disrupted experience a decline in immune function, leading to illness. For example, a lack of social connections negatively affected the recoveries of cancer and heart attack patients (Schwartz & Olds, 1997).

Clearly, people need stable social networks, and suffer without these connections. Today, the social networks of individuals largely stem from their work. Marks (1994) cites the 1986 General Social Survey as proof: Fifty percent of "respondents report having at least one close friend who is a co-worker, and 29 percent report at least two" (p. 847). Marks attempts to determine what proportion of intimate relationships, outside of family relationships, adults conduct with their co-workers. Marks states, "Millions . . . supplement some meaningful intimacy they do find at home with some important intimacy with one or more co-workers" (p. 852). He concludes that relationships with co-workers are central pillars of adult workers' social support networks. These relationships develop as a result of shared frames of reference, goals and interests, the ingredients that go into successful relationships (Schwarz & Olds, 1997).

Women who telecommute or run home-based businesses may not have the same opportunities as office workers to develop and nurture social connections. A telecommuter has an average of 5 face-to-face interactions per day, as compared with the 14 encounters of a conventional office worker (Chevron & Primeau, 1996).
That is why it is no surprise that teleworking can produce social isolation. In Huws' 1983 survey of U.K teleworkers, 60 percent cited isolation as the chief disadvantage (DiMartino & Wirth, 1990). Sharp (1988) reported that over one-third of teleworkers felt isolated and that 20 percent reported isolation as the primary drawback. DiMartino and Worth (1990) believe that "the lack of day-to-day interaction may gradually isolate teleworkers from a professional as well as a social point of view and affect their career development "(p. 541). This connection between working at home and feelings of isolation has been replicated in numerous studies (Collins, Conner, Martin, Norman & Rance 1995). Even an AT&T-sponsored study (1997) indicated that 20 percent felt more isolated working from home than from a conventional office.

A number of studies (Ramsower, 1993; Ross 1990; Sharp, 1988) have hypothesized that successful home workers have lower needs for social interaction, or affiliation, than the general working population. This theory both would explain the work-at-home choice and remove the need to address the loneliness issue. However, neither Sharp's (1988) nor Ross' (1990) experiments proved their theories. They found that homeworkers had equal or greater needs for affiliation than the control populations.

Type of Homework and Women's Satisfaction, Perceived Success and Isolation

Contemporary homework researchers contrast types of female homeworkers. Some classifications are: (a) responsible, autonomous jobs (traditionally professional, exempt positions) versus routine, processing positions (usually non-exempt); (b) corporate teleworkers versus home-based business owner-operators; and (c) part-time versus full-time workers.
Professional vs. Clerical Homeworkers.

Huws et al. (1996) studied European translators, both male and female, who worked full time from home as independent contractors. These translators are professional workers. Approximately one-third of the women had children under 18 at home, and 13 percent had an adult in their household who was financially dependent on them. (Over half of the men were supporting an adult.) Eighty-one percent of the women reported that another adult in the household worked outside of the home. Many had selected translation from home as a permanent career choice, although in interviews, some made it clear that they would prefer to work in a collegial setting, and plan to do so once their children are older. The stressful structure of the work arrangement -- similar to the industrial piecework of an earlier era, with bursts of activity followed by quieter, economically tougher interludes -- was preferred by a scant majority of the respondents. However, most believed that that their job satisfaction, amount of leisure and quality of life would decline if they worked outside the home, although they felt their career prospects and earnings would improve. As expected, the translators were enthusiastic about the opportunity for more control over their work and time and the elimination of the daily commute. Isolation, cited by half of the women, and time pressure from conflicting priorities, cited by one-third, were the major drawbacks.

Gerson and Kraut's 1985 study of clerical workers presents a different portrait of the female homeworker (Gerson & Kraut, 1988; Kraut, 1989). A statistically valid study of 297 women, it compared typists who worked from home (28 percent of the sample) with their in-office counterparts. Seventy percent of the clerical homeworkers were independent contractors, affiliating with typist bureaus to get work assignments, whereas only one-third of the in-house clerical workers owned their own businesses. The homeworkers were more likely to be married
and to have children under the age of 6. Often, they were the secondary wage earners in the household. Unlike the translators (Huws et al., 1996), clerical homeworkers worked less than full-time hours per week (34 hours versus the 41 of the clerical office workers). Clerical homeworkers were paid slightly less than in-house workers, and had inferior benefits packages. Homeworkers cited flexibility and freedom from supervision as drivers of their decisions to work from home. With the exception of those with young children, most said that they had freely chosen to work at home. (Most of the homeworkers with young children, however, paid more for childcare than did the office workers.) The clerical homeworkers had more "traditional" values than their in-office peers did. The homeworkers were less likely to believe in equality between men and women as expressed in their opinions about (a) the division of household labor between men and women, and (b) equal employment opportunities.

Overall, the clerical homeworkers reported higher job satisfaction levels than the office workers. They also reported feeling higher levels of social support than the office workers did, although they received less help from co-workers and less assistance from family members with household chores and childcare. Rather than measuring psychological state, the scale used by Gerson and Kraut (1988) measured objective items such as: "... tangible assistance like money or transportation, [people who] could provide feedback about problems and concerns, and with whom they could participate in social events" (Kraut, 1989, p. 39). The survey revealed that many of these women were married and identified with stay-at-home wives and mothers through their value and social systems.

The differences in value systems and expectations between professional and clerical employees may explain the lack of social isolation found in Gerson and Kraut's research. The average clerical homeworker worked an average of 34 hours per week, as opposed to the 40-plus-
hours of a translator. With paid work a smaller component of their lives, the clerical homeworkers may not look to work to obtain the social benefits and psychological satisfaction that full-time, professional workers expect from their jobs.

Corporate Teleworkers vs. Business Owners.

Even Jack Nilles, a teleworking proponent who is acknowledged as the father of telecommuting, found out firsthand that operating a full-time business from home can result in feelings of isolation (Farmanfarmaian, 1989). A small-scale study comparing office workers to corporate teleworkers and freelancers who worked at home everyday revealed that those who worked at home felt more isolated and got less support. Teleworkers, who did go into the office at regular intervals, felt less isolated and less stressed than the other two groups (Trent, Smith & Wood, 1994).

Part-time versus Full-time Homeworkers.

Mokhtarian (1991) summarizes the beliefs of several researchers concerning part-time versus full-time working at home: "Many commonly cited drawbacks of telecommuting (e.g., worker isolation) apply most forcefully to the full-time work-at-home version, and little or not at all to other forms of telecommuting" (p. 273). In a number of studies, the biggest differences in isolation were not between exempt or non-exempt employees or between business owners and corporate employees. Instead, the defining factor was the frequency of homework. Five-day-a-week teleworkers reported isolation similar to home-based business owners (Huws et al., 1990). Ramsower's dissertation (1983) reported reductions in communication only for full-time teleworkers. And Kugelmass (1995) points out that social isolation is much more of a problem
for full-time corporate telecommuters than those who work from home one or two days per week.

Social Networks

Social networks consist of people who communicate with each other. Social networks, then, can be studied as communication between people. Who is sending and receiving messages from whom? What channels are they using? How frequently do they communicate, and for what reasons? The answers to these questions shed light on the central question of this research.

Some of these questions have common sense answers. Working people socialize with family, friends, coworkers and fellow members of churches, clubs and community organizations. Parents often socialize with the parents of their children's friends. Although fraternizing sounds like something workers should do during non-work hours, this is not the reality. Dyads (groups of two people) are frequently created in the course of accomplishing business objectives; this creates opportunities for the development of intimacy and lasting friendships. Half of all workers have at least one co-worker as a close friend (Marks, 1994). Moreover, the office provides many opportunities, such as lunch breaks and water cooler chats, for cheerful interaction. These social connections are key to many workers' enjoyment of their day.

A number of researchers, students, consultants and journalists have thoughts on how homeworkers can fill the gaps (if any) in their social networks. In 1980, the futurist Alvin Toffler envisioned that citizens who live and work at home would re-create the close-knit, community-based social networks of small-town America. Christensen (1988) has other thoughts. Two-thirds of mothers work outside the home, and homework will not become the dominant work style any time soon. The suburbs "are likely to be deserted from eight to five . . . A home-based worker in
a suburban neighborhood may find she is alone" (p. 162). She suggests that home-based business owners join trade and professional groups to stay abreast of developments and pricing trends in their industries.

"Telesocializing"-- using telecommunications and computer technology for social interaction -- is another way to build and maintain social contact. E-mail, newsgroups and the World Wide Web are examples of computer-mediated communication that provide links to the outside world (Marcus, 1995). Teleworkers and home-based business entrepreneurs can access a number of listserves, chatrooms and websites that cater to their interests as well as to their businesses. Homeworkers have a dedicated slice of cyberspace in iVillage, a website dedicated to working women that offers "the intimacy of community with the scale of media" (Napoli, 1998).

Teleworking consultants often minimize the existence of social isolation. Grey et al. (1993) state: "Isolation, in teleworking practice, is a real issue for a small number of people, but the majority of central office-based managers and home-based telecommuters do not find it a problem" (p. 29). Despite his own initial work-at-home experience cited earlier (Farmanfarmaian, 1989), Nilles believes that the solitude of teleworking would bother only people whose personalities or situations make them less motivated or disciplined: "People who are great socializers . . . should stick to the office" (1994, p. 31). He also cites bureaucrats, singles who are shopping for mates and substance abusers on his list of unsuitable teleworkers. The popular press, however, recognizes that working from home can produce loneliness in normal people, and provides helpful hints on how teleworkers can avoid isolation. Chartrand (1996), writing for The New York Times, offers the following advice:
A. Schedule outside meetings with customers or clients, even if the same work could be done over the phone or by fax.

B. Plan lunches with colleagues, clients or even friends who work downtown or in a business environment.

C. Break up the work day with several errands instead of combining everything into one excursion.

D. Get out of the home office even if you don’t need to, by making deliveries yourself instead of calling a messenger, doing research on site instead of over the phone, or buying supplies instead of having them delivered.

E. Attend seminars and conferences to stay current in your field and to interact with colleagues.

F. Join business support and networking groups.

G. Don’t deny yourself outside meetings, lunches or breaks for errands because you think you’ve already wasted too much work time that day or week. Contact with the outside world will actually increase your productivity in the long run, even if it takes you away from work for awhile (On-line).

Homeworkers who miss social contact may take some offbeat measures to counteract it.

An Internet survey reveals that homeworkers are more likely to own cats than non-telecommuters, and to own a larger number of them (2.7 cats versus 1.8 cats). Homeworkers leave the home office during the workday more often than conventional office workers leave theirs. Even so, homeworkers have far fewer face-to-face interactions per day than office workers and report being lonely during work hours more frequently (Chevron & Primeau, 1996).

In conclusion, although the literature is contradictory, it seems clear that at least some women homeworkers make tough choices that compromise their earnings, their social networks,
or both. Moreover, it is reasonable to conclude, based on the literature that some significant percentage of female homeworkers with feelings of isolation and loneliness arising from their home office environments. As the number of homeworkers continue to rise, more women will struggle to find the best ways to reap the many rewards of working at home while minimizing the disadvantages of isolation and loneliness.
Chapter III

METHODOLOGY

This study analyzes the relationship between homework and women's social networks. Data were collected via a survey (see Appendix A) that was mailed to the 574 members of the New Jersey Business and Professional Women's Federation (BPW). The author also conducted supplemental interviews with five survey participants.

New Jersey's BPW is part of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs. It is the oldest organization in the United States dedicated to the interests of working women. Established in 1919, the organization promotes women's full participation in the workforce, including pay equity and economic self-sufficiency.

The author selected the BPW as the sample because its membership includes professional female homeworkers. Most BPW members are working women who are employed either full or part time. Like other American women who work out of choice or by necessity, they face the challenge of balancing their careers and personal lives. Their occupations work styles and family situations run the full gamut, from self-employed to corporate employee, parent to childless, single to married and from twenty-something to more than 65 years old.

The statewide BPW list is not usually available, even to members, of which the author is one. Through negotiation, however, the author agreed to share survey results with the BPW organization in return for permission to mail surveys to the membership list. In the end, the survey was sent to members under a BPW cover letter under the signatures of the author and BPW officials (see Appendix A).
The Questionnaire

The author developed a four-part survey that included 34 questions and a section for comments. Six workers, representing both office and at-home work styles, participated in a test of the questionnaire. Their suggestions for revisions and clarifications were incorporated into the final draft.

Section I asks 11 questions. The first question, employment status, seeks to determine if respondents are employed in full-time or part-time work, or not employed due to retirement or loss of job. The survey instructed retired or unemployed members to skip to the end of the questionnaire. Other demographic questions include age, marital status, education, percentage of household income earned and presence of children. An essential question in this section determined if respondents owned home-based businesses or teleworked.

Section II asks employed participants to describe their social and communication networks. The 16 questions in this section concern participation in professional and social groups, evening and lunchtime social calendars, and other outlets for satisfying their needs for affiliation and inclusion.

Section III's five questions gather attitudinal information from women who work from home at least 1 day per week. Finally, Section IV's two questions inquire if participants are willing to participate in a follow-up telephone interview and if they want a copy of the survey results. The author asked participants to write any comments on a separate sheet of paper.
Data Collection

The author mailed the surveys on September 23, 1998 and included postage-paid envelopes for respondents' survey responses. Within 2 weeks, respondents had returned 125 completed surveys. To boost response, on October 5, 1998, the author sent reminder postcards to the entire survey population. By the October 15, 1998 deadline, the author received 207 surveys, a 36 percent response rate.

The author tabulated the 34 closed-end queries using Scantron and Scanmark survey processing hardware and software. (These tools enable creation of scannable survey forms and provide for rapid tabulation of responses.) The respondents answered multiple choice questions by filling the appropriate circle with a pencil in a process similar to taking the paper-and-pencil version of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). An optical mark reader scanned the surveys and recorded the answers to the questions. These data were collected in an Excel file. Responses, percentages and correlation coefficients were computed using Excel. The author manually coded the data provided by respondents in the comment section.

The author asked survey respondents to indicate on the survey form whether or not they were willing to participate in follow-up interviews. Seventy of the survey respondents agreed to interviews; the author interviewed five. The purpose of the interviews was to expand on data from the survey and to animate the results with real-life examples from working women. The author conducted the interviews via telephone.

Preparing for Analysis

Of the 207 respondents, 47 did not work: Forty-four are retired and three are unemployed. The survey instructions told them to skip to question 33; if they failed to do so, the author excluded
their responses from further analysis. This left 160 completed surveys. Of these 160, 155 participants answered question four, which asked respondents to select their current work arrangement from among these responses: (a) work at employer's office only; (b) work at home office only; and (c) work at employer's office but telecommute from home at least one day per week. These three categories of workplaces, called "employer only", "home only", and "combination" for short, form the basis for analysis and comparison. The fourth and final category is the aggregate of all employed BPW members who completed surveys, called "all". Tables list data for 160 respondents in the "all" category. The responses of the 155 subgroup members consist of 109 employer only, 28 home only, and 18 combination.
Chapter IV

RESULTS

The findings of this study confirm previous research concerning feelings of isolation experienced by women who work at home, and women's attitudes towards homework. Moreover, they indicate differences between the social networks of women who work at home only, those who work at an employer's office only, and those who split their time between home and employer offices.

These results are based upon the 160 employed BPW members who responded to the survey by the October 15, 1998 deadline. Of these 160 working women, 109 (68 percent) work in an employer's office only, 28 (18 percent) work solely from a home office; and 18 (11 percent) combine working in a traditional office with working in a home office at least once per week. Five (three percent) percent did not respond to question four which asked about office location (see questionnaire in Appendix A). Survey responses are analyzed by subgroups from question four, termed "employer only," home only," and "combination" for short.

Overview of Profile and Demographics

Based upon the most frequently occurring responses in Section I of the questionnaire, the typical employed BPW member works full time in a traditional office for an employer. She logs between 41 and 50 hours per week at work. Well-established in her career, she is between 46 and 55 years old, married, and does not have young children at home. She has an undergraduate college degree and earns 85 percent or more of household income. Although she may not formally work from home, she has a home office set-up, most commonly in a separate room in the house.
While this is a typical profile, wide variations illustrate the range of working women represented in this survey. Twenty-nine percent are entrepreneurs (either business owners or self-employed). While 83 percent work full time (more than 32 hours per week) 17 percent work part-time. Almost universally, they are an educationally elite group: More than 90 percent have at least some college, and one-third of members have graduate degrees.

The personal lives of many respondents also vary from the typical BPW woman's profile. Thirty-five percent are less than 45 years old. Forty-four percent are currently unmarried, either divorced (16 percent), widowed (7 percent) or never married (21 percent). Some combine work and raising a family: Twenty-nine percent have one or more child at home, and juggle various child-care methods, most commonly nannies, babysitters and child-care centers. Fifteen percent earn less than 15 percent of household income, while 30 percent are the majority or sole breadwinners, earning more than 85 percent of household income.

Combination workers (those women who split their time between their home and employer's offices) work the most hours and make highest percentage of household income. Those that work solely from home work the fewest hours and make the smallest percentage of household income.

Employment Status

Most respondents are working full time. Part-time hours are most common among women who work at home only ("home only") and corporate teleworkers who split their time between their home and traditional offices ("combination").
Table 1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>92.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part time</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Work Hours

Women who combine working in a traditional office with working from home report working the most number of hours. On average, women who work at home only work fewer hours, although a larger proportion of home only workers toil for more than 50 hours per week than do than traditional office workers. Various studies show that women who work from home only run the full gamut, from part-time workers to overburdened individuals who labor for more than 40 hours per week (Gerson & Kraut, 1988; Huws et al., 1996).
### Table 2
Number of Hours Worked

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Hours</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th></th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th></th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 to 30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 to 40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 to 50</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Place of Work**

According to the 1990 U.S. Census (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1997), 3 percent of employed Americans work only or mostly from home. Conversely, a substantial proportion of BPW members (17.5 percent) works only or mostly from home (see Table 3). An additional 11.3 percent work from home at least 1 day per week.

All of the home only workers and two-thirds of the combination workers have home offices, most in a separate room. Home offices are popular among all survey respondents:

Twenty-five percent of employer only women also dedicate a room to a home office.
Table 3

Place of Work

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Locations</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer's office only</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home office only</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment Description

Two-thirds of all respondents are employees of a for-profit company, government agency or non-profit firm. Eight percent, or 12 women, own a company and employ at least one person beside themselves. Twenty-nine percent are self-employed or freelance workers. Logically, all but one of the 18 women who work at home only are small business owners or freelance workers.

However, half of the combination workers are employees, while the other half are self-employed. At least two of these combination workers are real estate agents who are affiliated but technically not employed by real estate firms. Still, they spend some time in the offices of these firms, "working the floor," servicing walk-in clients and meeting with their customers.

Age

Fifty-two percent of all respondents are between 35 and 55 years old. Although no clear pattern emerges, those who work at home only skew slightly older than the other two groups (see Table 4). This is consistent with other studies that report younger workers are less likely to work
at home (Deming, 1994). In addition, women older than 65 who are still working are slightly more likely to be home only or combination workers, possibly because these arrangements offer pleasurable employment for one's retirement years.

In at least one case, a retired woman earned her real estate license and now splits her time between her home and employer's offices. She is very satisfied with this arrangement, stating:

My prior [administrative] career was with [co-workers] in their twenties and thirties, and worked well, but there was a hint of resistance to my age . . . in this business, there seem to be room for any age. That, plus an overwhelming desire to leave the limitations of the desk job propelled me into this much freer work style.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entire Population</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer Office Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Office Only</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 25</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 to 35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 45</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46 to 55</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 to 65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 65</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Marital Status

According to correlation statistics, this survey does not show a strong relationship between marital status and working at home some or all of the time. When taken as a group,
those who work at home some or all of the time are only slightly more likely to be married than those who work solely at employers' offices (r-squared equals .92). However, those who work only from home are more likely to be married than the other two categories. In addition, traditional office workers are more likely to be divorced or never married. These findings are supported by Deming's 1996 analysis of U.S. Bureau of Labor statistics, which concludes that married persons are more likely to work from home only.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>90 56.3</td>
<td>57 52.3</td>
<td>22 78.6</td>
<td>10 55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>25 15.6</td>
<td>20 18.3</td>
<td>1 3.6</td>
<td>3 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>11 6.9</td>
<td>6 5.5</td>
<td>1 3.6</td>
<td>2 11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never married</td>
<td>34 21.3</td>
<td>26 23.9</td>
<td>4 14.3</td>
<td>3 16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
<td>0 0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160 100.0</td>
<td>109 100.0</td>
<td>28 100.0</td>
<td>18 100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Education

BPW survey respondents are highly educated, more so than average women. Less than eight percent have stopped their schooling at the high school level or below. Seventy percent have an undergraduate or graduate degree, as compared to just 21 percent of women nationwide (United States Department of Commerce, 1997). The combination and home only groups are more likely to have completed a college degree (78 percent and 79 percent, respectively) than the employer only group.
Table 6

Highest Level of Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some high school</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergrad degree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate degree</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children at Home

Slightly less than one-third of BPW women across all work styles have children at home, as compared with 38 percent of American women who work (Deming, 1994). Statistically, there is no correlation in this study between having one or more children at home and choosing part-time or full-time homework (r-squared equals .996). On this point, this study departs from previous research. The profiles assembled by Kraut (1987) and Christensen (1988) depict the typical female homeworker as having a young child at home.

Women with one or more children at home are equally likely to be working for an employer or working at home at least 1 day per week. However, as the number of young children in the household increases, it appears that working from home only becomes more likely. Twenty-nine percent of women who work at home only have more than one child at home, as compared with 17 percent of the entire survey population. Nationwide, 43 percent of working women have children at home (Deming, 1994).
Table 7
Presence of Children at Home

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Children</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>71.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Five</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income Earned

Working from home only correlates with earning a smaller percentage of household income. Correlation analysis comparing survey participants who earn more and less than 35 percent of household income reveals a relationship between earnings and place of work (r-squared equals .420). This replicates the findings of other studies that associate full-time homework with a reduction in income (Huws et al., 1993; Kraut, 1988).

Conversely, "combination women" (those who split their time between a traditional and home office) are more likely to earn more than 61% of income than all other subgroups, including those who work only at employer's offices. However, because a substantial number of all participants (31 women, or 19 percent) chose not to answer this question, these results are questionable.
Table 8

Percentage of Household Income Earned by Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Income</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 to 10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 35</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 to 60</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 85</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 85</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overview of Social Networks and Satisfaction Levels

The typical BPW member who responded to the survey is quite active. In addition to juggling her work, marital and household obligations, she belongs to two professional and two social organizations and is an officer or board member of one of these organizations. She uses the Internet and e-mail, but for less than an hour each day. At one per day, she keeps personal telephone calls to a minimum. She is likely to own one dog or cat. Her social life includes lunching with friends and colleagues once per week. On average, one evening a week is dedicated to socializing with friends. She first met her closest friends through school, social organizations and work. She does not take lessons or classes and is not likely to exercise regularly.
The typical respondent is satisfied with her job (rating her satisfaction level as four on a five-point scale), and never feels lonely or isolated at work. She is also satisfied with her level of interaction with others.

This research uncovers differences in social networks among BPW women who work at home, those who work at an employer's office, and those who split their time between their home and employers' offices.

Business and Professional Organizations.

All but one survey respondent reports belonging to at least one business and professional organization. Women who work at home only were more likely to belong to four or five organizations, while "combination" women more typically belonged to fewer organizations, perhaps one or two. (Employer only workers joined these groups at a slightly lesser rate than combination workers). Correlation analysis between home only and combination workers reveals a strong relationship between work location and participation; r-squared equals .557.

Lack of time may be an issue for women with dual work locations. The average combination worker puts in more hours than the women in other two categories (see Table 2). Other possible explanations for the disparity in participation between home only and other subgroups include the requirements of entrepreneurship: One home-based business owner explained that she was involved in multiple organizations, "to network for business." In fact, Christensen (1988) advised home-based entrepreneurs to join professional and trade groups to keep up with trends and pricing information.
Table 9

Membership in Business and Professional Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Five</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Social and Volunteer Organizations

Women who work only at employer's offices belong to far fewer volunteer organizations than do women who work only at home. Combination women are more likely to participate in volunteer activities than traditional office workers are, but not to the extent of home only workers. There is a very strong relationship (r-squared equals .248) between volunteering and home only work, as compared to employer only work. Again, time may be an issue; however, it is likely that these organizations are filling important social needs. One woman, a financial manager with a Big Five accounting firm and a full-time homeworker, explains that she joins organizations, like the Newcomers Club and the BPW "for the social aspects."
Table 10

Membership in Social and Volunteer Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Organizations</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Five</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leadership of Professional and Social Organizations

Respondents who work at home only hold more officer and board positions than all other subgroups. Eighty-six percent of women who work at home have leadership positions, as compared to 70 percent of the population as a whole (see Table 11). Combination workers, with a 56 percent involvement rate, are the least active. Moreover, the average home only worker holds 1.8 leadership positions, versus 1.5 for combination workers and 1.6 for the employer only group (see Table 12). Again, this may be a function of time, because combination and employer only women tend to work more hours. On the other hand, as evidenced by the fact that home only workers are more likely to have leadership positions in multiple organizations, it may be that the futurist, Toffler, was right. He envisioned vibrant communities, where people live, earn their livings, and work to make their towns better places to live (Toffler, 1980).
Table 11

Officer or Board Positions in Professional and Social Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer or Board Member</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12

Number of Leadership Positions in Organizations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Positions</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Six</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internet and e-mail use

Unlike what Marcus (1995) theorized, this study does not show a correlation between Internet use and work location. Sixty-five percent of all survey participants use the Internet (see
Table 13), most frequently for an hour or less per day (see Table 14). In general, Internet use
does not differ greatly between the three groups, although the combination group had the highest
usage. However, the survey did not ask respondents to differentiate between business and
personal use of the Internet; that may have pointed out some differences between how the
different subgroups use the Internet. It seems clear, however, that women who work at home are
not turning to the Internet to fill large portions of their social needs.

Table 13
Use of Internet and E-mail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use Internet or e-mail?</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14
Time Spent Using Internet or E-mail

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hours per day</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; One</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to Three</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Three</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal Telephone Calls

BPW members were asked to report how many personal calls, excluding calls to check on their children, they made each day. The data show that women who work at home some or all of the time make more personal telephone calls during the workday. Based on weighted averages, women who work at home some or all of the time make three personal telephone calls during each workday, versus less than one and a half for employer only group. Moreover, based on statistical correlation, the relationship between work location and number of telephone calls is especially strong when comparing the employer only to the home only groups ($r$-squared equals .368).

Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Personal Calls</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Six</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pet Ownership

There was no correlation between pet ownership and work location. This contradicts an Internet survey that concluded homeworkers were more likely to own dogs and cats than traditional office workers.
Eating lunch out with friends or colleagues

Traditional office workers have the most lunch dates during the workweek. Weighted averaging reveals that a traditional office worker eats lunch out 1.3 times per week. In contrast, home only workers lunch out .7 times per week, while combination workers average 1.0 luncheon engagements per week (see Table 16).

One explanation is that opportunity knocks less often for homeworkers. One full-time homeworker said, "I make an official lunch date once a week, when I dress up and get out of the house. You need these interpersonal contacts to ground you."

Table 16
Lunch Dates During the Workweek

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times per weeks</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>36.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evenings Out with Friends or Colleagues

The frequency of evening excursions is more similar across subgroups than mid-day lunch outings. Overall, survey participants average 1.3 nights out per week. Traditional office
workers average 1.3; home only workers, 1.4; and combination workers, 1.4. The reasons for these slight differences are unknown.

Table 17
Evenings per Week with Friends or Colleagues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of times per week</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>44.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lessons and Classes

Enrolling in academic or personal enrichment classes and lessons are another way to socialize with others. The data show that only 29 percent of those who work in traditional offices participate in these activities, versus 44 percent of combination workers and 36 percent of home only workers. In addition, women who work at home all or some of the time are the most likely to take multiple classes and/or lessons. However, any number of factors other than work style may cause these differences. For example, home only and combination workers may attend classes for professional advancement. Several of these BPW survey respondents are accountants.
or insurance agents who are required to take continuing education classes to retain their professional credentials.

Table 18
Extent of Enrollment in Lessons or Classes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of lessons/classes</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Physical Exercise

Weighted averaging reveals that BPW survey respondents exercise an average of 2.1 times per week, but that there is considerable variation between the subgroups. Employer only workers exercise 2.0 times per week; home only workers, 2.7 times per week; and combination workers, 1.6 times per week. Women who work at home only are most likely to exercise (75 percent) and do so more frequently than the other groups. While the phone interviews revealed that some homeworkers belong to gyms, and value the gym as a way to set aside time for themselves and to enjoy a social setting, the questionnaire only gathered data about exercise frequency. It did not probe for motivations (e.g., health, fitness, social needs and competitive training) nor ask where these women exercised. Therefore, homeworkers' commitment to
exercise may be a function of fewer hours of work, the schedule flexibility inherent in
homework, or any number of other factors.

The data in Table 19 reveal that combination workers are least likely to exercise, with
only 44 percent reporting weekly participation. Again, this may be due to time constraints, since
they work, on average, the most hours.

Table 19
Frequency of Physical Exercise

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sessions per week</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th></th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th></th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th></th>
<th>Combination</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Feelings of Loneliness and Isolation

Not surprisingly, 32.2 percent of women who work at home only report feeling lonely
and isolated during the workday, as compared to 11.2 percent of the combination workers and
17.5 percent of employer only workers. As suggested by Kugelmass (1995) and Trent, Smith and
Wood (1994), combination workers do not experience the isolation of home only workers. In
fact, they are the least likely of the subgroups to report isolation.
Correlation statistics support the relationship between home only work and isolation. A comparison between the home only and employer only groups results in r-squared equaling .758; a comparison between the home only and combination group results in r-squared equaling .573.

One BPW member, a social worker in her mid-sixties who counsels individuals from her home office, describes the experience as isolating. "I would prefer," she says, "to work outside of the home."

These findings are similar to those of other researchers, including Sharp (1988) who reported one-third of homeworkers felt isolated. However, the data are less extreme than those of Huws' 1993 study, in which 60 percent of homeworkers reported feelings of isolation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not often</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>33.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Satisfaction Concerning Interaction with Others

The survey asked BPW members about their interaction with other people, specifically, the quality and frequency of their interpersonal interaction. The data reveal that three-quarters of survey participants are satisfied with this aspect of their lives. Differences between the subgroups are small. At 88.9 percent, the combination workers were slightly less likely than the home only
group to report being satisfied, very satisfied or neutral, than the home only workers. The employer only workers had the highest satisfaction or neutral ratings (95.4%). This finding may mean that for BPW home only workers, higher levels of outside involvement successfully replaced the social rewards of the traditional office environment. On the other hand, the data continue to paint a picture of combination workers who are doing more -- working more, earning more, maintaining community involvement -- but enjoying it a bit less than the other two groups.

**Table 21**  
**Satisfaction with Quality and Frequency of Interaction with Others**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Satisfaction With Work Arrangement**

Clearly, the home only and combination workers are the most satisfied with their work arrangements. In fact, when the five categories are collapsed to three (satisfied, neutral and dissatisfied) the combination workers lead the pack with 89 percent reporting satisfaction, versus 86 percent for home only workers and 61 percent for the employer only group.

However, at 46 percent, more home only workers report being very satisfied than either of the other two subgroups. Those women working in a traditional office setting and combination workers were most likely to report being dissatisfied (13 percent), although combination
workers, at 11 percent, were close behind. One employer only worker is not shy about expressing her displeasure, "I am currently working full-time at a conventional office in a nursing center and I hate it."

Table 22
Satisfaction with Work Arrangement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Satisfaction</th>
<th>Entire Population</th>
<th>Employer Office Only</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Meeting Friends

Respondents were asked where they met their four closest friends, excluding their spouses. The top four answers for the employer only group, cited in order of frequency, are: (a) school; (b) social organizations; (c) work; and (d) professional organizations. Home only workers also listed school and social organizations first, followed by professional organizations and business contacts, such as clients and vendors. The combination workers listed professional organizations first, followed by school and social organizations. While these differences are relatively small, analysis reveals that the social lives of the combination workers seem to be tied more closely to their work than the employer or home only groups. Conversely, the other
subgroups are more likely to have stayed close to their school chums and made friends through social organizations.

Perception of Homework

Most women are optimistic about homework and feel it offers personal advantages while having little impact on career success and earnings.

All survey respondents, whether or not they worked at home, were asked to express agreement or disagreement about a series of statements about the impacts of homework. Overall, survey participants have positive perceptions about working from home. One survey participant who belongs to the employer only group effuses, "Working at home is terrific for American business workers. It is here to stay."

Despite the fact that women who work at home only tend to earn a smaller percentage of household income (see Table 8), many women are not convinced that working from home can hurt earnings or career prospects. Amazingly enough home only workers are most bullish on earning potential, although they earn a smaller percentage of household income than the other subgroups. Sixty-eight percent of home only workers agree that homework is a good way to build wealth, while slightly less than half of the other subgroups agreed with this statement. In a related question, women who work at home only are more likely to agree that homework is a career-boosting proposition.

As documented in the literature, traditional office workers sometimes resent their teleworking colleagues. This research provides further anecdotal evidence to that effect. One survey respondent, a full-time, traditional office worker, says:

... having to work around and cover for an at-home worker is frustrating and has added to an already heavy workload. [The two of us] who are in the office all the time have
increased responsibility -- coping with additional client calls, rush jobs from the boss and doing corrections and changes that have to be made -- sometimes being expected to stay late, without compensation to meet deadlines. The three of us used to agree that working at home is wonderful . . . the two of us who have to show up every day are no longer quite as enthused.

Eighty percent of all respondents believe that working from home allows one to balance work and family. However, at least one prospective telecommuter anticipates difficulty in getting the job done. She says, "Working from home is great if you have a designated room for an office and coverage for children. [Also], as a consultant, going to client's offices is important for continuing to build relationships."

Although home only women were the most likely to feel isolated during the workday (see Table 20), traditional office workers' fear of such isolation seems stronger than the reality. Approximately 40 percent of the employer only group agree that working from home would be isolating and lonely, while only 11 percent of the home only workers, who should know, concurred.

Finally, only 17 percent survey participants are in accord with researchers such as Huws et al (1990) and Christensen (1988), who postulated that homework exploits women. Once more, the home only workers were least likely to agree; only 11 percent concur with this statement.

Overview of Reasons for and Details of Homework

Section III of the questionnaire asked the 18 combination and 28 home only workers to detail their homework arrangements and their reasons for working from home. Most have been working from home for three or more years and work at home an average of 3.4 days per week. All but one previously worked in a traditional office. Schedule flexibility, control over one's
work, and the ability to operate one's own business are the reasons cited most frequently for
working from home.

Length and Frequency of Homework Arrangement

Most BPW homeworkers are quite experienced with the ins and outs of working from
home. Approximately three-quarters have been working from home for more than 2 years; the
most common responses are more than 11 years and 3 to 5 years (see Table 23). The
combination workers have the longest average tenure as homeworkers.

The average BPW homeworker puts in 3.4 days per week at her home office. Those who
work from home only clock an average of 4.4 days per week in the home office. Combination
workers, who also have a traditional office, report working from home an average of 3.0 days per
week. Combination workers most typically spend 2 days per week in their home offices (see
Table 22), slightly higher than the national average for teleworkers, which is 1.6 days per week.
However, because 22 percent of combination workers failed to answer this question, the
accuracy of their data is suspect.
Table 23

**Frequency of Homework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Days per Week</th>
<th>All Homeworkers</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Three</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; Six</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Preference for Working at Home**

Homeworkers were asked if they have ever worked in a traditional office. All BPW homeworkers, excepting one home only woman who works only from home, worked in a traditional office in the past.

Table 24 shows that 63 percent of homeworkers would work at home if given a choice between a home and traditional office setting. The data show that women who work at home only are the most enthusiastic, with 75 percent choosing the home office. Forty-four percent of combination workers would also choose to work from home; however, the high percentage of combination workers who did not answer this question makes accurate comparisons impossible. Eliminating the four "no response" answers (see Table 23) and recalculating the percentage would bring combination workers' affirmation of homework up to 57 percent. Seven percent of
all homeworkers would not choose to work from home, and 17 percent are unsure what their decision would be.

Table 24
Current Homeworkers Preference for Homework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Would Choose Homework?</th>
<th>All Homeworkers</th>
<th>Home Office Only</th>
<th>Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for Homework

Women who work from home were asked to their reasons. The questionnaire (see Appendix A) provided respondents with 19 possibilities. Survey participants chose as many as applied to their situation. They could also write in reasons if their motivations did not appear on the list. The top two reasons, schedule flexibility (31 responses) and control over work (23 responses), are both associated with quality of life. Ranking third with 21 responses is that working from home enables the one to operate her own business. Twenty women selected the fourth most common motivation: for convenience sake. Fifth place, a two-way tie, was shared by two factors: (a) homework allows more time for oneself; and (b) it is the best way to work part-time at professional work.

Women who worked at home only cited the ability to run their own business as the top reason for homework, followed by schedule flexibility and control over one's work. Combination workers most appreciated the schedule flexibility and convenience of working from home one or
more days per week. One combination worker, director of a family day care management service, explains that she works at home because her employer requires it:

[My employer] is a child care business and . . . by using a home office, we are not spending parent tuition on inflated office expenses. It allows [me] to have schedule flexibility to balance family needs when necessary. It also keeps [me] close to the geographic area [I] cover.

In general, BPW women who are combination workers gain flexibility for themselves and may be able to perform better for their employers. Home only workers also gain flexibility, but more importantly, realize their dreams of small business ownership or freelance work.
Chapter V

SUMMARY

Overview

This research begins to explore the differences between the social networks of traditional office and homeworkers. It identifies some ways that BPW members cope with the challenges of homework, information that can be helpful to women considering full- or part-time homework.

First, the demographics (e.g., age, marital status, the presence of children and education level) do not vary greatly between the home only, employer only and combination groups. Because of this, these conclusions focus on the differences between the three subgroups. In addition, most survey participants believe that homework is a positive phenomenon. The support of BPW women for homework centers on its quality of life advantages, such as flexibility and control over one's work. Most do not think that homework has an effect on career advancement or earning potential.

Although some women choose homework to spend more time with their children, the choice of homework did not statistically correlate with marital status or presence of children. Unfortunately, this study does not shed a strong light on the reasons behind women's choice of work arrangement. Everyone has a story. One married woman runs a home-based training business. She left corporate America after ten successful years because of a disagreement with her boss over a promised sabbatical. She took her time off, came back from her trip, and started a family and business. A company that wanted to retain a valued employee offered another woman five-day-per-week teleworking when she relocated from Texas to New Jersey for her husband's job. Other women, including an accountant and an interior designer, have businesses they can run well, at lower overhead, from a home office.
Summary of Primary Findings

This study indicates that home only workers are more at risk for social isolation. (One-third report feeling lonely and isolated at times during the workday). However, in the absence of the social environment of the workplace, they can and do take a variety of steps to build full social networks. Some of this is business-related, in the form of membership in professional organizations and socialization with vendors and clients, but volunteerism, telephone usage and physical exercise also appear to fill in the gap. In addition, many assume leadership roles within these business and volunteer organizations. These steps seem to be successful; home only workers report being as satisfied with their interaction with others as the employer only group, and much more satisfied with their jobs.

Home only survey respondents work fewer hours and earn less money than the other two subgroups. In fact, almost 40 percent of home only workers report working part time, and 15 percent earn less than 15 percent of household income. This more relaxed lifestyle may partially explain their higher satisfaction levels.

Women who work at home only, regardless of whether they are self-employed or 5 day-per-week teleworkers, perceive homework differently than women who split their time between home and traditional offices. Even as the experiences of these two groups are different from each other, they also vary from those of the employer only group.

The combination workers are enigmas. Sometimes the behaviors and attitudes of the combination workers are closer to those of the employer only group, while in other areas, such as frequency of personal telephone calls and job satisfaction, it more closely mirrors the home only workers. They work and earn the most, but are least likely to be satisfied with their interaction with others. Combination women seem committed to professional accomplishment, as evidenced
by the number of hours they work. In addition, this research indicates that their social lives
revolve more around work associates than the other two groups.

It may be that combining office and homework, especially full time, creates more stress.
It is clear that combination workers have many pots in the fire: They have higher rates of
community involvement than do traditional office workers, and go out to lunch more often than
homeworkers. They participate in lessons and classes more than employer only group, but less
frequently than do the home only workers. Not surprisingly, they are the least likely to exercise
regularly.

The bulk of survey respondents work at employer's offices. They work more hours than
the average home-only worker, but less than the average combination worker does. Although all
BPW women are involved in business and social organization, the employer only women are
involved in fewer organizations and hold fewer leadership positions. They are less likely to take
lessons or classes than the home only workers are or use the telephone for personal purposes
during the day. However, they are more likely to have mid-week lunch dates and as likely to go
out in the evenings. The typical employer only respondent earns more money than the home only
workers do, but less than the combination workers do.

Limitations

First, the population it examines limits this research. The sample is not statistically valid.
In addition, one cannot assume this study's results will hold true for the general population.
Third, the data are based on participants' reports of their behavior and attitudes, rather than by
observation or diaries. Self-reporting bias is a common research pitfall. Next, the research does
not establish cause-and-effect relationships between the findings and a woman's choice of work
location. Relationships are inferred, rather than scientifically proven. Fifth, because of the design
of the study, the author did not determine how other factors, including total household income, the values and attitudes of the women, race, entrepreneurship and part-time versus full-time work, influence the data. All of these elements may have played a major role in these results of this research.

Direction for Future Research

As many other studies have shown, homework is worthwhile: Women who work at home are more satisfied with their work arrangements than traditional office workers. It appears that home is, indeed, where the heart is.

However, quantitative studies could either prove or disprove the relationships between work location and level of participation in various social activities. For example, rather than being outlets for the social needs of homeworkers, the reason for their higher level of participation in community groups could be that they have the economic freedom to volunteer.

Another study idea is to compare the social networks of home only workers (both full-time and part-time) with the social networks of women who do not work at all. Part-time, home only workers may be walking the line between the working and stay-at-home lifestyles. They can steal a little time for themselves. Moreover, because they are filling dual roles as professionals and homemakers -- yet not exhausting themselves in the process -- they are the most satisfied.

Along these lines, additional research could examine the myth that teleworkers can have it all and be happy. This research shows that although combination workers earn a lot and have active social lives, they are often less satisfied with their interpersonal interaction than the other two groups. It is possible that they enjoy life less because they are burned out from pushing themselves so hard. Another possibility is that some combination workers work long hours because they need to prove to their employers that they deserve their telework arrangements.
Conversely, perhaps managers permit them to telework because, as classic overachievers, combination workers performed superbly in the office. Now their managers trust them to continue to work hard, even at home.

In conclusion, humans will always need to affiliate with others, in spite of all of the technology and work trends that today discourage interpersonal contact. To allow people to continue to balance the requirements of the workplace with their own psychological demands, more study is required to understand the impact of working at home with a computer as one's only companion. This study offers a natural segue into this and other research topics.
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APPENDIX A
Section I - Demographic Profile

This section provides background information about you and your work history. This information will remain confidential; nobody will be identified from the given answers.

1. Employment status. (Select the one that best describes your situation.)
   - Work full-time (32 hours per week or more)
   - Work part-time (less than 32 hours)
   - Retired (Skip to Section IV, Question 33)
   - Unemployed (Skip to Section IV, Question 33)

2. Number of hours worked in an average week. (Fill in one circle.)
   - None
   - 31 - 40
   - 41 - 50
   - 51 - 60
   - 60 or more

3. Employment description. (Select one.)
   - Employee of private or non-profit firm or government agency
   - Own small company; have at least one part-time employee
   - Self-employed/freelance worker; no employees on your payroll

4. Place of work during business hours, when you are not on the road or at a client’s workplace. (Select one.)
   - Work at employer’s office(s) only
   - Work at home office only
   - Work at employer’s office; telecommute from home office at least one day per week

5. Existence of home office. (Select one.)
   - I don’t have a home office.
   - My home office is in a separate room.
   - I use a section of another room (i.e., my bedroom or dining room) as a home office.

6. Age. (Select one.)
   - 18 - 25
   - 26 - 35
   - 36 - 45
   - 46 - 55
   - 56 - 65
   - 66 or more

7. Marital status. (Select one.)
   - Married
   - Divorced
   - Widowed
   - Never married

8. Highest level of education. (Select one.)
   - Some high school
   - High school graduate
   - Some college
   - Undergraduate (college) degree
   - Post-graduate degree

9. Number of children living at home.
   - None
   - One
   - Two
   - Three
   - Four
   - Five or more

10. Number of children living away from home.
    - None
    - One
    - Two
    - Three
    - Four
    - Five or more

11. Percentage of household income you earn. (Fill in one circle.)
    - None
    - 1 - 10%
    - 11 - 25%
    - 26 - 50%
    - 51 - 75%
    - 76 - 99%
    - 100%

Section II - Communication and Social Activities

This section provides information about your personal and professional social network. If you have a question about time period, please base your answers on your activities over the past three months.

12. To how many business and professional organizations do you belong? (Select one.)
    - None
    - One
    - Two
    - Three
    - Four
    - Five or more

13. In how many social or volunteer organizations do you actively participate? (Select one.)
    - None
    - One
    - Two
    - Three
    - Four
    - Five or more

14. Are you an officer, board member or committee chair for any professional, social or volunteer organizations? (Select one.)
    - Yes
    - No

15. How much time do you spend per day using the Internet or e-mail for communication or research? (Select one.)
    - Less than one hour
    - One to three hours
    - More than three hours

16. How many personal phone calls do you make or receive during a typical day during your work hours, not including checking on your children? (Select one.)
    - One
    - Two
    - Three
    - Four
    - Five
    - Six or more

17. How many personal phone calls do you make or receive during a typical day during your work hours, not including checking on your children? (Select one.)
    - None
    - One
    - Two
    - Three
    - Four
    - Five
    - Six or more

18. Do you own dogs or cats? (Select one.)
    - Yes
    - No

19. How often do you meet friends or colleagues for lunch? (Select one.)
    - None
    - One
    - Two
    - Three
    - Four
    - Five or more

20. How many evenings per week, on average do you spend with friends or colleagues? (Select one.)
    - None
    - One
    - Two
    - Three
    - Four
    - Five or more

21. Are you taking lessons or classes? (Select one.)
    - None
    - One
    - Two
    - Three
    - Four
    - Five
    - Six or more

22. On average, how many times per week do you exercise? (Select one.)
    - None
    - One
    - Two
    - Three
    - Four
    - Five or more

23. Do you feel lonely and isolated during the workday? (Select one.)
    - Never
    - Not very often
    - Sometimes
    - Frequently

24. How satisfied are you with the frequency and quality of your interaction with other people? (Select one.)
    - Very satisfied
    - Satisfied
    - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
    - Dissatisfied
    - Very dissatisfied

25. On balance, how satisfied are you with your work arrangement? (Select one.)
    - Very satisfied
    - Satisfied
    - Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied
    - Dissatisfied
    - Very dissatisfied
APPENDIX B
September 23, 1998

Dear BPW/NJ Members,

The new State Management Teams of Marketing, headed by Debbie Schmidt, and Membership, headed by Linda Szabo, are looking for information from BPW/NJ members to help us do our job better in developing a marketing plan and helping locals to attract more members. We have joined forces with Gail Nelson of Summit BPW to do a survey of the membership. That survey is enclosed, and we ask that you **complete and return it in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by October 15, 1998.** Your cooperation is greatly appreciated.

The information you share will be used to develop our marketing and membership strategy for 1999, and Gail will also use the information you send back for her master’s thesis. The survey will expand our understanding of how working at home affects women’s social and support networks. Specifically, we are trying to learn if the social networks of professional women who work at home, as either small business owners or corporate telecommuters, differ from those of women who work in a conventional office setting. Gail has agreed to pay for this mailing, and we are grateful to her for that, considering our limited budget.

Please be assured that the privacy of the BPW/NJ membership will be protected when you participate in this survey. We will also be happy to share the results of the research with interested BPW/NJ members who provide their contact information. The survey results will also be published in *The Voice.*

Both the Marketing and Membership Teams and Gail Nelson thank you for your help in providing this valuable information to us. If you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to call us.

Debbie Schmidt
Marketing Team
908-233-3021

Linda Szabo
Membership Team
732-417-0298

Gail Nelson,
Summit BPW Member
908-273-5228.
APPENDIX C
APPENDIX D
Stand up and be counted! •
If you haven't yet completed and mailed the NJ/BPW survey, please take a few minutes and complete it now!

The BPW and I thank you for your input.

Questions? •
Call Gail Nelson at 908-273-5228.