

A SURVEY OF HOME MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS TO APPRAISE AREAS  
OF EMPHASIS, TEACHING METHODS, AND FACILITIES IN  
SELECTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IN THE  
UNITED STATES

---

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR  
THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF EDUCATION IN HOME ECONOMICS  
EDUCATION IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF  
THE TEXAS WOMAN'S UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF  
HOUSEHOLD ARTS AND SCIENCES

BY  
HATTIE LAMB ARTHUR, B. S., M. S.

---

DENTON, TEXAS

AUGUST, 1969

# Texas Woman's University

Denton, Texas

August 11 19 69

We hereby recommend that the dissertation prepared under  
our supervision by Hattie Lamb Arthur  
entitled A SURVEY OF HOME MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS TO  
APPRAISE AREAS OF EMPHASIS, TEACHING METHODS, AND  
FACILITIES IN SELECTED COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES  
IN THE UNITED STATES

be accepted as fulfilling this part of the requirements for the Degree of  
Doctor of Education

## Committee:

Bernadine Johnson  
Chairman  
Jessie W. Bateman  
Helma A. Brown  
Dora R. Tyn  
Nick L. Lund  
Virginia P. Sloan

Accepted:

J. I. Morris  
Dean of Graduate Studies



## A C K N O W L E D G M E N T S

Sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Jessie W. Bateman, Dean of the College of Household Arts and Sciences, Texas Woman's University, for her encouragement and inspiration throughout this study.

To Dr. Bernadine Johnson, Chairman of the Graduate Committee, and to Dr. Wilma A. Brown for their patience, guidance, and helpful suggestions during the actual writing of this paper, and to committee members Dr. Virginia Sloan, Dr. Dora R. Tyer, and Dr. Nicholas Lund, gratitude is expressed for their assistance throughout the planning and execution of the study.

Acknowledgment is made to the Home Economics Departments, the Chairmen, Professors, and Resident-instructors who so generously provided the information for this study.

# T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

Chapter		Page
	ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iii
	LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
I	INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
	Statement of Problem. . . . .	5
	Purposes of the Study . . . . .	8
II	REVIEW OF LITERATURE . . . . .	9
	Historical Perspective Relative to	
	Home Management. . . . .	10
	Early Emphases . . . . .	12
	Changing Emphases. . . . .	13
	Research Relative to Home Management. . . . .	16
	Areas of Emphasis. . . . .	16
	Methods of Teaching. . . . .	20
	Home Management Facilities . . . . .	23
III	PLAN OF PROCEDURE. . . . .	31
	Purposes of the Study . . . . .	31
	Instrument. . . . .	32
	Selection of Sample . . . . .	33
	Collection of Data. . . . .	34
	Analysis of Data. . . . .	36
IV	PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA. . . . .	38
	Institutions. . . . .	39
	Areas of Emphasis . . . . .	45
	Home Management Courses . . . . .	57
	Home Management Courses Offered . . . . .	69
	Introductory Course. . . . .	69
	Resident Course. . . . .	69
	Teaching Methods. . . . .	72
	Introductory Course. . . . .	73
	Resident Course. . . . .	73
	Facilities. . . . .	80

## T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S (Continued)

Chapter		Page
V	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS. . . . .	84
	BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	94
	APPENDICES . . . . .	98
	Appendix A: Questionnaire (With Cover Letter). . . . .	99
	Appendix B: Follow-Up Letter . . . . .	109
	Appendix C: Classification of States by Geographical Region . . . . .	111

## LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHICAL REGION AND ENROLLMENT. . . . .	42
II	CLASSIFICATION OF CONCEPTS ACCORDING TO SIX AREAS OF EMPHASIS IN HOME MANAGEMENT. . . .	46
III	RESPONSES BY THE CHAIRMEN, PROFESSORS AND RESIDENT-INSTRUCTORS AS TO THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN HOME MANAGEMENT. . . . .	49
IV	PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES BY THE CHAIRMEN, PROFESSORS AND RESIDENT-INSTRUCTORS AS TO THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN HOME MANAGEMENT . . . . .	52
V	SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES BY CHAIRMEN, PROFESSORS AND RESIDENT-INSTRUCTORS AS TO DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS OF HOME MANAGEMENT . . . . .	54
VI	RESPONSES AS TO THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN THE INTRODUCTORY AND THE RESIDENT COURSES IN HOME MANAGEMENT . .	58
VII	PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES AS TO THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN THE INTRODUCTORY AND THE RESIDENT COURSES IN HOME MANAGEMENT . . . . .	60
VIII	SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES CON- CERNING DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN THE INTRODUCTORY AND THE RESIDENT COURSES IN HOME MANAGEMENT . . . . .	63
IX	RESPONSES AS TO DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN THE INTRODUCTORY COURSE IN HOME MANAGEMENT . . . . .	64

## L I S T O F T A B L E S (Continued)

Table		Page
X	RESPONSES AS TO DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN THE RESIDENT COURSE IN HOME MANAGEMENT . . . . .	65
XI	NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS OFFERING HOME MANAGEMENT COURSES ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHICAL REGION OF THE UNITED STATES . . . . .	70
XII	SUMMARY OF RESPONSES CONCERNING METHODS USED IN TEACHING HOME MANAGEMENT INTRODUCTORY COURSE . . . . .	74
XIII	METHODS LISTED AS FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD CHOICES BY RESPONDENTS AS TO THE MOST EFFECTIVE METHODS OF TEACHING HOME MANAGEMENT . . . . .	75
XIV	SUMMARY OF RESPONSES CONCERNING METHODS USED IN TEACHING HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENT COURSE . . . . .	77
XV	NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS PROVIDING VARIOUS TYPES OF FACILITIES FOR TEACHING HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENT COURSE ACCORDING TO THE GEOGRAPHICAL REGION OF THE UNITED STATES. . . . .	82

## CHAPTER I

### I N T R O D U C T I O N

Changing educational philosophies and resources as well as the dynamics of enrollment, curriculum, and employment opportunities necessitate frequent evaluation of educational objectives and the patterns by which these objectives are implemented and accomplished in various phases of home economics. Changing circumstances of society have intensified the need for appraisal of home economics educational objectives.

Scott (32) emphasized a need for educational leaders to make college education more functional in developing youth for effective citizenship and self realization essential for a satisfying life. However, the means or methods for meeting this need are subject to discussion and study.

"General education" as viewed by Scott (32) has been one of the major proposals accepted by many as the means for reaching the goal of more effective college graduates and citizens. General education has many definitions and facets. Many educators believe general education to be a common body of knowledge, accepted values, and experiences that are important for every individual. Suggestions for curriculum

may vary from a program of traditional liberal arts subjects to the newer survey type core courses frequently found in the curricula of higher educational institutions today.

According to Scott (32) some educators believe that general education is a quality of spirit in education, a way of working and guiding learning which furthers the growth and development essential for intelligent living. The spirit of guided learning should permeate all levels of education in a democratic society.

During President Kennedy's administration the Commission on Higher Education listed as one of its 11 goals for general education: "to acquire the knowledge and attitudes basic to a satisfying family life." A satisfying family life contributes to the welfare of the community as well as to that of the nation (19).

The late Ellen H. Richards (26), the first president of the American Home Economics Association, stated that Home Economics stands for:

- 1) The freedom of the home from the dominance of things and their due subordination to ideals.
- 2) The simplicity in material surroundings which will most nearly free the spirit for the more important and permanent interest of the home and of society.

Williamson and Lyle (37) stated that general education aims to develop those attitudes, appreciations, and abilities needed for future as well as for present living. Home living is included as one aspect of present living.

Home economics was founded on the belief that homes are fundamental to the welfare of today's society and that ways and means of promoting their improvement are worthy contributions of education. The underlying philosophy of home economics includes a cardinal principle of education--Worthy Home Membership. The basic emphases of home economics education are placed upon the home and family and the preservation of values significant in home life.

Speaking before the 1947 meeting of the Association of Land Grant Colleges and Universities, C. B. Hutchison (32), Vice-President of the University of California and Dean of Agriculture, stated:

The goal of home economics in all the phases is to increase the modicum of health, happiness, wholesomeness, effectiveness and charm in the homes of people.

H. Gorden Hullfish (32), a philosopher and professor of education at The Ohio State University, speaking to a



groups of college home economists attending an institute in June, 1946, related that:

Home economics may contribute to the general education of all students in all of its courses . . . by combining with other areas of knowledge to give leadership in constructing educative experiences which help young people become aware of themselves as having a responsibility for intelligent participation in the affairs of the family and the duties of citizenship.

Lee and Dressel (24) explained that the historic role of higher education has been threefold: the conservation of values and knowledge, the transmission of values and knowledge, and the search for truth--new knowledge. Home economics, like higher education of which it is a part, has the triple task of conserving the best of the past, teaching this to the students, and discovering and transmitting new ideas in its field.

Home management is a special subject area in home economics education devoted to the study of managing resources to realize values and to achieve the goals and satisfactions sought in personal and family living. Home management courses encourage the development of intellectual abilities and skills through integrated types of learning experiences. Subject matter is drawn from all areas of home economics, as well as from many other disciplines.

Management in the home takes place to varying degrees in the life of every individual, regardless of the environment in which the person lives or the stage of the life cycle. A goal of home management is to prepare an individual for the responsibilities of living in a social group, specifically the family group. Home management education is needed both when resources are limited or when goods and services are available in abundance. The increase in material goods, the increasing rate of social change, as well as the interdependence of individuals upon each other emphasize the importance of many of the management activities. Clarifying aims and values of home life, organizing activities, and decision-making are mental activities associated with coordinating or harmonizing the management process.

#### STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

The Accreditation Committee of the American Home Economics Association is currently investigating home economics curricula in the various colleges and universities of the United States. Leaders in the profession have indicated that the programs of some degree granting institutions of higher learning have not been revised or adjusted to meet the changing needs of students today.

The multiple role in the family and in the society that women of today and tomorrow must fill is a complex one.

Students' needs appear to be changing more rapidly than their educational environment. The educational programs offered in home economics should be reviewed regularly to determine the direction and degree of change required to meet these needs.

Home management was not incorporated into a subject matter group of the American Home Economics Association until 1946, when home management was joined with family economics to become a specialized area in home economics education. In 1959, the importance of home management was recognized in "New Directions for Home Economics" (2), the guide developed by the American Home Economics Association. At this time the Committee on Philosophy and Objectives set forth certain "competences" to be developed by students of home economics. Of the 12 competences listed, six are in the area of home management. One competency concerns values and goals; one concerns decision-making primarily; and four emphasize the planning and control steps of the management process in the use of resources to achieve personal and family goals. The study of home management, to a greater extent than that of many other fields of subject matter, involves many different areas of living. Moreover, home management is concerned with the ways in which a family uses all its resources, both human and material.

Many institutions of higher education are confronted with problems arising from an ever increasing enrollment and rising costs of higher education. This study was undertaken to examine practices in a representative number of institutions of higher learning to determine the contributions of home management education to the development of the desired competences as delineated by "New Directions for Home Economics" (2). The purposes of this study were to appraise the areas of emphasis and the effectiveness of current methods and facilities used in the home management courses.

The changing character of the student population has demanded that special attention be given to home management programs to determine how to better meet the needs of individuals. The fact that increasing numbers of mature and married students are continuing their college education in this area has introduced problems of providing meaningful learning experiences for individuals of different and varying levels of maturity.

Paolucci and Everett (30) asserted that for the college graduate of tomorrow the study of home management must be extended beyond the four walls of a house and include a fifth dimension, blending of the home with an outside career. The young women preparing for a mature life must be prepared to fill this dual role in contemporary society.

### PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The purposes of this study were to examine the area of emphases, methods of instruction, and facilities in teaching home management courses in colleges and universities offering a four year program and to determine effective ways to meet the needs of students, home economists, homemakers, and citizens of contemporary and future society. Specific purposes of the study were to determine:

- 1) The implications of current trends in home management education.
- 2) The differences in the teaching methods employed in introductory courses in home management and those used in the resident courses.
- 3) The extent to which independent study or problem-solving laboratory experiences have replaced the traditional home management resident course.
- 4) The correlation between theory and practices in home management.
- 5) The methods considered effective for teaching home management at the college level.
- 6) The changes in emphasis since the inception of home management in the home economics educational program.

## CHAPTER II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Little information is available to determine how the concept of home management developed into a field of study. The methods for managing resources have been passed on from generation to generation, with modifications within each generation. The principles of management as a field of study were developed and applied first in industry. The art of management eventually attracted the attention of educators and its study became an organized branch in several fields of education.

Terry (33) explained that management applied in the home is a science advanced by knowledge through prediction, definition, measurement, and impression. Home management is also an art advanced by practice, through feeling, imagining, describing, thinking, and creating.

Concerning the nature and role of management Dauten (9) claimed that:

In management, as well as in other areas of learning, the capacity of scholars to challenge traditional and deeply ingrained patterns of thinking plays an important role in the discovery of new knowledge. The views of other disciplines are now being drawn upon in the consideration of general

and specific management problems. Indeed, a restructuring of fundamental knowledge about the management process appears to be taking place, in part at a philosophical level. This conceptual restructuring of man's experience relates to his organizational endeavors, and in either case, it constitutes a rearrangement of managerial ideas, a basic philosophy of human action and human decision-making is emerging, one destined to find its proper place as a core discipline that will provide foundation and direction for all branches of learning that can properly be classified as "science-arts."

#### HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE RELATIVE TO HOME MANAGEMENT

The 1960-1962 survey of the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (36) reported statistics from 427 degree granting institutions indicating that in-residence experiences were numerous in home management education. Four hundred and eleven institutions offered a teacher education major. Of these institutions, 101 did not have a home management house and 92 were not approved for vocational certification.

There is a consensus among home economists that home management has been one of the most neglected areas of home economics research. Few studies in home management were conducted before the passage of Federal legislation initiating vocational education.

The Smith-Hughes Act (5) in 1917, provided federal funds, when matched by public school systems, for establishing laboratories and paying salaries of teachers of home

economics and agriculture. The act also provided funds to assist the state colleges in educational preparation of vocational teachers of home economics. Many new four-year curricula were established and, in some cases, a fifth year was added for the master's degree. Under the stimulus of this federal aid, teacher training became the main objective in many land-grant institutions, and training for home living was not emphasized.

Passage of the Smith-Lever Act in 1914, merging the United States Department of Agriculture and the land-grant institutions made possible the rapid development of that part of home economics linked with agriculture. Funds provided by the act were used for research and for extension services. Home economics also benefited indirectly by the Purnell Act in 1925, which provided experiment stations with funds to be used for economic and sociological investigation aimed at the improvement of rural life (5).

One of the recommendations in the statement of policies and procedures for the conduct of teacher education programs for vocational home economics under the Smith-Hughes Act was that college students have a period of in-residence experiences in a "practice" house. This recommendation resulted in the rapid growth of the so-called "practice houses" on college campuses in all parts of the United States (3). The



United States Office of Education (35) indicated that prior to 1917 there were home management houses in 12 of the institutions then approved for training home economics teachers.

### Early Emphasis

The first practice houses were established on the campuses of Iowa State University, University of Illinois, Kansas State University, Stout State University at Menomonie, Wisconsin, and Tuskegee Institute in Tuskegee, Alabama, in the early 1900's. The purpose of these resident courses was to provide experiences in household activities in a home-like environment. According to Amidon (3) these "practice houses":

. . . were thought of frequently as places providing opportunity to give performance tests. Students were expected to show whether they were able to buy food, prepare meals, keep the house clean, and keep the household accounts. Fairly early the houses were thought of as "model houses" or show places, in which so-called "home economics standards" were maintained.

Bevier (7) explained that the course of instruction recommended by the Standing Committee on Instruction of the Association of American Agricultural Colleges and Experiment Stations stressed the value of skill and practice in: 1) the presentation of the subject in concrete form, with accompanying practice, 2) the development of principles with

laboratory practices, and 3) the application of principles with opportunity for devising new methods and for experimental work. This emphasis on skill and practice accounts for the early residences being called "practice houses."

Since 1930 less attention has been given to techniques of household activities and more emphasis has been placed on individual and group development in decision-making concerning the use of resources to accomplish goals. This transition is described in a 1955 report of the United States Office of Education (35) as follows:

The emphasis in these houses shifted from the teaching of household skills in a "practice house" to an emphasis on learning to manage resources in a group living experience in order to achieve individual and group values, with more and more emphasis on the quality of relationships among group members . . . . It is felt that living in the house offers students a chance to apply what they learned about homemaking in its broadest sense.

### Changing Emphases

Home management has evolved through several stages since the early part of the century. As interpreted by Gross and Crandall (18) these stages are not sharply separated one from the other, nor do all the characteristics of earlier stages cease to be present in later ones. Rather

there has been a continuing change in the developmental stages that may be listed as:

- Stage I.      Dumping ground period
- Stage II.     Resource-centered emphasis
- Stage III.    Human-centered emphasis
- Stage IV.     Process-centered emphasis
- Stage V.      Values and decision-making emphasis

In 1947, Liston (25) proposed that a sixth stage, focusing emphasis on problem identification and solution through the managerial process has emerged.

As this analysis of the nature of home management has developed, the use of the residence or "practice house" has been the subject of re-evaluation. Recently its use has been questioned. The criticism of the "practice house" has been: 1) that the standard of living has sometimes been too costly, both in regard to time and money expended; 2) that with many students performing the activities no one individual assumes responsibility for the overall results; and 3) that the living conditions are not realistic experiences.

The concept of home management gradually expanded from the accepted idea that home management included primarily the performance of general housekeeping activities to the ideas that the focus of emphasis should be the overall

improvement of homes. The realization that the goal of home economics included working for the home and family, teaching women to view the home in its larger aspects, and an awareness of woman's role in the home led to an emphasis on the economics involved in managing the home and family. The concepts of "division of income" and "family budgets" were added to the subject matter of home management.

Gross and Crandall (18) defined home management as a series of decisions which constitute a process of using family resources to achieve family goals. The complete process consists of three or more consecutive steps: planning, controlling the plan in action, and evaluating the results preparatory to future planning. One of the important shifts in point of view concerning home management as a field of study has been from the emphasis upon skills in using resources to a concern for people and their goals as the focal point of management.

A report of the National Conference on Family Life (19) held in 1962, gave the following interpretation:

Home management is a series of decision-making activities constituting the process of using family resources to reach family goals. It is the major means by which families get what they want from the use of their resources throughout the family life cycle. Management in the home is a part of the fabric of family living. Its threads are interwoven because decisions for the use of resources are made, whether the family is at work or play.

## RESEARCH RELATIVE TO HOME MANAGEMENT

### Areas of Emphasis

According to Gross (17), studies of overall management in the home were not begun until the 1930's. A study designed to determine trends in home management courses and to formulate policies, conducted by Judy (23), is considered a milestone in home management research. The author investigated such matters as prerequisites, placement, time involvement, credit hours, aims and objectives, content and methods. By use of a questionnaire, data were collected from 68 institutions currently offering courses in home management. A panel of directors of home management evaluated the data for evidence of trends.

Judy (23) concluded that the goals and objectives in home management education had changed as the field had grown and developed. Emphasis on details regarding skills in household tasks were declining, while increased emphasis was being placed on economy in use of time, energy, and money. Also the development of judgment, family and community relationships, and the planned use of leisure time were considered to be important. Although the lecture method predominated as a method of teaching home management principles, the use of the home management house as a laboratory was

favorable as a teaching facility. The Judy study indicated a tendency to increase the number of courses required as prerequisites to home management. The data indicated clearly that home management was a subject requiring a background of material acquired from other home economics courses.

A two-year study reported by Elliott (14) in 1947, suggested that the goal of home management as a field of study is devoted to finding ways of achieving the highest values from human relations. This new concept seems to have been unacceptable to the respondents who indicated that skills and efficiency in performing tasks were essential to home management education.

Elliott (14) found that the majority of the teachers surveyed agreed with the philosophy that home management deals with a way of life. According to the responses, subject matter emphasis in home management, in order of importance, were as follows: the efficient home manager; time and energy management; philosophy; and the management of food, finances, housing, health and recreation, community problems, family care, and clothing. Elliott concluded these findings suggest a continued emphasis upon skills and reflect little change since the Judy study (23) conducted in 1929. Elliott recommended that home management courses teach not only practices and skills, but should lead the

student to perceive ideas, attitudes and beliefs which are carried into adult life.

Holbrook (22), in a study of management problems of resident students, undertook to determine the number and kinds of management problems occurring in the residence course. Both students and advisers participated in the study at Purdue University during 1957. The investigator attempted to identify areas of work in the home management houses to which greater attention might be given by teachers and advisers. The purposes were to find situations which students considered to be problems and to compare the student lists with the advisers' lists.

Indications from the Holbrook study (22) were that problems and their percentage of occurrence and order of incidence were essentially the same for both students and advisers. Use and care of equipment was the most prevalent problem, with housekeeping procedures, time management, preparation and service of food, small equipment, and group living listed in decreasing order and percentage of incidence.

A study by Hohenhau (21) at the University of Minnesota in 1959 was conducted to ascertain faculty and student perceptions of learning experiences during home management residence. Both students and faculty were requested to rate the residence course in relation to other laboratory courses.

A majority of the faculty, 98.6 per cent, and of the students, 88.9 per cent, rated the home management residence course as equal to or more valuable than other laboratory courses. A review of the responses led to the implication that when the management of resources was emphasized as a goal in the activities of the home management residence course, students attributed greater educational importance to the course.

Dopson (11) surveyed Auburn University students who had taken the residence course sometime during the interval of September, 1959 through August, 1961. The purpose of the study was to determine whether the home management residence course met the needs of students in relation to some of the social and economic changes and technological developments which influence all aspects of American life. The following suggestions were made in relation to course content: more information and experience be provided in time, money, and energy management; additional information and experience be provided in selection, use and care of home furnishings, furniture and household equipment; greater emphasis on human values and successful group living; better methods in evaluation for both groups and individuals; more realistic up-to-date experiences similar to home experiences; additional house meetings, individual conferences, and more class lectures.



Morgan (28), in 1962, sought to determine the inter-relationships of the goals and values of the traditional residence course and the competences considered fundamental to effective living. Of 153 institutions representing all regions of the United States surveyed, a 74 per cent response was tabulated. Data suggested considerable consistency in the practices of institutions and the experiences of home management students in the institutions included in the study. However, faculty and students did not rate the home management values in the same order of importance.

Morgan (28), on the basis of the data, recommended that more research should be directed toward understanding the student rather than at understanding the environment. Students change during the college years. This change cannot be fully understood until the student is studied in relation to the college environment, and the home management residence may be a very important exemplar of that environment.

#### Methods of Teaching

Mau (27) investigated the cognitive objectives of home management programs at the undergraduate level. Responses were received from 82 per cent of the professors to whom questionnaires were mailed. A set of 50 taxonomy-classified cognitive objectives was proposed for the development of

undergraduate home management courses. The respondents were requested to rate these cognitive objectives according to their opinions as to importance in teaching home management.

Among the 50 cognitive objectives listed by Mau (27), application was rated by the respondents as the most essential objective in home management education; analysis and synthesis each rated less essential than knowledge, and less than half as essential as application. Knowledge was rated as average on the essential scale in relation to the five more complex classes of cognitive objectives.

Mau (27), in summarizing the opinions of home management teachers, concluded that management curriculum be studied with regard to the development of subject matter leading to more complex cognitive behavior. This analysis also indicated that teachers in the home management area of home economics need to examine their choices of learning and evaluation experiences relevant to application, analysis and synthesis objectives.

Robbins (31), in 1961, evaluated the home management courses at Montana State College by comparing managerial test scores of 100 home economics graduates and a group of non-home economics majors, 51 wives of campus students. The two groups were compared in the areas of human resource

management, material resource management, and work simplification. The test scores in managerial abilities were significantly higher for the home economics graduates. Findings revealed that the concepts taught were the valuable part of the home management training, while the performance of individual tasks appeared less important.

A study was conducted by Bell (6) to ascertain the differences in attainment of basic home management concepts of freshman students who were taught by the conceptual method and those who were taught by the factual method of presentation. The findings suggest that basic home management concepts can be developed by freshman students. Statistical findings indicated that the students taught by the conceptual method had significantly higher scores on all three criteria tests than the students taught by the factual method. These findings tend to imply the need to strengthen the development of major concepts in the field of home management education.

Babcock and Ater (4) reported a study conducted at the Carnegie Institute of Technology in 1965, dealing with the analysis of home management education. A comparison of the pretest and retest given to the home management resident students was found to be inconclusive evidence on which to base a change in policy. State supervisors were surveyed to

determine practices and requirements of other states. Forty-nine state supervisors responded to a questionnaire; 41 reported teacher certification requirements included living in the home management house. The findings indicated that students receive many benefits from the home management residence course. Further research was recommended before proposing any changes in the traditional home management residence requirement.

Durr (13), in a 1968 study conducted at Texas Woman's University, surveyed leaders and directors of home management houses in 11 southern states to appraise policies and practices relative to home management residence courses. The long-range purpose of the study was to provide a basis for the improvement of home management education at the undergraduate level. In general, suggestions for improvement seemed to be related to maintaining qualified faculty personnel to direct and guide student achievements, to the need for a well defined theory underlying the course objectives and content, and to the encouragement of students in assuming responsibility for decision-making.

#### Home Management Facilities

To meet the changing needs of students the facilities for teaching the home management residence course have been,

and are presently being studied. Increased enrollment and the changing student population have caused administrators to question the use of the traditional home management house. The following studies are reports of how some colleges and universities have attempted to meet the challenge of providing for the increasing numbers of students at reasonable costs and with adequate supervision.

An experiment conducted at the University of Utah in 1954 and reported by Cutler (8) revealed that 97 per cent of home economics graduates lived in small apartments for the first five years following marriage. These findings were used as a basis for planning a home living center consisting of six small apartments, a central living area and a workshop-lecture-storage area. Group planning, group thinking, and social activities provided valuable group experiences.

Providing a home management residence course for married students with families and homes of their own presented an urgent reason for examining the resident program at Texas Technological College. This led to an experiment in 1957 involving a course in home management for married students. Having the married students use their own home as a laboratory for home management was found to be very successful. The learning was not identical with that of the single student living in the residence house, but there were

equivalent or comparable opportunities for training in good home management. Objectives, plans, records, and evaluations made and kept by individual students during the course convinced Drew and Tinsley (12) that real needs had been met. The students favored this attempt to keep home management compatible with changing times.

An experiment at the University of Missouri, by Halloway in 1960 (20), made use of university apartments for married students for the home management residence course. The use of these temporary residences broadened student experiences and aided the administration in planning for the type of housing suitable for teaching future courses in home management residence at this institution.

The University of Nebraska in 1960 provided a substitute course in special problems for students married five or more years. As reported by Davis (10), for the first four weeks the students participated in the activities of the management house during the day. The last four weeks they carried on special managerial experiences in their own apartments under the guidance of a graduate student. This experiment involved using the student's home as a means of meeting needs of married students in a practical way.

In an attempt to discover an effective way of fulfilling student needs at Appalachian State Teachers College in

1965, an apartment structure was built for home management residence to approximate a normal beginning homemaking experience. As reported by Allgood (1), the structure consisted of two large and two small apartments. Students were in residence for one full quarter and rotated to a different apartment at mid-term. The home economics faculty considered the change in apartment arrangement provided a valuable management experience for the students.

The Journal of Home Economics in the May, 1968 issue (15), presented a discussion of a symposium on "Facilities for Home Management Residence." Several different approaches for providing facilities for teaching home management were presented. The four institutions: Texas Technological College, University of Missouri, University of Rhode Island, and University of Nebraska made a commitment to home management residence as an important, although not the only means of teaching home management. The article presented a discussion of new or relatively new physical facilities which have been consciously planned to support effective teaching of home management in these four institutions.

Texas Technological College provides not only the facilities of the traditional residence house but also two mobile homes for home management residence. The students divide a nine-week residence period between the house and

mobile units. This allows for a variety of learning experiences in personal and home management. Different methods of teaching as well as different types of residential facilities are being explored. Consideration is now being given to more mobile units or apartments as part of the overall expansion and modernization program. Because only three or four students live as an independent unit in a mobile home or apartment, each can assume more managerial responsibilities and gain more practical homemaking experiences than would be possible for a larger number of students living together with a faculty adviser (15).

At the University of Missouri, a multi-use, three level Home Management Center is attached to the home economics building by a corridor. The students experience various types and sizes of living arrangements. In planning for effective use of all available resources, resident students are urged to use only the necessary amount of time on tasks to learn needed basic skills. To implement this idea and to minimize the household labor aspect of home management residence, maid service is available at the student manager's discretion (15).

At the University of Rhode Island, the management laboratory consists of five interrelated units of different sizes and types of arrangements. The facility is a



laboratory rather than a house, with at least four different groups operating at one time. Total group unity can be maintained without complete physical or organizational separation (15).

The University of Nebraska utilizes two laboratories, one providing residence and the other non-residence experiences for home management students. No differences exist in course requirements or experiences for students in the two laboratories. Married students use the non-residence laboratory. An effort is made to meet the same course objectives for married students while utilizing different experiences. Students take the home management laboratory course for eight weeks. Three weeks are spent in the laboratory class and five weeks in the actual laboratory portion of the course. Students have a theory course prior to the laboratory course (15).

The report of this symposium pointed out four experiences that support not only the objectives of the traditional learning experience of the resident course but the underlying philosophy of home management. The four experiences that help to highlight the accomplishment of the objectives of home management were as follows:

- 1) The student is the manager; development of goals and standards must be done by the student.

- 2) The laboratory situation provides opportunities to set goals and realize them, to choose among and utilize resources and to carry out and evaluate the choices made.
- 3) The value of democracy is strengthened through the home management course. Group planning and evaluating sessions lead themselves naturally to the inclusion of the democratic processes.
- 4) Special teaching aids are needed to take the laboratory course in home management more than just a course to utilize household activities and entertainment as sources of experiences.

This chapter has presented a review of some of the literature concerning the development of home management as an area of specialized study in the field of home economics education. The principles of management were first developed in industry and later applied to activities carried on in the home. The basic philosophy has been that home management is a way of life. Good home management was first considered to consist of developing household skills and conserving material things; later the concept has broadened to include managing income so as to obtain the material things needed in maintaining a home.

Passage of the Smith-Hughes Act stimulated the fast growth of home management residences on college campuses. As a part of vocational home economics teacher training, a period of in-residence experience was recommended. Teaching home management on college campuses began with the "practice

house" concept of keeping a model home. The subject later developed to include the management of all resources; especially time and money. More recently the subject has come to include the management of human resources, especially energy and intelligence.

All studies reviewed have related concern about methods and facilities. Many institutions of higher learning have examined objectives, goals, and methods of teaching. Recently methods of teaching concepts and a more complex factor, the development of cognitive behavior, have been investigated. Moreover the need to expand or improve facilities has brought about experiments in the use of apartments and mobile units for home living. The use of other laboratory methods as an alternate for the home management residence course has been explored.

Gross and Crandall (18) have stated that the fundamental purpose of management is to bring about change in an orderly way. It is recognized, however, that the process of management does not change; only the goals and resources are altered.

### CHAPTER III

#### P L A N   O F   P R O C E D U R E

##### PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The problem was a survey of areas of emphasis, methods of teaching and facilities used in home management education in institutions of higher learning. The overall aim of the study was to ascertain the policies and current practices in home management education in colleges and universities in the United States as a basis for future curriculum development. The specific purposes of the study were to determine:

- 1) The implications of current trends in home management education.
- 2) The differences in the teaching methods employed in introductory courses in home management and those used in the resident course.
- 3) The extent to which independent study or problem-solving laboratory experiences have replaced the traditional home management resident course.
- 4) The correlation between theory and practices in home management.
- 5) The methods considered effective for teaching home management at the college level.
- 6) The changes in emphasis since the inception of home management in the home economics educational program.

As a background for the present study, particularly for the preparation of the instrument, the author reviewed studies concerned with home management and its development. Recent publications, both books and journals, were surveyed for information concerning the emphasis on concepts and the effective methods of instruction recommended by leaders in the field of home management.

### INSTRUMENT

The survey method of research was employed for the study. To solicit information concerning current practices in home management education, a questionnaire was developed by the author and mailed to 120 selected colleges and universities. The colleges and universities were of various sizes and representative of all geographical areas of the United States.

The questionnaire, "A Survey of Home Management to Appraise Areas of Emphasis, Teaching Methods and Facilities," consisting of three parts, may be found in Appendix A.

Part I, entitled General Information, requested general information concerning the respondent, the institution and the home economics department. Specific information regarding the enrollment of the school, geographic location, current enrollment of the home economics department and department faculty was provided.

Part II, Definition of Terms, consisted of a clarification of terminology. This clarification was considered necessary to avoid misinterpretation of the questions regarding information requested (Appendix A).

Part III consisted of a questionnaire concerning information requested in the three areas with which this study was primarily concerned, namely, areas of emphasis, methods of teaching, and facilities used in teaching home management.

Each respondent indicated the degree of emphasis given to each of 30 concepts for both the introductory and the resident course for home management. The degree of emphasis was indicated by checking "None," "Little," "Some," or "Much."

Other portions of Part III of the questionnaire were concerned with questions related to curriculum offerings and requirements and teaching methods, and to teaching facilities provided by the universities and colleges participating in the survey. Also included were some open end questions requesting opinions and suggestions of responding faculty members.

#### SELECTION OF SAMPLE

A list of colleges and universities in the United States offering home economics programs was obtained from the April,

1968 issue of the Journal of Home Economics. This list of institutions of higher learning offering degree programs in home economics was checked with the 1968 edition of the Blue Book of American Colleges and Universities (34) to determine the size and location of the schools. The survey was planned to obtain information from colleges and universities varying in total enrollment and representative of all geographical areas of the United States. A list of 120 institutions who met these specifications was prepared.

The list from the Journal of Home Economics was used for specific names and addresses of directors or chairmen of individual home economics departments. No other current list of home economics directors or professors of home management education was available. Since the survey was to be obtained via mail, questionnaires sent to a specific individual and to a correct address was considered necessary to facilitate the completion of the survey and to expedite the study.

### COLLECTION OF DATA

The selection of the colleges and universities to be included in the study constituted the first step in the collection of data. The second step consisted of the addressing and mailing of the forms. Two complete copies of the questionnaire were mailed to the Chairman of the Department of

Home Economics of the 120 colleges and universities selected on March 15, 1969. The two questionnaires were accompanied by a letter requesting the cooperation of the department faculty in supplying information concerning home management (Appendix A). Of the two questionnaires sent to each institution, one was to be completed by a professor or instructor of home management. The second questionnaire was to be filled in by the resident-instructor of the home management residence. Each of the above named respondents was expected to have completed two or more years of experience in teaching or supervising home management. The department chairman was requested to complete one of the questionnaires in instances in which staff members did not meet the specified qualifications, or in small departments in which only one person or no faculty member was employed specifically for teaching home management. An addressed stamped return envelope was enclosed for the convenience of the respondents. Several weeks later a follow-up letter was sent, as a reminder, to the schools which had not yet returned the completed questionnaire (Appendix B).

Data were collected during March, April, and May of the 1968-1969 school year. It was requested that replies be relative to practices current during the year of this study.



### ANALYSIS OF DATA

Data in this study are classified according to the geographical area of the United States, size of the institution, and size of the home economics department. Geographical regions used are: Northern, Atlantic, Central, Southern, and Pacific (Appendix C). Figures designating the number of undergraduate majors were used since the home management courses studied are undergraduate courses.

Pertinent findings were organized for analysis and discussion into three main classifications; namely, areas of emphases, methods of teaching, and home management facilities pertaining to home management education. Data were categorized for analysis into three major groups: responses indicated by the department chairman, by the professor-instructor, and by the resident-instructor. The data were further organized to examine the differences between the emphasis on concepts in the introductory home management course and in the more advanced resident home management course.

Responses recorded and tabulated from the three groups specified above were analyzed using the chi-square technique to determine differences in the opinions of the different groups concerning emphasis on concepts in home management.

A significant chi-square value indicates differences between the variables in the population from which the sample was drawn. From these findings, a hierarchy of methods and emphasis was formulated according to the rankings indicated by the faculty responding. When the chi-square values were significant the contingency-coefficient was calculated to determine the strength of the relationships between the variables.

## CHAPTER IV

### P R E S E N T A T I O N   A N D   A N A L Y S I S O F   D A T A

This research study has involved a survey to investigate areas of emphasis, methods of teaching, and facilities used in teaching home management at the undergraduate college level. The study was concerned with opinions reported by teachers as to the degree of emphasis on concepts in home management education. The primary purpose of the survey was to determine the implications of current trends in home management education and whether the reported emphases contribute to the desired competences as recommended by the American Home Economics Association "New Directions" (2).

Data were obtained by means of a structured questionnaire mailed to 120 selected colleges and universities in the United States. To facilitate the interpretation of findings a plan of presentation was developed. The data will be presented in the following manner:

- 1) General information concerning institutions and faculty participating in the study.
- 2) Analysis of the data obtained from responses as to the degree of emphasis on concepts.

- 3) Analysis of differences in the degree of emphasis given to concepts in the introductory course and the resident course in home management.
- 4) Teaching methods used in the introductory course and the resident course.
- 5) Facilities provided and the administration of the resident course.

### INSTITUTIONS

Two questionnaires were mailed to 120 selected colleges and universities in the United States. The colleges were selected to be representative of all geographical regions of the United States and represented different sizes of institutions and departments of home economics. In selecting institutions an effort was made to include private and church supported schools as well as state supported institutions. More state than private or church supported colleges and universities returned a completed questionnaire to be included in this study.

Responses received before June 1, 1969, were tabulated for study and analysis. Replies were received from 101 colleges and universities. Of these institutions, 82 conformed to the criteria established for the study. A total of 123 completed questionnaires were received from these 82 institutions. Nineteen of the 101 institutions did not meet

the specified qualifications and were not included in the analysis for the following reasons:

<u>Reasons</u>	<u>Number</u>
No home management program	6
No staff member met the study criteria	7
Department under reorganization	1
Incomplete questionnaires	5

The responding colleges and universities were classified by states into five geographical regions. A complete list of the states and their regional classification may be found in Appendix C. The five geographical regions with the number and the proportion of schools represented were as follows:

<u>Geographical Region</u>	<u>Colleges and Universities</u>	<u>Per cent of Total</u>
	<u>Number</u>	
Northern	13	15.6
Atlantic	16	19.5
Central	22	27.0
Southern	21	25.7
Pacific	10	12.2

The 82 institutions in the study were representative of all sections of the United States. The Central Region was the largest in land area and in number of states, comprising 27

per cent of the total representation in this study. The Pacific Region was the smallest region represented, 12.2 per cent of the total. Over half of the institutions reporting from this region are located in the state of California.

The responding institutions included private, church and state colleges and universities. The majority were co-educational schools but several women's colleges were represented in the study.

The reported size of the institutions was based on total enrollment during the 1968-1969 school year. The size of the home economics department was based on the 1968-1969 enrollment of undergraduate students majoring in home economics. Table I lists the number of institutions according to region, total enrollment, and the size of the home economics department in each region.

The data include a good distribution of all sizes of institutions and departments of home economics. The 82 institutions were fairly evenly distributed between schools with a total enrollment of less than 7,000, 7,000 to 15,000, and more than 15,000 enrollment. The size of the colleges and universities ranged from a total enrollment of 800, for a college located in the Southern Region, to 43,000 for a university located in the Central Region. The mean enrollment for the 82 institutions was 11,866 students.

TABLE I  
NUMBER OF PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHICAL  
REGION AND ENROLLMENT

Region	Institutions		Enrollment						
			Total			Home Economics			
	Num- ber	Per cent	1,000 to 6,999	7,000 to 14,999	15,000 or More	29 to 299	300 to 599	600 to 899	900 or More
Northern	13	15.7	5	4	4	5	5	1	2
Atlantic	16	19.5	6	6	4	7	5	3	1
Central	22	26.9	5	6	11	7	7	4	4
Southern	21	25.7	6	9	6	11	6	2	2
Pacific	10	12.2	5	3	2	8	2	0	0
Total Number of Institu- tions	82	100.0	27	28	27	38	25	10	9

The enrollment in the home economics departments for this study ranged from 29 to 2,350 undergraduate majors in home economics. The overall mean enrollment for the 82 home economics departments was 403 students. Of the 82 departments represented in the study, 63 had an enrollment of less than 600 and 38 of these departments had less than 300 students majoring in home economics. This distribution appears to be representative of the size of home economics department occurring most frequently. The number of students majoring in an area of home economics is not a true picture of the total student enrollment for the departments. Many students from other disciplines elect to enroll in home economics courses, but total student enrollment was not requested for consideration in this study.

The number of home economics faculty ranged from two for a small college in the Pacific Region to 113 full-time teachers for a university in the Atlantic Region. Seven of the institutions employed 50 or more faculty members. Only 22 of the total 82 institutions reported employing more than 25 full-time faculty members. The overall mean was 19 for the reported number of faculty members employed by the 82 departments of home economics.

The total enrollment of the reporting colleges and universities did not necessarily predict the size nor enrollment



of the home economics department. One university in the Northern Region with less than 5,000 total enrollment reported the number of students majoring in home economics to be 1,650, while in the Central Region a university with 43,000 total enrollment had only 620 home economics majors. The student per teacher ratio could not be predicted accurately by the reported enrollment of the home economics department as illustrated by the following:

<u>Region</u>	<u>Group Mean</u>		<u>Student-Teacher Ratio</u>
	<u>Home Economics Enrollment</u>	<u>Number of Faculty</u>	
Northern	488	20	24.4
Atlantic	445	31	14.4
Central	549	23	23.9
Southern	359	15	23.9
Pacific	173	6	28.8

The list above indicates the highest number of students per teacher ratio was in the Pacific Region, while the Atlantic Region had the lowest student-teacher ratio. As previously stated the number of home economics students reported were undergraduate majors and not the total department enrollment. The comparison of enrollment, number of faculty and student-teacher ratio may not be a true picture of the actual situations.

The home economics department was a separate or independent school or college in 32 of the 82 participating

institutions. The responses indicated that most of the remaining home economics departments were associated with the Schools or Colleges of Applied Arts and Sciences, Agriculture, Education, and Liberal Arts.

### AREAS OF EMPHASIS

For the purposes of analysis the 30 items listed in section three of the questionnaire (Appendix A) as concepts were grouped into six areas of emphasis: I Skills, II Values and goals, III Management process, IV Environmental factors that influence use of resources, V Work simplification and VI Problem solving. The classification of the 30 concepts into these six areas of emphasis is recorded in Table II.

A total of 123 completed questionnaires were received from the 82 colleges and universities. The respondents were professors with at least two years of experience in the instruction of home management. The resident-instructors were home management teachers who had lived in the housing facility for two or more years. The investigator included the chairmen or directors of home economics departments as sources of information since the chairmen would be expected to have a general knowledge of the subject under investigation and to be familiar with teaching practices under her direction. Since four respondents from small departments

TABLE II  
CLASSIFICATION OF CONCEPTS ACCORDING TO SIX AREAS  
OF EMPHASIS IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Area of Emphasis	Concept
I: Skills	
9	Social responsibilities
13	Qualities of hospitality
14	Development of skills and techniques
15	Use and care of equipment
II: Values and goals	
1	Formation of values and goals
5	Influences of environment
6	Perception of family roles
10	Qualities of maturity
24	Recognition and appreciation of efforts of others
30	Professional qualities
III: Management processes	
2	Decision-making process
4	Process of management
7	Qualities of leadership
12	Rapport in group relations
20	Family financial management
21	Democratic processes in group living
IV: Environmental influences	
18	Effect of environmental and economic factors on use of resources
19	Relationship of family life cycle to use of resources
26	Sources of consumer information
29	Management for working mothers as well as for full-time homemakers

TABLE II (Continued)  
 CLASSIFICATION OF CONCEPTS ACCORDING TO SIX AREAS  
 OF EMPHASIS IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Area of Emphasis	Concept
V: Work simplification 8 17 22 23	Wise use of leisure time Work simplification techniques Emphasis on the process rather than the product Variety rather than repetitive skills
VI: Problem solving 3 11 16 25 27	Problem solving Faculty-student relations Management applied to real situations Evaluation of and by peer group Importance of people instead of things

qualified in all three categories their responses were tabulated with those of the resident-instructors. The table below indicates the status of the respondents and the proportion each group is of the total:

<u>Status of Respondents</u>	<u>Respondents</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
Department chairmen	39	31.7
Professors	38	30.9
Resident-instructors	46	37.4

Tabulations were made of the responses from the chairmen, professors, and resident-instructors and recorded according to the degree of emphasis indicated: "None," "Little," "Some," or "Much" for each concept area. Table III records the total number of responses from the three groups of respondents. The total responses relative to the practices in teaching home management are not the same for the introductory and the resident course. The respondents completed only the portion of the questionnaire that applied to their individual departments. Sixteen institutions did not offer a resident course in home management. Nine colleges and universities did not include the introductory course in their curriculum. For the purposes of comparison and discussion, proportions of the responses as to the degree of emphasis in the six areas were recorded in Table IV.

TABLE III

RESPONSES BY THE CHAIRMEN, PROFESSORS AND RESIDENT-INSTRUCTORS AS TO THE  
DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Area	Degree of Emphasis to Concepts								Total
	None		Little		Some		Much		
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	
I: Skills									
Respondent									
Chairmen	32	16.4	51	26.3	64	33.0	47	24.2	194
Professors	62	22.2	65	23.3	91	32.6	61	21.8	279
Resident- instructors	23	8.2	32	11.5	103	36.9	121	43.3	279
Total	117		148		258		229		752
$\chi^2=58.78$ $df=6$ $P<.01$									
II: Values and goals									
Respondent									
Chairmen	14	5.0	45	16.0	119	42.0	105	37.0	283
Professors	30	7.2	66	15.9	161	38.8	158	38.0	415
Resident- instructors	15	3.5	49	11.4	153	35.7	211	49.2	428
Total	59		160		433		474		1126
$\chi^2=19.61$ $df=6$ $P<.01$									

TABLE III (Continued)

RESPONSES BY THE CHAIRMEN, PROFESSORS AND RESIDENT-INSTRUCTORS AS TO THE  
DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Area	Degree of Emphasis to Concepts								Total
	None		Little		Some		Much		
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	
III: Management process									
Respondent									
Chairmen	18	6.2	34	11.8	89	31.0	146	51.0	287
Professors	34	8.1	67	16.0	127	30.3	191	45.5	419
Resident- instructors	11	2.6	44	10.4	109	25.9	257	61.0	421
Total	63		145		325		594		1127
$X^2=28.84$ $df=6$ $P<.01$									
IV: Environmental influences									
Respondent									
Chairmen	12	5.1	31	13.4	92	39.8	96	41.6	231
Professors	27	8.0	46	13.6	119	35.3	145	43.0	337
Resident- instructors	19	5.2	35	9.7	122	33.9	185	51.3	361
Total	58		112		333		426		929
$X^2=10.67$ $df=6$ $P<.05$									

TABLE III (Continued)

RESPONSES BY THE CHAIRMEN, PROFESSORS AND RESIDENT-INSTRUCTORS AS TO THE  
DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Area	Degree of Emphasis to Concepts								Total
	None		Little		Some		Much		
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	
V: Work simplification									
Respondent									
Chairmen	14	7.0	39	20.0	80	41.0	62	32.0	195
Professors	29	10.6	51	18.6	103	37.6	91	33.2	274
Resident-instructors	12	4.0	37	13.0	100	35.0	135	48.0	284
Total	55		127		283		288		753
$\chi^2=23.22$ $df=6$ $P<.01$									
VI: Problem solving									
Respondent									
Chairmen	14	6.0	36	15.0	63	26.4	125	52.5	238
Professors	42	12.0	42	12.0	93	26.7	171	49.1	348
Resident-instructors	15	4.5	28	8.4	71	21.4	217	65.6	331
Total	71		106		227		513		917
$\chi^2=29.77$ $df=6$ $P<.01$									



TABLE IV

PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES BY THE CHAIRMEN, PROFESSORS AND  
RESIDENT-INSTRUCTORS AS TO THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN  
TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Areas of Emphasis	Responses			
	None	Little	Some	Much
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent
I: Skills				
Chairmen	16.4	26.3	33.0	24.2
Professors	22.2	23.3	32.6	21.8
Resident-instructors	8.2	11.5	36.9	43.4
II: Values and goals				
Chairmen	5.0	16.0	42.0	37.0
Professors	7.2	15.9	38.8	38.0
Resident-instructors	3.5	11.4	35.7	49.2
III: Management process				
Chairmen	6.2	11.8	31.0	51.0
Professors	8.1	16.0	30.3	45.5
Resident-instructors	2.6	10.4	25.9	61.0
IV: Environmental influences				
Chairmen	5.1	13.4	39.8	41.6
Professors	8.0	13.6	35.3	43.0
Resident-instructors	5.2	9.7	33.8	51.3
V: Work simplification				
Chairmen	7.0	20.0	41.0	32.0
Professors	10.6	18.6	37.6	33.2
Resident-instructors	4.0	13.0	35.0	48.0
VI: Problem solving				
Chairmen	6.0	15.0	26.4	52.5
Professors	12.0	12.0	26.7	49.1
Resident-instructors	4.5	8.4	21.4	65.6

In each area a higher percentage of resident-instructors than of chairmen or professors checked the higher categories in the scale for degrees of emphasis. The predominant tendency was for the chairmen to check a greater degree of emphasis in all areas than did the professors. The exception was in the area of problem solving. A higher percentage of chairmen checked the lower end of the scale of emphasis for this area than did the professors or resident-instructors. Over 80 per cent of the chairmen marked the "Some" and "Much" columns in Areas II and IV, and over 70 per cent checked the higher degrees of emphasis in Areas II, V, and VI. The "Much" and "Some" categories for Area I were checked by a smaller percentage of chairmen, 57.2 per cent of the total, than for any other area. More professors than respondents in the other groups consistently checked the "None" and "Little" columns indicating, in their opinions, less emphasis in all six areas than did the chairmen or resident-instructors. In Area I, 45.7 per cent of the professors indicated "None" or "Little" emphasis and 54.4 per cent checked "Some" or "Much" for the concepts listed.

Chi-square analysis of the numbers of responses from the three groups of respondents as to the degrees of emphasis given to each of the six areas (Table V) revealed a significant difference between the degrees of emphasis checked for

TABLE V  
SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES BY CHAIRMEN,  
PROFESSORS AND RESIDENT-INSTRUCTORS AS TO  
DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN  
SIX AREAS OF HOME MANAGEMENT

Area of Emphasis	Chi-square Value	Degrees of Freedom	Level of Significance
I: Skills	58.78	6	$P < .01$
II: Values and goals	19.61	6	$P < .01$
III: Management process	28.84	6	$P < .01$
IV: Environmental influences	10.67	6	$P < .05$
V: Work simplification	23.22	6	$P < .01$
VI: Problem solving	29.77	6	$P < .01$

all six areas of emphasis: Area I, Skills; Area II, Values and goals; Area III, Management processes; Area IV, Environmental influences; Area V, Work simplification; and Area VI, Problem solving. Chi-squares for all areas were highly significant except for Area IV. The differences for Area IV were significant at the 5.0 per cent level of confidence.

In Area I, the observed number of responses for the resident-instructors was higher than the expected number in the "Much" and "Some" categories. In each of the other five concept areas the expected numbers were higher in the "Some" category than the observed numbers for the resident-instructors, while in the "Much" column the observed numbers were consistently higher than the expected numbers of responses for this group.

The observed numbers were higher than expected for the chairmen and professors in the "Some" column for Areas II, III, V, and VI. The reverse was true in the "Much" column, with the expected higher than the observed numbers. In Area I, the expected numbers were greater in both the "Some" and "Much" categories of responses for the chairmen and professors.

According to the opinions and responses as to the degree of emphasis by the three groups of respondents, the six areas

would tend to fall into the following descending rank order of concept position:

<u>Area</u>		<u>Chairmen</u>	<u>Pro- fessors</u>	<u>Resident- Instruc- tors</u>
I	Skills	3	6	6
II	Values and goals	4	4	3
III	Management processes	2	2	4
IV	Environmental influences	6	3	2
V	Work simplification	5	5	5
VI	Problem solving	1	1	1

The professors and resident-instructors agreed as to the relative concept position in the area of problem solving, while a small percentage of the chairmen would attach as high a degree of emphasis to this area. The rank order for chairmen and professors agreed as to relative concept positions in the areas of environmental influences, and values and goals.

Since all chi-square values were significant for each of the analyses of the degree of concept emphasis checked by chairmen, professors, and resident-instructors the contingency coefficients were calculated to determine the strength

of the associations. The contingency-coefficients are shown below in descending rank order:

<u>Concept Area</u>		<u>Contingency-coefficients</u>
I	Skills	.27
V	Work simplification	.17
VI	Problem solving	.17
III	Management processes	.14
II	Values and goals	.13
IV	Environmental influences	.10

#### HOME MANAGEMENT COURSES

In order to compare the concept emphasis between the introductory home management course and the resident home management course, the responses were tabulated and recorded (Table VI). The observed numbers from each group of respondents were combined and recorded using the "None," "Little," "Some" or "Much" ratings for both the introductory and resident courses. Percentages were computed and recorded in Table VII, as a basis for discussions in the comparison of the two courses. Examination of the responses concerning the introductory course indicated that more than 73 per cent of the respondents checked the "Some" or "Much" category for Areas II, III, and IV. Less emphasis was indicated for Area I, as only 43.8 per cent of the responses were in the "Some" to "Much" category for this area. For Area V, Work

TABLE VI

RESPONSES AS TO THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS  
IN SIX AREAS IN THE INTRODUCTORY AND THE RESIDENT  
COURSES IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Course	Area I: Skills								
	None		Little		Some		Much		Total
	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	
Introductory	95	28.5	92	27.6	99	29.7	47	14.1	333
Resident	22	5.2	56	13.3	157	37.9	182	43.5	419
Total	117		148		258		229		752
$\chi^2=139.83$ 3 df $P<.01$									
Course	Area II: Values and Goals								
	None		Little		Some		Much		Total
	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	
Introductory	38	7.5	71	14.0	210	41.6	186	36.8	505
Resident	21	3.3	89	14.3	223	36.0	288	46.3	621
Total	59		160		433		474		1126
$\chi^2=34.28$ 3 df $P<.01$									
Course	Area III: Management Process								
	None		Little		Some		Much		Total
	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	Num- ber	Per- cent	
Introductory	42	8.3	92	18.4	163	32.4	205	40.8	502
Resident	21	3.3	53	8.4	162	25.9	389	63.0	625
Total	63		145		325		594		1127
$\chi^2=124.36$ 3 df $P<.01$									

TABLE VI (Continued)

RESPONSES AS TO THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS  
IN SIX AREAS IN THE INTRODUCTORY AND THE RESIDENT  
COURSES IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Course	Area IV: Environmental Influences								Total
	None		Little		Some		Much		
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	
Introductory	26	6.0	35	8.2	163	38.5	199	47.0	423
Resident	32	6.3	77	15.2	170	33.6	227	44.8	506
Total	58		112		333		426		929
$\chi^2=11.19$ $3\text{ df}$ $P<.05$									
Course	Area V: Work Simplification								Total
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	
Introductory	41	12.0	76	22.3	126	36.9	98	28.7	341
Resident	14	3.4	51	12.3	157	38.1	190	46.1	412
Total	55		127		283		288		753
$\chi^2=44.66$ $3\text{ df}$ $P<.01$									
Course	Area VI: Problem Solving								Total
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	
Introductory	55	13.0	80	19.0	114	26.9	174	41.1	423
Resident	16	3.2	26	5.2	113	22.8	339	68.7	494
Total	71		106		227		513		917
$\chi^2=97.09$ $3\text{ df}$ $P<.01$									



TABLE VII  
PERCENTAGES OF RESPONSES AS TO THE DEGREE OF EMPHASIS  
GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN THE INTRODUCTORY  
AND THE RESIDENT COURSES IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Area of Emphasis	Responses			
	None	Little	Some	Much
	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent	Per cent
I: Skills				
Introductory	28.5	27.6	29.7	14.1
Resident	5.2	13.3	37.9	43.5
II: Values and goals				
Introductory	7.5	14.0	41.6	36.8
Resident	3.3	14.3	36.0	46.3
III: Management process				
Introductory	8.3	18.4	32.4	40.8
Resident	3.3	8.4	25.9	63.0
IV: Environmental influences				
Introductory	6.0	8.2	38.5	47.0
Resident	6.3	15.2	33.6	44.8
V: Work simplification				
Introductory	12.0	22.3	36.9	28.7
Resident	3.4	12.3	38.1	46.1
VI: Problem solving				
Introductory	13.0	19.0	26.9	41.1
Resident	3.2	5.2	22.8	68.7

simplification, and Area VI, Problem solving, the "Some" and "Much" columns were checked by a total of 65.6 per cent and 18.0 per cent, respectively.

<u>Concept Area</u>	<u>Rank Order</u>	
	<u>Introductory Course</u>	<u>Resident Course</u>
I Skills	6	5
II Values and goals	2	4
III Management processes	3	2
IV Environmental influences	1	6
V Work simplification	5	3
VI Problem solving	4	1

For the resident course, 78.4 per cent or more of all the respondents checked the "Some" and "Much" categories for each of six concept areas. The greatest difference between the extent of emphasis between the two courses was evident for the concept area, Skills. Approximately twice as many respondents checked the "Much" and "Some" categories for the resident course as checked these same categories for the introductory course. The greatest percentage of "Some" and "Much" responses for any concept area was for problem solving, checked by 91.5 per cent of all respondents for the resident course.

The data were analyzed using the chi-square technique. In each of the six concept areas, the extent of emphasis

checked by the 123 respondents for the introductory course were compared to the responses for the resident course (Table VIII). The chi-square value was highly significant ( $P < .01$ ) in the analysis of differences in the degree of emphases given to the two courses for Areas I, II, III, V, and VI. Analysis for Area IV, Environmental influences, revealed a chi-square value of 11.19 ( $P < .05$ ).

Since the chi-squares values were significant for all six concept areas the contingency-coefficients were calculated to determine the strength of the associations between responses for the two courses.

<u>Concept Areas</u>		<u>Contingency-coefficients</u>
I	Skills	.40
III	Management processes	.30
VI	Problem solving	.28
V	Work simplification	.24
II	Values and goals	.17
IV	Environmental influences	.10

Data were analyzed for both the introductory and the resident courses to determine the significance of difference in opinions of the 123 respondents as to the extent of emphases given to each of the six concept areas of home management (Tables IX and X).

TABLE VIII  
SUMMARY OF DATA ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES CONCERNING  
DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX  
AREAS IN THE INTRODUCTORY AND THE RESIDENT  
COURSES IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Area of Emphasis	Chi-square Value	Degrees of Freedom	Level of Significance
I: Skills	139.83	3	$P < .01$
II: Values and goals	34.28	3	$P < .01$
III: Management process	124.36	3	$P < .01$
IV: Environmental influences	11.19	3	$P < .05$
V: Work simplification	44.66	3	$P < .01$
VI: Problem solving	97.09	3	$P < .01$

TABLE IX  
RESPONSES AS TO DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN  
THE INTRODUCTORY COURSE IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Area of Emphasis	Degree of Emphasis								Total
	None		Little		Some		Much		
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	
I: Skills	95	28.5	92	27.6	99	29.7	47	14.1	333
II: Values and goals	38	7.5	71	14.0	210	41.6	186	36.8	505
III: Management process	42	8.3	92	18.4	163	32.4	205	40.8	502
IV: Environmental influences	26	6.0	35	8.2	163	38.5	199	47.0	423
V: Work simplifi- cation	41	12.0	76	22.3	126	36.9	98	28.7	341
VI: Problem solving	55	13.0	80	19.0	114	26.9	174	41.1	423
Total	297		446		875		909		2527
$\chi^2=242.20$ $df=15$ $P<.01$									

TABLE X  
RESPONSES AS TO DEGREE OF EMPHASIS GIVEN TO CONCEPTS IN SIX AREAS IN  
THE RESIDENT COURSE IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Area of Emphasis	Degree of Emphasis								Total
	None		Little		Some		Much		
	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	Num- ber	Per cent	
I: Skills	22	5.2	56	13.3	159	37.9	182	43.5	419
II: Values and goals	21	3.3	89	14.3	223	36.0	288	46.3	621
III: Management process	21	3.3	53	8.4	162	25.9	389	63.0	625
IV: Environmental influences	32	6.3	77	15.2	170	33.6	227	44.8	506
V: Work simplifi- cation	14	3.4	51	12.3	157	38.1	190	46.1	412
VI: Problem solving	16	3.2	26	5.2	113	22.8	339	68.7	494
Total	126		352		984		1165		3077
$\chi^2=132.79$ $df=15$ $P<.01$									

Table VII records the percentage of responses concerning concept emphasis within the introductory and resident courses. The 123 respondents tended to agree, according to the percentages checked, in the "Some" and "Much" columns, that each concept is emphasized to some degree in the introductory course. Area II, Values and goals, Area III, Management processes, and Area IV, Environmental influences received, according to the number of responses, the most emphasis in the introductory course. For all but one classification, Area IV, a higher percentage of "Much" and "Some" emphasis was reported in the resident course. The area of skills was emphasized "Little" or "None" in the introductory course and "Much" or "Some" in the resident course. Problem solving was given greater emphasis in the resident course than in any other area.

Chi-square values were highly significant for both the introductory course and the resident course. The contingency-coefficient values were computed to examine the strength of the relationships between degrees of emphasis checked by the respondents for the two home management courses. A contingency-coefficient value of .30 was obtained for the introductory course. For the resident course the contingency-coefficient value was .20.

The strength of the relationship between the degree of emphasis and either the classifications of respondents or the nature of the course was greater in the area of skills than any other concept area. Conversely the strength was lowest in the areas of environmental influences and goals and values.

The introductory course which is designed to teach basic theory, ideas, and principles and is generally scheduled during the freshman or sophomore years would be expected to emphasize different concepts than a more advanced course. Goodyear and Klohr (16) stated in their text, which is widely used for orientation or introduction to home management, that the subject matter in the introductory course is designed for beginning students and non-professional home economics college courses. The aim is to: 1) emphasize managing human and material resources to attain goals based on clearly defined values which contribute to a satisfying life, 2) highlight a few of the society's characteristics that help in understanding the individual and families, 3) present basic principles of management and consider the relation of decision making to them.

Gross and Crandall (18) explained the home management resident course:

The resident course, important in college teaching for several decades, is built upon the



practical application of management to a homelike situation. In practical situations, it is difficult to see and transmit principles. The practice of home management is related to the culture and social environment in which it takes place. Its principles are universal; its application is not. . . . The philosophy of a department is apparent in its resident course. Evidence of the philosophy underlying the resident course may be found in the degree of democracy in its organization. No other course lends itself better to genuine student control than the organization of house activities. True choice-making is possible along with the many decisions necessary to carry them out.

From the findings discussed previously, it appears that the respondents were of the opinion that the introductory course was important for the purpose of teaching basic principles and theory. This opinion agrees with the aims or purposes as set forth by Goodyear and Klohr (13) for a course in introductory home management.

The highly significant rankings ( $P < .01$ ) observed relating to the emphases in the resident course indicates the importance the respondents put upon the application of concepts and principles. The opinions seem to agree with the statement by Gross and Crandall (18) that: "A principle must be tied to something specific before it is effective."

## HOME MANAGEMENT COURSES OFFERED

### Introductory Course

Table XI is a summary of home management courses offered according to the geographical region of the 82 institutions included in the study. Eighty-nine per cent of the participating schools reported teaching an introductory course in home management. Eight colleges indicated the theory or introductory course was not taught until the junior year, just prior to the resident course. Nine of the 82 schools did not offer an introductory course.

There was no definite pattern as to requirements for the introductory course among the 82 colleges and universities. Thirty-five colleges indicated the course was required of all home economics majors regardless of area of specialization. In some schools the basic home management course was considered as a "core" course. Students majoring in general home economics or home economics education in 39 institutions included the introductory course in their required course of study.

### Resident Course

An examination of the data found in Table XI reveals 10 schools had no resident course nor a substitute course.

TABLE XI  
NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS OFFERING HOME MANAGEMENT COURSES ACCORDING  
TO GEOGRAPHICAL REGION OF THE UNITED STATES

Region	Total Num- ber	Courses					
		Introductory		Resident		Special for Married Students	Laboratory or Other
		Offered	Not Offered	Offered	Not Offered		
		Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
Northern	13	13	0	9	3	8	2
Atlantic	16	15	1	11	1	8	4
Central	22	17	5	18	2	12	2
Southern	21	18	3	15	2	11	3
Pacific	10	10	0	4	2	4	4
Total	82	73	9	57	10	43	15

Of the 82 colleges and universities reporting, 69.5 per cent offered a resident home management course. Of the 82 schools, 43 indicated some type of special provisions for married or mature students. Fourteen schools had changed to a laboratory or other type course as an alternate experience for the traditional home management course. The resident course was required for all home economics majors in 13 institutions while 48 required the course only for the general and home economics education majors. Fourteen institutions reported an alternate or substitute course in lieu of the resident requirements. Several colleges mentioned possible exemption from the course in cases involving men students or in extreme hardship cases involving mature students with dependent families.

Six institutions reported as other courses, a field course or a special problems course in place of the home management resident course. The purpose of the other courses in these instances was to focus on management or problems of low income families. Home visits provided an opportunity for students to observe and to assist in the management problems of various income levels and to be of aid to elderly people and to the physically handicapped homemaker.

### TEACHING METHODS

Presentation of subject matter is often the determining factor in the learning process. Methods and ways of teaching are important to the purposes of this investigation which seeks to determine concept emphasis. Both the introductory home management course and the resident home management course were examined to evaluate methods of teaching concepts in home management education.

Educators have given much thought to determining basic concepts and to developing a conceptual framework for more effective teaching. Educationally oriented studies of concepts have been more or less continuously reported since 1904 (6). Concept teaching and planning has been stressed in home economics education for a number of years. The concentration on concepts and conceptual teaching motivated this author to include a question concerning conceptual and factual teaching in the section of the questionnaire dealing with teaching methods. With the exception of three respondents all agreed that a combination of factual and conceptual teaching was used. All respondents indicated more emphasis on the conceptual method of organization and presentation of subject matter for preparation and teaching than on factual teaching.

### Introductory Course

From the 13 methods of teaching listed on the questionnaire all three groups of respondents agreed that the lecture, discussion and problem-solving methods were most used in teaching the introductory course (Table XII). All three groups indicated that television, role playing and field trips were the least used teaching methods. More than 50 per cent of the professors and resident-instructors checked individual reports, films and resource people as methods used. Less than half of the chairmen checked these methods as used in instruction.

The responses to the request to rank three teaching methods believed, from professional experience, to be most effective to emphasize the concepts of the course were not as decisive as the replies concerning methods used. There was less agreement between the three groups as to the effectiveness of the methods listed. Table XIII reports the five methods most often listed by the respondents.

### Resident Course

Examination of the replies concerning the teaching methods in the resident course indicated that the three groups of participants agreed on the most used methods in teaching home management resident course as: problem solving, discussion and demonstrations. According to responses, the

TABLE XII  
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES CONCERNING METHODS USED IN  
TEACHING HOME MANAGEMENT INTRODUCTORY COURSE

Method of Teaching	Respondent		
	Chairman	Professor	Resident
	Number	Number	Instructor Number
Lecture	25	39	30
Demonstrations	14	27	21
Individual reports	17	31	23
Panels	11	16	15
Television	2	2	0
Films	17	24	22
Problem solving	20	30	26
Case studies	20	29	20
Resource people	17	27	24
Field trips	8	7	11
Discussions	23	37	26
Role playing	4	9	8
Group or team	7	11	9
Other	5	5	3

TABLE XIII  
METHODS LISTED AS FIRST, SECOND, AND THIRD CHOICES BY  
RESPONDENTS AS TO THE MOST EFFECTIVE METHODS OF  
TEACHING HOME MANAGEMENT

Respondent	Introductory Course				Resident Course			
	First	Second	Third	To- tal	First	Second	Third	To- tal
Lecture Method								
Chairmen	3	3	5	11	1	0	3	4
Professors	15	3	6	24	1	0	3	4
Resident- instructors	10	4	5	19	1	0	3	4
Total	28	10	16	54	3	0	9	12
Demonstration Method								
Chairmen	3	0	2	5	3	3	6	12
Professors	0	7	2	9	2	9	4	15
Resident- instructors	2	3	2	7	0	6	11	17
Total	5	10	6	21	5	18	21	44
Problem Solving Method								
Chairmen	4	4	4	12	7	7	0	14
Professors	6	5	6	17	12	1	3	16
Resident- instructors	2	5	5	12	13	8	3	24
Total	12	14	15	41	32	16	6	54
Case Study Method								
Chairmen	6	3	4	13	0	0	0	0
Professors	5	11	1	17	1	3	0	4
Resident- instructors	2	5	5	12	0	1	0	1
Total	13	19	10	42	1	4	0	5
Discussion Method								
Chairmen	8	6	3	17	6	7	5	18
Professors	12	7	8	27	12	5	6	23
Resident- instructors	8	5	3	16	16	8	7	29
Total	28	18	14	60	34	20	18	70



least used methods were television, role playing, panels and films. There was less agreement on the remaining five methods. More than half of the resident-instructors indicated using the lecture method. Slightly more than one-fourth of the chairmen and less than half the professors checked the lecture method. The resident-instructor and the professor checked group activity, resource people and individual reports as methods used in teaching. The chairmen tended to rate these as little used methods. Based on responses, the remaining 10 methods were not considered to be as effective as the three most frequently checked. The three methods ranked by the respondents as most effective in teaching the resident course were problem solving, discussion, and demonstration (Table XIV).

Other methods that were not listed in the questionnaire but suggested by the respondents as effective teaching methods were tape recordings, individual conferences, group councils, research projects, personal projects, actual experience in decision making and the use of transparencies for illustrative purposes.

The five methods ranked by the 123 respondents as a first, second, or third choice for an effective teaching method were recorded in Table XIII. The proportion of

TABLE XIV  
SUMMARY OF RESPONSES CONCERNING METHODS USED IN  
TEACHING HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENT COURSE

Method of Teaching	Respondent		
	Chairman Number	Professor Number	Resident Instructor Number
Lecture	11	16	24
Demonstrations	21	20	34
Individual reports	8	15	22
Panels	6	6	2
Television	2	1	1
Films	5	9	8
Problem solving	21	22	36
Case studies	6	10	11
Resource people	12	15	19
Field trips	4	13	13
Discussions	21	28	35
Role playing	5	4	9
Group or team	10	12	14
Other	0	4	5

responses was not as large when the respondents were requested to rank teaching methods as when they were requested to check teaching methods used.

The lecture method was ranked as an effective teaching method by 54 respondents who checked it as a first, second, or third choice for the introductory course. Only 16 indicated lecture as an effective method for teaching the resident course. The professors checked the lecture method more frequently than did the resident-instructors; the chairmen ranked the lecture method lower than the other two groups of respondents for the introductory course. All three groups indicated by responses that the lecture method was not one of the most effective methods for teaching the resident course.

The proportion of rankings by the three groups of respondents for demonstration methods was approximately the same for both the introductory and the resident course. Demonstration method was ranked as more effective for the resident course, with 44 ranking this method as a first, second or third choice. Twenty-one respondents ranked this method as effective for the introductory course.

Problem solving was ranked as first, second or third choice by 41 respondents for the introductory course and by

54 individuals for the resident course. The professors ranked this method higher than did the other two groups for teaching the introductory course. In the resident course it was the resident-instructors who ranked the demonstration method highest as an effective method of teaching.

Case studies were ranked as a first, second or third choice by a total of 42 respondents for the introductory course. This method was checked as one of the least effective methods for the resident course. Again a larger proportion of professors tended to check this method more often than did the resident-instructors or chairmen.

There was more agreement among the respondents as to the effectiveness of the discussion method than for any other method. All three groups of respondents ranked discussion as an effective method for both the introductory and resident courses. This method received the highest number of responses as a first, second or third choice, a total of 60 for the introductory course and 70 for the resident course.

The professors, who probably do more actual classroom teaching than do the resident-instructors or the chairmen, ranked lecture and discussion methods as choices of effective methods for teaching the introductory course. In the opinion of the professors who responded to this question, discussion

was ranked as the most effective method for teaching the resident course. The nature of the two courses could account for these differences in choices.

### FACILITIES

The inquiry pertaining to facilities related mainly to the resident, special or laboratory courses. It is assumed that regular classroom facilities are used for the introductory course and that no special provisions are generally needed for the instruction of basic theory or principles.

Eighty-two individual colleges and universities responded to the questionnaire. Ten institutions indicated no resident, special or laboratory course was offered. Of the 72 remaining institutions, 58 were reported as maintaining one or more houses or apartments, and three provided mobile homes to expand their facilities. The addition of the mobile homes is an attempt to provide a realistic learning experience for the students. Eight schools had changed from the traditional home management course to a laboratory course, providing no live-in experiences. Four schools reported a combination of the traditional house experience plus the laboratory experience. Forty-three of the respondents indicated married and mature students were given the choice of a special or project course in which their own homes were used

as the laboratory. The frequencies and types of facilities provided in each of the geographical regions are reported in Table XV.

The length of time the students participated in the traditional home management residence varied from three weeks to eighteen weeks. Live-in experience of six to nine weeks was the length of time indicated by the majority of the respondents. This length of time seems to be fairly typical of the practices in the residence course at the present time.

Sixteen schools reported the use of houses and apartments for the resident course and six reported the use of apartments only. One university in the Southern Region reported a new home economics building under construction would include apartments for home management residence. Several respondents reported planning for a change to the use of apartments for the resident course. These apartments, according to the explanations of the respondents, will be of various sizes in order that the "simulated family" will be more realistic to the family size of the present. The responses from this particular survey would indicate that as the need for new or additional facilities arise, there is a trend toward the use of apartments for the residence experience.

Nine colleges and universities in this study reported the use of a laboratory only, indicating no group living

TABLE XV

NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS PROVIDING VARIOUS TYPES OF FACILITIES FOR TEACHING  
HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENT COURSE ACCORDING TO THE GEOGRAPHICAL  
REGION OF THE UNITED STATES

Region	Total Num- ber	Facilities for Resident or Non-resident Course					
		House	Apartment	House and	House and	Laboratory	Other
		Number	Number	Apartment	Laboratory	Only	Courses
		Number	Number	Number	Number	Number	Number
Northern	13	4	2	3	1	0	1
Atlantic	16	4	1	5	1	2	3
Central	22	13	3	1	0	3	0
Southern	21	7	0	6	2	2	1
Pacific	10	3	0	1	0	2	1
Total	82	31	6	16	4	9	6

experience. Three other schools reported that due to the expanding building programs of the individual institutions involved, the plan for the coming year is to change to a laboratory experience in place of the traditional home management house.

In reply to the question about which of the 30 concepts listed in Part III of the questionnaire might be lost if the traditional method of group living in the home management residence course is changed, a large portion of all three groups of respondents commented that all of the 30 concepts considered to be important in the traditional experience could be lost, depending on the alternate experience or experiences. This group concluded that it would be difficult to provide the experiences listed below without the traditional home management experience.

- 1) Democratic process in group living.
- 2) Evaluation of and by peer group.
- 3) Recognition and appreciation of efforts of others.
- 4) Rapport in group relations.



## CHAPTER V

### S U M M A R Y   A N D   C O N C L U S I O N S

This study was a survey of selected colleges and universities in the United States to appraise areas of emphasis, methods of teaching, and facilities used in teaching home management at the undergraduate college level. Data for the study were based on opinions of home economics department chairmen, professors, and resident-instructors experienced in teaching home management. The overall aim of the study was to ascertain the current policies and practices in home management education in colleges and universities in the United States as a basis for future curriculum development. The primary problem was to determine if the emphasis given basic concepts, important to present home management education, meets the needs of students today and prepares them for contemporary and future society.

A structured mailed questionnaire consisting of three parts was used as the instrument to obtain data from persons experienced in the administration and the instruction of home management education in selected colleges and universities. Data were obtained from 39 chairmen, 38 professors and 46 resident-instructors, a total of 123 completed

questionnaires. The 82 responding institutions were representative of all sizes and types of colleges and universities and of all geographical sections of the United States. The 82 colleges and universities were classified by states into the following geographical regions: Northern Region, 13 schools; Atlantic Region, 16 schools; Central Region, 22 schools; Southern Region, 21 schools; and Pacific Region, 10 schools. The size of the institutions was based on the total enrollment of the institution during the 1968-1969 academic year. The size of the home economics department was based on the 1968-1969 enrollment of undergraduate students majoring in home economics. The institutions were evenly distributed between schools with a total enrollment of less than 7,000, from 7,000 to 15,000, and more than 15,000 student enrollment. Of the home economics departments in the 82 colleges and universities participating in the study 63 had an enrollment of less than 600 and 38 of these departments had less than 300 students majoring in home economics. Data indicated that there was no apparent relationship between geographical region, size of the institutions, size of the home economics departments and the number of faculty employed and the variables being investigated. .

The 123 respondents checked the degree of emphasis to 30 concepts. These concepts were classified into six concept areas of emphasis: I Skills, II Values and goals, III

Management processes, IV Environmental factors that influence the use of resources, V Work simplification and VI Problem solving. Each concept area was statistically analyzed to determine the differences between the opinions of the three groups of respondents as to the degree of emphasis to the 30 concepts. The professors and resident-instructors were in agreement as to the relative concept position in the area of problem solving, while a smaller percentage of the chairmen would attach as high a degree of emphasis in this area. The rank order for chairmen and professors agreed as to the relative concept position in the areas of environmental influences, and values and goals.

Chi-square analysis revealed a significant difference between opinions of the chairmen, professors, and resident-instructors as to the degree of emphasis in all six areas. Since all chi-square values were significant, the contingency-coefficients were calculated to determine the strength of the association. Analysis revealed that the strength of the relationship was highest in Area I, Skills, and lowest in Area IV, Environmental influences.

The responses from the chairmen, professors and resident-instructors were analyzed to determine the differences in concept emphasis between the introductory and the resident home management courses. The emphasis on five of the

areas was significantly higher for the resident course than in the introductory course. The exception was in Area IV, Environmental influences; this area was emphasized to a greater degree in the introductory course. Area VI, Problem solving received greater emphasis in the resident course.

Since the chi-square values were significant for all six areas the contingency-coefficients were calculated to determine the strength of the association between responses and the two courses. The contingency-coefficient was highest for skills and lowest for environmental influences.

The 123 respondents tended to agree that each concept is emphasized to some degree in the introductory course but the concept emphasis is greater in the resident course. These findings tend to support the philosophy or aims set forth for the introductory course: that of teaching basic principles and concepts. The more advanced course, whose basic design is a laboratory facility for the purpose of applying learnings from other courses in home economics, placed greater emphasis in five of the six concept areas.

More colleges and universities reported teaching the introductory course than reported teaching the resident, laboratory or special courses. Eighty-nine per cent of the schools offered an introductory course and it is considered

as a basic or "core" course in many schools. Of the 82 colleges and universities reporting, 69.5 per cent offered a resident home management course. Ten schools had no resident or substitute course.

For the resident course, 43 institutions reported special provisions for married or mature students. In the majority of institutions the resident course is required only for general and home economics education majors. Many states still require the traditional home management experience for teacher certification. Fourteen schools reported having changed to a laboratory or other type course as an alternate experience for the traditional home management course. Alternate or substitute courses reported by six institutions were field courses or special problems management courses. The purpose of these courses is to focus on management problems of low income families, the elderly and the handicapped homemaker.

Data indicated that a combination of factual and conceptual methods of teaching were used with an emphasis on the more recent approach, the concept method of organization and presentation. Opinions of the three groups of participants were similar: the lecture, discussion and problem solving methods of teaching were the most frequently used methods in the classroom. When asked to rank the methods

students were given the choice of a special or projects course, in which their homes were used as the laboratory. This indicates that many schools are attempting to meet the needs of the married and mature students in a realistic way. One of the respondents expressed the modern view:

The rationale for requiring a residence experience is to provide a social unit representing a family within which the student makes managerial decisions. If a student is already part of an existing social unit her family should be used, not just represented.

Respondents indicated that many institutions need and want to make changes in methods and facilities to provide a realistic learning experience for the home management course. Increased student enrollment and old and obsolete equipment present urgent problems in the area of home management education. Many colleges seem to be in a state of indecision about making changes without further research or definite recommendations from the American Home Economics Association. According to this survey data would indicate, as the need for new or additional facilities arise, the trend is toward the use of apartments for the resident experience.

Home management has been the subject area for studies and experimentation since home management became a specialized field of study. The scope and the purposes of these

studies by necessity have been limited to local problems or concerns of the investigators.

Much has been written and discussed in recent years concerning the problems confronting colleges and universities in regard to methods and facilities for teaching home management. The resident course has been particularly vulnerable to criticism--many educators and administrators feel the original plan for a live-in laboratory no longer meets the needs of students today. As enrollment increases and university building expands, some home economics departments, under emergency circumstances, have had to make new or alternate arrangements for the home management resident course.

The recommendations for change in emphasis made by the American Home Economics Association have been the focal point of this study. In accepting the 12 competences presented in New Directions (2) as fundamental to effective living the six competences related to home management were examined for emphasis on concepts. These competences are as follows:

- 1) Establish values which give meaning to personal, family, and community living; select goals appropriate to these values.
- 2) Make and carry out intelligent decisions regarding the use of personal, family, and community resources.

- 3) Establish long-range goals for financial security and work toward their achievement.
- 4) Plan consumption of goods and services--including food, clothing, and housing--in ways that will promote values and goals established by the family.
- 5) Purchase consumer goods and services appropriate to overall consumption plan and wise use of economic resources.
- 6) Perform the tasks of maintaining a home in such a way that they will contribute effectively to furthering individual and family goals.

Examination of the findings from the groups studied indicate that emphases on concepts have changed. The development of skills, establishment of goals and values, and the understanding of how environmental factors affect the management processes are considered important and basic to good management. The greater emphasis is toward problem solving and the preparation and experience necessary to make decisions in managing personal and material resources.

The recommendations resulting from this study and listed below are based on opinions and suggestions provided by the three groups of home economics personnel:

- 1) The home management resident course needs additional study and research about feasible methods and facilities to provide flexible opportunities for decision making.



- 2) As a specialized area home management should develop well defined purposes and practices which are universally accepted to strengthen the subject.
- 3) Opportunities for students to observe and gain understanding of management problems of different cultural and ability levels should be provided in this area.
- 4) Guide lines but not barriers should be established to stimulate individual thinking and experimentation.
- 5) More information and training for wise consumption should be provided in order for the student to be better prepared for the consumer society of the future.

In conclusion a quote by Margaret M. Morris (29), concerning the vastness of the home economics discipline, explains the commitment of the thousands of educators in the profession of Home Economics.

Probably no other profession has as much to offer as home economics in helping people to live, make a living, and serve others and, in so doing, to realize their potential as human beings.

## B I B L I O G R A P H Y

1. Allgood, Mary Brown. "Home Management Residence Gets a New Look", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 57 (October, 1965).
2. American Home Economics Association. Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics: New Directions. June, 1959.
3. Amidon, Edna P. "Some Factors Involved in the Teaching of Home Management in Colleges." Report, United States Department of the Interior, Office of Education, Vocational Division, Publication 2119. (Mimeographed)
4. Babcock, Gladys and Carolyn Ater. A Study of Home Management Education. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1966.
5. Baldwin, Keturah E. The Saga of A H E A. American Home Economics Association, Washington, D. C., 1949.
6. Bell, Camille Graves. "A Comparative Study of Conceptual and Factual Methods of Teaching Freshmen." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Texas Technological College, 1967.
7. Bevier, Isabel. "The Development of Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 9 (January, 1917).
8. Cutler, Virginia F. "Home Living Experience at the University of Utah," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 46 (November, 1954).
9. Dauter, Paul M., Jr. Current Issues and Emerging Concepts in Management. New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1962.
10. Davis, Jean. "Non-resident Home Management for Married Students," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 52 (January, 1960).
11. Dopson, Elizabeth. "Social and Economic Trends as They Affect the Home Management Residence." Unpublished Master's thesis, Auburn University, 1962.

12. Drew, Lola, and Willa V. Tinsley. "Home Management at Home for the Married Student," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 49 (May, 1957).
13. Durr, Gloria Ebarb. "An Appraisal of Policies and Practices Relative to Home Management Residence and/or Problem Courses Provided by Selected Colleges and Universities" in Eleven Southern States." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Texas Woman's University, 1968.
14. Elliott, Eileen. "An Analysis of Home Management Education," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 40 (March, 1948).
15. "Facilities for Home Management Residence--A Symposium," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 60 (May, 1968).
16. Goodyear, Margaret, and Mildred Chapin Kloor. Managing for Effective Living. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965.
17. Gross, Irma H. "Impact of Certain Basic Disciplines on Home Management and Family Living," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 58 (June, 1966).
18. Gross, Irma H., and Elizabeth W. Crandall. Management for Modern Families. New York: Meredith Publishing Company, 1963.
19. Halliday, Jean, and Beatrice Paolucci. "An Exploration of Home Management Goals," Journal of Marriage and Family Living, Vol. 24 (May, 1962).
20. Halloway, Joann. "Home Management Resident Uses Apartments," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 52 (November, 1960).
21. Hohenhau, Helen S. "Faculty and Student Perception of the Home Management Residence." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1959.
22. Holbrook, Betty Janet. "Management Problems of Home Management House Students." Unpublished Master's thesis, Purdue University, 1956.

23. Judy, Helen Elizabeth. "Trends and Needs in Home Management an Analytical Study of Home Management in Higher Institutions in Order to Ascertain Trends and to Formulate Policies." Teachers College, Columbia University, Contribution to Education #365. New York: Bureau of Publications, Columbia University, 1929.
24. Lee, Jeannette A., and Paul L. Dressel. Liberal Education and Home Economics. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Publications, 1963.
25. Liston, Margaret I. "Home Management as an Evolving Field." Talk for the Home Management Workshop for the Texas Extension Service, College Station, Texas, May, 1966.
26. Lyle, Mary S. "Graduates Reflect Their Education," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 49 (January, 1957).
27. Mau, Helen Dickens. "An Investigation of Cognitive Objectives for College Undergraduate Home Management Programs." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1965.
28. Morgan, Etoile J. "Values and Goal Convictions in the Residence Course in Home Management." Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, Texas Woman's University, 1962.
29. Morris, Margaret M. "What is a Home Economist To Do?" Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 59 (November, 1967).
30. Paolucci, Beatrice, and Esther Everett. Family Decision Making. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1965.
31. Robbins, Patricia Johnson. "An Evaluation of the Montana State College Home Management Courses." Unpublished Master's thesis, Montana State College, 1962.
32. Scott, Dorothy. "General Education and Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 41 (October, 1949).
33. Terry, George R. Principles of Management. Homewood, Illinois: Richard Irwin, Inc., 1964.

34. The College Blue Book. College Planning Program, LTD.  
Los Angeles, California, 1968.
35. United States Office of Education, 1955. Vocational Education in Home Economics. United States Office of Education, Division of Vocational Education, Home Economics Branch, Publication 3478.
36. United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Home Economics in Institutions Granting Bachelor's or Higher Degrees, 1960-1962. Miscellany No. 42.
37. Williamson, Maude, and Mary Stewart Lyle. Homemaking Education. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1961.

A P P E N D I C E S

A P P E N D I X A

QUESTIONNAIRE (WITH COVER LETTER)

Box 2313, T.W.U. Station  
Denton, Texas 76204

Dear Professor:

Current trends in Home Economics Education have created a need to appraise the emphasis and the methods used in teaching home management in colleges and universities in the United States. Your assistance in this survey will be appreciated.

The primary purpose of the proposed study is to satisfy a doctoral degree requirement at Texas Woman's University. However, the ultimate purpose is to provide a basis for improving the home management program.

To complete the enclosed questionnaire will require some of your valuable time, but your cooperation will contribute to research for the improvement of our profession.

Enclosed are two questionnaires, one to be completed by a professor or instructor of home management. The second questionnaire should be filled in by the resident-instructor of the home management residence. Each respondent should have two or more years of experience in teaching home management. If you have only one person with home management teaching experience, will the department chairman please complete the second form? Only composite responses will be reported. Individuals and schools will not be identified.

An addressed, stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Your early response, on or before March 25, will aid in the completion of the study.

Thank you for your professional interest and your contribution.

Very truly yours,

Hattie Arthur



A SURVEY OF HOME MANAGEMENT TO  
APPRAISE AREAS OF EMPHASIS,  
TEACHING METHODS AND  
FACILITIES

PART I: GENERAL INFORMATION

Name of respondent \_\_\_\_\_

Name of institution \_\_\_\_\_

Location of institution \_\_\_\_\_

Area of United States \_\_\_\_\_

Current institution enrollment \_\_\_\_\_

In what department, school, or college of the institution is  
the Home Economics Department included? \_\_\_\_\_

Current Home Economics Department enrollment (undergraduate)

Total majors \_\_\_\_\_ Total minors \_\_\_\_\_

Is your department departmentalized into specialized areas?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Number of areas \_\_\_\_\_

In which area is Home Management? \_\_\_\_\_

Do you offer a bachelor's degree in Home Management and Family  
Economics? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_ Number of students in this  
area \_\_\_\_\_

Number of full-time faculty in the Home Economics Department  
\_\_\_\_\_

Number of full-time faculty in the Home Management area \_\_\_\_\_

Position of respondent: Department Chairman \_\_\_\_\_

Professor-Instructor \_\_\_\_\_ Resident Instructor  
Director \_\_\_\_\_

## PART II: DEFINITION OF TERMS

Professor-Instructor: the faculty person who teaches the theory of one or more of the home management courses--two or more years of experiences. The 1968-1969 school year may be counted as one year.

Resident Instructor-Director: the faculty person who teaches and lives in the facility as the resident director, or has had the live-in experience. Or one who supervises projects or special problems course offered in lieu of residence with two or more years of teaching experience in home management. The 1968-1969 year may be counted as one year. (Not a graduate assistant unless she also teaches theory related to the course.)

Introductory course: course designed for freshman or sophomore students to introduce management principles.

Residence course: traditional concept of facility in which students live in group situation under supervision--house, apartment, or a section of the departmental building specified for residence purposes.

Special or project course: course for married or mature students who conduct projects or problems in their own home or apartment in lieu of the residence course.

Laboratory course: course scheduled as other laboratory courses, lecture plus laboratory experiences. No residence required.

Factual teaching: teaching which emphasizes the importance of facts about a subject considered important by leaders in that field and possessing its own inherent logic.

Conceptual teaching: teaching which focuses upon the vital concepts of the subject and learning experiences which provide opportunities for the student to form perceptions and concepts for further thinking and behavior that is satisfying to individuals and society.



Item Number	Concept	Degree of Emphasis							
		Introductory Course				Residence, Special, or Laboratory Course			
		None	Little	Some	Much	None	Little	Some	Much
20	Family financial management								
21	Democratic processes in group living								
22	Emphasis on the process rather than the product								
23	Variety rather than repetitive skills								
24	Recognition and appreciation of efforts of others								
25	Evaluation of and by peer group								
26	Sources of consumer information and aid								
27	Importance of people instead of things								
28	Management for working homemakers as well as for full-time homemakers								
29	Management related to wise consumption								
30	Professional qualities								

From your knowledge and experience in teaching home management which of the concepts listed above might be lost if the traditional method (group living in house or apartment) is changed, or has already been changed?

---



---



---



---

## Curriculum Offerings and Requirements

Place a check (✓) in the appropriate blank to indicate your answers.

### 1. Home management courses offered:

- a) ☐ Introductory Management      c) ☐ Management Residence  
 b) ☐ Special problems or project course      d) ☐ Laboratory course  
 e) ☐ Other \_\_\_\_\_

Are b) and d) offered in the place of \_\_\_\_\_ or in addition to \_\_\_\_\_ the home management residence course?

### 2. Are there provisions whereby a student may be given credit or exemption from one or more of the home management courses? Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Reasons or conditions \_\_\_\_\_

### 3. Management courses required for a degree in the following areas:

	<u>Introductory Course</u>	<u>Residence, Special, or Laboratory Course</u>
Teacher Education	_____	_____
General Home Economics	_____	_____
Family and Child Development	_____	_____
Home Management and Family Economics	_____	_____
Foods and Nutrition	_____	_____
Textiles and Clothing	_____	_____
Housing and Equipment	_____	_____
Other _____	_____	_____

## Survey of Teaching Methods

1. Method used: Factual \_\_\_\_\_ Conceptual \_\_\_\_\_ Both \_\_\_\_\_

2. How many hours per week for classes?

	<u>System</u>	
	<u>Semester</u>	<u>Quarter</u>
Lecture class	_____	_____
Laboratory (if any)	_____	_____

3. Check methods used in teaching the introductory course:

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a) Lecture            | <input type="checkbox"/> i) Resource people |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b) Demonstrations     | <input type="checkbox"/> j) Field trips     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c) Individual reports | <input type="checkbox"/> k) Discussions     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d) Panels             | <input type="checkbox"/> l) Role playing    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e) Television         | <input type="checkbox"/> m) Group or team   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> f) Films              | <input type="checkbox"/> n) Others _____    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> g) Problem solving    |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> h) Case studies       |   |

List teaching methods most used in descending order of importance. (List most important first.)

---

4. From your professional experiences which three methods in the above listings do you find most effective to emphasize the concepts of the course. (Indicate by the letter as listed above.)

Number 1 \_\_\_\_\_

Number 2 \_\_\_\_\_

Number 3 \_\_\_\_\_

Residence Course

1. Courses required as pre-requisites to residence course:

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> a) Introductory Management | <input type="checkbox"/> f) Housing         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> b) Introductory Foods      | <input type="checkbox"/> g) Equipment       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> c) Meal Management         | <input type="checkbox"/> h) Other (specify) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> d) Nutrition               |   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> e) Family Living           |   |

2. Classification required in order to register for residence.

Sophomore \_\_\_\_\_

Junior \_\_\_\_\_

Senior \_\_\_\_\_

3. Period of time to fulfill requirements for residence.

House or apartment \_\_\_\_\_

Number of weeks \_\_\_\_\_

Lecture: Hours per week \_\_\_\_\_

Number of weeks \_\_\_\_\_

Laboratory: Hours per week \_\_\_\_\_

Number of weeks \_\_\_\_\_

Problems or

Special: Class hours  
per week \_\_\_\_\_

Total number  
of weeks \_\_\_\_\_

## 4. Facilities for residence management course.

House\_\_\_\_ Number of Houses\_\_\_\_ Number of students per  
residence period\_\_\_\_ Total per semester\_\_\_\_

Apartment\_\_\_\_ Number of apartments\_\_\_\_ Number of students  
per residence period per apartment\_\_\_\_ Total for  
semester\_\_\_\_

Laboratory\_\_\_\_ Number of laboratories\_\_\_\_ Number of  
students per residence period per apartment\_\_\_\_  
Total for semester\_\_\_\_

Other: (explain)\_\_\_\_\_

Location of house or apartments:

College owned:

\_\_\_\_ On campus

\_\_\_\_ Off campus

Privately owned

\_\_\_\_ On campus

\_\_\_\_ Off campus

\_\_\_\_ Adjacent to Home Economics building

\_\_\_\_ Adjoining Home Economics building

\_\_\_\_ A part of Home Economics building

\_\_\_\_ In student dormitories

5. Teaching methods used: Factual\_\_\_\_ Conceptual\_\_\_\_ Both\_\_\_\_

6. Check methods used in teaching the residence course:

\_\_\_\_ a) Lecture

\_\_\_\_ b) Demonstrations

\_\_\_\_ c) Research reports

\_\_\_\_ d) Panels

\_\_\_\_ e) Television

\_\_\_\_ f) Films

\_\_\_\_ g) Problem solving

\_\_\_\_ h) Case studies

\_\_\_\_ i) Resource people

\_\_\_\_ j) Field trips

\_\_\_\_ k) Discussions

\_\_\_\_ l) Role playing

\_\_\_\_ m) Group or team

\_\_\_\_ n) Others\_\_\_\_\_

List teaching methods most used in descending order of  
importance. (List most important first.)

7. From your professional experiences which three methods in  
the above listings do you find most effective to em-  
phasize the concepts of the course. (Indicate by the  
letter as listed above.)

Number 1\_\_\_\_\_

Number 2\_\_\_\_\_

Number 3\_\_\_\_\_

8. List suggestions of how desirable emphases might be achieved to meet the changing needs of the students.

---

---

---

---

---

---

---

---



A P P E N D I X B

FOLLOW-UP LETTER

Box 2313, T.W.U. Station  
Denton, Texas 76204  
April 7, 1969

Dear Professor:

Several weeks ago Texas Woman's University sent you a letter and survey questionnaire regarding the emphasis and methods used in teaching home management. Since we would like to include your information and evaluation in our study, we hope you will complete and return the form.

Please accept this letter as our thanks to you for your reply and contribution to our study.

Sincerely yours,

Jessie W. Bateman, Dean  
College of Household  
Arts and Sciences  
Texas Woman's University  
Denton, Texas 76204

A P P E N D I X C

CLASSIFICATION OF STATES BY  
GEOGRAPHICAL REGION,

CLASSIFICATION OF STATES ACCORDING TO GEOGRAPHICAL  
REGION WITH THE NUMBER OF INSTITUTIONS  
PARTICIPATING IN THE STUDY

Geographical Region	Number of Schools	
	State	Region
	Number	Number
Northern Region		13
Alaska	1	
Maine	1	
Michigan	1	
Minnesota	4	
Montana	2	
North Dakota	2	
Wisconsin	2	
Atlantic Region		16
Florida	1	
Maryland	1	
Massachusetts	2	
New Hampshire	1	
New York	4	
North Carolina	2	
Pennsylvania	1	
Rhode Island	1	
South Carolina	1	
Virginia	2	
Pacific Region		10
California	7	
Washington	3	

Geographical Region	Number of Schools	
	State	Region
	Number	Number
Central Region		22
Colorado	1	
Kansas	1	
Kentucky	1	
Missouri	3	
Nebraska	1	
Nevada	1	
Idaho	1	
Illinois	4	
Indiana	2	
Iowa	1	
Ohio	2	
South Dakota	1	
Utah	2	
Wyoming	1	
Southern Region		21
Alabama	1	
Arizona	1	
Arkansas	2	
Georgia	1	
Louisiana	2	
Mississippi	3	
New Mexico	3	
Oklahoma	2	
Texas	6	