AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Christine Elizabeth Williams for the degree of Master of Science in Home Economics Education presented on June 9, 1983

Title: A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS', TEACHERS', AND PRINCIPALS' ATTITUDES TOWARD CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

Redacted for Privacy

Abstract Approved: _____
Dr. Helen C. Hall

The purpose of this study was to assess the attitudes of students, teachers, and principals toward skills taught in consumer and homemaking education. The sample included 35 principals, 58 teachers, and 272 students in Oregon secondary schools. Respondents' attitudes were assessed by analyzing the data on the basis of the comprehensiveness of consumer and homemaking education, relationship of five content areas, and specific skills taught in consumer and homemaking education. A secondary purpose in the study was to determine the importance of factors that influence teachers' and principals' curriculum decisions in home economics.

Construction and validation of the instrument Attitudes Toward Consumer and Homemaking Education was accomplished through a review of current literature, a review by a panel of home economics educators, and a pretest with a class of high school students. A reli-

ability coefficient of .90 was determined. The respondents rated each statement by means of a five point Likert-type scale ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree." There were 15 skill statements on the instrument representing the five content areas (three from each area). The content areas represented were: Human Development and the Family, Home Management and Family Economics, Food and Nutrition, Textiles and Clothing, and Housing.

Analysis of Variance, Student's "t", and Chi Square tests were used to analyze the data. The .05 level of probability was selected as the criteria for acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses. The Tukey HSD Procedure was used to identify where differences occurred between means.

Results indicate that there was a significant difference in the overall attitudes of students, teachers, and principals toward consumer and homemaking education. Teachers had the most comprehensive perspective of skills taught in consumer and homemaking education. Principals had the second most comprehensive view; and students had a less comprehensive perspective of skills taught.

Respondent means on the content areas taught in consumer and homemaking education were also significantly different. Students' means were significantly lower on three of the five content areas: Human Development and the Family, Food and Nutrition, and Textiles and Clothing. When an analysis was done on each content area based on sex, results indicated that females' mean scores were signifi-

cantly higher than males on those same content areas (Human Development and the Family, Food and Nutrition, and Textiles and Clothing). When content area mean scores were ranked, Food and Nutrition continued to be seen as the most integral part of consumer and homemaking education among all three groups. The content area Housing represented the least integral area in consumer and homemaking programs for teachers and principals; whereas, students perceived Textiles and Clothing as the least integral area of home economics.

Analysis of specific skill statements revealed that the respondents had positive attitudes toward most of the statements. Students' mean scores were the lowest for statement L (use clothing as a means of expressing yourself) indicating they did not perceive the social and psychological aspect of textiles and clothing as being an integral part of home economics.

With the exception of statement F (make wise decisions when purchasing goods and services), females indicated a more positive attitude toward all skill statements for consumer and homemaking education.

Teachers and principals in the study both indicated four factors as most influential in their curriculum decisions: students' need, students' interest, enrollment of students, and teachers' undergraduate/graduate preparation. Federal guidelines had least influence on teachers' curriculum decisions and what is taught in other home

economics programs had least influence on principals' curriculum decisions.

Based on the data, it was concluded that a need exists for home economics teachers to broaden the textiles and clothing content to emphasize social and psychological aspects of clothing. It was recommended that in-service education for teachers encourage innovative teaching strategies, ways to stimulate student interest, and creative curriculum development in Housing and Home Management and Family Economics.

A Comparison of Students', Teachers', and Principals' Attitudes Toward Consumer and Homemaking Education

by

Christine Elizabeth Williams

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Masters of Science

Completed June 9, 1983

Commencement June 1984

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Professor of Home Economics Education in Charge of Major

Redacted for Privacy

Head of Department of Home Economics Education

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented June 9, 1983

Typed by WORD PROCESSING SPECIALISTS for Christine Elizabeth Williams

To my parents: Henry and Fannie Williams

This book is dedicated in appreciation and love to the two people that have continually enriched my life with love, joy, respect, and most of all inspired me to be what I have become.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the members of my committee for the support, advice, and encouragement given to me during the writing of this thesis: Dr. Helen Hall, my major advisor for providing freedom, guidance, and interest in this study; Dr. Sylvia Lee, for her guidance and advice during the planning stage of this study; Dr. Tom Grigsby, for reassuring me of the confidence he had in my ability to complete this study; Dr. Marge Woodburn, for her advice, suggestions, and professional expertise in research that has contributed immensely to the success of this study.

Special thanks are also expressed to Helen Berg and Pamela Bodenroeder of the Survey Research Center for assisting with the research design and construction of the questionnaire.

Last, but not least, my appreciation to my mother and father, who have always encouraged and supported me throughout my academic endeavors; to my sister and brother who have provided both financial support and encouragement during this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS
(Continued)

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES
(Continued)

A COMPARISON OF STUDENTS', TEACHERS', AND PRINCIPALS' ATTITUDES TOWARD CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

I. INTRODUCTION

Background for the Study

> Home economics education like all other educational fields is at the crossroads today. It is at the crossroads that our profession will determine its future and the education of millions of American children (Alexander, 1969, p. 2).

Educators express agreement with Alexander. The future of the profession depends to an extent on the attitudes, support and understanding received from the patrons and those affiliated with the program. According to Dannison (1976) and Stinnett and others (1971), over the past decade there has been major concern for portraying an accurate image of the home economics profession to the general public. Too often the general public's perception of home economics is limited to one of food preparation and clothing construction. The public fails to recognize the purpose or mission of home economics and all that is inclusive in the program. According to East (1980) "most people think of home economics as what they saw it to be in their own secondary school" (p. 7).

Not only does the general public have limited views of home economics, but as Yankelovich (1974) revealed, secondary school administrators, legislators, and business executives perceived home economics as not having a clear identity. His study stated "there

can be little question that home economics and home economists need the support of an active, well-positioned public relation program" (p. 5).

In a description of the profession of home economics, Meszaros and Brown (1980) stated "by their practice they shall be known" (p. 7). In the past, men and women perceived homemaking as "women's work" (Hill et al., 1979) and home economics as a field of study for females. Today the traditional "women's field" is gradually increasing male enrollment in educational programs. The National Institute of Education (1981) revealed a 13% increase in male enrollment from 1972 (6%) to 1977 (19%). The National Census Study (Hughes et al., 1980) reported that 20% of the participants in consumer and homemaking programs were males.

However, the stereotypical view of home economics as cooking and sewing remains. There is concern among home economics educators that too much time is devoted to cooking and sewing in the secondary home economics class (Rollins, 1981; Blankenship and Moerchen, 1979). For most people their view of home economics is dominated by females who study domestic or household chores like cooking, canning, sewing, clothing care, home sanitation, etc. There is a need to reexamine what we are teaching in the home economics class in order to make needed changes to keep pace with needs of society (Alexander, 1969).

Discrepancies exist between what teacher educators believe should be taught and what is taught (Ross, 1975; Yankelovich, 1974;

Blankenship and Moerchen, 1979). It appears that factors other than just the teachers' professional education influence what they choose to teach. According to Murray (1979), teachers' choice of courses is influenced by their strengths, and reflects their interest--"interests that are personal in nature and ought not be the basis of curriculum development" (p. 148). However, she alluded that "often it seems the personal interests of the teacher or leader dominate both what is taught and how it is taught" (p. 149).

Although teachers and teacher educators recognize a need to decrease emphasis on clothing construction and food preparation, several studies have indicated that most secondary home economics curricula include a majority of food preparation and clothing construction (Ross, 1975 and Coon, 1962). In a study conducted by Hall (1978), teachers who were graduates of teacher education programs with different program focuses indicated that they emphasized food and nutrition most in their teaching, regardless of undergraduate program completed.

The National Institute of Education (1981) undertook an evaluation of the responsiveness to legislation and the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking programs mandated by the 1976 Vocational Education Amendments. Some evidence exists to support an increase in knowledge after the participation in a consumer and homemaking class, but evidence is lacking to support affected attitudes and behavior. Therefore, NIE concluded "...no conclusive statements can be made

about the effectiveness of C&HE programs on the basis of available research findings" (p. VI-25).

One study designed to address the issue of what is taught and who is served by vocational consumer and homemaking programs in grades 9-12 was the National Census Study conducted in 1980 by Hughes et al. They indicated that comprehensive homemaking, food and nutrition, clothing and textiles, family relations, and child development were the courses most often taught in home economics. Those subjects least often taught were housing, home furnishing and equipment and consumer education.

Significance of the Study

As indicated by Smith (1976) one of the most important tasks of the curriculum specialist is the selection of concepts to be taught because concepts shape attitudes. This study is significant in that attitude assessment provides valuable information for the secondary home economics teacher to plan and implement curriculum that considers the students' beliefs about what concepts should be taught.

Baxter (1972) stressed the importance of education being relevant to the clientele served, "education programs should help students interpret the past, cope with present situations, and prepare for the future" (p. 1). It is essential for teachers to identify concepts that students perceive relevant as a means of planning and developing curriculum designed to meet the needs of

perspective students. Planning educational objectives that incorporate students' interest and needs allows a greater chance for student participation. As Tyler (1949) acknowledged, "Education is an active process. It requires active participation on the part of the learner" (p. 11).

In home economics, secondary teachers should play an important role in helping students adjust to the rapidly changing needs of society and to meet the needs of the future based on current social and economical conditions. The increase in single parent families, child abuse, divorce, teenage pregnancies, women working outside the home, changing sex roles and family violence are all characteristics of today's families in which home economics has potential to affect change (Simpson, 1981). Secondary curriculum is a channel through which teachers can effectively help students develop skills designed to accommodate a futuristic society.

Principals can be one of the most influential persons in promoting growth of home economics programs at the secondary level. For that reason it is appropriate to ascertain insight into their attitudes about what should be taught in secondary home economics programs. As stated by Nollingham (1979) "no significant changes occur in a school without the active support of the principal" (p. 32).

Not only is the study significant from the standpoint of identifying attitudes about skills perceived to be important to teach by students, teachers, and principals; but, also it is important because

students, teachers and administrators collectively help create an image of home economics. If stereotyped images persist, the program is weakened. Improved programs can only be developed if those affiliated with the program, or in a decision-making position, have an up-to-date understanding and knowledge of the program.

Statement of the Problem

It was the aim of this research to investigate the attitudes of students, teachers, and principals toward skills taught in consumer and homemaking education. Specifically, the research sought answers to the following questions:

1. To what extent do students, teachers, and principals differ in their expressed attitudes toward skills taught in consumer and homemaking programs?
2. To what extent do males and females differ in their expressed attitudes toward skills taught in consumer and homemaking programs?
3. To what extent do teachers and principals differ on the importance of selected factors that influence curriculum decisions in home economics education?

Objectives

The objectives of this study were to:

1. identify students', teachers', and principals' attitudes toward skills taught in consumer and homemaking education;
2. compare students', teachers' and principals' attitudes toward skills taught in consumer and homemaking education;
3. identify males and females attitudes toward skills taught in consumer and homemaking education;
4. compare males' and females' attitudes toward skills taught in consumer and homemaking education;
5. identify the importance of selected factors on curriculum decisions in secondary home economics education.

Assumptions

The study was based in part upon the following assumptions:

1. The theoretical curriculum model for consumer and homemaking education is comprehensive and representative of skills taught in consumer and homemaking education. However, local control may result in programs limited in scope and, therefore, not compatible with the model.
2. The identification of what respondents think should be taught will reflect an image that is portrayed of home economics.

3. The sample size of students, teachers, and principals is representative of that of the schools in the sample.
4. Respondents answered the questionnaire honestly.

Definition of Terms

Attitude - A readiness to react toward or against some situation, person, or thing, in a particular manner, for example, with love or hate, fear, or resentment, to a particular degree of intensity (Good, 1959).

Vocational Home Economics Education - The total program of offerings at the local and state levels which is composed of one or both types of instructional programs: consumer and homemaking education (unpaid employment in the occupation of homemaking) and occupational home economics education (paid employment in home economics occupations) (Griffin and Clayton, 1981).

Consumer and Homemaking Education - The instructional program within the total vocational home economics education program which prepares males and females at the elementary through adult educational levels for the occupation of homemaking (unpaid employment) (Griffin and Clayton, 1981).

Occupational Home Economics Education - The instructional program within the total vocational home economics education program which prepares males and females at the middle/junior high school

through adult educational levels for paid employment in home economics occupations (Griffin and Clayton, 1981).

Comprehensive Program - Includes all five of the subject matter areas of home economics: individual and family resource management, nutrition and foods, textiles and clothing, living environments, human development and the family (Mellen, 1981).

Curriculum - That portion of the instructional program which identifies the content of the offerings and the plan for instruction (Griffin and Clayton, 1981).

Skill - Anything that the individual has learned to do with ease and precision; may be either a physical or mental performance (Good, 1959, p. 536).

Skill, Homemaking - The ability to deal with all needs of the family; includes home management, care of the children, feeding and clothing the family; and the establishment of attitudes and practices conducive to the development of good family relationships (Good, 1959, p. 537).

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

In a time of rapidly changing social and economic conditions, demand for program accountability, decreasing student enrollment and less federal and local monetary support for programs, vocational home economics educators are constantly having to defend the value of vocational home economics education to the public, administrators, and legislators (Ballard, 1982). A distorted view of home economics as primarily concerned with cooking and sewing has been detrimental to the profession's image and its existence in some schools.

The first section of this review will include an overview of the literature on the image of home economics and examine the background of stereotypes associated with the profession, the second section will review the basis for home economics curriculum, and the third section will review influences that impact curriculum decisions in home economics education.

Image of Home Economics

Rollins (1981) described the dynamics of the home economics profession in a time of a vast changing society this way:

> No other discipline has encompassed all the factors that impinge upon human activity in the way that home economics has. In the 1980's, when individuals and families are bombarded from all directions by social, political and economic change, home economics stands as the one discipline that can effectively study these changes and

> suggest ameliorative alternatives for problematic situations (p. 24).

Although home economics has a lot to contribute in the struggle with a variety of current societal problems faced by the family, many people continue to have a limited, stereotyped view of the contributions of home economics. In the minds of many, the words "home economist" or "home economics" tend to portray an image of a female profession designed to help women to become a gourmet cook or seamstress. According to East (1982) most people don't know enough about what home economics does or is because (1) most people base their vague ideas on what they saw it to be in their junior and high school program, (2) home economists are so meek, and (3) it is so many different things with a variety of specializations.

Misunderstanding of the program, according to Hughes (1979), stems from a lack of knowledge of the "depth and breath" of home economics. Most people, including those in leadership positions such as legislators, business people, and school administrators, have only vague ideas about what constitutes the concepts and skills emphasized in home economics. Rollins (1981) states that the public's image of "home economists" and "home economics" as being a field that prepares females to be good "stitchers and stewers" can be attributed to the fact that home economists have not kept the public informed and up to date on what the field has become (p. 24). She reported that secondary home economics programs have not projected a holistic view of home economics. The secondary program has perpetuated a stereotyped

image of cooking and sewing and has not projected the other subject matter areas on the same level.

Projecting an accurate and positive image of the profession has been a major concern of home economics educators (Dannison, 1976 and Stinnett et al., 1971). However, in the last decade few studies have focused on attitudes toward home economics.

A study by Magrabi (1970) at Michigan State University investigated perceptions toward home economics as general education elective courses at the college level. The study hypothesized that the image of the home economics course appeared to be influenced by course titles.

Several comparisons were made in Magrabi's study:

(1) the extent to which the selected home economics course were perceived by the students as contributing to their general education,

(2) the students' perception of course titles, and

(3) whether students' recognition of a course's contribution to general education is related to their image of course title.

The following conclusions were drawn from the study: (1) students rated the home economics courses quite high in reference to their contribution to general education with the exception to two freshman level home economics courses, (2) students who had taken the course either did not differ from or had a more favorable image of

the course title than students who had not taken the course, and (3) the favorable view of the course was related to a favorable image of the course title (Magrabi, 1970). She also noted that some home economics courses appear to have potential as general education and that course titles do appear to create favorable or unfavorable images. A conclusion was that the image conveyed by course titles is of the upmost importance.

> ...educators concerned with making home economics courses more accessible to all students should recognize course titles as one means of creating an image. Titles may be useful means of alerting prospective students to the contributions course might make to their general education (p. 48).

One study that contradicts the frequently voiced view of an unfavorable attitude toward home economics held by those outside the profession was a study conducted by Stinnett et al. (1971). The study was conducted at Oklahoma State University to investigate perceptions of undergraduate students in various college disciplines concerning the home economics profession and major. The study consisted of 282 Oklahoma State University students; 69% men and 31% women.

Results indicate that college students' perceptions of the profession of home economics and the home economics major were positive. Most of the respondents (67%) felt that home economics was a profession primarily of women and few men; whereas, 21% felt home economics was a field exclusively for women. In addition, the respondents (70%) did not associate home economics with one particu-

lar area, but equally with all of its subject matter areas. Stinnett et al. (1971) concluded:

> This may suggest an increasing awareness, at least at the college level, of the diversity of the profession and that the stereotyped image of home economics as a field of 'cooking and sewing' is fading (p. 608).

Investigation of sources of influence on respondents' attitudes toward home economics revealed that a number of factors affect attitudes, including peer group (34%), publicity from mass media and organizations (21%), teachers and courses (19% and 16%, respectively), and parents (10%). The respondents' attitudes toward home economics were primarily formed at the high school level rather than the college level.

In the analysis of the perception of the home economics major the following results were reported:

1. the greatest proportion (43%) of respondents felt that home economics students were informed of world affairs;
2. 28% felt the home economics student attended college for the preparation for a profession;
3. academic competence of home economics students was perceived as average by 79% of respondents;
4. 58% felt that home economics students generally receive a comprehensive education;
5. 46% indicated that women majoring in home economics make better than average wives;

6. 49% felt women majoring in home economics make better than average mothers;
7. women majoring in home economics have favorable attitudes toward men (64%); and,
8. home economics students are neither very conservative nor liberal (Stinnett et al., 1971, pp. 608-609).

In a study conducted by Yankelovich (1974) the image depicted of home economics by college and secondary school administrators, legislators, and business persons was not so positive. The study was conducted as a means of providing resource information for a planned public relations program. The study revealed "home economics as a discipline is itself rather thoroughly misunderstood and polarized" (p. 10). School administrators, legislators, and business people did not perceive home economics as having a clear identity. Seventy percent of the respondents revealed that "the home economist's major function and real role in society is relatively unknown" (p. 14).

Three of the more recent studies that have investigated attitudes toward home economics and indicated a more positive result were studies conducted by Sisson (1977); Dannison (1976); and Hayes (1974).

Hayes (1974) sought to investigate prevailing attitudes among students at the eighth and eleventh grade levels toward major concepts in the Ohio Home Economics Curriculum Guide. Results indicated there was significant association between grade levels of students

and student attitudes toward concepts taught. More students at the eleventh grade level tended to express a more positive attitude than eighth grade students on the following major concepts: Buyer, Communication, Decisions, Family, Food, Furnishings, Future, Grooming, Leisure, Management, Marriage, Money Management, Nutrition, Prenatal Care, Safety, Values, and Wages. Whereas, more eighth grade students expressed positive attitudes than eleventh grade students on the concepts of Community and Self.

When an analysis was done on association between sex and the expressed attitudes, more girls expressed a positive attitude than boys on these concepts: Buyer, Children, Church, Clothing, Communication, Decisions, Friends, Furniture, Future, Grooming, Management, Marriage, Money Management, Prenatal Care, and School. More boys expressed a positive attitude than girls on the concepts of Safety and Self.

A study designed to assess similarities and differences in attitudes of students who had experience in home economics as compared to those who did not was conducted by Dannison in 1976. Subjects consisted of 364 students in eighth grade English classes and twelfth grade government classes. A total of six twelfth grade classes and 10 eighth grade classes participated.

When an analysis was made of the significant differences on the usefulness scale by course, mean scores on the concepts of child care, marriage and family relationships, foods, clothing, and home

economics, were significantly higher (.05) for students with home economics background than would-be home economics students at both the eighth and twelfth grade levels. On the perceived helpfulness scale, home economics students ranked the concept child care significantly higher than would-be home economics students, whereas would-be home economics students ranked the concept decision making significantly higher. Home economics students ranked the curriculum area foods significantly higher than the would-be home economics students on the basis of perceived preference or liking for the concept. Would-be home economics students ranked the area of decision making and personality development significantly higher than home economics students.

Significant difference by sex indicated that females rated the concept of child care, housing and home furnishing, marriage and family relationships, clothing, personality development, and home economics significantly higher than males on the usefulness scale. Male subjects ranked the concept family finance significantly higher than females on the basis of how they perceived the course as useful. Females ranked the concepts child care, and marriage and family relationships significantly higher than males on the basis of their perceived preference or liking the curriculum concept as presented.

On the ranking scale for the perceived helpfulness measure, the areas of housing, home furnishings, and clothing was ranked significantly higher by eighth grade students than by twelfth grade stu-

dents. However, family finance and marriage and family relationships was ranked significantly higher by twelfth grade students. On the perceived preference or liking scale, eighth grade students ranked the concept of clothing significantly higher than twelfth grade students.

Sisson (1977) conducted a study to explore students, teachers, and parents attitudes toward the mandated prevocational wage-earning program in Florida. The mandate was a result of the Vocational Education Act of 1963 and the 1968 amendments to vocational education. Consumer and homemaking (skills) emphasis was completely eliminated and wage-earning programs became the focus. The curriculum emphasized the exploration of various careers related to home economics. A comparison was made between eight consumer and homemaking statements and seven statements which emphasized careers or occupations. Data were calculated on the basis of percentages. The total group surveyed included 240 teachers, 149 parents, and 236 students. Of the total group, 91% or higher rated developing skills in food preparation for personal and family use, competencies for successful family relationships, responsibilities in managing a home and an awareness of good consumer practices as being very important/important. All of the consumer homemaking statements were rated as very important/important by 76-94% of the respondents; while the wage-earning statements were rated very important/important by 45-67% of the respondents. Although the participants rated consumer and home-

making activities very important/important, 45% of the participants did rate the wage-earning activities as important also.

Teachers were reported as giving the highest single rating to developing an awareness of good consumer practices; parents gave the highest single rating to developing an awareness of the roles and responsibilities in managing a home; students gave the highest rating to developing skills in food preparation for personal and family use (Sisson, 1977).

Rollins (1981) in her article "Secondary Home Economics Curricula Perpetuate A Stereotype," revealed two sources that have contributed to misconceptions concerning home economics: the vocational home economics curriculum which does not reflect the current trends in home economics and the lack of content knowledge required in college curriculum for future teachers of home economics. According to Rollins, contemporary home economics classes have aided the public's perception of a stereotyped image. She stated:

> Clothing classes often hold style shows to display their accomplishments to the entire student body and parents. Home economics foods classes are called upon to take charge of many of the banquets. Parents hear about or observe these activities; little wonder they associate home economics with the same program they encountered in high school (p. 25).

Riggs (1980) believes home economists have a chance to eradicate this situation. She states:

> There is no gain without pain! The pain is hearing the criticism and assuming some of the blame. The gain is telling our story. If we fail to read the road signs and direct the traffic, the traffic will direct us (p. 21).

Several studies confirm Rollins' conviction of secondary programs perpetuating a stereotype (Ross, 1975; Coon, 1962).

Coon's (1962) study revealed that specific aspects of both foods and clothing consistently were given a high proportion of time. "These two aspects were clothing construction and food preparation, each of which absorbed from 60 to 70 percent of the time given to the area" (p. 110). The areas which were reported receiving the least amount of time were management and consumer education.

Ross in 1975 conducted a study to examine what was being taught in home economics at the secondary level and the length of time spent on each area. The study revealed that in the areas of Foods and Nutrition, 50 to 76 percent of teachers in vocational and nonvocational home economics programs taught food preparation skills for a period of more than six weeks. In the Clothing, Textiles and Related Arts area, 55 to 68 percent of the teachers in each program taught clothing construction. The areas in the curriculum reported by the teachers as being taught for the least amount of time were Child Development; Personal, Family and Community Relations; and Career Education.

It is interesting to note that teachers indicated that "a skill orientation was more important than a 'people orientation' or the teaching of concepts" (Ross, 1975; p. 93).

Yankelovich (1974) revealed that policy makers did not perceive home economics as "career oriented (but) interested in cooking and

sewing skills" (p. 22). As a result of the negative images perceived by others, Rollins (1981) stated there is definitely a need for educators to reexamine those two activities in the secondary schools as a means of clarification of the image of home economics.

Home Economics Curriculum

The question of what should be the content of home economics has been posed since the first Lake Placid Conference in 1899 and is still a major concern of home economics educators today (Hall, 1978). The home economics curriculum focuses on different ways of solving problems of different eras. At the turn of the century, according to Hall (1978) when families were living in a predominately production-oriented world, they had very different problems from individuals and families fifty years later in a consumer-oriented society.

In the production-oriented society, families were considered a fairly independent economic unit that grew and preserved their own foods; transportation was by foot, horse, wagons, or buggies; clothing for women and children was constructed at home and washing was done by hand (East, 1980). Tate (1973) describes the role and responsibilities of women during the colonial days:

> The woman was the nurse, the social worker, and in a sense the manufacturer of household goods. She did the spinning, the weaving, the perserving and canning. She was the butcher, the baker, and the candlestick maker. She made the soap, carded and dyed the yarn, and styled

> and made the clothing for the family. She was the laundress and, so far as her daughters were concerned the family-life teacher. Education for homemaking in that day was in the home itself (p. 3).

Today society has changed drastically. Blankenship and Moerchen (1979) added, "the world has moved from a horse and buggy to the space age" (p. 7). Rapid social and technological changes have forced families to become more of a consuming unit over the traditional producing unit. According to McGrath and Johnson (1968), social and economic conditions that have contributed to the development of home economics include mobility of the family, increasing number of women in the labor force, the growing trends toward urbanization, decreasing isolation among family members, increased economic affluence, and humanitarian and equilitarian traditions of the United States.

These drastic social changes prompted educators to reevaluate the curriculum for relevancy. In the late 1950's, the curriculum reform movement was taking place in all aspects of education. There was a felt need among home economics educators, administrators and teachers specifically, to reevaluate and improve curriculum in the secondary schools. In 1961, the Home Economics Education Branch of the U. S. Office of Education initiated a national project to identify concepts and generalizations that should be included in the home economics curriculum. The resulting concepts and generalizations in home economics were published by the American Homes Economics Association 1967 in the publication Concepts and Generalizations: Their

Place in High School Home Economics Curriculum Development. The subject-matter areas identified were: Human Development and the Family, Home Management and Family Economics, Food and Nutrition, Textiles and Clothing, and Housing. Three major concepts "contribute to the overall purpose of home economics and unify the content of all subject-matter areas." These concepts include (1) human development and interpersonal relationships, (2) values, and (3) management. These concepts are interrelated and should be incorporated in all subject-matter areas of home economics (AHEA, 1967, p. 54).

P.L. 94-482, Subpart 5, Section 150 provides a description of priority subject-matter content in vocational home economics by providing funding, including but not limited to:

> consumer education, food and nutrition, family living and parenthood education, child development and guidance, housing and home management (including resource management), and clothing and textiles (p. 2196).

The law further stipulates that high priority be given to consumer education, management of resources, promotion of nutrition knowledge and food use, and parenthood education to meet the current societal needs.

Subpart 5, Section 150 further charged home economists and teacher educators to make home economics programs more meaningful in terms of real problems of individuals and families in today's society. Peterson and Sisler (1975) noted that the traditional curriculum and teaching methods in home economics are being challenged, evaluated and revised as never before. As a result of federal cut-

backs in programs and funding, decreasing enrollment and federal legislation demanding evidence of program effectiveness, educators are prompted to take a hard look at the curriculum, the audience served, ways to better meet the needs of the learner, and implementing program relevancy based on the changing social and economical developments in society.

Cross (1979) provides a more recent view of what should be the basis of home economics content considering the current social and economical conditions that exist today:

> I am convinced that essential competencies needed by both male and female homemakers must form the basis for designing programs. This is the concise answer to what we should be teaching. Those competencies that seem most essential in terms of current socio-economic conditions are parenting, maintaining interpersonal relationships, developing coping skills, managing financial resources and meeting nutritional needs of the family (p. 37).

One study that was mandated by Congress in P.L. 48-482 to evaluate vocational education and particularly to review and report on the effectiveness of programs funded under Subpart 5 (consumer and homemaking) was conducted by the National Institute of Education (NIE) in 1981. According to Hughes (1980), prior to the mandate by Congress few studies had been done on the state and local levels, and nothing on the national level to evaluate the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking programs. Two reasons were cited: (1) it was not demanded and (2) there was little funding provided for program evaluation. NIE investigated two aspects of consumer and homemaking programs: (1) effectiveness, or the extent to which state and local

programs are responsive to the legislative mandates, particularly with respect to subject-matter taught and the targeted groups of students, and (2) impact or the result of participation in consumer and homemaking programs for the learner.

The legislation was also the catalyst for research on effectiveness and impact of consumer and homemaking programs by home economics researchers nationwide. An Ad Hoc Research Committee formed by the Home Economics Division of the American Vocational Association had as its purpose "to determine immediate and long-range research needs in order to describe the current status and effectively plan for the future" (Mears et al., p. iii, 1981). Studies sponsored by the committee included Gritzmacher et al., (1981); Fedje et al., (1981); Caputo and Haymore, (1981); Mears et al., (1981); and Hughes et al., (1980).

Using results of the Hughes et al. study, NIE reported on a census study based on 1,147 secondary schools in 41 states. With respect to what is taught, the most frequently offered course was Comprehensive Consumer Homemaking (all subject matter areas included). This accounted for the highest enrollment between 1972 and 1978, and was offered more than any of the other six content areas. Food and Nutrition and Clothing and Textiles had the highest enrollment of the content areas. Enrollment in Consumer Education remained the lowest, and Food and Nutrition enrollment was highest.

Student enrollment in Consumer and Homemaking programs represented the highest enrollment in any of the other vocational education program fields. Nationally, 75% were secondary students, adult programs comprised 24%, and post-secondary students comprised 1% (NIE, 1981). A 17% increase in Consumer and Homemaking enrollment was revealed by NIE. Although females account for 80% of enrollment in Consumer and Homemaking progrms, the increased enrollment was due in part to increased male participation in Consumer and Homemaking programs.

In addition, Hughes (1980) reported that 19% of students enrolled in Consumer and Homemaking programs are males, an increase of 17% as compared to the 2% enrollment reported in the Coon study (1962). Simpson (1979) revealed 23% of secondary school students enrolled in home economics in the United States are males. NIE revealed a 13% increase in male enrollment between 1972 (6%) and 1977 (19%). Of the ten states surveyed, two special needs groups were most often served, the educationally disadvantaged and the elderly. The handicapped persons also participate in the Consumer and Homemaking programs through secondary school programs, human services or health care agencies (NIE, 1981).

The importance of curriculum change in home economics has been echoed by many home economics educators (Rollins, 1981; Hughes et al., 1980; and Cross, 1979). Yankelovich (1974) described the home economics profession and curriculum in a state of flux. On one hand,

home economists seem to be placing emphasis on the traditional skills of cooking and food preparation, sewing and homemaking, while at the same time they are admitting that updating curriculum relevancy is definitely needed (p. 31). Spitze (1977) described the significance of change in this way:

> The home economics curriculum must change along with society, if the profession is to make any impact at all on individuals' ability to survive in a rapidly changing world (p. 7).

In a recent article, she states that incorporating education for survival, for responsibility, for morality and for a healthy environment into the curriculum are the most important contributions home economics teachers can make to the future of home economics (1977).

Nichols et al. (1983) conducted a study to examine what home economics courses should be included in the secondary school curriculum in the next decade and the possible impact of a mother's employment on her attitude toward home economics. The participants were mothers of third grade children in Kansas. Results indicate that mothers "would like the curriculum of their children to include more (and different) home economics courses than had been available to them" (p. 28). Respondents indicated that family relations--child development and management areas should be given more emphasis than they received in their education. Although respondents indicated that home economics was important for both males and females, they tended to select a different emphasis for their sons than for their daughters. Mothers indicated a strong desire for their sons to take

courses in equipment and consumer education, whereas garment construction was a stronger desire for their daughters.

Differences concerning attitudes toward home economics was significantly different among working mothers and homemaking mothers. Working mothers had taken more home economics in secondary schools than homemaking mothers. Mothers employed outside the home were significantly different on clothing selection, personal grooming, textiles, nutrition, food planning, and child development. Nichols et al. speculated that "the difference might reflect more academic interest among employed women" (p. 30).

Spitze (1983) conducted a survey in 1981 among 100 teacher-subscribers to Illinois Teacher to determine important content for high school home economics. Teachers were asked to list and rank the ten most pressing social problems and whether they could and should be helping to solve them in the classroom. Among the top social problems were teenage drug and alcohol abuse, peer pressure, teenage pregnancies and marriage, economic instability, family communication, marriage and role expectations.

Teachers were asked to rate the importance of teaching 30 societal topics/problems in home economics as identified by the researcher. Respondents indicated the following rank order of importance for teaching those items in home economics at the secondary level.

Rank	Topic or Problem
1	Improving health through better nutrition
2	Improving human relations through better nutrition
3	Protecting the children and helping them develop
4	Being responsible consumers
5	Increasing decision-making skills
6	Managing family resources
7	Preventing family violence
8	Taking care of one's own health
9	Recognizing consequences of values held
10	Improving quality of life with less expenditure
11	Increasing ability to handle stress
12	Adapting lifestyle to conserve resources
13	Increasing our individual productivity
14 (tie)	Increasing employability
14	Teaching ways to conserve energy

(Spitze, 1983, p. 157)

Although the image depicted in the secondary schools perpetuates a stereotype, East (1982) states, "What home economics will be in the future will depend on what will be created by what home economists are doing today and will do in the near future" (p. 21).

Influences On Curriculum

Although society undergoes many cultural and social changes, the school is to incorporate basic values and reflect social, economic and cultural change (Trump and Miller, 1979). In order for schools to accommodate innovative change and reflect pragmatic, worthy procedures, the secondary school curriculum needs constant reevaluation. There are many forces that affect the curriculum. If a definition of curriculum includes what teachers teach and how they teach, then the following forces affect the curriculum:

1. changing concept of student needs, rights, and responsibilities
2. changing parental demands for explanation of what the school is doing and what it ought to be doing
3. court interpretations of the law as it affects students
4. legislation in the various states dictating what students shall be taught and how they shall be taught

5. national movements reflecting philosophic approaches to control and instruct procedures
6. the militancy of teacher organizations demanding economic and professional benefits with the willingness to strike to obtain them
7. movements such as accountability and "back to the basics," that are calling for more precise methods of evaluating classroom results (Trump and Miller, 1979, p. 37-8).

In addition, Murphy (1978) felt the following were the most influential factors which influence home economics curriculum development in secondary schools: priority of the federal education dollar, back to basics movements, and federal legislation. Saylor et al. (1980) indicated that curriculum planning is influenced by a number of individuals and groups: clients, critics, professionals, legislative groups and courts.

Teachers and administrators greatly influence what is taught in vocational home economics. According to Leese et al. (1961), traditionally, teacher participation in curriculum planning was minimal or nonexistent. Over the last several decades there has been a recognition that teachers can make valuable contributions in various kinds of decision making. Since then, it has become common practice for teachers to decide when, how, and what they teach, to select content

and plan learning activities, to revise course offerings, and to produce aids for teaching.

When planning the curriculum, Lueck et al. (1966), revealed several factors that are necessary to consider; students' ability and needs, student expectations, teacher expectations, school facilities, community needs and national needs. Of these factors, the student needs and interests should receive major attention in curriculum endeavors (Tyler, 1949). If students perceive the curriculum to be irrelevant, enrollment decreases, dropout rates increase, and support for programs lessens with the likelihood that eventually the program is eliminated from the school curriculum.

Spitze (1977) cited four important aspects of curriculum planning and implementation: teacher effectivenss, evaluation techniques, teaching materials and grouping. Evaluation techniques and teaching materials selected may affect the student's self-concept, attitude toward the subject, learning, motivation, achievement and skills in interpersonal relationships, and communication. If learning is to occur, teachers must first get the attention of their students. Students who are bored with materials or methodology will not learn.

As indicated by Mears et al., (1981) consumer and homemaking programs exist for students and the major focus of the program are students' learning and meeting their needs. The teacher can and should impact and influence his/her students and the tool which is the guide--curriculum (Bent and Kronenberg, 1966). Curriculum should

be used as a tool that allows the teacher to use flexibility and create variety in teaching. The authors stated it is not a guide or sacred tool that must be adhered to diminishing the student's or teacher's chance for creativity.

> The teacher so motivated is a worthy member of the profession, and the curriculum in his hand is a tool he uses with skill and judgment. He knows when to wield this tool and when to lay it aside. It is not a crutch or a refuge; it is, rather, an implement - only one implement of many - for the gentle shaping of a life (Gould 1966, p. 305).

Teachers should have knowledge and skill enough to adapt and revise curriculum to meet the needs of the students for whom the class is designed. Meeting the needs of the students may, at times, involve changing content structure, discarding obsolete information and adding relevent materials, modifying teaching strategies or incorporating visuals to assist learning. As advocated by Gould (1966), the educational system must provide avenues for change, innovation, deviation, and exploration. These stages all provide the system a chance to refurbish/reiterate life and vitality back into education, keeping it current and healthy.

There is no doubt that administrators contribute significantly to the progress of a school. Nollingham (1979) acknowledged "no significant change occurs in a school without the active support of the principal" (p. 32). Support of administrators/principals can only be achieved if there is a thorough understanding of what it is they are supporting.

Trump and Miller (1979) indicated that because the principal is in the best position to see the total picture of the school and is in charge, he/she is responsible for organizing change to improve curriculum. Lingens (1979) added "the local school principal is the key to change. He/she is the one who must hear the community's voice and must know how to tap its resources" (p. 16). There has been much said for the importance of principals in relation to the quality of the instructional program. Those who are able to articulate a sense of direction and provide insight on satisfying experiences in a program have great potential to influence school programs. Barkelew (1979) reported that 90% of public relations are built upon who you are and what you do as a school administrator, while only 7% is based on listening to the various audiences, with the remaining 3% on communications through newspapers, letters, flyers, etc. (p. 7). Therefore, in order to be an influential administrator in the school, articulation with the public is essential.

West (1977) urged that "the initiating action for curriculum involvement is the professional responsibility of everyone in the school system" (p. 316-17). All channels of communication must flow harmoniously from teachers, to principals, to the board of education, to the public.

Summary

A review of the current literature indicates major concern for projecting an accurate image in home economics. The stereotyped images related to home economics are still present. The public's vague misconceptions about the comprehensiveness of home economics, the secondary school curriculum, and a lack of public relations efforts to inform the constituents about what home economics has become, all contribute to the perpetuation of stereotypes in home economics. The activities of "cooking" and "sewing" are, in most instances, identified with home economics and have prompted the public, legislators, and administrators to think of home economics as "not career-oriented but interested in cooking and sewing skills." Other subject matter areas of home economics have not gained status or visibility to the degree of "cooking" and "sewing."

The discussion of what should be taught in consumer and homemaking programs has been and still is a great concern of leaders in home economics education. The importance of curriculum change has been recognized by many educators. The literature implies home economics programs should be designed to help the clientele meet the changing social and economical conditions existing today. At present, the most pressing needs are parenting education, maintaining interpersonal relationships, management of financial resources, and meeting nutritional needs of the family. Three major concepts unify and contribute to the purpose of home economics; values, human devel-

opment and interpersonal relationships, and management. These concepts are interrelated and should be incorporated in all subject-matter areas.

Several circumstances have influenced curriculum decisions in home economics. Changing social and economical conditions in society, students' needs and interests, and federal legislation have all impacted the home economics curriculum. Other factors that may influence teacher curriculum decisions are expert knowledge and skills, attitude of school administrator and teachers, and funding. Of these factors, federal mandates have had the most significant impact on curriculum in home economics requiring programs to address the vast changing social and economical needs and terms for funding of consumer and homemaking programs.

III. METHODOLOGY

The major purpose of this study was to investigate attitudes of students, teachers, and principals regarding the skills taught in consumer and homemaking education. Two other purposes were to: (1) compare the responses of students, teachers, and principals, and (2) to identify the importance of selected factors on curriculum development in secondary home economics education.

The following procedure was used to achieve the purpose of the study: (1) selection of the sample; (2) development of the instrument; (3) data collection and procedures; and (4) statistical analysis.

Selection of the Sample

For the purpose of this study, the target population was consumer and homemaking teachers, principals, and students in the state of Oregon. A statified random sampling procedure was used to identify the number of schools to be included. The sample of schools from which teachers and principals were selected was stratified according to large or "AAA" schools with a student population of 600-2,281 (N=83); medium or "AA" schools with a student population of 200-599 (N=54); and small or "A" schools with a student population of 1-199 (N=93). To determine a representative number of schools for each strata in the sample, the percent of schools in each cell was

multiplied by the total sample size (n=40) (Table 1). A table of random numbers was used to select schools to be included in the sample. Schools represented in the study were identified from the Oregon School Directory. The selection of schools included in the sample was limited to those schools offering consumer and homemaking at the secondary level.

Consumer and homemaking teachers and principals in the forty schools selected were asked to participate. Of the forty, four schools in each strata were randomly selected for student participation.

Development of the Instrument

Data for the purpose of this study were collected by means of a structured questionnaire. The items on the questionnaire were developed by the researcher. A review of current literature served as basis for developing the questionnaire. The instrument, Attitudes Toward Consumer and Homemaking Education (ATCHE), (Appendix A) has fifteen items, three from five content areas (Human Development and the Family, Home Management and Family Economics, Food and Nutrition, Textiles and Clothing, and Housing) as identified in the publication Concepts and Generalizations: Their Place in High School Home Economics Curriculum Development (AHEA, 1967).

The format of the questionnaire utilized principles recommended by Dillman (1978). All items that were similar in content were

Table 1

CLASSIFICATION, NUMBER, PERCENTAGE AND SAMPLE SIZE OF SCHOOLS

	Number of Schools	Percentage of Schools	Number Sample Schools
Class AAA[a]	83	36%	15
Class AA	54	23%	9
Class A	93	40%	16
	230	100%	40

[a]Classification
Class "AAA" schools with a student population of 600-2,281
Class "AA" schools with a student population of 200-599
Class "A" schools with a student population of 1-199

grouped together to encourage well thought-out answers and keep respondents' concentration focused on one topic thereby leading to more accurate results and a sense of continuity throughout the questionnaire.

A five-point Likert-type scale was chosen to measure attitudes because of the ease of responding and familiarity of categories (Carruth and Anderson, 1977) as well as its ease of construction and good reliability (Oppenheim, 1966). Possible responses were "Strongly Agree," "Agree, "Undecided," "Disagree," and "Strongly Disagree." Each response was assigned a score of five to one. A score of five was assigned to "Strongly Agree" indicating a positive attitude and one to "Strongly Disagree" representing less positive attitude toward the skill statements.

Students, teachers, and principals were all asked to respond to the first fifteen items on the ATCHE. In addition, the second part of the questionnaire requested teachers and principals to indicate how important selected factors were in deciding what skills are taught in consumer and homemaking education at the secondary level. The items were developed based on a review of the current literature that indicated factors which may influence choice of concept selection in curriculum development. Responses were "Very Important" (VI), "Somewhat Important" (SI), to "Not too Important" (NI). In addition, teachers and principals were asked to indicate the factors they considered to have "Most Influence," "Second Most Influence,"

and "Least Influence" on curriculum decisions.

The instrument was reviewed by a panel of specialists consisting of home economics teacher educators, the home economics state department specialist, and a group of secondary home economics teachers. The panelists evaluated the instrument for content appropriate for secondary home economics and wording. The panelists were asked to accept, reject, or modify the statements. After receiving the evaluations from the specialists, the responses were tallied for each item and revisions were made.

The instrument was pretested with a class of history students. A history class was selected because it was the targeted student group. Pretesting was conducted by the researcher in order to observe the respondents' verbal feedback as recommended by Dillman (1978).

Data Collection and Procedures

For the twelve schools in which students were participating, permission was first secured by telephone from each school district superintendent and second, from the principal. A packet containing the surveys was then mailed to principals. Cover letters were mailed to the principals, home economics teachers, and history teachers explaining the purpose of the study and instructions for administering the questionnaires (Appendix B). An additional envelope was provided for the home economics teacher to seal the response if

desired. A stamped, self-addressed envelope was enclosed for return of the surveys. The principals of the schools were asked to collect all materials and return them in the large stamped, return-addressed envelope.

All consumer and homemaking teachers and principals in the remaining twenty-eight schools were mailed letters (Appendix C) seeking their participation in the study and a copy of the questionnaire. A pre-paid self-addressed envelope was included. A period of two weeks was allowed for response. A follow-up post card was sent as a reminder for those who had not returned the questionnaire (Appendix D) within two weeks.

Statistical Analysis

The plan for statistical analysis involved the following hypotheses and statistical tests:

Hypothesis I

There is no significant difference in responses of students, teachers, and principals regarding the:

a. comprehensiveness of skills taught in consumer and homemaking education;

b. skills taught in each content area;

c. specific skills taught in consumer and homemaking education.

Statistical Technique: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Hypothesis II

There is no significant difference in responses of male and female students regarding the:

a. comprehensiveness of skills taught in consumer and homemaking education;

b. skills taught in each content area;

c. specific skills taught in consumer and homemaking education.

Statistical Technique: Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

Hypothesis III

There is no significant difference in the responses of teachers and principals regarding the importance of each factor which influences curriculum decisions in home economics education at the secondary level.

Statistical Technique: Chi Square

A computer analysis of the data was conducted with the aid of a consultant from the Computer Center at Oregon State University. The computer program Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie et al., 1975) was used for the analysis of all questionnaire items.

The .05 level of probability was selected as the criteria for acceptance or rejection of the null hypotheses. When the F test indicated significance at the .05 level, the Tukey HSD Procedure

(Kerlinger, 1964) was used to identify sources of differences between individual means. The results are presented in Chapter IV.

IV. PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

Introduction

The study was designed and conducted to determine the attitudes among students, teachers, and principals toward skills taught in consumer and homemaking education at the secondary level. Inquiry concerning skills taught in home economics from five content areas were studied; Human Development and the Family, Home Management and Family Economics, Food and Nutrition, Textiles and Clothing, and Housing. Two other purposes were to compare the attitudes of students, teachers and principals, and to identify the importance of selected factors on curriculum decisions.

Findings resulting from the analysis of data are reported in the following manner: Description of the Sample, Measurement Characteristics of the Instrument, and Testing the Hypotheses.

Description of the Sample

A stratified random sampling procedure was used to select schools to be included in the study. A total of 40 schools were selected to request teacher and principal participation, including 15 "AAA" schools, 9 "AA" schools, and 16 "A" schools. Of the 40 schools selected, 12 schools were randomly chosen (4 for each strate, "AAA," "AA," and "A") to request student participation.

Letters (Appendix C) describing the purpose of the study and requesting teachers' and principals' participation were sent to the principals and teachers in the 28 schools without student participation. A stamped self-addressed envelope was included for return of the questionnaires mailed (teachers =47, principals =28), a total of 63 (84%) were returned (Table 2).

For the schools that included student participants, permission was secured first from the district superintendent, and, second, from the school principal. Packets were mailed to the principals containing surveys, cover letters to the principals, home economics teachers, and history teachers explaining the purpose of the study and instructions for administering the questionnaire (Appendix B). Packets that were mailed to the 12 schools in which students participated were all returned. This included 18 home economics teachers, 12 principals and 272 students.

A total of 58 teachers and 35 principals participated in the study. The years of teaching experience ranged from 1 year to 31 years. The majority of teachers, 18 (31%), had 11 to 20 years teaching experience (Table 3). The number of years in administration for principals ranged from 1 year to 26 years. The largest percent (37%) of the principals had 11 to 20 years in administration (Table 4).

There were 141 male and 131 female students participating in the study. Table 5 presents a total of student, teacher, and principal participants based on sex.

Table 2

RETURNS FROM TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS FROM SCHOOLS WITHOUT STUDENT PARTICIPATION

	Number Mailed	Number Returned	Percent Returned
Teachers	47	40	85
Principals	28	23	82
Total	75	63	84%

Table 3

YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE OF TEACHERS IN THE SAMPLE

Years	N	Percent
1-5	17	29
6-10	15	26
11-20	18	31
21-31	8	14
Total	58	100

Table 4

YEARS OF EXPERIENCE IN ADMINISTRATION OF PRINCIPALS IN THE SAMPLE

Years	N	Percent
1-5	8	23
6-10	11	31
11-20	13	37
21-26	3	9
Total	35	100

Table 5

SEX OF TEACHERS, PRINCIPALS, AND STUDENTS IN THE SAMPLE

	Teachers	Principals	Students
Males	0	34	141
Females	58	1	131
Total	58	35	272

Students' ages ranged from 14 to 21. The majority of the students who provided their age (n=262) were 16 (44%) and 17 (35%) (Table 6).

Of the respondents, most of the students (73%) had taken some coursework in home economics (n=272). Table 7 is a summary of the number of semesters/quarters the students had taken. Six percent had nine weeks (one quarter of home economics), 19% had one semester (two quarters), 19% had two semesters, and 29% had more than two semesters of coursework in home economics.

A large percentage of students lived with their mother (92%) and/or father 80% (Table 8). Six percent did not live with their mother; whereas, 17% did not live with their father (Table 8). In response to the question regarding employment of their parents, 10% of the students' fathers did not work whereas, 29% of mothers were not employed outside the home (Table 9).

Measurement Characteristics of the Instrument

The instrument used in this study was Attitudes Toward Consumer and Homemaking Education (ATCHE) (Appendix A). There were a total of 15 items on the first part of the instrument. Items were scored 5 (Strongly Agree) to 1 (Strongly Disagree). The total score possible for the Attitudes Toward Consumer and Homemaking Education ranged from 15, for the least comprehensive view, to 75 for the most comprehensive view of consumer and homemaking education. Items were

Table 6

AGE RANGE OF STUDENTS IN THE SAMPLE

Years	N	Percent
14	10	4
15	28	11
16	114	44
17	91	35
18	17	6
19	1	<.5
21	1	<.5
Total	262[a]	100.0

[a]Ten students did not provide this information.

Table 7

SUMMARY OF COURSEWORK TAKEN IN HOME ECONOMICS

Category	N	Percent
Nine Weeks (One Quarter)	17	6
One Semester (Two Quarters)	51	19
Two Semesters (Four Quarters)	53	19
More Than Two Semesters	79	29
No Course Work	72	27
TOTAL	272	100

Table 8

STUDENTS CLASSIFIED BY PARENTS IN RESIDENCE

Category	N	Percent
In Residence - Mother	251	92
In Residence - Father	217	80
No Answer	4	2
Not In Residence - Mother	17	6
Not In Residence - Father	47	17
No Answer	8	3

Table 9

EMPLOYMENT OF PARENTS OF STUDENTS IN THE SAMPLE

	N	Percent
Work		
Mother	178	69
Father	224	86
Do Not Work		
Mother	76	29
Father	26	10

grouped into the five content areas, three items per group. Items A-C represented Human Development and The Family, D-F Home Management and Family Economics, G-I Food and Nutrition, J-L Textiles and Clothing, and M-O Housing. All returned questionnaires were used. All unanswered questions were considered missing data and therefore "n's" vary among items.

An Alpha Coefficient, an internal-consistency method for determining reliability, was computed (Novick and Lewis, 1967). A reliability of .90 for the Attitudes Toward Consumer and Homemaking Education was computed.

Testing of Hypotheses

The hypotheses for this study dealt with students', teachers', and principals' attitudes toward consumer and homemaking education and factors which influence curriculum decisions in home economics education. Three statistical tests were used to test the hypotheses: Analysis of Variance, Student's t, and Chi Square. If a significant difference occurred, the Tukey HSD Procedure was used to ascertain where the difference occurred.

Hypothesis Ia

There is no significant difference in responses of students, teachers, and principals regarding the comprehensiveness of skills taught in consumer and homemaking education.

Statistical Technique: Analysis of Variance

Results indicate that there was a significant difference in the overall attitude of students, teachers, and principals (Table 10). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level. The Tukey HSD Procedure revealed that the students' overall mean scores were lowest (3.7), principals' second (4.3) and teachers' highest (4.6) (Table 11).

Hypothesis Ib

There is no significant difference in responses of students, teachers, and principals regarding skills taught in each content area in consumer and homemaking education.

Statistical Technique: Analysis of Variance

Results show that there was a significant difference regarding the attitudes toward the various content areas taught in consumer and homemaking education (Table 12). Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level. Tukey's HSD Procedure indicated where differences occurred. Results are summarized in Table 13. For three content areas (Human Development and the Family, Food and Nutrition, and Textiles and Clothing) students' mean scores were significantly lower. For two content areas (Home Management and Family Economics, and Housing), students', teachers', and principals' mean scores were all significantly different, with teachers' mean scores the highest and students' lowest.

Table 10

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR THE OVERALL ATTITUDE OF STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS CONCERNING THE COMPREHENSIVENESS OF CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	41.8	20.9	73.8	.000
Within Groups	362	102.4	.283		
Total	364	144.2			

Table 11

MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS CONCERNING THE COMPREHENSIVENESS OF CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

Group	N	Mean[a]	SD
Students	272	3.7*[b]	.6
Principals	35	4.3*[b]	.4
Teachers	58	4.6*[b]	.4

[a]The score for most comprehensive was 5 and for least comprehensive was 1.

*[b]Students', teachers' and principals' mean are significantly different from each other ($p<.05$ Tukey HSD)

Table 12

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS CONCERNING THE FIVE CONTENT AREAS REPRESENTED ON THE ATTITUDE SURVEY TOWARD CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

ITEM A, B, C: Human Development and The Family

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	42.7	21.3	39.2	.000
Within Groups	362	196.9	.544		
Total	364	239.6			

ITEMS D, E, F: Home Management and Family Economics

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	24.3	12.1	26.2	.000
Within Groups	362	167.9	.464		
Total	364	192.2			

Table 12
(Continued)

ITEMS G, H, I: Food and Nutrition

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	35.0	17.5	40.3	.000
Within Groups	362	157.0	.434		
Total	364	192.0			

ITEMS J, K, L: Textiles and Clothing

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	74.4	37.2	63.6	.0000
Within Groups	362	212.1	.586		
Total	364	286.5			

Table 12
(Continued)

ITEMS M, N, O: Housing

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	41.6	20.8	36.4	.000
Within Groups	362	206.9	.572		
Total	364	248.5			

Table 13
MEAN SCORES AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS FOR THE FIVE CONTENT AREAS

ITEM A, B, C: Human Development and The Family

Group	N	Mean	SD
Students	272	3.7*[a]	.9
Principals	35	4.3	.5
Teachers	58	4.6	.5

ITEMS D, E, F: Home Management and Family Economics

Group	N	Mean	SD
Students	272	3.9*[b]	.7
Principals	35	4.2*[b]	.6
Teachers	58	4.6*[b]	.5

Table 13
(Continued)

ITEMS G, H, I: Food and Nutrition

Group	N	Mean	SD
Students	272	4.0*[a]	.7
Principals	35	4.7	.5
Teachers	58	4.8	.3

ITEMS J, K, L: Textiles and Clothing

Group	N	Mean	SD
Students	272	3.3*[a]	.8
Principals	35	4.2	.7
Teachers	58	4.4	.5

Table 13
(Continued)

ITEMS M, N, O: Housing

Group	N	Mean	SD
Students	272	3.5*[b]	.8
Principals	35	3.9*[b]	.6
Teachers	58	4.4*[b]	.5

*p<.05 (Tukey HSD)
[a]Student's mean is significantly less than principals' mean and teachers' mean
[b]Students', teachers' and principals' mean scores are significantly different from each other p<.05 (Tukey HSD)

Summaries of the content area ranking of mean scores for students, teachers and principals are presented in Tables 14, 15, and 16. Students', teachers', and principals' mean scores were highest on the content area of Food and Nutrition. Mean scores were lowest on the content area of Housing for principals (3.9) and teachers (4.4). Textiles and clothing mean scores (3.3) were lowest for students.

Hypothesis Ic

There is no significant difference in responses of students, teachers, and principals regarding the specific skills to be developed in consumer and homemaking education.

Statistical Technique: Analysis of Variance

Results of the analysis of variance indicated that there was a significant difference among all items tested (Table 17), therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level. The Tukey HSD Procedure was used to determine where the difference occurred. For 13 of the items, students' mean scores were significantly lower than teachers' and principals' (Table 18). The Tukey HSD for item D (develop money management skills for personal and family use) revealed that students and principals had significantly lower mean scores than teachers. Students', teachers', and principals' mean scores were all significantly different for item M (develop skills in choosing a place to live which is best for the needs of the indi-

Table 14

CONTENT AREA RANKING OF MEAN SCORES OF STUDENTS

Content Areas	Mean
Food and Nutrition	4.0
Home Management and Family Economics	3.9
Human Development and the Family	3.7
Housing	3.3
Textiles and Clothing	3.3

Table 15

CONTENT AREA RANKING OF MEAN SCORES OF TEACHERS

Content Areas	Mean
Food and Nutrition	4.8
Human Development and the Family	4.6
Home Management and Family Economics	4.5
Textiles and Clothing	4.4
Housing	4.3

Table 16

CONTENT AREA RANKING OF MEAN SCORES FOR PRINCIPALS

Content Areas	Mean
Food and Nutrition	4.7
Human Development and the Family	4.3
Textiles and Clothing	4.2
Home Management and Family Economics	4.2
Housing	3.9

Table 17
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS CONCERNING SPECIFIC ITEMS ON THE ATTITUDE SURVEY TOWARD CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

I believe home economics should teach students to:

Item A: develop communication skills that enrich marriage, associations with family members and others.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	59.2	29.6	34.327	.000
Within Groups	349	301.1	.863		
Total	351	360.3			

Item B: develop skills in the care and guidance of children.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	40.4	20.2	30.9	.000
Within Groups	361	236.3	.655		
Total	363	376.7			

Table 17
(Continued)

Item C: develop skills in coping with the stresses associated with being a homemaker and wage earner.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	25.8	12.9	15.7	.000
Within Groups	361	297.8	.825		
Total	363	323.6			

Item D: develop money management skills for personal and family use.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	16.9	8.4	9.9	.000
Within Groups	361	309.8	.858		
Total	363	326.6			

Table 17
(Continued)

Item E: develop skills to conserve energy.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	31.3	15.6	18.0	.000
Within Groups	361	313.6	.868		
Total	363	344.9			

Item F: make wise decisions when purchasing goods and services.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	23.2	11.6	22.7	.000
Within Groups	359	183.8	.512		
Total	361	207.1			

Table 17
(Continued)

Item G: develop skills in food preparation for personal and family use.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	27.3	13.6	26.016	.000
Within Groups	359	188.8	.526		
Total	361	216.1			

Item H: plan nutritious meals within the family food budget.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	31.0	15.5	26.7	.000
Within Groups	361	209.6	.581		
Total	363	240.6			

Table 17
(Continued)

Item I: develop food habits which supply basic nutritional needs.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	42.7	21.361	36.9	.000
Within Groups	359	207.3	.578		
Total	361	249.9			

Item J: develop sewing skills for personal and family use.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	59.4	29.7	34.5	.000
Within Groups	361	310.5	.860		
Total	363	369.9			

Table 17
(Continued)

Item K: develop an ability to select and care for clothing.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	80.6	40.3	46.2	.000
Within Groups	361	315.2	.873		
Total	363	395.8			

Item L: use clothing a a means of expressing yourself.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	83.8	41.9	42.9	.000
Within Groups	362	353.4	.976		
Total	364	437.2			

Table 17
(Continued)

Item M: develop skills in choosing a place to live which is best for the needs of the individual and family.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	46.4	23.2	27.7	.000
Within Groups	362	302.3	.835		
Total	364	348.7			

Item N: develop skills in selection, care and maintenance of furniture and equipment in the home.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	42.8	21.4	24.0	.000
Within Groups	361	321.0	.889		
Total	363	363.8			

Table 17
(Continued)

Item O: develop skills in interior design and home furnishing for personal and family use.

Source of Variation	DF	SS	MS	F Ratio	F Prob.
Between Groups	2	36.2	18.1	18.6	.000
Within Groups	362	351.1	.970		
Total	364	387.3			

Table 18

MEAN SCORES FOR STUDENTS, TEACHERS, AND PRINCIPALS FOR SPECIFIC ITEMS ON THE ATTITUDE SURVEY TOWARD CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

I believe home economics should teach students to:

Item A develop communication skills that enrich marriage, associations with family members and others.

Group	N	Mean
Students	262	3.6*[a]
Principals	34	4.2
Teachers	56	4.7

Item B: develop skills in the care and guidance of children.

Group	N	Mean
Students	271	3.9*[a]
Principals	35	4.4
Teachers	58	4.8

Table 18
(Continued)

Item C: develop skills in coping with the stresses associated with being a homemaker and wage earner.

Group	N	Mean
Students	271	3.7*[a]
Principals	35	4.1
Teachers	58	4.4

Item D: develop money management skills for personal and family use.

Group	N	Mean
Students	271	3.9*[b]
Principals	35	4.0*[b]
Teachers	58	4.5

Table 18
(Continued)

Item E: develop skills to conserve energy.

Group	N	Mean
Students	271	3.5*[a]
Principals	35	4.0
Teachers	58	4.3

Item F: make wise decisions when purchasing goods and services.

Group	N	Mean
Students	269	4.1*[a]
Principals	35	4.4
Teachers	58	4.7

Table 18
(Continued)

Item G: develop skills in food preparation for personal and family use.

Group	N	Mean
Students	269	4.1*[a]
Principals	35	4.6
Teachers	58	4.7

Item H: plan nutritious meals within the family food budget.

Group	N	Mean
Students	271	4.1*[a]
Principals	35	4.7
Teachers	58	4.8

Table 18
(Continued)

Item I: develop food habits which supply basic nutritional needs.

Group	N	Mean
Students	269	3.9*[a]
Principals	35	4.6
Teachers	58	4.7

Item J: develop sewing skills for personal and family use.

Group	N	Mean
Students	271	3.6*[a]
Principals	35	4.4
Teachers	58	4.6

Table 18
(Continued)

Item K: develop an ability to select and care for clothing.

Group	N	Mean
Students	271	3.4*[a]
Principals	35	4.4
Teachers	58	4.5

Item L: use clothing as a means of expressing yourself.

Group	N	Mean
Students	272	2.9*[a]
Principals	35	3.7
Teachers	58	4.2

Table 18
(Continued)

Item M: develop skills in choosing a place to live which is best for the needs of the individual and family.

Group	N	Mean
Students	272	3.5*[c]
Principals	35	4.0*[c]
Teachers	58	4.4*[c]

Item N: develop skills in selection, care and maintenance of furniture and equipment in the home.

Group	N	Mean
Students	271	3.4*[a]
Principals	35	3.9
Teachers	58	4.3

Table 18
(Continued)

Item 0: develop skills in interior design and home furnishing for personal and family use.

Group	N	Mean
Students	272	3.4*[a]
Principals	35	3.8
Teachers	58	4.2

*p<.05 level (Tukey HSD)

[a] Students' mean is significantly less than principals' mean and teachers' mean

[b] Students' and principals' means are significantly less than teachers' mean

[c] Students', teachers' and principals' mean scores are significantly different from each other

vidual and family). Teachers had the most positive attitude, followed by principals', and students' attitudes which were less positive.

Hypothesis IIa

There is no significant difference in the responses of male and female students regarding the comprehensiveness of skills taught in consumer and homemaking education.

Statistical Technique: Student's t-test

The Student's t-test revealed that there was a significant difference between male and female overall attitudes concerning the comprehensiveness of skills taught in consumer and homemaking education (Table 19). Females' mean scores were significantly higher than males' mean scores. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis IIb

There is no significant difference in responses of male and female students regarding the skills taught in each content area in consumer and homemaking education.

Statistical Technique: Student's t-test

The analysis of data, reported in Table 20, indicated that there was a significant difference in mean scores of males and females in three of the five content areas: Human Development and the Family;

Table 19

STUDENT'S t-TEST OVERALL RESULTS FOR MALES AND FEMALES CONCERNING THE COMPREHENSIVENESS OF CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	141	3.6	.6	-3.71	270	.000
Females	131	3.9	.4			

Table 20

STUDENT'S t-TEST RESULTS FOR MALES AND FEMALES CONCERNING THE FIVE CONTENT AREAS

ITEM A, B, C: Human Development and The Family

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	141	3.5	.8	-3.97	270	.000
Females	131	3.9	.7			

ITEMS D, E, F: Home Management and Family Economics

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	141	3.8	.7	-1.42	270	.157
Females	131	3.9	.6			

Table 20
(Continued)

ITEMS G, H, I: Food and Nutrition

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	141	3.9 .8	-3.03	270	.003	
Females	131	4.1 .5				

ITEMS J, K, L: Textiles and Clothing

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	141	3.1 .8	-3.27	270	.00	
Females	131	3.5 .7				

ITEMS M, N, O: Housing

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	141	3.3 .8	-1.76	270	.080	
Females	131	3.5 .7				

Food and Nutrition; and Textiles and Clothing. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected for those three areas. In all cases females' mean scores were higher than males'.

Hypothesis IIc

There is no significant difference in responses of male and female students regarding the specific skills taught in consumer and homemaking education.

Statistical Technique: Student's t-test

There was a significant difference between male and female attitudes on items A, B, H, I, J, K, L, and O (Table 21). Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected for those skills. Females' mean scores were significantly higher on the following items: A, develop communication skills that enrich marriage, association with family member and others; B, develop skills in the care and guidance of young children; H, plan nutritious meals within the family food budget; I, develop food habits which supply basic nutritional needs; J, develop sewing skills for personal and family use; K, develop an ability to select and care for clothing; L, use clothing as a means of expressing yourself; and O, develop skills in interior design and home furnishing for personal and family use.

Table 21

STUDENT'S t-TEST RESULTS FOR MALES AND FEMALES CONCERNING SPECIFIC ITEMS ON THE ATTITUDE SURVEY TOWARD CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

I believe home economics should teach students to:

Item A: develop communication skills that enrich marriage, associations with family members and others.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	138	3.4	.9	-3.09	260	.002
Females	124	3.7	.9			

Item B: develop skills in the care and guidance of children.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	140	3.6	.8	-4.82	269	.000
Females	131	4.1	.7			

Table 21
(Continued)

Item C: develop skills in coping with the stresses associated with being a homemaker and wage earner.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	140	3.1 .9	-1.42	269	.154	
Females	131	3.8 .9				

Item D: develop money management skills for personal and family use.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	140	3.8 1.0	-1.55	269	.123	
Females	131	4.0 .8				

Item E: develop skills to conserve energy.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	140	3.5 1.0	-.98	269	.330	
Females	131	3.6 .9				

Table 21
(Continued)

Item F: make wise decisions when purchasing goods and services.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	138	4.1	.7	.26	267	.796
Females	131	4.0	.8			

Item G: develop skills in food preparation for personal and family use.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	138	4.0	.8	-.99	267	.324
Females	131	4.1	.7			

Item H: plan nutritious meals within the family food budget.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	140	4.0	.9	-2.24	269	.026
Females	131	4.2	.7			

Table 21
(Continued)

Item I: develop food habits which supply basic nutritional needs.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	139	3.7	.8	-3.70	267	.000
Females	130	4.1	.7			

Item J: develop sewing skills for personal and family use.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	140	3.4	1.0	-2.86	269	.005
Females	131	3.7	.9			

Item K: develop an ability to select and care for clothing.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	140	3.3	1.0	-2.14	267	.033
Females	131	3.5	1.0			

Table 21
(Continued)

Item L: use clothing a means of expressing yourself.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	141	2.8	1.1	-2.68	270	.008
Females	131	3.1	.9			

Item M: develop skills in choosing a place to live which is best for the needs of the individual and family.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	141	3.4	1.0	-.56	270	.576
Females	131	3.5	.9			

Item N: develop skills in selection, care and maintenance of furniture and equipment in the home.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	141	3.4	1.1	-.60	269	.550
Females	131	3.4	.8			

Table 21
(Continued)

Item O: develop skills in interior design and home furnishing for personal and family use.

Group	N	Mean	SD	T Value	DF	2-Tail Prob.
Males	141	3.2	1.1	-2.95	270	.003
Females	131	3.6	.9			

Hypothesis III

There is no significant difference in the responses of teachers and principals regarding the importance of each factor which influences curriculum decisions in home economics education at the secondary level.

Statistical Technique: Chi Square

The results of the Chi Square test indicated that there was not a significant difference between teachers and principals regarding the importance of factors that influence curriculum decisions in home economics education (Table 22). Therefore, the null hypothesis was retained.

When mean scores were compared for each factor that influences curriculum decisions, students' needs (B), students' interest (A), principal's support/attitude (I), and materials and resources (N), received the highest mean scores from both teachers and principals. Expectations of other teachers in the school (K) received the lowest mean score (Table 23) for both teachers and principals.

Appendix E contains a summary of the percentage of teachers and principals responding to each item as "Very Important," Somewhat Important," and "Not too Important."

Teachers and principals were also asked to indicate which factors they considered to have the most influence (Table 24), second most influence (Table 25), and least influence (Table 26) on curriculum decisions in consumer and homemaking education. Results were

Table 22
CHI-SQUARE FOR TEACHERS AND PRINCIPALS CONCERNING
THE IMPORTANCE OF CURRICULUM INFLUENCES

	ITEM	CHI-SQUARE	DF	P	DECISION
A.	Students' interest	1.87	1	.18	Retained
B.	Student need	1.03	2	.60	Retained
C.	Enrollment of students	.16	2	.93	Retained
D.	Community attitudes	2.33	2	.20	Retained
E.	Community needs	.10	2	.95	Retained
F.	Parental expectations	1.60	2	.47	Retained
G.	State guidelines	.986	2	.61	Retained
H.	Federal guidelines	.70	2	.71	Retained
I.	Principal's support/attitude	2.60	1	.11	Retained
J.	What is taught in other home economics programs	.59	2	.75	Retained
K.	Expectations of other teachers in the school	1.50	2	.47	Retained
L.	Teachers undergraduate/ graduate preparation	4.30	2	.12	Retained
M.	Subject-matter specialist	.07	2	.97	Retained
N.	Materials and resources	.84	2	.66	Retained

Table 23
RANKING OF MEAN SCORES FOR CURRICULUM INFLUENCES

	ITEMS	TEACHERS' MEANS		ITEMS	PRINCIPALS' MEANS
B.	Student needs	2.85	B.	Student needs	2.83
A.	Students' interest	2.71	A.	Students' interest	2.57
I.	Principals' support/attitude	2.66	I.	Principals' support/attitude	2.49
N.	Materials and resources	2.54	N.	Materials and resources	2.42
E.	Community needs	2.41	L.	Teachers undergraduate/ graduate preparation	2.40
C.	Enrollment of students	2.38	E.	Community needs	2.40
L.	Teachers undergraduate/ graduate preparation	2.29	D.	Community attitudes	2.40
G.	State guidelines	2.26	C.	Enrollment of students	2.34
D.	Community attitudes	2.26	F.	Parental expectations	2.26
F.	Parental expectations	2.23	G.	State guidelines	2.23
J.	What is taught in other home economics programs	2.12	J.	What is taught in other home economics programs	2.06
H.	Federal guidelines	2.05	M.	Subject-matter specialist	2.03
M.	Subject-matter specialist	2.00	H.	Federal guidelines	1.94
K.	Expectations of other teachers in the school	1.75	K.	Expectations of other teachers in the school	1.86

Table 24

FACTORS THAT HAD MOST INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM DECISIONS

n=58 Teachers	Percent	n=35 Principals	Percent
B. Student needs	45.6	B. Student needs	64.7
A. Students' interest	31.6	A. Students' interest	8.8
C. Enrollment of students	8.8	G. State guidelines	8.8
L. Teachers undergraduate/ graduate preparation	5.3	L. Teachers undergraduate/ graduate preparation	8.8
N. Materials and resources	3.5	C. Enrollment of students	5.9
D. Community attitudes	1.8	E. Community needs	2.9
F. Parental expectations	1.8		
I. Principal's support/attitude	1.8		

Table 25
FACTORS THAT HAD SECOND MOST INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM DECISIONS

	n=58 Teachers	Percent		n=35 Principals	Percent
A.	Students' interest	28.1	A.	Students' interest	20.6
C.	Enrollment of students	17.5	C.	Enrollment of students	17.6
B.	Student need	15.8	D.	Community attitudes	8.8
L.	Teachers undergraduate/ graduate preparation	8.8	E.	Community needs	8.8
E.	Community needs	7.0	J.	What is taught in other home economics programs	8.8
N.	Materials and resources	7.0	F.	Parental expectations	5.9
D.	Community attitudes	5.3	G.	State guidelines	5.9
G.	State guidelines	3.5	I.	Principal's support/attitude	5.9
I.	Principal's support/attitude	3.5	L.	Teachers undergraduate/ graduate preparation	5.9
H.	Federal guidelines	1.8	N.	Materials and resources	5.9
K.	Expectations of other teachers in the school	1.8	B.	Student need	2.9
			K.	Expectations of other teachers in the school	2.9

Table 26

PERCENT OF FACTORS THAT HAD LEAST INFLUENCE ON CURRICULUM DECISIONS

	n=58 Teachers	Percent		n=35 Principals	Percent
H.	Federal guidelines	17.5	J.	What is taught in other home economics programs	17.6
K.	Expectations of other teachers in the school	15.8	H.	Federal guidelines	14.7
C.	Enrollment of students	10.5	E.	Community needs	11.8
D.	Community attitudes	10.5	F.	Parental expectations	11.8
N.	Materials and resources	8.5	K.	Expectations of other teachers in the school	11.8
G.	State guidelines	7.0	C.	Enrollment of students	5.9
I.	Principal's support/attitude	7.0	M.	Subject-matter specialist	5.9
J.	What is taught in other home economics programs	7.0	N.	Materials and resources	5.8
A.	Students' interest	5.3	A.	Students' interest	2.9
E.	Community needs	3.5	B.	Student need	2.9
B.	Student need	1.8	D.	Community attitudes	2.9
F.	Parental expectations	1.8	G.	State guidelines	2.9
M.	Subject-matter specialist	1.8	L.	Teachers undergraduate/ graduate preparation	2.9

tallied using frequencies. Of the 14 factors that influence curriculum decisions, teachers and principals both indicated students' needs, students' interest, and teachers' undergraduate/graduate preparation, and enrollment of students as having most influence on deciding what to teach (Table 24). In addition, individual teachers also indicated materials and resources, community attitudes, parental expectations and principal's support/attitude as having most influence. Individual principals indicated state guidelines and community needs as having most influence on curriculum decisions. Although frequencies varied, 12 of 14 items were listed as having least influence on curriculum decisions by both teachers and principals. Item L (teachers' undergraduate/graduate preparation) was not mentioned among teachers as having least influence and Item I (principals' support/attitude) was not mentioned by principals. The largest percent of teacher respondents (17.5%) indicated federal guidelines as having least influence on their curriculum decisions; whereas, the largest percent of principal respondents (17.6%) indicated what is taught in other home economics programs as having least influence on their curriculum decisions.

V. DISCUSSION

This research investigated the attitudes of students, teachers, and principals toward skills taught in consumer and homemaking education. In addition, the importance of selected factors that influence curriculum decisions in home economics education were explored.

Summary of Findings

The subjects for the study were 272 students, 58 teachers, and 35 principals in randomly selected schools in Oregon.

A 15-item scale, developed by this researcher, was used to measure the attitudes of students, teachers, and principals toward statements describing skills taught in consumer and homemaking education. The last part of the instrument requested teachers and principals to indicate how important 14 factors were in deciding what to teach in their consumer and homemaking programs. In addition, respondents were asked to indicate the factors that had most influence, second most influence, and least influence on curriculum division.

The first two hypotheses of this study examined the attitudes of students, teachers, and principals toward skills taught in consumer and homemaking education. The results of thi analyses failed to support the first hypothesis that there were no significant differences among students', teachers', and principals' attitudes toward

the (a) comprehensiveness of consumer and homemaking education, (b) content areas, and (c) specific skills taught in consumer and homemaking education. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The data also failed to support the second hypothesis that no significant difference existed between male and female students toward the comprehensiveness of consumer and homemaking education. In addition, the data did not support the hypothesis related to three of the five content areas; Human Development and The Family, Food and Nutrition, and Textiles and Clothing. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected for those three content areas, while the data supported the hypothesis for two of the content areas: Home Management and Family Economics, and Housing. The hypothesis was retained for those content areas. Finally, the data related to specific skills did not support differences related to statements A, (develop communication skills that enrich marriage, associations with family members, and others) B, (develop skills in the care and guidance of children); H, (plan nutritious meals within the family food budget); I, (develop food habits which supply basic nutritional needs); J, (develop sewing skills for personal and family use); K, (develop an ability to select and care for clothing); L, (use clothing as a means of expressing yourself); and O, (develop skills in interior design and home furnishing for personal and family use). The hypothesis was rejected for those items, whereas, the hypothesis related to items C, (develop skills in coping with the stresses associated with being a homemaker

and wage earner); D (develop money management skills for personal and family use); E (develop skills to conserve energy); F (make wise decisions when purchasing goods and services); G (develop skills in food preparation for personal and family use); M (develop skills for choosing a place to live which is best for the needs of the individual and family); and N (develop skills in selection, care, and maintenance of furniture and equipment in the home) was retained.

Teachers' mean scores were consistently higher than principals' and students'; students' mean scores were consistently the lowest. When mean scores of students, teachers, and principals were compared on the content areas, Foods and Nutrition received the highest mean score. For students, Textiles and Clothing received the lowest mean score. Both teachers' and principals' mean scores were lowest on the content area Housing.

The third hypothesis of the study examined factors that influenced teachers' and principals' curriculum decisions related to consumer and homemaking education. The data supported the null hypothesis and, therefore, was retained. Although there was not a significant difference observed between teachers and principals mean scores, students' needs, students' interest, principal's support/attitude, and materials and resources ranked as the top four factors influencing curriculum decisions for both teachers and principals. However, upon further investigation, both teachers and principals ranked four factors as most influential on curriculum decisions. These included

student needs, student interest, enrollment of students, and teachers' undergraduate/graduate preparation Teachers ranked federal guidelines as having least influence on curriculum decisions, whereas principals ranked what is taught in other home economics programs as having least influence.

Discussion and Implications

The data analyses indicated that teachers had the most comprehensive view of skills taught in consumer and homemaking education, principals had the second most comprehensive view, and students had the least comprehensive view of home economics. These findings indicate that home economics teachers do think all aspects of home economics are important to be taught in consumer and homemaking education. The results of this study also suggest that students and administrators do not have a totally comprehensive view of home economics. This implies a need for public relations efforts with principals and students in certain content areas to expand their understanding of the comprehensive nature of home economics.

Although teachers had the most comprehensive view of skills taught in home economics, as suspected, it should be acknowledged that principals' perceptions of skills taught was somewhat comprehensive. This implies that home economics educators may have made strides in projecting a comprehensive image of home economics to administrators and to a lesser degree to students. This also indi-

cates support by principals for a comprehensive home economics curriculum in secondary schools.

Results indicate significant differences between students, teachers, and principals concerning attitudes about the various content areas taught in consumer and homemaking education. In all areas, students' mean scores were lower; but, for the content areas Human Development and The Family, Food and Nutrition, and Textiles and Clothing, student mean scores were significantly lower indicating less positive attitude for those areas in comparison with teachers and principals. Students', teachers', and principals' mean scores were all significantly different from one another on the content areas Home Management and Family Economics, and Housing. Even though teachers' mean scores were highest among the groups, there seems to be less certainty among students, teachers, and principals about those skills being taught in consumer and homemaking education. It is interesting to note that the areas of Home Management and Family Economics, and Housing are areas in which the literature indicates a definite need for emphasis in home economics education Ballard, (1982); Spitz (1977); (P.L. 94-482, Subpart 5. The content area with the highest mean for all three groups was Foods and Nutrition. Housing had the lowestmean for teachers and principals. Clothing and Textiles had the lowest mean among students.

Students' mean scores were significantly lower for specific skills, revealing a less positive and comprehensive view of skills

taught in home economics education. This could be a reflection of the emphasis or visibility of certain classes in secondary programs. This finding supports Rollins (1981) who said home economics programs in high schools fall short of depicting an accurate image of the current trends in our profession. It is also consistent with findings of Hughes (1980), Hall (1978), Ross (1975), Langham (1974) who indicated that the areas of Foods and Nutrition, and Textiles and Clothing as being taught most often in the secondary home economics curriculum. Another factor that relates to students' less comprehensive attitude toward home economics may be their limited knowledge about what is included in home economics. Therefore, teachers need to broaden students' perspectives on what home economics includes.

Although student mean scores for individual items indicate that overall student attitudes about skills taught in home economics were positive (3.0 and above), it is important to note that item L (use clothing as a means of expressing yourself) received the lowest rating (3.1, females, and 2.8 males) of all skill statements. It appears that students do not perceive the social and psychological aspects of clothing and textiles as a definite part of the home economics curriculum. Therefore, teachers need to broaden textiles and clothing content to emphasize social and psychological aspects and, according to Rollins (1980), decrease emphasis on clothing construction.

Principals' mean scores were lower than teachers' in all cases; but, for item D (develop money management skills for personal and family use) and item M (develop skills in choosing a place to live which is best for the needs of the individual and family), principals' mean scores were significantly lower than teachers'. This is evidence that home economics educators need to continue to publicize the importance and relevancy especially of the areas of Housing and Home Management and Family Economics.

Females had a more comprehensive view and positive attitude about skills taught in consumer and homemaking education.

Females had significantly higher mean scores than males on the content areas of Human Development and the Family, Food and Nutrition, and Textiles and Clothing. Even though home economics educators have made progress in recruiting male students in home economics programs, Rollins (1981), NIE (1981), Hughes (1979), Cross (1979), there continues to be a need to promote a more positive and comprehensive image of the profession to males. More importantly, there exists a need for curriculum development that stimulates and attracts males to consumer and homemaking programs. Males' and females' mean scores were more alike on the content areas Home Management and Family Economics and Housing. There is a need to promote those two areas among males as well as females.

Examination of the various items indicated females' mean scores were higher on all items with the exception of item F (make wise

decisions when purchasing goods and services). This is consistent with Baxter's (1972) study that indicated males showed higher levels of importance in most of the areas of family economics. This might have been because traditionally males were considered the breadwinner and therefore, responsible for the purchase of goods and services in the family. Perhaps many females continue to have that perspective as well which explains their less positive attitude about the statement. It may also explain why mothers in Nichols' et al. (1983) study preferred a stronger emphasis in the areas of household equipment and consumer education for their sons.

The fact that female attitudes toward home economics were more positive than males' is consistent with other studies such as Baxter (1972) and Hayes (1974). Female mean scores were significantly higher than males' on the following items A, B, H, I, J, K, L, and O (Table 20). It is interesting to note that most of these skills are traditionally performed by the female. Therefore, it is suspected that females' attitudes would be more positive than males' primarily because these are skills in which females are directly involved at one point in their lives, although many males are readily assuming these responsibilities in today's society.

Investigation into the third hypothesis revealed that among the selected factors that influence curriculum decisions in home economics education there was not a significant difference observed between teacher and principal responses. Further examination of mean

scores on factors revealed that student needs, student interest, principal attitude/support and materials and resources were the top four factors influencing curriculum decisions for both. This information supports the (1) importance of ascertaining student feedback on what they think should be taught as one resource for curriculum change and modification, and (2) importance of the role administrators play in deciding what to teach. These findings are supported by educators like Tyler (1949), Nollingham (1979), Trump and Miller (1949), and Spritz (1977).

However, when respondents were asked to indicate factors that had most, second most, and least influence on their curriculum decisions, student needs, student interest, enrollment of students, and teachers' undergraduate/graduate preparation were cited as most important influences. Several things can be concluded based on these findings:

(1) that programs in home economics definitely should be geared toward addressing student needs in the present and future,

(2) teacher educators need to provide in-service education that encourages innovative teaching techniques/strategies, ways to stimulate interest, and curriculum development in Housing and Home Management and Family Economics,

(3) college curriculum designed for home economics educators

should provide a broad and comprehensive scope of home economics.

Mean scores between teachers and principals on item K (expectations of other teachers in the school) was ranked the lowest factor influencing curriculum decisions. Perhaps this is an indication that teachers and principals are gradually moving from a "teacher centered" perspective to a "student centered" approach to curriculum development. As indicated in the literature (Mears et al., 1981), consumer and homemaking programs exist for students and the major focus of the program are students' learning and meeting their needs. Teachers indicated federal guidelines as having least influence on deciding what to teach, whereas principals indicated what is taught in other home economics programs as having least influence. Perhaps this indicates that principals place much emphasis on meeting local needs of students. An important implication for home economics educators is to promote an understanding of what effects federal efforts can have on their consumer and homemaking programs at the local level.

Recommendations for Further Study

On the basis of the findings, the following areas of concern may be considered for further study.

1. In a time when federal cutbacks, limited budgets, decreased student enrollment, and program accountability

directly affect quality and perhaps survival of programs at the secondary level, an analysis of legislators' attitudes toward consumer and homemaking education as a viable and important aspect of secondary programs would be appropriate.

2. Since students had the least comprehensive view of home economics, it would be appropriate to investigate reasons students do not perceive home economics in a more comprehensive framework. The researcher may consider such factors as student motivation, interest level of students, subject-matter relevancy, and materials and resources.
3. Since the field of home economics is gradually increasing male enrollment in the profession, perhaps a study that examines male attitudes concerning skills they consider important to be taught in consumer and homemaking education is needed as a tool for curriculum modification or program development.
4. Housing continues to be one area that definitely needs emphasis in consumer and homemaking programs. Perhaps the most appropriate next step is to develop curriculum guides in the area of Housing that would stimulate student interest in the content area. An approach would be to survey students first to discover what aspect of housing appeals to students then proceed to develop the curriculum guide.

5. A study to explore and evaluate the effectiveness of how teachers present Housing would provide another perspective for curriculum development.
6. The use of federal vocational monies for consumer and homemaking education varies from state to state. It would be appropriate to compare federally reimbursed consumer and homemaking programs versus non-reimbursed programs in different states to see if there are differences based on funding allocations.

Summary

There was statistical evidence in this study that teachers had the most comprehensive perspective of skills taught in consumer and homemaking education. Principals had the second most comprehensive view, and students' perspective was less comprehensive.

Respondents' means on the content areas taught in consumer and homemaking education were significantly different. Students' means were significantly lower on three of the five content areas: Human Development and the Family, Food and Nutrition, and Textiles and Clothing. Upon further examination, results indicated that the content area of Food and Nutrition continues to be seen as the most integral part of consumer and homemaking education. There was less certainty among teachers and principals regarding Home Management and Family Economics and Housing as an integral part of consumer and

homemaking education; whereas, Textiles and Clothing was not seen as an integral part of Consumer and Homemaking.

Analysis of specific skills taught in consumer and homemaking education revealed that respondents (students, teachers, and principals) indicated positive attitudes toward most skill statements taught in consumer and homemaking education. However, students rated the skill statement concerning social and psychological aspect of clothing the lowest. Principals rated skill statements D (develop money management skills for personal and family use) and M (develop skills in choosing a place to live which is best for the needs of the individual and family) significantly lower than teachers.

The profession of home economics is gradually increasing male enrollment in home economics programs. However, females' perspective of the comprehensiveness of skills taught in the program continues to be more positive than males. Females rated all skill statements higher than males with the exception of statement F (make wise decisions when purchasing goods and services). Perhaps females perceive financial decisions as the responsibility of males in the family. The findings suppport the need to promote public relation effort in (1) the areas of Housing and Home Management and Family Economics, (2) sociological/psychological aspects of clothing, and (3) the recruitment of males in consumer and homemaking programs.

Many factors influence teachers and principals curriculum decisions. But the findings in this study revealed that teachers and

principals identified students' needs, students' interest, enrollment of students, and teachers' undergraduate/graduate preparation as predominate factors influencing their curriculum decisions. Federal guidelines had least influence in teachers' curriculum decisions and what is taught in other home economics programs had least influence on principals' curriculum decisions.

Since research is a procedure frequently used to discover or revise facts, recommendations for future research were: analyses of legislators' attitudes, skills that males consider important to teach in home economics, reasons students do not have comprehensive views of home economics, creative ways to teach the content area of Housing and consumer and homemaking programs that are federally funded versus non-reimbursed programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alexander, Capi F. Teachers' Beliefs and Willingness to be Involved with Certain Aspects of Oregon Home Economics Education Curriculum. Unpublished Master's Thesis, Oregon State University, 1969.

American Home Economics Association. Concepts and Generalizations: Their Place in High School Home Economics Curriculum Development. Washington, D.C.: American Home Economic Associaiton, 1967.

Ballard, Ida G. "Save Home Economics Funding!" What's New In Home Economics. 16 (October, 1982).

Barkelew, Ann H. "No One Said It Would Be Easy--But It Can Be Fun!" Thrust for Education Leadership 9 (October, 1979):7.

Baxter, Judy. Student and Parent Opinion Concerning Home Economics Subject Matter Content in the Lake Washington School District. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Washington, 1972.

Bent, Rudyard K. and Henry H. Kronenberg. Principals of Secondary Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Blankenship, Martha L. and Barbara D. Moerchen. Home Economics Education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1979.

Caputo, Coleen C. and Judy Haymore. The Value of Home Economics Education: Observations of Students, Teachers, and Parents. Division of Occupational and Vocational Studies: The Pennsylvania State University, 1981.

Carruth, B.R. and H.L. Anderson. "Scaling Criteria in Developing and Evaluating an Attitude Instrument " Journal of the American Dietetic Association, 70:42-47, 1977.

Coon, Beulah I. Home Economics in the Public Secondary Schools. (HEW, U.S. Office of Education, Circular No. 661) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1962.

Cross, Allene S. "Charting the Course for Consumer-Homemaking Education." Voc Ed 54 (April, 1979):37-39 & 43.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Continued)

Dannison, Linda. Student Attitudes Toward Secondary Home Economics Curriculum. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Kansas State University, 1976.

Dillman, Don A. Mail and Telephone Surveys. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1978.

East, Marjorie. "A Look Back To Plan Ahead: The Fences and the Stakes." Illinois Teacher 26 (September/October, 1982):19-21.

East, Marjorie. Home Economics: Past, Present, and Future. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1980.

Educational Amendments of 1976. Title II (Vocational Education). P.L. 94-482.

Fedje, Cheryl G., Ellen M. Champoux and Melinda Holcombe. Impact Research Focusing on Mildly Mentally Handicapped Students in Secondary Vocational Consumer and Homemaking Programs in Minnesota. Division of Occupational and Vocational Studies: The Pennsylvania State University, 1981.

Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1959.

Gould, Samuel B. "The Teacher's Impact on the Curriculum." Principals of Secondary Education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1966.

Griffin, Wilma P. and Kermeta Clayton. Standards for Vocational Home Economics Education. Austin, Texas: The University of Texas at Austin, 1981.

Gritzmacher, Joan E., Jerelyn B. Schultz, Terrie Shannon and Janine Walts. Child Development/Parent Education Program Effectiveness. Division of Occupational and Vocational Studies: The Pennsylvania State University, 1981.

Hall, Helen C. The Relationship of Undergraduate Home Economics Education Programs to the Home Economics Curricula in the Secondary Schools: A Follow-Up Study. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1978.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Continued)

Hayes, Anne. Assessment of Eighth and Eleventh Grade Student Attitudes Toward Major Home Economics Curriculum Concepts. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1974.

Hill, Alberta D., Twyla Shear, Camille G. Bell, Aleene A. Cross, Enid A. Carter and Leora N. Horning. "Vocational Home Economics Education: A Statement by the Vocation Education Coalition." Journal of Home Economics 71 (Winter, 1979) 12-16.

Hughes, Ruth. "Consumer and Homemaking Education Today: An Analysis." The Planning Papers on Consumer and Homemaking Education Programs: Vocational Education Study Publication No. 2. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1979.

Hughes, Ruth, Barbara Rougvie and Barbara Woods. The National Census Study of Secondary vocational Consumer and Homemaking Programs. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Research Foundation, Inc., 1980.

Hughes, Ruth. "Consumer and Homemaking Education." Voc Ed 1 (Fall, 1980): 46-49.

Kerlinger, Fred. Foundations of Behavioral Research. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1964.

Leese, Joseph, Kenneth Frasure and Mauritz Johnson. The Teacher in Curriculum Making. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1961.

Lingens, Hans G. "They're Working Together and Building Public Support." Thrust for Education Leadership 9 (October, 1979):16.

MacFarlane, William H. A Study of the Mathematical Competence Requirements for Graduation Among Oregon's A-AA-AAA Senior High Schools. Ph.D. Dissertation, Oregon State University, 1982.

Magrabi, Francis M. "The Image of Home Economics Courses As General Education." Journal of Home Economics, 62 (January, 1970): 43-48.

Meszaros, Peggy and Bonnie Brown. "And By Their Practice They Shall Be Known." The Distaff (Fall, 1980): 7,8.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Continued)

McGrath, Earl J., and Jack T. Johnson. The Changing Mission of Home Economics. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1968.

Mears, Ruth A., Connie J. Ley and Elizabeth M. Ray. Dimensions of Home Economics Programs: Seven Case Studies. Division of Occupational Vocational Studies: The Pennsylvania State University, 1981.

Mellen, Elaine. Program Planning For Consumer and Homemaking Education. Oregon: Division of Vocational Education, Oregon Department of Education, 1981.

Murphy, Patricia. "Needs In The Secondary Home Economics Education Program In the 1980's," Proceedings of the Conference on current Concerns In Home Economics Education. (April, 1978): 37-38.

Murray, Eloise. "What Is The Role of Home Economics in Teaching Family Housing?" Illinois Teacher. January/February, 1979.

National Institute of Education. U. S. Department of Education. The Vocational Education Study: The Final Report. Vocational Education Study Publication No. 8. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1981.

Nichols, Constance W., C.E. Kennedy and Walter Schuman. "What Home Economics Programs Do Mothers Want for Sons and Daughters?" Journal of Home Economics. (Spring, 1983): 28-30.

Nie, N., C. Hull, J. Jenkins, K. Steinbrenner, and D. Bent, 1975. Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. Second edition. McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, New York.

Nollingham, M.A. "Power To The Principal." Thrust for Education Leadership. 8 (May, 1979): 32.

Novick, M.R. and C. Lewis. "Coefficient Alpha and the Reliability of Composite Measurements," Psychometrika, 32:1-13, 1967.

Oppenhiem, A.N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.

Peterson, Mary D. and Grovalyna Sisler. "Time For Change." Journal of Home Economics. 67 (January, 1975): 21-22.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Continued)

Riggs, Em. "No Gain Without Pain." Journal of Home Economics. 72 (Fall, 1980): 20-22.

Rollins, Judy. "Secondary Home Economics Curriculua Perpetuate a Stereotype." Journal of Home Economics. 73 (Spring, 1981): 24-26.

Ross, K.R. The Image Projected of Home Economics as Indicated by Secondary Teachers' Attitudes and Reported Course Offerings. Master's Thesis, Ohio University, 1975.

Saylor, Galen J., William M. Alexander and Arthur J. Lewis. Curriculum Planning For Better Teaching and Learning. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1980.

Simpson, Elizabeth J. "What People Need to Know in the 80's and Beyond to be Intelligent Consumers and Effective Homemakers." School of Family Resource and Consumer Sciences, University of Wisconsin--Madison. (Prepared for National Institute of Education). Feb., 1981.

Simpson, Elizabeth J. "Legislation for Consumer and Homemaking Education: Social Implication." The Planning Papers on Consumer and Homemaking Education Program. Vocational Education Study Publication No. 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1979.

Sisson, Mary Jo. An Identification of Teachers', Parents' and Students' Attitudes Toward the Home Economics Program, Grades Seven Thru Nine in Florida. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, Florida State University, 1977.

Smith, B.O. "The Curriculum: Content and Utility." Theory Into Practice 15 (June, 1976): 191-197.

Spitze, Hazel T. "The Future of Secondary Home Economics." Journal of Home Economics 69 (March, 1977): 7-10.

Spitze, Hazel T. "Illinois Teacher Survey: What Content is Important for High School Home Economics?" Illinois Teacher. (March/April, 1983) 157-158.

Stinnett, Nick and Others. "Perceptions of College Students." Journal of Home Economics 63 (November, 1971): 607-610.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
(Continued)

Tate, Mildred T. Home Economics as a Profession. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc., 1973.

Trump, Lloyd J. and Delmas F. Miller. Secondary School Curriculum Improvement. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1979.

Tyler, Ralph W. Basic Principals of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1949.

Vocational Education Study. The Vocational Education Study: The Final Report. Vocational Education Study Publication No. 8. Washington D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1981.

West, Jeff. "Administrative Involvement in Curriculum Improvement." Curriculum Handbook: Administration and Theory. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1977.

Yankelovich, Daniel Inc. Home Economics Image Study: A Qualitative Investigation. American Home Economics Association, Washington, D.C., 1974.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

ATTITUDE SURVEY TOWARD CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

ATTITUDE SURVEY TOWARD
CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION

Below is a list of statements about skills developed in consumer and homemaking programs. Please indicate how strongly you agree or disagree with each of the statements by circling the letter that best describes your opinion.

1. I believe home economics classes should teach students to:	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
A. develop communication skills that enrich marriage, associations with family members, and others.	SA	A	U	D	SD
B. develop skills in the care and guidance of children.	SA	A	U	D	SD
C. develop skills in coping with the stresses associated with being a homemaker and wage earner.	SA	A	U	D	SD
D. develop money management skills for personal and family use.	SA	A	U	D	SD
E. develop skills to conserve energy.	SA	A	U	D	SD
F. make wise decisions when purchasing goods and services.	SA	A	U	D	SD
G. develop skills in food preparation for personal and family use.	SA	A	U	D	SD
H. plan nutritious meals within the family food budget.	SA	A	U	D	SD
I. develop food habits which supply basic nutritional needs.	SA	A	U	D	SD
J. develop sewing skills for personal and family use.	SA	A	U	D	SD
K. develop an ability to select and care for clothing.	SA	A	U	D	SD
L. use clothing as a means of expressing yourself.	SA	A	U	D	SD
M. develop skills for choosing a place to live which is best for the needs of the individual/family.	SA	A	U	D	SD
N. develop skills in selection, care, and maintenance furniture and equipment in the home.	SA	A	U	D	SD
O. develop skills in interior design and home furnishing for personal and family use.	SA	A	U	D	SD

ATTITUDE SURVEY TOWARD
CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING EDUCATION
STUDENT SURVEY - PAGE 2

The last series of questions are designed to help us interpret our results more accurately.

2. Have you taken any coursework in home economics? (Circle number)

1. NO
2. YES

2a. How many semesters (or quarters) of home economics coursework have you had? This should include courses in Elementary, Middle, or Junior High School. (Circle one number)

1. NINE WEEKS (ONE QUARTER)
2. ONE SEMESTER (TWO QUARTERS)
3. TWO SEMESTERS (FOUR QUARTERS)
4. MORE THAN TWO SEMESTERS (FOUR QUARTERS)

3. In the table below, please indicate whether or not each parent lives with you; and also indicate whether or not each works for pay.

(Circle Number of One Choice in Each Category for Mother and Father)

	LIVES WITH YOU?		**WORKS FOR PAY?**		
	YES	NO	YES	NO	DON'T KNOW
MOTHER	1	2	1	2	3
FATHER	1	2	1	2	3

4. What is your age?

_____YEARS

5. Are you male or female? (Circle number of your answer)

1. MALE
2. FEMALE

TEACHER SURVEY - PAGE 2

Next, we would like to know about the importance of certain things that may/may not influence teachers' or administrators' choice of concept selection.

2. Please indicate how important each of the following items are in deciding what skills are taught in your consumer and homemaking program. (Please circle the appropriate letter for each item.)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not too Important
A. students' interest	VI	SI	NI
B. student needs	VI	SI	NI
C. enrollment of students	VI	SI	NI
D. community attitudes	VI	SI	NI
E. community needs	VI	SI	NI
F. parental expectations	VI	SI	NI
G. state guidelines	VI	SI	NI
H. federal guidelines	VI	SI	NI
I. principal's support/attitude	VI	SI	NI
J. what is taught in other home economics programs	VI	SI	NI
K. expectations of other teachers in the school	VI	SI	NI
L. teacher's undergraduate/ graduate preparation	VI	SI	NI
M. subject-matter specialist	VI	SI	NI
N. materials and resources	VI	SI	NI

2a. For those items above that you indicated as very important or somewhat important, please indicate by letter (A, B, C, etc.) which has the most influence, second most influence, and least influence in deciding what skills should be taught.

_____MOST INFLUENCE
_____SECOND MOST INFLUENCE
_____LEAST INFLUENCE

The last two questions are designed to help us interpret our results more accurately.

3. Are you male or female? (Circle number of your answer)

1. MALE
2. FEMALE

4. How many years have you been teaching home economics?

_____YEARS

PRINCIPAL SURVEY - PAGE 2

Next, we would like to know about the importance of certain things that may/may not influence teachers' or administrators' choice of concept selection.

2. Please indicate how important each of the following items are in deciding what skills are taught in your consumer and homemaking program. (Please circle the appropriate letter for each item.)

	Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not too Important
A. students' interest	VI	SI	NI
B. student needs	VI	SI	NI
C. enrollment of students	VI	SI	NI
D. community attitudes	VI	SI	NI
E. community needs	VI	SI	NI
F. parental expectations	VI	SI	NI
G. state guidelines	VI	SI	NI
H. federal guidelines	VI	SI	NI
I. principal's support/attitude	VI	SI	NI
J. what is taught in other home economics programs	VI	SI	NI
K. expectations of other teachers in the school	VI	SI	NI
L. teacher's undergraduate/ graduate preparation	VI	SI	NI
M. subject-matter specialist	VI	SI	NI
N. materials and resources	VI	SI	NI

2a. For those items above that you indicated as very important or somewhat important, please indicate by letter (A, B, C, etc.) which has the most influence, second most influence, and least influence in deciding what skills should be taught.

_____MOST INFLUENCE
_____SECOND MOST INFLUENCE
_____LEAST INFLUENCE

The last two questions are designed to help us interpret our results more accurately.

3. Are you male or female? (Circle number of your answer)

1. MALE
2. FEMALE

4. How many years have you worked in school administration?

_____YEARS

APPENDIX B

LETTER TO PRINCIPALS

LETTER TO HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

LETTER TO HISTORY TEACHERS

School of Education
Vocational-Technical
Education Division

Oregon State University

Corvallis, Oregon 97331

January 21, 1983

XXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXX
XXXXXXXXXX

Dear Principal:

Thank you for agreeing to participate in our study! Your school was drawn in a random sample as one which would be invited to participate in the survey. They purpose in our study is to identify specific skills students, teachers, and principals think should be developed in secondary consumer and homemaking programs in Oregon as a basis for curriculum development.

One of the major concerns of teachers and principals is the selection of relevant skills to be developed based on current social and economic conditions. In order to plan relevant programs for students their input is essential. This information will help us to develop strategies to improve programs designed to meet their needs.

Your assistance is requested to:

1. give the enclosed set of student questionnaires (printed on blue) to a 10th or 11th grade history teacher to administer to a class (a letter to the history teacher with brief directions is enclosed.),

2. give the enclosed teacher questionnaires (printed on green) to all home economics teachers in your school,

3. complete a copy of the administrator's questionnaire (printed on yellow), and

4. collect all questionnaires and return them in the enclosed self-addressed, prepaid envelope by February 11.

Answering the questionnaire will take about ten minutes. Be assured that all responses will be kept confidential. The code number on the questionnaire is used for follow-up purposes only. No names will be used in any way with the data provided for them.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact us at 754-3101 for further information.

We appreciate your efforts in helping with this study. Again, thank you very much!

Sincerely,

Redacted for Privacy

Redacted for Privacy

Christine E. Williams
Graduate Student
Home Economics Education
Oregon State University

Helen C. Hall
Assistant Professor
Home Economics Education
Oregon State University

cew

Enclosures

School of Education
Vocational-Technical
Education Division

Oregon State University

Corvallis, Oregon 97331

January 20, 1983

Dear Home Economics Teacher:

One of the major concerns of teachers and principals is the selection of relevant skills to be developed based on current social and economic conditions. Society has entrusted schools with a great charge--to prepare students to cope with present situations and prepare for the future. Secondary curriculum is a channel through which you can effectively help students to accomplish this goal by planning and implementing curriculum designed to meet the needs of society.

Since you are one who contributes immensely to planning and implementing curriculum, your participation is requested to complete this study. The information you provide will be useful to help develop strategies to improve programs designed to meet the needs of the students. The purpose of this study is to identify specific skills you think should be developed in secondary consumer and homemaking programs in Oregon.

Please read the questions carefully and respond accordingly. Answering the questionnaire will take about ten minutes of your time. All responses will be kept confidential. The code number on the questionnaire is used for follow-up purposes only. No names will be used in any way.

Upon completion of the questionnaire please return it to the principal to be mailed back to us along with the student questionnaires. An envelope is provided in case you wish to seal your response.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Redacted for Privacy

Christine Williams
Graduate Student
Home Economics Education
Oregon State University

Redacted for Privacy

Helen Hall
Assistant Professor,
Home Economics Education
Oregon State University

Enclosure

School of Education
Vocational-Technical
Education Division

Oregon State University

Corvallis, Oregon 97331

January 20, 1983

Dear History Teacher:

We are conducting an attitude survey of students, teachers, and principals in selected secondary schools in Oregon. Your school was chosen as one of a select group whose assistance is requested. The purpose in our study is to identify specific skills students, teachers, and principals think should be developed in consumer and homemaking programs in Oregon as a basis for curriculum development in home economics. We hope you will take ten to fifteen minutes of your class time to have one class of your 10th or 11th grade students complete the questionnaire.

Please read the directions carefully to the students and be sure to have the students answer all items on the questionnaire. This is important to ensure response useability.

Upon completion of the questionnaire by the students, please return the questionnires to the principal to be mailed back to us.

Thank you in advance for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

Redacted for Privacy

Redacted for Privacy

Christine Williams
Graduate Student
Home Economics Education
Oregon State University

Helen Hall
Assistant Professor,
Home Economics Education
Oregon State University

Enclosure

APPENDIX C

LETTER TO HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS/PRINCIPALS

School of Education
Vocational-Technical
Education Division

Oregon State University

Corvallis, Oregon 97331

January 17, 1983

Dear Home Economics Teacher/Principal:

One of the major concerns of teachers and principals is the selection of relevant skills to be developed based on current social and economic conditions. Society has entrusted schools with a great charge--to prepare students to cope with present situations and prepare for the future. Secondary curriculum is a channel through which you can effectively help students to accomplish this goal by planning and implementing curriculum designed to meet the needs of society.

Since you are one who contributes immensely to planning and implementing curriculum, your participation is requested to complete this study. The information you provide will be useful to help develop strategies to improve programs designed to meet the needs of the students. The purpose of this study is to identify specific skills you think should be developed in secondary consumer and homemaking programs in Oregon.

Please read the questions carefully and respond accordingly. Answering the questionnaire will take about ten minutes of your time. A self-addressed, prepaid envelope is provided for returning the questionnaire by February 11.

Be assured that your responses will be kept confidential. The code number on the questionnaire is used for follow-up purposes only. No names will be used in any way.

If you have any questions please feel free to contact us at (503) 754-3101 for further information.

Thank you in advance for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Redacted for Privacy

Redacted for Privacy

Christine Williams
Graduate Student
Home Economics Education
Oregon State University

Helen Hall
Assistant Professor,
Home Economics Education
Oregon State University

Enclosure

APPENDIX D

FOLLOW-UP POST CARD

February 1, 1983

Last week a questionnaire seeking your opinion about skills developed in home economics was mailed to you. If you have already completed and returned it to me, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, I would appreciate your completing and sending it to me today.

Because it has been sent to only a small, but representative sample of teachers and administrators, it is extremely important that your responses be included in the study.

If by chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or it got misplaced, please call me at (503) 754-3101 and I will mail you another immediately.

Sincerely,

Christine Williams
Graduate Student
Oregon State University

APPENDIX E

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES CONCERNING CURRICULUM INFLUENCES

PERCENTAGE OF TEACHERS' AND PRINCIPALS' RESPONSES CONCERNING CURRICULUM INFLUENCES

	ITEMS	n=85	% TEACHERS		n=35	% PRINCIPALS	
		VI	SI	NI	VI	SI	NI
A.	student interest	70.7	29.3	--	57.1	42.9	--
B.	student needs	86.2	12.1	1.7	82.9	17.1	--
C.	enrollment of students	46.4	44.6	8.9	45.7	42.9	11.4
D.	community attitudes	34.5	56.9	8.6	40.0	60.0	--
E.	community needs	48.3	44.8	6.9	48.6	42.9	8.6
F.	parental expectations	31.6	59.6	8.8	28.6	68.6	2.9
G.	state guidelines	34.5	56.9	8.6	37.1	48.6	14.3
H.	federal guidelines	24.1	56.9	19.0	17.1	60.0	22.9
I.	principal's support/attitude	65.5	34.5	--	48.6	51.4	--
J.	what is taught in other home economics programs	26.3	59.6	14.0	25.7	54.3	20.0
K.	expectations of other teacher's in the school	5.2	62.1	32.8	11.4	62.9	25.7
L.	teacher's undergraduate/graduate preparation	44.8	39.7	15.5	42.9	54.3	2.9
M.	subject-matter specialist	22.2	55.6	22.2	22.9	57.1	20.0
N.	materials and resources	55.2	43.1	1.7	45.7	51.4	2.9