HOMEROOM PROGRAMS IN SELECTED SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES

by

DAVID BENSON McCORKLE

A THESIS

submitted to

OREGON STATE COLLEGE

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

June 1953

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Head of Department of Education

In Charge of Major

Redacted for Privacy

Chairman of School Graduate Committee

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented August 12, 1952

Typed by Eunice L. Roth

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This study was possible only with the cooperation and assistance of the writer's graduate committee, the home-room teachers and school administrators.

The writer is particularly indebted to Dr. F. R. Zeran, major advisor, for his kind help and encouragement. To Dr. J. W. Sherburne, Dr. H. R. Laslett, and Dr. R. R. Reichart, the writer wishes to express appreciation for their many helpful suggestions and criticisms.

The writer expresses appreciation to his wife, George, for her help and encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES

HOMEROOM PROGRAMS IN SELECTED SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN THE UNITED STATES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Administrators and teachers in the secondary school are usually willing to admit that the homeroom program does not operate as well as it might. Because this doubt of the effectiveness of the homeroom has permeated throughout the school staff as well as the student body many schools have dropped the homeroom entirely; others have attempted reorganization, and some have simply endured the ineffectiveness or have relegated the homeroom to a very small role in the school program.

That the homeroom does not operate as effectively as it might is not sufficient reason for discontinuing it. Should any social institution as the church, lodge, or school be discontinued merely because it does not operate as effectively as it might? A positive approach to the role of the homeroom should be an evaluation of the present homeroom program by the teachers and administrators in the school. From a study of the strengths and weaknesses of each homeroom program should come a need for information about other homeroom programs. Such pertinent questions as:

What are the purposes of the better homeroom programs?

What practices are carried out in the better homeroom programs?

How are these homerooms organized?

What materials are used by homeroom teachers?

What are the problems faced by homeroom teachers?

What plans and ideas do homeroom teachers have about improving homeroom programs?

From the answers to the preceding questions administrators and teachers may secure valuable data in statistics and ideas which may be adapted to their own situation.

It is believed that such data should be helpful to institutions engaged in the training of teachers by providing information to assist in the development of skills and methods in the use of the homeroom. Such data may be most helpful to those individuals interested in the organization and administration of guidance services by showing how schools have used the homeroom as a part of the guidance program, as well as answering such questions as:

What guidance activities are carried out in the homeroom?

What techniques are used in the homeroom?

What are the purposes and functions of the homeroom as an agency for guidance?

The answers to these and similar questions may be helpful in reorganizing or in organizing homeroom programs to provide guidance services. Another important outcome of a study of the homeroom in the secondary school may be the arousing of interest or the awareness of the need for evaluation of

homerooms in schools with the idea to make the homeroom a more effective part of the school program.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the present practices in the more successful homeroom programs in the secondary schools in the United States.

Specific purposes of this study are: (a) to find general and specific purposes of the homeroom programs, (b) to identify practices carried out in homeroom programs, (c) to determine trends in the uses of homerooms, and (d) to crystallize problems of homeroom teachers.

This study is not intended to solve the problems of the homeroom by offering an ideal homeroom program. The writer does hope, however, that by revealing some of the practices of the more successful homeroom programs in secondary schools administrators and teachers will profit by trying these and other ideas with the objective of offering the best possible service to the pupils and to the community.

Scope of the Study

This study concerns itself with 268 homeroom programs in selected secondary schools throughout the United States. The homeroom programs surveyed are those recognized by the state department of education in each of the respective states as being outstanding or at least creditable, and

includes junior high schools, senior high schools and other schools designated as secondary schools. Only public secondary schools are used, since no private schools were mentioned by representatives of the state departments of education.

For the purpose of this study the definition of a homeroom as given by Dunsmoore (8, p. 28) is used. This is: "A homeroom is a unit of school administration, which is under the direct supervision of a teacher known as a homeroom sponsor, and which serves as the school home of the pupils assigned to it for the purpose of administering routine and other educational activities, not ordinarily connected with subject-matter instruction". This is an operational definition.

Several major limitations may be found in this study. First, the selection of the schools that participated in the study is a limitating factor. The schools were suggested by an official of each state department of education; but each state official used his own criterion of "outstanding" or "creditable". This was necessary since few, if any, state departments of education require the schools in their states to report on their homeroom programs. In addition, there is not a standardized rating device for homeroom programs.

Second, the use of a checklist has limitations. Since teachers are only human, it is expected that in some

instances additions reported or omissions may not represent the actual situations. Then there is the checklist itself which, although great effort was made to make it definite and understandable, represents a weakness in that the organization of the checklist might misrepresent or distort the situation as it exists. To overcome this limitation, ample space was provided for comments on each of the topics as well as at the end of the checklist.

Third, not all of the states or schools were willing to participate in the study. Officials of forty-three states cooperated in the study by suggesting schools in their states. Although not all of the schools suggested were willing to cooperate nevertheless, from the number and the completeness of the returns, it is believed that there are sufficient data for this study. The data are further enhanced by the many comments, suggestions, and enclosures of descriptive material about homeroom programs received from homeroom teachers.

One of the first steps in making this study was to obtain information about homeroom programs in secondary schools. After reviewing much of the literature, interviewing members of the writer's Graduate Committee, homeroom teachers and administrators using the homeroom type organization, an agendum of proposed research procedures was prepared and submitted to the Graduate Committee. The Committee and later the Graduate Council approved the title of

Homeroom Programs in Selected Secondary Schools in the United States. The word "Selected" was placed in the title because it was believed that a study of the better homeroom programs would be more helpful than a representative study of all homerooms in the secondary school.

Research Procedures

Preparation of the checklist

To visit and observe homeroom programs throughout the United States would be a tremendous task. Finances alone would prohibit such a venture. Thus the only feasible method of obtaining information about homeroom programs in the United States is to use a checklist or a similar type of instrument. The writer decided to use a checklist because, first, a checklist requires less time to complete. This is a major factor to consider since teachers have duties other than filling out forms. Second, it is believed the instrument requiring the least amount of time to complete and yet cover the topic adequately would get better returns both in number of responses and in terms of information provided in the checklist.

After a review of instruments used in previous studies of various phases of the homeroom and after consultation with faculty members of the School of Education, Oregon State College, a rough draft of a checklist was prepared and presented to the writer's Graduate Committee for

suggestions and criticisms. Each criticism and suggestion was carefully considered and the checklist was revised to include these suggestions.

Twenty of the revised checklists were sent to homeroom teachers, administrators of homeroom programs, and leaders in the field of guidance. Their suggestions were included in the final draft. After approval by all members of the writer's Graduate Committee, the checklist was printed. Appendix A contains a copy of the checklist.

The checklist was organized into sixteen sections each requesting the recipient to check items that applied to his or her homeroom. Only items that directly related to the subject were included; each item was very specific. Ample space was provided for comments and additions at the end of each section, and at the end of the checklist.

Cover letters were prepared to the administrator and homeroom teacher explaining the purpose of the study. These letters were written on official stationery of the School of Education, Oregon State College. No mention was made that the checklist was part of a doctoral project because of the belief that such mention might decrease the number of replies. Each letter was signed by the writer and was written over the title of Instructor (see Appendices B and C).

Members of the writer's Graduate Committee approved the proposal to send approximately five hundred checklists to the selected secondary schools throughout the United

States. This represents a great number of teachers because of the request to the administrator to ask a representative homeroom teacher in his school to complete the checklist.

Selection of the recipients

The first step in the selection of the recipients was to secure the names and addresses of secondary school principals having outstanding homeroom programs. In order to do this the writer contacted the Director of Secondary Education, or similar official, in each State Department of Education requesting the names of several schools in his state which have outstanding homeroom programs. As there is no standardized method of evaluating homeroom programs, the director was asked to use his own criteria of outstanding since he is probably the one who is most familiar with homeroom programs throughout the state. In the event that there were many schools having outstanding homeroom programs the director was requested to suggest schools in varying sections of the state. This request was made with the hope of getting a more representative group of schools for the state.

The number of schools requested was determined by the number of Congressmen that state has to the Congress of the United States as listed in the Congressional Directory of the 82nd Congress, 2nd Session, January 1952. Two purposes were served by using this procedure; first, the number of

Congressmen is based on the state's population thus making the selection representative of the United States as to population, and second, the number of Congressmen corresponded roughly to the number of checklists the author had originally planned to use.

Officials of forty-three states responded to this request and suggested either as many schools as requested or at least some schools. Most of the officials were prompt in their answers. One state official said he did not know the various programs well enough to suggest any schools and five states did not respond to the initial request or two subsequent requests.

Table I gives a list of the states, the number of schools requested for that state, and the number of schools suggested by an official of each state department of education.

It may be noted that in eighteen states there is a discrepancy between the number of schools requested and the number suggested. This can be partly explained by the fact that better homeroom programs do not always coincide with the number of congressmen to the state. Another reason stated by the majority of officials is that the homeroom programs suggested were the only outstanding ones familiar to the official. Several made the point that they were certain there were other successful homeroom programs, but they were listing the more familiar ones. As a whole the

TABLE I

NUMBER OF SCHOOLS REQUESTED AND NUMBER OF SCHOOLS SUGGESTED BY STATE

State	Number Requested	Number Suggested	State	Number Requested	Number Suggested
Alabama	11	11	Nebraska	6	6
Arizona	4	4	Nevada	3	3
Arkansas	9	9	New Hampshire	4	3
California	25	23	New Jersey	16	6
Colorado	6	6	New Mexico	4	6
Connecticut	7	7	New York	47	42
Delaware	3	3	North Carolina	14	14
Florida	8	7	North Dakota	4	4
Georgia	12	11	Ohio	25	25
Idaho	4	0	Oklahoma	10	10
Illinois	28	0	Oregon	6	11
Indiana	13	13	Pennsylvania	35	35
Iowa	10	5	Rhode Island	4	0
Kansas	8	0	South Carolina	8	10
Kentucky	11	11	South Dakota	4	3
Louisiana	10	10	Tennessee	12	13
Maine	5	5	Texas	23	22
Maryland	5	5	Utah	4	4
Massachusetts	16	14	Vermont	3	0
Michigan	19	7	Virginia	11	11
Minnesota	11	11	Washington	8	0
Mississippi	9	9	West Virginia	8	8
Missouri	15	5	Wisconsin	12	6
Montana	4	4	Wyoming	3	3
Total				530	424

responses from the officials were encouraging with many requests for a summary of the findings. One official in the Northeast requested a detailed account of the study to be used in a local study of homeroom programs. The great majority of officials noted the lack of information received from schools in their state on homeroom programs.

Approximately half of the officials replying gave permission to use their names in contacting the principals of the schools in their state. Most of the officials that did not give permission to use their names were kind enough to explain why. These are the explanations most frequently given:

1. That administrators might feel the state department is shoving work onto them.
2. That friction might be caused between schools by the state department suggesting some schools as outstanding and omitting others.
3. That it is not a policy of the state department to rate or classify schools.

In many instances the schools having better homeroom programs were checked on a directory or as in the case of one state, the members of a committee working in this area were named.

Some officials did not feel that there were any outstanding homeroom programs in their state. However, they suggested good or creditable homeroom programs. Whenever possible these schools were used in the study.

The statement that "Your school was suggested by your state department of education as being an outstanding or

representative homeroom program" was deleted from the cover letter sent to those schools in the state in which the official did not give permission to use his name.

Responses to the checklist

Officials of state departments of education of forty-two states suggested 424 schools, but 5 schools could not be used because of the illegible writing of one state official. The total number of schools contacted was 419. These schools were sent letters containing the checklist, cover letter to the principal and homeroom teacher, and a self-addressed envelope. The letters were mailed on February 5 and 11, 1952.

The responses tapered off until the last of March. It was believed that by April 12, 1952, all checklists were received that were to be returned. A sample was made of the schools not responding. The sample was obtained by listing the states alphabetically, then picking every fifth school not reporting. This gave a sample of 32 schools representing a cross section of the United States. These schools were sent another letter containing the checklist, cover letter, self-addressed envelope, and a note requesting their cooperation in making the study more meaningful by including their schools.

Table II shows the number of checklists sent, the number

of responses to the initial request, the number of checklists sent as a follow-up, and the number of responses obtained from the follow-up. Also shown are the total number of responses and the percentages. The 268 responses to the initial request represent approximately a 64 per cent return. The 18 responses to the follow-up represent a 59 per cent return. This low percentage of response may be explained partially by the late mailing of the follow-up letters when teachers were probably busy with all the duties that arise toward the end of each school year. The total number of responses to the request was 286, which represents slightly over a 68 per cent return.

TABLE II

RESPONSE TO THE INITIAL REQUEST, RESPONSE TO THE FOLLOW-UP, TOTAL NUMBER OF RESPONSES, AND PERCENTAGES

	Number of Checklists Sent	Number of Responses	Percentage Returned
First mailing	419	268	64
Follow-up	32	18	59
Total		286	68

The total responses by each state to the initial request, and the follow-up are shown in Table III. It may be noted that 7 states gave a 100 per cent response. The low percentage of responses obtained from Virginia, Georgia, and Oklahoma may be due somewhat to the fact that the names

TABLE III

THE NUMBER OF CHECKLIST SENT AND THE NUMBER RETURNED BY STATES

State	Number Sent	Number Returned	Percentage
Alabama	11	6	55
Arizona	4	4	100
Arkansas	9	3	33
California	23	16	70
Colorado	6	5	83
Connecticut	7	7	100
Delaware	3	2	67
Florida	7	6	86
Georgia	11	9	82
Indiana	13	11	85
Iowa	5	4	80
Kentucky	11	5	45
Louisiana	10	4	40
Maine	5	2	40
Massachusetts	14	8	57
Michigan	7	6	86
Minnesota	11	9	82
Mississippi	9	6	67
Missouri	5	4	80
Montana	4	3	75
Nebraska	6	5	83
Nevada	3	2	67
New Hampshire	3	3	100
New Jersey	6	6	100
New Mexico	6	4	67
New York	42	32	76
North Carolina	14	8	57
North Dakota	4	4	100
Ohio	25	14	56
Oklahoma	10	6	60
Oregon	11	11	100
Pennsylvania	35	17	49
South Carolina	10	5	50
South Dakota	3	2	67
Tennessee	13	10	77
Texas	22	18	82
Utah	4	4	100
Virginia	11	6	55
West Virginia	8	4	50
Wisconsin	6	3	50
Wyoming	3	2	67
Total	419	286	68

of the principals were not listed by the state official, and hence the address was to the school and not as personal as in the case of the other states where the letter was addressed to the principal.

Not all the responses to the request to complete the checklist were usable in the study. Table IV shows that of the 286 responses 268 or 94 per cent could be used in the study. Of the 18 responses classified as unusable, 9 reported no homeroom programs operating at present and 4 returned the checklist uncompleted but included mimeographed material dealing with the homeroom program. The checklist was returned by 4 principals with the comment that the checklist did not apply to their program. One checklist was returned with a critical comment about teachers being "Questionned to death". This was the only critical comment received. Many teachers expressed an interest in the study and showed this interest by attaching supplementary materials as well as by stating that this is an area where something could be done.

TABLE IV

RESPONSES CLASSIFIED AS USABLE AND UNUSABLE

Responses	Number	Percentage
Usable Responses	268	94
Unusable Responses	18	6
Total	286	100

As the checklists were returned, each was tabulated on a 5" by 8" card using the Thurstone Edge Marking system (31).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature dealing with the homeroom in the secondary school is not as voluminous as the literature available on other aspects of the school program. This is revealed through an examination of the Education Index which lists a yearly average of eight references dealing with the homeroom for the past 21 years. Not all of these dealt with the homeroom in the secondary school. Much of the available literature deals with the homeroom in the upper elementary grades and the junior high school.

The literature may be classified into three groups:

(a) Descriptions of homeroom programs written generally by the principal or homeroom teacher.

(b) Promotional articles showing the merits of the homeroom organization and including, in many instances, ideas for use in the homeroom.

(c) Reports of research on homeroom programs.

References to reports of such research studies on homeroom programs listed in Education Index are relatively few. Granted that many schools may do some evaluating of their homeroom program, there are few reports of these studies. There is also a dearth of research data on homeroom programs involving large or representative groups of homeroom programs.

Only the materials that apply directly to the homeroom in the secondary school will be reviewed. And in order to provide a degree of continuity the literature will be reviewed as it relates to the specific objectives of this study. These objectives are:

(a) Purposes of the homeroom.

(b) Organization of the homeroom.

(c) Practices carried out in the homeroom program.

(d) Problems of the homeroom teachers.

Before beginning an analysis of the literature as it relates to each specific purpose of this study, a brief account of the origin and development of the homeroom is necessary.

Origin of the homeroom

The exact origin of the homeroom is unknown and perhaps will always remain so. Dunsmoore (8, p.35) has traced its origin back to about 1862 in Michigan.

One of the developments leading up to the homeroom was the "house system" used by the English. Johnson states: (14, p.669)

> In the English public schools, the house, in which 40-60 boys live, forms the natural unit of organization of the social life. On entrance at the school a boy is placed in a certain house of which he continues to be a member so long as he remains in the school.

This house system of the English school contributed the idea of using this type organization for social development;

however, the homeroom in the American public schools has other purposes besides the development of social relations.

McKown gives this explanation of the origin of the homeroom: (22, p.48)

> The grandparent of the home room was an assembly, study, or opening-exercise period, a short period scheduled for the beginning of the school day. The pupils hung their wraps and dinner pails on the hooks at the back of the room, left here their surplus books and equipment, and took their seats. In this period the attendance was taken, announcements made, admonitions given, and devotionals held. In a part of it the pupil could hastily run over his first lessons, become oriented in the spirit of the school, rest himself a bit, and "get settled down to work". Later, when the small one-room school grew into a multi-room building, this same setting was transferred to the various individual rooms, and these same activities were performed there. This was, and still is, the well known "report room" or "report period".

Dunsmoore supports McKown by stating: (8, p.34)

> We might say that even the one-room school had, and still does have, some of the characteristics of what now constitutes our homeroom organization. The similarity of functions which exists in many respects between some of the larger one-room schools and the homeroom of twenty or forty pupils is quite obvious. Matters of administrative routine, for instance, are inevitably present in the one-room school as are matters of educational and civic guidance regardless of how well or how poorly they may be executed.

Goetting stresses the origin of the homeroom as a result of the increased size of the school. He states: (12, p.450)

> The homeroom in the modern sense, originated with departmentalized teaching. Growing from a record room, report period, or book room where attendance was checked and opening exercises held, the home room serves to unify and integrate the work of pupils in the modern departmentalized high school.

Development of the homeroom

The homeroom idea spread rapidly. Galen Jones, in a study of the introduction of activities in 269 high schools, found that homeroom programs were introduced and reported in two schools between 1875 and 1879, and that the number of schools reporting the introductions of homeroom programs increased to 33 between 1925 and 1929. (15, p.17) McKown states that the greatest development of the homeroom in American schools was between 1920 and 1930. (21, p.24)

McKown wrote in 1932: (20, pp.vii-viii)

> The home room has appeared within the last fifteen or twenty years, and its growth has been astounding. If the reader doubts this, let him attempt to find references to the home room in the professional literature of fifteen years back, and then contrast these, in number and extent with those he finds today.

Fowlkes substantiates McKown by stating: (10, p.72)

> Not a single article is listed in Reader's Guide on the homeroom between 1919 and 1928, while between 1928-1931, some thirty-two articles appeared.

Some idea of the extent of the development of the homeroom is shown by Kefauver and Scott in an article published in 1930. (16, p.624)

> The homeroom plan, involving the assignment of a group of students to a teacher for special service, has been widely adopted as a means of improving the program of secondary education. It has been used especially in the junior high school. In a canvass by Leonard V. Koos and Grayson N. Kefauver of guidance activities in 336 high schools, it was found that two-thirds of the schools utilized the homeroom. Seven-eighths of the junior high schools indicated provision for this organization. This proportion far exceeded the 16 per cent for

> the senior high school. The proportions for the four and six-year high schools were both 60 per cent.

In 1934 Abernethy made a study of homerooms in Massachusetts secondary schools and found that over 86 per cent of these schools had homeroom organizations. (1, p.138)

Mogill in an article published in 1951 found: (24, p.143)

> According to the results of the survey, practically all of the secondary schools in cities with populations of 100,000 or more have homeroom organizations. Further, it is found in 360 senior high schools; 216 junior high schools; 14 junior-senior high-school combinations; and, in 23 vocational high schools.

In an article published in 1952 Gerald Van Pool, Director of Student Activities for the National Association of Secondary School Principals, states: (32, p.150)

> So important has the homeroom become that practically all larger high schools have some form of a homeroom, and it is also found in most medium-sized high schools and many junior high schools.

Many factors have contributed to the growth of the homeroom in the American school. One factor was the increased size of the high schools. Chisholm summarizes this problem with the statement: (5, p.337)

> When the high school was small, and students and teachers came in close contact with each other every day, everyone knew everyone else and to some extent, at least, took an interest in each other personally. With the rapid increase in enrollment in the high schools throughout the country during the past quarter of a century or more, many schools reached the place where the number of

> students and teachers was large enough for the individual to be "lost in the mass".

Another problem which faced the larger high schools and which contributed to the growth of the homeroom idea was that of orienting the pupils to the complexities of the school curriculum. Goetting clarifies the above problem with his statement: (12, p.451)

> Whether the offerings of the school are organized as parallel curricula or on a constants-with-variables pattern, the pupil is confronted with a program that is amazing, to say the least. This is further complicated by an additional list of offerings of the school in the form of extra-curricular activities. In this situation it is essential that some provision be made for orienting the pupil to the opportunities which he has.

With the increased size of the high school has come increased administrative problems. Cockrell states: (6, p.11)

> The homeroom program came into existence in most schools for the purely administrative reason that some one must be responsible for the conduct, attendance, study, and general attitude of pupils throughout the day.

Smith (28, p.3) emphasizes the increased heterogeneity of the school population after the year 1900 as a factor in the rapid growth of the homeroom idea.

Krug gives these reasons for the development of the homeroom: (18, p.91)

> Homerooms developed because there seemed to be no place or time in the regular subjects to deal with such matters as personality development, vocational guidance, manners, getting along with people, orientation to the school, hobbies, and family living.

McKown disagrees with this as to the original reason for the development of the homeroom, but he does show how the increased emphasis on the individual has changed the homeroom by stating: (22, p.49)

> With the rapidly developing interest in guidance, the homeroom as an educative opportunity, rather than merely as an administrative device, came into existence. Teachers and administrators were quick to see the excellent possibilities offered by this more or less informal and nonacademic setting and began to capitalize it for purposes of individual and group guidance. And with the present trends in guidance---individualization and decentralization---the homeroom has acquired an importance and a significance second to no other setting or opportunity in the school.

Purposes of the Homeroom

It is important that administrators and teachers have a clear understanding of the purposes of the homeroom in the secondary school if the homeroom is to function effectively. Most of the activities carried out in the homeroom may be grouped under two main headings -- those which facilitate the administration of the school and those which provide some guidance services for pupils. Obviously not all homerooms have to have either one or the other. Rather, both administrative and guidance activities are carried out to some degree.

Even though there is some disagreement as to the original purpose of the homeroom, this disagreement should not interfere with the functioning of present homeroom programs.

Reports of research studies as well as descriptions of homeroom programs will be reviewed as the findings refer to homeroom purposes, which are administrative and guidance. Since many studies do not state specifically the purposes of the homeroom, they must be inferred from the practices and activities carried out in the homeroom program.

Administrative functions of the Homeroom

Cockrell says that the homeroom came into existence purely for administrative reasons. (6, p.12) And many of the studies have reported findings which indicate the importance of the homeroom as an administrative device.

Although McKown (21) and Krug (18) disagree with this, and give purposes other than administrative, as the original purpose; they recognize that the increased size of the high school has created the problem, as Chisholm puts it, of: (5, p.338) "Bringing the office closer to the student". McKown states: (22, p.45)

> The home room is the logical place for the handling of a number of "report room" activities such as taking attendance, reading announcements and bulletins, receiving and caring for records and reports of various kinds, care and distribution of supplies, tickets, publications, etc., and collections of various types.

McKown, also, emphasizes the "educative opportunity" of the homeroom as an agency for guidance.

Swarm (30, p.90) reports in a survey of 47 high schools

in the State of Washington in 1936 that 87.2 per cent of the high schools use the homeroom to some extent as an administrative device. In 1934 Abernethy reported in a study of 184 Massachusetts high schools: (1, p.135)

> Administrative effeciency appears to be a common purpose for all but a few schools, 147, or 91.9 per cent, reporting this as an objective. It is the only objective listed by 27 schools, or 16.9 per cent of the total.

In 1930 Kefauver and Scott found in a study of 130 schools in 37 states that the following administrative activities were reported in at least 75 per cent of the schools: (16, p.631)

> Discussion of ideals and purposes of home-room organization
> Daily routine and bulletin notices
> Collections of contributions of school funds
> Sale of tickets
> Subscriptions to school publications
> Discussion of punctuality and attendance
> Contests between divisions of homeroom group on tardiness, scholarship, etc.

Mogill, in one of the most comprehensive studies of the homeroom in cities of populations of over 100,000, has this to say about the use of the homeroom as an administrative device: (24, p.146)

> In the modern public school there must be some unit of organization for administration. The home room is a unit through which schools are administered and through which all educational problems are pursued. It has been found that the size of a school makes it necessary to have small administrative sub-units functioning in relation to an overall administrative program. In general, it

> may be stated that the home room, used as an administrative technique, increases in value as the enrollment of the school increases. One administrator stated that the home room is: "Absolutely necessary from an administrative point of view. We could not function without it in a school with a population of 4,580". One principal has stated that the home room is: "All for the purpose of getting the best job done in the least possible time, for the most people to serve with the least amount of energy".

Mogill grouped the administrative functions of the home room into five areas:

(1) Make general announcements

(2) Record attendance

(3) Issuing and collecting report cards

(4) Collection of money

(5) Issuing lockers.

Mogill states further: (24, p.146)

> Routine administrative announcements of a general nature are made in 87 per cent of the cases replying to the survey questionnaire while only 13 per cent do not use the homeroom for this purpose. The homeroom is used to record attendance in 84 per cent of the schools, while only 16 per cent do not use it. In 75 per cent of the cases report cards are collected through the homeroom. Only 25 per cent of the schools do not use this administrative device.

Kefauver and Scott found that certain home room activities contributed to school spirit. The state and believe that "School spirit and loyalty are important in the administration of the school". (16, p.632) This school spirit was shown by the discussion of the needs for improvement in one-third of the schools; boosting school enterprises and school songs and yells were reported by the

majority of the schools. (16, p.623) Some writers, such as Smith (28) and Van Pool (32) list the development of a healthy school spirit as a separate function of the homeroom. Smith states: (28, p.4)

> The institution function includes such things as the development of school spirit, understanding of and participation in the extra-curricula program of the school, promoting good sportmanship and loyalty, building up in the student body a cooperative attitude toward the program of the administration, and an appreciation of the opportunities which the institution offers to the students.

There are, of course, many other administrative functions of the home room besides those reported by the research studies. One of these, the development of an overall educational philosophy, and some specific administrative functions, would be peculiar to the school. These were not reported as such but were grouped under general headings.

Guidance functions of the homeroom

The emphasis on the individual, the increased size of the high schools, the heterogeneous character of the school population, and other factors have all contributed to making the homeroom an agency for guidance. This emphasis on the individual and some of the factors which make it more necessary are, as stated by Goetting: (12, p.450)

> Although the typical high school is a small institution, it must be recognized that a majority of pupils attend high schools of such size that an understanding of individual personalities by teachers is difficult, if not impossible. With the increased enrollment of the schools, the improvement of this condition has been undertaken by

> the establishment of home rooms where groups of thirty to forty pupils would be assigned to a home room teacher. Each pupil would thus come to feel that there is at least one teacher in the high school who knows him intimately, and who takes a personal interest in his progress.

Dunsmoore gives these similar reasons for placing guidance activities in the homeroom: (8, p.25)

> There developed a recognition of the fact that many pupils were not obtaining the individual attention and guidance which they had under a system whereby at least one teacher knew the pupil well through frequent and somewhat continuous contacts with him. Inasmuch as the homeroom had already been established for administrative-routinary purposes, it seemed logical that schools should consider the extension of its use to provide for a close personal contact between homeroom teacher and pupils. Gradually guidance activities of various types were introduced into the homeroom period, and thus it assumed in many instances the dual function of performing both routine and guidance activities.

In 1936 Swarm, after investigating the literature available, stated: (30, p.98) "There is quite general agreement among the writers in this field that the purpose of the homeroom is primarily guidance."

Kefauver and Scott in a study of 130 high schools in 37 states in 1930 found that high schools indicate a wide variety of guidance activities. They state: (16, p.633)

> The largest number is reported by the junior high schools, the median being 21.2. The median for the senior high schools is 16.0, and 12.5 for the four-year high schools.

In discussing the results of the survey to determine the activities contributing to guidance in the homeroom, Kefauver and Scott say: (16, pp.633-635)

> Certain things are done by most of the schools. The items occuring most frequently are the discussion of courses offered in the school, requirements for graduation from high school, requirements for admission to college and nature of extra-curricular activities in college, and the advising of students in choice of subjects and curricula---. Approximately one-half of the junior high schools and slightly more than a third of the senior and four-year high schools are making some attempts toward informing pupils about the conditions and opportunities in occupations. A smaller proportion of the schools are studying the members of the groups by tests, rating of character traits, and visits to homes.

Abernethy in a study of 184 Massachusetts high schools published in 1934 found: (1, p.138)

> The only forms of guidance appearing among the objectives of one-half of the schools or over are orientation, personal guidance, and educational guidance, which are found in 56.3 per cent, 51.1, 51.3 per cent respectively. Other forms of guidance range in order from social guidance in 41.9 per cent of the schools, through moral guidance in 38.8 per cent, health guidance in 31.1 per cent, and vocational guidance in 26.9 per cent, to recreational guidance in 18.1 per cent.

Swarm, in a study of 104 high schools in the State of Washington in 1936, found: (30, p.99)

> That guidance and counseling are the main features of the homeroom programs in thirty-one or 65.9 per cent of the schools.

In 1941 Votaw in a survey of homeroom programs in Oregon high schools reported: (33, pp.71-72)

> 87 per cent of the 47 schools reported had ten per cent or less of the homeroom period devoted to vocational guidance, only one school reported over 25 per cent of the homeroom period concerned with vocational guidance.

Votaw also found that other phases of guidance, such as the

personal interview and personal problem discussions, reported less than 25 per cent devoted to the homeroom period.

This is not necessarily a refutation of the findings of the other studies quoted, inasmuch as Votaw's study was an attempt to determine the amount of time spent in each activity and the percentages represent this proportion of time. It is interesting to note that some attempt at vocational guidance in the homeroom was reported by 63 per cent of the schools, (33, p.72) that 93 per cent of the schools reported some time devoted to the personal interview, and 100 per cent reported some time devoted to discussions of personal problems in the homeroom. Discussion of school problems was reported by 100 per cent of the schools. The per cent of time devoted to these discussions varied, with the majority being 10 per cent or less. (33, p.75)

Mogill reports, in his study of 613 high schools located in cities of 100,000 population or over: (24, p.150)

> Student counseling in terms of curriculum programs occurs in 80 per cent of the schools. The next most important aspect of the homeroom program is student counseling in terms of personal problems, which occurs in 78 per cent of the schools.

Apparently there is a great discrepancy between the time spent in these activities and the checking of the items. Votaw's study is a good illustration of this.

The findings of these studies that guidance is a major

function of the homeroom does not prove that effective guidance is carried out or that the majority of the time in the homeroom is devoted to these activities. That the teachers check these activities as contributing to guidance, indicates a recognition to some degree, of the need for assistance to the pupils and of the possibility that the homeroom can meet this need.

Other purposes of the homeroom

Undoubtedly some homerooms are used as instructional units for unrelated subjects that cannot conveniently be included in other periods. Kefauver and Scott found that activities such as driver training, life saving and music appreciation were carried out in a very small percentage of the homerooms. (16, p.638)

Berman emphasized the use of the homeroom as a practical factor in democratic living when he stated: (4, pp.72-73)

> It is obvious that the school can do more about democracy and democratic living. Its obligation is implicit in these days of uncertainty, but no matter what the school attempts to do, it should proceed calmly without pedagogical hysterics. A thousand and one opportunities are at hand with which to undertake a practical, sane, effective program. One of these opportunities rests in the homeroom. No startling innovations are needed; the possibility for democratic living is inherent in the homeroom itself.

Actually many of the purposes given by the various writers can be classified under either guidance or

administration or both. The development of a desirable pupil-teacher relationship is a prerequisite to effective guidance.

Organization of the Homeroom

In order to provide as complete a picture of the organization of the homeroom as is possible the literature was reviewed as it relates to the organization of the homeroom within the school, and the organization within the homeroom.

Organization of the homeroom within the school

The literature is particularly meager on this aspect of the homeroom. In the final analysis, the principal is responsible for the organization of the homeroom program. However, the general organization may be under a homeroom director, homeroom committee, council composed of teachers, pupils and principal, or various other ways and combinations of organizing the homeroom.

In 1930 Kefauver and Scott made a survey of 130 high schools in 37 states and found: (16, pp.628-629)

> The most unsatisfactory characteristic of the administration of the homeroom is the lack of coordinating leadership. The principal very infrequently attempts to develop the program. A committee of teachers represents the most frequently used type of organization. This committee outlines in a general way the nature of the activity for the different groups, and in some

> instances, develops the materials in a detailed manner for use by the home-room teachers. In more than half the schools canvassed, however, each homeroom teacher works independently without any attempts being made to assist her in developing satisfactory activities and in coordinating the activities of the various groups.

Swarm reports in a study of Washington state high schools in 1936 that 59.4 per cent of the 47 schools reporting homeroom organizations had a Director of Homeroom Activities. Three schools reported the use of a committee. The large percentage of directors is easily understood when it is explained that all reported this as a part-time job. No mention was made of the amount of time spent by the directors. In this study, Swarm supports the findings of Kefauver and Scott by showing that the principal or vice-principal directs the homeroom in over 65 per cent of the schools reporting. The degree of this direction may be very active or very passive because, as previously stated, the principal is the one responsible for the homeroom, and its effectiveness depends upon the degree of leadership.

Votaw in a study of 47 Oregon high schools in 1941 reports finding much the same results, with approximately 53 per cent of the responses indicating no formal organization except the usual teacher-principal organization. Votaw also found that a committee of teachers was responsible for the homeroom organization in 10 per cent of the schools, and 3 per cent reported the use of the student council and teachers.

Wagner (34, p.94) in a study of 104 high schools in 1946 found that 21 schools had faculty committees entirely responsible for the promotion and development of the homeroom program with 78 schools reporting no such committee.

From the reports of homeroom organizations listed above, it appears that no elaborate organizational plan exists among homeroom programs. However, it should be kept in mind that the studies reported may not represent the entire country. McKown in his book, Homeroom Guidance, states: (21, p.50)

> In general, it appears that an organization built around a faculty committee is a more desirable plan than an organization built around an activity or guidance director. Of course, if there is an activity or guidance director he will be a member of the committee, perhaps its chairman. Such an organization combines the natural advantages of both of the methods suggested. But, in any case some central office or committee should be charged with the responsibility for organizing, promoting, and developing the homeroom plan.

Van Pool in his article on the homeroom published in 1952 suggests that in the small school the homeroom should probably be under the direction of a single person, probably the principal. Since there is such a great difference in school programs and school personnel, a formal or rigid organization would not apply to all situations. Factors to be considered would be the personnel, both teachers and students, school program as to time, purpose of the homeroom, and in general the overall philosophy of the school.

The selection of a teacher for the homeroom has been

the subject of much discussion. This is an important point since essentially the success or failure of the homeroom program depends upon the homeroom teacher. Swarm found that approximately half of the schools required all teachers to have a homeroom. Wagner reports that of 57 schools reporting, 7 said the homeroom teachers were selected, whereas, 50 schools reported that all teachers were expected to have homeroom. The consensus is that one of the major reasons for the failures of the homeroom is the requirement that every teacher must have a homeroom, regardless of personal characteristics, training or desire.

A possible solution to the lack of training of homeroom teachers has been reported by Leaver who states that the rotation of homeroom teachers in a Midwestern state school works successfully. She states: (19, pp.8-10)

> Teachers serve as chairmen of the various discussions and rotate from session to session so that they meet with each group once during the year. Each teacher selects a topic and becomes rather a specialist on that one subject and guides in its presentation and interpretation to the students. Thus a teacher presents just one topic during the year to each of the various groups.

A warning about over organization may be interjected here. As Swarm states: (30, pp.16-17)

> It is possible to over-organize because of the enthusiasm for the homeroom when one becomes acquainted with it and sees its possibilities; and also because of the desire to keep up with the newer conception of modern education.

Membership of the homeroom

Numerous plans have been suggested in the literature for selecting pupils for the homeroom. Abernethy found that the larger high schools selected pupils for the homeroom either by sex or alphabetically. (1, p.138) Wagner reports in her study of 104 high schools in 1946 that of 73 schools reporting, 47 schools selected pupils for the homeroom by the grade level of the pupil. The second method in importance was reported by 15 schools, which selected pupils by class, such as first, second or third-period class. (34, p.89) Swarm found that class and sex were the most-used methods of selecting pupils for the homeroom in 57.5 and 27.7 per cent of the teachers reporting respectively. (30, p.88)

Kefauver and Scott found that the alphabetical and random methods of selection were used the most, occasionally by grade level. Ability grouping was reported in only a few cases. Vocational interests are also used by placing in a group pupils from a common vocational curriculum or with a common vocational ambition. Kefauver and Scott give the following opinion of methods of selection: (16, p.627)

> The bases of distribution of students to the homeroom should be determined by the program projected for the homeroom. Certainly the plan adopted, even though it has certain disadvantages, should be adapted to the achievement of the major purposes.

Payne (26) found, in experimenting with different methods of grouping pupils in his southern high school, that grouping by centers of interest or ability did not work out in his particular school. Grouping by alphabetical order and sex were the most popular with the pupils.

Van Pool in a study of researches on homeroom programs in 1952 reemphasizes Kefauver and Scott's observations by stating: (32, p.153)

> Each school must decide which plan it will use. However, the one that appears to be most popular is that system in which the members of certain grade level are divided alphabetically into groups of about the same size. In general, these groups are re-arranged every year but in some schools this group is made up in the first year of high school and the pupils remain together throughout their entire high-school career.

Some of the methods that may be used to select pupils are listed by Fretwell as follows: (11, pp.38-40)

By classes and alphabetically within the class
By representatives of all classes within the school
By sex
By intelligence quotients or ability ratings within classes
By first period recitation groups
By curricula pursued or by extra-curricular activities
By random selection

Almy lists these methods in addition to the above: (2, p.231)

By schools from which pupils come
By mental age
By permitting pupils to choose
By interests of pupils

Of the numerous plans in operation for selecting the students for specific homerooms Van Pool in a summary of current practices lists the most commonly used methods as: (32, p.153)

> Grade level, alphabetically dispersed; first period class; assignment by principal; pupil's free choice; "cross-section" homeroom; alphabetical dispersion; curriculum; grade level, divided into groups by sponsor; IQ; school marks; other period class; special group for athletes.

The length of time the pupil remains in the same homeroom has also been a point of discussion. Kefauver and Scott after surveying 130 high schools in 37 states report: (16, p.628)

> If the homeroom is to render a significant guidance service in which the home-room adviser is to be well informed about her students and to furnish the close personal contact considered desirable, the longer assignment is more advantageous. Frequent change in groups preclude desirable familiarity between teacher and student. Semiannual assignment with the relatively short period is almost certain to make attempts at guidance ineffective.

However, they found, in this same study, that the assignment of pupils on a permanent basis is used less frequently than the semester or annual assignment. (16, p.628)

McKown has analyzed the possibilities of the permanent versus the temporary membership in the homeroom and gives these main advantages of the temporary homeroom membership: (21, p.75)

> The main advantages of the temporary plan are: (1) the student has opportunities of knowing more teachers, and vice versa, the

> teacher has opportunities of knowing more students; (2) the students can become acquainted with a greater number of their schoolmates than if they were with the same group for a longer period; (3) the novelty of the situation---new sponsor and new home room mates---adds to the general attractiveness of the home room plan; (4) if student-teacher relationships are not mutually pleasant they will not be continued for long.

McKown lists these main advantages to the permanent membership homeroom plan: (21, p.76)

> (1) the members and the sponsor can become better acquainted than they could if the period were short; (2) there will be no duplication of work, emphasis, or activities; and (3) responsibility for the success of the room is definitely placed. All three are good arguments.

Unfortunately little data are available to show which of these plans are the most widely used. If Wagner's study of 104 schools is representative, then the permanent homeroom seems to be gaining in popularity. Wagner found in her survey that 70 schools used the permanent homeroom plan, whereas only 26 schools used the temporary plan. Four schools did not answer. Mogill (24) did not report any findings dealing with the membership in the homeroom.

Size of the homeroom

The size of the homeroom depends upon the local situation. McKown states: (22, p.63)

> The usual homeroom is composed of from 25 to 35 students, because the regular classes are traditionally organized on this basis, and also because the room itself accomodates about this number.

Another advantage is that in classes of this size the pupils get to know each other.

Wagner's study of 104 high schools in 1946 revealed the number of pupils in the homeroom ranged from 25 to 35. (34, p.89) Mogill, in the study of homeroom programs in cities with population of 100,000 or over, found that the average number of pupils in the homeroom was 33. (24, p.157)

Length of the homeroom period

The length of the homeroom period should be determined by the purposes of the homeroom. Short periods are all that are necessary for checking attendance and similar routine details. The average period, according to Mogill's study, is 22 minutes. Mogill, in the latest study available, gives the following results from 511 schools reporting: (24, p.145)

> The length of the home room period shows wide distribution. Numerically, 154 cases indicated the preference for 11-20 minutes. In numerical descendency 112 cases prefer 21-30 minutes, 85 cases select 1-10 minutes; 69 cases choose 31-40 minutes; 68 cases check 41-50 minutes; 16 cases indicated 41-60 minutes; 3 cases prefer 61-70 minutes; and 4 cases indicate 71-80 minutes.

In 1930 Kefauver and Scott found that 150-209 minutes a week were usually allotted to the homeroom. This represents approximately a 36 minute period each school day of the week. (16, p.639) In 1936 Swarm found essentially the

same in his study of 47 schools in the State of Washington. (30, p.86)

In her study of 104 schools in 1945, Wagner found that fifteen minutes was the most common length of the homeroom. A majority of schools reported periods of 10-20 minutes with 40 minutes the next most popular length, although a wide variation existed of from five to 60 minutes. (34, p.91)

It is generally agreed that the homeroom period should be the same length as the instructional period. This would tend to give status to the homeroom. (22, p.61)

Not all homerooms meet daily as is indicated from results obtained in Mogill's study. He found that 85 per cent of the schools reported meeting daily; 8.9 per cent weekly, with the remainder meeting less often or when necessary. (24, p.144) The length of the period and the number of meetings per week are determined by the purposes of the particular homeroom.

Organization within the homeroom

In his revised edition of Homeroom Guidance, McKown devotes all of Chapter V to the internal organization of the homeroom and emphasizes student participation and responsibility as the most desirable plan. He states: (21, p.81)

> The main objectives of the home room plan cannot be achieved through a teacher-dominated, formal or even informal, class. They can be achieved only through a miniature democracy in which the students assume and more or less

> successfully discharge the responsibilities for the room's various programs and activities.

The internal organization of the homeroom will vary with the individual teacher and her students. It is not the purpose of this review to list an elaborate organizational plan, but rather, to show the type of organizations which have been used in homerooms.

Stewart, in developing a homeroom program for a high school in the Northeast, gave the pupils a large share in its internal organization. He writes: (20, p.117)

> In each homeroom, pupil committees were elected to plan, with the help of the teacher, each meeting of the guidance hour. The pupils found the Student Council a convenient organization to which to refer questions and suggestions for general improvement.

Bartholomew, in a report of guidance services in the homeroom in a Northeast high school, states that the homeroom is: (3, p.144) "The basis of pupil participation in school government".

In a survey of 47 high schools in 1936, Swarm found that 34 per cent of the schools utilized social committees in the homeroom; other committees, such as scholarship and attendance, occurred less frequently. However, Votaw in a study of 47 Oregon high schools in 1941 found that approximately 57 per cent of the schools reported less than 25 per cent of the homeroom programs planned by the pupils.

Little is available in the literature regarding recent findings on the internal organization of the homeroom.

Van Pool has summarized this problem of the homeroom by stating: (32, p.153)

> Some schools find it helpful to permit each homeroom to develop a rather elaborate internal organization, complete with officers, committees, colors, constitution, and even dues or fees. There is considerable doubt about the efficacy of such an elaborate system for directing the activities of the average home room, but there may be some justification for the election of officers.

Homeroom Practices

Two aspects of the practices carried out in the homeroom will be reviewed. These are the methods and the materials used by homeroom teachers in secondary schools.

Methods used by homeroom teachers

Broad pupil participation is obviously one of the most desired characteristics of any homeroom program which is devoted to any phase of guidance.

Dunsmoore made an intensive study of 33 homeroom programs in 1938 and found that the responsibility for handling homeroom meetings varied considerably. These are the findings: that the homeroom teacher presides only occasionally in most of the schools; that the next method used was that the pupil officers preside at all meetings; next, was that the homeroom teacher never presides, but takes part as a member. Dunsmoore in his study found that in no homerooms did the teacher preside at all the meetings. (8, p.245)

It must be emphasized that this study dealt with the guidance aspects of the homeroom and that schools studied were recognized as having good guidance programs in the homeroom.

Group discussion seems to be the predominant method used in the homeroom. Abernethy (1) reports in 1934 that the discussion method was widely used in Massachusetts secondary schools.

Little mention is made in the literature of the methods used by homeroom teachers. This can probably be explained by the wide divergence of practices as well as by the wide variation of materials used and developed in the homeroom.

Materials used in the homeroom

Reference to materials used in the homeroom are seldom found because, it is realized, that the materials may be rapidly outdated because of the wide variation in purposes and practices.

In the writer's opinion McKown has, at present, the only major book in this area. His first edition of Home Room Guidance was published in 1934 and was revised in 1946. This represents the classic in the field of books devoted exclusively to the homeroom. Some additional books and pamphlets dealing with the homeroom are listed in the bibliography. (7, 9, 17, 23, 27)

Of course, many books, pamphlets, and articles deal with topics of interest to the homeroom teacher. These will

not be reviewed because, obviously, it would be an unending task.

Many schools apparently develop materials for use in the homeroom. Since these are not published and are not available to the author no method of tabulating the type or contents is available.

Generalizing from a study of 160 responses from principals of homerooms in Texas, Van Pool states: (32, p.155)

> Some schools find it helpful for the staff, or certain members of the staff and students, to prepare a mimeographed handbook or bulletin on homeroom planning, operation and program.

This may not be an important aspect of the homeroom; however, the author believes that the discussion and dissemination of materials used in the homeroom is a necessary prelude to the improvement of homeroom programs throughout the country.

Problems Faced by Homeroom Teachers

The literature dealing with the homeroom in the secondary school contains many words about the problems and failures of the homeroom. Novak, writing in 1951, has analyzed the failures of homerooms and states: (25, p.50)

> Nearly all of these failures can be traced to violations of the following principles:
> (1) Homeroom sponsors must be specially qualified, trained and interested.
> (2) Content of programs must be of direct and immediate interest to most of the members of the group and must fill needs of which they are aware.

(3) The program should be student planned and student conducted, but intelligent assistance should be provided by the sponsor.
(4) The primary outcomes are largely the development of attitudes and the making of adjustments. There are no grades or subject matter assignments.
(5) The student composition of the group should be one that will be conducive to achievement of satisfactory outcomes.
(6) The scheduling and time allotted for the program must be adequate.
(7) The importance of the homeroom as an integral part of the educational program should be so accepted that obstacles will not be placed in the way of regular attendance by all students of the group.

His findings in general are substantiated by the findings of Van Pool. (32, p.150)

Problems in the homeroom are expected, since few, if any homerooms are near perfection. It is interesting to note that in the literature available the writer could find no mention of a study where the homeroom teachers listed their problems. This aspect of the homeroom program will be discussed further in Chapter IV.

Summary

The homeroom in the secondary school was in existence as early as 1862 and was developed primarily as a device to facilitate the efficient administration of the school. Between 1920 and 1930 the increased size of the secondary schools with the attendant problems gave a great impetus to the use of the homeroom type organization which still exists today in more than half of the secondary schools.

Although the purposes and specific functions of the homeroom vary greatly among secondary schools, the major purpose of the homeroom is to provide some form of guidance service to the pupils. The facilitation of administrative routines also remains a function of most homerooms. The present trend is for even greater use of the homeroom as an agency for guidance.

There is a tendency for the pupils in the homeroom to be given more of the responsibility for planning and activating the program. However, not all schools are, as yet, ready or willing to give this opportunity to the pupils.

The introduction of guidance services in the homeroom resulted in many disappointments and problems. The assignment of classroom teachers to the homeroom without training or consultation remains one of the greatest problems of the homeroom. Another basic problem is the lack of status accorded the homeroom as shown by pupils and particularly by administrators, many of whom show this by their lack of a coordinated purposeful homeroom program.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

A detailed account of the research procedures used in collecting the data for this chapter is given in Chapter I. Table IV, page 15, shows that of the 419 schools contacted with a checklist, 268 or 64 per cent are usable for statistical purposes. A few of the schools returning checklists not completed were kind enough to send mimeographed material which had been developed in their homeroom programs. This material, though not lending itself to statistical treatment, will be included whenever practical. In this chapter it is proposed to examine the responses to the 268 checklists and the materials received from the homeroom teachers.

In order to present the data obtained from the checklists as logically as possible, the same general structure of classification used in Chapter II, Review of the Literature, is used in this chapter. This classification corresponds to the major purposes of the study. The headings are:

(a) Administrative practices in the organization of the homeroom

(b) Purposes of the homeroom

(c) Current homeroom practices

(d) Problems of homeroom teachers

(e) Trends in the use of homeroom programs.

Organization of the Homeroom

Administrative practices in the organization of the homeroom will be considered under this heading. Specific practices to be considered are:

The basis of assignment of pupils to the homeroom.

Organization of the homeroom within the school.

Number of pupils in the homeroom.

Number of weekly meetings of the homeroom.

Length of the homeroom period.

Length of assignment of pupils to the same homeroom.

Also under this heading the internal organization of the homeroom will be considered.

Basis of assignment of pupils to the homeroom

The procedure used to select pupils for the homeroom may be an important aspect of the success of the homeroom program. There are essentially two methods of selecting pupils:

(a) A heterogeneous grouping of the class or of the school; this grouping represents some form of a cross-section of the school population, and

(b) A homogeneous grouping; this method involves the assignment of pupils to the homeroom according to some criteria. The most common criteria used are: ability, sex, vocational aspirations or

course of study, and special cases.

The data show that the predominant method of selecting pupils for the homeroom is that of grouping pupils alphabetically by classes. One hundred twenty-nine schools, or 48 per cent, reported using this method. Fifty-two schools, or 19 per cent, use the first period, or other class as the basis of assigning pupils to the homeroom. The next most common method is a random selection of pupils by the administration. This method was reported used in forty schools, or 15 per cent of the responses. These three methods are similar in that a heterogeneous grouping of pupils is obtained in each. A heterogeneous grouping was used by 82 per cent of the schools responding or 221 of the 355 responses.

In only ten schools, or 4 per cent of the responses, are pupils allowed to select their homeroom. Perhaps some consideration may be given to allowing pupils to change homerooms; unfortunately, this was not asked of the homeroom teachers.

The selection of pupils for the homeroom by geographical areas is practiced in four schools. Special homerooms for disciplinary cases are found in four schools, and special homerooms for pupils with personality problems are found in eleven schools, or 4 per cent of the responses.

The criteria of sex, once a major method of selecting pupils for the homeroom, is used in only eighteen schools, or 7 per cent of the responses. The twenty-seven schools

using ability or achievement ratings as a basis of assignment represent 10 per cent of the responses. Of the thirty-one schools reporting other methods than those listed in Table V, the great majority use a combination of methods rather than just one.

Table V shows the number of responses given to each of the methods or criteria.

TABLE V

BASIS OF ASSIGNMENT OF PUPILS TO THE HOMEROOM IN 268 SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Method	Number of Responses*	Per Cent of 268 Schools
Alphabetical grouping by classes	129	48
First period, etc., class	52	19
Random selection by administration	40	15
Ability or achievement	27	10
Course of study	20	7
Sex	18	7
For personality problems	11	4
Pupils select homeroom	10	4
Alphabetical grouping of entire school	9	3
Geographical areas of school district	4	1
Special homeroom for disciplinary cases	4	1
Others	31	11
Total	355	

*The reason the total responses exceeds the number of schools represented is that some schools checked two methods of assigning pupils to the homeroom. Many homeroom teachers checked one method and "Others" indicating a combination of methods according to the situation.

Organization of the homeroom within the school

Since the organization would depend upon the purposes of the homeroom and the local situation, no one method of organizing the homeroom is best. The details of the organization should be those which best fit the situation and which best meet the needs of the pupils and staff. An excellent opportunity is provided in the homeroom to practice democratic living. To utilize this opportunity the homeroom must practice the principles of democracy. One way this may be done is to give the pupils an opportunity to assist in planning and executing the homeroom program.

Not all schools have developed to the point that the pupils and staff are ready for a great degree of pupil participation in planning and carrying out the homeroom program. Only ten schools, or 4 per cent of those reporting, said that the pupils plan and activate the entire homeroom program. Teachers and pupils plan the homeroom program in 154, or 58 per cent of the schools. No pupil participation is reported in planning the homeroom program by 143, or 53 per cent of the schools. Of the 143 responses, 56 report that the teachers plan the homeroom program, and in 87 schools, or 33 per cent of the schools, report that the homeroom program is planned by the teachers and the administration.

TABLE VI

ORGANIZATION OF THE HOMEROOM WITHIN THE SCHOOL

Method	Number of Responses*	Per Cent of 268 Schools
Pupils and teachers plan program	154	57
Administration and teachers plan program	87	32
Teachers plan program	56	21
Pupils plan and activate entire program	10	4
Others	41	15
Total	348	

*Some schools use two methods of organization. An analysis of responses reveals much overlapping between the last three methods.

An analysis of the responses which indicated the pupils plan and activate the entire homeroom program reveals that the homeroom teacher acts only as an adviser. It should be pointed out that the planning and carrying out of the homeroom program is a school function and is under the immediate supervision of the school staff. Within limits, which the pupils assist in setting, the homeroom program is planned and executed by the pupils.

It appears that a discrepancy exists between theory and practice in many schools. If schools are to give the pupils an opportunity to participate in the planning of the school program, the homeroom is an ideal place to begin because of the nature of the homeroom---the pupil's home at school.

The responses of the 41 schools reporting the use of other methods than those listed on the checklist may be

categorized as follows:

1. Teacher, administrator, and guidance director plan the homeroom program.
2. Committees of teachers are delegated this responsibility.

That all the homerooms in the school have similar organizations and activities was reported by 108, or 40 per cent of the homeroom teachers.

Number of pupils in the homeroom

The number of pupils in the homeroom has a direct bearing on what the homeroom teacher can accomplish. A small homeroom enrollment is conducive to an individual or personal relationship which is essential if the teacher is to help the individual pupil. On the other hand, if the homeroom is to have as its only function the facilitation of administrative efficiency by performing such duties as checking attendance and giving out report cards, much larger numbers can be handled adequately. As is often the case, the homeroom is set up to care for administrative routines, and later is given the responsibility for offering at least some of the guidance services.

The number of pupils assigned to the homeroom ranges from 15 to 62. Twenty-one schools, or approximately 9 per cent, report over forty pupils per homeroom. On the opposite side, twenty schools, or approximately 8 per cent,

TABLE VII

NUMBER OF PUPILS ASSIGNED TO THE HOMEROOM

Number of Pupils	Number of Responses
15	1
16	2
17	2
18	3
20	5
21	2
22	2
23	3
24	7
25	16
26	12
27	3
28	11
29	6
30	46
31	10
32	18
33	11
34	5
35	23
36	6
37	6
38	5
39	5
40	6
41	2
42	4
43	3
44	2
45	3
48	1
49	1
50	1
53	1
55	1
59	1
62	1
Varies	5
No answer	26
Total	268

report that less than 24 pupils are assigned to each of the homerooms in 268 schools.

A majority, 73 per cent, of the schools have homerooms composed of from 24 to 40 pupils. The median number of pupils per homeroom is 30. It is generally agreed by writers in this field that schools having from 24 to 40 pupils in the homeroom, the degree to which the homeroom teacher can function in a guidance capacity will depend to a great extent upon how well the homeroom is organized. By having an internal organization functioning so that the pupils carry on the program, the homeroom teacher can devote some time to working with individual pupils.

Length and number of weekly homeroom meetings

Table VIII shows the number of weekly meetings of the homeroom in 226 schools. One hundred twenty schools, or 53 per cent, meet five times per week. An analysis of the responses show these to be daily meetings. The next most-common number of weekly meetings is that of one meeting per week which is practiced by 43 schools, or 19 per cent , of the schools reporting. It is generally agreed by writers in this field that around five meetings each week is the most desirable practice. One hundred thirty-six schools, or 60 per cent, meet this criteria with five or more homeroom meetings each week.

TABLE VIII

NUMBER OF WEEKLY MEETINGS IN 226 HOMEROOMS

Frequency	Number of Responses	Per Cent
Five	120	53
One	43	19
Two	16	7
Four	13	6
Three	11	5
Ten	10	4
Six	5	2
Biweekly	2	1
Fifteen	1	1
Varies	5	2
Total	226	100.0

Schools reporting that the number of homeroom periods per week varied gave these explanations; (a) the homeroom meets when necessary or desired, and (b) the number of homeroom periods per week varies during the school year because of special events, scheduling, registration, and similar reasons.

The length of time devoted to the homeroom in 226 schools is shown in Table IX. Fifty-six, or 25 per cent, of the homerooms meet for 30-40 minutes each day of the week. It is generally recognized by writers in this field that shorter periods than 30 minutes, although sufficient to handle administrative details, are not of sufficient length to provide any great degree of guidance.

TABLE IX

LENGTH OF THE HOMEROOM PERIOD PER DAY
IN 226 SCHOOLS

Minutes Per Day	Number of Cases	Per Cent of Cases
0-4	2	1
5-9	5	2
10-14	26	11
15-19	30	13
20-24	21	9
25-29	18	8
30-34	56	25
35-39	13	6
40-44	16	7
45-49	18	8
50-54	9	4
55-59	7	3
60-64	1	1
75-79	1	1
Varies	3	1
No answer	--	--
Total	226	100

Actually the length of the homeroom period is not as meaningful as it would be if it is compared with the number of weekly meetings. Most of the reports found in the literature failed to reveal the relationship, except in statistical averages. Table X, page 59, shows the length of the homeroom period according to the number of weekly homeroom meetings.

With the exception of one homeroom which met seven minutes each week, the great majority of homerooms meeting once per week have periods of 30 minutes or more. The

length of the homeroom period is sufficient, but it is doubtful if one meeting a week is often enough.

TABLE X

LENGTH AND NUMBER OF HOMEROOM MEETINGS

Length in Minutes	Number of Weekly Meetings									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	10	15	Varies	Total
0-4								1	1	2
5-9	1				3		1			5
10-14			1		23		2			26
15-19			1	3	22		3		1	30
20-24	5	1	1	1	10	2	1			21
25-29	6		2	1	9					18
30-34	12	8	3	4	27	1	1			56
35-39	1	3	1		8					13
40-44	5			3	6	1	1			16
45-49*	6	2	1	1	6					18
50-54	5		1		2		1			9
55-59	1	2			3	1				7
60-64					1					1
75-79	1									1
Varies									3	3
Total	43	16	11	13	120	5	10	1	5	226

*Two homeroom teachers stated that their homerooms met biweekly.

The 120 schools reported to have daily meetings of the homeroom showed these meetings to vary in length of time. Fifty-three of the 120 schools met for a period of 30 minutes or more. Forty-six of these schools meet for 20 minutes or less every day. The length of time the homeroom meets will depend upon the purposes of the homeroom. This point will be elaborated upon under the topic of purposes of the homeroom.

The school reported to have fifteen, three-minute meetings each week doubtlessly uses the homeroom for purely administrative reasons. The school reported to have nearly two hours each day devoted to the homeroom uses the "Core" program of organization with one period called the homeroom. The checklist reveals that some instruction is given in this homeroom along with guidance services and administrative activities.

Length of assignment of pupils to same homeroom

It is generally agreed by writers in this field that it is highly desirable to assign pupils to the same homeroom for a period of at least one year. It is believed that when pupils are assigned for less than a year, teachers and pupils do not have time to become well enough acquainted for teachers to render effective guidance services.

The assignment of pupils to the same homeroom depends upon the number of grades in the secondary school.

Seventy-five schools reported the assignment of pupils for more than four semesters or two years. Two schools reported pupils remaining in the same homeroom for six years or twelve semesters.

In 16 schools, or 6 per cent, pupils are assigned to the same homeroom for one semester; 146 schools, or 54 per cent, assign the pupils to the homeroom for two semesters or one school year, and 42 schools, or 15 per cent, assign pupils to the same homeroom for six semesters or three years.

Table XI shows the number of semesters pupils are assigned to the same homeroom.

TABLE XI

LENGTH OF TIME PUPILS ARE ASSIGNED TO THE SAME HOMEROOM IN 268 SCHOOLS

Number of Semesters	Number of Responses	Per Cent of Responses
1	16	6
2	146	54
3	1	1
4	10	4
5	1	1
6	42	15
8	30	11
12	2	1
Varies	4	1
No answer	16	6
Total	268	100

A word of caution is necessary to those schools which assign pupils to the same homeroom for a long period of

time. When the best interest of the pupil or teacher is involved the administration of the school should make some arrangement whereby the pupil can be transferred to another homeroom.

Internal organization of the homeroom

The degree of individual attention which the homeroom teacher can give to her pupils will depend upon the effectiveness of the internal organization of the homeroom. Since individual interviews are at times necessary, the only way the homeroom teacher can arrange for this time while supervising the homeroom is to have the pupils organized in such a way that supervision is not needed for short periods of time.

The responses of homeroom teachers as to the organization within their homerooms are shown in Table XII. In 190 homerooms, or 71 per cent, the pupils have a parliamentary organization. In 125 schools, or 47 per cent, the pupils choose committees or projects to work on during the homeroom period. In 36 schools, or 13 per cent, the pupils are assigned to committees by the homeroom teacher according to expressed interests of the pupils. In 12 schools, or 4 per cent, definite assignments are made as in a regular course.

Other forms of organization listed by 46 homeroom teachers were the student council or other forms of student

government. Other responses than those related to the student council were combinations or aspects of those listed in the checklist and in Table XII.

A very interesting point to note is that approximately 61 per cent of the responses showed that pupils had a voice in the planning of the homeroom program. Yet practically all of the homerooms have parliamentary organizations or allow pupils to choose committees or projects to work on in the homeroom.

TABLE XII

ORGANIZATION WITHIN THE 268 HOMEROOMS

Methods	Responses	Per Cent
Pupils have parliamentary organization, electing president, etc.	190	71
Pupils choose committees or projects to work on	125	47
Pupils are grouped into committees according to expressed interests of pupils	36	13
Definite assignments are made as in a regular course	12	4
Others	46	17
Total	409	

It appears that in many schools the pupils have parliamentary organizations which function only to carry out the homeroom program planned by the teachers and/or administration. To the writer this is a serious indictment against

those schools not allowing pupil participation in the planning and activation of the homeroom program. The writer has observed, too often, cases where student councils or forms of student government are organized to show the ways and means of democracy only to be relegated to assisting the administration in carrying out policies made by the administration.

Summary

A wide variation exists in the physical characteristics of the homerooms. The data show that:

The majority of schools report from 24 to 40 pupils per homeroom.

The homeroom meets five or more times each week.

The median length of the homeroom period is from 30 to 34 minutes.

Membership in the homeroom is determined by alphabetical grouping by classes.

Pupils are assigned to the same homeroom for two or more semesters.

In 53 per cent of the schools, homeroom teachers reported that pupils do not have a share in the planning and activating of the homeroom program. Even though this seems extremely low to the writer, there appears to be a trend for more pupil participation in the homeroom program, inasmuch as Kefauver and Scott (16) did not report any pupil

participation in 1930.

The majority, 71 per cent, of the homeroom teachers reported that the pupils have a parliamentary organization for such activities as electing officers. If this be true, then it would appear that the pupils have not been given as much responsibility as is possible in the planning and activating of the homeroom program.

Purposes of the Homeroom

In Chapter II it was found that basically the homeroom has two major purposes, the facilitating of administrative routines and the rendering of guidance services. It was pointed out that most homerooms have some activities designed to serve both purposes.

Guidance and administration were reported equally important as objectives of the homerooms in 172, or 64 per cent, of the schools. Promoting administrative efficiency was reported the predominant objective by fifty, or 18 per cent of the homeroom teachers, and guidance was the chief objective reported by 43, or 16 per cent, of the schools. Table XIII shows the responses of the homeroom teachers to the predominant objectives of their homeroom.

TABLE XIII

PREDOMINANT OBJECTIVES IN 268 HOMEROOMS

Objective	Number of Responses	Per Cent
Guidance and administration	172	64
Administration	50	18
Guidance	43	16
Others	1	1
No answer	2	1
Total	268	100

The responses to the general purposes of the homeroom are shown in Table XIV.

TABLE XIV

PURPOSES OF THE HOMEROOM

Purpose	Number of Responses*	Per Cent of 268 Schools
Orientation of pupils to school life	190	74
Guidance in social adjustment of pupils	190	74
To promote administrative efficiency	168	63
Personal guidance	161	60
Educational guidance	146	54
Vocational guidance	126	47
Activity period, music, etc.	84	31
Social period, clubs, etc.	62	23
Others	35	13
Total	1162	

*Many homeroom teachers checked several purposes

Table XIV reveals that orientation of pupils to school life and guidance in social adjustment of pupils were listed as purposes by 190 of the schools. Although the homeroom originated as an administrative device, in only 168, or

63 per cent of the schools was this reported as a purpose. In all 1162 responses were made by homeroom teachers from 268 schools. This represents an average of over four purposes per school.

It appears, when one considers the length and number of homeroom meetings per week and the purposes of the homeroom, that many homeroom teachers checked purposes but did not consider the time element in carrying out these purposes to any great extent. The degree to which these purposes are translated into activities varies, although there is some doubt by the writer that any great degree of effective orientation, personal and social guidance as well as performing administrative routines can be integrated into a 30-minute period each day, much less in a 30-minute period once a week.

The general purposes of the homeroom have been enumerated and discussed. It is the purpose of this section to ascertain the specific functions of the homeroom. The functions to be considered are as follows:

(a) Administrative functions of the homeroom

(b) Orientation

(c) Educational guidance

(d) Vocational guidance

(e) Guidance in social problems

(f) Individual counseling.

Administrative functions of the homeroom

The specific administrative functions of the homeroom as reported by 268 homeroom teachers are shown in Table XV. The regular function of checking attendance is reported by 195 homeroom teachers, or in 73 per cent of the schools. Making announcements and reading bulletins and similar routine functions are carried out in 217, or 81 per cent of the homerooms reporting. Actually these functions are of minor importance as to the purposes of the homeroom because of the short amount of time necessary to perform these activities.

The supervising of collections and drives for social and civic organizations required considerable time and effort. The homeroom teacher has charge of this function in 225, or 84 per cent of the homerooms. The issuing and collecting of report cards in the homeroom is reported by 196, or 73 per cent of the homeroom teachers. Other administrative functions requiring considerable time to complete are keeping personnel records up to date as shown by 138, or 52 per cent of the schools; sale of tickets as reported by 133, or 50 per cent of the schools; and registration of students as checked by 117, or 44 per cent, of the homeroom teachers.

TABLE XV

SPECIFIC ADMINISTRATIVE FUNCTIONS OF THE HOMEROOM

Function	Number of Responses	Per Cent of 268 Schools
Collections and drives	225	84
Make announcements, read bulletins, etc.	217	81
Issue and collect report cards	196	73
Check attendance	195	73
Election of school officers	162	60
Keep personnel records up to date	138	51
Sale of tickets	133	50
Registration	117	44
School assembly programs	111	41
Supervise study period	103	38
Visit homes of pupils	46	17
Distribution of textbooks and materials	44	16
Others	22	8
Total	1709	

In all 1709 responses were made to the question about the specific administrative functions of the homeroom. This represents an average of 6.4 responses per homeroom teacher. When one considers the length of the homeroom period and the number of weekly meetings, it is little short of amazing that homeroom teachers can perform all the administrative functions of the homeroom much less any of the functions of guidance.

Orientation

The responses to the specific functions of the homeroom in providing orientation for the pupils are shown in Table XVI. Orientation to school life was reported by 201,

or 75 per cent, of the homeroom teachers. Orientation to school functions was reported by 188, or 70 per cent; school regulations by 201, or 75 per cent, and student government orientation was reported by 190, or 71 per cent, of the homeroom teachers as a function of their homeroom.

TABLE XVI

ORIENTATION IN THE HOMEROOM

Orientation to:	Number of Responses	Per Cent of 268 Schools
School life	201	75
School regulations	201	75
Student government	190	71
School functions	188	70
School clubs	151	56
School buildings	122	45
Guidance services	116	43
School publications	116	43
Athletics	94	35
Total	1379	

Acquainting pupils with the guidance services in the school was reported by 116, or 43 per cent, of the homeroom teachers. The least number of responses was given to the orientation of pupils to the athletic program.

An important fact revealed from the responses is that the homeroom is the predominant agency for the orientation of pupils to the school. An analysis of the responses reveals that 255, or 95 per cent, of the homeroom teachers reported at least some form of orientation as a function of the homeroom. Of the 268 schools represented in this study,

42, or 16 per cent, report using a special course for orientation of the pupils. Orientation is reported carried out in regular courses by 46, or 17 per cent, of the schools. The fact is that even in some of the schools utilizing special courses for orientation the homeroom has certain responsibilities for orientation.

Obviously the homeroom does not perform all the functions of orientation of the pupils. However, the data obtained from 268 homeroom teachers show that the homeroom has the responsibility for a major part of the orientation program.

Only 46 schools reported using special counselors such as a "big brother" and "big sister" in the orientation program. It appears that more schools might investigate this possibility for improving the orientation procedures. This method has proved helpful in many schools both at secondary and college level. The value of the pupils assisting new pupils in the school is obvious to any one who has observed this method. Of course, the use of special pupil counselors does not constitute the total orientation program.

Educational guidance

The homeroom functions planned to provide assistance to pupils with educational problems are shown in Table XVII. The study of curricular offerings and courses of study are offered in 161, or 60 per cent, of the homerooms. Methods

of study and the improvement of study habits are reported by 127, or 47 per cent, of the schools as a function of the homeroom.

The study of courses as a preparation for vocations was reported by 119, or 44 per cent, of the homeroom teachers, and 115, or 43 per cent, reported the study of the requirements of colleges and other educational institutions.

The function of the homeroom to assist in the improvement of reading was reported by 29, or 11 per cent, of the homeroom teachers. The discussion of the educational problems of the pupils was reported by 74, or 28 per cent, of the homeroom teachers to be a function of the homeroom.

In 31, or 12 per cent of the schools represented in this study special courses are offered to provide educational guidance services. In 50 schools homeroom teachers report that assistance in educational problems is provided in a regular course or courses. The use of special counselors to handle educational problems of the pupils was reported by 124, or 46 per cent, of the schools represented.

It appears that the homeroom is tending to be used more for an over-view of the school program while individual problems of an educational nature are being referred to special counselors.

TABLE XVII

EDUCATIONAL GUIDANCE IN THE HOMEROOM

Function	Number of Responses	Per Cent of 268 Schools
Study of curricular offerings	161	60
Methods of study	127	47
Relation of courses to vocation	119	44
Higher education requirements	115	43
Educational problems faced by pupils	74	28
Improvement of reading	29	11
Others	16	—
Total	641	

Vocational guidance

The responses of the homeroom teachers to the function of the homeroom in providing vocational guidance services are shown in Table XVIII. The study of occupations in the world of work as a function of the homeroom was reported by 69, or 26 per cent, of the homeroom teachers. The study of industries in the community was reported a function of the homeroom in 38, or 14 per cent, of the schools. The study of aptitudes, skills, and other requirements for different jobs was reported by 67, or 25 per cent, of the schools. In 30, or 11 per cent, of the schools the pupils make a detailed study of their job choice. The discussion of the vocational problems of the pupils was reported by only 41 homeroom teachers as a function of their homeroom.

TABLE XVIII

VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE IN THE HOMEROOM

Function	Number of Responses	Per Cent of 268 Schools
Study of occupations in the world of work	69	26
Study of aptitudes needed for vocation	67	25
Vocational problems faced by pupils	41	15
Study of industries in community	38	14
Pupils make detailed study of jobs	30	11
Others	24	9
Total	269	

Special counselors are reported available in 111, or 41 per cent, of the schools to assist pupils with their vocational problems. In 52, or 19 per cent, of the schools special courses are available for the study of occupations. Vocational problems are considered in a regular course or courses in 76, or 28 per cent, of the schools.

It appears that the homeroom as an agency for vocational guidance is losing out in favor of special counselors or special courses. It is the opinion of the writer that this is a highly desirable development because of the need for additional training as well as detailed information which the homeroom teacher may not have, either because of lack of time or interest.

Guidance in social problems

The functions of the homeroom to provide assistance in the solution of problems arising out of the social contacts

of the pupils are indicated in Table XIX. Dealing with such problems as manners, etiquette, and social behavior in general was reported a function of the homeroom by 186, or 69 per cent, of the schools. Assistance in general adjustment problems of the pupils was reported by 131, or 49 per cent, of the homeroom teachers.

Specific problems dealing with the conduct of the pupil were included in the checklist. The conduct of the pupils in the halls, and in the assembly was reported considered in 204, or 76 per cent, of the schools. The conduct of the pupils at athletic events was noted by 174, or 65 per cent of the homeroom teachers. In 134 homerooms the discussion of the pupils conduct off the school campus was reported a function of the homeroom. Disciplinary problems was reported by 155 homeroom teachers to be a function of their homeroom.

It appears that the behavior of the pupils is considered in the majority of the homerooms. This is shown by an analysis of the checklists which reveals most homeroom teachers checking at least one problem as a function of the homeroom. The amount of guidance provided depends upon the teacher. This section was included in an effort to determine the extent to which the homeroom considered such problems. It is recognized that the discussion of these problems may be considered as administrative devices for the administration of the school. As pointed out above they also may be an excellent opportunity for the teacher to

provide assistance to the pupils.

The function of the homeroom to provide assistance to pupils with personal problems was reported by 128, or 48 per cent, of the schools. Discussion of boy-girl relationships was noted as a function of the homeroom in 127, or 47 per cent of the schools. Although one of the aims of the homeroom as reported in the literature is that of providing a desirable pupil-teacher relationship, only 130 homeroom teachers reported this as a function of their homeroom.

Discussions on inter-racial relations were reported by 61, or 23 per cent, of the schools, and family relationships was reported by 73 of the homeroom teachers as a function of the homeroom.

The problems of the pupils regarding social adjustment was reported discussed in special courses by 27 homeroom teachers, or in 10 per cent of the schools. The use of regular courses to handle such problems was reported by 45 homeroom teachers, or in 17 per cent of the schools. Special counselors were reported available to handle social problems by 88 homeroom teachers, or in 33 per cent of the schools.

The responses show a wide variation in the functions of the homeroom to provide assistance to pupils with problems of a social nature. Homeroom teachers from 268 schools checked 1683 functions of the homeroom as an agency for social guidance. This is an average of 6.3 per homeroom

teacher. Here again is demonstrated the great degree of responsibility placed upon the homeroom teacher.

TABLE XIX

FUNCTION OF THE HOMEROOM FOR SOCIAL GUIDANCE

Function	Number of Responses	Per Cent of 268 Schools
Conduct in halls, assembly	204	76
Manners, etiquette, social behavior	186	69
Conduct at athletic events	174	65
Student council problems	167	62
Disciplinary problems	155	58
Conduct off school grounds	134	50
Problems of adjustment (in general)	131	49
Teacher-pupil relationships	130	48
Personal problems	128	48
Boy-girl relationships	127	47
Family relationships	73	27
Inter-racial relations	61	23
Others	13	5
Total	1683	

Individual counseling

The extent to which a homeroom teacher can interview individual pupils depends upon the internal organization of the homeroom. If a homeroom can be organized so that the pupils take an active part in conducting it, then the homeroom teacher is able to spend some time with individual pupils. The time element would partially determine the number of pupils interviewed. The homeroom teacher has an opportunity to study individual pupils and get to know them personally. This knowledge of the pupils should enable the homeroom teacher to be of valuable assistance to special

counselors. Homeroom teachers from 127, or 47 per cent, of the schools report cooperating with special counselors. Most of the homeroom teachers report referring special cases to the counselor. The role of the homeroom teacher in gathering data about individual pupils was stressed by many. Some comments by homeroom teachers as to how they cooperate with counselors are:

> Often counselor asks me for data concerning pupils.
>
> We cooperate by having conferences between teacher and counselor, between pupil and counselor, and between pupil and teacher.
>
> Discuss with special counselor some of the problems of pupils. Sometimes the three of us sit together in conference.
>
> Informal unscheduled reports, serve jointly on guidance committee.
>
> Report to counselor and superintendent health and guidance problems of pupils from homeroom.

To be familiar with the cumulative record of the pupils is a function of the homeroom teacher in 175, or 65 per cent, of the schools. Most of the comments stressed the function of the homeroom teacher to obtain information about each pupil, yet, only 67, or 25 per cent, of the homeroom teachers reported keeping anecdotal records of each pupil. This is certainly not a contradiction because of the many other ways of obtaining and storing data on pupils. However, the use of anecdotal records might be investigated as a possible tool for the homeroom teacher.

Interviewing each pupil regarding choice of an occupation was reported a function of the homeroom in 77, or 29 per cent, of the schools. An interview with each pupil regarding school adjustment and personal problems was reported by 86 and 77 homeroom teachers respectively. An individual interview to plan the pupil's program of study was reported by 109, or 41 per cent, of the homeroom teachers to be a function of the homeroom. One hundred thirty-two, or 49 per cent, of the homeroom teachers reported conferences with each pupil failing subjects.

TABLE XX

FUNCTION OF THE HOMEROOM AS TO INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING

Function	Number of Responses	Per Cent of 268 Schools
Familiar with cumulative records	175	65
Interview each pupil failing	132	49
Interview on program of study	109	41
Interview on adjustment to school	86	32
Interview on choice of vocation	77	29
Interview on personal problems	77	29
Keep anecdotal records	67	25
Others	31	11
Total	754	

Of the 31 homeroom teachers who checked "Others", some stressed the group guidance nature of the homeroom. Most of the teachers stressed that the interviewing was on an "as needed" basis.

In the writers opinion the most important finding is

that the homeroom teachers in 47 per cent of the schools cooperated with special counselors. This is a highly desirable situation for maximum assistance to the pupil.

Summary

The majority of homerooms were reported to have dual objectives; that of guidance, and that of assisting in the administration of the school.

Administrative details reported by the majority of homeroom teachers are: checking attendance, supervising collections and drives, reading announcements and bulletins, and issuing and collecting report cards.

There appears a trend to use the homeroom for the social adjustment of the pupils. This is shown by the majority of schools reporting orientation of the pupils to the school program, and to school life as a function of the homeroom. Social adjustment in general was reported by the majority of homeroom teachers as a function of the homeroom.

The use of the homeroom for vocational guidance is declining. It appears that assistance in educational and vocational problems are being handled by special counselors in more and more of the schools. Nevertheless, the numerous functions of the homeroom as reported by the homeroom teachers are not at all in line with the limited time available in the homeroom to carry out these functions.

Homeroom Practices

A section of the checklist that was sent to the homeroom teachers dealt with the activities carried out in the homeroom within the past three years. A list of homeroom activities was given and the teachers were asked to check the letter of "A" if the particular activity listed was carried out in cooperation with other school agencies or "B" if the activity was carried out only in the homeroom. In addition to the activities listed in the checklist space was provided for the teachers to report other homeroom activities.

The activities are grouped into the following general headings to facilitate illustration:

1. Activities relating to vocations.
2. Activities relating to individual analysis.
3. General homeroom activities.

Also included in this section are methods and materials used by homeroom teachers in carrying out these activities.

Activities relating to vocations

The responses of homeroom teachers to the activities relating to vocations carried out in the homeroom within the past three years are shown in Table XXI. The low number of responses to activities carried out in the homeroom indicates that the homeroom does not play an important role

in the vocational guidance of the pupils.

TABLE XXI

HOMEROOM ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE

Activity	Number of Responses to: "A"*, "B"**		Total Number of Responses
Career days	88	16	104
Follow-up of school leavers	85	8	93
Group conferences on occupations	76	15	91
Visits to business and industry	71	14	85
College days	59	14	73
Community occupational surveys	54	9	63
Job interview practice	49	11	60
Study of employment blanks	35	7	42
Career clubs	18	3	21
Total	535	97	652

*"A" was checked if the activity was carried out in cooperation with other school agencies.
**"B" was checked if the activity was carried out only in the homeroom.

The minor role of the homeroom as an agency for vocational guidance is shown by the fact that only eight homeroom teachers reported that a follow-up of school leavers is carried out only in the homeroom; 85 homeroom teachers indicated this was carried out in connection with other school agencies. Unfortunately there is no way to determine the degree of cooperation, or the extent to which the activities are carried out in the homeroom.

Career days were reported by more homeroom teachers than any of the other activities relating to vocations.

The very nature of the homeroom lends itself to the promotion of career and college days. Yet these activities were reported by only 16 homeroom teachers, with the homeroom cooperating in carrying out these activities in 88 and 59 schools respectively. Career clubs were reported by 21 homeroom teachers, three of whom reported career clubs an activity exclusive with the homeroom.

Here again is emphasized the varied role played by the homeroom in the secondary school. Although it can be stated that vocational guidance is not a function of most homerooms, nevertheless, those homeroom teachers reporting activities such as community occupational surveys and follow-up of school leavers apparently spend considerable time in carrying out activities of a vocational nature. It must be emphasized that the activities listed in Table XXI do not represent all activities relating to vocational guidance. They do, however, represent popular methods for obtaining information on occupations. The list used was obtained from Hoppock's book, Group Guidance. (13)

Activities relating to individual analysis

Table XXII shows the number of responses made by homeroom teachers about the activities carried out in the homeroom that deal with an analysis of the individual. Psychological testing was reported by 115 homeroom teachers to be an activity carried out in the homeroom in connection with

other school agencies. In 19 schools psychological tests are administered only in the homeroom. Remedial reading procedures are noted by 48 homeroom teachers as an activity in connection with other school agencies, and by 14 homeroom teachers as exclusively an activity of the homeroom. Improving study habits as an activity of only the homeroom was reported by 69 homeroom teachers, and 66 homeroom teachers reported that improving study habits was carried out in connection with other agencies in the school.

TABLE XXII

HOMEROOM ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTING TO INDIVIDUAL ANALYSIS

Activity	Number of Responses to: "A"*,	to "B"**	Total Number of Responses
Psychological testing	115	19	134
Study habits	66	69	135
Self-appraisal, using rating scales	64	25	89
Remedial reading procedures	48	14	62
Self-improvement projects	18	3	21
Psychodrama	13	14	27
Sociograms	16	14	30
Group therapy	21	12	33
Total	361	170	531

*"A" was checked if the activity was carried out in cooperation with other school agencies.
**"B" was checked if the activity was carried out only in the homeroom.

The use of psychodrama, sociograms, and group therapy was reported in only a few homerooms probably because these are relatively new developments requiring very special training.

Miscellaneous activities carried out in the homeroom

Talks and lectures by outsiders were reported by 136 homeroom teachers. In 120 of the 136 homerooms this activity was carried out in cooperation with other school agencies. Only nine homeroom teachers report that the homeroom prepares handbooks; 70 homeroom teachers report this activity carried out in cooperation with other school agencies. The publishing of a homeroom paper was reported by 33 homeroom teachers, 12 of whom reported that the paper was prepared exclusively by the homeroom. The use of visual aids in the homeroom was reported by 83 homeroom teachers. Films of interest to the student body were reported most, particularly films dealing with travel to foreign lands. Many homeroom teachers stressed the use of all available films on personality and vocations.

In response to the question about the use of group conferences on problems, the majority of the 68 homeroom teachers reported discussions of problems involving pupil-teacher relationship, student government, and school regulations. A few homeroom teachers reported discussing personality, mental hygiene, and citizenship. Library study as an activity of the homeroom was reported by 41 homeroom teachers. The majority stressed showing pupils how to use the library as the most important phase of library study.

Table XXIII shows the number of responses given by homeroom teachers to some of the activities.

TABLE XXIII

MISCELLANEOUS ACTIVITIES CARRIED OUT IN THE HOMEROOM

Activity	Number of Responses to: "A"*, to "B"**		Total Number of Responses
Talks and lectures by outsiders	120	16	136
Use of visual aids	72	11	83
Preparation of handbooks	70	9	79
Group conferences on problems	51	17	68
Library study	35	6	41
Publishing homeroom paper	21	12	33
Total	369	71	440

*"A" was checked if the activity was carried out in cooperation with other school agencies.
**"B" was checked if the activity was carried out only in the homeroom.

Methods used in the homeroom

Table XXIV shows the responses of the homeroom teachers to the methods used in the homeroom. The homeroom teachers were asked to indicate the predominant method used and also the lesser used methods. "Discussions led by the teacher" as a predominant method was reported by 101 of the homeroom teachers, and 57 reported this as a lesser used method. "Discussions led by pupils" was reported as a predominant method by 92 homeroom teachers, and by 50 homeroom teachers as a lesser used method.

Individual interview with the teacher, pupil reports, and committee projects were reported by approximately the same number of homeroom teachers. Lectures by teachers was

reported as a predominant method by 16 of the homeroom teachers, and by 46 as a lesser used method.

TABLE XXIV

METHODS USED IN THE HOMEROOM TO CARRY OUT ACTIVITIES

Method	Number of Responses to: "P"*, to "L"**		Total Number of Responses
Discussions led by teacher	101	57	158
Discussions led by pupils	92	50	142
Pupil reports	73	44	117
Committee projects	75	41	116
Individual interview with teacher	77	36	113
Lectures	16	46	62
Others	7	3	10
Total	441	277	718

*"P" was checked if the method was used predominantly.
**"L" was checked if the method was a lesser used method.

The great majority of homeroom teachers report methods involving participation of pupils. It is interesting to note that even though pupils may not be given much responsibility in planning the homeroom program they do participate in the homeroom. This is shown by the 240 responses to the methods used which require the active participation of the pupils. This does not mean that all pupils participate in the homeroom program, neither does it mean that the homeroom program is alike if similar methods are used; the purpose of including this section was to ascertain the general methods used to see if an opportunity for pupil participation and leadership was available. The findings show

that the methods used are conducive to participation by pupils, the extent to which this is accomplished depends upon the homeroom teacher and the local situation.

The use of a leadership class is reported by a homeroom teacher in California. Her comment on the methods used in the homeroom is very interesting and may be helpful. She states:

> Our homeroom plan centers about our leadership class which meets one period per day as a regular class (in place of social studies). Each meeting is conducted according to parliamentary procedures and all student problems and activities are handled through student committees (with faculty sponsors) responsible to this organization (known as Student Council). The homeroom president takes full charge of his or her homeroom and the teacher acts as adviser when called upon by the president.

The consensus of homeroom teachers reporting "Others" on the checklist is that the method varies with the situation. There were many remarks to the effect that less teacher domination and more pupil participation was the trend.

Materials used by the homeroom teacher

Materials for use by the homeroom teacher are an important part of the homeroom program. In an effort to find the names of the books and pamphlets used by the homeroom teacher a section of the checklist requested teachers to list three books and three pamphlets which had been most

helpful to them in the homeroom.

The books listed covered a wide variety of subjects ranging from books dealing exclusively with the homeroom to books on dating, school administration, psychology, and educational methods. A total of 96 books were listed. A list of the 25 most mentioned books is as follows:

McKown. Home Room Guidance.
Detjen. Home Room Guidance Programs.
Fedder. Guiding Homeroom and Club Activities.
Jones. Principles of Guidance.
McKown. Extra-Curricular Activities.
Detjen. Your High School Days.
Hamrin. Guidance in the Secondary Schools.
Hamrin and Paulson. Counseling Adolescents.
Hoppock. Group Guidance.
Strang. Counseling Techniques in College and Secondary Schools.
Arbuckle. Teacher Counseling.
Cunningham. Understanding Group Behavior of Boys and Girls.
Gesell. Personal Problems.
Crawford and Woodward. Better Ways of Growing Up.
Forrester. Methods of Vocational Guidance.
Myers. Principles and Techniques of Vocational Guidance.
Traxler. Techniques of Guidance.
Chisholm. Guiding Youth.
Endicott. One Hundred Guidance Lessons.
Wright. Homeroom Programs for Four Year High Schools.
Folk. Your High School Record.
Douglass. Organization and Administration of Secondary School.
Hamrin. Guidance Talks to Teachers.
Sorenson-Malm. Psychology for Living.
McKown and Bailard. So You Were Elected.

It is interesting to note that McKown's book, Home Room Guidance, was listed by 24 homeroom teachers. Detjen's book, Home Room Guidance Programs, and Fedder's book, Guiding Homeroom and Club Activities, were listed by 13 and 6 homeroom teachers respectively. The Principles of Guidance by Jones, and Extra-Curricular Activities by McKown were listed

by four homeroom teachers. The remainder of the books rated no more than three listings. The great majority of books were listed only once by homeroom teachers.

It appears to the writer that there is a need for a book devoted to the homeroom; a book containing methods and suggestions for the homeroom teacher. From the comments and responses given by the homeroom teachers such a book does not exist at present. It seems that a book of this type would be of great service to homeroom teachers throughout all the secondary schools utilizing the homeroom type organization.

Homeroom teachers listed 232 pamphlets and magazines as being the most helpful to them in the homeroom. Many of the pamphlets pertained to the pupils rather than the homeroom. In particular one or more of the Life Adjustment Series pamphlets published by Science Research Associates was listed by 54 homeroom teachers. The National Forum Guidance Series was listed by 25 homeroom teachers, and Human Relations in the Classroom was listed by 11 homeroom teachers. The remainder of the pamphlets, 142, were mentioned by no more than three homeroom teachers per pamphlet with the majority being mentioned by only one homeroom teacher.

A list of the most-mentioned pamphlets and magazines follows:

"Life Adjustment Series". Science Research Associates.
National Forum Guidance Series.
Human Relations in the Classroom. Bullis and O'Malley.
Clearing House. Ignor Publishing Company, Inc., 207, 4th Ave., N. Y.
Journal of National Education Association.
Guiding the Adolescent. Douglas A. Thom. Children's Bureau.
"Junior Citizen Series". Traw, Zapf, McKown. McGraw-Hill.
"Careers". Institute of Research. Research Monograph. Chicago.
It Starts in the Classroom. Public Relations Council. NSPR.
Occupations Outlook Handbook. U. S. Department of Labor, Bulletin No. 998.

The wide variation of subjects covered by the pamphlets mentioned is amazing, ranging from dating to "Codes of Ethics" for teachers. Several homeroom teachers stated that they used numerous books and pamphlets, none of outstanding value; and others stated that the materials were handled by the guidance office. One teacher said, "I have not been able to use published materials very effectively".

Only materials that were developed by the school were reported used by 21, or 8 per cent of the homeroom teachers. Published materials as well as those developed by the school were reported used by 127, or 44 per cent of the homeroom teachers. An analysis of the checklist reveals that generally those who did not complete the section on books and pamphlets used in the homeroom program, also omitted checking whether the materials were developed by the homeroom or that published materials were used along with those developed in the homeroom.

Table XXV shows the responses of the homeroom teachers

to the questions on the source of materials used in the homeroom.

TABLE XXV

SOURCE OF MATERIALS USED IN THE HOMEROOM

Source of Materials	Number of Responses	Per Cent
Materials used in homeroom are developed by school and are used entirely	21	14
Some materials used in homeroom are developed by school and are used along with other published materials	127	86
Total	148	100

Following is a list of some of the materials developed in the homerooms which were sent to the author along with the checklist:

Welcome New Students. Folwell Junior High School, Minneapolis, Minnesota.
Introduction of 8th Graders to Clifton Forge High School. Clifton Forge High School, Clifton Forge, Virginia.
Teachers Handbook and Guidance Syllabus. Waycross High School, Waycross, Georgia.
Getting Acquainted with the Homeroom Plan. Lincoln Junior High School, Santa Monica, California.
Homeroom Bulletin. Lincoln Junior High School, Santa Monica, California.
Guidance News Bulletin. Johnson Junior High School, Cheyenne, Wyoming.
Home Room Guidance Handbook and Home Room Record. Albuquerque High School, Albuquerque, New Mexico.
Suggestions for Home Room Programs. Murfreesboro High School, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.
Home Rooms. Austin High School, Austin, Minnesota.
Home Room Guide. Kane High School, Kane, Pennsylvania.
Student's Three Year Program. Royal Center Regional High School, Royal Center, Indiana.
Home Room Guidance Program. Memorial Junior High School, San Diego, California.
The Advisory. Bronxville Senior School, Bronxville, N. Y.

The homeroom teachers also included many of the various forms and informational materials used in their homeroom programs.

Summary

Homeroom teachers appear to cooperate with other school agencies in carrying out the group guidance activities. Tables XXI, XXII, and XXIII show that in only a few schools are activities carried out exclusively in the homeroom.

Possibly one reason for the low number of responses to activities of the homeroom is that the activities listed are relatively new and may not be familiar to the majority of homeroom teachers.

The methods reported used by homeroom teachers indicates an opportunity for pupil participation in the homeroom program. It is interesting to note that lectures was reported a predominant method by only 16 homeroom teachers, whereas, the great majority stressed the use of methods in which pupil participation is encouraged.

One of the most disheartening findings is the lack of materials available to homeroom teachers. This is shown by many remarks as well as by the great variety of materials listed by homeroom teachers.

The writer believes that homeroom programs could be improved if a way were found to disseminate materials developed by schools for the homeroom program.

Problems of the Homeroom Teacher

In reviewing the literature many problems of the homeroom were found. However, the writer could find no mention of a study of the problems from the homeroom teacher's point of view. It is the purpose of this section to show the problems and factors contributing to the morale of homeroom teachers as reported in the checklists.

The responses of the homeroom teachers to the questions dealing with their problems are shown in Table XXVI. Inadequate time for the homeroom period was checked by 129, or 48 per cent of the teachers. This problem is easily understood when one considers the many functions of the homeroom. Some teachers commented that the many administrative details to be carried out in the homeroom left little time for guidance.

Lack of interest on the part of the pupils was reported a problem by 79, or 29 per cent of the homeroom teachers. This may seem to be paradoxical inasmuch as the length of time devoted to the homeroom was considered to be too short. This is not necessarily true because a greater emphasis on the homeroom would perhaps generate more enthusiasm on the part of the staff and pupils in improving the homeroom program. The fact that 73, or 27 per cent of the homeroom teachers noted the lack of an overall school program for the homeroom would account in some part for the

lack of pupil interest.

Too many clubs and activities were checked as problems by 66, or 25 per cent of the homeroom teachers. Interruptions such as pupils being called to the office was checked by 61, or 23 per cent of the homeroom teachers. Several comments were made about the pupils going to clubs and other activities during the homeroom period. This situation prompted one teacher to remark, "I never know who will be in the homeroom or for how long".

The disconcerting effect of the interruptions caused by the public address system was noted as a problem by 27, or 10 per cent, of the homeroom teachers. From the comments it is obvious that all schools do not have a public address system.

Lack of materials for use by the pupils was reported a problem by 67, or 25 per cent, of the homeroom teachers, while 51, or 19 per cent, noted the lack of materials for the homeroom teacher. Some commented on the problem as follows:

> Our school library has very little, if any materials for the faculty members, on this subject.
>
> I have had little experience in the homeroom, but I do need materials and methods.

Various problems other than those listed in the checklist were reported by 40 homeroom teachers with the majority stressing:

Lack of interest on the part of the teacher.

Lack of time for preparation of the homeroom program.

Lack of planning for the homeroom.

Several comments were made which blamed teachers and administrators for not stressing careful planning of the homeroom program. Characteristic comments on this problem were:

> I am a believer in a good uniform homeroom program at any age level. I think teachers as a whole are too lazy to make an original effort for a good homeroom program, which would eventually ease this burden.

> The homeroom period in our school is only as good as the teacher that guides it. I think the administration should take a stand and recommend that the teachers use it for some constructive purpose.

The responses of teachers to the questions dealing with the problems of the homeroom are shown in Table XXVI.

TABLE XXVI

PROBLEMS OF HOMEROOM TEACHERS IN 268 SCHOOLS

Problem	Number of Responses	Per Cent of Schools
Not enough time	129	48
Lack of interest	79	29
Lack of over-all program	73	27
Lack of materials for pupils	67	25
Too many clubs and activities for pupils	66	25
Interruptions, pupils called to office	61	23
Lack of materials for teacher	51	19
Discipline problems	28	10
Public address system disconcerting	27	10
Others	40	14
Total	621	

Other factors indirectly related to the problems of homeroom teachers will also be considered in this section because they are factors affecting the morale of the homeroom teacher.

The selection of a teacher for the homeroom is very important because essentially the success or failure of the homeroom program rests with this teacher. The tendency to delegate more specific guidance functions to the homeroom teacher has made the selection of this teacher doubly important.

Answers to the question as to whether or not the teachers who responded had a choice in being assigned to a homeroom are shown in Table XXVII. Only 52, or 19 per cent, of the homeroom teachers reported that they were consulted about being assigned to a homeroom; whereas, 197, or 74 per cent, of the homeroom teachers reported they had no choice in being assigned to a homeroom. The assumption that if a teacher can teach he can also carry out the guidance functions of the homeroom is a controversial issue. Some of the comments to this question point out the disadvantages of the way teachers are selected for the homeroom. One teacher said:

> I believe a homeroom program, if educationally sound, should include all of the classroom teaching corps. Special cases and seniority in homeroom administration undermines united action.

TABLE XXVII

RESPONSES BY HOMEROOM TEACHERS TO THE QUESTION, "DO YOU HAVE ANYTHING TO SAY ABOUT WHETHER OR NOT YOU ARE ASSIGNED TO A HOMEROOM?"

Response	Number of Responses	Per Cent
No	197	74
Yes	52	19
No answer	19	7
Total	268	100

The rotation of teachers among the various homerooms as reported by Leaver (19) offers a possible solution to the problem of the selection of the homeroom teacher. When asked if the teachers rotated among the homerooms during the semester, 247, or 92 per cent, reported that they did not rotate. Only 4, or 2 per cent, reported using a rotation system. Perhaps the reason few schools use the rotation system is that it is relatively new. Some homeroom teachers were interested in the rotation system and asked, "Is this really done?" The number of responses to the rotation of teachers in the homeroom are shown in Table XXVIII.

A comment about using two homeroom teachers to rotate was given by a teacher from West Virginia. She stated:

> A homeroom, if possible, should have two sponsors. One a woman teacher, the other a man. This would give the students a chance to get personal advice. If this would be impossible, I believe rotation of teachers in the homerooms would be advisable. This is a handicap in some cases, because it reduces the efficiency of reports.

TABLE XXVIII

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION, "DO TEACHERS ROTATE AMONG THE HOMEROOMS DURING THE SEMESTER?"

Response	Number of Responses	Per Cent
No	247	92
Yes	4	2
No answer	17	6
Total	268	100

The responses to the question, "Do you feel the administration of your school looks upon the homeroom as a definitely planned part of the total educational program?" are shown in Table XXIX. Only 31, or 12 per cent, of the teachers reported, "no" to this question whereas 78 per cent, or 210, homeroom teachers reported that they believed the administration considered the homeroom a definitely planned part of the school program.

TABLE XXIX

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION, "DO YOU FEEL THE ADMINISTRATION OF YOUR SCHOOL LOOKS UPON THE HOMEROOM AS A DEFINITELY PLANNED PART OF THE TOTAL EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM?"

Response	Number of Responses	Per Cent
Yes	210	78
No	31	12
No answer	27	10
Total	268	100

The writer thoroughly agrees with the teacher who suggested that perhaps the question was misphrased. Perhaps the way the administration "acts" should have been substituted for the was the administration "looks".

Homeroom teachers in 85 secondary schools report some in-service training for homeroom work. No in-service training was reported by 152, or 57 per cent, of the homeroom teachers. Thirty-one teachers did not answer the question. Table XXX shows the responses given by the homeroom teachers.

TABLE XXX

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION, "IS THERE ANY IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR HOMEROOM WORK IN YOUR SCHOOL?"

Response	Number of Responses	Per Cent
No	152	57
Yes	85	32
No answer	31	11
Total	268	100

From the many comments it appears that in-service training of homeroom teachers is increasing. Comments such as the following were given:

> This year our faculty is making a detailed study of the homeroom as part of the county in-service training program.
>
> Our school is planning an in-service training course before school begins next September to try to plan ways in which the homeroom can be used to better advantage.

A need for special training of homeroom teachers was reported by 198, or 74 per cent of the homeroom teachers; 47, or 17 per cent of the homeroom teachers stated they felt there was no need for special training. An analysis of the responses reveals that the majority of those teachers reporting no need for special training have homerooms devoted primarily to carrying out administrative routines. It appears that the homeroom teachers feel a need for training in guidance practices that apply to the homeroom. The observations reported under comments of the homeroom teachers are very interesting in that they stress the need for some preparation for the homeroom in the teacher-training program. One teacher states:

> There is a definite need for prospective teachers to have a required course or courses in homeroom and extra-curricula activities. Many of our teachers, new and old, fear having a homeroom.

The need for requirements other than course work was pointed out by a teacher from the Mid-west, who states:

> If a teacher has interest, zest, and personality, he or she will take the homeroom job in regular stride. I've had courses in guidance, read books and pamphlets, etc., but these are not responsible for any successes I may have. You simply have "to want to help people." If you do not, teaching is not the profession for you.

There were many such remarks in the comments; however, only a few gave this type response. The writer feels that in many of these cases the checklist was used as a method

of relieving some of the pent-up emotions of the homeroom teachers. Possibly the teacher from Georgia summed up the situation as regards training for the homeroom by saying, "I have had a homeroom for two years and have a great deal to learn."

TABLE XXXI

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION, "DO YOU FEEL THERE IS A NEED FOR SPECIAL TRAINING?"

Response	Number of Responses	Per Cent
Yes	198	74
No	47	17
No answer	23	9
Total	268	100

In an attempt to ascertain the training of the homeroom teacher, the question was asked, "Have you had any direct or special training for homeroom work?" There was a wide variation in responses, with 97, or 36 per cent, reporting special training. From the responses it is impossible to state what degree of training or what types of training the teachers have had. The majority, or 151 of the homeroom teachers reported no special training for work in the homeroom. These responses are shown in Table XXXII.

TABLE XXXII

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION, "HAVE YOU HAD ANY DIRECT OR SPECIAL TRAINING FOR HOMEROOM WORK?"

Response	Number of Responses	Per Cent
No	151	57
Yes	97	36
No answer	20	7
Total	268	100

In an effort to determine the degree of administrative supervision of the homeroom teacher the question was asked, "How much do you have to say about what takes place in your homeroom?" Responses from 73, or 27 per cent of the homeroom teachers showed that the administration of the homeroom was left entirely to the teacher, while 156, or 58 per cent, indicated that the administration of the homeroom was left partly to the teacher. Five homeroom teachers reported having no choice in the administration of the homeroom. Thirty-four teachers declined comment on this question. It appears that in the majority of homerooms there is some supervision by the administration. The practice of a rigid and prescribed course was reported by a very small number of schools.

TABLE XXXIII

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION, "HOW MUCH DO YOU HAVE TO SAY ABOUT WHAT TAKES PLACE IN YOUR HOMEROOM?"

Response	Number of Responses	Per Cent
Left partly to me	156	58
Left entirely to me	73	27
Nothing	5	2
No answer	34	13
Total	268	100

In an attempt to discover the opinions of the homeroom teachers as to the value of the homeroom this question was asked, "Do you believe the time spent in your homeroom is justified by the results obtained?" Of the 268 checklists returned, Table XXXIV shows that 171, or 64 per cent, of the homeroom teachers feel that the time was definitely justified; 58, or 22 per cent of the homeroom teachers reported that they were uncertain, and 12, or 4 per cent, stated they did not believe the time spent in the homeroom was justified by the results obtained. Twenty-seven homeroom teachers declined comment on this question.

TABLE XXXIV

RESPONSES TO THE QUESTION, "DO YOU BELIEVE THE TIME SPENT IN YOUR HOMEROOM IS JUSTIFIED BY THE RESULTS OBTAINED?"

Response	Number of Responses	Per Cent
Yes, definitely	171	64
Uncertain	58	22
No	12	4
No answer	27	10
Total	268	100

Summary

The responses of the homeroom teachers as to their problems as well as some factors contributing to their morale may be summarized as follows:

1. Inadequate time for the homeroom period was listed a problem by approximately one half of the homeroom teachers.
2. Homeroom teachers from 197, or 74 per cent, of the schools report no voice in being assigned to a homeroom.
3. The practice of rotating homeroom teachers during the semester was reported by only 4 schools.
4. In-service training for homeroom teachers was reported in 85, or 31.5 per cent, of the schools. The many comments by the teachers indicate a trend toward more in-service training.

5. A need for special training was reported by 198, or 74 per cent, of the homeroom teachers.
6. A majority of the homeroom teachers feel that the administration of the school looks upon the homeroom as a definitely planned part of the total educational program.
7. A majority of the homeroom teachers reported that they believed the time spent in the homeroom was definitely justified by the results obtained.

Homeroom Trends

In an effort to ascertain trends in homeroom procedures, a section of the checklist requested homeroom teachers to list trends which they had observed in their homerooms in the past five or ten years. Trends were listed by 162, or 60.4 per cent of the homeroom teachers. Many of the teachers who did not answer this section explained that they had not been teaching long enough to detect trends.

An analysis of the responses given by the homeroom teachers reveals three major trends in the use of the homeroom in the secondary school. Following are the trends and remarks made by some of the homeroom teachers:

1. The increased use of the homeroom as an agency for guidance.
2. The increased emphasis on pupil participation in the homeroom program.

3. The increased emphasis on training for the homeroom teacher.

More and more specific guidance services are being added to the responsibility of the homeroom. This is shown by the remarks of 54 homeroom teachers who stressed the increased role of the homeroom in the guidance program. Some typical comments given by homeroom teachers are:

> From an administrative convenience to a planned supplement of the guidance program.
>
> Greater emphasis on both individual and group guidance.
>
> There seems to be a shift from administrative convenience to a real educational function.

Some teachers stressed the increased emphasis on the individual pupil rather than on subject matter in the homeroom. This was expressed in this way by a teacher from Georgia:

> Time is spent in becoming acquainted with the child, rather than a period for making announcements, class elections, study time, etc. The problems of the child are more numerous and more serious in this changing world, and we accept more of the responsibility of helping him solve them.

Although a few of the homeroom teachers stressed the trend of the homeroom toward the handling of vocational problems, the majority of responses noted the emphasis of the homeroom in social problems and orientation. Some typical responses are given:

> The main trend in our system is toward better social adjustment to high school life.
>
> More and more toward providing situations where relationships within the group can be observed---also setting up groups for discussions of pupils problems to clarify and gain security through each others' experiences.

The trend toward greater pupil participation was checked by teachers in the section of the questionnaire dealing with methods used in the homeroom. The comments of 38 homeroom teachers also stressed the use of pupils in the planning and activating of the homeroom program. Many other comments were made inferring the trend toward the practice of democracy in the homeroom. Some of the comments are:

> The main trend has been allowing pupils to assume greater responsibilities.
>
> The trend has been to bring students more and more into a cooperative acceptance of responsibility in working with sponsors and student body affairs.
>
> The main trend has been toward greater student participation in homeroom activities.
>
> The trend has been to give more authority to the students. The class president takes the attendance daily, arranges for the Bible reading and flag salute, reads notices, etc. The members of the homeroom get along very well by themselves. They are given more and more responsibility.

Some schools in California reported using "leadership classes" as a part of the homeroom program.

The increased emphasis on in-service as well as preparatory training for the homeroom teacher was stressed by

many homeroom teachers. As stated previously this training is due primarily to the increased responsibility of guidance in the homeroom. Not all stated that in-service training was available, however, many reported that teachers were more cognizant of the need for training. Some typical responses follow:

> The main trend has been the gradual in-service training and experiences of teachers in group guidance techniques so that they might share counseling work by testing and other processes.

> The trend has been toward more emphasis on the homeroom and in-service training for the homeroom teachers. The main problem has been enough time for the homeroom period. Some teachers do not use the time profitably therefore the administration feels some time is wasted.

> Trend toward a realization of the need for training for homeroom work.

Many homeroom teachers reported that a director of guidance or a person with similar duties was employed, or contemplated, to assist teachers with the homeroom program. This apparently would promote in-service training of the teachers.

Other trends were not subscribed to by the majority. An example is this trend noted by a teacher from California.

> Assignment of lockers, lost and found, lost book accounts, and all ticket selling as well as other matters of such nature involving handling of funds, have been put on a business basis, and are now conducted through a central "Accountants Office".

Several teachers noted the trend away from routine details in the homeroom, but still others noted the trend toward more administrative and clerical work. This then would depend upon the administration of the school and is not a trend as given by the majority of homeroom teachers. It should be emphasized that the trends listed above represent the majority of the responses. Six homeroom teachers reported that the homeroom was declining importance and one homeroom teacher reported that the homeroom was a "waste of time".

Proposed changes in the homeroom

Responses were given by 115, or 43 per cent, of the homeroom teachers to the question, "What, if any, changes are you planning in your homeroom program?" These responses ranged from "drop it", as suggested by one respondent, to the use of the homeroom as an integral part of the school program.

An analysis of the responses reveals the following major changes planned in the homeroom:

1. Development of materials for the homeroom.
2. Evaluation of the homeroom program.
3. More and careful planning of the homeroom program.
4. More emphasis on pupil participation in the homeroom program.
5. Greater length of the homeroom period.

6. More emphasis on guidance, especially on social problems.

The writer was particularly impressed by the many statements indicating that the homeroom program was not static, but that effort was being made to improve the homeroom program. This statement by a teacher from Pennsylvania illustrates this point:

> We are in the process of developing a definite program for entire school. Still experimenting.

Some teachers stressed the needs of the pupils as the basis for changes in the homeroom program. This statement is by a teacher from Nevada:

> My homeroom changes each semester so I revamp it, particularly as to discussion topics, to the needs and wishes of the group. The organization remains the same in the main.

The following statements indicate that the homeroom teachers are making plans for changes in their homerooms.

> We are planning the working out of a more fully developed program. As new procedures and methods are used checks on the practicality are made periodically. Careful study of the problem is constantly being made. We are thinking of developing a guidance handbook for incoming homeroom teachers.

> Our homeroom set-up as it is at present is still developing. It was started just two years ago and still is flexible and in a state of flux. Personally, I am most interested just now in building up my homeroom library so that it includes sufficient materials for every reading level. Other changes will come along as they are needed...we really are experimenting a great deal in many lines.

The use of in-service training was not discusses although several homeroom teachers noted that a counselor would assist them in the homeroom program. Apparently the in-service training for the homeroom is tied in with the guidance training which to the writer seems logical and highly desirable.

Comments by homeroom teachers

Space was left at the end of the checklist for comments of the homeroom teachers; 110, or 41 per cent, of the teachers made some form of comment. Many comments dealt with problems of the homeroom and these are included in the section of this chapter devoted to the problems of the homeroom teacher. The remainder, except for a few, of the comments dealt with the teachers personal opinions of the value of the homeroom. Not all the comments were complimentary to the homeroom type organization. However, the great majority of homeroom teachers are apparently sold on the value of the homeroom and stated so in unmistakable terms. The following comments are given to show the various attitudes and feelings teachers have for the homeroom.

> The homeroom is potentially one of the greatest boons to child development yet is the most sadly neglected and abused of all the schools' programs.

> I think that the homeroom organization is the most important organization within the school. The pupil's conduct, his attitudes, his thinking are greatly influenced by what is said and done in the homeroom.

This is my personal reaction to homeroom activities. The homeroom should be the most important place to a pupil in school. The primary purpose of education is to help the child adjust himself to living in a way that will produce happiness for him. Subject matter is only one of the means of doing that. A properly conducted homeroom can be even more important than subject matter.

In our school the homeroom group and the teacher remain together throughout the three years of high school. During this period teacher and pupils come to know one another, and the homeroom has an opportunity to develop a desirable pupil-teacher relationship, as well as to simplify the carrying on of routine administrative requirements. When given time for operation, the homeroom can, through planned leadership, help to bring about a spirit of cooperation and loyalty within the group which will extend into the activities of the whole school program.

We look upon our homerooms as individual democracies within the school, designed to offer opportunity for citizenship in practice, and to serve as basic units for the school organizations from which a great many of the school activities originate. The success of our various school activity clubs, publications, plays, sports, and school government plan depends to a great extent upon the support developed in the homeroom.

Our teachers on the whole are agreed that rather than being monotonous tasks, their homerooms offer opportunities to select activities which are closely related to the needs and life situations of their pupils. We develop programs for homerooms for each year of school in order to avoid duplication.

Since the homeroom is an important source of educational opportunities through its activities, homeroom teachers should be given more time to coordinate the programs of pupils, and to work with the individual members of the room. If homeroom groups are kept down to workable size, and if ample time is allowed for group guidance

> in studying and considering problems which are common to all the students, an invaluable contribution of the group will be the provision for study and discussion of topics not provided in the regular classrooms, since the children can be entirely free from the restraint of texts, tests, and grades.

Some principals attached notes to the checklists after they had been completed by the homeroom teachers. Three of these notes are included to show the varied responses obtained.

> The homeroom is the most important adjusting agency in our high school of 2200 students.

> I was under the impression that the homeroom idea was decreasing in significance. We have thought of it more or less as a "rag-bag closet". We can do considerably better guidance, etc., by using our modern counseling system.

> I have felt for many years that homeroom keeps teacher alert to full school program (avoids isolation in subject matter area) aids awareness of "whole" pupil in relation to extra-curricula activities, interests, potentialities, as well as academic achievement.
>
> Another thing--do not disregard--this is sometimes the only time a pupil bows his head and prays.

Requests for the findings of this study by many teachers and principals indicates the interest on the part of the school staff to improve the homeroom program.

Summary

The main trends in the use of the homeroom as reported by homeroom teachers are:

1. The increased use of the homeroom as an agency for guidance.

2. The increased emphasis on pupil participation in the homeroom program.
3. The increased emphasis on training for the homeroom teacher.

The proposed changes in the homerooms indicate that many homeroom teachers are aware of the problems and possibilities of the homeroom and are making an effort to improve the homeroom program. This is shown further by the many comments about the value of the homeroom in the secondary school.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study is to ascertain present practices in the most successful homeroom programs in secondary schools in the United States. Specific purposes of this study are: to find general and specific purposes of actual homeroom programs, to identify practices carried out in homeroom programs, to determine trends in the use of the homeroom, and to crystallize problems of homeroom teachers.

An examination, through the use of a survey, was made of 268 homerooms in selected secondary schools. A summary of the data obtained is arranged according to the five sections used in Chapters II and III. These sections are:

1. Organization of the homeroom.
2. Purposes of the homeroom.
3. Practices of the homeroom.
4. Problems of the homeroom teacher.
5. Trends in the use of the homeroom.

The recommendations in this chapter are based on the responses from the 268 homeroom teachers, and from the writer's reading of the literature relating to the homeroom.

Summary

Organization of the homeroom

While a wide variation exists in the characteristics of homerooms, it was found that:

1. The majority of schools select pupils for the homeroom by an alphatetical grouping by classes.

2. In approximately half of the schools the pupils are given a voice in the planning of the homeroom programs.

3. A majority of the schools have from 24 to 40 pupils in each homeroom. The average number of pupils in a homeroom is 30.

4. In 57 per cent of the schools the homeroom meets at least five times weekly.

5. A wide variation exists in the length of the homeroom period, with 54 per cent of the homerooms meeting 30 minutes or more each period.

6. In 93 per cent of the schools pupils are assigned to the same homeroom for two or more semesters.

7. The majority of homerooms are reported to have a parliamentary type of organization.

Purposes of the homeroom

1. The majority of homerooms were reported to have dual objectives, that of guidance and that of assisting in the administration of the school.

2. Administrative details reported by a majority of the homeroom teachers are: checking attendance, supervising collections and drives, reading announcements and bulletins, and issuing and collecting report cards.

3. Orientation of the pupils to the school and guidance in social adjustment of the pupils were reported as functions of the homeroom by a majority of the homeroom teachers.

4. Vocational guidance was checked as a purpose of their homeroom by approximately half of the homeroom teachers, but it is questionable as to whether it can be classified as a major purpose since the majority of schools reported using special courses or special counselors to handle vocational problems.

5. Since the time available to the homeroom teacher is so limited in contrast with the multitude of purposes as checked by these homeroom teachers, it is doubtful whether or not all of the purposes can ever by fully achieved.

Homeroom practices

1. The majority of homeroom teachers report cooperation with other school agencies in carrying out many of the homeroom activities.

2. The methods used by the great majority of homeroom teachers offer opportunity for pupil participation in the

homeroom programs. In only 16 schools were lectures reported as a predominant method used in the homeroom.

3. A wide variety of materials for use by the homeroom teacher was reported. The most-mentioned book was McKown's Home Room Guidance (21) which was reported as used by 24 homeroom teachers. The most-mentioned pamphlets were the "Life Adjustment Series" published by Science Research Associates.

4. The great majority of homeroom teachers used published materials along with materials developed in the homeroom.

Problems of the homeroom teacher

1. Inadequate time for the homeroom period was listed a problem by approximately half of these homeroom teachers.

2. The majority of these homeroom teachers report having no choice in being assigned to homerooms.

3. Rotation of homeroom teachers during the semester is practiced in only a very few schools.

4. In-service training for homeroom teachers was reported in 85, or 31 per cent of the schools. The many comments by these teachers indicates a trend toward more in-service training in this area.

5. The majority of these homeroom teachers reported there is a need for special training for homeroom work.

6. A majority of these homeroom teachers believe that

the administration of the school looks upon the homeroom as a definitely planned part of the total educational program.

7. A majority of these homeroom teachers reported that they believed that the time spent in the homeroom was definitely justified by the results obtained.

Trends in the use of the homeroom

1. The trend is toward the increased use of the homeroom as an agency for guidance.

2. The trend is toward the increased emphasis on pupil participation in the homeroom programs.

3. The trend is toward the increased emphasis on training for the homeroom teacher.

4. It appears that the use of the homeroom for vocational guidance is declining in favor of special counselors and special courses.

5. There seems to be a trend toward greater emphasis on school orientation and guidance in social adjustment problems in the homeroom.

Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. Administrators and teachers carefully evaluate their present homeroom programs as a basis for a concerted effort toward improving the entire homeroom program.

2. In-service training courses be provided for homeroom teachers in techniques for working with group problems.

3. Training be given prospective teachers in group techniques as well as methods and materials for use in the homeroom.

4. Homeroom teachers be selected on the basis of training, interests, and personal qualifications.

5. An effort be made by teacher training institutions and state departments of education to make materials developed in successful homeroom programs widely available.

6. Schools using the homeroom type organization carefully study the desirability of making the homeroom a regular period of the day. It is believed that this will greatly improve the status of the homeroom as well as promoting a better over-all homeroom program.

7. Pupil participation and pupil leadership be emphasized in the planning and executing of the homeroom programs.

8. Social adjustment be emphasized in the homeroom and that referral sources be made available to the homeroom teacher.

9. Administrators and teachers carefully consider the possibility of using the homeroom as a basic part of the school orientation program.

10. Purposes of the homeroom should be assigned on the basis of time allotted in order to assure the attainment of these purposes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Abernethy, T. J. Homeroom guidance. Education 55: 134-140. Nov. 1934.

2. Almy, H. C. Present status of homeroom in secondary schools. Educational administration and supervision 21:230-234. March 1935.

3. Bartholomew, B. M. Guidance service through the agency of the homeroom. National association of secondary school principals bulletin 29:143-148. April 1945.

4. Berman, Samuel. The homeroom as a practical factor in democratic living. National association of secondary school principals bulletin 26:72-76. Dec. 1942.

5. Chisholm, Leslie Lee. Guiding youth in the secondary school. New York, American, 1945. 433p.

6. Cockrell, Emerson T. The home room period. Junior senior high school clearing house 2:12. 1935.

7. Detjen, Mary E. Ford, and Erwin W. Detjen. Homeroom guidance programs for junior high school years. New York, Houghton, 1940. 509p.

8. Dunsmoore, C. C. The role of the homeroom as an agency for guidance in junior high school. Ed. D. diss. Harvard University, 1938. 385p.

9. Fedder, Ruth. Guiding homeroom and club activities. New York, McGraw, 1949. 467p.

10. Fowlkes, John Guy. Administering home room in junior high schools. Nations schools 8:72-74. Nov. 1931.

11. Fretwell, E. K. Extra-curricular activities in secondary schools. Boston, Houghton, 1931. 552p.

12. Goetting, M. L. Teaching in the secondary school. New York, Prentice, 1942. 519p.

13. Hoppock, Robert. Group guidance. New York, McGraw, 1949. 393p.

14. Johnson, F. W. Social organization of the high school. School review 17:665-680. Dec. 1909.

15. Jones, Galen. Extra-curricular activities in relation to the curriculum. New York, Teacher's college, Columbia Univ., 1935. 99p.

16. Kefauver, G. N. and R. E. Scott. The homeroom in the administration of the secondary school. Teacher's college record 31:624-641. April 1930.

17. Koos, Leonard V. and Grayson N. Kefauver. Guidance in secondary school. New York, MacMillan, 1937. 640p.

18. Krug, Edward A. Curriculum planning. New York, Harper, 1950. 306p.

19. Leaver, Lila M. Home rooms in the guidance program. Topeka, Guide posts 1:8-10. Dec. 1951. (Kansas board for vocational education, Guidance service, No. 3)

20. McKown, Harry C. Home room guidance. New York, McGraw, 1934. 447p.

21. _____. Home room guidance. Second. New York, McGraw, 1946. 521p.

22. _____. Extra-curricular activities. Revised. New York, Macmillan, 1949. 734p.

23. Minka, Ernest A. Home room program aids and educational guidance principles. Maryland, Minka, 1951. 56p. (Apt. 7, 198 E. Green St., Westminister, Maryland)

24. Mogill, Raymond G. The educational value of the home room. National association of secondary school principals bulletin 35:143-152. May 1951.

25. Novak, Benjamin J. Don't sell the homeroom short. Nation's schools 48:49-51. Oct. 1951.

26. Payne, W. D. Experiences in homeroom administration. National association of secondary school principals bulletin 30:120-123. April 1946.

27. Roemer, Joseph, and Charles Forrest Allen. Extra-curricular activities in junior and senior high schools. Boston, Heath, 1926. 333p.

28. Smith, W. S. Plan for the homeroom. School activities 17:3-4. Sept. 1945.

29. Stewart, S. T. Jr. Organization and administration of a homeroom program. National association of secondary school principals bulletin 26:109-120. Dec. 1942.

30. Swarm, Jenry Jay. The status of the home room in the state of Washington: a recommended plan for high school. Corvallis, Oregon state college, July 1936. 128p. (Master's thesis)

31. Thurstone, L. L. The edge-marking method of analyzing data. Chicago, Psychological corporation, 1948. 10p.

32. Van Pool, Gerald M. The home room. National association of secondary school principals bulletin 36:150-156. Feb. 1952.

33. Votaw, Marjorie Brown. A study of the home room as an aspect of guidance in Oregon high schools. Corvallis, Oregon state college, August 1941. 95p. (Master's thesis)

34. Wagner, J. E. Factors conducive to the effective functioning of the home room organization. National association of secondary school principals bulletin 30:88-100. Jan. 1946.

35. Warters, Jane. High-school personnel work today. New York, McGraw, 1946. 277p.

APPENDIX A

Homeroom Checklist

Person making this report: .....

School .....

City ..... **State** .....

Please fill out the following as regards *YOUR* homeroom:

Number of pupils ..... Number of meetings weekly ..... Length of homeroom period (minutes per day) ..... Length of time pupil is assigned to same homeroom: ..... Semester(s) ..... Year(s) ..... Other .....

Is the predominant objective of your homeroom: Administrative ..... Guidance ..... Both .....

Others (Please specify) .....

Basis of assignment of pupils to homeroom: (*Please check items that apply*)

- ☐ Alphabetical grouping of entire school
- ☐ Alphabetical grouping by classes (freshman, sophomore, etc.)
- ☐ Random selection by administration
- ☐ Pupils select homeroom
- ☐ Geographical areas of school district
- ☐ First period, etc., class
- ☐ Ability or achievement
- ☐ Course of study
- ☐ Sex
- ☐ Special homeroom for disciplinary cases
- ☐ For personality problems
- ☐ Others (*Please specify*)

Organization of the homeroom within school: (*Please check items that apply*)

- ☐ Pupils plan and activate entire program
- ☐ Pupils and teacher plan program
- ☐ Teachers plan programs to meet needs of each homeroom
- ☐ Administration (including guidance director) and teachers plan program
- ☐ All homerooms in your school have similar organizations and activities
- ☐ Others (Please specify) .....

Organization within your homeroom: (*Please check items that apply*)

- ☐ Pupils have parliamentary organization, electing president, etc.
- ☐ Pupils choose committees or projects to work on
- ☐ Pupils are grouped into committees by you according to expressed interests of pupils
- ☐ Definite assignments are made as in a regular course
- ☐ Others (Please specify) .....

Purposes of your homeroom: (*Please check items that apply*)

- ☐ To promote administrative efficiency
- ☐ Orientation of pupils to school life
- ☐ Guidance in social adjustment of pupils
- ☐ Activity period, music, etc.
- ☐ Educational guidance
- ☐ Vocational guidance
- ☐ Personal guidance
- ☐ Social period, clubs, etc.
- ☐ Others (Please specify) .....

Specific administrative functions of your homeroom: (*Please check items that apply*)

- ☐ Issue and collect report cards
- ☐ Keep personnel records up to date
- ☐ Distribution of textbooks and materials
- ☐ Make announcements, read bulletins, etc.
- ☐ Elections of school officers
- ☐ Collections and drives, Community Chest, Red Cross, etc.
- ☐ Registration
- ☐ Check attendance
- ☐ Sale of tickets
- ☐ Visit homes of pupils
- ☐ School assembly programs
- ☐ Supervise study period
- ☐ Others (Please specify) .....

HOMEROOM FUNCTIONS INVOLVING GUIDANCE WORK

Orientation to: (*Please check items that apply*)

- ☐ School functions
- ☐ School life
- ☐ Student government
- ☐ Athletics
- ☐ Guidance services
  - ☐ Orientation is done in a special course, outside homeroom
  - ☐ Orientation is part of a regular course or courses
  - ☐ Special counselor: big brother and big sisters, etc.
- ☐ School buildings
- ☐ School regulations
- ☐ School clubs
- ☐ School publications
- ☐ Others (Please specify) .....

Educational guidance in the homeroom: (*Please check items that apply*)

- ☐ Study of curricula offerings and courses of study of your high school
- ☐ Study of courses as preparation for a vocation
- ☐ Study of requirements of colleges and other educational institutions
- ☐ Methods of study, improvement of study habits
- ☐ Improvement of reading
- ☐ Educational problems faced by pupils
  - ☐ Educational guidance is offered in a special course, outside homeroom
  - ☐ Educational guidance is a part of a regular course or courses
  - ☐ Special counselors are available to handle educational problems
- ☐ Others (Please specify) .....

Vocational guidance in the homeroom: (*Please check items that apply*)

- ☐ Study of occupations in world of work
- ☐ Study of industries in your community
- ☐ Study of aptitudes, skills, etc., needed for different jobs
- ☐ Pupils make detailed study of jobs of own choice
- ☐ Vocational problems faced by pupils
  - ☐ Vocational guidance is offered in a special course, outside homeroom
  - ☐ Vocational guidance is a part of a regular course or courses
  - ☐ Special counselors are available to handle vocational problems
- ☐ Others (Please specify) .....

Social aspects of guidance

PROBLEMS FACED BY PUPILS: (*Please check items that apply*)

- ☐ Manners, etiquette, social behavior in general
- ☐ Problems of adjustment faced by pupils in general
  - ☐ Disciplinary problems
  - ☐ Conduct off school grounds
  - ☐ Conduct at athletic events
  - ☐ Student council problems
  - ☐ Conduct in halls, in assembly, etc.
  - ☐ Personal problems
  - ☐ Boy-girl relationships
  - ☐ Inter-racial relations
  - ☐ Teacher-pupil relationships
  - ☐ Family relationships
  - ☐ Problems of pupils are discussed in a special course, outside homeroom
  - ☐ Problems of pupils are discussed in a regular course or courses
  - ☐ Special counselors are available to handle problems of a social nature
- ☐ Others (Please specify) .....

What are the functions of your homeroom as to individual counseling? (*Please check items that apply*)

- ☐ Interview each pupil regarding choice of vocation
- ☐ Interview each pupil regarding adjustment to school life
- ☐ Interview each pupil on personal problems
- ☐ Interview each pupil to plan program of study
- ☐ Interview each pupil failing subjects
- ☐ Keep anecdotal record of each pupil
- ☐ Be familiar with cumulative record of each pupil
- ☐ Cooperate with special counselors. How? .....
- ☐ Other (Please specify) .....

Activities carried out in your homeroom within the last three years:

(Please circle the more appropriate letter)

A—If activities are carried out in cooperation with other school agencies

B—If activities are carried out only in the homeroom

A-B Follow-up of school leavers
A-B Community occupational surveys
A-B Talks and lectures by outsiders
A-B Visits to businesses and industries
A-B Psychological testing and interpretation
A-B Preparation of handbooks
A-B Psychodrama, role playing
A-B Study of employment blanks
A-B Group conferences on occupations
A-B Self-appraisal using rating scales, tests
A-B Job interview practices
A-B Remedial reading procedures
A-B Study habits
A-B Career days
A-B Career clubs
A-B College days
A-B Sociograms
A-B Group therapy
A-B Publishing homeroom paper
A-B Self-improvement projects

A-B Group conferences on problems, such as: .....

.....

A-B Visual aids, movies, slides, such as: .....

.....

A-B Library study of: .....

Methods used to carry out these activities:

(Please check P for Predominant; L for Lesser used methods)

P-L Discussions led by teacher
P-L Individual interview with teacher
P-L Committee projects
P-L Others (Please specify) .....
P-L Discussions led by pupils
P-L Lectures
P-L Pupil reports

Materials used in your homeroom program:

Please list three books considered by you as having been the most helpful in your work with the pupils.

AUTHOR: TITLE:

.....

.....

.....

Please list three pamphlets considered by you as having been the most helpful in your work with the pupils.

AUTHOR: TITLE: PUBLISHER:

.....

.....

.....

(Please check items that apply)

☐ Materials used in homeroom are developed by school and are used entirely
☐ Some materials used in homeroom are developed by school and are used along with other published materials.

Problems faced by you in the homeroom: *(Please check items that apply)*

☐ Not enough time
☐ Discipline problems
☐ Lack of materials for pupils
☐ Interruptions, pupils called to office, etc.
☐ Too many clubs and activities for pupils
☐ Others (Please specify) .....
☐ Public address system is disconcerting
☐ Lack of interest on part of pupils
☐ Lack of materials for teacher
☐ Lack of an over-all school program for homeroom

.....

PLEASE CIRCLE THE MOST APPROPRIATE OF THE FOLLOWING:

Yes No Do you have anything to say about whether or not you are assigned to a homeroom?

Yes No Do you feel the administration of your school looks upon the homeroom as a definitely planned part of the total educational program?

Yes No Do teachers rotate among the homerooms during the semester?

Yes No Is there any in-service training for homeroom work in your school?

Yes No Have you had any direct or special training for homeroom work?

Yes No Do you feel there is a need for special training?

Yes No Prior planning for conducting homeroom, daily, weekly, year, semester, is suggested. (Underline suggested time.)

(1) (2) (3) Do you believe the time spent in your homeroom is justified by the results obtained? (1) Yes, definitely, (2) Uncertain (3) No

(1) (2) (3) How much do you have to say about what takes place in your homeroom? (1) Left entirely to me (2) Left partly to me (3) Nothing

What in your observation have been the main trends in your homeroom procedures in the last five to ten years?

What, if any, changes are you planning in your homeroom?

Comments:

APPENDIX B

OREGON STATE COLLEGE

School of Education

Corvallis, Oregon

Letter to School Administrators

Considerable attention is being focused on the homeroom in secondary schools. Many schools have been experimenting with various plans in an attempt to make the homeroom a more important and more effective part of the school program. A study of the purposes and practices of better homeroom programs will be helpful to those who are planning new homeroom programs or improving their homeroom programs, and also to those who are training teachers.

Your school was suggested by your State Department of Education as having an outstanding or representative homeroom program.

Will you please ask a representative homeroom teacher in your school to fill in the enclosed check list and return it in the enclosed envelope? It will only take a few minutes, and I am sure you will agree that the information will be of great value in improving homeroom practices.

Your cooperation in this study will be greatly appreciated. The results will be made available through a professional magazine. I would be happy to correspond with you at any time regarding the study and findings.

Yours truly,

David B. McCorkle
Instructor

DBM/jtm

Enc.

APPENDIX C

OREGON STATE COLLEGE

School of Education

Corvallis, Oregon

Dear Homeroom Teacher,

Many schools have been experimenting with various plans in an attempt to make the homeroom a more important and effective part of the school program. By consolidating information from certain schools of your state along with information from other states, we hope to be able to assist in making homeroom programs more effective.

This information should be helpful to administrators and teachers in planning new homeroom programs or in improving their present programs. It will also be valuable in the training of teachers. Findings of this study will be made available through a professional publication.

Your school administrator has suggested that you could best represent your school in this study of homeroom programs.

Will you please take time to check the items on the attached check-list as they relate to your homeroom? Your attention is called to the last two items dealing with trends and changes.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Yours truly,

David B. McCorkle
Instructor