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The purpose of this study was designed to answer

1. What are the beliefs and attitudes that Oregon home economics teachers hold about various new trends?

2. Are Oregon home economics teachers willing to support the various new trends?

3. Are Oregon home economics teachers willing to further prepare themselves to work with the trends?

4. Are Oregon home economics teachers willing to accept teaching responsibilities for the trends?

5. Are Oregon home economics teachers willing to assume leadership responsibilities for the trends?

The six trends included in the study were related to programs for

1. The handicapped
2. The socio-economically disadvantaged
3. Occupational education
4. Coeducational classes
5. Specialized semester courses
6. Family life courses

A questionnaire was constructed, validated, and sent to 394 home economics teachers in the State of Oregon to gain answers to the five questions as they related to the six trends. Of the questionnaires mailed out, 241 were returned and 160 (41 percent) were usable.

Nearly one half of the respondents were 40 years of age or older. Approximately two thirds were married. Nearly 70 percent received their bachelor's degrees since 1940. Fewer than 15 percent of the respondents had master's degrees and over 80 percent of these were received since 1960. About one half of the teachers had taken from 1-42 quarter hours beyond their last degree. At least one half of the respondents had had six or fewer years teaching experience and some experience in teaching other subject matter areas. Most (two thirds) taught in senior high schools where enrollments of more than one half of the schools were less than 1,000. Nearly one half of the respondents did not indicate that boys were a part of their program.

Analysis of data showed that the respondents held quite positive beliefs concerning each of the six trends. For every trend, except programs for the handicapped, at least 70 percent felt that the home economics education programs were very important or moderately
important. Fewer than five percent had negative feelings about any of the trends excepting programs for the handicapped and occupational education where 30 percent and 12 percent of the replies were negative and most often showed the feeling that respondents felt other groups were better qualified.

The respondents showed a general willingness to support the trends with at least three fourths giving positive replies for every trend except programs for the handicapped and coeducational classes. The majority of the positive responses showed that the respondents were most interested in indirect types of support rather than active support. Negative replies most often showed that respondents believed other programs were more important, that they did not have time to support the trend, or that there was no need for the program in their community.

Over one half of the respondents were willing to further prepare themselves for involvement in the six trends and were most interested in family life courses, occupational education and programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged. Special workshops was most often indicated as the preferred method of preparation. Negative replies showed that respondents were more interested in other areas or were already prepared.

At least 80 percent of the respondents were willing to assume teaching responsibilities for every trend except occupational education and programs for the handicapped. Respondents often said they
would teach in these trends only if they were given special preparation or if they were given time to prepare. Replies in the negative category most often indicated that the respondents were already involved or were more interested in other areas.

Although nearly 70 percent of the respondents would assume leadership roles for family life, specialized semester, and coeducational classes, fewer than one half would take on this responsibility for occupational education and programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged and fewer than one fourth would lead programs for the handicapped. Respondents who replied negatively felt that they did not have the background or did not have the time or interest.

The following conclusions were reached.

1. The majority of the respondents held favorable attitudes about the six trends.

2. Programs for the handicapped, the socio-economically disadvantaged, and occupational education followed similar patterns of acceptance and of respondents' willingness to be involved, while coeducational classes, specialized semester courses, family life courses were more accepted than the first three trends.
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TEACHERS' BELIEFS AND WILLINGNESS TO BE INVOLVED WITH CERTAIN ASPECTS OF OREGON HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION CURRICULUM

I. INTRODUCTION

Home economics education is at an important juncture in its development. Answers to many of the problems of the field must be found soon, but these must be the right answers if the potentialities of the field for helping meet needs of individuals and of society are to be realized. In respect to some of the critical issues facing home economics education, a general agreement among those in the field may be essential for the progress and development of the field. In regard to other issues, diversity in points of view may be not only tolerable but desirable.

(Elizabeth Simpson, 1965)

The literature shows that like Simpson, most home economics educators seem to believe that the future of the profession depends upon home economics teachers accepting the challenge for immediate and radical change in secondary curricula. Therefore, this writer chose to investigate this problem.

Statement of Problem

This study was planned to discover the attitudes of Oregon home economics teachers towards certain trends or innovations in home economics education today, and their willingness to become involved with these educational practices or trends.

The trends to be studied are programs for (1) the handicapped; (2) the socio-economically disadvantaged; (3) occupational education;
(4) coeducational classes; (5) specialized semester courses; (6) family life courses.

Five major questions concerning each trend were asked to obtain the following information.

1. The beliefs that Oregon home economics teachers hold about each of the trends.
2. The willingness of the Oregon home economics teachers to support each of the trends.
3. The willingness of the Oregon home economics teachers to prepare themselves to teach in each of the trends.
4. The willingness or interest of the Oregon home economics teachers in teaching or working with the trends.
5. The willingness or interest of Oregon home economics teachers to provide and/or accept leadership for the various trends.

**Need for Study**

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

The cry is heard in many educational circles for change. If change, which may appear as innovations or as modifications of old
techniques, is the answer to the present educational problems, there must be agreement among the members of the profession concerning the changes, and there must be teachers who are ready and/or willing to initiate and carry out the changes.

This study was planned to gain information concerning the educational climate among secondary home economics teachers in Oregon. It is particularly concerned with the attitudes and beliefs of these teachers towards certain changes or trends.

**Method of Procedure**

**Construction of Questionnaire**

The questionnaire used in this study was constructed in two major sections. The first contained the personal and professional history of the respondents and was organized to obtain information about the respondents' background that might be related to their beliefs and attitudes about the trend areas.

The second section was designed to answer questions concerning the teachers' beliefs and the degree of their willingness to be involved with new programs. This section was subdivided into five divisions to differentiate various levels of concern or involvement of the respondents for each trend area (see Appendix).

In each of these five divisions, each respondent was asked to
choose from a group of statements, including both positive and negative points of view, the statement(s) that most closely corresponded with her beliefs or feelings about each trend.

Seven trends were included in the questionnaire. The data for one trend, interdisciplinary courses, were not analyzed or included in this discussion because very few of the respondents replied to questions related to this trend.

Analysis of Questionnaire

Since the purpose of the study was to attempt to present an overview of the beliefs and willingness of Oregon home economics teachers to be involved in and to accept new trends in home economics education, no attempt was made to consider the six trends in depth. An indepth study of any one of the trends would have required a complete study.

The respondents were permitted to mark only one phrase in each section to indicate their feelings concerning that level of involvement for each of the trends. This limitation might have given a distorted picture of the respondents' feelings about each trend.

If the questionnaire had been organized in any other way—for example, if the respondents had been allowed to mark more than one item in each section—the results of this study might have been different. Limiting the respondents to one choice within each section forced
respondents to make one decision and mark only the item that most closely corresponded with her beliefs. This forced response might have made some respondents more realistic in their choice than if multiple responses had been acceptable. For other respondents, such a forced choice might have caused respondents to make a choice that did not completely or accurately portray their feelings.

The respondents were instructed to answer the questionnaire using their present communities to guide their response. The results, then, gave information concerning the respondents' feelings about the six trends as those trends related to her own community.

The items within each section were divided into two categories of positive and negative replies. The writer separated each item to place it into one of the two categories.

The two categories concerned with positive and negative replies related only to the particular section in which they occurred. Positive replies were interpreted as an indication that the respondent either believed in or was willing to be involved in supporting, preparing, teaching or leading the various trends. Negative replies indicated that the respondent was unwilling to be involved with the trends at that one specific level of involvement. A negative reply was not interpreted as indicating a general opposition or resistance to the trend.

Within each section it was important to consider more than just a comparison of positive and negative replies. The percentage of
respondents marking each of the items within each section gave a more complete view of the type, amount of and/or reasons for the positive or negative feelings.

**Validation of Questionnaire**

After the questionnaire was prepared, it was sent to 16 home economics educators in Oregon, Washington and California. Questionnaires returned by these educators contained comments about the wording, the construction, and the directions contained in the questionnaire. There was no unanimity in their suggestions, but the questionnaire was changed slightly by clarifying the directions given for marking each section and by adding responses in each section.

Although the jury of judges who helped to validate this questionnaire seemed to have comparatively few suggestions and apparently were able to fill out the questionnaire easily and quickly, the respondents' replies indicated that the questionnaire was difficult to answer. Use of the questionnaire was changed to show general attitude patterns concerning new trends rather than to show specific and exact statistical analysis of the data. This was a limiting factor in this study.

**Distribution of Questionnaire**

The population sample for this study was obtained from the list
of home economics teachers provided by Miss Pauline Goodwin, Supervisor of Home Economics Education, Oregon State Department of Education, Salem, Oregon. All Oregon home economics teachers, with the exception of those in the Portland City School District, were sent questionnaires.

Returns of Questionnaire

Questionnaires were mailed to 394 home economics teachers. Of these, 241 were returned and 160 of these were usable. The findings of this study are based on the responses of 41 percent of the home economics teachers in Oregon to whom the questionnaires were sent. These findings are valid only to the extent that the respondents expressed their sincere opinions at the time they answered the questionnaires.

Of the questionnaires not used, 60 were returned with information too incomplete for analysis. Twenty-one arrived too late for tabulation.

Definition of Terms

The trend areas selected for this study refer to specific curriculum programs. The definitions of these trends are included in the review of literature.

Home economics is commonly used to designate the college,
university and/or professional level of those disciplines directly related to improving the home and family. Homemaking education commonly refers to the level of home economics below the professional level, which includes most public school programs, both secondary and adult education. Home economics can be used as a general term to refer to any level of the program. A teacher of homemaking may be referred to as a home economics teacher or as homemaking teacher. In this thesis the term home economics will be used in the general context and no distinction will be made between homemaking and home economics.
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Change

Change in Education

The winds of change are blowing strong and hard in American education today. There has never been a time in the history of our educational system when there was as much interest in innovation and change. Although our society and our educational system have long held to a belief in the need and worth of change, it has only been in the last 20 years that extreme emphasis has been placed on this concept.

Recent concern for change in the American educational system has not necessarily solved the problems facing that system. John Gardner (Gallagher, 1967, p. 442), serving as Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, enjoined American education to "stop nibbling around the edges of educational problems and take a barracuda bite at them." At the 1965 White House Conference on Education, Gardner further suggested that

The toughest question facing us now, in my judgement, is whether we have the courage, flexibility, and imagination to innovate as the time requires. ... The old ways of doing things are not good enough. ... We are a flexible and inventive people--we are at an intensely creative moment in American education. (Cressman and Benda, 1966, p. 412)
Gardner is not alone in his criticism of past attempts toward change. Lloyd Trump (1959) feels that our society demands both quantity and quality of its education. With the majority of American youth in school and most classrooms manned by well prepared teachers, the challenge of quantity has been largely met. The challenge of quality still faces us and may be more difficult than ever to meet. Changes toward quality become particularly urgent as schools must provide education for more people, for longer periods of time, and at higher competency levels than ever before—at the same time always attempt to strengthen our democratic way of life.

The challenge of change for quality requires that decisions be made concerning questions of how, where, when, why, and if a particular change should occur. Our society and the profession of education has accepted the idea of change, but thoughtful members realize that change is neither good nor bad in itself (Smith, 1968). Change must be evaluated by the effects it produces. Change for change sake is worthless, but change because it brings about certain desired results is valuable (Garrison, 1968).

We are warned by many that we must take a long, hard, critical look at all proposed changes (Smith, 1968; Massey, 1967). Reflective acceptance or resistance is unbecoming to the education profession. Samuel Moore and James E. Heald (1968, p. 117) suggest that because innovation and change have a high and almost
automatic credibility in our society, we need to find ways by which education can guard against "the spread effect of practices which are unsupported." One solution might be to become more skeptical of change.

Guidelines to provide a basis for the evaluation of any particular change have been developed by several educators. Thomas R. Bennett (1965) has formulated four questions for consideration by an educator before accepting or becoming involved with change. In brief these are:

1. Why do you believe that this change should occur and why do you want to be involved?
2. Are you the best person to promote the change and if not, who might be?
3. Is the level of motivation and concern for this change high enough to produce the desired change?
4. To what degree are you willing to permit the person or group to which the change is directed to be who they are and not what you want them to be?

Moore and Heald (1968, p. 117) introduced criteria for evaluating change by outlining situations where change should be resisted. These included:

1. When change is unalterably out of phase with existing sequences.
2. When results of change are unknown and unalterable.
3. When change is attractive but inappropriate to the environment or setting.
4. When cost is out of proportion to the potential good of the change.
5. When change is dependent on special personnel that are not available.
6. When potential dangerous effects of change cannot be tested.
7. When the proposed change will preclude or prolong a better conceived and more permanent solution to the problem.

Just as we do not think that all change is good or of equal value, neither do we accept all that goes by the name of change or innovation. Smith (1968) believes that we have spawned many pseudo-innovations because of the recent popularity of the idea and the fact that foundation, federal, and state moneys go to projects labelled innovative. Smith suggests that some things labelled innovative may even be retrogressive and education must constantly be alert to these projects.

Maturation in any field may be evidenced by willingness of members of the profession to examine issues, come to general agreement on some issues, and to tolerate and even respect disagreement with respect to other issues (Simpson, 1966). It is important that education meet the issues head on (Karnes, 1965).

There is then, according to Simpson (1965), a time for commitment and a time for refraining from commitment. Premature commitment to a point of view or to a course of action may be disastrous for the individual, for the student, or for the professional field seeking to solve its problems and find direction for its foreseeable future.
Change in Home Economics Education

The challenge of change is perhaps greater for home economics education than for any other subject matter field (Blackwell, 1962). Home economics education must remain alert to changes in society and must make a rigorous evaluation of everything taught if it is to survive in this sophisticated world. Simpson (1965, p. 1) believes that home economics education is at a very important point in its development. Her view of the subject will be quoted because it seems to provide the foundation for this study.

Answers to many of the problems of the field must be found soon, but these must be the right answers if the potentialities of the field for helping meet the needs of individuals and of society are to be realized. In respect to some of the critical issues facing home economics education, a general agreement among those in the field as to positions may be essential for the progress and development of the field. In regard to other issues, diversity in points of view may not only be tolerable but desirable.

It is time that we face the issues and not worry about the damage it might do to the image of home economics education (Karnes, 1965). If there were no issues and no debating, that field of education would be sterile and would not be meeting its responsibility.

There are educators who feel that home economists have rested on their laurels after they met the challenge of the depression and World War II (Hoffman, 1968). Ruthanna Russel (Massey, 1967, p. 197) points out that it is "high time that as individuals we stand up
to be counted--and as a professional group we become initiating, innovative and influential."

Oliver Wendell Holmes (Massey, 1967) once said that the great thing in the world was not so much where we stand as where we are heading. There is a call in home economics education today for finding a perspective for the field. There is a challenge to discover where home economics is today, where it is going, and where it should go. Home economics has a proud heritage but it has greater opportunities ahead to perform a more significant function than in the past.

Home economics education, with all other fields of education, must examine the issues, accept and support those changes that will enhance personal and family living, while rejecting those changes that might lead to harmful effects, and must find a perspective for the future.

This study was developed with the belief that every home economist has the responsibility of shaping the future of home economics by thinking through her own philosophy of home economics, present and future, and her feelings concerning various changes occurring in the profession.

Alberta Hill (1966) gives the home economist direction by suggesting that every home economics educator consider the following questions when making decisions related to change.
1. What should the educational goals of our profession be?  
   (How can we prepare people for fullest potentials and meet 
   the needs of our society?)

2. Who should provide certain phases of education?  (Could 
   other agencies help or do a better job than is being done 
   today?)

3. Is all education carried out best in a realistic situation or 
   a simplified purified situation?

4. What do you believe about the change?  (Will it give oppor- 
   tunities or impose restrictions?)

5. What do you really believe about home economics?

Change in American Society

The field of home economics, like most other subjects in the 
school curriculum, is bound to be affected by the changing social 
order. Societal changes in fact, directly and indirectly, affect home 
economics education, just as trends and changes in society direct 
trends and all changes in education. Trump (1968, p. 120) warns 
that "those making decisions concerning home economics must be 
very conscious of the social forces that are shaping modern family 
living." Home life today must be evaluated in terms of a changing 
social order.

The conditions of life in our society are complex and ever 
changing. These conditions influence the necessity of education for 
homemaking and also influence the nature of the contribution.
Lela O'Toole (1967) outlines certain conditions which affect the homes and families in the nation and that have a bearing on the future of home economics education. The changes she stresses include the following:

1. Technology has brought new products, new services, new processes and new equipment to families, providing comforts, pleasures, and a high standard of living along with new management complexities and other problems.

2. The mobility of much of the population has brought new problems to families in such areas as housing, home management, family relations and family stability.

3. Families today are consuming rather than producing units.

4. The urban-suburban population has brought particular problems for each socio-economic level.

5. The United States is a young population with nearly 40 percent falling under the 19 year age mark.

6. More men and women now live to complete their life spans and this older population is increasingly independent of family support and ties.

7. The child bearing period is considerably shorter today and couples have longer periods of time together after the children are grown.

8. Family members have more leisure time.

9. Family roles have changed.

10. Families today are better educated than ever before, but we still have large numbers of capable youths who do not even complete high school.

11. Families today have more resources as they work less, earn more and live better.
12. Malnutrition exists among families at all income levels. Massey (1967) suggests that we should also consider certain other changes in our society that hold special significance for the future of home economics education. These include the opportunity for geographic, social, and economic mobility, the high and relatively stable marriage rate, the prevalence and availability of birth control techniques, and the increase in two-income families.

The home economics profession is going through a period of evaluation and signs point to the fact that it is also on the threshold of a new era. "We need to see more clearly the realities of a changing world and the implications for change in the home economics curriculum" (Massey, 1967, p. 215).

The trends reviewed in the following sections are examples of some of the attempts home economics education is making to meet the challenges of the changes occurring in our society.

Trends in Home Economics Education

Programs for the Handicapped

Our founding fathers have given us the great but sometimes uncomfortable legacy that all men are created equal. This can only mean that all men should have equal opportunities. If we are to live up to that legacy, we must match our actions to our words (Howe,
The principle of special education (or education for the handicapped) rests on the foundation of this legacy to provide education for all children that is appropriate with their needs and abilities.

The term "handicapped children" refers to children with exceptional school needs and includes many different types of disabilities such as

1. Blindness
2. Deafness
3. Impaired speech
4. Physically handicapped
5. Emotionally disturbed
6. Socially disturbed
7. Mental retardation
8. Other health impairments


There is great individual variation among these children in intelligence, emotional stability and personal and social characteristics (Cashcroft, 1967).

Since 1950 there has been a remarkable surge to develop programs for handicapped children. In most states funds have doubled and redoubled within the last 20 years. With the increase in funds these programs are reaching greatly increased numbers of students. Enrollment has risen from 400,000 students in 1948 to nearly two million in the late 1960's. In 1968 alone, 11 million dollars were
set aside for research and another 24 million budgeted for training programs. In that same year nearly 30,000 teachers and specialists were involved in programs for the handicapped (Howe, 1968; Reynolds, 1967). Despite these remarkable advances in the year 1967-1968 only 35 percent of the children requiring special education services were getting them (Reynolds, 1967).

Impetus for recent growth in these programs has been provided by federal and state legislatures in the form of fellowships for teachers, grants to institutions for teacher education, and funds for teaching facilities and equipment (Abraham, 1966).

Newest emphasis in the field seems to be with attempts in the two areas of correcting the severe teacher shortage and reducing the high cost of individualized instruction (Abraham, 1966).

The effort to reduce the cost of individualized instruction has developed a clear trend toward educating the handicapped child in the regular classroom. Educators are beginning to agree that the regular classroom is not only the most economical, but the best environment for most handicapped children to receive their schooling (Cashcroft, 1967; Gallagher, 1967; Abraham, 1966 and Reynolds, 1967).

These children have usually been provided with an abnormal type of education which usually involves separation or isolation from normal children. The new trend is to make as little separation of the handicapped child from normal school, home and community life
as possible in an attempt to prepare these children for the world outside the school where they must eventually live, work, and compete (Wright, 1967; Reynolds, 1967). Separation is not necessary and may even lead to undue and harmful extremes (Welsh, 1968).

As the special programs expand and school boundaries of several kinds are stretched or reshaped, the regular classroom teacher will increasingly be responsible for the education of handicapped children (Reynolds, 1967 and Abraham, 1966).

This type of children being special will continue to require special provisions even when they are in a regular classroom. A cooperative coordinated effort by classroom teachers is recognized by educators of the handicapped as an essential element in effective programming. The regular classroom teachers may need more special education as well as experience in this area (Goodman, 1968 and Gallagher, 1967).

Literature contains little reference to the role of home economics in the education of the handicapped although experimental programs are being conducted, particularly in the area of adult education (Kennedy, 1967).

In the literature, two implications seem apparent in view of the changes taking place in special education. First, the trend toward education of the handicapped in regular classrooms will give increased responsibility to home economics teachers for the education of
handicapped children.

Secondly, home economics appears to be an essential element in the education of these children whether in a regular or a special classroom. These are the youth who most particularly will need the special education in the skills and knowledges related to home and family living.

Programs for the Socio-Economically Disadvantaged

Delinquency, poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, school dropouts and the need for public welfare are not new situations in our society, but full scale attempts by Congress in the form of legislation and financial aid are new.

George Artelle (1967, p. 507) believes that the success of these new programs is essential to the life of our society.

The recent spate of books and articles about the poor and the disadvantaged have been like a fire alarm awakening us from our complacent acceptance of affluence as the final achievement of our economy. The war on poverty and recent federal legislation on education and related matters have been a response to this alarm.

The problem of poverty is the ultimate challenge to both our public schools and our democratic dream. The problem of poverty not only poses a threat to law and order, to our economy and a challenge to our schools, it is an affront to all the values of the American Dream.

A curious product of the new interest in the fate of the socio-economically disadvantaged is confusion over the unappropriateness
of terms to describe these people. In the past few years we have
seen many terms coined including culturally deprived, underprivi-
leged, educationally handicapped, children of the poor, poverty class
and disadvantaged. In this thesis the term socio-economically dis-
advantaged will be used because of its more general acceptance
(Frost and Hawkes, 1966 and Webster, 1966).

Kingsley Price (1967) uses the word culturally deprived as a
label in his discussion of what deprivation involves. He says that
one who is deprived of something does not merely fail to possess it.
Most people have never possessed a large fortune, but this does not
constitute deprivation. Deprivation, according to Price, presup-
poses the possession of a "right." To be deprived, then, means that
one possesses the right to do a certain thing but that the right is in-
fringed on so that the person cannot or is not able to use and act on
the right. Socio-economical deprivation means that the rights of
humanity and of our society have been infringed upon.

Who then are these disadvantaged or deprived people? Michael
Harrington (1966) tells us that 25 percent of our total population are
classified as poor. This group is predominantly white, although the
non-white members suffer from the most severe and intense poverty.
One-third of the poor are children. According to Harrington (1966,
p. 175), these are the people
... who lack education and skill, who have bad health, poor housing, low levels of aspirations and high levels of mental distress. They are, in the language of sociology—multiproblem families in which each disability is more intense because it exists within a web of other disabilities.

Harrington suggests that these are the strangest poor in the history of mankind because they do not suffer extreme privation and because they exist within the most powerful and rich society the world has ever known.

The socio-economically disadvantaged are found not only in the slums of New York and the ghettos of Los Angeles but they appear in every city, every state, and every school.

The disadvantaged student often has trouble thinking well of himself. He may feel that he has been cheated out of a fair deal in life, and moral and social responsibility may make little sense to him. The disadvantaged student may also be reticent and insecure about his abilities and goals (Willard Congreve, 1966).

To help these young people we need to be aware of their characteristics as learners.

Mary Anne Symons (1967) lists the following characteristics:

1. Lack of experience
2. Limited concepts of the world
3. Low self esteem
4. Low level of aspiration
5. Need for physical activity
6. Want immediate utilitarian goals.
7. Anxious to be accepted by their peers

These students are not all alike, however, although most will lack confidence in their ability, live with fears of rejection and eviction, and be accustomed to physical aggression (Tips and Topics, April 1966).

Rehabilitation of adults is one method of attacking social ills, but prevention is a sounder approach than cure, and the prescription for prevention is education (Frost and Hawkes, 1966). Our public schools are faced with a great challenge to provide effective education for the socially alienated, often unmotivated, and retarded disadvantaged learner. The initial impact of this societal commitment caught schools, communities, and teachers off guard and unprepared.

Many educators feel that the schools are not as effective as they might be in helping the disadvantaged and that money alone is not the answer. One critic has remarked that "no one can say the school cannot win its difficult battle for the street. It has never really tried" (Schools and the poor: the high cost of classroom candor. Educational Forum 32:55-63. Nov. 1967).

If we wish the poor to break out of the vicious cycle of poverty and become a part of our society, effective education for their young is a must, and effective education means teachers educated to understand, respect, and communicate with their pupils.
Slum children however come to school with a pattern of habits and values of which even the most tolerant teacher can hardly approve (Christopher Jencks, 1964). This situation is compounded by the fact that most middle class teachers unrealistically presume that the poor have a choice regarding their status. A further complication is the fact that teachers tend to prefer the middle class children. Of course this tendency has a negative effect on the education of the disadvantaged children (Educational Forum, Nov. 1967).

Effective education and good teachers who can accept, believe in, and be concerned with these students may be the key to breaking the poverty cycle (Shelley Koeningsberg, 1966).

Home economics education because of its subject matter and approach and home economics teachers because of their preparation, have a unique opportunity to help the neglected student (Mark Beach, 1966). The curriculum in home economics, as much or more than any other course, is often related to, or can be made to relate to the needs, abilities and interests of this group.

Home economics programs now in progress involve both adults and youth. In the past these students have often been a part of our regular home economics programs without recognition of their special needs. In the future efforts to reach this group must be a willing responsibility of home economics. If home economics is to reach this group it must
1. Be willing to allow these home economics programs to be less academic

2. Relate curriculum and experiences to their needs, interests and way of life

3. Provide and prepare teachers who can work successfully with these girls (Beach, 1966 and Koeningsbery, 1966).

Programs for Occupational Education

In the beginning, and for many years thereafter, job training was passed on within a family from father to son. Apprenticeship as a means of job training appeared much later and with it came the appearance of guilds and the still later development of their use for job skill instruction (Melvin Barlow, 1965). Today occupational education is usually received either on the job or in some type of school training situation.

Vocational education in the public schools of the United States began in the beginning of the twentieth century with general public support of the idea and with most states adopting some variation of a vocational program (Barlow, 1965). Early concern for the development of vocational efficiency as the fundamental aim of secondary education is evidenced in its inclusion in the Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education in 1918 (Cressman and Benda, 1966, p. 197).

The 1950's and the appearance of the first Russian satellite brought new attacks on vocational education and new emphasis on the
more academic aspects of education (Barlow, 1965).

In recent years a renewed concern for vocational education has been aroused and as a result of this concern the Vocational Education Act of 1963 was passed by Congress. Two basic principles underlying the act were

1. Vocational education programs must be adjusted to the labor market. Vocational programs must then be more flexible and everchanging.

2. All secondary schools must be concerned with all non-college bound students. Vocational education is needed for the very bright, for the average, and for the educationally handicapped (Nerden, 1965).

This act pours unprecedented amounts of money into many types of vocational programs. It provides for education of all age groups and puts special emphasis on new experimental programs. The act also gives funds to home economics to be used specifically for employment preparation, and for the first time in its history home economics had an additional emphasis to the traditional education for homemaking (Barlow, 1965).

The funds for occupational education in home economics were earmarked to provide instructional programs which would prepare individuals for working in occupations using the knowledge and skills of the field of home economics. Employment opportunities are greatest in occupations which provide "services to families in the home or to persons in institutions or similar group situations; or those which provide assistance" (Cleo Reinwald, 1964).
More recently the 1968 Vocational Education Amendments to the 1963 act were enacted. The 1963 funds were for programs to "fit individuals for gainful employment, including business and office occupations not covered by previous laws." The amendments will also give large amounts of money to programs for the disadvantaged, for curriculum development and for research and training, as well as allotting 110 million dollars for homemaking education and consumer education for the years 1970-1972 (Vocational Education Facts, Nevada Vocational Reflector 51:1-3. Nov. 1968).

Several years ago there were great debates regarding what responsibility, if any, home economics should assume for preparing students for wage earning occupations. The recent federal legislation has convinced many that home economics must do something and the discussion today centers around the questions of what and how (Simpson, 1966).

The occupational aspects of home economics have developed in response to the seven major developments in our society listed below.

1. Vocational Education Act of 1963
2. A rapid increase of women in the labor forces
3. An increase in the need for service occupations utilizing home economics skills
4. A desire to help persons with special needs
5. The decrease in the availability of jobs for the unskilled
6. The high rate of drop outs in our schools today, who leave
our schools with no skills for employment

7. The small number of youth who are getting vocational employment today although many need it (Ekman, 1967; Rua Van Horn, 1964; and Simpson, 1966).

Home economics has been receiving vocational education funds since 1917 for its homemaking programs. Today the profession has three vocational commitments that include

1. Preparing young people for making a home
2. Preparing some young people for occupations which use home economics knowledges and skills

Justification for vocational education is often debated, but it is based on three philosophical beliefs. These are

1. The right of each individual to a total education
2. The responsibility of society to provide such instruction
3. The effect of vocational education on the economic strength of the nation (Barlow, 1965).

Vocational education should lead a person to an economic future that would be better than what he might have had without that help. Nerden (1964) suggests that the newest philosophy of vocational education has its foundation in the beliefs that we must prepare to educate more youth for work than for college. He further states that vocational programs must be available to all ability levels, and that programs should provide opportunities to explore and examine various occupations.
The recent impetus for vocational programs has not been based on philosophy alone, but also on certain societal facts. A testimony before the House General Subcommittee on Education revealed that on the average 22 percent of young men and 24 percent of young women are unemployed. These percentages climb for young Negro men and women to 31 and 46 percent. One million young people leave high school unprepared in any salable skill yet we expect them to find work (Roman Pucinski, 1967). There are more youth unemployed today than during the depression. The rate of unemployment is five times as high for persons under 21 years of age as for those older (Fred Wilhelms, 1965). We are further reminded that only one sixth of those who begin the first grade finish college (Nerden, 1964). In view of these facts, we are driven to the conclusion that some type of vocational education is a necessity.

The greatest imagination and inventiveness must be applied to the vocational programs if the needs of modern youth are to be met. The 1963 Vocational Education Act frees schools and teachers to create new programs and to change old ones that were too rigid, narrow, or stereotyped (Wilhelms, 1965).

Vocational educators, however, are faced with a myriad of problems and their task is not easy because they must provide for wider areas of interest and greater flexibility (Nerden, 1964). Vocational education must further prepare workers for adaptability
because future workers will be faced with the necessity of changing jobs many times (Cressman and Benda, 1966). Provisions must be made for swift changes and for a larger mental ingredient in most people's work (Wilhelm, 1965). Further complications include the facts that good vocational education is expensive and that most states face a critical shortage of vocational teachers. In the future an increase of 13 to 66 percent of home economics vocational teachers will be needed.

Trump (1968, p. 210) calls for new approaches to vocational education, claiming that most vocational education has been crisis education because the federal government has turned to vocational education to solve its manpower problems in military and economic crises. He continues by saying,

Vocational education is a must for all people, but vocational education has been associated with the middle and lower ability students in agriculture, home economics, distributive education, trades and industrial arts and in business. Sights must be raised and service areas broadened if vocational education is to fulfill its promises of a golden era. Vocational education must provide opportunities for students at all levels of intelligence, ability and aptitude.

Home economics in the future will be challenged to provide education for occupations at all levels of interest and ability, in addition to their educational efforts with handicapped and socio-economically deprived students.
Programs for Coeducational Classes

The appearance of the first Russian satellite in the 1950's brought new criticism and pressure on the United States educational system. In our attempt to maintain our place as a world power, we began to equate power and world leadership with the physical sciences and forgot that the advancement of civilization also requires "advances in humanitarianism, philosophy and in leadership" (Johnnie Nell Ray, 1958).

The philosophy of home economics education has long held as its goal the establishment of effective personal and family living for all people. Today as our picture of family life changes and as men assume greater and greater responsibilities in the home, this philosophy is based also on the belief in cooperation among family members. Men and women are partners in family living, therefore both need assistance in preparing for that life. Home economics has something to contribute to boys as well as girls, but for too long we have forgotten that men are a part of every family and have educated only the female members (Dorothy J. Barnett, 1958 and Mary Ellis, 1958).

Hazel Anthony (1957, p. 581) is concerned with this problem also. She says that

For years we have been educating girls in our homemaking classes. At last we have awakened to the fact that
boys are also a part of the future family and that both parties need to have the same basic understandings of family life if they are to establish successful homes.

Boys were first included in home economics programs some 30 years ago in exchange classes with the agriculture and industrial arts (Nancy Dunhoff, 1965). Some years later many schools established special all male classes in home economics. Although both of these practices exist today, the trend is toward coeducational classes in the belief that coeducation in this subject is most effective (Massey, 1967; Simpson, 1966; and Trump, 1964). Boys today, however, make up only approximately one percent of the total home economics enrollment (Buelah I. Coon, 1962).

One of the two basic assumptions concerning home economics that Trump (1964) outlines is that it is essential that all boys and all girls be educated better for their present and future homemaking roles. He believes that home economics education in the future should be coeducational to provide opportunities for working relationships that develop mutual respect and appreciation among the sexes. He further suggests that home economics offers experiences needed by both sexes--particularly in areas such as home management and child guidance.

Maude E. Williamson and Mary Stewart Lyle (1961, p. 40) quote Bess Goodykoontz about the need for coeducational home economics classes.
Education for family living must be coeducational. It concerns one sex just as much as the other and must meet the needs of both from the beginning of life until the end. Men and boys are homemakers and home members. The tasks they perform and the contributions they make are quite as important as the tasks performed and the contributions made by women. Men and boys then have at least an equal right to the kind of education which will help them to meet their problems as effectively as possible.

The President's Commission on the Status of Women reports that "courses in social and economic responsibility involved in establishing a home" are advantageously studied by boys and girls together, and that this contributes to their understanding of one another (Massey, 1967).

The goals of a coeducational program are very similar to the goals for other home economics classes. The foundation for these classes is personal understanding and family relations and should also include finance, child development and house planning. These programs attempt to

1. Develop a degree of adult maturity in the student
2. Develop an appreciation of various patterns of family life in students
3. Help students become more socially adept
4. Help students form a wholesome philosophy of life
5. Help students develop an acceptance of others (Anthony, 1956).

The growth of coeducational courses seems indicative of the changing attitude about and acceptance of the dual role and responsibility in the home, as well as a recognition of the contribution a man
makes to a home (Dunhoff, 1965 and Olive Hall, 1965). This new attitude requires a new curriculum that is adapted to the interests and needs of students (Dunhoff, 1965). Classes should be small and should be led by well qualified teachers (Hall, 1965). Ray (1958) believes that when home economics teachers are presented with the challenge of coeducational courses they should be willing to assume leadership to teach and learn and prepare themselves for this field. Home economics teachers who believe that homemaking education is for all young people will work to provide opportunities to include both boys and girls in their programs (Anthony, 1956).

Education for coeducational classes will of necessity be different. Classes must be meaningful and realistic, and deal with significant problems if they are to be effective (Tips and Topics, April 1966). They should include a down to earth approach and provide significant opportunities for the sexes to learn from one another (Ray, 1958). Such classes must also be based on the needs of boys as well as on the needs of girls (Barnett, 1958).

Coeducational classes, although not a new idea, offer a new challenge to home economics education and home economics teachers.

Programs for Specialized Semester Courses

Trump (1968) believes that the content and sequence of course work in home economics is of primary concern in curriculum planning.
He suggests that surveys have shown two common patterns in existing curricula. One pattern consists of a series of separate courses. The second pattern has yearly comprehensive courses in which each year a series of units in the various areas of home economics is covered.

The concept of specialized semester courses follows the philosophy of the first curriculum pattern Trump mentioned. These courses have been designed for indepth study of one particular area of home economics such as child development or consumer education.

The literature contains little if any mention of this practice although it is presently operating in some of our American schools. In many schools where two years of home economics is required, the first year might be a general comprehensive course. From then on students might choose specialized semester courses.

These programs also provide home economics courses for girls without previous home economics experience and make boys classes and coeducation courses available for all boys and girls, regardless of previous home economics experience.

Specialized semester classes are becoming increasingly popular. The list of semester courses grows longer each year, although some of the most common subjects include family living, consumer education, child development, home furnishing, as well as various courses centering on foods and nutrition, clothing and related
These classes and other semester courses encourage boys and girls to become involved in home economics programs, allow both boys and girls to participate in an intensive study of a particular interest area, and give students the opportunity to select the areas of home economics of most interest or value to them.

Programs for Family Life Education

Our society and our families are vastly different than they were 100 years ago. Many writers believe that the breakdown of the traditional American home and family is one of the major reasons for the ills of today (Mary Elizabeth Moore, 1962).

There is a growing recognition of the need for education for family and community living. The notion of increased emphasis on the family is not new, but education for family living needs to be a part of the curriculum if home economics is to serve modern families (Simpson, 1962).

Family breakdown can be as "destructive to an individual as a serious disease, so the need for family life education as a stabilizer for all youth still exists" (Moore, 1962, p. 46). Increased attention and emphasis to family living courses carry with them a clear directive for evaluation by home economics leaders and teachers (Simpson, 1967).
Home economics programs with focus on family living must be developed to meet the needs of modern youth.

Dorothy Lawson (1964, p. 15) expands on this idea when she says,

Home economics programs take on a new urgency in the need to help youth and adults expand their capacity to make discriminating use of human and material resources in the face of novel situations. The ever increasing amount of knowledge available requires that careful selection be made of the things to be taught. Current problems, concerns and strengths of families serve as criteria in determining program emphasis and course content.

Home economics has not succeeded in meeting the challenge of providing effective family life education or of meeting the needs of today's families. Hoffman (1968) accuses home economics of being surrounded by an aura of provincialism. In the last two decades, members of the profession too often have paid little attention to the changes that have occurred in family living or have failed to recognize the different types of families that it was to serve.

When one looks at statistics one finds startling facts pointing to the need for family life education or attest to more effective family life education. It is estimated that 20 to 30 percent of the people in the United States today are not happy with their marriages and that another 50 percent are not happy with their life's work (Tips and Topics, Fall 1960). The U. S. Bureau of Statistics found that one out of every three teenage marriages ends in divorce (Tips and Topics,
In spite of the great changes occurring in family stability and family living, we find that in our schools home economics programs still consist largely of instruction in the areas of foods and clothing. Coon (1962) in her national survey found that, on the average, 70 percent of home economics class time was spent in the areas of food preparation and clothing construction. The remaining 30 percent of time was devoted to only 13 percent in consumer education, nine percent in housing and six to eight percent in family relations and child development.

Family life specialists agree that marriage and family life education can play a significant role in

1. Reducing the number of youthful marriages
2. Providing an education which will develop meaningful attitudes and values toward marital experience and family living

Educators and home economists with insight are increasingly recognizing the need for expanded emphasis on relationships and family life regardless of the approach used, and are suggesting that more time be spent in family relations, child development, consumer education, and home management (Simpson, 1965).

Whether the push button age arrives or not, certain phases of
basic living will remain. Mary Lee Hurt (1962, p. 17) believes that
the school may not ever be a substitute for the family but that the
school ought to support and reinforce the family if we believe that
family life is the basic foundation of our society.

The specialists have pointed out the immediate need for good
family life programs in our schools. Home economics, whose major
goal is improvement of family living, is capable of meeting this need
and providing family life education. The success of this type of educa-
tion however rests on home economics teachers accepting
responsibility for these programs and developing, guiding, or
assisting successful family life programs in their own schools.
III. ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to gain information concerning the attitudes and willingness of Oregon home economics teachers to be involved with certain trends in home economics education. It was designed specifically to answer the following major questions:

1. What are the beliefs and attitudes concerning the six trends in home economics education that Oregon home economics teachers hold?
2. Are the Oregon home economics teachers willing to support the six trends?
3. Are the Oregon home economics teachers willing to prepare themselves further for involvement with the six trends?
4. Are the Oregon home economics teachers interested in or willing to assume teaching positions in the six trends?
5. Are the Oregon home economics teachers willing to provide or accept leadership for the six trends?

To answer these questions the study was divided into five sections

1. Beliefs
2. Support
3. Further Preparation
4. Teach
5. Lead

These sections relate directly to the questions listed above. They concern teachers' beliefs and the level of involvement which the respondents would be willing to accept. Throughout this chapter, the
titles have been shortened for the sake of succinctness.

The trends included in this study were home economics programs for

1. The handicapped
2. The socio-economically disadvantaged
3. Occupational education
4. Coeducational classes
5. Specialized semester courses
6. Family life courses

A seventh trend, interdisciplinary courses, was contained in the questionnaire, but responses for this trend were scattered and incomplete. Many respondents even said they were unfamiliar with such courses in home economics and did not mark that category.

For these reasons, this trend was not covered in the analysis of data.

A questionnaire which was developed to study Oregon home economics teachers' attitudes toward each trend yielded a total of 160 responses from the 394 teachers to whom it was mailed. Of this number, 241 (or 61 percent) were returned and 160 (or 41 percent) of this total were usable. Eighty-one (or 34 percent) of the questionnaires returned were unusable. The questionnaires not used were incomplete or were received too late to be tabulated. Data for the 160 respondents was used in the study. The findings are valid only to the extent that the data on these questionnaires were valid at the time the study was made.
PART I

Personal and Professional History of Respondents

Ages of Respondents

Table 1 shows that the ages of the respondents were nearly equally distributed within each of the six age ranges, although few respondents fell within the 30-39 year category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ages</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>21.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or over</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The largest number of respondents, or approximately 24 percent, marked their ages as falling within the single category of 40-49 years. Almost one half of the respondents were 40 years of age or older. On the other hand, approximately 40 percent of the respondents were 20-29 years of age. The 30-39 year age range
accounted for less than 14 percent.

**Marital Status of Respondents**

Information concerning marital status of the 160 respondents is contained in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marital Status</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>65.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest percentage of respondents (66 percent) were married at the time they filled out the questionnaire. Single women made up 24 percent of the respondents. Approximately six percent were widowed and a smaller group of three percent were divorced. Separation was marked by only one respondent.

**Educational History of Respondents**

The educational history of the respondents included the degrees received, the years the degrees were received, and the institutions
from which the degrees were received. It also encompassed the number of quarter hours that the respondents had taken since their last degree and the number of quarter hours taken in home economics in the last five years. Tables 3-7 contain this information. These data seemed to indicate that respondents had been active in educational endeavors beyond their last degrees.

Table 3. Years 160 Respondents Received Bachelor's Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Graduated</th>
<th>Respondents Total</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920-1939</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Years 160 Respondents Received Master's Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years Graduated</th>
<th>Respondents Total</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1940-1949</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950-1959</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960-1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td></td>
<td>136</td>
<td>85.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Institutions from which 160 Respondents Received Bachelor's and Master's Degrees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions</th>
<th>Bachelor's Degree Only</th>
<th>Master's Degree Only</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon State University</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another institution</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>44.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No institution indicated</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Quarter Hours Beyond Last Degree Reported by 160 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - 6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 - 12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 - 30</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 42</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 - 60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 - 75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 and over</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>18.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7. Quarter Hours in Home Economics Taken in the Last Five Years Reported by 160 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarter Hours</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-6</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>22.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13-21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43-60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 or more</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nearly 39 percent of the respondents received their bachelor's degrees within the last eight years. The preceding ten years (1950-1959) accounted for fewer than nine percent, while 21 percent of the respondents graduated between the years of 1940-1949. Eleven percent fell within the 1920-1939 graduation dates and none of the respondents graduated before 1920. Almost 21 percent of the respondents gave no answer to this question.

A total of 15 percent of the respondents indicated receiving master's degrees. Nearly all of this group (11 percent) received their degrees since 1960. The remaining three percent were
obtained between the years of 1940-1960. At least 85 percent of the respondents did not reply to this question, which was interpreted to mean that they had not achieved a graduate degree.

The institution where respondents received their bachelor's degrees showed only a small difference between Oregon State University (53 percent of the respondents) and other institutions (44 percent). Oregon State University accounted for 13 percent of the respondents with master's degrees, while other institutions were marked by nine percent of the respondents with master's degrees.

Twenty-five percent of the respondents had taken 43-60 quarter hours beyond their last degrees. A nearly equal distribution of respondents seemed to exist among each of the quarter-hour ranges, with most ranges containing approximately ten percent of the respondents. Fewer than six percent of the respondents marked over 61 additional quarter hours beyond their last degree. Approximately 19 percent of the respondents did not reply to this question.

Quarter hours taken in home economics courses in the last five years might have included courses which were part of a master's program, and as such, may have accounted for more than just quarter hours in home economics classes beyond last degree. Over 50 percent of the respondents indicated taking from 0-12 quarter hours in home economics in the last five years. The largest percentage of respondents marking each of the other ranges fell rapidly and encompassed fewer than 20 percent, with ten percent of the group indicating 13-21 quarter hours preparation. Three
persons said they had taken more than 76 quarter hours in home economics within the last five years. No response was given by 29 percent of the respondents.

**Professional Organization Memberships of the Respondents**

Most respondents appeared to be involved in at least two or more professional organizations (Table 8).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Organization Affiliations</th>
<th>Respondents Total</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 or more</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While only about six percent of the respondents were involved in only one professional organization, 50 percent of the respondents participated in or were members of two or three of these organizations. Approximately 29 percent showed four to six organization affiliations. At least seven percent held six or more professional memberships. About nine percent of the respondents did not reply.
Teaching Experience of Respondents

The data seemed to show that a majority of the teachers have had less than six years of teaching experience. Many of the respondents indicated involvement in teaching other subject matter areas or at other educational levels (Table 9).

At least 52 percent of the respondents had been teaching six or fewer years. The greatest percentage of respondents (31 percent) fell within the three-to-six-year experience range. On either side of this range, 21 percent of the respondents had fewer than two years experience and 14 percent had seven to ten years teaching experience. The percentages fell steadily with fewer than seven percent of the respondents marking 22 or more years.

Distribution for the number of years of involvement in teaching only home economics classes seemed to closely follow the ranges and percentages for total teaching experience discussed above. The majority of respondents (66 percent) had had less than ten years experience in teaching only home economics. The percentages of respondents declined as the number of years of teaching experience increased. Almost 16 percent gave no reply to this question.

A majority of the respondents had had some experience teaching home economics and one or more other subjects concurrently. Forty-three percent of the respondents did not give any answer to
Table 9. Teaching Experience of 160 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range of Years Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Total Teaching Experience</th>
<th>Only home economics</th>
<th>Home economics and other subjects concurrently</th>
<th>One or more subjects other than home economics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One semester to 2 years</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.25</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3- 6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.63</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22-27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Over 50 percent of the total group indicated that they had had this dual responsibility for between less-than-one year and ten years, with 28 percent falling within the less than two-years-experience range and another 17 percent falling within the range of three to six years.

Table 10. Levels of Teaching Experience in Subjects other than Home Economics of 160 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Experience in Subjects other than Home Economics</th>
<th>Respondents Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and College</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Secondary</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary, Secondary and College</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fewer respondents (24 percent) had had experience teaching only in a subject other than home economics at some time in their teaching careers. Of this 24 percent of the respondents, the greatest percentage (20 percent) have been involved in this type of teaching for less than two years. Over 75 percent of the respondents made no response to this question.
School Levels of Present Positions of 160 Respondents

Table 11 gives information concerning the level of the schools in which the respondents teach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Level</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>29.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>63.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority of respondents (64 percent) were teaching in senior high schools. Another 29 percent were working in junior high schools and approximately six percent were in both junior and senior high schools. Only about one percent of the respondents failed to reply to this section.

Current Enrollment of Schools Where Respondents Taught

School enrollment data show that respondents more often taught in smaller schools than larger schools (Table 12). Schools with an enrollment of less than 1,000 students represented 66 percent of the schools where respondents taught. Of those schools,
34 percent of the respondents were in schools with under 500 students.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Enrollment</th>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 500</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>34.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500-999</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>31.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000-1,500</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1,500</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thirty-one percent of the teachers taught in schools with an enrollment between 500 and 999. The 1,000-1,500 student enrollment range accounted for another 16 percent of the respondents' schools. Approximately 14 percent of the respondents indicated school enrollments of over 1,500. Fewer than four percent failed to respond to this section.

Enrollment of Home Economics Classes in the Schools Where the Respondents Taught

Enrollment of home economics classes in many cases varies with changes in the total school enrollment but the size of home economics classes is independent of the total school enrollment and can indicate specific strengths or weaknesses of a home economics
program. Table 13 shows the enrollment of boys and girls in the home economics classes in schools where the respondents taught.

Table 13. Enrollment of Home Economics Classes in Schools Where 160 Respondents Taught

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Girls Enrolled in Home Economics Classes</th>
<th>Schools Total</th>
<th>Boys Enrolled in Home Economics Classes</th>
<th>Schools Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1-9</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-59</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-99</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-139</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>140-179</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>180-229</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>230-300</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 300</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Over 69</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Most enrollment responses (65 percent) fall within the range of 60-139 and 230-300 and over for number of girls enrolled in respondents' programs. Approximately nine percent of the respondents indicated that fewer than 59 girls were enrolled. The greatest percentage of responses fell into the 60-99 enrollment range. At least 30 percent of the respondents gave home economics enrollment of over 230.

Enrollment figures for boys were substantially less than the
figures on girls enrollment. Almost 50 percent of the respondents did not make any indication that boys were a part of their programs. Twenty-six percent said that fewer than nine boys participated in home economics classes. Another 11 percent of the respondents had 10-29 boys in their programs. Enrollment of 50 or more was marked by fewer than four percent of the respondents.

PART II

Beliefs and Willingness of Respondents to be Involved with the Six Trends in Home Economics Education

The purpose of the second half of the questionnaire was to gain information concerning teachers' attitudes about, and their willingness to become involved with certain trends or innovative home economics education programs.

This segment of the analysis of data is divided into five separate sections arranged on a hierarchy of concern and involvement, beginning with beliefs and ending with willingness to lead such programs.

This organization allowed respondents to differentiate between their general beliefs about the trends and the degree of support or active participation with which they would be willing to be involved.

Respondents indicated beliefs and levels of involvement separately for each program as follows:
1. The handicapped
2. The socio-economically disadvantaged
3. Occupational education
4. Coeducational classes
5. Specialized semester courses
6. Family life courses

Each of the five sections of this segment of the questionnaire contained a number of items that consisted of short phrases representing various feelings or attitudes. These phrases include both negative and positive comments. Each positive response was interpreted as representing the respondents' beliefs concerning or willingness to participate in that specific level of involvement for that specific trend. Positive comments also indicated the type or amount of participation the respondent would accept. A negative response was interpreted as disbelief or unwillingness on the part of the respondent to be involved with the specific trend. Negative comments further specified some type of opposition or resistance to the trend. It is important to note that negative replies may not always have represented truly negative responses to a trend, but may merely indicate situations which the respondent had no interest in being a leader in a specific trend because she believed that there was no need for the trend in her community. She might also have said that she had no interest in preparing to teach a particular class because she was already prepared.
Respondents marked the one item within each section that most closely corresponded with their feelings or willingness to become involved at that specific level. Respondents were able to mark more than one item in the section relating to preparation. The purpose of allowing multiple answers in this section was to give a more complete indication of all of the various ways the respondents might be willing to use in order to become prepared for work in the various trends.

Beliefs of Respondents

This section was designed to indicate the general attitudes, feelings or beliefs that Oregon home economics teachers hold about the various trends.

Items included within this section were as follows:

To indicate your strongest belief, check only one item for each trend.

1. very important now
2. moderately important now
3. important in coming years
4. considered only after more pressing problems are solved
5. home economists do not have time for this
6. others are more qualified
7. should not be a responsibility of our profession

Respondents marked the item that most closely corresponded with their beliefs about each of the trends.

Items 1-4 were considered to be positive replies and were
interpreted as belief in the worthiness of the trend and of home economics education being involved in the various programs. These items also gave a measure of the degree of belief in the programs. Item 4 might be considered a negative response, but for the purposes of this study it was categorized as a positive reply because it indicates some degree of belief in the programs.

Items 5-7 were considered to be negative responses and were interpreted as indicating a lack of belief in the idea that home economics education should be involved in these trends. The negative replies also suggested reasons for negative feelings.

Oregon home economics teachers seemed generally to have more positive than negative feelings about the six trends studied. They seemed to feel that home economics education should be involved in these trends. Table 14 shows the comparison of positive and negative replies for the belief section of the questionnaire.

In all areas, excepting programs for the handicapped and possibly occupational education, the respondents were almost unanimously in favor of the programs. Over 90 percent of the respondents gave positive replies concerning their beliefs about these programs. Family living classes received the highest percentage of favorable replies (98 percent). Ninety-four percent of the respondents marked positive items for coeducational courses, with programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged and specialized semester
classes following closely with 93 percent positive responses.

Table 14. Positive and Negative Beliefs of 160 Respondents about Trends in Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trends - Programs for</th>
<th>Positive Replies</th>
<th>Negative Replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>68.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>92.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Education</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>85.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeducational Classes</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>94.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Semester Courses</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>92.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Life Courses</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>98.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents indicated less favorable beliefs related to occupational education. Eighty-five percent of the respondents marked positive items for this trend. Programs for the handicapped received the smallest percentage of positive replies with only 68 percent of the respondents indicating belief in home economics education involvement in these programs.

Information concerning the respondents specific beliefs for each of the trends is found in Table 15.

Again for every trend except programs for the handicapped, at least 70 percent of the respondents expressed the belief that the trends were either "very important now" or "moderately important now." The greatest percentage marked the first item of "very
Table 15. Beliefs of 160 Respondents Concerning the Six Trends in Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs</th>
<th>Socio-economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>Occupational Education</th>
<th>Coeducational Classes</th>
<th>Specialized Semester Courses</th>
<th>Family Life Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very important now</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.63</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>67.50</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately important now</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important in coming years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considered only after more pressing problems are solved</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home economists do not have time for this</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others are more qualified</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should not be a responsibility of our profession</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
important now."

All of the trends, except programs for the handicapped and occupational education, had fewer than five percent of the respondents marking any negative items. Almost 12 percent of the respondents had some negative feelings about home economics education working in occupational education. Nearly 29 percent of the respondents expressed doubt about home economics education being involved in programs for the handicapped.

**Programs for the Handicapped.** While Table 15 shows that a total of 68 percent of the responses for programs for the handicapped were positive, only about 25 percent of the respondents marked that it was a very important area in which to be involved. Another 25 percent suggested that it was moderately important. At least 28 percent of the replies were negative. "Others are more qualified" was marked by 23 percent of the respondents. An additional 13 percent of the respondents felt that these programs should be "considered only after more pressing problems are solved." Five percent of the replies indicated beliefs that these programs will be important in the coming years.

**Programs for the Socio-economically Disadvantaged.** The trends concerning home economics education programs for socio-economically disadvantaged received at least 92 percent positive
responses, with 68 percent of the respondents indicating the belief that these programs were very important. Fifteen percent of the respondents felt that this trend was moderately important now and another ten percent either said that these programs will be important in the coming years or that they should be considered only after more important problems have been solved.

**Occupational Education.** Negative items were checked by at least 12 percent of the respondents concerning their beliefs about home economics education's responsibility in occupational education. About ten percent said either that others were more qualified to carry out these programs or that this should not be a responsibility of the profession. Interestingly, at least 64 percent of the respondents marked that they believed that these programs were "very important now" and another 11 percent marked "moderately important now."

**Coeducational Classes.** Coeducational classes received the second largest percentage of positive replies, although only approximately 40 percent of the respondents indicated these classes to be very important at the present time. Thirty percent of the respondents suggested that these classes are moderately important and 24 percent believed that they will be important in the coming years or after other more pressing problems have been solved. Just over one percent of the respondents gave negative replies.
Specialized Semester Courses. Replies showed that 43 percent of the respondents believed that programs for specialized semester courses are very important. An additional 24 percent believed that the courses are only moderately important. That these courses will be important in the coming years is believed by 17 percent of the respondents. At least eight percent of the replies indicated the belief that these courses should be considered only after more pressing problems are solved.

Family Life Courses. At least 90 percent of the respondents marked that the programs in family life "are very important now." Another five percent of the respondents believed that these are moderately important and fewer than one percent of the items marked indicated negative feelings about this trend (Table 15).

Willingness of Respondents to Support Trends

The purposes of this section of the questionnaire were to find out how willing Oregon home economics teachers were to support the six trends in this study, what amount of support the respondents would give to these programs, and their reasons for replying negatively. Support in this study was used to mean uphold, sustain, or "back."

Items included within this section were as follows:
To indicate your support of the trends, check only one item for each trend.

1. would like to see it established in my school
2. would support indirectly - (no time and effort)
3. would help make initial plans for class
4. would present and interpret program to others
5. would "go to bat" for this program
6. feel other things are more important
7. don't have enough time
8. don't believe in the program
9. there is no need in community
10. would oppose the program

Respondents marked the one phrase that most closely corresponded with their willingness to support each of the trends.

Items 1-5 were considered to indicate positive replies and were interpreted as a willingness to support the various trends. These items also showed the type and/or degree of support the respondent exhibited.

Items 6-10 were interpreted as negative replies and further indicated the reasons for unwillingness to support the trends.

As a group the respondents gave positive replies in this section of the questionnaire, indicating a general willingness to support innovative programs for six home economics education trends.

At least 70 percent of the respondents indicated a willingness
to support all but one of the trends (Table 16). Fewer of the respondents, or approximately 62 percent, showed a general interest in supporting programs for the handicapped. This appears to be the one trend in this study that respondents would be least likely to support. Family life courses led the trends with 90 percent of the respondents giving positive responses, but the four other trends had from 71 to 79 percent support.

Table 16. Positive and Negative Attitudes of 160 Respondents Concerning Their Willingness to Support Trends in Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trends - Programs for</th>
<th>Positive Replies</th>
<th>Negative Replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>61.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>77.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Education</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>79.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeducational Classes</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>71.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Semester Courses</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>75.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Life Courses</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>90.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data suggest a real willingness on the part of the respondents answering the questionnaire to uphold the new programs.

Table 17 contains the information related to the respondents willingness to support the trends. In addition, it shows the type of support the teachers would exhibit and the specific reasons for
Table 17. Willingness of 160 Respondents to Support the Six Trends in Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels of Support</th>
<th>Programs for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
|                   | Socio-
|                   | economically
|                   | Disadvantaged|
|                   | Occupational|
|                   | Education |
|                   | Coeducational Classes |
|                   | Specialized Semester Courses |
|                   | Family Life Courses |
| No.   | Percent | No.   | Percent | No.   | Percent | No.   | Percent | No.   | Percent | No.   | Percent | No.   | Percent |
|------------------|----------|----------------|----------|----------------|----------|----------------|----------|----------------|----------|----------------|----------|----------|----------------|----------|
| would like to see it established in my school | 24 | 15.00 | 38 | 23.75 | 54 | 33.75 | 59 | 36.88 | 62 | 38.75 | 69 | 43.12 |
| would support it indirectly - (no time and effort) | 38 | 23.76 | 37 | 23.13 | 27 | 16.88 | 8 | 5.00 | 8 | 5.00 | 11 | 6.88 |
| would help make initial plans for class | 20 | 12.50 | 28 | 17.50 | 15 | 9.37 | 24 | 15.00 | 30 | 18.75 | 22 | 13.75 |
| would present and interpret program to others | 7 | 4.37 | 9 | 5.63 | 11 | 6.88 | 13 | 8.12 | 7 | 4.37 | 10 | 6.25 |
| would "go to bat" for this program | 10 | 6.25 | 12 | 7.50 | 20 | 12.50 | 10 | 6.25 | 14 | 8.75 | 32 | 20.00 |
| feel other things are more important | 9 | 5.63 | 5 | 3.12 | 10 | 6.25 | 23 | 14.38 | 16 | 10.00 | 4 | 2.50 |
| don't have enough time | 15 | 9.37 | 6 | 3.75 | 10 | 6.25 | 9 | 5.63 | 9 | 5.63 | 1 | 0.62 |
| don't believe in the program | 1 | 0.62 | 1 | 0.62 | 1 | 0.62 | 2 | 1.25 | 1 | 0.62 | 0 | 0 |
| there is no need in community | 28 | 17.5 | 10 | 6.25 | 3 | 1.88 | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.62 | 0 | 0 |
| would oppose the program | 0 | 0.00 | 1 | 0.62 | 1 | 0.62 | 2 | 1.25 | 1 | 0.62 | 0 | 0 |
unwillingness to support the trends.

The greatest percentage of positive responses for all of the trends, except programs for the handicapped, showed an interest on the part of respondents in having the programs established in their schools. "Indirect support (no time or effort)" received the second largest percentage of positive replies for the trends related to occupational education and the socio-economically disadvantaged. A smaller percentage of respondents showed an interest in making the initial plans for these programs.

For coeducational classes, specialized semester and family life courses, respondents gave willingness to help initiate programs the second highest percentage of positive responses. For these trends, very few respondents marked "would support indirectly," but many more marked "would go to bat for these programs" or "would present and interpret these programs to others."

For each of the trends, as high as 14 and ten percents and as low as one percent of the respondents gave negative replies, believing most often that "other things are more important" or that they did "not have the time" to support the programs. Another group of respondents felt that there was no need for the programs in their communities. This item was marked most often for programs for the handicapped or socio-economically disadvantaged. For each of the trends, one percent or fewer said they would oppose the programs.
Programs for the Handicapped. Of the respondents whose replies were categorized as positive for programs for the handicapped, the greatest percentage (24 percent) indicated that they would offer only indirect support. Another 15 percent said they would like to see such programs established in their schools. Approximately 12 percent of the respondents suggested that they would make initial plans for a program. "Would go to bat for this program" was marked by only six percent of the respondents, while four percent said they would "interpret and present the program to others." Eighteen percent of the respondents said there was no need for these programs in their communities. Over nine percent of the replies suggested that the respondents did not have time to support programs for the handicapped. "Other things" were considered to be more important by six percent. Fewer than one percent said that they didn't believe in the programs.

Programs for the Socio-economically Disadvantaged. Forty-seven percent of the respondents felt that they would like to see programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged established in their schools or that they would indirectly support the programs. A willingness to help initiate these programs was evidenced by 18 percent of respondents marking this item. Approximately 13 percent of the respondents would present and interpret, or would go to bat for these programs. The greatest percentage of negative responses
suggested that there was no need for programs for the socio-
economically disadvantaged in their communities. Two items,
"feel other things are more important" and "don't have enough time"
were marked by six percent of the respondents. Fewer than one
percent would actually oppose these programs.

**Occupational Education.** Approximately 51 percent of the
respondents wanted to see occupational education programs estab-
lished in their schools or would support those programs in an indirect
way. Another 29 percent would be willing to actively support the
program by initiating plans for classes, presenting and interpreting
programs to others, or going to bat for the program. Fewer than
16 percent of the respondents marked negative replies. Of this
group at least 12 percent said that other things were more important
or that they did not have enough time. Fewer than three percent of
the respondents felt that there was no need in the community, that
they did not believe in the trend, or that they would oppose the pro-
gram.

**Coeducational Classes.** While nearly 37 percent of the
respondents would like to see coeducational classes established in
their schools, approximately 70 percent of the respondents replied
negatively saying that other things were more important or that they
did not have enough time. None of the respondents marked that there
was no need in her community, but about three percent of the group
said they did not believe in the program or said that they would oppose coeducational classes. Only six percent of the respondents said they would go to bat for the program. Another eight percent would be willing to interpret and present the programs to others. Willingness to make initial plans for coed classes was indicated by the responses of 15 percent.

**Specialized Semester Courses.** A large number of respondents (38 percent) would like to see specialized semester courses established in their schools. Items 3, 4 and 5 in Table 17 were marked by 32 percent of the respondents, suggesting a willingness for some type of active support. Nearly 16 percent of the replies indicated that the respondents thought that other programs were more important or that they did not have time to be involved with these courses. Fewer than one percent felt that there was no need for these courses in their communities, and an equal percentage of the respondents said they did not believe in this trend or that they would oppose it.

**Family Life Courses.** Just over three percent of the respondents made negative replies relating to willingness to support family living courses saying that they believed other programs to be more important or that they did "not have enough time." At least 20 percent of the respondents would be willing to go to bat for family living courses and another 14 percent said they would be willing to help initiate plans for the classes. Interest in interpreting and
presenting these courses to others was indicated by only six percent of the respondents. Nearly 50 percent of the replies signified that the respondents would like to see the programs established in their schools or would indirectly support the program.

**Willingness of Respondents to Prepare to Work With Trends**

This portion of the questionnaire relating to preparation indicated the general willingness of the respondents to take certain steps to become prepared to work with any or all of the trends, the specific type or types of preparation the respondent would prefer, and the possible reasons for negative feelings.

Items included within this section were as follows:

To indicate your willingness for further preparation in the home economics program, check one or more items.

1. would go to night classes
2. would go to special workshops
3. would go to summer school
4. would prepare on my own
5. would prepare only if given released time
6. am already prepared
7. do not have time for this
8. am more interested in other areas

In this section of the questionnaire multiple responses were permitted. Respondents usually marked one item, but when and if more than one of the items corresponded with their feelings about
their willingness to prepare for involvement in the various trends they marked several.

Items 1-5 were interpreted as positive responses, while items 6-8 were considered to be negative responses.

The positive replies suggested the specific kinds of preparation in which the respondents would be willing to participate. The negative responses were developed to indicate the possible reasons for negative feelings in this area. It is important to note that item 6—"am already prepared"—does not literally connote a negative reply. It does infer a negative response to this section because "already prepared" indicates an unwillingness or lack of interest in further preparation, which is what this section was designed to study.

Because in this section multiple answers were allowed, the information contained in Table 18, _Positive and Negative Attitudes of 160 Respondents Concerning Their Willingness to Prepare for Involvement in the Trend Programs_, relating to general positive and negative replies, the first reply of the respondent was counted as a general indication of the respondent's feelings. Multiple responses that fell into both the positive and negative categories were interpreted as indicative of a positive response when the number of responses in each category was equal. In other cases the category with the greater number of responses marked served as the indicator of the respondents' feelings.
Table 18. Positive and Negative Attitudes of 160 Respondents Concerning their Willingness to Prepare for Involvement in Trends in Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trends - Programs for</th>
<th>Positive Replies</th>
<th></th>
<th>Negative Replies</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>53.75</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>39.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>66.88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Education</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>66.88</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>28.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeducational Classes</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>61.25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Semester Courses</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>65.00</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Life Courses</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18 suggests that respondents would generally be willing to make some effort to prepare themselves to be involved with the six trends.

Positive responses marked in this section showed a willingness on the part of the respondents to expend effort for the trends. This moved the respondents out of the levels of passive involvement, represented in this study by the belief and support sections, and into the realm of active involvement.

Over 50 percent of the respondents gave positive replies for all of the trends in this section, suggesting an inclination toward preparing for involvement in the trends. Family living courses received the greatest percentage of positive responses (75 percent).
Programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged and occupational education each received positive replies from 67 percent of the respondents. Sixty-five percent of the respondents would be willing to prepare for involvement in specialized semester courses, while 61 percent of the respondents said they would prepare to work with coed classes. Just over 50 percent of the replies showed a willingness to prepare for involvement with programs for the handicapped.

The willingness of the respondents to further prepare for involvement in the trends, the kinds of preparation they would most prefer, and the possible reasons for negative feelings about preparation are included in Table 19. The data in this table represents the actual replies of the respondents. It includes all the replies given in this section, including multiple responses.

In this section respondents marked many more positive than negative items, although negative responses represented between 23-39 percent of the replies for the various trends.

For the trends related to programs for the handicapped, the socio-economically disadvantaged and occupational education, the greatest percentage of negative replies indicated that the respondents were more interested in other areas. In contrast, the greatest percentage of respondents who replied negatively for coeducational classes, specialized semester courses, and family living courses indicated that it was because they were already prepared.
Table 19. Willingness of 160 Respondents to Further Prepare Themselves for Involvement in the Six Trends in Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to Prepare Further</th>
<th>Programs for</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Handicapped</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would go to night classes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would go to special workshops</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would go to summer school</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would prepare on my own</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would prepare only if given released time</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am already prepared</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not have time for this</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am more interested in other areas</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents seem to be most interested in receiving their preparation through special workshops (over 30 percent in each trend). Summer school and night classes were the two items checked second most frequently.

Between 14 percent and 19 percent of the responses showed that respondents would be willing to prepare on their own to teach coeducational classes, specialized semester courses, and family life courses, but fewer than five percent of the responses indicated this same willingness for programs for the handicapped, the socio-economically disadvantaged and occupational education. Over nine percent of the replies showed that respondents would prepare for those trends only if they were given extra time.

Programs for the Handicapped. Of the 187 replies in this section, at least 34 percent of the respondents indicated that they were more interested in areas other than programs for the handicapped and were not interested in preparing for involvement in this trend. Approximately eight percent of the respondents said they did not have time to prepare and less than two percent believed themselves to be already prepared for work in this area. The greatest majority of respondents (33 percent) who were willing to prepare were interested in gaining their preparation through special workshops. Another 15 percent of the respondents marked "night classes" and nine percent marked "summer school." Fewer than six percent
of the respondents were willing to prepare on their own and 12 percent indicated that they would prepare only if given extra time.

Programs for the Socio-economically Disadvantaged. Special workshops appeared to be the preferred method of preparation for involvement in programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged, with 40 percent of the respondents marking this item. Willingness to go to night classes and summer school were each indicated by 17 percent of the respondents. Fewer than five percent were interested in preparing on their own. Extra released time would be required by nine percent of the respondents before they would consider preparation in this trend. Sixteen percent of the respondents said they were more interested in working in other areas. Lack of time was given by five percent of the respondents. At least six percent of the replies suggested that the respondents were already prepared for involvement in this trend.

Occupational Education. Nearly nine percent of the respondents felt that they were already prepared to work with occupational education programs. More interest in other areas was indicated by 18 percent of the respondents, with another six percent saying that they did not have time to prepare for this work. Special workshops (41 percent), summer school (23 percent) and night classes (19 percent) were most frequently chosen as the ways the respondents preferred to prepare. Six percent of the respondents would be
willing to prepare on their own and 11 percent would be willing to prepare only if they were given extra time for preparation.

Coeducational Classes. Almost 21 percent of the respondents said they were already prepared to participate in coeducational home economics programs. Lack of time or more interest in other areas was chosen by 16 percent of the respondents. Special workshops were felt to be the preferred method of preparation by 30 percent of the respondents, but 15 percent were willing to go to summer school and 13 percent were interested in night classes. At least 19 percent of the replies showed a willingness on the part of the respondents to prepare on their own.

Specialized Semester Courses. Respondents who were willing to prepare for involvement in specialized semester classes most often marked special workshops (33 percent), summer school (19 percent), and night classes as the way they wished to receive their preparation. Fourteen percent of the respondents indicated a willingness to prepare on their own. Extra time would have to be provided for eight percent of the respondents before they would prepare. A substantially large percentage of the respondents said they were already prepared. Lack of time and interest in other areas accounted for approximately 12 percent of the replies.

Family Life Courses. Respondents seemed to be more willing to prepare for involvement with family life courses than for
involvement in the other trends, indicated by the greater percentage of responses in the positive range.

Thirty-eight percent of the respondents would go to special workshops. Another 43 percent would go to night classes or summer school. A willingness to prepare on their own was indicated by 19 percent of the respondents. Only four percent would demand extra time for preparation. A large percentage (25 percent) of the respondents said they felt that they were already prepared. Less than three percent of the respondents were unwilling to prepare because of lack of time but six percent gave negative replies suggesting that they were more interested in other areas.

**Willingness of Respondents to Teach Trend Programs**

This section was concerned with the respondents' willingness to assume teaching roles in one or more of the six home economics education programs. This section was designed to give an indication of the general willingness of the respondents to assume teaching positions, the circumstances under which the respondents would accept teaching positions, and the possible reasons for respondents with negative feelings.

The following items were included in this section:

To indicate your willingness to teach one or more classes in the six home economics education trends, mark one item.
1. only if no one else would
2. only if someone would help me
3. only as an assistant to someone else
4. only if I could get special preparation
5. if given adequate time to prepare
6. if conditions and setting were conducive to this problem
7. willing to assist program in any capacity needed
8. am already involved
9. don't feel qualified
10. more interested in other areas
11. don't have enough time

Respondents marked only the one phrase that most nearly represented their feelings about their willingness to become involved in teaching in the six trends.

Positive responses were considered to be items 1-8. Negative responses fell within the range of items 9-11. The items in the positive reply category were concerned with the circumstances under which the respondent would teach in a trend program or that the respondent was already involved in this work. The responses interpreted negatively gave some possible reasons for a respondents unwillingness to teach in the trends.

Table 20 shows the general willingness or unwillingness of the respondents to teach in the six trend areas by comparing the number and percentage of positive and negative replies.
Table 20. Positive and Negative Attitudes of 160 Respondents Concerning Their Willingness to be Directly Involved in Teaching in Trends in Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trends - Programs for</th>
<th>Positive Replies</th>
<th>Negative Replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>58.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>80.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Education</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>78.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeducational Classes</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>82.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Semester Courses</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>84.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Life Courses</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>85.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this section, respondents seemed to show the most interest in teaching programs related to family life and specialized semester courses. Eighty-five percent of the respondents gave positive replies to these two trends. A smaller group (83 percent and 81 percent) suggest an interest in involvement with coeducational classes and programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged. Occupational education classes which had a high percentage of respondents willing to support and prepare for involvement in this trend, received 78 percent positive replies. Programs for the handicapped received the fewest positive responses with 58 percent of the respondents indicating interest in teaching in this area.

The information contained within Table 21 represents the willingness of the respondents to be directly involved with teaching
Table 21. Willingness of 160 Respondents to Teach in the Six Trends in Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to Teach</th>
<th>Handicapped</th>
<th>Socio-economically Disadvantaged</th>
<th>Occupational Education</th>
<th>Coeducational Classes</th>
<th>Specialized Semester Courses</th>
<th>Family Life Courses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only if no one else would</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only if someone would help me</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only as an assistant to someone else</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only if I could get special preparation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.88</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if given adequate time to prepare</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if conditions and setting were conducive to this program</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing to assist program in any capacity needed</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am already involved</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't feel qualified</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23.13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more interested in other areas</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.62</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't have enough time</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
activities in the trend areas. The positive items yielded information concerning the circumstances under which the respondents would be disposed to assume teaching responsibilities and also gave information relating to the reasons other respondents marked negative items.

Response to the items in this section were much more equally distributed between all of the items than for any of the three preceding sections.

For programs relating to handicapped, socio-economically disadvantaged and occupational education, the greatest percentage of the respondents marked that they would teach in this area only if given special preparation. The greatest percentage of positive replies for coeducational classes, specialized semester courses and family life courses indicate a willingness of over 19 percent of the respondents to assist the programs in any way possible. For all of the trends the percentage of respondents who marked "only if given adequate time" and "if conditions and setting were conducive to this program" showed a real concern on the part of the respondents for the responsibility involved in accepting teaching positions in the trends. These two items were marked almost twice as often for programs relating to handicapped, socio-economically disadvantaged and occupational education as for the last three trends.

Negative responses varied with each trend, but the replies "I am already involved" or "am more interested in other areas" were
the most common replies for coeducational, specialized semester, and family life courses. "Don't feel qualified" and "more interested in other areas" were the most common replies for trends relating to handicapped, socio-economically disadvantaged and occupational education.

Programs for the Handicapped. The responses for programs for the handicapped were widely distributed among all of the items in the section. Respondents did not seem to generally agree on one or two views as they had in the other sections. The respondents most often indicated a feeling that they were not qualified to do this type of teaching (23 percent) or that they were more interested in other areas (16 percent). Fourteen percent of the respondents showed an interest in teaching the handicapped if they could receive special preparation. If the conditions and setting were conducive to this program, approximately 11 percent would be willing to teach. Replies showed that ten percent of the respondents would teach if given adequate time or if they worked as an assistant to someone else. Seven percent of the respondents suggested a willingness to teach these programs if someone would help them or if no one else would take the responsibility (four percent). About six percent of the respondents said they would assist the program in any capacity needed and another six percent said they were already involved in teaching in this area.
Programs for the Socio-economically Disadvantaged. Replies for programs relating to the socio-economically disadvantaged showed that the greatest percentage of respondents (17 percent) would teach only if given special preparation. "If conditions and setting are conducive to this program," "if given adequate time to prepare," and willing to assist in any capacity" were marked by 15 percent of the respondents. Less than two percent of the respondents would teach classes for the socio-economically disadvantaged only if no one else would and nine percent would participate either as an assistant or with an assistant.

Negative replies most often showed more interest in other areas as the reason for unwillingness to teach in this area. Five percent of the respondents did not feel qualified and eight percent were already involved. Lack of time was marked by fewer than two percent of the respondents.

Occupational Education. Approximately 20 percent of the respondents would teach occupational education only if given special preparation. Another 24 percent (12 percent responding to each item) would teach if given time to prepare and if setting and conditions were conducive. Over 12 percent of the respondents were interested in teaching as an assistant or with the help of someone else. Negative feelings were quite evenly distributed between "interested in other areas" (nine percent), "don't have enough time"
(seven percent), and "don't feel qualified" (six percent). "Already prepared" was marked by six percent of the respondents.

**Coeducational Classes.** The greatest percentage of replies for coeducational classes showed that respondents (23 percent) are willing to assist these classes in any capacity. Another 22 percent would teach coeducational classes if conditions were right. Almost 17 percent of the respondents would teach only if given adequate time to prepare. "Only if given special preparation" or "if no one else would take on the responsibility" were each marked by five percent of the respondents. Just over two percent of the group would teach cooperatively with another person or as an assistant. Most of the negative responses showed that the respondents were more interested in other areas (nine percent) or were already involved (nine percent).

**Specialized Semester Courses.** The greatest percentage of respondents (23 percent) would be willing to assist specialized semester courses in any way possible. At least another 23 percent said they would teach if given adequate time. If conditions and setting were right, 17 percent of the respondents would be interested in teaching. Six percent suggested a willingness to teach only if given special preparation. Just over six percent of the respondents said they would teach if no one else would or in cooperation with someone else. Negative replies most often indicated that the respondents were already working with specialized semester courses (11 percent).
Six percent were more interested in other areas and three percent believed that they did not have enough time. Fewer than one percent of the respondents marked that they did not feel qualified.

**Family Life Courses.** Twenty percent of the replies for family living courses suggested that respondents would be willing to teach if they were given adequate time to prepare. Another 19 percent said they would assist these programs in any capacity needed. "If conditions and setting are conducive" was marked by 14 percent of the respondents. Special preparation would be needed before six percent of the respondents would teach in this area. Three percent of the respondents indicated each of the following as their feelings: "only if no one else would," "only as an assistant to someone else," and "only if someone would help me."

**Willingness of Respondents to Assume Leadership Positions**

The last section of this questionnaire was designed to answer questions related to the respondents' willingness to assume leadership roles for the various home economics education programs.

The items included in this section were as follows:

To indicate willingness to take the lead in establishing home economics education programs, check one item.

1. would help own school district in planning
2. would take over leadership once plans are established
3. would expand and strengthen local programs
4. would initiate local programs
5. am already involved
6. do not have time
7. do not have interest
8. don't want that much responsibility
9. not enough need in my community
10. other groups are already taking care of this
11. don't have enough background

Only the one item that most closely represented the respondents' feelings concerning this level of involvement was marked.

Items 1-5 represented positive replies and specifically showed the type of leadership the respondent would be willing to accept or indicated that the respondents are presently participating in leadership responsibilities for the trends. Items 6-11 were considered negative responses and showed respondents' unwillingness to assume leadership responsibilities.

Respondents generally appeared to be willing to accept leadership roles in the six trends of home economics education.

Table 22 gives information related to the general positive and negative replies given by the respondents.

Of the respondents, 80 percent marked positive items for programs relating to specialized semester classes, which showed that they would be willing to assume some type of leadership responsibilities. Family living courses received 81 percent positive replies and 71 percent of the replies related to coeducational classes indicated
willingness of those respondents to accept leadership responsibilities.

Table 22. Positive and Negative Attitudes of 160 Respondents Concerning Their Willingness to Provide Leadership for Trends in Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trends - Programs for</th>
<th>Positive Replies</th>
<th>Negative Replies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Handicapped</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economically Disadvantaged</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>53.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational Education</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>56.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeducational Classes</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>71.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Semester Courses</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>80.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Life Courses</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>81.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Slightly more than 50 percent of the respondents showed an interest in leading occupational education programs and programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged. Very few of the respondents were interested in leadership positions in programs for the handicapped.

Table 23 gives an indication of the willingness of the respondents to assume leadership responsibilities for the six trends. In this table there is information concerning specific types of leadership roles the respondents might be willing to assume, or the reasons for unwillingness to lead in the six trends.

The respondents gave more positive than negative responses
Table 23. Willingness of 160 Respondents to Provide Leadership for the Six Trends in Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness to Lead</th>
<th>Programs for</th>
<th>Handicapped</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Disadvantaged</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Occupational Education</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Coeducational Classes</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Specialized Semester Courses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Family Life Courses</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>would help own school district in planning</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>13.75</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>28.13</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30.62</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>38.12</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>38.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would take over leadership once plans are established</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would expand and strengthen local programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>16.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would initiate local programs</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am already involved</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.38</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not have time</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not have interest</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.62</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't want that much responsibility</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not enough need in my community</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other groups are already taking care of this</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't have enough background</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.37</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
in this section for all trends except the one related to programs for handicapped students.

The greatest percentage of respondents (between 28-40 percent) suggested their willingness to be involved with local school planning for all but that one trend. They also indicated an interest in expanding and strengthening local programs and in initiating local programs.

Programs relating to handicapped, occupational education, and socio-economically disadvantaged had a substantially large group (14-20 percent) of the respondents saying that they did not feel qualified to work in those trends. Other respondents said that other groups were already taking care of the leadership positions in their communities, while less than six percent showed these concerns in relation to the other three trends.

Over eight percent of the replies for each trend, with the exception of programs for the handicapped which received only four percent, indicated that the respondents are already involved in leadership responsibilities.

Programs for the Handicapped. The greatest number of responses in this section accounted for 20 percent of the respondents and showed that they thought that they did not have enough background to lead in this area. Another 16 percent of the respondents felt that there was not enough need for leadership for these programs in their communities and, that for at least 13 percent of the respondents,
other groups were already taking care of the leadership responsibilities. Fourteen percent of the respondents said they would help with planning in their own school districts. "Do not have enough interest" was marked by 11 percent of the respondents and "don't want that much responsibility" was chosen by another 5 percent of the respondents.

Fewer than four percent of the respondents marked each of the three items indicating unwillingness to take over leadership once plans were begun, to expand and strengthen local programs, or to initiate local programs. Present involvement in leadership roles for these programs was shown by four percent of the respondents.

Programs for the Socio-economically Disadvantaged. Interest in helping with planning in local school districts received the greatest percentage of responses (28 percent). Eight percent of the respondents would expand and strengthen local programs but fewer than nine percent would initiate local programs or take them over once they had begun.

At least 14 percent of the respondents did not feel that they had the background for accepting leadership positions. The items, indicating that there was not enough need in the community and that others are taking over these responsibilities, each received seven percent of the replies.

Negative replies also show that 12 percent of the respondents
did not have the time or the interest or did not care to accept that much responsibility. Over eight percent of the respondents were already involved with leadership programs at this level.

**Occupational Education.** The responses for occupational education followed very closely the responses given for programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged.

The largest group of respondents (30 percent) would help with planning in their own school districts. The next largest group said they were not interested in leadership positions because they did not have the background. Unwillingness to lead was attributed to lack of need for the program in their community by less than three percent of the respondents.

**Coeducational Classes.** Nearly 38 percent of the respondents would be willing to assist with local district planning of coeducational courses. Increased willingness to assume leadership responsibilities in this area was shown by another 13 percent who indicated an interest in initiating local school programs. The percentage of respondents willing to take over programs once the plans have been established or to strengthen and expand local programs was nearly the same (13 percent).

Fewer than four percent of the respondents felt that they did not have enough background for leadership responsibilities for coeducational classes and an additional four percent said that there
was not enough need in their communities or that other groups were already taking care of leadership for these programs. "Do not have time" and "do not have enough interest" was marked by 13 percent of the respondents, but less than three percent said that they did not want that much responsibility. Approximately eight percent of the respondents were presently participating in leadership positions for coeducational classes.

**Specialized Semester Courses.** While 40 percent of the respondents stated a willingness to help with local planning for specialized semester courses, at least another 31 percent of the respondents evidenced a willingness to be involved in other types of leadership responsibilities and nine percent said that they were already involved.

Negative replies accounted for a small proportion of the total group and were distributed among each of the following items: "do not have time" and "do not have interest," each receiving four percent of the replies. Fewer than four percent of the respondents indicated concern about the program being too much responsibility for them, there not being enough need for the program in their community, their not having enough background, and other groups are already taking care of this.

**Family Life Courses.** Present involvement in leadership responsibilities in family living courses was marked by 13 percent
of the respondents. An additional 68 percent marked one of the other positive items that indicated a willingness to lead. The largest percentage of replies fell into the categories of local planning (39 percent) and expanding and strengthening local programs (17 percent).

Responses indicated that for six percent of the respondents, disinterest in assuming leadership responsibilities was due to the fact that they saw no need in their community. Lack of proper background was marked as a reason for negative feelings by four percent of the respondents. Only three percent said that they did not have time for leading these programs and less than one percent marked "do not have interest" or "do not want that much responsibility."

Relationship of Respondents' Answers Concerning Their Beliefs and Their Willingness to Support, Prepare, Teach and Lead

The purpose of this section is to compare the replies given in each of the five sections of the questionnaire; beliefs, willingness to support, willingness to further prepare, willingness to teach, and willingness to lead.

Data for this comparison is contained in Tables 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22 and 23. These data relate to the respondents' feelings about programs for the handicapped, the socio-economically disadvantaged, occupational education, coeducational classes, specialized semester courses and family life courses.
Beliefs. Respondents in every instance gave the greatest percentage of positive replies in the section related to beliefs. For all of the trends, over 50 percent of the respondents felt those programs to be very important or moderately important. At least 68 percent of the respondents gave indications that they believed in the six trends studied. With the exception of programs for the handicapped (68 percent positive replies) and occupational education (86 percent positive replies), over 90 percent of the respondents indicated belief in the value of the trends studied.

Using the number of positive replies as a measure of the strength of belief in the trends, the following list was developed. The list begins with the trend which the respondents seemed to have the most strongly positive feelings about and ends with the trend receiving the fewest positive replies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Economics Education Programs</th>
<th>Percent Positive Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Family life courses</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Coeducational classes</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The socio-economically disadvantaged</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Specialized semester courses</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Occupational education</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The handicapped</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to note that the list gives only a general picture of the respondents positive or negative feelings. It does not give any indication of the breakdown within each trend on the strength of
the beliefs marked.

Willingness to Support. Respondents gave slightly fewer positive responses in answering questions concerning their willingness to support the six trends than they gave in the beliefs section. This was interpreted to mean that fewer respondents would be willing to support the programs than would merely believe in the programs. This was expected because support involves a stronger commitment than does general belief in a program.

Although for every trend, fewer respondents made positive replies in this section than in the preceding section, loss of the number of positive items marked (or loss of the number of respondents willing to participate at this level of involvement) varied for each trend.

The order of the trends changes for the support section. The list of trends, in the order suggested by the number of respondents who would support the programs, were as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Economics Education Programs</th>
<th>Percent Positive Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Family life courses</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Occupational education</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The socio-economically disadvantaged</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Specialized semester courses</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coeducational classes</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The handicapped</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Family living classes received the largest percentage of positive items marked but has eight percent fewer respondents supporting the programs than believed in them.

Occupational education, which was one of the trends receiving the fewest number of positive replies in the beliefs section, had only about seven percent fewer positive replies for the support section and carries the second highest percentage of respondents who would be willing to support this program.

Specialized semester courses and programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged generally fell at the same position for the rankings listed for beliefs and for support. They did however lose respectively 16 percent and 17 percent of respondents making positive replies in the beliefs section.

Although receiving a high percentage of positive responses concerning the respondents' beliefs, coeducational classes lost 23 percent of its proponents in the support section and became second to the last in the ranking given for support.

Programs for the handicapped remained in the last position on the list, but there was only a difference of six percent positive replies between the respondents who made favorable replies in the support section and those who made favorable replies in the beliefs section. In contrast, there was an eight to 23 percent drop from the beliefs to the support section for the other trends.
For most of the trends, there were more respondents interested in indirect support or in seeing the program established in their schools, than there were respondents interested in direct support of the programs such as going to bat for the programs or presenting and interpreting the programs.

**Willingness to Prepare.** The preparation section revealed an even greater difference between the percentage of respondents who marked positive items in this section on preparation and the preceding two sections related to beliefs and support.

Preparing to be involved in these programs requires active participation on the part of the individual. At this point a respondent, if she is answering realistically, would have had to begin making some decisions concerning the areas in which she might be most interested and willing to work.

Ranking for this section was again based on the percentage of positive replies, which was interpreted as the degree of interest or willingness to prepare for involvement in the trends. The result was the following list.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Economics Education Programs</th>
<th>Percent Positive Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Family life courses</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Occupational education</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The socio-economically disadvantaged</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Specialized semester courses</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Coeducational classes</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. The handicapped

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent Positive Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The greatest percentage of respondents seemed to be most willing to prepare for involvement in family life programs. Another 25 percent marked that they were already prepared in this area.

Occupational education remains high in the ranking with 67 percent of the respondents indicating a willingness to prepare for work with these programs. Fewer than ten percent of the respondents indicated being presently prepared.

Specialized semester classes and programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged remained in the same position on this list as on the support ranking. Fewer than seven percent of the respondents were prepared to work with the socio-economically disadvantaged but at least 23 percent were ready for involvement with specialized semester courses.

Programs for coeducational classes ranked low in the total number of positive replies but over 21 percent of the respondents said they were already prepared and were therefore counted as negative responses.

Programs for the handicapped remained in the last position on the rankings but well over a majority of replies were positive. Fewer than two percent of the respondents marked that they were already prepared to work in this area.
Willingness to Teach. Willingness on the part of the respondents to be involved in actual teaching responsibilities was more likely than willingness to prepare to work with the trends and less likely than willingness to support the various trends.

For most trends, with the exception of family life courses, there was only a slight difference between the response to the preparation section and to this section, but more teachers appear willing to teach than to obtain further preparation for involvement in the trends. In every instance however, more than 50 percent of the respondents indicated an interest in teaching in the six trends.

Listed in order of general willingness of the respondents to teach in the programs, the six trends are ranked as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Home Economics Education Programs</th>
<th>Percent Positive Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Family life courses</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Specialized semester courses</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coeducational classes</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The socio-economically disadvantaged</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Occupational education</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The handicapped</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At this level of involvement responses showed that there was really very little difference between each trend in the amount of willingness the respondents showed for teaching responsibilities.

The respondents seemed to exhibit a fairly equal interest in teaching each of the trends, except programs for the handicapped,
with fewer than eight percent positive responses separating any two trends.

**Willingness to Lead.** Willingness to assume leadership responsibilities for the six trends followed two major paths. Programs related to the handicapped, the socio-economically disadvantaged, and occupational education lose from 21 to 30 percent of the positive responses marked in the willingness to teach section. Coeducational classes, specialized semester courses, and family life courses lost only from four to 11 percent of the favorable responses given in the previous section.

The ranking for the positive replies in the leadership section for the six trends was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Percent Positive Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Family life courses</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Specialized semester courses</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Coeducational classes</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Occupational education</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The socio-economically disadvantaged</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The handicapped</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Replies that the respondents would be willing to lead programs for the handicapped dropped to only 28 percent. Programs for occupational education and socio-economically disadvantaged declined a little less spectacularly to 57 and 53 percent favorable responses. The negative replies from the respondents suggest three major
reasons for negative feelings about these three areas: not enough need in their community, other groups are already taking care of this, and the respondents do not feel that they have enough background.

Although the percentage of positive replies concerning leadership responsibilities for coeducational classes, specialized semester courses, and family life courses decreased from between four to 11 percent under the positive responses given for willingness to teach, the percentage of positive responses were still high. Respondents seemed willing to accept leadership positions for these three trends, but most of them were interested in either planning, or extending and strengthening local programs.

Acceptance of Trends

Programs for the Handicapped. Programs for the handicapped appear to be the least well accepted of the six trends in home economics education. It is important to note that even at the belief level only 68 percent of the respondents indicated a belief in the importance of teachers in home economics being involved in educational programs for handicapped persons. The 62 percent who were willing to support these programs, either wanted to see them established in their schools or were willing to support the program indirectly. Such support would not entail giving time and/or effort. Those who would not support the program most often said that there
was no need in their communities. The responses also showed that the respondents did not have time, that there was no need in their communities, or that other things were more important.

In the section relating to preparation, 39 percent of the respondents were unwilling to make further preparation while 34 percent stated that they were more interested in other areas.

The largest percentage of respondents said that they did not feel qualified to teach in this area and 68 percent of the respondents were unwilling to assume leadership responsibilities because they felt that they lacked the background, that there was no need in their community, or that other groups were already taking care of this.

Although respondents seemed more cautious about and less willing to be involved with programs for the handicapped, over 50 percent of the respondents indicated that they believed in and were willing to support, prepare for, and teach. On the other hand, only 28 percent said they would assume leadership roles.

Programs for the Socio-economically Disadvantaged.

Respondents seemed generally to favor programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged. Responses in every section indicated that feelings about this trend fell between the extreme feelings related to handicapped and family life courses. Over 65 percent of the respondents said that they believed in and would support, prepare, teach and lead these programs.
Fewer respondents indicated positive beliefs about this program than for four of the six trends, but 68 percent of the respondents marked "very important now." A total of 83 percent of the replies were positive. This indicated that respondents had strong feelings about this program even though the total percentage of positive replies may be less than for other trends.

The reason most often marked by the respondents for unwillingness to support programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged was that there was no need for the program in the respondents' communities. But, on the other hand, most of the respondents would either like to see a program established in their schools or would support it indirectly.

The respondents who were not interested in further preparing for involvement in this area said they were more interested in other areas. The data was not set up on the computer to discover whether respondents who so answered their questionnaire marked other programs more positively.

The greatest percentage of respondents indicated they would teach in this area only if they could get special preparation, but would be willing to be involved in leadership roles in local planning.

**Occupational Education.** While fewer of the respondents seemed to believe in occupational education than in the other trends, respondents indicated a stronger willingness to support and prepare
for these programs than for most of the others. More respondents stated that they would go to bat for this program than for any other program except family living courses, although most respondents were interested only in the more indirect forms of support. The greatest percentage of those unwilling to prepare themselves further for work in this area gave such reasons as "already prepared."

Interest in teaching this area fell behind four of the other trends. Of the respondents who were willing to teach, the greatest percentage stipulated that they would teach only with special preparation. The respondents who were unwilling to lead most often marked that they did not have the proper background.

Coeducational Classes. Respondents appear to be very interested in this area. A great percentage of respondents indicated general positive belief about these programs, but the replies were almost equally divided between "very important now" and "moderately important now." Another 14 percent said that coeducational classes should be begun only after other more pressing problems are solved. Respondents did not have the strong positive feelings about this trend that they seemed to have about certain others.

Willingness of respondents to support and prepare for involvement with coeducational classes fell behind the other trends. More respondents marked that other things were more important for this trend than for any other trend.
In the preparation section, respondents indicated greater willingness to prepare on their own for coeducational classes than for any other trend except family life courses. The negative replies most often showed that the respondents were already prepared.

Interest in teaching and leading programs for coeducational classes rose with at least 23 percent of the respondents willing to help assist the programs in any capacity needed.

**Specialized Semester Courses.** Specialized semester courses and family life courses appear to be the trends in which the respondents are most willing to teach and lead.

Indications of the respondents' willingness to support and prepare for these programs fell slightly behind the other areas. Twenty-three percent of the respondents said they were already prepared to work in this trend.

Respondents seemed generally to believe in this program but the replies did not show strong beliefs. Approximately 17 percent stated that it would be important in the future rather than indicating a belief in the importance of the program at the present time.

**Family Life Courses.** This trend is obviously the program that interested the greatest percentage of the respondents and the trend that they are most likely to have positive feelings about. Over 90 percent believed that family life courses are very important.

Family life courses was also the trend with which the
respondents were most willing to become involved. Positive replies never fell below the level of 75 percent of the responses. This lowest percentage of positive replies occurred in the preparation section where another 25 percent of the respondents said they were already prepared. Nineteen percent of the respondents said they would prepare on their own for these programs.

In the section on support, over 20 percent of the respondents were willing to go to bat for these programs, which is the highest number of positive replies this item received for any of the six trends.

The respondents who were willing to teach family living courses most often said they would require adequate time to prepare or would assist the program in any capacity needed.
IV. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to answer the following questions concerning Oregon home economics teachers' beliefs about and their willingness to be involved with certain trends in home economics education:

1. What are the beliefs and attitudes that Oregon home economics teachers hold about various new trends?
2. Are Oregon home economics teachers willing to support the various new trends?
3. Are Oregon home economics teachers willing to further prepare themselves to work with the trends?
4. Are Oregon home economics teachers willing to accept teaching responsibilities for the new trends?
5. Are Oregon home economics teachers willing to assume leadership responsibilities for the trends?

Six trends were included in the study. They were related to programs for

1. The handicapped
2. The socio-economically disadvantaged
3. Occupational education
4. Coeducational classes
5. Specialized semester courses
6. Family life courses
A questionnaire was constructed, validated, and sent to 394 home economics teachers in the State of Oregon to gain answers to the five questions as they related to the six trends. Of the questionnaires mailed out, 241 were returned and 160 or 41 percent were used.

First the personal and professional history of the respondents was analyzed to show who participated in the study. Then the beliefs of the respondents were analyzed. Finally, the willingness of the respondents to support, to prepare further for teaching, to teach in, and to assume leadership roles for developing one or more of the six home economics trends was analyzed. Data reported can only be considered valid for these 160 respondents at the time of their responses.

Respondents' Personal and Professional History

The ages of the respondents were nearly equally distributed among all of the age ranges. Twenty-four percent of the respondents were 40-49 years of age and two-fifths were 20-29 years of age. Nearly one half of the respondents were 40 years of age or older.

Approximately two thirds of the respondents were married. Only one fourth of the respondents were single.

Nearly two fifths of the respondents graduated from college since 1960. Seventy percent received their bachelor's degrees since 1940. Fewer than 15 percent of the respondents had master's degrees and almost 80 percent of this group received their graduate
degrees since 1960. Slightly more than one half of the respondents graduated from Oregon State University.

In the last five years, approximately one half of the respondents had taken from 1-42 quarter hours beyond their last degree with from 1-12 hours relating to home economics.

Well over one half of the respondents were members of one to three professional organizations.

At least one half of the respondents had had six or fewer years teaching experience. Over one half of the respondents had had some experience teaching other subject matter areas concurrently with their home economics assignments. Fewer than one fourth had experience in teaching other subject matter areas exclusively.

Nearly two thirds of the respondents taught at the senior high school level. Schools with enrollments of fewer than 1,000 students accounted for well over half of the respondents' teaching positions.

Enrollment of girls in the home economics classes in the schools where the respondents taught most commonly fell into the 60-139 and the 230-300 and over ranges. At least one half of the respondents did not indicate that boys were a part of their programs, while twenty-six percent said they had fewer than nine boys in their classes.
Beliefs of Respondents

The respondents showed quite positive beliefs concerning each of the six trends studied. For every trend, except programs for the handicapped, at least 70 percent of the respondents said that the home economics programs were either very important or moderately important. Fewer than five percent of the respondents had any negative feelings about any of the trends, excepting those related to programs for the handicapped and occupational education.

Almost 30 percent of the respondents did not believe that home economics education should be concerned with programs for the handicapped. The reason most often given for this feeling was that they felt that other groups were more qualified. Nearly 12 percent of the respondents had negative feelings about occupation education. This group believed that other groups were more qualified and that this type of education should not be the responsibility of the profession.

Willingness of Respondents to Support Trends

The respondents indicated a general willingness to support the various trends. At least three fourths of the respondents were willing to support every trend except programs for the handicapped and coeducational classes. Slightly less than three fourths would be willing to support coeducational classes and almost two thirds would
support programs for the handicapped. Family living courses received positive replies from 90 percent of the respondents.

The greatest percentage of the replies suggesting a willingness of the respondents to support programs for the handicapped, the socio-economically disadvantaged, and occupational education showed that they were interested either in seeing the programs established at their school and that they would support them indirectly.

Positive replies for coeducational classes, specialized semester courses, and family life courses most often indicated that the respondents wished to see the programs established in their schools, would help make initial plans or would "go to bat" for these programs.

Negative replies most often showed that the respondents believed that other programs were more important or that they did not have the time to support the trend. Almost one fifth of respondents felt that there was no need for the programs for the handicapped in their communities.

Willingness of Respondents to Further Prepare for Involvement With the Trends

Over one half of the respondents suggested that they would be willing to further prepare themselves for involvement in the six trends. Respondents were most willing to prepare for involvement
in the programs related to family living courses, socio-economically disadvantaged, and occupational education. Slightly fewer of the respondents said they would prepare for (listed in order of acceptance) specialized semester classes, coeducational classes and programs for the handicapped.

Respondents indicated that they were most interested in receiving their preparation through workshops. Summer school and night classes followed in popularity.

Between 14 and 19 percent of the respondents said they would be willing to prepare to teach coeducational, specialized semester and family living courses on their own. Fewer than six percent of the respondents showed this same willingness for programs for the handicapped, the socio-economically disadvantaged, and occupational education. Over nine percent said they would prepare for these last three trends only if they were given extra time.

Negative replies accounted for between 23 and 39 percent of the respondents replies in this section. The greatest percentage of negative replies for programs related to the handicapped, the socio-economically disadvantaged, and occupational education indicated that the respondents were more interested in other areas. Negative replies concerning further preparation for coeducational, specialized semester, and family living courses usually showed that the respondents were already prepared.
Willingness of Respondents to Accept Teaching Responsibilities in the Trends

Respondents seemed most interested in or willing to teach family life courses, specialized semester courses, coeducational classes and programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged. These trends received positive replies from over 80 percent of the respondents. A slightly smaller percentage of respondents were interested in teaching occupation education and just over one half of the respondents indicated a willingness to teach the handicapped.

The greatest percentage of positive replies for coeducational classes, specialized semester courses, and family life courses indicated that respondents would assist these programs in any way possible, but many respondents stipulated that they would require adequate time to prepare or would require that conditions and setting be conducive to these programs.

For programs dealing with the handicapped, the socio-economically disadvantaged, and occupational education the respondents most often said they would be willing to teach these only if they were given special preparation.

Negative replies most often showed that the respondents were already involved with the programs or were more interested in other areas. Respondents, however, most often marked that they did not feel qualified to teach the handicapped as the reason for negative
feelings about teaching this area.

Willingness of Respondents to Accept Leadership Positions in the Trends

Respondents appeared to be generally willing to assume leadership responsibilities related to the trends. At least 70 percent of the respondents would accept leadership roles for specialized semester courses, family living courses, and coeducational classes.

Slightly fewer than one half of the respondents would assume leadership roles for occupational education and programs for the socio-economically disadvantaged. Fewer than one fourth of the respondents gave positive replies concerning their willingness to lead programs for the handicapped.

The greatest percentage of respondents suggested a willingness to be involved with local school planning. Respondents were also somewhat interested in initiating local school programs and in expanding and strengthening local programs.

Negative replies for programs for the handicapped, the socio-economically disadvantaged, and occupational education showed that 15-20 percent of the respondents did not think that they had the background to lead. A smaller percentage of the respondents said that other groups were already taking care of these functions in their communities.
Negative replies for coeducational classes, specialized semester courses and family living courses most often indicated that the respondents did not have the time or the interest for assuming the leadership for these types of home economics education programs.
Conclusions

The replies of 160 respondents seemed to imply that

1. A majority of the respondents held favorable attitudes about all of the six trends. For most trends this was a large majority. The respondents held positive attitudes about these programs and seemed very willing as a group to accept these trends in home economics education.

2. In general, the six trends seemed to divide themselves into two separate groups in relation to their acceptance. Programs for the handicapped, the socio-economically disadvantaged and occupational education followed similar patterns of acceptance and of respondents' willingness to be involved with these areas. In this same manner, coeducational classes, specialized semester courses and family living courses received similar patterns of acceptance from the respondents. The last three trends seemed to be generally more popular and more likely to be accepted than the first three trends.

3. Although in the questionnaire, the six trends in home economics were not organized with any preconceived pattern of acceptance, the results of the study showed that the various trends were accepted by the respondents in the
order in which they were presented. The first trend, programs for the handicapped, was the area least well accepted by the respondents. Acceptance increased for each of the trends as they appeared on the questionnaire. The last trend, family living courses, was the most well accepted of all of the trends.

4. The results of this study show, that for all of the trends, the general pattern was for more respondents to believe in the trends than to show a willingness to be actively involved in the programs. This pattern of less positive acceptance appeared for the two sections of the study related to support of and preparation for the trends. This pattern changed at the teaching and leading section for most of the trends where positive responses increased slightly over the preceding sections. What this means is not known. It does show, that in some cases, the respondents were more interested in teaching and/or leading than in preparing for involvement in a particular trend. This may however have been only a result of the fact that replies of respondents who were already prepared to teach in the trends, were considered negative rather than positive.

5. Respondents were neither unanimously in favor of every trend, nor willing to take on any and all responsibility
related to every one of the six trends. It is important that every new innovation be thoroughly considered before it is embraced by the profession. This thorough consideration requires proponents and opponents of these programs to give a more complete picture of the program and its possible implications. It is also important to remember that each respondent has only a limited amount of time at her disposal. Realistically a respondent could not be actively involved in every trend or innovation. Each respondent must make some decisions concerning the amount of involvement she will assume for new programs.

6. Many respondents indicated that they would require special provisions (i.e., adequate time, special preparation) before they would assume responsibility for these trends. This showed that the respondents seemed to realize the importance of these programs and recognized the time, preparation, facilities etc. that they needed to make the programs successful.
Recommendations

This investigation shows that the respondents have generally very positive attitudes about the six trends which were studied and are willing to be involved with these programs. However, they need assistance from the State Department of Education and the university staff in the following areas:

1. In-service training for preparing these teachers. Many of the respondents said that they would teach only if they could receive special preparation.

2. Workshops should be the method used for in-service training whenever possible because respondents most often marked it as the method by which they would prefer to prepare for involvement with the new programs in home economics. Conferences and short session courses were not included in the questionnaire but might also be acceptable because they are or can be similar to workshops.

3. Introduce Oregon home economics teachers to all of the new trends and keep them informed about the latest innovations and changes in the profession. The lack of response to the questions relating to interdisciplinary courses indicates that very few of the teachers were familiar with some of the newest programs in home economics education.
4. Provide education in the immediate future to prepare teachers to work with the handicapped and the socio-economically disadvantaged. These were the trends that the respondents seemed most hesitant about, and the trends for which they said they would require special preparation. It is a recognized fact that home economics teachers need special preparation for more than an exploratory course in occupational education.

It is also recommended that teachers who are really interested in working with new aspects of home economics be given adequate time to prepare themselves and extra time to develop or direct these programs. They should not be expected to carry these responsibilities in addition to a regular full teaching load.

It is recommended that further study be undertaken to expand and test the results of this study. The following suggestions for further study are

A. An extensive indepth study of teachers' attitudes towards each of the six trends.

B. An indepth study dealing with specifics in interdisciplinary courses.

C. A comprehensive study on consumer education, one of the newest trends in home economics education because of the 1968 amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963.
D. A comprehensive study concerning the acceptance of change and new trends in general, rather than acceptance of a certain group of trends.

E. A study designed to test the relationship of home economics teachers' personal history (age, educational background, teaching experience) to their attitudes about change and new trends.

F. A study that includes personal interviews with a representative sample of home economics teachers to help gain an understanding of the beliefs and attitudes of home economics teachers.
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APPENDIX
INSTRUCTIONS: This study has been divided into five sections to allow you to differentiate your beliefs and willingness to be involved in each of the seven trend areas. Please check the statement(s) in each section that most closely corresponds with your feelings about and willingness to be involved with the trend areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beliefs and Levels of Involvement (relating to your present community)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YOUR BELIEFS (feelings, attitudes) Check only one item for each trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>very important now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderately important now</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important in coming years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>considered only after more pressing problems are solved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home economists do not have time for this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>others are more qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>should not be a responsibility of our profession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR SUPPORT (uphold, sustain, advocate) Check only one item for each trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would like to see it established in my school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would support indirectly - (no time and effort)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would help make initial plans for class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would present and interpret program to others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would &quot;go to bat&quot; for this program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feel other things are more important</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't have enough time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't believe in the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there is no need in community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would oppose the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR FURTHER PREPARATION Check one or more items for each trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would go to night classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would go to special workshops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would go to summer school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would prepare on my own</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would prepare only if given released time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am already prepared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not have time for this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am more interested in other areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR WILLINGNESS TO TEACH Check only one item for each trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only if no one else would</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only if someone would help me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only as an assistant to someone else</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>only if I could get special preparation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if given adequate time to prepare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if conditions and setting were conducive to this program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>willing to assist program in any capacity needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't feel qualified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more interested in other areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't have enough time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am already involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YOUR WILLINGNESS TO LEAD Check only one item for each trend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would help own school district in planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would take over leadership once plans are established</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would expand and strengthen local programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>would initiate local programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not have time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>do not have interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't want that much responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>am already involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not enough need in my community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other groups are already taking care of this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>don't have enough background</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRENDS - program for...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economically Dependent Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook Classes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialized Courses in Contemporary Consumer Living</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Living Courses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dear Home Economics Teacher:

Home economics education appears to be at a crossroad today. The direction our profession takes now will affect the future education of millions of Americans. Somehow we each must be responsible for analyzing the new trends and establishing our own beliefs which will help determine the future direction of our profession.

As a basis of a thesis for a Master of Science Degree in Home Economics Education, under the direction of Dr. May DuBois, I am interested in studying:

1) the beliefs Oregon home economics teachers hold about certain new trends,
2) the willingness of Oregon home economics teachers to be involved with certain aspects of these programs.

Therefore I am asking your cooperation in completing the enclosed questionnaire.

To assure you that your answers will be anonymous, we are asking for no identification. Remember that just as home economics educators cannot accept responsibility for every worthy educational project, you as an individual will not be interested in, nor could you realistically be involved in every trend area mentioned.

The success of the study depends on your cooperation. Your help is earnestly sought. Please return the questionnaire in the enclosed stamped envelope within two weeks. Thank you very much.

Sincerely,

Capri Alexander
2662 Tyler
Corvallis, Oregon 97330

PERSONAL PROFESSIONAL HISTORY

Age:

- 20-24
- 25-29
- 30-34
- 35-39
- 40-49
- 50 and over

Marital Status:

- Single
- Married
- Widowed
- Divorced
- Separated

Educational History:

- OSU
- Another Institution
- Bachelor's Degree

- OSU
- Another Institution
- Master's Degree

- Quarter hours beyond last degree.
- Quarter hours taken in home economics in last five years.

Professional Organizations Membership:

- NEA
- AHEA
- OEA
- OVA
- ASCD
- OSCD
- Others

Professional Organization Leadership Positions and/or Committee Participation (Last five years)

Teaching Experience:

- Total years teaching experience
- Years teaching only home economics classes.
- Years teaching home economics and one or more subject matter areas concurrently,
- Years teaching only subject matter areas other than home economics (circle the levels that apply: elementary, secondary, college)

Level of Present School Position:

- Junior High School
- High School
- Both

Current Enrollment of School in Which You Teach:

- under 500
- 500-999
- 1,000-1,500
- over 1,500

Home Economics Class Enrollment for School: (Estimate)

- Total number of girls,
- Total number of boys,

(over)