

South Dakota State University

Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

1983

The Subject Matter and Content Emphases of Secondary Home Economics Programs in South Dakota

Darlys Olson Zaske

Follow this and additional works at: <https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Zaske, Darlys Olson, "The Subject Matter and Content Emphases of Secondary Home Economics Programs in South Dakota" (1983). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 4393.
<https://openprairie.sdstate.edu/etd/4393>

This Thesis - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Open PRAIRIE: Open Public Research Access Institutional Repository and Information Exchange. For more information, please contact michael.biondo@sdstate.edu.

THE SUBJECT MATTER AND CONTENT EMPHASES
OF SECONDARY HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS
IN SOUTH DAKOTA

BY
DARLYS OLSON ZASKE

A thesis submitted
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
degree Master of Science
Major in Home Economics
South Dakota State University

1983

THE SUBJECT MATTER AND CONTENT EMPHASES
OF SECONDARY HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS
IN SOUTH DAKOTA

This thesis is approved as a creditable and independent investigation by a candidate for the degree, Master of Science, and is acceptable for meeting the thesis requirements for this degree. Acceptance of this thesis does not imply that the conclusions reached by the candidate are necessarily the conclusions of the major department.

Edna Page Anderson
Professor and Head
Home Economics Education
Thesis Advisor

Date

Ardyce Gilbert, Dean
College of Home Economics

Date

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer expresses her sincere appreciation to her advisor, Dr. Edna Page Anderson, for encouragement and guidance throughout her graduate program. Special thanks are also extended to Dr. Lee Tucker for his interest and contributions to the study.

To all the teachers whose cooperation made this study possible, a grateful thank you.

A special thank you is extended to the writer's husband, Curtis Zaske, for his understanding and support.

DOZ

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	iii
LIST OF TABLES.	vi
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
ABSTRACT.	viii
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose	5
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.	7
Documenting Program Activities.	8
Legislative Influences on Documenting	10
The NIE Studies	12
Responsiveness Study.	13
Effectiveness Study	15
Projections Study	15
The National Census Study	16
Other Documentation	19
III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	26
Description of Sample	26
Development and Selection of Instruments.	27
Procedures.	32
IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA	34
Descriptive Information on Subjects	34
Teacher Experience.	37

Chapter	Page
Class Enrollments	38
Personal Preference of Teaching Subject	41
Professional Involvement.	42
Subject Matter Emphasis in Home Economics	44
Content or Pervasive Themes in Home Economics	46
Testing the Hypotheses.	47
Multiple Regression	58
Summary	59
V. SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS.	61
Discussion of the Findings.	61
LIST OF REFERENCES.	65
APPENDIXES	
A. Letter of Transmittal	68
B. Curriculum Orientation Survey	69
C. Demographic Data Sheet.	73
D. Subject Matter Emphasis Subscales	74
E. Content Emphasis Subscales.	75

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number and Percent of Responses on Demographic Characteristics by Population Subgroup.	35
2. Means and Standard Deviation for Number of Boys, Total Class Enrollment, and Professional Involvement for Total Sample and by Population Subgroup.	40
3. Mean Scores and Standard Deviation for COS Subject Matter Emphases Subscales	45
4. Mean Scores and Standard Deviation for COS Content Emphases Subscales.	47
5. Correlation Coefficients and Probability of R for Subject Area and Content by Experience, Professional Involvement, Number of Boys, and Class Enrollment.	49
6. Analysis of Variance, F Values, and Probability of F for Content and Subject Matter Emphases Scores and Independent Variables.	50
7. Mean Scores and Standard Deviation for Subject Matter Emphases Subscales by Population Subgroup.	53
8. Mean Scores and Standard Deviation for Content Emphases Subscales by Population Subgroup	54
9. Correlation Coefficients for Content by Subject Matter.	57

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
1. Table of Specifications for the Curriculum Orientation Survey.	29

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to describe secondary home economics programs in South Dakota. Specifically, it was designed to identify subjects being taught and pervasive themes running throughout the subjects of home economics programs. A secondary objective was to investigate the relationship between curricular emphases and certain characteristics of the school and teacher. Variables studied were 1) teaching experience, 2) class enrollments, 3) school size, 4) personal preference of teaching subject, and 5) professional interaction.

To determine the curriculum emphases of the teachers, the Curriculum Orientation Survey (COS), developed by Hall, was used to measure the extent to which selected home economics teaching objectives were included in the curricula. The instrument measures two different areas of emphasis: subject matter and content. Subject matter emphasis subscales included Human Development and the Family, Home Management and Family Economics, Foods and Nutrition, Textiles and Clothing, and Housing. Content emphasis subscales included Information and three process subscales which measured the integration of the unifying concepts of Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships, Management, and Values. Background information on the subjects for descriptive and statistical operation was obtained via a Demographic Data Sheet developed by this researcher.

Data from the Curriculum Orientation Survey showed that teachers are including a variety of home economics subject matter areas in their curriculums. Foods and Nutrition received the most emphasis; Housing

received the least emphasis. The most persistent theme running through all the subject matter areas was Information followed by Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships. Values received the least emphasis. Subject matter taught was shown to have a significant relationship to the content theme emphasized.

Professional involvement was found to be a significant factor in determining both subject matter and content emphases. Results of the study also showed a significant relationship between subject matter emphasis and teaching experience. School size, enrollment in home economics classes, the number of males in home economics classes, and personal preference of teaching subject did not have a significant effect on subject matter and content emphases.

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

"The focus of home economics has changed since its inception from an emphasis on assistance to families in a productive society to one of family service helping people to meet their problems in a rapidly changing society" (McMullen, 1975, p. 1). Many societal changes affecting individuals and families have been witnessed during the past two decades, including an increased number of women working outside the home, assumption of multiple roles by men and women, energy shortages necessitating conservation of resources, technological advances, and economic fluctuations requiring increased knowledge of management skills (Hughes, 1980).

To assess the effects of societal changes on home economics programs and to plan for the future, periodic research is needed. Home economics has not been especially good about documenting what it does on a broad scale. There were only two national studies completed until the early 1960's, a study entitled Home Economics in Public High Schools, 1938-39, published by the United States Office of Education (1941), and the Coon Study in 1962. Concern about the future direction of home economics education was voiced at the French Lick Conference (Home Economics Seminar, 1961) and during a curriculum development study conducted by the Home Economics Branch of the United States Office of Education in 1961. Concepts and Generalizations: Their Place in High School Home Economics (American Home Economics Association, 1967) was published as a result of this study. However, the next national study was not until Congress mandated the National Institute of Education (NIE) studies of

vocational education, including home economics education, in 1976. As a complement and supplement to the NIE studies, a special ad hoc research committee was formed by the Home Economics Division of the American Vocational Association in 1978. The committee initiated a National Census Study as their first project (Hughes, 1980).

One of the major reasons for the surfacing of the NIE and National Census studies was the impending reauthorization of vocational education legislation in 1982. Many criticisms, such as lack of documentation and not keeping abreast of changes taking place, surfaced as the planning and evaluation legislative task force prepared its recommendations for the 1982 vocational education reauthorization legislation.

Previously, the attitude seems to have been that considering the long history of vocational education in this country, extensive efforts to justify expenditures for vocational education were unnecessary. "However, the simple fact is that vocational educators have to continue to provide documentation that vocational education is needed and does make a difference" (Hopkins, 1979, p. 61).

The lack of statistical collection and hard-nosed program evaluation in vocational education could result in loss of funding. Congress and the taxpayer cannot know whether programs are effective or even in proper compliance with federal statutes without this information (Morton and Cross, 1981). Because Consumer and Homemaking Education is generally an elective program, it is an obvious target for cost-cutting decision makers (McFadden and Griggs, 1981). Federal support for vocational home economics is needed more than ever to meet our goals and standards (Hill, et al., 1979).

With so little documentation, the value of homemaking programs has not been universally established (McFadden and Griggs, 1981). Home economics educators are not able to tell parents, administrators, and students why home economics is important and what they are doing. Many feel that homemaking skills can and should be learned in the home. However, Hill, et al. (1979) state that "homemaking functions are increasingly cognitive and complex and not likely to be learned in the contemporary home and family setting without some intervention (p. 12)." This point is further emphasized by Carr and Ellis (1981):

If consumer and homemaking skills are so simply learned, why do we have so much mismanagement of family incomes, as evidenced by credit abuse, bankruptcy and fraud? If parenting skills are automatic, why is there so much evidence of desertion, divorce, and child abuse? If making food choices and preparing food is inherently known, why is there so much evidence of poor nutrition and waste in food consumption? It would appear...that planned, educational experiences can solve or minimize many problems in today's society (p. 44).

Another effect of not documenting what home economics does is that it is difficult to dispel stereotyped notions. Home economics has traditionally been perceived as a field of study for females. However, the competencies and attitudes necessary for homemaker roles can and should be learned by both men and women (Hill, et al., 1979). An increasing number of males are enrolling in home economics at all educational levels but research is needed to "allow sex equity to progress from an externally imposed 'numbers game' to an internal restructuring that will enrich the vocational experience for both students and faculty" (Smith, 1981, p. 49).

The traditional emphasis on clothing construction and food preparation is still with home economics. Most home economics educators

object vehemently when confronted with this image but while they say what they are not, they cannot tell what they are. In order to escape the "stitching and stewing" image home economics educators need to educate others about the value of the field and how their profession serves society (Spitze, 1980). Furthermore, they must not fool themselves by saying that parents, administrators, and students expect clothing and foods. It is their responsibility to explain to each of these groups the rationale for making changes (Cross, 1979).

Documentation would serve as a basis for planning to eliminate gaps and overlaps by showing trends in the field and in society. Hopkins (1979) states that "If you define planning as (1) the rational determination of where you are, (2) where you want to go, and (3) how you are going to get there, then it is clear that planning cannot be accomplished without evaluation" (p. 62).

The accountability movement in all areas of education in the last decade has emphasized the need for documentation research. With shrinking funds, if home economics educators cannot show what they do, they cannot expect to get funds.

Many aspects of homemaking education need to be documented to make the public aware of what is being done and the need for home economics programs (Spitze, 1980). Home economics educators are aware of the need to have better information about their programs. One priority is to obtain data on what and how we teach in the home economics curriculum. Research must be conducted to provide consistent assessment and comparable data from state to state (Fedje, Champoux, and Holcombe, 1981).

Purpose

The purpose of the study was to describe secondary home economics programs in South Dakota. Specifically, it was designed to identify subjects being taught and pervasive themes running throughout the subjects of home economics programs. Resulting information was correlated with certain demographic data.

The objectives were:

- (1) to describe the subject matter taught in secondary home economics programs in South Dakota (i.e. Human Development and the Family, Home Management and Family Economics, Food and Nutrition, Textiles and Clothing, and Housing).
- (2) to describe the content emphases or pervasive themes (i.e. information, human development, management, and values) of secondary home economics programs in South Dakota.
- (3) to determine the effects of selected aspects of teaching and the teacher (i.e. teaching experience, class enrollments, school size, personal preference of teaching subject, and professional interaction) on subject-matter and content emphasis.

The following hypotheses were developed for testing:

- (1) There is no significant relationship between the amount of teaching experience and subject matter emphasis.
- (2) There is no significant relationship between teaching experience and content emphasis.
- (3) There is no significant relationship between class enrollment (size of home economics classes and number of boys) and subject matter emphasis.
- (4) There is no significant relationship between class enrollment (size of home economics classes and number of boys) and content emphasis.
- (5) There is no significant relationship between school size and subject matter emphasis.
- (6) There is no significant relationship between school size and content emphasis.

- (7) There is no significant relationship between personal preference of teaching subject and subject matter emphasis.
- (8) There is no significant relationship between personal preference of teaching subject and content emphasis.
- (9) There is no significant relationship between professional interaction and subject matter emphasis.
- (10) There is no significant relationship between professional interaction and content emphasis.
- (11) There is no significant relationship between subject matter taught and content emphasis.

Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Accountability has been a growing concern in education. Pressures have increased for education to demonstrate concrete understandable results for the billions of dollars it spends. The wave of accountability has already resulted in fundamental shifts in the ways that administrators and teachers view their jobs. "There is an increased emphasis on behavioral objectives and the need to define specifically the end results of instruction" (Pine, 1976, p. 49).

The demands for accountability emanated from a variety of factors:

...the escalating cost of education; developments in the field of management techniques which have spurred sharpening of goals, specificity of planning, and the establishing of cost effectiveness measures; the Coleman report, which emphasized educational output rather than input; the politicalization of the schools; and the rising educational expectations among minority groups without a corresponding rise in educational achievement (Landers, 1973, p. 539).

One can also speculate that the accountability movement reflects to some degree the American obsession with rendering every human activity--intellectual, physical, moral, social, and even sexual--accountable in terms of dollar expenditures. Behavioral objectives, systems analysis, and performance contracting fit the American philosophy of things. They are logical, ordered, objective, pragmatic, precise, and lend themselves to mechanized, computerized, and business-like ways of learning and measuring outcomes (Welch, 1974, p. 60).

Accountability is forcing educators to ask questions about the goals and values of the educational system. Unlike the past, when failure to learn was seen as a weakness in the student, the popular view is that if pupils have not learned, the teacher has not taught.

Can the school or can teachers be held accountable for results? Pine (1976) answers:

Yes, but only for the results of instruction when that instruction reaches a measurable state. Instruction in basic skills and knowledge can be tested reasonably well, but this is not true for higher order cognitive skills, affective and valuing behaviors, or problem-solving skills. The more the pressure for accountability mounts, the more the school will confine its work to results that can be tested. The more this is the case, the less the school will be able to assume responsibility for affective goals and those long-range life outcomes to which education should contribute (p. 54).

The growing emphasis throughout education on being accountable has given impetus to documentation efforts. "Persons within the home economics profession and those who support home economics programs at the local, state, and national level are increasingly asked what is being taught today in home economics classes" (Hughes, 1980, p. vi).

This study was devised to aid home economics educators in documenting their programs. Its primary purpose was to describe secondary home economics programs in South Dakota by identifying the subject matter emphases and pervasive themes running throughout the subjects of home economics programs. A secondary objective was to relate findings to demographic data. The literature review focused on previous efforts at documenting program activities and legislative influences on documentation.

Documenting Program Activities

One of the first efforts at documenting home economics program activities was a study entitled Home Economics in Public High Schools, 1938-39, published by the U.S. Office of Education (1941). In 1959,

Beulah Coon, Specialist in Research, Home Economics Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, conducted a national survey of homemaking programs to update the findings of the 1938-39 study (Coon, 1962). The purpose of Coon's study was to obtain information about the availability of home economics in the public secondary schools, the nature of the programs, and the proportion of students having instruction. Coon found that seventy-five percent of the time spent in home economics courses was in the foods and clothing areas. Only twenty-five percent of the time was spent on family relations, child development, and housing combined, with slight variations depending on grade level. Management and consumer economics, if any time was devoted to them, were integrated with foods and clothing related learnings. Coon concluded:

The proportion of time spent on different areas and aspects within areas, even though a crude estimate, is worthy of serious study. In viewing these proportions, home economics teachers and leaders must ask themselves such questions as the following: What areas of home economics and what aspects are of major concern to the family's well being? Is the emphasis being given that which is most needed by boys and girls in the public secondary schools? Do the courses reflect as clearly as leaders believe they should the significance of child development, of relations between individuals and between homes and communities, of the consumer and management responsibilities, of health and nutrition? Would a more detailed study of the way many of these topics are taught reveal greater differences between grade levels than the time spent on them indicates? Have the teacher education programs given adequate preparation in the consumption, management, relationships, and child development aspects of home economics? Is the relative proportion of time spent on manual skills justified in comparison with the other aspects in each grade? Are these more difficult to teach? Is the proportion spent on different areas in family living courses any more consistent with today's needs? Are the areas and aspects taught in different grades those most important in the stage of development of those pupils? (1962, p. 110)

The results of the Coon (1962) study, rapid social, technological, and economic changes, and the need for a more precise definition of the field of home economics led to two national conferences in the 1960's. In 1961, a conference was called by the Home Economics Branch of the U.S. Office of Education to instigate a curriculum development study at the secondary level. The possibility of identifying important concepts and some supporting generalizations for secondary home economics programs was discussed (American Home Economics Association, 1967). At the same time, the Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges met at French Lick, Indiana, to discuss the problems of articulation and differentiation of home economics subject matter at various education levels (Home Economics Seminar, 1961). The focus of the seminar was to explore the "'concept approach' as a possible way of identifying, organizing, structuring, and unifying significant subject-matter content in the field of home economics" (American Home Economics Association, 1967, p. 20). The results of these two conferences led to identification of key concepts as a basis for curriculum development and emphasis, published in the booklet Concepts and Generalizations: Their Place in High School Home Economics Curriculum Development (American Home Economics Association, 1967). The "Bird Book", as it is commonly referred to, has proved to be a valuable resource in helping home economics teachers select goals and experiences that are meaningful to students.

Legislative Influences on Documenting

Federal legislation has also influenced the direction of home-making programs. The Smith-Hughes Act was passed in 1917 as a perma-

nent appropriation of over \$7 million annually to vocational education. The next important Federal vocational education measure, the George-Reed Act was adopted in 1929. Additional funding for agricultural and home economics education was authorized. The George-Deen Act of 1937 and the George-Barden Act of 1946 further increased the level of funding for home economics. In 1963, the Vocational Education Act stressed the need for high quality programs of vocational education that were readily available to persons of all ages in all communities. This Act permitted a state to transfer federal funds allotted under the Smith-Hughes Act from one to another category of students to assure programs that met local manpower needs and job opportunities (Exton, 1964). Amendments to the Vocational Education Act of 1963, passed in 1968, broadened federal aid to vocational education. Liberalized funds for home economics were included in this bill, and home economists were called to be aware of social and cultural conditions and needs in order to prepare youth and adults for the dual role of homemaker and wage earner. "Very few pieces of legislation have given stronger support than this to the field of home economics or called for more of the kind of professional expertise that home economists have to give" (Poyner, 1967, p. 692).

Prior to the Educational Amendments of 1976, hearings were held to assess the progress made in vocational education since the Vocational Amendments of 1968. The hearings magnified the need for current data about home economics programs. The Coon study was "out of date, narrowly focused, and described the state of affairs before the significant restructuring of vocational education that occurred in 1963,

and long before the introduction of a separate legislative section for consumer and homemaking education in 1968" (Hendrickson and David, 1980, p. 15).

Hughes (1980) summarizes:

Federal legislation, from the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917 to the Education Amendments of 1976, Title II, has both guided the direction of homemaking programs and reflected the concerns of professional home economists and society as a whole. Among the purposes stipulated for vocational consumer and homemaking programs by the 1976 legislation were (1) to encourage participation of both males and females to prepare for combining the dual role of homemaker and wage earner, (2) to prepare males and females to enter the work of the home, (3) to give greater consideration to economic, social, and cultural conditions, and (4) to emphasize education, management of resources, promotion of nutritional knowledge and food use, and the promotion of parenthood education in order to meet current societal needs" (p. 1).

The National Institute of Education Studies

The 1976 legislation specifically requested an evaluation of the effectiveness of all vocational education programs with consumer and homemaking identified for specific study (Caputo and Haymore, 1981). Congress wanted the study of vocational education programs so that better justification could be available in reauthorizing the Vocational Education Act in 1982 (Hendrickson and David, 1980). Because the reauthorization committee would be too preoccupied with other educational legislation to devote adequate time to the study of the current vocational education system before the reauthorization hearings, Congress asked the National Institute of Education (NIE) to complete the studies requested by Congress.

Three studies within the study of consumer and homemaking educa-

tion programs were designed to answer the Congressional questions. The NIE studies of consumer and homemaking programs were designed to determine (1) the responsiveness of the consumer and homemaking education system to the intent of the 1976 legislation; (2) the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking programs as measured by acquisition of consumer and homemaking knowledge and skills; and (3) the knowledge, skills, and abilities that people will need to be effective consumers and homemakers (Hendrickson and David, 1980).

Responsiveness study. The responsiveness study was divided into three categories of inquiry:

- 1) An examination of the flow of federal funds for consumer and homemaking education programs, the purposes for which they are allocated, the amounts allotted, and the mechanisms used for fund allocation;

- 2) An examination of state and local needs, priorities, policies, and other factors that may influence the use and impact of federal funds and attainment of the legislation's purposes;

- 3) An analysis of enrollment and other data regarding populations served and program content and offerings.

(Webb, Siegel, and Jones, 1980, p. 16)

Information on vocationally approved home economics programs for the responsiveness study was collected during the 1979-80 school year in ten states: California, Florida, Illinois, New York, Texas, Georgia, Idaho, Maine, Nebraska, and West Virginia. Data were collected on one hundred programs through interviews, a review of documents, questionnaires, and on-site observation.

The NIE findings showed that the degree of responsiveness to the 1976 Federal Legislation varied considerably among States. Several state and local factors were cited for the variance, such as:

1) the extent to which consumer and homemaking education is integrated into a State's larger vocational education administrative structure;

2) the goals of the consumer and homemaking education network;

3) the visibility of Federal funds at the local level (a factor potentially subject to direct Federal control); and

4) State education laws, policies, and funding practices.

(U.S., The National Institute of Education, 1981, p. VI-20)

Program content data revealed that comprehensive consumer and homemaking education classes were offered the most frequently and had more students enrolled in them than in the other six content areas of home economics studied by the NIE. However, there was beginning to be a shift in enrollment from comprehensive courses to the more specific content areas. Enrollment in food and nutrition and in clothing and textiles courses was the highest of the six content areas while enrollment in consumer education was the lowest. The two kinds of consumer and homemaking education programs focusing most on the content areas emphasized by the Educational Amendments of 1976 were the outreach programs for adults and "adult living" courses for high school students (U.S., The National Institute of Education, 1981).

According to the NIE findings from the 10 States studied, the majority of the students enrolled in consumer and homemaking education programs were secondary school students, followed by adults and post-secondary students, respectively. Enrollment in consumer and homemaking education programs increased 17 percent between 1972 and 1979 and more students were enrolled in consumer and homemaking education programs than in any other vocational education program field. The growth during this period was mainly a result of the increased male

enrollment in consumer and homemaking education. Male enrollment rose from 6 percent in 1972 to 19 percent in 1977. Adult participation also increased greatly during this time. A 59 percent increase was noted in enrollment in adult programs from 1972 to 1978. Of the special groups listed in Subpart 5 of the 1976 legislation, the educationally disadvantaged, the handicapped, and the elderly were the most extensively served (U.S., The National Institute of Education, 1981, p. VI-10).

Effectiveness study. Program effectiveness was assessed by analyzing existing research that described the impact of homemaking education programs on learners. The data used for this study was obtained by standard library searches, solicitation to state home economics supervisors and colleges and universities that offer graduate degrees, and general appeals through professional meetings and publications (Griggs and McFadden, 1980).

Because of the lack of methodologically sound research on the effects of consumer and homemaking education programs on learners in terms of changes in knowledge, attitudes, or behavior, the NIE researchers could not make a conclusive statement about the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking education programs. Although students reported that the subject matter they had learned was very useful, significant evidence that students' attitudes and behavior were affected was lacking (U.S., The National Institute of Education, 1981).

Projections study. The third study by the NIE on consumer and homemaking education was designed to "project what people will need to

know in 1982 and beyond to be intelligent consumers and effective homemakers" (Simpson, 1980). It was thought that the "projections study" would promote positive feelings in the field. Results of the study prompted professionals to plan updated programs which address such topics as inflation, consumerism, energy conservation, nutrition, parenting skills, management of resources, living environments, stress management, coping skills, interpersonal relationships and human development at all stages of the life cycle. It was recommended that homemaking programs continue to help individuals and families improve the quality of personal and family life, and prepare them for the dual role of homemaker/wage-earner. Skills should be developed to aid students in values clarification, personal relationships and decision making. (U.S., The National Institute of Education, 1981).

The impact of the NIE studies has already been felt. "There is an increasing awareness of the question of responsiveness to federal legislation. This awareness is causing states to look more critically at their consumer and homemaking education programs in relation to the purposes and emphases specified in the 1976 legislation" (Simpson, 1980, p. 18).

The National Census Study

Designed to complement and supplement the NIE studies, the National Census Study was initiated by the ad hoc research committee of the Home Economics Division, American Vocational Association in 1978 (Hughes, 1980). This committee was given standing committee status as of January 1, 1982. The census study identified what was

taught and who was served by vocational consumer and homemaking programs in the secondary schools across the country. A major goal of the study was to provide baseline data for use in program planning, implementation, and revision.

The population for the study consisted of public schools in all 57 states and territories offering courses in vocational consumer and homemaking in grades 9-12. A nationwide sample of about 2000 schools was desired, with the restriction that no state sample exceed 75 schools. On the questionnaire, 20 topics considered essential by home economics teachers, state supervisors of home economics, and teacher educators were listed for each of the six subject matter areas included in vocational consumer and homemaking programs. Teachers were asked to indicate in which courses offered in their school each topic was included. Student enrollment was requested for each taxonomy category included in a school's program.

The data from the National Census Study revealed that all 120 topics considered essential for vocational consumer and homemaking programs and listed on the survey instrument were being taught in approximately two-thirds of the schools in the sample, with 52 percent of the topics included in more than 87 percent of the schools. By subject matter areas, food and nutrition topics were included most frequently, followed in descending order by the topics in family relations, clothing and textiles, child development/parenting, consumer education and management, and housing/home furnishing/equipment. The data indicated that increased attention to consumer education and management and housing concepts would be appropriate (Hughes, 1980).

Enrollment data indicated that approximately 20 percent of the students in vocational consumer and homemaking programs are male, an increase from two percent reported in the Coon study. Males were more frequently enrolled in courses in foods and nutrition, comprehensive homemaking, family relations, and consumer education. Females enrolled more frequently in comprehensive homemaking, child development, foods and nutrition, and clothing and textiles (Hughes, 1980).

Looking at the lists of content topics as a whole, and the number of schools including these, some broad areas of emphases were evident throughout vocational consumer and homemaking programs. For example, the number of topics taught in each of the five subject matter areas that related to decision-making was significant. And these topics were included in more than three-fourths of all the schools participating in the study. Furthermore, topics frequently included by large numbers of schools in the sample were directed at current needs and trends within society, which illustrates that the content of home economics does include topics of concern for today's students (Hughes, 1980).

When compared to the Coon (1962) study, the emphasis on foods and nutrition was still prevalent. Coon noted that the amount of Management and Consumer Education included in the curriculum at the time of her study was negligible. Even though the emphasis on these two topics had increased by the time of Hughes (1980) study, it was suggested that more attention be focused on Management/Consumerism and Housing.

Other Documentation

In 1975, Janet S. McMullen conducted a study entitled The Relationship of Undergraduate Home Economics Education Programs to the Home Economics Curricula in the Secondary Schools. The purpose of the study was to investigate the professional practices of first year teachers who were graduates of two distinctly different home economics education programs. The subjects for the study were 73 first year home economics teachers who were employed in middle schools, junior high schools, and senior high schools in seven states.

To compare the relationship between the curriculum in the secondary schools and the teacher education programs, the undergraduate programs were classified as Traditional or Contemporary. Traditional programs emphasized production courses in foods and clothing and had only one student teaching experience in the senior year. The contemporary program emphasized human development and management, and provided for three student teaching experiences beginning in the sophomore year (McMullen, 1975).

Two measures, the Farris Pupil Feedback Instrument and Ray's Student Estimate of Teacher Concern questionnaire, were used to provide data which examined the students' perception of the teachers. Three structured interviews provided the data to identify the home economics content provided by first year teachers. Specifically, the interviews identified the concept emphasis in each area, the length of time the unit was taught, and the place of this concept in the unit. Data from the questionnaires were subjected to analysis of variance; to analyze data from the interviews chi-square distribution was employed (McMullen, 1975).

The findings on the curriculum emphases from the interviews varied among teachers from the two Traditional programs and among teachers from the Traditional and Contemporary programs. Some teachers from the Traditional programs spent as much time on contemporary areas as did the teachers who had graduated from the Contemporary program.

The findings revealed that all five areas of home economics are included in the secondary curricula. The amount of time devoted to each area and the number of classes in each area was consistent with Coon's findings. The average length of the units in food preparation and clothing construction was much longer than units in human development, relationships, management and consumer education. Over 50 percent of the classes taught were in clothing construction and food preparation as compared to approximately 14 percent in human development and relationships and eight percent in management and consumer education (McMullen, 1975).

Helen C. Hall conducted a follow-up to the McMullen study in 1978. The purpose of the study by Hall was to investigate the relationship of undergraduate home economics teacher education curriculum emphases to curriculum practices of professionally mature teachers. Graduates of three different home economics teacher education institutions in Pennsylvania were the subjects for the study. The programs were classified as Traditional or Contemporary just as in the McMullen (1975) study.

To determine the curriculum emphases of the teachers, the Curriculum Orientation Survey (COS) was developed. The instrument measured subject matter and content emphases. Subject matter subscales

included: Human Development and the Family, Home Management and Family Economics, Foods and Nutrition, Textiles and Clothing, and Housing. Content emphases subscales included Information, Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships, Management, and Values.

As a total group, subjects in this study indicated that they emphasized the subject matter area of Foods and Nutrition, followed by Human Development and the Family, Textiles and Clothing, and Home Management and Family Economics. Housing received the least emphasis. The rank order for content emphases, from most to least emphasis, was Information, Management, Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships, and Values. Graduates of traditional programs emphasized Information content more than graduates of the contemporary teacher education programs. Other differences were not significant (Hall, 1978).

In addition to the Census Study, the ad hoc research committee of the Home Economics Division, American Vocational Association instigated various studies on the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking programs. The effectiveness of consumer and homemaking courses for mentally handicapped students was reported by Fedje, Champoux, and Holcombe (1981). The study focused on the three subject matter areas mandated for study by Congress in the Vocational Amendments of 1976 -- child development/parenting, nutrition, and consumer education. Because evaluation of mildly mentally handicapped students was cited as a special challenge for educators, the study was specifically designed to develop reliable test instruments for mildly mentally handicapped students enrolled in the three consumer and homemaking subject areas studied (Fedje, Champoux, and Holcombe, 1981).

The subjects for the study were mildly mentally handicapped students from 20 programs in Minnesota. A control group consisted of mildly mentally handicapped students who had not taken any of the consumer and homemaking courses being tested. A group of regular students were also tested for comparison purposes.

Results showed that the child development/parenting courses were effective in increasing the knowledge of mildly mentally handicapped students enrolled in the course. However, the results from the nutrition and consumer education tests indicated that mildly mentally handicapped students not enrolled in the consumer and homemaking courses scored slightly higher than the mildly mentally handicapped students who had taken the course. Possible explanations included: 1) more time in class was spent on food preparation principles while the test was composed of more knowledge level items; 2) the factual information could have been learned from other sources, i.e. the media or other courses in school; 3) the groups may not have been very homogeneous because of a wide range of IQ scores, different reading abilities, a disproportionate number of females in the mildly mentally handicapped control group, and the differing backgrounds related to the content areas; 4) no pretesting was done to assess knowledge prior to instruction. On the basis of these results, it was recommended that both the nutrition and consumer education tests be revised (Fedje, Champoux, and Holcombe, 1981).

A case study method of determining the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking programs was employed by Caputo and Haymore (1981) in The Value of Home Economics Education: Observations of Students,

Teachers, and Parents. The study included 74 success stories from home economics teachers, students, and parents in 29 states. The qualitative research approach helped to gain understanding of the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking education from the subject's point of view and, when combined with the results of the Census study, provided a valuable overview for program evaluation. As stated by Caputo and Haymore: "The census study identifies what is being taught and who is served by vocational consumer and homemaking programs in the secondary schools while the case studies reveal how the programs are being utilized by and affecting the students enrolled" (1981, p. 3).

A third study to help determine the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking programs, Dimensions of Home Economics Programs: Seven Case Studies, was designed by Mears, Ley, and Ray (1981). The researchers developed a model to use as a framework for investigating and analyzing the variables from the case studies. Variables in the model included: teachers, students, parents, support personnel, curriculum, facilities and resources, and community. Generalizations were then developed from the analysis of the case studies.

A packet of instructions and guidelines for assessing program elements was sent to twenty-four individuals who had indicated an interest in doing a case study of an effective program for the project. However, only seven completed case studies were returned by the deadline.

The curriculum emphases, as measured by the Curriculum Orientation Survey (COS) and observations by the researchers, are in agreement with the findings of the Census study (Hughes, 1980).

After analyzing the data from all seven case studies, the following generalizations were drawn:

- 1) Teachers appear to be the key factor in effective programs.
- 2) Students see teachers of outstanding programs as concerned about them and how they feel.
- 3) Teachers of outstanding programs are knowledgeable about the goals of home economics and incorporate these goals into their curriculum, care about students and what they learn, are committed and involved, gain support from administrators and community, and establish a class climate where students are goal directed and interested.
- 4) The goals of effective programs tend to be comprehensive of home economics subject matter, related to helping students in everyday life, and facilitate learning helpful in future family life.
- 5) Students in effective home economics programs tend to have extremely positive feelings toward the subject matter of home economics, the teachers, and the class environment.
- 6) Student involvement at all levels, planning, class activities, and outside activities, relates highly to a successful program.
- 7) Parents, students, support personnel, administrators, and other faculty have a consistently positive view of home economics.
- 8) Community involvement enhances, but is not an essential element of successful programs. Some programs had good community involvement but other programs did not.
- 9) Resources aid but do not make or break a home economics program.
- 10) Changes in existing programs are facilitated by a teacher's participation in graduate or in-service programs.
- 11) Vocational education money is helpful to programs but is not identified as a key success factor. Vocational education money was identified as more helpful in some programs than in other programs.
- 12) Programs' responses to legislative mandates differ according to the needs of the local community and the local school structure of home economics.

(Mears, Ley, and Ray, 1981, pp. 36-37)

An evaluation of child development/parenting effectiveness was the fourth and final study initiated by the ad hoc committee in 1978 (Gritzmacher, et al., 1981). A pretest/posttest design was used to assess the cognitive learning of child development/parenting concepts

taught in high school Child Development/Parenting classes. Secondary students in four states enrolled in Child Development/Parenting courses were the subjects for the study. A group of students not enrolled in such a class was randomly selected for comparison purposes.

Results indicated that the pretest scores were higher for the child development/parenting group than those of the comparison group. Both groups gained knowledge in child development/parenting concepts from pretest to posttest, but the gain was greater for students enrolled in the Child Development/Parenting classes. Females scored higher than males. However, the number of males included in the sample was very small so conclusive statements were not possible. The content of Child Development/Parenting courses varied widely from state to state. Possible explanations included the existence of different state recommended curriculums and different emphases of State Supervisors or leaders (Gritzmacher, et al., 1981).

It was suggested that additional information on what is taught in Child Development/Parenting courses from state to state would be helpful. Studies of student attitudes toward parenting and level of parenting skills are needed (Gritzmacher, et al., 1981).

Chapter III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

The major purpose of the study was to describe curricular emphases of secondary home economics programs in South Dakota. A secondary objective was to investigate the relationship between curricular emphases and certain characteristics of the school and teacher. Variables studied were 1) teaching experience, 2) class enrollments, 3) school size, 4) personal preference of teaching subject, and 5) professional interaction. The factors were chosen because of their perceived influence on decisions about what to teach.

Description of Sample

Secondary home economics programs in South Dakota were the population for this study. Public and non-public schools were included in the population. A stratified random sample from the following four population subgroups was sought.

Group I--under 100 students in grades 9-12

Group II--101 to 250 students in grades 9-12

Group III--251 to 500 students in grades 9-12

Group IV--over 500 students in grades 9-12

Secondary schools with home economics programs were listed alphabetically and numbered within their respective population subgroups. The table of random numbers method was used for the random selection of a sample. An entry number was obtained by looking at a dollar bill and choosing the first two digits of the serial number.

By flipping a coin it was determined which number was the horizontal and vertical digit. If the coin came down "heads", the first digit would be that of the horizontal series. Using this method, 25 schools were randomly selected for each of the four population subgroups for a total of one hundred to be included in the sample.

The names and school addresses of the home economics teachers selected for the sample were obtained from a listing of all secondary home economics teachers and their schools compiled by the South Dakota State Supervisor of Vocational Home Economics. A letter (Appendix A) describing the study and requesting the teacher's participation was sent with the instruments to be completed, the Curriculum Orientation Survey and the Demographic Data Sheet, in October of 1981. A stamped, self-addressed return envelope was included. Instructions for completing and returning the survey were stated. A postcard reminder was sent to those teachers who had not responded within three weeks.

Development and Selection of Instruments

The Curriculum Orientation Survey (COS), developed by Helen C. Hall in 1978, was used to determine the teachers' curricula emphasis (Appendix B). The COS was designed to diagnose two types of curricular emphases: subject matter and content themes or processes integrated throughout a program. Concepts and Generalizations: Their Place in High School Home Economics Curriculum Development (AHEA, 1967) was the basis for instrument development (Hall, 1978). In Concepts and Generalizations five subject matter areas of secondary home economics were identified:

1. Human Development and the Family
2. Home Management and Family Economics
3. Foods and Nutrition
4. Textiles and Clothing
5. Housing

The content emphases or prevasive themes were categorized as information or process. "Information content is the facts, substance, and arrangement of knowledge for a particular subject matter area" (Hall, 1978, p. 31). This type of content represents the knowledge and comprehension levels of the cognitive domain. Process content involves using, communicating, and integrating home economics concepts through one of three unifying themes that cross all subject matter areas: human development and interpersonal relationships, management, or values (AHEA, 1967). The higher levels of the cognitive domain are more characteristic of process content. These four themes, 1) information, 2) human development and interpersonal relationships, 3) management, and 4) values, became the content emphases headings for the COS.

A table of specifications (Figure 1), using the Concepts and Generalizations subject matter and content emphases headings, was devised with subject matter areas listed vertically on the left-hand side. The horizontal entries across the top of the table are the content emphases.

Using the cells of the table of specifications and various teaching resources, 100 instructional objectives were generated; five per cell. Each objective was typed on an index card and a master chart was compiled to indicate the intended subject matter areas and content emphases (Hall, 1978).

SUBJECT MATTER
AREAS

CONTENT EMPHASES

	Information	Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships	Management	Values
Human Development and the Family				
Home Management and Family Economics				
Food and Nutrition				
Textiles and Clothing				
Housing				

Figure 1

Table of Specifications for the
Curriculum Orientation Survey

Source: Hall, Helen Cecelia. "The Relationship of Undergraduate Home Economics Education Program to the Home Economics Curricula in the Secondary Schools: A Follow-up Study," The Pennsylvania State University, November 1978, p. 30.

A jury of experienced teachers who were graduate students in Home Economics Education at The Pennsylvania State University was selected to determine the accuracy of the objectives in fulfilling the criteria for cell assignment. Jury members were asked to sort the objectives into the appropriate cells according to subject matter and content emphasis. Three items per cell were chosen for the instrument from those for which there was unanimous agreement on classification by the jury members. These 60 items became the COS measure. The COS was administered to a class of undergraduates in Home Economics Education at The Pennsylvania State University who recently had completed student teaching. Their responses were used to make further modifications (Hall, 1978).

Respondents indicated the extent to which selected home economics objectives were included in their curriculums according to the following choices:

- A. This is not an objective in my teaching.
- B. This is an incidental objective in my teaching.
- C. This is an important objective in my teaching.
- D. This is a major objective in my teaching.

To obtain a score, the responses were weighted as follows: A=1, B=2, C=3, D=4. Each of the five subject matter emphasis subscales included 12 items (Appendix D). Possible scores for each scale ranged from 12 (no emphasis) to 48 (major emphasis). The content emphasis subscales included 15 items (Appendix E) with possible scores for each scale ranging from 15 (no emphasis) to 60 (major emphasis). Hall (1978) reported a reliability for the total instrument of .95; subscale reliabilities ranged from .74 to .93.

The Demographic Data Sheet (Appendix C) was developed by this researcher to provide background information for descriptive purposes and statistical operations. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of years they had taught, professional involvement, home economics class enrollments, number of boys in home economics classes, and favorite and least favorite home economics subjects. Professional involvement was measured by the membership and amount of participation in four professional organizations. A total score for professional involvement was computed with a possible score ranging from 0 (no involvement) to 8 (very involved).

Reasons for obtaining information on the five background factors are indicated below:

- 1) Teaching experience was included to determine whether or not the extent of teaching experience influenced the content level of teaching. Does an experienced teacher emphasize higher cognitive levels of process content (human development and interpersonal relationships, management, and values) more than a beginning teacher? Are experienced teachers better able to provide a balanced subject matter emphasis?
- 2) The assumption that professional involvement increases teacher classroom skills is commonly accepted. This may be because of educational programs and written materials provided by the organizations or because associating with other professionals in home economics encourages the sharing of ideas and resources. Is there a basis for this assumption?
- 3) Class enrollments, especially the number of boys in home economics classes, may influence the subject matter and content emphasis. Some

preliminary observations showed an increase in the number of boys enrolled in home economics. Would that change teachers' ideas about what to teach? For example, would classrooms with a large number of boys emphasize clothing concepts as much as those with low male enrollment? National data are available for comparison with data from South Dakota home economics programs.

4) Large schools with large home economics class enrollments may have a different subject matter and content emphasis because they may be able to provide more courses on a semester basis and more materials. For example, a semester course in child development would be able to present more concepts than a short unit in a comprehensive homemaking course.

5) A teacher's personal preference for a subject area may influence him/her to spend more time teaching in that area while leaving inadequate time for other important areas. Favorite subjects may be taught with a different content emphasis or theme than less favored subject areas.

Procedures

Respondents' answers were summarized and statistical operations were performed at the SDSU Computer Center. The frequency, mean score, and standard deviation was computed for each of the five subject matter areas, the four content areas, and the independent variables. This data provided descriptive information for the overall sample and for each of the four school size subgroups.

Correlational techniques linked content emphasis and subject matter emphasis with each of the independent variables. Correlation analysis was chosen to determine which of these independent variables are highly related to subject matter and content emphasis, either directly or by a common connection to another variable. Multiple regression was used to analyze how combined variables affected the subject matter and content emphasis.

Chapter IV

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF DATA

The purpose of this study was to describe the curriculum in secondary school home economics programs in South Dakota. Curriculum emphases in the secondary schools was studied through the teachers' self reports via the Curriculum Orientation Study (Appendix B). The COS measured the extent to which selected home economics teaching objectives were included in the implemented curricula. Background and descriptive information on subjects was obtained from a Demographic Data Sheet (Appendix C).

Descriptive Information on Subjects

Of the one hundred surveys distributed, 88 percent were returned; four sets of data were unusable. Subjects for the study were the 84 randomly selected secondary home economics teachers who returned complete sets of data. A summary of the characteristics of the subjects is presented in Table 1. Subjects are described in relation to the enrollment of the school in which they taught: subgroup I, under 100 students; subgroup II, 101 to 250 students; subgroup III, 251 to 500 students; and subgroup IV, over 500 students. All enrollment subgroups were represented; therefore, the researcher considers the data to be representative of the state as a whole.

TABLE 1

Number and Percent¹ of Responses on Demographic Characteristics
by Population Subgroup

Demographic Characteristics	Population Subgroups									
	I		II		III		IV		Total	
	(Under 100)		(101-250)		(251-500)		(Over 500)			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Total Responses	24	100.0	24	100.0	19	100.00	17	100.0	84	100.0
Years of Experience										
--1st year	4	16.7	2	8.3	0	0.0	1	5.9	7	8.3
--1 to 2 years	6	25.0	1	4.2	1	5.3	1	5.9	9	10.7
--3 to 5 years	5	20.8	6	25.0	3	15.8	1	5.9	15	17.9
--6 to 10 years	5	20.8	11	45.8	4	21.1	5	29.4	25	29.8
--11 to 15 years	1	4.2	3	12.5	6	31.6	3	17.6	13	15.5
--16 or more years	3	12.5	1	4.2	5	26.3	6	35.3	15	17.9
Professional Organizations ²										
--SDEA Members	9	37.5	14	58.3	13	68.4	12	70.6	48	57.1
--SDEA Attended Meeting	5	20.8	5	20.8	6	31.6	6	35.3	22	26.2
--SDVA/AVA Members	18	75.0	16	66.7	13	68.4	10	58.9	57	67.9
--SDVA/AVA Attended Meeting	12	50.0	13	54.2	13	68.4	8	47.1	46	54.8
--SDHEA/AHEA Member	14	58.3	9	37.5	7	36.8	10	58.9	40	47.6
--SDHEA/AHEA Attended Meeting	8	33.3	5	20.8	4	21.1	8	47.1	25	29.8
--FHA/HERO Member	15	62.5	18	75.0	14	73.7	3	17.6	50	59.5
--FHA/HERO Attended Meeting	17	70.8	19	79.2	13	68.4	3	17.6	52	61.9
Favorite Teaching Subject										
--Human Development	10	41.7	9	37.5	3	15.8	6	35.3	28	33.3
--Home Management	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
--Foods and Nutrition	6	25.0	5	20.8	4	21.1	4	23.5	19	22.6

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Demographic Characteristics	Population Subgroups									
	I		II		III		IV		Total	
	(Under 100)		(101-250)		(251-500)		(Over 500)			
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
--Textiles and Clothing	7	29.2	9	37.5	12	63.2	7	41.2	35	41.7
--Housing	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
--No Response	1	4.2	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	2.4
Least Favorite Teaching Subject										
--Human Development	1	4.2	1	4.2	2	10.5	1	5.9	5	6.0
--Home Management	15	62.5	12	50.0	9	47.4	8	47.1	44	52.4
--Foods and Nutrition	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	5.3	1	5.9	2	2.4
--Textiles and Clothing	1	4.2	1	4.2	1	5.3	3	17.6	6	7.1
--Housing	5	20.8	9	37.5	6	31.6	4	23.5	24	28.6
--No Response	2	8.3	1	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	3.6
Number of Teachers in Department										
--One Teacher Only	24	100.0	24	100.0	17	89.5	12	70.6	77	91.7
--Two or more teachers	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	10.5	5	29.4	7	8.3

¹ Does not always equal 100.0 percent due to rounding.

² Multiple responses in some categories result in numbers greater than total number of responses.

Teacher experience. Of the 84 teachers participating, 8.3 percent were first year home economics teachers, compared to a statewide average of 5.81 percent new public school classroom teachers (Comparative Statistics on Classroom Teachers by School District, 1981-1982). When the percentage of all new public teachers was extrapolated from the publication cited above for each enrollment subgroup, it was found that schools with small enrollments (less than 100 students) averaged 10.08 percent new teachers while 16.7 percent of the home economics teachers were first year teachers in that group. As school enrollments increased the number of first year teachers employed by those schools decreased. This is evidenced by only 3.25 percent new public school teachers and 5.9 percent new home economics teachers in schools with large enrollments (over 500 students). Still, the percentage of new home economics teachers is almost double the overall percentage of new public school classroom teachers.

Over two-thirds of the teachers in the study had taught less than ten years; approximately 18 percent had taught for more than 15 years. As school enrollment increased the number of experienced teachers also increased. Over 35 percent of the home economics teachers in the large schools had over 15 years of teaching experience. These results are similar to the findings of The National Census Study of Secondary Vocational Consumer and Homemaking Programs (Hughes, 1980). The census study reported that "while 50 percent of the teachers had taught for seven years or less, 25 percent had taught for more than 15 years" (Hughes, 1980). The Hughes study showed a greater percentage of very experienced home economics teachers nationwide than did the

South Dakota data. When compared to other South Dakota classroom teachers, home economics teachers were slightly less experienced. The average amount of teaching experience for all public school teachers in the state was 11 years (Comparative Statistics on Classroom Teachers by School District, 1981-1982). The figure was approximately 8 years for home economics teachers in South Dakota.

Most of the South Dakota home economics teachers in the sample (91.7 percent) were in one teacher departments. The National Census Study reported approximately one-half of the schools had one home economics teacher and two homemaking teachers were employed in 33 percent of the schools (Hughes, 1980). Hall (1978) indicated that most of the teachers who participated in her study were employed in multiple teacher departments with only 19 percent of the teachers being the only home economics teacher in their school. The high rate of one teacher departments in South Dakota could be explained by the low population, the few high population centers and the large number of small schools in the state. Only 17 schools in South Dakota have over 500 students in grades 9-12, while 198 schools have fewer than 500 students in the high school. Eighty-six schools have fewer than 100 students in the high school (Comparative Statistics on Classroom Teachers by School District, 1981-1982).

Class enrollments. South Dakota home economics classroom enrollment varied widely as indicated by the large standard deviation (Table 2). Student enrollment for home economics departments ranged from 5 students to 190 students. The mean number of students in a home eco-

nomics program was 64.4 and the median was 54 students (Table 2). Home economics enrollment in South Dakota tends to have more departments in the lower half of the 5 to 190 range than the upper half.

The mean number of students for each population subgroup is also shown in Table 2. Total enrollment in home economics classes increased as the size of school increased but the amount of variation in home economics enrollment also increased as size of school increased. Schools with small enrollments had a more consistent level of enrollment in home economics classes. Schools with large enrollments had a higher variance.

Thirteen schools (15.7 percent) reported no boys enrolled in home economics programs. Approximately half of the schools studied in the sample had fewer than 10 boys enrolled in home economics classes. The mean number and standard deviation of boys enrolled in home economics for the total sample, 13.69 and 13.60, respectively, shows that (assuming a normal curve) 68 percent of all schools in South Dakota fall into a category of having between approximately 1 to 27 boys enrolled in home economics. About 95.5 percent of South Dakota schools have 0 to 41 boys in home economics classes.

The mean number of boys in home economics classes, 13.69, divided by the mean number of all students enrolled in home economics, 64.36, suggests that almost 21 percent of the home economics enrollment in South Dakota is boys. This is higher than the 19 percent boys reported by Hughes in The National Census Study of Secondary Vocational Consumer and Homemaking Programs (1980). The Coon study (1962) reported an enrollment of 98 percent females and 2 percent males in vocational

TABLE 2

Means and Standard Deviations for Number of Boys,
Total Class Enrollment, and Professional Involvement
for Total Sample and by Population Subgroups

Population Subgroup	N	Total Enrollment		Number of Boys		Professional Involvement	
		\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.	\bar{X}	S.D.
Total Sample	84	64.36	(41.67)	13.69	(13.60)	4.10	(2.12)
I (Under 100)	24	32.46	(15.03)	6.38	(5.32)	4.08	(2.30)
II (101-250)	24	53.74	(19.38)	13.04	(8.73)	4.13	(2.11)
III (251-500)	19	76.59	(38.87)	13.28	(15.67)	4.61	(2.12)
IV (Over 500)	17	111.53	(46.03)	25.35	(17.64)	3.53	(1.88)

homemaking programs.

The Education Amendments Act of 1976, Title II, stressed that both males and females be encouraged to participate in, and have equal access to, vocational education programs. An increase from 2 percent nationwide to nearly 21 percent in South Dakota indicates considerable progress in male participation in home economics programs. The reasons for the increase may be that increased efforts to encourage male enrollment in consumer and homemaking programs have been successful, and that attitudes about the male and female roles in the family are changing. Hughes (1980) cited the need for home economics classes to be made accessible to male students in terms of class schedules and for providing nonsexist course descriptions. Perhaps an awareness of these factors has brought about some of the increase in male home economics enrollment.

The number of males enrolled in home economics increased slightly as the size of school increased (Table 2). However, the amount of variance increased as school size increased, so the relationship of number of boys to school enrollment was not consistent. Having more students did not necessarily contribute to having more boys in class.

Personal preference of teaching subject. Teachers were asked to indicate their favorite and least favorite subject matter to teach by putting the five subject matter areas into rank order. Almost 42 percent of the sample chose Textiles and Clothing as their favorite subject matter to teach (Table 1). One-third chose Human Development and the Family as their favorite; Foods and Nutrition was the favorite of

the remaining teachers responding to this question. No one chose Home Management and Family Economics or Housing as their favorite subject to teach. A breakdown of these responses by population subgroup (Table 1) showed that teachers in smaller schools (Population Subgroups I and II) indicated Human Development and the Family as a favorite more often than teachers in larger schools (Population Subgroups III and IV). Textiles and Clothing was a favorite of a few more teachers in population subgroups III and IV than in I and II.

Over one-half of the sample chose Home Management and Family Economics as the least favorite subject to teach (Table 1). Housing was next with 28.7 percent, followed by Textiles and Clothing, Human Development and the Family, and Foods and Nutrition, respectively. A breakdown of the data by population subgroup yielded the same rank-order results as the entire sample. Home Management and Family Economics was the least favorite subject matter to teach in all four population subgroups.

Professional involvement. Responses related to membership in professional organizations and attendance at meetings indicated that the South Dakota Vocational Association/American Vocational Association (SDVA/AVA) was the most popular professional organization in both membership and attendance (Table 1). About 68 percent of the sample were members of SDVA/AVA and over 80 percent of the membership attended regular meetings. The South Dakota Education Association (SDEA) had the second greatest membership in the sample but the attendance at SDEA meetings ranked last. The high membership in SDEA is probably due to

the pressure exerted on teachers by peers to join for legal reasons, and to show unity in the profession. The smallest membership percentage belonged to the South Dakota Home Economics Association/American Home Economics Association (SDHEA/AHEA) but over 60 percent of the members attended regular meetings. Future Homemakers of America/Home Economics Related Occupations (FHA/HERO) involved about 60 percent of the sample as advisors with 100 percent of the advisors in attendance at the State Meeting. The large percentage of attendance at FHA/HERO meetings may be attributable to it being a student activity. Teachers accompany students to supervise and share the learning experience. Attendance may be better at SDVA/AVA and SDHEA/AHEA meetings because the vocational organizations are more specifically aimed at home economics concepts than SDEA.

A professional involvement score was computed with a possible score of 0 (no involvement) to 8 (very involved in professional organizations). The mean score of 4.10 for the sample (Table 2), shows that home economists in South Dakota are moderately involved in professional organizations. The percentage of attendance for the organizations indicates that for some home economists, the extent of involvement may be just membership and not actively attending meetings.

Table 2 shows the professional involvement mean scores for each population subgroup. Population subgroup III (251 to 500 students) had the highest mean score of 4.61 and population subgroup IV (over 500 students) had the lowest mean score of 3.53.

Mears, Ley, and Ray (1981) reported that a reoccurring factor in reports on teachers of exemplary programs was their involvement in pro-

fessional organizations. A variety of professional activities enabled them to continually update their professional competence.

Subject Matter Emphasis
in Home Economics

The Curriculum Orientation Survey (COS) was used to measure the subject matter emphases in South Dakota home economics programs. Possible scores for each subject matter subscale ranged from 12, indicating that the subject matter was not included in the teacher's curriculum, to 48, indicating that the subject matter was a major part of the curriculum. The mean scores for all of the subject matter areas were above the median of 30.00 (Table 3), indicating that all of the subject matter areas included in the survey are emphasized to a moderate extent. Housing had the least emphasis with a mean score of 31.33. The greatest emphasis was given to Foods and Nutrition with a mean score of 38.66 followed by Human Development and the Family (35.92), Home Management and Family Economics (35.12), and Textiles and Clothing (34.92). Human Development and the Family and Housing showed the greatest variance in mean scores, indicating that home economics teachers in South Dakota differed most in their emphasis of these areas.

Hall's findings (1978) were comparable to these results. The rank order was almost the same, the exception being that the teachers in Hall's study ranked Textiles and Clothing before Home Management and Family Economics. Subject area mean scores in Hall's study were considerably lower than in South Dakota's home economics programs. In the Hall study (1978), Foods and Nutrition was the only subject area with a mean above the median of 30.00.

TABLE 3

Mean Scores and Standard Deviation for COS
Subject Matter Emphases Subscales

Subject Matter Emphases Subscales	N ¹	Mean ²	Standard Deviation
Human Development and the Family	83	35.92	6.42
Home Management and Family Economics	83	35.12	5.72
Food and Nutrition	83	38.66	3.56
Textiles and Clothing	83	34.92	5.54
Housing	83	31.33	6.19

¹ N does not always equal 84 because not everyone responded to all the questions.

² Possible scores ranged from 12 (no emphasis) to 48 (major emphasis).

The results of this study were supported in a study by Pickard (1983). The subject area given most emphasis by the South Dakota home economics teachers sampled was Foods and Nutrition. It was emphasized by 62.35 percent of the respondents. The second most emphasized subject matter was Parenting/Child Development (21 percent), followed by Consumerism/Management (12 percent) and Clothing and Textiles (4 percent). None of the participants cited Housing as a major area of emphasis.

Content or Pervasive Themes in Home Economics

Content emphases scores had a possible range of 15 to 60. A score of 15 indicated that the teacher did not integrate the concept in teaching, and a score of 60 indicated total integration of the concept in all units. The subscale mean scores were all above the median of 37.5 (Table 4). Information oriented objectives received the greatest emphasis with a very high mean score, followed by Management, and Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships. Values received the least emphasis (mean=38.63) of all the content or pervasive theme subscales. Variability ranged from 5.13 for Information content to 6.10 for Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships content. Even with this much variability, the majority of home economics teachers in South Dakota were within the parameters of at least a moderate emphasis for all the content areas.

TABLE 4
Mean Scores and Standard Deviation for COS
Content Emphases Subscales

Content Emphases Subscales	N ¹	Mean ²	Standard Deviation
Information	83	48.30	5.13
Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships	84	42.86	6.10
Management	82	46.18	5.44
Values	83	38.63	6.02

¹N does not always equal 84 because not everyone responded to all the questions.

²Possible scores ranged from 15 (no emphasis) to 60 (major emphasis).

The rank order of content areas was the same in Hall's study (1978) as in South Dakota. However, the Hall study mean scores were lower in every content area, ranging from 40.32 for Information content to 30.93 for Values content (1978, p. 53).

Testing the Hypotheses

Eleven hypotheses were developed and tested by analysis of variance to determine the extent of interaction between subject matter and content emphases and certain demographic variables. The minimum level of probability acceptable for significance was set at .05 for probability of F and R values.

Hypothesis One

There is no significant relationship between the amount of teaching experience and subject matter emphasis.

The hypothesis was tested with the Pearson r and analysis of variance. The relationship between teaching experience and Foods and Nutrition was found to be significant at the .05 level but the correlation coefficient was not particularly high (Table 5). Therefore, experience did not explain a very large percentage of the variance in Foods and Nutrition scores. Results from the analysis of variance testing also showed that a significant relationship existed between teaching experience and subject emphasis (Table 6). Teachers who were in their first year of teaching had a significantly lower emphasis on Foods and Nutrition than teachers with more experience. The highest mean scores in Foods and Nutrition emphasis were found in the upper levels of teaching experience (over 10 years). Perhaps the newer teachers are reflecting the push to get away from the "stitching and stewing" image that some feel to have been prevalent in home economics. Another explanation could be that older teachers are responding to community demands. The hypothesis was rejected because a significant relationship was noted between subject matter emphasis and experience.

Hypothesis Two

There is no significant relationship between teaching experience and content emphasis.

Results from using the Pearson r and the analysis of variance testing revealed that there was no significant relationship between teaching experience and content emphasis (Tables 5 and 6). The

TABLE 5

Correlation Coefficients and Probability of r for Subject Area and Content
by Experience, Professional Involvement, Number of Boys, and Class Enrollment

Variables	S1	S2	S3	S4	S5	C1	C2	C3	C4
Experience									
--Pearson's r	0.15	0.13	0.25*	0.19	-0.12	0.14	0.16	0.14	0.08
--Probability of r	0.17	0.23	0.03	0.08	0.27	0.20	0.16	0.22	0.47
Involvement									
--Pearson's r	0.43*	0.41*	0.24*	0.19	0.13	0.33*	0.36*	0.37*	0.29*
--Probability of r	0.0001	0.0002	0.03	0.08	0.26	0.003	0.0007	0.0008	0.007
Boys									
--Pearson's r	-0.10	-0.10	0.02	-0.04	0.11	-0.03	-0.07	-0.01	0.01
--Probability of r	0.38	0.37	0.83	0.74	0.31	0.76	0.56	0.91	0.95
Class Enrollment									
--Pearson's r	0.08	-0.01	0.10	0.02	0.08	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.09
--Probability of r	0.48	0.99	0.36	0.85	0.48	0.68	0.59	0.56	0.42

S1 = Human Development and
the Family

S2 = Home Management and
Family Economics

S3 = Foods and Nutrition

S4 = Textiles and Clothing

S5 = Housing

C1 = Information

C2 = Human Development and
Interpersonal Relationships

C3 = Management

C4 = Values

* Less than .05

TABLE 6

Analysis of Variance, F Values, and Probability of
F for Content and Subject Matter¹ Emphases and
Independent Variables¹

Dependent Variables	Size	Experience	Favorite Subject Matter	Least Favorite Subject Matter
Subject Matter Emphases				
--Human Development and the Family	0.52 0.7193	0.85 0.4950	1.24 0.5862	2.09 0.1561
--Home Management and Family Economics	0.49 0.6951	1.57 0.1804	0.10 0.9024	0.66 0.6246
--Foods and Nutrition	0.22 0.8809	2.47 0.0418*	0.22 0.8017	2.07 0.1062
--Textiles and Clothing	0.49 0.6972	1.17 0.3326	1.88 0.1657	1.60 0.1976
--Housing	0.93 0.4326	0.47 0.7964	1.46 0.2443	6.26 0.0005*
Content Emphases				
--Information	0.44 0.7307	0.52 0.7614	0.26 0.7697	0.52 0.7242
--Human Development and Interpersonal Rela- tionships	1.00 0.4026	1.81 0.1237	0.21 0.8113	0.34 0.8477
--Management	0.18 0.9047	0.92 0.4767	0.41 0.6646	0.21 0.9287
--Values	1.49 0.2242	1.19 0.3243	0.23 0.7980	0.82 0.5203

¹ In the table, the top number is the F Value and the bottom number is probability of F.

* Less than .05

results did not support the premise behind this hypothesis that teachers with more experience would teach at a higher cognitive level by including more Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships, Management, and Values content rather than Information oriented content. Therefore, the hypothesis could not be rejected.

Hypothesis Three

There is no significant relationship between class enrollment (size of home economics classes and number of boys) and subject matter emphasis.

Pearson's r correlation testing provided the basis for analysis of the hypothesis. With the increasing number of boys enrolled in home economics, it was thought that there might be a corresponding change in subject matter emphasis. However, the relationship was not significant (Table 5). The hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Four

There is no significant relationship between class enrollment (size of home economics classes and number of boys) and content emphasis.

The Pearson r was again used to test the hypothesis of correlation between class enrollment and content emphasis. The correlation coefficients in Table 5 indicate that very little of the variance in content emphasis could be explained by class enrollment. Hypothesis four could not be rejected on the basis of these test results.

Hypothesis Five

There is no significant relationship between school size and subject matter emphasis.

The mean scores for subject matter emphasis by population subgroup did not show a significant difference between the four sizes of schools. Subject matter emphasis mean scores were very similar in each size subgroup (Table 7). When probability of F values were computed for school size and subject matter emphasis, no significance was found. Thus, the hypothesis was not rejected.

Hypothesis Six

There is no significant relationship between school size and content emphasis.

Analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. None of the F values revealed a significant relationship between school size and content emphasis. The mean scores for content emphasis were very similar in each size subgroup, with one exception. Population subgroup IV (over 500 students) had a slightly higher emphasis on Values and lower emphasis on Information than the other three subgroups (Table 8). However, the hypothesis was not rejected because this relationship was not significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis Seven

There is no significant relationship between personal preference of teaching subject and subject matter emphasis.

Personal preference of teaching subject is subdivided into the teachers' favorite and least favorite subject to teach. As described earlier, Textiles and Clothing was ranked first and Home Management

TABLE 7

Mean Scores and Standard Deviation for Subject Matter Emphases
Subscales by Population Subgroup

Subject Matter Areas	Population Subgroups			
	I (Under 100) N=24	II (101-250) N=23	III (251-500) N=19	IV (Over 500) N=17
--Human Development and the Family	35.29 (6.73)	36.22 (6.65)	36.58 (4.94)	35.65 (7.51)
--Home Management and Family Economics	35.50 (5.54)	35.00 (5.79)	35.42 (5.53)	34.41 (6.49)
--Foods and Nutrition	38.25 (3.66)	38.61 (3.59)	38.95 (3.08)	39.00 (4.08)
--Textiles and Clothing	34.58 (4.31)	35.78 (3.80)	34.26 (6.07)	34.94 (8.20)
--Housing	31.04 (4.99)	31.78 (6.25)	30.84 (4.36)	31.65 (9.20)

TABLE 8

Mean Scores and Standard Deviations for Content Emphases
Subscales by Population Subgroup

Content Area	Population Subgroups			
	I (Under 100) N=24	II (101-250) N=23	III (251-500) N=19	IV (Over 500) N=17
--Information	48.96 (4.06)	48.44 (6.06)	48.58 (4.51)	46.88 (5.92)
--Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships	42.42 (7.11)	43.54 (6.04)	43.11 (4.86)	42.24 (6.30)
--Management	46.04 (5.02)	46.00 (6.05)	46.42 (5.02)	46.35 (6.07)
--Values	37.25 (6.75)	39.48 (5.73)	37.95 (5.35)	40.18 (6.01)

and Family Economics last.

One very significant relationship (.0005) was discovered between Housing emphasis and the teachers' least favorite subject to teach by applying the F-test (Table 6). Teachers who rated Housing as their least favorite subject to teach put less emphasis on Housing concepts in their curriculum. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level.

Hypothesis Eight

There is no significant relationship between personal preference of teaching subject and content emphasis.

Analysis of variance was used to test this hypothesis. It was thought that teachers who preferred a certain subject matter may teach that subject on a higher cognitive level than one that was disliked. However, no significant relationship between the teachers' favorite and least favorite subject and any of the content areas was found (Table 6). The hypothesis could not be rejected on the basis of these findings.

Hypothesis Nine

There is no significant relationship between professional interaction and subject matter emphasis.

Professional interaction was measured by the membership and amount of participation in four professional organizations. The hypothesis was tested using Pearson's r correlation testing. The results indicated that professional interaction was a significant factor in three of the five subject matter areas (Table 5). Involvement was a very, very important factor in determining what was taught in both

Human Development and the Family and Home Management and Family Economics. Foods and Nutrition scores were also significantly effected by the amount of professional interaction. Teachers who were more professionally involved had higher mean scores in these three subject areas.

The hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level and the researcher concluded that professional involvement does influence what is taught in South Dakota's home economics classrooms.

Hypothesis Ten

There is no significant relationship between professional interaction and content emphasis.

Table 5 shows the results of the Pearson r correlation test between professional interaction and content emphasis. It appears that all of the content areas were significantly effected by the amount of teacher involvement in professional organizations. As professional interaction increased, content mean scores increased. The results were extremely significant in the Information, Human Development/Interpersonal Relationships, and Management content areas and very significant in Values emphasis. Therefore, the hypothesis was rejected at the .01 level.

Hypothesis Eleven

There is no significant relationship between subject matter taught and content emphasis.

The five subject matter areas were correlated (Pearson's r) with the four content areas or pervasive themes of home economics to determine if a relationship existed between what was being taught and the

TABLE 9
Correlation Coefficients for Content
by Subject Matter

Content Areas	Subject Matter Areas				
	Human Development and the Family	Home Management and Family Economics	Foods and Nutrition	Textiles/ Clothing	Housing
--Information	0.52	0.65	0.49	0.64	0.55
--Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships	0.82*	0.78*	0.55	0.61	0.53
--Management	0.68	0.87*	0.52	0.63	0.59
--Values	0.77*	0.82*	0.56	0.53	0.52

* Significant at the .05 level.

type of content focus in the program (Table 9). A significant relationship at the .05 level was found between the subject matter of Human Development and the Family and the content areas of Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships, and Values. Home Management and Family Economics subject matter had a significant relationship (.05 level) with Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships, Management, and Values. It is possible that the subject areas of Human Development and the Family and Home Management and Family Economics are taught from a more theoretical perspective than courses such as Textiles and Clothing and Foods and Nutrition. Teaching methods may involve more communication and value clarification exercises.

The hypothesis was rejected at the .05 level. Subject matter does significantly influence the pervasive themes in the home economics classrooms of South Dakota.

Multiple Regression

Multiple regression testing was done to determine how several variables combined effected the subject matter and content emphasis. Professional involvement, number of boys enrolled in home economics, school size, and teaching experience were the four variables used for multiple regression testing. It was found that these four variables did not explain enough of the variance in subject matter or content emphasis to make a significant contribution in this analysis and discussion of the data. Obviously, other factors are influencing home economics curriculum emphasis in South Dakota that were not included in this study. Some possible factors to be investigated could be:

parental expectations, administrative influences and expectations, advisory board recommendations, student teaching experiences, and other curriculum offerings in the schools that may overlap home economics curriculum.

Summary

Home economics teachers in South Dakota were generally a little less experienced than the average public school teacher. First year teachers tend to be employed in schools with small enrollments more often than in large schools; and the number of teachers with over 15 years of experience increased as school enrollment increased. Teaching experience was shown to be a determining factor in what subject matter was taught in South Dakota home economics classrooms but not in the content emphasis or pervasive themes. One teacher home economics departments were the most prevalent in South Dakota.

The average enrollment in South Dakota home economics programs was about 64 students, with approximately 14 of those students being male. This was a higher percentage of boys enrolled in home economics than was reported by a national study in 1980. Male enrollment was not a significant factor in explaining choice of subject matter and content emphasis.

Home economics teachers' favorite subject areas to teach were Textiles and Clothing, Human Development and Family Relations, and Foods and Nutrition, respectively. Home Management/Family Economics and Housing topped the list of least favorite subjects to teach. Since all of the subject areas were emphasized to a moderate extent, teachers

do emphasize some areas even when it is not their favorite subject to teach. However, personal preference of teaching subject was shown to have a very significant effect on subject matter emphasis in Housing, i.e. teachers who disliked teaching Housing emphasized Housing concepts less.

South Dakota's home economics teachers were moderately involved in professional organizations. The South Dakota Vocational Association/American Vocational Association (SDVA/AVA) was the most popular organization in both membership and attendance, followed by the South Dakota Education Association (SDEA) and South Dakota Home Economics Association/American Home Economics Association (SDHEA/AHEA), respectively. The amount of professional interaction did influence both the subject matter and content emphases in South Dakota home economics curriculum. Subject matter and content emphases mean scores increased as involvement in professional organizations increased.

Chapter V

SUMMARY, IMPLICATIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

This study investigated the curricula emphases of secondary home economics teachers in South Dakota. The purpose of the study was to identify the subject matter emphases and pervasive themes of home economics classes and to determine if there was a relationship between curriculum emphasis and certain demographic data. A review of the related literature revealed that home economics has not been very consistent in documenting program activities.

The subjects for the study were the 84 South Dakota secondary home economics teachers who returned the Curriculum Orientation Survey (COS) and the Demographic Data Sheet. The COS measured the extent to which selected home economics teaching objectives were included in the curricula, and the Demographic Data Sheet requested descriptive information about the subjects and the subjects' classrooms.

Analysis of variance and the Pearson r were the statistical tools used to analyze the relationships between curricula emphases and the independent variables. Descriptive measures were also employed.

Discussion of the Findings

Data from the Curriculum Orientation Survey showed that home economics teachers in South Dakota are including a variety of home economics subject matter areas in their curriculum. None of the subject matter mean scores fell below the median score, and yet the mean scores did not indicate a dominance in any of the subject areas. Subject areas

emphasized in secondary classrooms, from most to least emphasis were: Foods and Nutrition; Human Development and Family Relations; Home Management and Family Economics; Textiles and Clothing; and Housing. Earlier studies established that the major portion of time in secondary home economics on a national scale was spent on the two areas of foods and clothing (Coon, 1962; McMullen, 1975).

Data were analyzed to determine the presence of persistent themes in the home economics curriculum. The four themes investigated were Information, Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships, Management, and Values. The most persistent theme running through all the subject matter areas taught was Information followed by Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships. Management and Values received the least emphasis. Home economics teachers in South Dakota are teaching the home economics subject areas on a factual level more than the higher levels that involve using, communicating, and integrating home economics concepts. Perhaps more emphasis in teacher education programs should be focused at preparing teachers who would emphasize human development, management, and values as well as information content.

The subject matter taught was shown to have a significant relationship to the content theme emphasized in some instances. Human Development and the Family subject matter correlated highly with the content areas of Human Development/Interpersonal Relationships and Values; Home Management and Family Economics subject matter correlated with Human Development/Interpersonal Relationships, Management, and Values. These findings are not surprising since the two subject areas are more theoretically based, requiring decision-making and communica-

tion skills and knowledge of how values effect our relationship and management decisions.

A significant relationship between subject matter emphasis and teaching experience was found for the Foods and Nutrition area. Teachers with greater experience emphasized Foods and Nutrition concepts more than beginning home economics teachers. This relationship could be investigated further to determine reasons for changes. Content emphasis was not significantly effected by teaching experience.

School size, enrollment in home economics classes, and the number of males in home economics classes were not significant factors in determining subject matter and content emphases. Further studies could be conducted on more specific effects of male enrollment in home economics. This study used the male enrollment for all home economics classes and tested for changes in subject matter and content emphasis. Perhaps more insight could be gained by using the male enrollment figures for specific classes.

Textiles and Clothing, Human Development/Family Relations, and Foods and Nutrition were the favorite subject areas of home economics teachers in South Dakota. The least favorite areas were Home Management and Family Economics and Housing. However, all of these subject areas were emphasized to at least a moderate extent in South Dakota home economics classrooms. Personal preference of teaching subject did not have a significant effect on subject matter and content emphases in most cases. The one exception was that teachers who disliked teaching Housing emphasized Housing concepts less in their classrooms. These teachers may have to make a conscious effort to include more Housing

concepts in their curriculum plans.

Professional interaction, defined as membership and amount of participation in four professional organizations, was found to be a significant factor in both subject matter and content emphases. This finding supports efforts to continue to encourage home economics teacher participation in professional organizations.

Further research could be conducted on what motivates teachers to be members of professional organizations and actively involve themselves in the activities and meetings of those organizations. Research related to professional involvement could provide suggestions for professional organizations to design a format which would attract more members and keep them involved with relevant programs.

This study was limited to senior high school programs. Further research could be done on junior high level programs to see if subject matter and content emphases are similar.

The results of the multiple regression testing in this study indicate that there are other factors which could be effecting the subject matter and content emphases of home economics programs in South Dakota. Research is needed to determine what these factors are and to what extent they influence home economics curriculum.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- American Home Economics Association. Concepts and Generalizations: Their Place in High School Home Economics Curriculum Development. Washington, D.C.; The Association, 1967.
- Campbell, William J., and Stephen Vaughan Ballau. Form and Style. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1978.
- Caputo, Colleen C., and Judy Haymore. The Value of Home Economics Education: Observations of Students, Teachers, and Parents. Division of Occupational and Vocational Studies, The Pennsylvania State University, July, 1981.
- Carr, Audrey, and Jewell D. Ellis. "Categorical Funding: Changing the Focus of Consumer and Homemaking Education." VOC-ED, 56:42-44, October, 1981.
- Comparative Statistics on Classroom Teachers by School District, 1981-1982. South Dakota: Division of Elementary and Secondary Education.
- Coon, Beulah. Home Economics in the Public Secondary Schools--A Report of a National Study. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1962.
- Cross, Aleene A. "Charting the Course for Consumer Homemaking Education." VOC-ED, 54:37-39+, April, 1979.
- Exton, Elaine. "The New Vocational Education Law." Industrial Arts and Vocational Education, April, 1964.
- Fedje, Cheryl G., Ellen M. Champoux, and Melinda Holcombe. Impact Research Focusing on Mildly Mentally Handicapped Students in Secondary Vocational Consumer and Homemaking Programs in Minnesota. Division of Occupational and Vocational Studies, The Pennsylvania State University, September, 1981.
- Gritzmacher, Joan E., et al. Child Development/Parent Education Program Effectiveness. Division of Occupational and Vocational Studies, The Pennsylvania State University, 1981.
- Griggs, Mildred Barnes, and Joan Robertson McFadden. "Effectiveness of Consumer and Homemaking Education Programs." Journal of Home Economics, 72:17-18, Spring, 1980.
- Hall, Helen C. "The Relationship of Undergraduate Home Economics Education Programs to the Home Economics Curricula in the Secondary Schools: A Follow-up Study." PhD dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1978.

- Hendrickson, Gerry and Henry David. "Vocational Education Study--A Policy Inquiry." Journal of Home Economics, 72:14-16, Spring 1980.
- Hill, Alberta D., et al. "Vocational Home Economics Education: A Statement by the Vocational Education Coalition." Journal of Home Economics, 71:12-16, Winter 1979.
- Home Economics in Public High Schools, 1938-39. Vocational Division Bulletin No. 213. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education, 1941.
- Home Economics Seminar, A Progress Report. French Lick, Indiana, 1961.
- Hopkins, Charles O. "Is the Proof in Our Planning and Evaluation?" VOC-ED, 54:61-63, November/December, 1979.
- Hughes, Ruth P. The National Census Study of Secondary Vocational Consumer and Homemaking Programs--A Final Report. Iowa State University Research Foundation, Inc., 1980.
- Landers, Jacob. "Accountability and Progress by Nomenclature: Old Ideas in New Battles." Phi Delta Kappan, April, 1973.
- McFadden, Joan R., and Mildred B. Griggs. "An Ounce of Prevention." VOC-ED, 56:54-56, January/February, 1981.
- McMullen, Janet S. "The Relationship of Undergraduate Home Economics Education Programs to the Home Economics Curricula in the Secondary Schools." PhD dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1975.
- Mears, Ruth Anne, Connie J. Ley, and Elizabeth M. Ray. Dimensions of Home Economics Programs: Seven Case Studies. Division of Occupational and Vocational Studies, The Pennsylvania State University, March 1981.
- Morton, Michael R., and Richard E. Cross. "Can Program Improvement Be Mandated?" VOC-ED, 56:36-38, October, 1981.
- Pickard, Mary J. "Attitudes of South Dakota Home Economics Teachers Toward the Use of Microcomputers." Masters thesis, South Dakota State University, 1983.
- Pine, Gerald J. "Teacher Accountability: Myths and Realities." The Educational Forum, 41:49-60, November, 1976.
- Poyner, Edna. "Washington News." Journal of Home Economics, 59:692, November, 1967.
- Simpson, Elizabeth J. "Implications for Home Economics." Journal of Home Economics, 72:18-19, Spring 1980.

Smith, Amanda J. "Sex Equity: A Mammoth Job Well Begun." VOC-ED, 56:48-49, January/February, 1981.

Spitze, Hazel T. "Visions and Decisions for the 80's." Illinois Teacher, 24:2-4, September/October, 1980.

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

Webb, Anita, Judith Siegel, and Fran Jones. "Responsiveness of Consumer and Homemaking Education Programs." Journal of Home Economics, 72:16-17, Spring 1980.

Welch, I. David, "The Quest for Accountability." Journal of Teacher Education, Spring 1974.

Appendix A

October 30, 1981

Please help! Funding for home economics is being cut because information on programs is lacking. We need to know what is being taught in South Dakota home economics classrooms. The attached survey was designed to describe the subject matter and content emphasis of secondary home economics programs.

You are being asked to participate in this study because your name was randomly selected from a list of all South Dakota secondary home economics teachers. All information which you provide will be kept confidential and data will be presented in group form. Names of teachers and schools will not be included in the research report.

Please complete and return the survey in the stamped, self-addressed envelope by November 10th. Indicate on the survey form if you would like a summary of the study's results.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Darlys M. Zaske
Graduate Student

Edna Page Anderson, Ph.D.
Head, Home Economics Education

Appendix B

CURRICULUM ORIENTATION SURVEY

DIRECTIONS: Read each objective and then circle the appropriate response to indicate the extent to which the objective is included in your teaching.

- A. This is not an objective in my teaching.
- B. This is an incidental objective in my teaching.
- C. This is an important objective in my teaching.
- D. This is a major objective in my teaching.

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| A | B | C | D | 1. Define the meaning of management. |
| A | B | C | D | 2. Analyze the results of consumer behavior in relation to intended goals. |
| A | B | C | D | 3. Understand why food must be properly stored. |
| A | B | C | D | 4. Compare the value orientation of individuals reflected in their choice of home furnishings. |
| A | B | C | D | 5. Analyze financial management practices of the family in relation to the stages of the family cycle. |
| A | B | C | D | 6. Assess the needs, wants, and resources of individuals and families in the selection of living space. |
| A | B | C | D | 7. Illustrate how housing provides the setting for the social development of individuals and of family members and their interactions. |
| A | B | C | D | 8. Evaluate a variety of life-styles in terms of how they meet basic human needs differently. |
| A | B | C | D | 9. Assess the resources available for meeting personal and family food needs. |
| A | B | C | D | 10. Propose methods of creating, conserving, and substituting resources. |
| A | B | C | D | 11. Analyze values reflected in an individual's clothing. |
| A | B | C | D | 12. Demonstrate understanding of cooking terms, measurement techniques, and equipment care and use. |
| A | B | C | D | 13. Interpret the process of self-development through which an individual develops a set of values which are important criteria for decision making. |

- A B C D 14. Explain how family food preferences vary with the values placed on food.
- A B C D 15. Analyze ways in which housing, furnishings, and equipment influence the development of individuals and families.
- A B C D 16. Plan for adequate maintenance of living space, home furnishings, and equipment.
- A B C D 17. Develop a system for the storage, care, cleaning, and selection of clothing.
- A B C D 18. Explain major value orientations of different cultural groups.
- A B C D 19. Analyze the influence of the family upon growth and development of a self-concept.
- A B C D 20. Explain how clothing reflects an individual's self-concept.
- A B C D 21. Analyze the relationship of values to clothing preferences.
- A B C D 22. Comprehend the importance of self-understanding in interpersonal relationships.
- A B C D 23. Assess the features that tots, young children, the elderly, and the physically handicapped need to have in their clothing.
- A B C D 24. Prepare a meal implementing efficient work habits, organization, and appropriate table setting.
- A B C D 25. Evaluate resources available for meeting clothing needs.
- A B C D 26. Explain ways in which values are changed in relation to food preferences.
- A B C D 27. Assess the value basis for different individuals' use of non-material resources.
- A B C D 28. Compare the value orientation of different individuals related to their use of money.
- A B C D 29. Relate prenatal nutrition and early diet of a child to mental and physical well-being throughout life.
- A B C D 30. Describe the rights and responsibilities of both the consumer and producer.

- A B C D 31. Explain the interaction of heredity and environment on an individual's development.
- A B C D 32. Construct a craft project such as macrame, decoupage, etc., to use in decorating one's room or home.
- A B C D 33. Plan a rational approach to choosing housing from among the multiplicity of alternatives in the market.
- A B C D 34. Plan nutritionally adequate meals stressing basic principles of food preparation and service.
- A B C D 35. Recognize furniture representing various periods and styles.
- A B C D 36. Assess methods of solving value conflicts related to food choices.
- A B C D 37. Assess differences among individuals' and families' values as evidenced by their behavior.
- A B C D 38. Contrast construction standards of clothing purchased in a variety of stores with clothing constructed at home.
- A B C D 39. Evaluate the changes in today's society that have an impact on the family's management practices.
- A B C D 40. Compare the use of living space of individuals from a variety of cultural groups.
- A B C D 41. Appraise clothing choices in terms of social, cultural, political, and psychological factors.
- A B C D 42. Identify different options available for meeting housing needs.
- A B C D 43. Contrast the value orientation of different social groups as reflected in their clothing choices.
- A B C D 44. Analyze the different values of individuals related to their preferences for using personal living spaces.
- A B C D 45. Describe the decision-making process.
- A B C D 46. Demonstrate ability to use a sewing machine.
- A B C D 47. Define the following terms as they relate to people: (a) development, (b) growth, (c) maturation, (d) behavior, and (e) learning.

- A B C D 48. Explain the function of values in the management process.
- A B C D 49. Explain the function of nutrients in the body.
- A B C D 50. List the federal standards for food labeling.
- A B C D 51. Identify some basic needs common to all individuals.
- A B C D 52. Demonstrate basic skills necessary to construct simple garments, to make simple repairs and alterations.
- A B C D 53. Propose implications of the historical, cultural, and sociological significance of food.
- A B C D 54. Assess decision-making process as it operates in selecting a life-style from among a variety of alternatives.
- A B C D 55. Tell how woven and non-woven fabrics are constructed and how they differ in performance.
- A B C D 56. Explain how an individual or family consciously or unconsciously expresses their values through housing.
- A B C D 57. Analyze the relationship of finances to marital happiness.
- A B C D 58. Explain ways in which organization can make management more effective.
- A B C D 59. Describe ways in which management of resources increases satisfaction in establishing a chosen life-style.
- A B C D 60. Explain the relationship of human values to a quality of life.

Appendix C

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Please provide the following information:

1. Years of teaching experience

- ☐ Currently in first year of teaching
☐ 1 - 2 years
☐ 3 - 5 years
☐ 6 - 10 years
☐ 11 - 15 years
☐ 16 or more years

2. Professional Organizations--Please check if you are a member and/or have attended a meeting within the last year.

	Member	Attended Meeting Within Last Year
SDEA/NEA		
SDVA/AVA		
SDHEA/AHEA		
FHA/HERO (State or Regional Mtg)		

3. Total number of boys currently enrolled in home economics classes

_____.

4. Total enrollment in home economics classes_____.

5. Rate the subject areas in order of your preference in teaching them.
(1 = favorite . . . 5 = least favorite)

- ☐ Human Development and the Family
☐ Home Management and Family Economics
☐ Food and Nutrition
☐ Textiles and Clothing
☐ Housing

Appendix D

Subject Matter Emphasis Subscales

<u>Human Development and the Family</u>			<u>Home Management and Family Economics</u>			<u>Food and Nutrition</u>		
<u>Item</u>	<u>Letter Chosen</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Letter Chosen</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Letter Chosen</u>	<u>Weight</u>
8	_____	_____	1	_____	_____	3	_____	_____
13	_____	_____	2	_____	_____	9	_____	_____
18	_____	_____	5	_____	_____	12	_____	_____
19	_____	_____	10	_____	_____	14	_____	_____
22	_____	_____	27	_____	_____	24	_____	_____
31	_____	_____	28	_____	_____	26	_____	_____
37	_____	_____	30	_____	_____	29	_____	_____
47	_____	_____	39	_____	_____	34	_____	_____
51	_____	_____	45	_____	_____	36	_____	_____
54	_____	_____	48	_____	_____	49	_____	_____
59	_____	_____	57	_____	_____	50	_____	_____
60	_____	_____	58	_____	_____	53	_____	_____
Your Total	<input type="text"/>		Your Total	<input type="text"/>		Your Total	<input type="text"/>	

<u>Textiles and Clothing</u>			<u>Housing</u>		
<u>Item</u>	<u>Letter Chosen</u>	<u>Weight</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Letter Chosen</u>	<u>Weight</u>
11	_____	_____	4	_____	_____
17	_____	_____	6	_____	_____
20	_____	_____	7	_____	_____
21	_____	_____	15	_____	_____
23	_____	_____	16	_____	_____
25	_____	_____	32	_____	_____
38	_____	_____	33	_____	_____
41	_____	_____	35	_____	_____
43	_____	_____	40	_____	_____
46	_____	_____	42	_____	_____
52	_____	_____	44	_____	_____
55	_____	_____	56	_____	_____
Your Total	<input type="text"/>		Your Total	<input type="text"/>	

Appendix E

Content Emphasis Subscales

<u>Information</u>		
<u>Item</u>	<u>Letter Chosen</u>	<u>Weight</u>
1	_____	_____
3	_____	_____
12	_____	_____
22	_____	_____
30	_____	_____
32	_____	_____
35	_____	_____
42	_____	_____
45	_____	_____
46	_____	_____
47	_____	_____
50	_____	_____
51	_____	_____
52	_____	_____
55	_____	_____
Your Total		<input type="text"/>

<u>Human Development and Interpersonal Relationships</u>		
<u>Item</u>	<u>Letter Chosen</u>	<u>Weight</u>
5	_____	_____
7	_____	_____
8	_____	_____
15	_____	_____
19	_____	_____
20	_____	_____
23	_____	_____
29	_____	_____
31	_____	_____
39	_____	_____
40	_____	_____
41	_____	_____
49	_____	_____
53	_____	_____
57	_____	_____
Your Total		<input type="text"/>

<u>Management</u>		
<u>Item</u>	<u>Letter Chosen</u>	<u>Weight</u>
2	_____	_____
6	_____	_____
9	_____	_____
10	_____	_____
13	_____	_____
16	_____	_____
17	_____	_____
24	_____	_____
25	_____	_____
33	_____	_____
34	_____	_____
38	_____	_____
54	_____	_____
58	_____	_____
59	_____	_____
Your Total		<input type="text"/>

<u>Values</u>		
<u>Item</u>	<u>Letter Chosen</u>	<u>Weight</u>
4	_____	_____
11	_____	_____
14	_____	_____
18	_____	_____
21	_____	_____
26	_____	_____
27	_____	_____
28	_____	_____
36	_____	_____
37	_____	_____
43	_____	_____
44	_____	_____
48	_____	_____
56	_____	_____
60	_____	_____
Your Total		<input type="text"/>