

EXPRESSED NEEDS OF YOUNG FAMILIES IN MUSKOGEE
COUNTY FOR COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS

By

RILETTA SMITH MARSHALL

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1965

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1982

Thesis
1982
M369e
cop. 2



EXPRESSED NEEDS OF YOUNG FAMILIES IN MUSKOGEE
COUNTY FOR COOPERATIVE EXTENSION
HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS

Thesis Approved:

Margaret S. Callen

Thesis Adviser

Anna M. Gorman

Elaine Jorgenson

Norman H. Neuman

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express appreciation to the many people who were involved in this research, the completion of which would have been impossible without their cooperation. Special appreciation goes to my research committee. To Dr. Margaret Callsen, major adviser, thank you for your never ending time, encouragement, and ideas. To Dr. Anna Gorman, thank you for starting me on the research project and for helping see it to completion. To Dr. Elaine Jorgenson, thank you for your assistance and encouragement. Thank you all for the growth that the writer has experienced.

A very special thank you goes to the young homemakers who took part in completing the questionnaires. Your willingness to become involved made this study possible. Thank you for sharing of yourselves and your families. I hope some programs will be developed to meet your needs and help solve some of those problems you shared.

Appreciation goes to my coworkers who have supported me in programming and encouraging me along the way. To the several whom have also had this experience, thank you for sharing your work and ideas.

To my family who made some sacrifices in the name of mother's thesis, I say thank you. Thank you to my husband Ernest, whose support, cooperation, help, and understanding made this possible. To Ava Dawn and Tammy, thank you. Now, on to those projects we've put off and those visits we've planned.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Purpose and Objectives	2
Hypotheses	3
Assumptions Related to the Study	4
Limitations of the Study	5
Definition of Terms.	6
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	9
Cooperative Extension Service.	9
Extension Home Economics Programs Emerge. . .	10
Program Planning Process	11
The Family Today	14
Characteristics of Young Families	15
Studies of Young Families in Extension Programs. .	16
Reasons for Non-Involvement	19
Program Needs	19
Preferences of Receiving Information.	20
Program Timing.	21
Current Situation of Extension Homemakers.	22
NEHC Survey Recommendations	24
A Critique of Extension Homemakers' Programs as They Relate to Young Homemakers	26
III. RESEARCH DESIGN	28
Type of Research	28
Population of the Study	29
Sampling Procedure Limitations.	30
Selection of Sample	31
Development of Instrument	31
Statistical Analysis	33
IV. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA.	34
Introduction	34
The Sample	34
Characteristics of the Sample.	35
Age	35
Children in Families.	36
Employment.	38

Chapter	Page
Incomes	38
Place of Residence.	40
Home Ownership.	42
Educational Attainment.	42
Home Economics Background	44
4-H Experiences	47
Homemaker Activities.	47
Contact With Extension.	50
Extension Homemaker Membership.	50
Newspaper Readership.	53
Use of News Column.	57
Homemakers' Information Resources	57
Perceived Problems and Needs.	59
Preferred Teaching Methods.	61
Need for Child Care	66
Potential for Husband Involvement	67
Time Preference	69
Analysis of Factors.	69
Hypotheses	71
Ages of Homemakers and Children	72
Place of Residence and Ownership of Home.	74
Employment.	74
Knowledge of Extension Office Programs.	74
Homemakers' Involvement in Other Activities	78
Methods of Program Delivery	78
Programmatic Needs.	80
Time Preference for Programming	82
Summary.	82
V. CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	85
Findings and Conclusions	86
Objective 1: Participation or Non Participation	87
Objective 2: Programmatic Needs.	88
Objective 3: Involvement in Other Activities	89
Objective 4: Time and Method Preference.	90
Recommendations for Further Research	91
Implications	92
Meetings.	92
Independent Learning.	93
Information Resources	94
Needs	95
Awareness and Acceptance.	96
Change Image.	97
Recommendations.	99
BIBLIOGRAPHY	101

	Page
APPENDIXES	104
APPENDIX A - COVER LETTERS.	105
APPENDIX B - QUESTIONNAIRE.	108
APPENDIX C - TABULATED DATA	114
APPENDIX D - TABLES	129

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Respondents' Ages by Frequency and Percentage.	36
II. Ages and Number of Children in Respondents' Families .	37
III. Status and Type of Respondents' Employment	39
IV. Respondents' Family Incomes.	40
V. Respondents' Place of Residence and Home Ownership . .	41
VI. Respondents' Educational Attainment by Frequency and Percentage	43
VII. Respondents' Home Economics Background in Junior or Senior High School	45
VIII. Respondents' Home Economics Background in College. . .	46
IX. Respondents' Home Economics Background in 4-H Club . .	48
X. Number and Percentage of Homemakers Involved in Other Activities	49
XI. Respondents' Awareness of Extension Office and Services	51
XII. Extension Homemaker Membership by Respondents; Past, Present, or Future	52
XIII. Respondents' Reasons for Not Belonging to Extension Homemakers	54
XIV. Newspaper Readership by Respondents.	55
XV. Ranking of Homemakers' Information Sources About Home Economics.	58
XVI. Problems and Concerns of Respondents During the Past Year	60
XVII. Problems That Educational Programs May Have Helped Respondents to a Solution.	62

Table	Page
XVIII. Respondents' Preferences for Future Programs	63
XIX. Preferred Methods of Receiving Information	64
XX. Respondents' Child Care Considerations	67
XXI. Potential for Getting Husbands Involved in Educational Programs	68
XXII. Time Preference of Respondents for Meetings.	70
XXIII. Chi-Square Analysis of Relationship of Age of Respond- ents and Children and Involvement in Extension Home Economics Programs.	73
XXIV. Chi-Square Analysis on the Significance of Providing Child Care for Young Families in Extension	73
XXV. Relationship Between Extension Office Contacts and Program Involvement.	75
XXVI. Chi-Square Significance Levels of Reasons for Not Belonging to an Extension Homemakers Group	77
XXVII. Chi-Square Analysis of Homemakers' Participation in Other Activities	79
XXVIII. Chi-Square Analysis of Methods for Receiving Infor- mation	80
XXIX. Chi-Square Analysis of Significance of Factors Re- lated to Program Involvement	81
XXX. Ranking of Group 1 Homemakers' Information Sources for Home Economics	130
XXXI. Ranking of Group 2 Homemakers' Information Sources for Home Economics	131
XXXII. Ranking of Group 3 Homemakers' Information Sources for Home Economics	132
XXXIII. Ranking of Group 4 Homemakers' Information Sources for Home Economics	133

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Each year, millions of adults attend educational programs which are planned and sponsored by Cooperative Extension. At the same time, many people choose not to attend. Little is known about what motivates people to attend or not to attend an Extension-sponsored program (Coward, 1978).

Extension Home Economics programs traditionally have revolved around the organized educational unit or Extension Homemakers, Home Demonstration Clubs, or Town and Country Clubs. This has been true in Oklahoma.

Oklahoma Extension Homemakers participated in the 1979 National Extension Homemakers' Council Study of Membership. In the Muskogee County surveys that were returned, there were 13.2 percent of the homemakers under age 35. This compared to 23.21 percent in the northeast district and 15.97 percent statewide. About eight percent were under age 30 in the National Survey (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1981). A study in an adjoining county showed 10.2 percent of 157 extension homemakers under age 30 (Wooley, 1979). Wooley (1979, p. 1) stated "Some of the groups had 50th anniversary celebrations in 1975 with charter members present. This tells the story of the ages of many of the members." A similar situation exists in Muskogee County.

Young family programs became a national program thrust of the Cooperative Extension Service in 1974. By 1980, it was estimated that

there would be 42 million young adults in the age 20-29 group in the United States. This included over 752,000 young persons in Oklahoma (Smith, 1974).

The 1980 Census showed that Muskogee County had a total population of 66,939 consisting of 24,736 households. The city of Muskogee had 40,011 persons in 15,605. Data showed Muskogee County had 16,097 young adults aged 18 to 34, of which 8,813 were female.

Housing data showed 17,771 owner occupied housing units, which was 72.84 percent of the total housing in Muskogee County. City data showed 10,403 owner occupied houses, which was 83.66 percent of the total. Median value of county homes was \$27,700, compared to \$27,800 for city homes (Department of Economic and Community Affairs, 1981).

The 1979 per capita personal income for Muskogee County was \$7,585 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1981). No updated income distribution data was available for the county.

Census data from 1980 showed the population for Oklahoma to be 3,025,290, of which 1,476,705 were men, or 48.81 percent and 1,548,585 were women, or 51.18 percent. The median ages for all individuals were 30.1 years, 28.7 years for men, and 31.6 years for women (Department of Economic and Community Affairs, 1981). Data showed that 24 percent of Oklahoma's population was between age 18 and 34 (U.S. Department of Commerce, 1971). With so great a number of potential participants in the county, state, and nation, it is a major concern why young families were not participating more fully in Extension programs.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to determine (a) ways of increasing

young family participation in extension programs by looking at reasons they gave for choosing not to participate, (b) the educational needs and interests of young families, and (c) preference of times for programming and methods of receiving educational information. These were looked at with extension home economics programs in mind. The specific objectives of this study were:

1. To determine reasons for participation or non-participation by young families in formal Cooperative Extension home economics programs.
2. To determine the programmatic needs of young families.
3. To assess the involvement of young families in other activities.
4. To determine time preference and method preference for delivery of program information.
5. To make recommendations for further research and to recommend procedures for improving programming for young families.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were postulated for the study. They were:

H₁ - There will be no significant difference in ages of homemakers and ages and numbers of their children in young families who are not involved in extension programs as compared to families who are involved in extension educational programs.

H₂ - There will be no significant difference in the place of residence and home ownership by young families who are not involved

in extension programs as compared to families who are involved in extension educational programs.

H₃ - There will be no significant difference in the number of employed homemakers that are not involved in extension programs and the number of employed homemakers who are involved in extension educational programs.

H₄ - There will be no significant difference in the knowledge level about Extension programs by young homemakers who are not involved in extension programs and by young homemakers who are involved in extension educational programs.

H₅ - There will be no significant difference in involvement in other activities for young families not involved in extension programs and in young families involved in extension programs.

H₆ - There will be no significant difference in programmatic needs for young families not involved in extension programs as compared to interests and needs of young families who are involved in extension educational programs.

H₇ - There will be no significant difference in the method of program delivery preference in young families not involved in extension programs and in young families involved in extension programs.

H₈ - There will be no significant difference in the preference of time for programming in young families not involved in extension programs and in young families who are involved in extension programs.

Assumptions Related to the Study

The following assumptions are made for the study:

1. The home economics program of the Cooperative Extension Service is educational in nature and is designed to assist individuals and families in solving everyday problems in home, family, and community living (Wampler, 1963).

2. A large potential clientele is young families. The Extension Service is interested and has the capabilities of developing programs and methods to reach these young families.

3. Young families have programmatic needs and can and will participate in extension programs if the programs are planned to meet their needs.

4. It is possible to assess needs and preferred program delivery methods through use of a questionnaire.

Limitations of the Study

1. The study will be limited to young homemakers in Muskogee County, Oklahoma.

2. The study will be limited to determining needs of young families in home economics related areas, namely: food and nutrition, clothing, consumer education, home management, family financial management, housing, and family relations and child development.

3. The study will have the usual limitations ascribed to use of a questionnaire survey for collecting data. According to Compton and Hall (1972, p. 143), limitations on surveys are "dependent on the cooperation of respondents. If the procedure seems tedious or unimportant, the responses given may be careless and/or insincere."

4. Information and data obtained will be representative of young families in one county and area of Oklahoma, but will not necessarily be applicable to all other sections of the state.

Definition of Terms

Definitions which are related to this study have been formulated from the educational literature reviewed and from other studies related to Cooperative Extension Service programs. The following terms are defined for use in this study:

Clientele - Clientele is the term used to identify people who are served by the educational programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. The clientele participate voluntarily in educational programs (Thompson, 1967).

Cooperative Extension Service - Extension - Cooperative Extension Service or Extension refers to the phase of the land-grant institutions doing off-campus informal educational programs in agriculture, home economics, youth development, and related areas. Extension provides an informal education to clientele. The Extension Service is supported by county, state, and federal funds (Thompson, 1967; Wampler, 1963).

Extension Home Economist - Extension Home Economists are home economics college graduates employed by the Cooperative Extension Service of the state land-grant institution. An Extension Home Economist is a field representative for a local geographic area (Thompson, 1967). In Oklahoma, Extension Home Economists usually serve one county.

Extension Home Economics Program - The extension home economics program is the informal educational program provided to clientele by home economists employed in Extension (Thompson, 1967).

Extension Homemakers - Homemakers who are members of an organized Extension Homemakers group that meets monthly or bi-monthly for educational programs in home economics and related areas are extension homemakers.

Employed Homemaker - Employed homemaker is the term for a homemaker who works part-time or full-time for pay, either at home or away from home (Wampler, 1963).

Involvement - Participation, inclusion of young homemaker in extension programs.

Program Delivery Methods - Program delivery methods are methods of delivering information to clientele. Methods may be teaching techniques used in meetings or may also include use of media for information delivery.

Program Involvement - Participation in an aspect of Extension programs, such as Extension Homemakers, workshops, and meetings.

Program Noninvolvement - Failure to report participation in any aspect of Extension programs.

Program Planning - Program planning is the process in which representatives of the people are intensively involved with Extension professionals and other professional people in four activities: studying facts and trends; identifying problems and opportunities based on those facts and trends; making decisions about problems and opportunities that should be given priority; and establishing objectives or recommendations for future development through educational programs (Boyle, 1965).

Timing - Timing refers to the time of the program: morning, noon, afternoon, or evening; best day of the week for the program; and season of the year.

Young Families - Young families are young adults, ages 17 to 35. The term is used to identify several adults living together, a single adult, a single parent with one or more children, or a couple with or without children. Young families may be older teenagers, school drop-outs, engaged couples perhaps living together, premaritally pregnant girls, newlyweds, new parents, families with preschool children, one-parent families, singles, a working wife/mother or husband/father, or a commune group. Marital status may be single, married, divorced, or widowed (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973).

Place of Residence - Place of residence is the locality where one resides: rural, farm or non-farm, small town, or urban or city.

Rural - Rural in this study refers to where a family lives, in the country, either on a farm or non-farm, not in town.

Farm - Farm in this study refers to living in the country on agriculturally productive land, either involved with crops or livestock or both in earning a portion of the family income.

Non-Farm - Non-farm in this study refers to living in the country, but not on agriculturally productive land, possibly an acreage, with family income coming from sources other than farming.

Town - Town in this study refers to a settlement of homes with a population of under 2,500 people; in this study, every town except Muskogee in Muskogee County, Oklahoma.

Urban - Urban refers to living in a city with more population than 2,500; in this study, specifically the city of Muskogee.

Home Ownership - Home ownership refers to a respondent reporting owning their own home rather than renting or residing with family or quarters furnished with employment.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter reviews literature related to the modern young family and programming for the young family. A brief overview of the Cooperative Extension Service is given. Program planning, use of committees, determining needs, and recruitment and involvement are discussed. Also reported are characteristics of young families and several formal studies made on young families in Extension programs.

Cooperative Extension Service

The Federal Cooperative Extension Service was established in 1914 by the Smith-Lever Act. Peterson and Peterson (1960, pp. 204-205) stated the Service "was designed to facilitate education 'relating to agriculture and home economics' for persons 'not attending' college with special stress on 'practical demonstrations.'"

Earlier in history, the Enabling Act of 1862 created the United States Department of Agriculture. The purposes of the agency were stated as follows:

There shall be the seat of government a Department of Agriculture, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and to diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with Agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word (Joint Committee Report on Extension Programs, Policies and Goals, 1948, p. 12).

Also in 1862 the Morrill Act provided for a grant of public land to each state for a land-grant institution. Colleges created under the Morrill Act were to teach agriculture, mechanical arts, and military tactics as state legislatures would prescribe.

According to Bailyn (1960), the Hatch Act created agriculture experiment stations in 1887. The Act also provided for the dissemination of research information to the people. Federal agriculture agents were employed from the early 1900's through the pre-creation years of the Extension Service.

Extension Home Economics Programs Emerge

The organized groups of home demonstration clubs or extension homemakers began in the south in 1913. This was one year before the Extension Service actually began (Miller, 1973). Scott (1959) stated that the home economics is concerned with the improvement of individual, family, and community living.

Mann and Fleming (1975) emphasized six areas of concern in Extension Home Economics programs. The areas were human nutrition, children and families, consumer concerns, housing, health, and community development. The family would be benefited by all these areas regardless of age and stage of development of the family.

Cooperative Extension programs traditionally had been planned through formal and informal committees. Members of the committees were selected from clientele which the programs served and from representatives of other groups, agencies, and organizations located in the county or community. Needs identification and clarification were done by

committee members. Cooperative Extension programs were developed to meet these needs (Boyle, 1965).

Coward (1978, p. 11) states that

even though 'needs assessment' has been done, the demonstration of a 'need' within a community doesn't assure attendance at programs. Many people need the information and don't attend, others attend but don't need the information. The motivation for attendance, and reasons for non-attendance, are complex and may not be a direct result of 'need.'

Program Planning Process

Reisbeck and Reynolds (1976, p. 53) stated

People's problems and needs are the basis of Extension educational programs. Finding those needs certainly requires the involvement and the input of those who share the needs. This is usually done by establishing an Extension Advisory Committee composed of representatives of various clientele groups.

Committees functioned at the county, state, and national levels.

Boyle (1965, p. 12) stated

Program planning is viewed as a process through which representatives of the people are intensively involved with Extension personnel and other professional people in four activities:

Studying facts and trends;

Identifying problems and opportunities based on these facts and trends;

Making decisions about problems and opportunities that should be given priority; and

Establishing objectives or recommendations for future economic and social development of a community through educational programs.

Five phases of the program planning process were given by Boyle (1965, pp. 7-9) as follows:

- Phase I. The formulation of a broad organizational philosophy, objectives, policies, and procedures for program planning in the state.
- Phase II. The identification and clarification of a need and preparation for planning county programs.
- Phase III. The organization and maintenance of a county planning group.
- Phase IV. The reaching of decisions on the problems and concerns and opportunities.
- Phase V. The preparation of a written program document.

For such a process to be effective it had to be understood by the Extension personnel, had to have the same design statewide, and established and utilized favorable relationships with representatives from government, other agencies, and key individuals from clientele. Boyle (1965, p. 9) stated "educational leadership by Extension personnel requires developing cooperation and coordination in the planning effort among the professional staff of all agencies who work directly with the problems of people."

Boyle's (1965) findings related to the program planning phase. Theory showed separate mechanical process on paper, but when the social and human processes were added during the planning, the segments became interdependent.

Committee structure was determined when organizing the committee. Membership, officers, duties, member rotation and replacement, meeting schedules, and committee responsibilities were defined (Boyle, 1965).

Heard (1962), O'Connell (1961), and Voorhees (1960) used the Jahns instrument in studying committees. Boyle (1965, p. 35) summarized their findings as follows:

Committee members who were farmers or wives of farmers tended to have lower performance ratings than other members;

- b Members who had very favorable attitudes toward Extension did not have higher performance ratings than those members who had only favorable attitudes toward Extension;
- c Those members who had higher previous participation in Extension activities did not have higher performance ratings than those who had lower previous participation in Extension activities;
- d Members of higher educational level tended to have higher performance ratings than those of lower levels of education;
- e Members who participated to a greater degree in other organizations tended to have higher performance ratings than members less active in other organizations;
- f Members who had a greater knowledge of Extension tended to have higher performance ratings than those having a lower degree of knowledge about Extension; and
- g There was a tendency for those in the older age group (forty-one and over) to have higher performance ratings than those in the younger age group.

Richert (1957) showed that committee membership was related to success. According to Boyle (1965, p. 36), the following suggestions for committee membership were given:

- a The mere representation of people and interest in program planning committees is not enough. The representatives should be individuals who exhibit leadership traits, whose perspective goes beyond their own group boundaries, and who are interested in the work of the program planning committee.
- b Community leaders selected as representatives should be those who will be most aware of community problems, yet be those whose social and prestige status will not create a distinct differentiation of prestige status within the committee.
- c It would be better to use the individuals of high social status who could make contributions to the program planning group as resource persons rather than to include them as committee members.
- d It is unwise to include professional persons, such as vocational agriculture teachers and soil conservation personnel, in the membership of the county Extension

program planning committee because they may be regarded by the lay representatives as persons of higher status. Then much of the interaction of the group will center around them.

Leagans (1964) suggested a framework for determining the needs of clientele. Boyle (1965, pp. 42-43) reported:

Needs represent an imbalance, lack of adjustment, or gap between the present situations or status quo and a new or changed set of conditions assumed to be more desirable. Needs may be viewed as the difference between what is and what ought to be; they always imply a gap. . . .

What is can be determined by a study of the situation. To be useful, facts must be carefully selected, analyzed and interpreted through joint efforts of the Extension staff and lay leaders. Since people are concerned about their immediate situation, Extension workers and leaders can use properly selected and interpreted facts to arouse interest and indicate possible solutions to problems. Thus, facts help identify needs by pointing to gaps between what is and what should be. To be adequate, such facts must be obtained that generally fall into four categories: (1) current trends and outlooks, (2) people (what they think their needs are), (3) physical factors, and (4) public problems and policy.

The Family Today

The family today goes beyond the dictionary definition of the traditional family as the basic unit of society having as its nucleus two or more adults living together and cooperating in the care and rearing of their own or adopted children. Today a family may be: single adults living together, a single adult, a single parent with one or more children, or a couple with or without children (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973).

The Handbook for Extension Staff stated

There are more than 60 million people in the United States between 15 and 34 years of age. This represents 30 percent, or more than one-fourth of the total population. This segment of society includes most of the

individuals in the young family category, but members alone do not give a clear perspective of the potential young family audiences (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973, p. 3).

Young families were classified according to age, including those headed by teenagers, young adults living separate from the parental family, and couples living with relatives. Young family subgroups may be overlapped. These were

- older teenagers
- high school dropouts
- engaged couples, perhaps living together
- premaritally pregnant girls
- newly married couples
- new parents
- families with preschool children
- one-parent families
- working single male or female (may live in a cooperative or a bachelor apartment)
- working wife and/or mother; husband and/or father
- communal groups (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973, p. 3).

The Handbook for Extension Staff stated some special needs of young families. They were as follows:

How to cope with or avoid over extended spending--using credit to buy homes, cars, furnishings, and appliances. How to meet the demands and pressures of executive living, such as entertaining the boss, relatives, and friends, with little knowledge or experience in entertaining on a budget. How to meet the pressures when the husband is unemployed or in school. How to provide for the family when a parent is without a partner (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973, p. 4).

Characteristics of Young Families

Characteristics of young families included high mobility to advance in education, to establish a career, or to upgrade family housing. Young families tended to be located around middle-sized cities. They often lived in lower-priced housing and were receptive

to mobile home living as an alternative to apartments or less expensive houses. Young adults were often better educated than their parents (Smith, 1974).

The higher cost of living, changes in lifestyles, and career minded women changed the picture of the labor force. In 1973, 58.5 percent of all married women were employed. The number of married women entering the labor force continued to rise as working women contribute more to the total family income (Smith, 1974).

Wampler (1963, p. 12) stated

Various social and economic changes in our society and throughout the world have brought about the need for adjustments in programs. One of these is the increasing number of homemakers in the labor force. This situation has created new problems for the homemaker and her family, thus bringing about the need for programming adjustments.

Young families with children were concerned with child care and time involved for quality parenting. Family activities took precedent over outside activities. Young families often had limited resources since they were starting out, and with limited funds, there were many needs for their time and money. Extension programs helped the young family learn the skills and knowledge needed in this stage of life (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1973).

Studies of Young Families in Extension Programs

There were few recent studies of young homemakers in Extension Home Economics programs. Doremus (1964) studied 20 young homemakers in one county in New York. Program needs, program involvement, and preferred methods of receiving information were studied.

Barton and Gilchrist (1970) studied low income homemakers in two public housing projects in Alabama. There were 50 white and 50 non-white homemakers in the study that had family incomes of less than \$3,000 per year. Questionnaires were used to collect the data. There were 85 homemakers who responded.

There were 26 homemakers who said they got information from their friends or neighbors and 26 homemakers who got information from their mothers when they had questions about caring for the family and home. The researchers recommended that mother-daughter discussion groups of small numbers as a possible way to meet the needs of both groups. Television was suggested as a possible educational programming tool for this group, since it was accessible to all.

Shultz and Riggs (1972), Extension Agents, conducted a study of young homemakers in 1970. They studied the needs and interests of young homemakers in home economics, ways that young homemakers would like to receive this educational information, and reasons why they do not take advantage of existing home economics programs offered through Extension.

The study was a random sample of 535 young homemakers. There were 86 questionnaires returned that were useable in the analysis. Half of those returning the questionnaires were personally interviewed to get more information about their interests.

Their ages were evenly distributed between 21 and 35 years of age. Respondents were evenly distributed in residence among rural, urban, and suburban areas. There were 94 percent that were married. One-fourth of the homemakers with children were employed.

Shultz and Riggs (1972) felt that more facts and fewer assumptions were needed for getting young homemakers to participate in Extension programs. This was the case especially in the area of interests and preferences.

A survey conducted by Johnstone and Rivera (1965) through the National Opinion Research Center found that self-teaching or independent learning was quite common in adults. Respondents of higher income and higher educational levels had over twice as much preference for independent study and self-teaching as those from lower educational and lower income backgrounds. Johnstone and Rivera believed that experience and success with self-teaching promoted feelings of competency for future independent learning situations.

A study by Miller (1973) was more extensive on Extension Study Groups in Michigan. Information was obtained from 279 questionnaires of a systematic random sample of 573 members over 31 areas of the state. Age, residence, income, number of organization belonged to, length of membership in the Extension Study Group, size of group, help from the home economist, perception of the Extension Home Economist's responsibilities, use of leader training, most important things about the extension group, factors for joining, not joining, and dropping out were discussed.

McClain (1978) studied 146 young homemakers in two counties in West Virginia. The study analyzed preferences of ways to receive information, reasons for non-participation, preferences of subject matter, and preferred times for meeting.

A study conducted by the National Extension Homemakers Council, Inc. (NEHC) was designed to survey certain aspects of the organization

and its membership (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1981). The study examined membership demographics, leadership, and explored future directions for programming.

Reasons for Non-Involvement

Young family involvement in organized groups in the above studies had traditionally been low. McClain (1978) used census data that showed there were 9,364 women between the ages of 18 and 35 in the two counties in the study. Only 112 were participating in the non-formal educational programs of Extension Homemakers Clubs in the two counties.

Several reasons for non-involvement were found to be the same in the studies of Doremus (1964), Miller (1973), and McClain (1978). Lack of knowledge of the program and of Extension was the major reason for non-involvement in all three studies. Lack of interest in the program was the second major reason found for non-involvement in the studies of Doremus and Miller. The second major reason for non-involvement in the McClain study was meeting at an inconvenient time. Not being invited, not having any friends attending, employment, lack of a baby sitter, and lack of time were other reasons cited for non-involvement. Involvement in other organizations and needs not being met by the program offered were additional reasons found by Doremus.

Program Needs

Barton and Gilchrist (1970) noted some differences by race in needs and interests in their study. Non-white homemakers wanted more programs on understanding credit. White homemakers desired more programs on money management.

Programs of interest were a big factor in the Shultz and Riggs (1972) study. There were 94 percent who indicated they would attend programs if they were interested. Program preferences were food shopping, interior decorating, and beginning clothing construction.

Perceived needs in the studies of Doremus (1964) and McClain (1978) differed. Doremus found the needs of families to be as follows: sewing, 30 percent; interior design, 20 percent; gardening, food, and cooking, child care, and problems with teenagers, each 15 percent; stain removal, 10 percent; and none, 20 percent. Homemakers in the study indicated needs in each area, if they felt they had a need in the area.

McClain's research found the six top subject matter areas needed or preferred were good family communications, first aid in the home, reading, home gardening, child rearing, and living within an income. The entire area of food and nutrition was popular with, with over half the subjects listed on the survey rated above the 50 percent need or interest range to the 65 percent range. A need for self improvement for career planning was shown by 72 percent. The survey listed specific programs within each subject area.

Preferences of Receiving Information

Doremus (1964) and McClain (1978) found that 62 to 70 percent of the homemakers in their studies preferred to receive information by a newsletter. Second in each study was leaflets or pamphlets. Printed information was preferred by 58 to 65 percent of the homemakers in the studies. Meetings and newspaper articles were preferred by 55 percent of the homemakers in the McClain study. Television was preferred by 54 percent in the McClain study but was not a preferred method in the Doremus study.

Shortcourses were preferred by 40 percent and telephone by 30 percent in the Doremus study. McClain found other methods preferred were group membership, 38 percent; educational tours, 36 percent; workshops or conferences, 36 percent; adult education classes, 31 percent; radio, 25 percent; special interest groups, 21 percent; and other, three percent.

The National Extension Homemakers Study found that the members of all ages who were surveyed preferred direct contact (71 percent), either by group meetings, which was preferred by 46 percent, or by response to individual request, which was preferred by 25 percent (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1981). Indirect contact was preferred by 28 percent in the form of newsletters by eight percent, publications by six percent, exhibits and displays by four percent, television and radio by six percent, and newspaper by four percent. Other was preferred by one percent. These were the methods the homemakers considered to be of the most value to them.

Homemakers in the Shultz and Riggs (1972) study preferred to receive their program information through newsletters, magazines, or pamphlets. This would permit them to learn independently and at their own pace within their own time frame.

Program Timing

The best times of day for West Virginia homemakers to meet were morning and evening. Extension homemakers preferred morning meetings, while non-members preferred evening sessions. This was significant at the .05 level. Those homemakers who were under age 25 preferred evening programs, while those over age 25 preferred morning and evening meetings (McClain, 1978).

Homemakers in the study by Shultz and Riggs (1972) preferred to have their programs in their own communities. They preferred spring and fall programs because the weather was better for traveling and vacations were over. It was also found that few homemakers would attend a meeting if they did not have a friend going.

Current Situation of Extension Homemakers

The National Extension Homemakers Council conducted a survey of 10,663 Extension Homemaker members that represented a total membership of 135,534 (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1981). The survey was conducted in local group meetings during September and October of 1979. A random sample was done with 10 percent of the members within 13 states and Puerto Rico. In the study, there were 17.4 percent who were under age 35. The survey obtained data on the development of leadership through the Extension Homemakers organization and demographic and characteristic data on the membership.

The typical Extension Homemaker member lived on a farm or in a rural community. She was married, over age 45, and had a high school education. She was less likely to be employed than a non-member. If she were among the one-third who worked, she was in a clerical, sales, or secretarial position. The median family income was in the \$12,000 to \$14,999 range. There were children at home in over 50 percent of the homes, with over two-thirds of those children over 10 years of age. Most members had more than four years of membership and had served as a lesson leader for a variety of subjects. Extension Homemakers preferred group meetings for receiving Extension information.

The National Extension Homemakers study found that 62 percent of the U.S. population resided in cities of 10,000 or greater, compared to only 30 percent of the NEHC membership surveyed. The National Extension Homemakers Council admitted this posed a challenge to meet the needs of the urban homemaker while continuing to meet the needs of the rural homemaker.

The benefits of improving relationships, improving self esteem, and improving family were perceived strengths of the NEHC study. Leadership and involvement in the community were perceived as benefits of being a member, and were recommended as worthy of continual development. The study concluded that a variety of subjects were necessary to meet the needs and interests of members in the various stages of the life cycle. Concise educational programs needed to be developed and targeted to particular age groups to meet their needs, yet overcome any limitations.

The age group under age 24 was the least represented of any age group in the National Extension Homemakers study, with only two percent, compared to 19 percent, of the U.S. population in this age grouping. The study recommended that potential young homemaker members, 4-H "graduates," and others who could benefit from educational programs during the time when homes are established, families are begun, and careers are fashioned be continued as a priority. At the same time, the study noted that 67 percent of the membership surveyed was over age 45, compared to only 40 percent of the U.S. population. This indicated the need to continue programs for the preretirement and post-retirement groups. The survey acknowledged the challenge of the development of programs that provide breadth and depth of education to

meet the needs and maintain the interest of the current membership while attracting new members.

The study showed that the marital status of the homemakers surveyed was not proportionate with the marital status of the U.S. population. Almost one-fourth of the homemakers surveyed were single, divorced, or separated. Only three percent each were divorced, separated or single members. This compared to 25 percent that were single or divorced or separated in the U.S. population. Programming through Extension Homemakers was basically for families until the new clientele focuses in the last decade.

Extension Homemakers placed great value on public events and activities that affected their communities and neighborhoods. Of greatest importance were citizenship activities, with 49 percent of the homemakers in the NEHC survey participating. Community outreach and public affairs had a participation rate of 32 percent. International programs and activities were reported by 19 percent.

Extension Homemakers reported sharing their learning and updating of knowledge with others, mainly family members, with 71 percent, community with 20 percent, and others with nine percent. Home economics information that was shared was mainly in the areas of housing, energy, and home environment, foods and nutrition and gardening, and family and individual development and leadership.

NEHC Survey Recommendations

There were several recommendations made from the NEHC study, part of which were covered in the review of the preceding material (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1981). Goals and directions recommended

by the task force of the NEHC Board of Directions, State Leaders of Extension Home Economics, and Federal staff were for a five year time frame, as follows:

50 percent increase above 1980 levels in leadership participation of members.

Two percent per year increase in membership from 1980.

50 percent of new membership under age 35.

75 percent of the programs that fall within new initiatives be updated from 1980.

Develop volunteer recognition or CVU program for 30 percent of members and awarded by major public figures within each state.

Leadership training in each state.

Dues structure and voting privilege changes in the national organization (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1981, p. 33).

The study recommended that a positive replacement member ratio replace members lost. It was also recommended that other delivery methods be expanded to reach those who could not attend group meetings and to extend group outreach.

The task force recommended the following from Cooperative Extension support:

Models for guidelines and definition of working relationship between Home Economics and Extension Homemakers groups, clubs, and councils.

Extension professionals provide leadership development to EHC's and be reflected in plans of work and annual narrative reports.

Extension support of new initiatives and priorities of EHC program content and other program development.

Extension professionals provide opportunities for EHC leadership involvement in program planning and implementation.

Impediments in program delivery for membership participation identified and barriers modified in time, meeting

site, physical comfort, learning styles, self esteem, money costs, energy, and socio and psychological comfort.

Extension's emphasis on Young Families and EHC Young Homemaker outreach coordinated to reach audiences under age 35.

Extension aid in identifying potential audiences to assist NEHC outreach.

Extension program packages related to fundamentals and economics (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1981, pp. 33-34).

A Critique of Extension Homemakers' Programs as They Relate to Young Homemakers

McClain (1978, p. 123) concluded that Extension Homemakers organizations had expressed concern over the young homemaker as a member and felt "they must evaluate where they are and determine the changes which may need to be made." McClain further stated that with no more than one-third of non-members failing to join because of lack of knowledge about the organization, that other causes of non-participation should be considered.

McClain said the Extension Homemakers organizations needed to "evaluate their image" and determine their good and bad points. Extension Homemakers often were considered by many as "farm women's groups." In the study, 85 percent of the extension homemakers were rural, while only 67 percent of non-members were rural. Many of the older members refer to themselves as "farm women."

"Educational" purposes of the extension homemakers may not mean the same thing to everyone in terms of curriculum and methods. Some indicated they associated groups with "gossip, refreshments, and snobbery." This would not encourage participation or new memberships.

Few indicated they knew the organization had any relationship to a university. If the homemakers were re-educated toward their educational purposes, this might help the organization to expand its membership (McClain, 1978).

Another limiting factor of the organization was the majority of the organized meetings were held in the daytime. Young non-members overwhelmingly preferred evening sessions because of work schedules and child care. Consideration of rotating meeting times so that part of the meetings were held in the evening provided easier accessibility for some to attend.

Programs of local and county meetings and events were not publicized as well as they should be sometimes. Potential attendees may not hear about the event until too late to attend, if they hear about it at all.

Groups often expected young homemakers to seek membership. Most people preferred an invitation to participate. McClain (1978, p. 125) stated "Young homemakers tend not to like to commit themselves to constant involvement in organizational activities." Groups might emphasize education rather than commitment to attend meetings.

Young homemakers preferred a group with all young members rather than mixed ages, so it was recommended that all young groups be formed to meet that preference. Older members in mixed age groups served as advisers and allowed the young members to plan and implement their own programs and activities.

Young homemakers had a high desire for self-teaching rather than group learning situations. This provided questions and challenges to the Extension Service to recognize this trend and program changes in methodology and reports of fewer group contacts (McClain, 1978).

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN

This chapter reviews descriptive research as the type of research that was done in this study. The population and sample are discussed. The development and use of the questionnaire as the instrument are included. Finally, a description of the statistical analysis completes the chapter.

Type of Research

A survey type of needs assessment was conducted rather than working through a program planning committee for the following reasons:

(1) Committees sometimes have failed to function as effectively as they might because of poor attendance or many other reasons, (2) poor attendance or poor representation of clientele on the committee, and (3) ineffective work at a program planning committee meeting may have resulted in leaving an entire area of concern or clientele group out when suggesting program concerns and priorities for the county. For this reason, it has been desirable to include a means of getting information and input directly from the clientele. Therefore, by asking the clientele for their concerns, they felt that they had a voice in the programs offered. For these reasons, a survey instrument was used to gather data on the expressed need of young families residing in Muskogee County, Oklahoma.

A comparison was made of young families who were participating in the Muskogee County Oklahoma State University Cooperative Extension Center programs related to home economics and other homemakers who were not participating. Homemakers in the non-participation group had varying degrees of contact with the Extension office preceding the study, so the study handled the data as four groups.

The data gathered reflected the size of families in the study, location, income levels, ages of children and homemakers, educational backgrounds of the homemaker, involvement with and knowledge of Extension programs, and involvement in other organizations, activities, and community programs. Needs, involvement, program delivery, and timing were assessed in relation to differences in programming for young families currently involved in Extension programs and for families who are not involved in Extension programs.

Population of the Study

The families studied resided in Muskogee County. The sampling method used purposive sampling to include all the Extension Homemakers who were thought to be under age 35. Age groupings on the Extension Homemakers enrollment card helped in selecting Extension Homemakers that were eligible for the study. This group was classified as participating in Extension programs and was referred to as Group 1.

A second group was systematically selected from the homemakers whose names were on the original mailing list for the young family newsletter. The mailing list was started in late 1974 and early 1975 by asking Extension Homemakers to list young families in their communities, along with their addresses for the newsletter. This group

received newsletters periodically and possibly had contact with the Extension Homemakers who had added their names to the mailing list. They participated little, if any, in county educational programs. This group was referred to as Group 2.

Since 1978, names of county families in the public record of babies born at the Muskogee General Hospital, the only obstetric hospital in the county, were collected and added to the young families' mailing list. The group of families had little, if any, previous contact with the Extension office. This group was sent the periodic young family newsletter also. They were referred to as Group 3.

The newsletter list grew and finally became unmanageable after two years, with little feedback of its value. Names and addresses of families who had babies were still kept after 1979, but they did not receive a newsletter. They had no contact from the Extension office, and unless they requested materials or were referred to the office by a friend or family member, they made no contact with the Extension office. This group was referred to as Group 4.

Sampling Procedure Limitations

There were some sampling procedure limitations that should be noted. Everyone may not have been listed in the birth records that were made public through the newspaper. Addresses may not have been correct. Questionnaires that were returned for address correction were returned to the same person if the address was traceable. If the address was untraceable, the homemaker on the list immediately above the name of the homemaker who had moved was selected for the study

and sent the blank returned materials. Mobility was a factor in the survey. There were 36 questionnaires that were returned for address correction and others stated that they had moved when they responded.

Selection of Sample

Approximately 400 families were included in the selected sample to meet the size of sample requirement suggested by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). Enough data were expected from a sample of this size that even with a poor rate of return it would be valid and reliable. Every Extension Homemaker who was thought to be under age 35 was included in the study. Every other name on the mailing list was selected for homemakers in Groups 2, 3, and 4. The mailing list was by communities in alphabetical order for Group 2, and was by order of hospital births recorded for Groups 3 and 4.

Development of Instrument

The questionnaire was developed incorporating ideas from questionnaires used in similar studies done elsewhere (Appendix B). The questionnaire included questions for demographic data, and information on involvement and understanding of Extension. The survey included use of information sources, preferences of time for programs and meetings, preferences of methods to receive information, and perceived problems and needs. Open-ended questions were used in gathering data about information sources, problems, and interests so that information received was not controlled by the researcher.

The instrument was pretested with Extension Homemakers in McIntosh and Wagoner Counties, which were adjoining counties with similar

programs and people with similar needs. The pretest groups helped with the question on news column readership and use, since they resided in the newspaper circulation area. The questionnaire was pretested in October and November of 1980.

The questionnaire was changed as needed and tested again in December with the Muskogee-Ft. Gibson young homemakers organization, a vocational home economics adult group. One question was revised slightly to gather more data after this testing. The questionnaire was evaluated so that all questions could be analyzed by the computer.

The instrument was mailed with a letter of explanation (Appendix A) to the selected homemakers in the sample in mid-January, 1981. This was after the holidays and families were back to normal routines and were more likely to respond. Questionnaires were color coded and numbered to show the different groups of homemakers in the study (Appendix B). A second mailing was made in March after 143 of the 400 questionnaires, or 35.75 percent had been returned. Of the 206 questionnaires that were finally returned, only six were unusable. Blank questionnaires that had been returned and two out-of-state responses were discarded from the study data. The useable questionnaires represented 50 percent of the sample. Responses from the four groups were of similar size; each group representing 21 to 27.5 percent of the total sample. This was an added strength to the study and indicated the data was more valid.

Since all groups had some homemakers over age 35 in them, their data were included. In programming for Cooperative Extension programs, audiences sometimes vary slightly from the target audience, so those older than the young family age classification were included since their peers or family life cycle had put them there.

Statistical Analysis

The statistical analysis for this study was processed by the computer at Oklahoma State University. The frequency and percentages of responses were calculated for the four subgroups and the total group. Data was hand calculated for chi-square analysis.

The chi-square (X^2) statistical technique was used for summarizing differences in distribution. With the chi-square technique, the probability that frequencies observed in the study differ from an expected theoretical frequency can be determined. The chi-square has also been used to test the departure of two distributions from one another (Compton and Hall, 1972). "In educational studies the five (.05) percent level of significance is often used as a standard for rejection" (Best, 1977, p. 277). Therefore, the .05 level of significance was selected for this study. Best (1977, p. 291) showed the formula for chi-square as

$$X^2 = \sum \frac{(f_o - f_e)^2}{f_e}$$

Siegel's (1956, p. 249) table of critical values of chi-square was used to show significance levels of .05, .01, and .001 in this study when data was hand calculated.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Introduction

This chapter considers the demographic data of the survey sample. Ages, number of children, education, home economics background, employment, incomes, places of residence, and home ownership were studied.

The purpose of this study was to determine: (1) why young families were or were not participating more fully in Cooperative Extension programs, specifically, home economics; (2) the educational needs and interests of young families, and (3) preference of times for programming and methods of receiving educational information. These were examined by looking at regular participation in groups, organizations, and activities, newspaper readership, extension homemaker membership, and knowledge and use of the Extension office. Information sources homemakers used when they had a question or problem, preferred meeting times, preferred ways of receiving information, and possible husband involvement were studied. Questions of concern, problems the young family had in 1980, and preferences for future programs were examined. Presented in this chapter is a description of the participants, and findings resulting from an analysis of the data.

The Sample

The research sample consisted of four groups of homemakers in

Muskogee County. Group 1 consisted of extension homemakers. Group 2 were homemakers on the original young family newsletter mailing list. Homemakers were included in the sample if they were thought to be under age 35. Group 3 were homemakers who had been added to the mailing list from the hospital birth records. Group 4 were homemakers from later hospital birth records in 1980 and had not received any newsletters from the Extension office.

Questionnaires were returned by 200 homemakers out of a potential sample of 400. Questionnaires were sent through the mail requesting their response.

Characteristics of the Sample

Age

Examination of data in Table I showed that ages varied with the homemakers groups. Group 1 had 87 percent who were under age 35. Group 2 had 69 percent who were under age 35. Group 3 homemakers had 86 percent under age 35. Group 4 had 94 percent who were under age 35. Mean ages varied too. Mean ages were as follows: Group 1 - 32, Group 2 - 34, Group 3 - 29, and Group 4 - 27.

By design of using women of childbearing ages in the study, Group 4 homemakers, who had recorded births in late 1979 and early 1980, was younger than the others. Group 4 homemakers ages were two to seven years younger than other groups in the study. If the numbers were plotted on a curve, these groups would resemble a normal distribution.

TABLE I
 RESPONDENTS' AGES BY FREQUENCY
 AND PERCENTAGE

Age	Young Family Group									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Under 20	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	1.5
21-25	2	4	4	7	11	26	19	35	36	18.0
26-30	17	35	18	33	13	31	24	44	72	36.0
31-35	21	42	16	30	12	29	8	14	57	28.5
36-40	6	12	9	17	1	2	2	3	18	9.0
Over 40	2	4	7	13	5	12	0	0	14	7.0

Children in Families

The design of the study which used young families in two groups whose names had originated from hospital births from the previous three years indicated that these groups would have had homemakers with at least one child in either of the age groups under age five. Examination of data in Table II indicates 100 percent of Groups 3 and 4 had children. Of the other groups, 94 percent of the Group 1 homemakers had children, and 96 percent of the Group 2 homemakers had children.

The total number of children in Group 1 families ranged from none to six. There were none to four children in Group 2, except for one homemaker who had 11 children. There were one to six children in Group 3 families, except for one homemaker who had 10 children. There were one to five children in group 4 families, except for one homemaker who had seven children.

TABLE II
AGES AND NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN
RESPONDENTS' FAMILIES

Children in Families	Young Family Group									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Ages of Children in Family*</u>										
Under 1 year	5	10	2	4	10	24	43	78	60	30.0
1-5 years	23	47	27	50	37	88	28	51	113	56.5
6-11 years	29	59	30	56	19	45	16	29	97	47.0
12-14 years	13	27	12	22	7	17	3	5	35	17.5
15-19 years	7	14	9	17	4	10	2	4	22	11.0
Over 20 years	2	4	4	7	5	12	0	0	11	5.5
<u>Number of Children in Family*</u>										
None	3	6	2	4	0	0	0	0	5	2.5
One	14	29	14	26	5	12	31	56	64	32.0
Two	18	37	25	46	18	43	14	25	75	37.5
Three	8	16	8	15	12	29	4	7	33	16.5
Four	3	6	2	4	3	7	3	5	11	5.5
Five	1	2	0	0	2	5	2	4	5	2.5
Six	2	4	1	2	1	2	0	0	4	2.0
Seven	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	.5
Ten or more	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	2	1.0
<u>Total Children</u>	103		120		116		100		439	
Average Number	2.1		2.24		2.76		1.81		2.18	

*Respondents had more than one child in several age groups; therefore, totals and percentages will not equal 100 percent.

The youngest age group, Group 4, showed 56 percent had only one child, compared to less than 30 percent in the other groups. Group 4's child ratio was 1.81, compared to up to 2.76 children in other families. As Group 4 was still in their childbearing years, those figures were subject to change.

Employment

Table III shows that there were 113 women, or 56.5 percent of the sample, who were employed. Of that group, 87 women, or 43.5 percent, were employed 20 or more hours each week. Types of employment were: 29.2 percent clerical, 23.9 percent public service, 33.6 percent professional or technical, approximately nine percent production, approximately four percent other, and under one percent executive. Type of employment revealed little new information and further substantiated that few women were in executive or management positions.

Incomes

Examination of Table IV shows the families in the sample represented incomes ranging from under \$8,000 to over \$20,000. Twelve percent of the families reported incomes of less than \$8,000 annually. There were 2.75 percent reporting incomes of more than \$20,000 annually. Incomes of greater than \$15,000 were reported by 46 percent of the Extension Homemaker members responding in the NEHC study (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1981). The national income level was approximately one-half percent higher than the total sampling income. No real comparison can be made with the Group 1 Extension Homemaker

TABLE III
STATUS AND TYPE OF RESPONDENTS' EMPLOYMENT

Employment	Young Family Group									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Employment Status</u>										
None	26	53	19	35	20	48	22	40	87	43.5
1-10 hours a week	3	6	3	6	3	7	4	7	13	6.5
11-20 hours a week	2	4	5	10	2	5	2	5	11	5.5
21-30 hours a week	4	8	4	7	3	7	2	5	13	6.5
31-40 hours a week	10	20	21	39	12	29	19	35	62	31.0
Over 40 hours a week	4	8	2	4	2	5	6	11	14	7.0
<u>Type of Employment</u>										
	(N=23)		(N=35)		(N=22)		(N=33)		(N=113)	
Clerical	4	17	12	34	4	18	13	39	33	29.2
Household or Public Service	7	30	5	15	9	41	6	18	27	23.9
Professional or Technical	9	39	14	40	7	32	8	24	38	33.6
Executive	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	1	.9
Production	2	9	3	9	1	5	4	12	10	8.8
Other	1	4	1	3	0	0	2	6	4	3.5

incomes, since 18 percent failed to respond. These figures compare to the 1979 Muskogee County per capita income of \$7,585, as was stated in Chapter I.

TABLE IV
RESPONDENTS' FAMILY INCOMES

Income	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Under \$8,000	7	15	8	16	4	10	5	9	24	12.0
\$8,000-\$9,999	4	8	6	11	2	5	7	13	19	9.5
\$10,000-\$11,999	3	6	6	11	5	12	4	7	18	9.0
\$12,000-\$13,999	5	10	2	4	2	5	1	2	10	5.0
\$14,000-\$15,999	4	8	2	4	6	14	10	18	22	11.0
\$16,000-\$17,999	2	4	0	0	2	5	3	5	7	3.5
\$18,000-\$19,999	5	10	5	10	5	12	3	5	18	9.0
Over \$20,000	10	20	20	37	10	24	15	27	55	27.5
No response	9	18	5	10	5	12	7	13	27	13.5

Place of Residence

Table V shows that over 47 percent of the survey sample lived in an urban area. Over 41 percent resided in a rural area (23 percent non-farm; 18.5 percent farm). Only 9.5 percent of the respondents lived in small towns.

TABLE V
 RESPONDENTS' PLACE OF RESIDENCE
 AND HOME OWNERSHIP

Residence	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Place of Residence</u>										
On a farm	11	22	17	31	4	10	5	9	37	18.5
In the country, not on a farm	17	34	12	22	6	14	11	20	46	23.0
In a town of 1,000 or less	2	4	5	10	1	2	4	7	12	6.0
In a town of 1,000 to 2,500	2	4	2	4	0	0	3	5	7	3.5
In a town of over 2,500	17	34	18	33	31	76	29	53	95	47.5
No response	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	1.5
<u>Type of Residence</u>										
Mobile home	10	20	3	6	5	12	9	16	27	13.5
Single family home	37	76	48	89	35	83	44	80	164	82.0
Apartment	0	0	2	4	0	0	1	2	3	1.5
Duplex	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	.5
Other	1	2	1	2	2	5	0	0	4	2.0
<u>Ownership</u>										
Own	41	84	46	85	36	86	40	73	164	82.0
Rent	5	10	7	13	6	14	15	27	33	16.5

Fifty-five percent of the extension homemakers in Group 1 were from rural areas. Group 2 had a similar percentage, with 53.7 percent. This can be explained. When the group of names were submitted for the young family newsletter, the names originated from their extension homemaker friends, so it is likely that the two groups would show similar residency patterns. Only 24 percent of the hospital births homemakers in Group 3 lived in rural areas, and 29 percent of Group 4.

Home Ownership

There were 82 percent of the homemakers in the study who owned a home. Even in the youngest age group, almost three-fourths of the families owned their homes. As shown in Chapter I, census data gave home ownership at 71.84 percent for the county and 83.66 percent in the city of Muskogee.

Single family homes constituted 82 percent of the living quarters for the families in the study. Mobile homes made up 13 percent of the homes.

Educational Attainment

Examination of data in Table VI on educational attainment shows 89 percent of the total sample were high school graduates. An overall total of 45.5 percent attended college. Attendance ranged from 36 percent in Group 3 to 55 percent in Group 4. Groups 1 and 2 were similar in college attendance, with approximately 45 percent.

Degrees or advanced degrees were held by over 25 percent of the homemakers in Groups 1 and 2. Group 3 had somewhat less, with 22

percent. Group 4 had 24 percent who had received at least a bachelor's degree from college.

Home Economics Background

Data in Table VII show that home economics was taken as a subject in high school or junior high by 90 percent of the total sample. Food and nutrition was taken by 92 percent of Group 1 homemakers and by over 80 percent of the homemakers in the other groups. There were 83 to 91 percent of each of the four groups taking clothing. This compared to a total group average of 29 percent having housing, 36.5 percent having family relations, 34 percent having child development, 31 percent having home management, and four percent having other areas such as first aid.

Table VIII shows that several subjects were taken in the area of home economics at college. Child development was taken by 11.5 percent of the total sample. Family relationships classes were taken by 11 percent. Food and nutrition was taken by almost 10 percent and clothing by eight percent.

Two-thirds of the homemakers with college home economics backgrounds had 12 hours or less in home economics subject matter courses. There were one to five homemakers in each group with more than 24 hours of home economics subject matter. While there was an awareness of some of the homemakers who had degrees, knowing who the other homemakers were who had home economics in college would be of use later, as many resource people are used in various ways in Extension programming.

TABLE VII
 RESPONDENTS' HOME ECONOMICS BACKGROUND IN
 JUNIOR OR SENIOR HIGH SCHOOL

Home Economics Experiences	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Had home economics	45	92	48	89	36	86	51	93	180	90.0
Did not have home economics	4	8	6	11	6	14	4	7	20	10.0
<u>Subject Matter Areas Studied*</u>										
Food and nutrition	45	92	44	81	35	83	50	91	174	87.0
Clothing and textiles	42	86	45	83	35	83	50	91	172	86.0
Housing	13	2	15	28	15	36	15	27	58	29.0
Family relationships	19	39	18	33	16	38	20	36	73	36.5
Child development	18	37	15	28	17	40	18	33	68	34.0
Home management	15	31	20	37	14	33	13	24	62	31.0
Other	4	8	1	2	1	3	1	2	7	3.5

*Respondents could have studied more than one subject matter area; therefore, percentages and numbers will not total 100 percent.

TABLE VIII
 RESPONDENTS' HOME ECONOMICS BACKGROUND
 IN COLLEGE

Home Economics Experiences	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Had home economics	9	18	8	15	7	17	13	24	37	18.5
Did not have home economics	20	41	25	46	15	35	23	42	83	41.5
No response/ not applicable	20	41	21	39	20	48	19	34	80	40.0
<u>Subject Matter Areas Studied*</u>										
Food and nutri- tion	6	12	5	9	4	10	4	7	19	9.5
Clothing and textiles	3	6	5	9	4	10	4	7	16	8.0
Housing	3	6	1	2	3	7	2	4	9	4.5
Family rela- tionships	3	6	6	11	5	12	8	15	22	11.0
Child devel- opment	3	6	6	11	3	7	11	20	23	11.5
Home manage- ment	3	6	1	2	3	7	2	4	9	4.5
Other	3	6	0	0	2	5	0	0	5	2.5
<u>Majors</u> ¹	2 ²	4	1 ³	2	5	12	2	4	10	5.0

*Respondents could have studied in more than one area; therefore, percentages do not equal 100 percent.

¹Had more than 24 hours; ²67; ³40.

4-H Experiences

Table IX shows that only 37 percent of the homemakers surveyed remembered having 4-H home economics project experiences as a youth. Membership of less than four years was reported by 23.5 percent.

While in 4-H, clothing and textiles participation were highest for the four groups, with a 29.5 percent participation rate. This was understandable with the emphasis that is placed on participation in the county dress revue event in 4-H.

There were 24 percent who had food and nutrition experience in 4-H. Food preservation was recalled as a project by 14 percent of the homemakers when they were members.

There were approximately nine percent who remembered having home improvement and housing experiences. Less than seven percent remembered having family relationships, child development, and home management project experiences. Other home economic areas, including first aid, were reported by one percent of the homemakers who had been 4-H members.

Homemaker Activities

Table X shows that young families were involved in a variety of other activities. Almost 70 percent of the homemakers in the survey reported that they participated regularly in church-related activities. Forty-eight percent participated in their children's school activities. Families involved in extension homemakers groups generally had a higher involvement in church activities and in their children's school activities. The high level of church involvement was in agreement with what Wooley (1979) found in her study in an adjoining county.

TABLE IX
 RESPONDENTS' HOME ECONOMICS BACKGROUND
 IN 4-H CLUB

Home Economics Experience	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=54)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Had 4-H Club home economics	18	37	17	31	15	36	24	44	74	37.0
No 4-H Club home economics	31	63	37	69	27	64	31	56	126	63.0
<u>Subject Matter Areas Carried as Projects*</u>										
Food preparation and nutrition	12	24	12	22	10	22	14	25	48	24.0
Food preservation	6	12	8	15	7	15	7	13	28	14.0
Clothing and textiles	13	27	15	28	12	29	19	35	59	29.5
Housing and home improvements	4	8	5	9	5	12	3	5	17	8.5
Family relationships	3	6	6	11	3	7	1	2	13	6.5
Child development	1	2	3	6	3	7	1	2	8	4.0
Home management	1	2	5	9	3	7	2	4	11	5.5
Other	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	1.0

*Respondents could have carried more than one 4-H Club project in home economics; therefore, totals will not equal 100 percent.

TABLE X
 NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF HOMEMAKERS
 INVOLVED IN OTHER ACTIVITIES

Homemaker Activities*	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Participation in church activities	42	86	42	78	23	55	32	58	139	69.5
Participation in children's school activities	27	55	38	70	20	48	11	20	96	48.0
Education for self	10	20	10	19	9	21	5	9	34	17.0
Trade club or group	4	8	5	9	3	7	2	4	14	7.0
Service club	32	65	10	19	6	14	4	7	52	26.0
Other activities	4	8	2	4	7	17	11	20	24	12.0

*Respondents could mark more than one activity that they were involved in; therefore, numbers and percentages will not equal 100 percent.

Education for themselves was pursued by 17 percent of the respondents. Seven percent participated in a trade or work-related group. There were 26 percent involved in a service club or group.

Young homemakers in extension homemakers saw their group as a community service group. Other homemakers were involved in community service organizations to a lesser degree. Young homemakers were involved in continuing their educations along with rearing children, possibly being employed, and being involved in family recreation and other activities. Young families assumed some leadership positions

in the community as scout leaders or 4-H leaders, and members of community service and political awareness groups. There were 12 percent who took part in a wide range of other activities such as singing; volunteering in the hospital; doing home art hobbies, such as quilting or crochet; and involvement in sports such as bowling, raquetball, or exercise. Bingo, Bunco, Kids' Day daycare, union, sorority, Business and Professional Women, Farm Bureau, and the League of Women Voters were other activities or organizations in which time was spent.

Contact With Extension

Table XI shows kinds of contact with the Extension office. There were only 50 percent in the survey who related some kind of contact with the Cooperative Extension Office. Literature had been requested or picked up by 25 percent. Programs had been attended by 18 percent. A similar number was familiar with the office because of other organizations with which Extension works. Only six and a half percent said their family belonged to an organization that Extension worked with, including the Extension Homemakers in the survey. Other contact was described by 11 percent. Other contact was through weight control classes, newsletters, news columns, EFNEP aide, the fair, craft shows, and telephone. Half of the respondents said they had no contact with the Extension office during the past year.

Extension Homemaker Membership

Examination of Table XII shows that 32 percent of the sample were or had been Extension Homemakers. Group 1 had 45 percent that had been members less than one year. Twenty-nine percent of Group 1 had

been members for one to three years. There were 27 percent with four to nine years membership and one percent with membership for over 10 years.

TABLE XI
RESPONDENTS' AWARENESS OF EXTENSION
OFFICE AND SERVICES

Contact With Extension Office*	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Requested or picked up lit- erature	22	45	15	28	8	19	5	9	59	25.0
Attended pro- grams	22	45	7	13	4	10	3	5	36	18.0
Familiar with other organiza- tions Extension works with	17	35	11	24	3	7	3	5	34	17.0
Family is in organization Extension works with	6	12	3	6	2	5	2	4	13	6.5
Other	6	12	11	20	3	7	2	4	22	11.0
None	9	18	24	44	26	62	40	73	99	49.5

*Respondents could have checked more than one contact; therefore, number of homemakers and percentages do not total 100 percent.

TABLE XII

EXTENSION HOMEMAKER MEMBERSHIP BY RESPONDENTS; PAST, PRESENT, OR FUTURE

Extension Homemaker Status	Young Homemakers Group									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Past or Present Membership</u>										
Member	49	100	7	13	4	10	5	9	65	32.5
Never a member	0	0	47	87	38	90	50	91	135	67.5
<u>Years of Membership</u>										
Less than 1 year	22	45	1	2	0	0	2	4	25	12.5
One-three years	14	29	4	7	0	0	1	2	19	9.5
Four-nine years	13	27	2	4	2	5	0	0	17	8.5
Ten-Fifteen years	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	1	.5
<u>Interest in Extension Homemaker Membership*</u>										
Would like to join existing group of all ages			10	19	4	10	4	7	18	9.0
Would like to join new or existing group of young home- makers			5	9	4	10	6	11	14	7.0
Need more in- formation			17	31	19	45	23	42	59	29.5
Later			14	26	6	14	9	16	29	14.5
Other			2	4	1	2	2	4	5	2.5
Not interested			13	24	13	31	14	25	40	20.0

*Respondents could have checked more than one interest; therefore, homemakers and percentages do not total 100 percent.

When asked if they would be interested in becoming an extension homemaker, 16 percent said yes, either in an existing group of all ages, or in a group of young homemakers. Other responses were: need more information, 29.5 percent; later, 14.5 percent; and not interested, 20 percent. Comments were later, when she retired, when time permits, or when her situation changes.

Even though several extension homemakers completed this part of the questionnaire, their responses were not included. This was because respondents were currently members.

Respondents were asked why they were not a member of extension homemakers if they were not currently a member. Respondents from Group 1 were not included since they were members. They could indicate as many reasons as were applicable. The information in Table XIII shows the two main reasons were lack of knowledge about the program, 40 percent; and was never invited to attend or join, 33.7 percent. Other concerns were lack of other young members and employment, by approximately 12 percent. Lack of time and child care were a problem for approximately nine percent on each response.

Newspaper Readership

Information in Table XIV reveals newspaper readership in Muskogee could be helpful for program releases and for releasing other information, because of high readership. The Muskogee area newspaper was read by 84 percent of the homemakers in the survey. The Tulsa newspapers had a readership of 12 percent. Oklahoma City newspapers had a readership of two percent. Small town newspapers in the county had an overall readership of about one percent each. Nine percent related that they read no newspapers at all.

TABLE XIII
 RESPONDENTS' REASONS FOR NOT BELONGING
 TO EXTENSION HOMEMAKERS

Reason*	Young Family Groups							
	Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=151)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Lack of knowledge concerning the program	15	28	22	52	24	44	61	40.4
Have never been invited to attend or join	14	26	14	33	22	40	50	33.7
Work	9	17	3	7	6	11	18	11.9
No other young members	7	13	7	17	4	7	18	11.9
Children are too involved and I don't have time	11	20	2	5	1	2	14	9.3
Child care is a problem	1	2	4	10	3	14	13	8.6
Programs are for older women	4	7	2	5	4	7	10	6.6
Requires too much personal involvement	2	4	2	5	4	7	8	5.3
Group disbanded	4	7	1	2	1	2	6	4.0
Fear or dislike organizations	1	2	3	7	1	2	5	3.3
No group is easily accessible	2	4	1	2	2	4	5	3.3
Lack of transportation	1	2	2	5	0	0	3	2.0
Husband disapproved	0	0	1	2	1	2	2	1.3
Other	8	15	5	12	5	9	18	11.9

*Respondents could have checked more than one reason; therefore, number of homemakers and percentages do not total 100 percent.

TABLE XIV
NEWSPAPER READERSHIP BY RESPONDENTS

Subject	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 1 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Newspapers Read</u>										
Muskogee Daily Phoenix	38	71	51	93	36	80	43	78	168	84.0
Tulsa World/ Tribune	4	7	10	19	4	9	6	11	24	12.0
Daily Oklahoman/ Oklahoma City Times	1	2	2	4	0	0	1	2	4	2.0
Ft. Gibson- Weekly	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	1.0
County News- weekly	1	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	1.0
Haskell News- weekly	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	.5
Others	2	4	5	9	0	0	4	7	11	5.5
<u>Read "Home Hints" Extension News Column</u>										
	26	53	36	67	16	38	23	42	101	50.5
<u>Have Used Information from Column</u>										
	16	33	24	44	8	19	11	20	59	29.5
<u>What Information Has Been Used</u>										
Food and nutri- tion	7	14	6	11	2	5	1	2	16	8.0
Clothing and textiles	2	4	3	6	0	0	2	4	7	3.5
Consumer educa- tion and buying	2	4	2	4	0	0	1	2	5	2.5
Home management	3	6	2	4	0	0	2	4	7	3.5
Home furnish- ings	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	1.5
Financial man- agement	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	4	3	1.5
Child develop- ment	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	2	1.0

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Subject	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>What Information Has Been Used (Cont.)</u>										
Energy	0	0	3	6	0	0	0	0	3	4.5
Home arts	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.5
General/variety	0	0	2	4	0	0	3	6	5	2.5
Other	2	4	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	1.5
<u>Information Readers Would Like in the News Column*</u>										
Food and nutri- tion	6	12	6	11	4	10	6	11	22	11.0
Clothing and textiles	1	2	3	6	0	0	1	2	5	2.5
General, same, variety	5	10	7	13	1	2	1	2	14	7.0
Financial man- agement	2	4	3	6	1	2	5	9	11	5.5
Home management	1	2	4	7	1	2	3	5	9	4.5
Child care and development	1	2	3	6	1	2	2	4	7	3.5
Home arts	1	2	3	6	1	2	0	0	5	2.5
Consumer edu- cation	0	0	1	2	2	5	1	2	4	2.0
Home furnish- ings	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	.5
Housing	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	.5

*More or less than one response was given by some homemakers; therefore, number of homemakers and percentages do not total 100 percent.

Use of News Column

Use of a local area newspaper has helped to disseminate home economics information. The home economist's weekly news column was read by 50.5 percent of the homemakers in the survey. Information had been used by 29.5 percent of the readers. Food and nutrition information had been used by eight percent, followed by clothing and textiles and home management at approximately four percent each. When asked what information homemakers would prefer, food and nutrition information was a choice of 11 percent. General information on a variety of topics, or the same format currently used, was preferred by seven percent; and financial management information by approximately six percent. Care had been taken that the column was not stereotyped as a food column.

Homemakers' Information Resources

Information in Table XV reveals that young homemakers of today received much of their information from reading books and magazines. In all areas of home economics, books and magazines supplied a major part of information needed by young families. Young families in the survey were asked to give responses about where they sought information if they had a question or problem in 11 different home economics areas. Data on individual group responses can be seen in Tables XXX through XXXIII in Appendix D. Periodicals that were named are shown in the Tabulated Data in Appendix C.

The data showed that only in the area of child care did the family look to the doctor as much or more than to books and magazines.

TABLE XV
 RANKING OF HOMEMAKERS' INFORMATION
 SOURCES ABOUT HOME ECONOMICS

Source*	Young Family Groups				Total (N=200)
	Group 1 (N=49)	Group 2 (N=54)	Group 3 (N=42)	Group 4 (N=55)	
Books	73	87	90	104	354
Magazines	38	68	84	89	279
Mother	17	45	32	49	143
Doctor	28	29	26	51	134
Friend/neighbor	29	37	22	29	117
Newspaper	40	34	18	34	115
Other family member	10	35	31	36	112
Self	1	16	34	36	87
OSU Extension home economist/aide	25	29	5	14	73
Husband	19	14	11	13	57
Department store/related business	14	18	9	15	56
Library	20	9	8	15	52
Church/minister	4	18	8	11	41
Extension homemaker	33	2	0	0	35
Health department	12	4	1	6	23
Banker	4	4	4	7	19
Television	0	1	11	2	14
Nowhere	0	8	4	0	12
Professional friend	1	5	1	4	11
Classes/seminars	0	6	0	4	10
Labels/tags/package information	4	0	1	4	9
Catalogs	0	1	2	1	4
Other	5	0	4	0	9

*More or less than one response could be given in 11 home economics subject matter areas; therefore, totals will not equal number in study. Percentages are not shown because of multiple responses in the 11 home economics areas.

The homemakers in Group 4 had greater use of the doctor than any other group. As ages of the groups decreased, use of reading materials such as books and magazines increased.

Extension Homemakers shared their information with each other, but were not looked to by other groups as being someone knowledgeable. Perhaps homemakers in the other groups did not know an Extension Homemaker, or know that one might be knowledgeable, or respondents may have considered an Extension Homemaker as a friend or neighbor.

Extension was the second professional group named as a resource for information. Responses on Extension office and staff included names of three Expanded Food and Nutrition Program or EFNEP aides, a 1890 Home Economics Program aide, and the professional home economists. Responses naming the EFNEP aides were in the area of food and nutrition. The 1890 aide was named in clothing. These programs were for limited income families.

Perceived Problems and Needs

Data in Table XVI shows that young homemakers' major questions of concern last year were in food and nutrition, with 26.5 percent; child care and development, with 22.5 percent; family health, with 16 percent; and financial management, with 15 percent. Clothing was a concern for seven percent. A concern for just over 11 percent was housing. Home management, consumer education and buying, and safety were concerns to about eight percent.

Young Extension homemakers reported no questions of concern on financial management in this particular question, but later 10 felt that they could have used an educational program on financial

TABLE XVI
 PROBLEMS AND CONCERNS OF RESPONDENTS
 DURING THE PAST YEAR

Problem Area*	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Food and nutrition	17	35	11	20	13	31	12	22	53	26.5
Child care and development	8	16	10	19	8	19	19	35	45	22.5
Family health	5	10	10	19	9	21	8	15	32	16.0
Financial management	0	0	13	24	7	17	10	19	30	15.0
Clothing	9	18	6	11	6	14	2	4	23	11.5
Housing	3	6	9	17	5	12	2	4	19	9.5
Consumer education and buying	6	12	3	15	1	2	2	4	17	8.5
Home management	4	8	5	9	1	2	5	9	16	8.0
Safety	7	14	2	4	5	12	2	4	16	8.0
Home furnishings	3	6	6	11	2	5	3	5	14	7.0
Family relations and communication	2	4	3	6	4	10	3	5	12	6.0
Energy	4	8	1	2	0	0	0	0	5	2.5
Other	1	2	1	2	2	5	2	4	6	3.0
None	1	2	1	2	1	2	6	11	9	4.5

*Respondents could show more than one problem area; therefore, numbers and percentages will equal more than 100 percent.

management in order to reach a solution to a problem. Eight Extension Homemakers requested a financial management program for the future.

The survey asked about home economics related problems during the past year where educational programs might have helped homemakers to a solution. Table XVII shows that problems of young families were in food and nutrition, with 24 percent; in child care and development, with 19.5 percent; and in financial management by 17 percent. Almost 10 percent felt that family communication programs could have helped their families. Approximately seven to eight percent felt programs in clothing, housing, and home furnishings would have benefited them. Approximately four percent said programs on consumer education and buying, home furnishings, and energy conservation would have been of help.

Table XVIII shows the preference for future programs. Programs were preferred in food and nutrition by 38.5 percent, in child care and development by 25 percent, in clothing and textiles by 21 percent, and financial management by 16 percent. Home furnishings and home arts were a choice of 12 to 13 percent.

Preferred Teaching Methods

Extension has had many ways to disseminate information. A list of possible ways was given to allow a check mark for as many ways as the homemaker would like to receive information. Table XIX shows that over 56 percent of the homemakers in the survey preferred printed materials. The sample showed a preference for newsletters by 55 percent, workshops by 37.5 percent, newspaper articles by 36.5 percent,

TABLE XVII
 PROBLEMS THAT EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS MAY
 HAVE HELPED RESPONDENTS TO A SOLUTION

Problem*	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Food and nutri- tion	11	22	18	33	7	17	14	25	48	24.0
Child care and development	5	10	11	20	9	21	14	25	39	19.5
Financial man- agement	10	20	8	15	5	12	11	20	34	17.0
Clothing	5	10	6	11	2	5	5	9	16	8.0
Family rela- tions communi- cations	5	10	2	4	6	14	6	11	10	9.5
Home furnish- ings	1	2	7	13	0	0	7	13	15	7.5
Housing	5	10	2	4	2	5	5	9	14	7.0
Home management	0	0	7	13	2	5	4	7	13	6.5
Consumer educa- tion and buying	4	8	2	4	1	2	4	7	11	5.5
Family health	2	4	2	4	4	10	1	2	9	4.5
Home arts/crafts	2	4	4	7	1	2	1	2	8	4.0
Energy	3	6	1	2	1	2	1	2	6	3.0
Safety	2	4	2	4	1	2	0	0	5	2.5
Other	6	12	7	13	5	12	4	7	22	11.0
None	2	4	4	7	2	5	6	11	14	7.0

*Respondents could mark more than one problem; therefore, totals will not be 100 percent. Other included 15 gardening or landscaping.

TABLE XVIII
RESPONDENTS' PREFERENCES FOR FUTURE PROGRAMS

Program Subject Preferred*	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Food and nutri- tion	18	37	24	47	14	33	23	42	77	38.5
Child care and development	14	29	10	19	9	21	17	31	50	25.0
Clothing	14	29	14	26	5	12	11	20	42	21.0
Financial man- agement	8	16	10	19	5	12	9	16	32	16.0
Home furnish- ings	7	14	9	17	2	5	8	15	26	13.0
Home arts/crafts	10	20	6	11	2	5	6	11	24	12.0
Home management	2	4	7	13	4	10	7	13	20	10.0
Family relations communications	6	12	1	2	5	12	5	9	18	9.0
Consumer educa- tion and buying	4	8	7	13	1	2	5	9	17	8.5
Garden/landscape	3	6	4	7	1	2	4	7	12	6.0
Housing	3	6	2	4	1	2	5	9	11	5.5
Family health	2	4	1	2	2	5	1	2	6	3.0
Self-improvement	0	0	2	4	1	2	3	5	6	3.0
Other	5	10	5	10	1	2	2	4	12	6.0
None	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	1.0

*Respondents could show more than one program choice; therefore, total will not equal 100 percent. Other included 3 safety, 2 energy.

TABLE XIX
PREFERRED METHODS OF RECEIVING INFORMATION

Method *	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Newsletter	35	71	30	56	18	43	27	49	110	55.0
Printed material	26	53	37	69	17	40	30	55	110	55.0
Workshops	24	49	16	30	15	36	19	27	75	37.5
Newspaper arti- cles	24	49	15	28	14	33	20	36	73	36.5
Shortcourses	20	41	21	39	12	29	19	27	72	36.0
Home study les- sons	15	31	14	26	8	19	19	27	56	28.0
Special inter- est meeting	17	35	15	28	10	24	13	24	55	27.5
Extension home- maker lesson	27	55	9	17	7	17	11	20	54	27.0
Browsing mater- ials	12	24	15	28	11	26	14	25	52	26.0
Eight hundred toll-free telephone	15	31	16	30	6	14	13	24	50	25.0
Check out learn- ing packages	12	24	12	22	5	12	17	31	46	23.0
Television	11	22	11	20	5	12	11	20	38	19.0
Lunch and Learn noon brown bag program	8	16	8	15	7	17	11	20	34	17.0
Public service announcements	5	10	10	19	7	17	8	15	30	15.0

TABLE XIX (Continued)

Method*	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Radio	6	12	1	2	3	7	7	13	17	8.5
Special correspondence	5	10	6	11	2	5	3	5	16	8.0
Study group	4	8	3	6	5	12	3	5	15	7.5
Telephone conversation	3	6	1	2	4	10	2	4	10	5.0
Talk back television	3	6	3	6	1	2	2	4	9	4.5
Telelecture or teleconference	1	2	1	2	2	5	2	4	6	3.0
Video tape	2	4	1	2	0	0	2	4	5	2.5

*Respondents could check more than one preferred method; therefore, totals do not equal 100 percent.

shortcourses by 36 percent, and home study by 28 percent. Extension homemakers lessons were preferred by 27.5 percent, as was 800 toll-free telephone information. Browning materials in waiting rooms and other public areas were preferred by 25.5 percent. Check out learning packages were preferred by 22.5 percent. Other methods were television; with 19 percent; lunch and learn programs, with 17 percent; and public service announcements, with 15.5 percent.

Commonly used methods that did poorly in the survey were radio, with eight and one-half percent; special correspondence, with eight

percent; and telephone, with five percent. Respondents from all groups indicated they did not want to receive information by the methods rated above.

Newer media methods of talkback television, telelecture, or teleconference and videotape ranged from two and one-half percent to four and one-half percent preference. These last methods listed were newer methods which some county staffs know little about. Only some county staffs with special equipment have used the methods so far, so it is doubtful that many of the clientele studied have seen much of the newer technological methods.

Included in the methods preferred for learning were methods that independent learners can use in their own time span while at home, on a lunch hour, or whenever time permits. These were newsletters, printed materials, home study, and browsing materials.

Need for Child Care

Data in Table XX shows that for homemakers to attend an educational program, 114 homemakers, or 57 percent, said that child care was necessary or desirable. Homemakers were willing to pay a small amount to have child care. Twenty-six percent preferred to pay 50 cents per child, while 25 percent were willing to pay \$1.00 per hour. Other ideas of payment for child care or alternatives were given, such as using volunteers to keep the children, paying \$1.00 per child or 50 cents an hour, 75 cents an hour, using a sliding income fee scale, paying the going rate, or \$4.00 per day, or \$10.00 for two children. Several stated they could not afford child care expense and that care should be free.

TABLE XX
RESPONDENTS' CHILD CARE CONSIDERATIONS

Consideration	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Need for Child Care*</u>										
Necessary	16	35	10	19	20	53	23	42	69	34.5
Desirable	7	15	9	17	7	18	22	40	55	27.5
Not necessary, but desirable	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	2	1.0
Not necessary	22	45	29	54	11	26	8	15	70	35.0
No response	3	6	5	9	4	10	2	4	14	7.0
<u>Cost of Child Care</u>										
.50 per child	10	20	8	15	9	21	16	29	43	21.5
\$1.00 per hour	9	18	7	13	7	17	18	33	41	20.5
Other	4	2	6	11	8	19	10	18	28	14.0
Not applicable	15	30	20	37	7	17	9	16	51	25.5
No response	11	22	13	24	11	26	2	4	37	18.5

*Several respondents listed more than one need; therefore, number of homemakers and percentages do not total 100 percent.

Potential for Husband Involvement

The question was asked, "Would your husband attend an educational meeting with you?" Table XXI shows that only 11 percent said yes, but possibilities existed for involving the husband in programs, since 33 percent said maybe. There were 36 percent who felt their husband would not attend a program. Approximately three percent were not married, or were divorced. Concern for his work schedule or his being

busy otherwise was the response of 10 percent. If the meeting was free, or if his wife asked him to attend, was the response of one percent. There were five percent who thought their husband would not attend a meeting under any circumstances.

TABLE XXI
POTENTIAL FOR GETTING HUSBANDS INVOLVED
IN EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS

Potential for Husband Involvement	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Would Husband Attend Program?</u>										
Yes	6	12	4	7	7	17	6	11	23	11.5
Maybe	14	29	25	46	8	21	20	36	67	33.5
No	23	49	18	33	21	50	21	38	73	36.5
Not applicable	0	0	1	2	2	5	2	5	5	2.5
No response	6	12	6	12	4	10	6	11	22	11.0
<u>Conditions in Which Husband Might Attend</u>										
	(N=18)		(N=26)		(N=14)		(N=24)		(N=82)	
Subject of interest	7	39	15	58	9	64	15	27	46	56.0
Subject of interest/other men present	3	17	2	8	0	0	1	4	6	7.5
Subject of interest and not working	2	11	2	8	1	7	3	12	8	10.0
In the evening	4	22	1	4	0	0	0	0	5	6.0
Not working or busy otherwise	0	0	6	23	1	7	2	8	9	11.0
Other	2	11	0	0	3	21	3	12	8	10.0

Time Preference

All groups had various involvements each season of the year. Table XXII shows approximately 28 percent said there was a time when they preferred not to try to attend a program. Summer was designated as too busy a season for 10.61 percent. Conflicts were gardening, canning, league ball games, and other activities, plus, with school out, the children were home, and this would mean that a child care consideration would have to be made. Winter concerns centered mostly around the weather for nine percent of the homemakers in the study.

Spring and fall were not a preferred time for five percent of those answering the survey. Other reasons for other times were given by eight and one-half percent.

The best time of the day for meetings varied with each group of homemakers. Extension homemakers had about one-third who could meet at each time, morning, afternoon, or evening. For the other three groups, evening preferences increased significantly to a range of 41 to 47 percent. There were 26 percent who preferred a morning meeting; 23 percent an afternoon meeting; eight percent could meet anytime; and one percent preferred no meeting or could not come. Morning and afternoon meetings were not as preferred by Group 3 and Group 4 as they were by Group 1.

Analysis of Factors

The data were analyzed with the chi-square analysis to test the following hypothesis. As was mentioned in Chapter III, a significant level of .05 was established as acceptable for the statistical test

TABLE XXII
 TIME PREFERENCE OF RESPONDENTS FOR MEETINGS

Time Preference	Young Family Groups									
	Group 1 (N=49)		Group 2 (N=54)		Group 3 (N=42)		Group 4 (N=55)		Total (N=200)	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Is There a Time When You Couldn't Attend?</u>										
Yes	10	20	13	24	11	26	14	25	48	24.0
No	36	74	32	59	21	50	35	64	124	62.0
No response	3	6	9	17	10	24	6	11	28	14.0
<u>When?*</u>										
Fall	3	6	3	6	2	5	2	4	10	5.0
Winter	5	10	4	7	4	10	6	11	19	9.5
Spring	2	4	4	7	1	2	5	9	12	6.0
Summer	4	8	6	11	5	12	6	11	21	10.5
Other	4	8	4	7	6	14	3	5	17	8.5
<u>Best Time of Day to Meet</u>										
Morning	16	32	17	31	8	19	11	20	52	26.0
Evening	15	30	22	41	19	45	26	47	82	41.0
Afternoon	18	36	11	20	7	17	12	22	48	24.0
Anytime	6	12	4	7	4	10	3	5	17	9.5

*More than one response was given by some homemakers and no response was given by some; therefore, totals do not equal 100 percent.

used. Significance and non-significance of each factor and other relationships are discussed in the analysis.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were postulated for the study. They were:

H₁ - There will be no significant difference in ages of homemakers and ages and numbers of their children in young families who are not involved in extension programs as compared to families who are involved in extension educational programs.

H₂ - There will be no significant difference in the place of residence and have ownership by young families who are not involved in extension programs as compared to families who are involved in extension educational programs.

H₃ - There will be no significant difference in the number of employed homemakers that are not involved in extension programs and the number of employed homemakers who are involved in extension educational programs.

H₄ - There will be no significant difference in the knowledge level about Extension programs by young homemakers who are not involved in extension programs and by young homemakers who are involved in extension educational programs.

H₅ - There will be no significant difference in involvement in other activities for young families not involved in extension programs and in young families not involved in extension programs and in young families involved in extension programs.

H₆ - There will be no significant difference in programmatic needs for young families not involved in extension programs as compared to interests and needs of young families who are involved in extension educational programs.

H₇ - There will be no significant difference in the method of program delivery preference in young families not involved in extension programs and in young families involved in extension programs.

H₈ - There will be no significant difference in the preference of time for programming in young families not involved in extension programs and in young families who are involved in extension programs.

Ages of Homemakers and Children

As shown in Table XXIII, the chi-square analysis indicated that age was a significant factor at the .001 level for homemakers who were involved in Extension programs and for those who were not involved in Extension programs. The chi-square analysis on ages of children of the homemakers showed two age groups to be of significance: infancy or under one year and preschool or ages one to five. Children over age six were not a significant factor in whether or not a homemaker chose to participate in Extension home economics programs. Therefore, hypothesis H₁ that there is no significant difference in ages of homemakers and their children and their involvement in Extension home economics programs was not accepted.

Homemakers who were members of Extension Homemakers were generally older than non-member homemakers. Women who were of childbearing ages in Muskogee County and who had one or more children five years of age or younger were less likely to belong to Extension Homemakers or to participate in Extension home economics programs.

TABLE XXIII

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF RELATIONSHIP OF AGE OF
RESPONDENTS AND CHILDREN AND INVOLVEMENT
IN EXTENSION HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS

Age	χ^2	df	Significance Level
Homemaker's age	41.89	15	.001
Child under one year	89.14	3	.001
Child one-five years	20.54	3	.001

For young families to be able to be involved in Extension programs, child care considerations will have to be provided. Table XXIV shows the level of significance was .001 for providing child care. Low cost quality care was approaching significance; therefore, cost of child care should be considered if homemakers are to pay for the care.

TABLE XXIV

CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS ON THE SIGNIFICANCE OF
PROVIDING CHILD CARE FOR YOUNG
FAMILIES IN EXTENSION

Child Care Consideration	χ^2	df	Significance Level	S/NS
Need to provide child care	25.09	6	.001	S
Low cost for child care	15.51	9	< .10 >.05	NS*

*Approaching significance

Place of Residence and Ownership of Home

Over 50 percent of the homemakers in the total sample were from rural areas. Approximately two-thirds of the homemakers in Group 1 and Group 2 resided in rural areas. From half to three-fourths of the homemakers in Group 3 and Group 4 resided in the city of Muskogee.

A chi-square analysis (see Table XXIX) on rural and urban living showed place of residence to be significant at the .01 level. Ownership was a significant factor in the study at a .05 level.

Therefore, hypothesis H_2 was not accepted. Homemakers who live in rural areas in this county were more likely to be involved in Cooperative Extension home economics programs than homemakers who resided in the city of Muskogee.

Employment

Employment was not a significant factor in the study (see Table XXIX). Therefore, the hypothesis H_3 that there was no significant difference in the number of employed homemakers who are involved in Extension programs and the number of homemakers who are not involved was accepted.

Knowledge of Extension Office Programs

Educational attainment and home economics background in secondary school, college, or through 4-H Club projects were found not to have significance. The information in Table XXV shows the type of contacts with the Extension Office that were of significance. Literature requested or picked up, attendance at programs, familiarity because of

other work and organizations associated with Extension, and other types of contact were significant beyond the .05 level. Only their family being in an organization that Extension works with showed non-significance. No contact with the Extension office was the most significant. Therefore, the hypothesis H_4 that there will be no significant difference in the knowledge level about Extension programs among homemakers who were involved in Extension programs, and those who were not involved in Extension programs, was not accepted.

TABLE XXV
RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN EXTENSION OFFICE
CONTACTS AND PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT

Type of Contact With Office	χ^2	df	Significance Level	S/NS
Literature requested or picked up	16.25	3	< .01	S
Attended one or more programs	32.87	3	< .001	S
Familiar with office because of other organizations Extension works with	19.83	3	< .001	S
Family is in organization Extension works with*	3.69	3	.30	NS
Other*	8.61	3	< .05	S
No contact with office	42.85	3	< .001	S

*Over 20 percent of the cells had counts of less than five; therefore, chi-square may not have been a valid test for the two types of contact.

Homemakers who were in contact with the Extension office were generally Extension Homemaker members or participants in some other program area. Homemakers needed to have some knowledge of program devices in order to have contact with the office. The less a homemaker was involved in a program or newsletter contact, the less she would contact the Extension office.

Reasons for non-participation in Extension Homemakers were analyzed as shown in Table XXVI. Lack of knowledge about the organization, not being invited to attend or join, and lack of time were reasons that were significant at the .001 level. Child care as a problem was significant at the .05 level.

This indicates that homemakers who do not participate generally have a lack of knowledge about the program or have not been invited to attend or join Extension Homemakers. If the trend is going to change, Extension Homemakers must do more publicity and image development with the young homemaker. Even more importantly, members must invite young homemakers to be a part of their organization and make them feel welcome and accepted. If houses where homemakers meet become too small, other meeting places or new groups must be found to accommodate young homemakers.

Some homemakers had no desire to become members in a traditional Extension Homemakers group because of limited time and other reasons. Other ways to reach and involve this homemaker should be considered and developed, although 100 percent involvement could not be expected.

Child care was a problem for some young homemakers. Some young homemakers may feel their children were not welcome in some homes, or feel uncomfortable about having to watch their children while a meeting

TABLE XXVI
 CHI-SQUARE SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS OF REASONS FOR
 NOT BELONGING TO AN EXTENSION
 HOMEMAKERS GROUP

Reason	χ^2	df	Significance Level	S/NS
Group disbanded				NS
Work				NS
No other young members				NS
Child care is a problem*	9.53	3	.05	S
Had to take my child and did not feel welcome				NS
Did not like it				NS
Required too much time				NS
Lack of transportation				NS
Children are too involved and I don't have time*	17.85	3	.001	S
No group is easily accessible				NS
Have never been invited to attend or to join	21.63	3	.001	S
Fear or dislike organizations				NS
Programs are for older women				NS
Lack of knowledge about the organization	25.74	3	.001	S

*Over 20 percent of the cells had counts of less than five; therefore, chi-square may not have been a valid test for the reasons marked.

was in progress, even though this was or was not the case. Therefore, young homemakers may not choose to become members in a group of older homemakers until their children are older. Members must help non-members feel that their children are welcome, provide child care, or organize a new group of young homemakers who all have children and are conscious of the flexibility mothers of young children have.

Homemakers' Involvement in Other Activities

Data from Table XXVII show that homemakers' involvement in other activities showed significant differences in church activities, in children's school activities, in service group or club activities, and other miscellaneous activities. Extension Homemakers generally considered themselves a service to the community because of the community service they did or the community betterment projects they did. The hypothesis H_5 that there would be no significant difference in activities of homemakers who were involved in Extension programs and homemakers who were not involved in Extension programs was not accepted.

Homemakers who participated in church activities and in children's school activities tended to be members of Extension Homemakers. Extension Homemakers in Muskogee County generally considered themselves a service to the community because of the community service they did or the community betterment projects they were involved in. Homemakers who participated in other activities generally were non-members.

Methods of Program Delivery

A chi-square analysis in Table XXVIII shows that Extension homemakers' lessons were significant at the $<.001$ level. Newsletters and

printed materials were significant at the $<.05$ level. Methods that were found to be nonsignificant were shortcourses, workshops, special interest meetings, newspaper articles, study groups, lunch and learn programs, radio, television, talkback television, telelecture, teleconference, telephone, video tape, 800 toll-free telephone, check out learning packages, home study lessons, public service announcements, special correspondence, and browsing materials. Therefore, the hypothesis H_7 that there was no significant difference in the methods of program delivery of homemakers who were involved and those who were not involved in Extension programs was not accepted. Homemakers responding to this survey want to gain information from cooperative extension personnel by attending lessons, by newsletters, and by use of printed materials.

TABLE XXVII
CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF HOMEMAKERS' PARTICIPATION IN OTHER ACTIVITIES

Participation	χ^2	df	Level of Significance	S/NS
Church activities	15.44	3	$<.01$	S
Children's school activities	29.09	3	$<.001$	S
Education for self	3.5	3	$>.30$	NS
Trade or work related group*	1.48	3	$>.70$	NS
Service group or club	53.95	3	$<.001$	S
Other activities*	8.39	3	$<.05$	S

*Over 20 percent of the cells had expected counts of less than five; therefore, chi-square may not have been a valid test for the two activities.

TABLE XXVIII
 CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF METHODS FOR
 RECEIVING INFORMATION

Methods	χ^2	df	Level of Significance	S/NS
<u>Methods Preferred</u>				
Extension Homemakers' leader lesson	25.79	3	<.001	S
Newsletters	8.62	3	<.05	S
Printed materials	8.14	3	<.05	S
<u>Method Used</u>				
Read Home Economist's news column	11.341	3	<.01	S

Even though news media was not significant in preferences by homemakers for various program delivery methods, use of a weekly news column was found to be significant beyond the .01 level. Information can be disseminated successfully to clientele through the newspaper. As was indicated in the survey of sources of information for various problems, young homemakers are seeking information on their own through reading books, magazines, and newspapers.

Programmatic Needs

Problems of young families were reported in all areas of home economics by all groups. Programmatic needs that were found to be non-significant were food and nutrition, clothing and textiles, consumer education, family relations and communication, child care and development, financial management, home furnishings, housing, gardening and

landscaping, and home arts and crafts. There was one significant difference in the programmatic needs of young families not involved in Extension programs and young families who were involved in Extension programs. As shown in Table XXIX, home management was significant at the .05 level; therefore, the hypothesis H_6 was not accepted. Members and non-members all reported programmatic needs in home economics. Non-members reported a significant need for home management information. Other needs were similar but may change during a period of new activity such as becoming employed or having a new baby to care for. Change is imminent and needs will change as times and situations change.

TABLE XXIX
CHI-SQUARE ANALYSIS OF SIGNIFICANCE OF FACTORS
RELATED TO PROGRAM INVOLVEMENT

Factor	χ^2	df	Level of Significance	NS/S
Ownership of Home*	12.59	6	<.05	S
Place of Residence*	28.85	12	<.01	S
Employment	27.016	30	.6224	NS
Programmatic Needs				
Home Management*	8.32	3	<.05	S
Preference of time for programming	9.38	15	.40	NS

*Over 20 percent of the cells had expected counts of less than five; therefore, chi-square may not have been a valid test for these factors.

Time Preference for Programming

As shown in Table XXIX, there were no significant differences in preference of time for programming. Therefore, the hypothesis H_8 that there is no significant difference in the preference of times for programming by young families who are involved in Extension programs and by those who are not involved was accepted.

Summary

As shown in this chapter, there were similarities and differences between Extension Homemaker members and non-members. Extension Homemaker members were older than non-members. Extension Homemakers had older children than non-members. These factors were due partly to the design of the study. The chi-square analysis showed a significant difference in ages of homemakers, number of preschool children, and involvement in Extension programs. Homemakers who were older and those with no preschool children were more likely to be involved as an Extension member.

The non-involvement of homemakers with preschool children or infants indicates the need to provide child care, which was significant. Low cost child care is needed for homemakers with children to participate more fully in Extension programs.

Place of residence and ownership of residence were found to be significant factors for involvement in Extension programs. Non-members were more likely to live in an urban area or the city of Muskegon. Respondents were more likely to live in a conventional single family home and to own it.

Although 53.5 percent of the homemakers in the study were employed, this was not a significant factor in program involvement. There were no significant differences in income.

Knowledge levels about Extension and contact with the Extension office were significant. The less contact a group had with the Extension office through programs, literature, or newsletters, the less they reported knowing about Extension programs. Having had no contact with the Extension office was also significant for non-members.

Extension homemaker members were more likely to be involved in church, children's school activities, and community service. These involvements were highly significant. Involvement in other activities was of slight significance.

Non-member program needs differed slightly from Extension Homemakers. Non-members who were employed or had an infant desired programs in home management, making it a significant need at the $<.05$ level. There were no significant differences in needs in the other home economics subject matter areas.

Extension Homemaker members preferred Extension leader lesson programs to receive information. All groups preferred newsletters and printed materials. Only these three methods of program delivery were found to be significant.

There were no significant differences in preference of time for programs. Non-members were more likely to prefer evening programs. Extension Homemakers were nearly evenly divided in their preference of morning, evening, or afternoon programs.

The study indicated that young families get much of their information from reading books, magazines, newspapers, and related materials.

Young homemakers also asked their mothers, friends, or neighbors to share their experiences and knowledge when they have a problem and did not seek help from reading sources.

The next chapter will be a discussion of the findings, implications, and suggestions for further research. This information will provide insight for needed program changes in order to increase Extension program participation of young homemakers.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLICATIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of this study were to determine the needs and interests of young families and to look at ways of involving them more in ongoing extension home economics educational programs of the Cooperative Extension Service. Young families' preferences of times for programming and preferences of receiving educational information were also studied.

The review of literature included information on the Cooperative Extension Service, Extension Homemakers, and problems significant to the young family. Several early studies of extension home economics programs for young families were found, along with fewer more recent studies.

Young families in Muskogee County, Oklahoma, made up the population for this study. A total of 200 homemakers participated. Homemakers in the study were predominantly between ages 18 and 35. The sample was divided into four groups that had varying levels of participation and non-participation in Cooperative Extension Home Economics programs in Muskogee County. The groups were Extension Homemakers, an original mailing list of young families, homemakers later added to the mailing list, and homemakers who had not received any newsletters; the latter two groups being identified from hospital birth records.

The sample was surveyed by a mailed questionnaire. Questionnaires were distributed to a total of 400 homemakers in mid-January, 1981. Questionnaires were returned within an eight week period.

The questionnaire was designed to collect demographic data and information pertaining to home economics backgrounds. Problems the homemakers had the previous year, information sources homemakers utilize, preferred methods and meeting times for receiving information, child care considerations, and educational program needs were also studied.

Pretesting the questionnaire was done with homemakers not included in the study. Changes were made and the instrument re-tested using a second non-involved group.

The data were collected, tabulated, and submitted to the Oklahoma State University Computer Center for a frequency count, percentages, and chi-square analysis. Cells were collapsed and hand computed for the final analysis of the four study groups.

Findings and Conclusions

Young families in Muskogee County averaged having 2.8 children. If the children were preschool age, child care became a major factor in determining whether young mothers could attend a meeting or educational event. This was considered for Extension home economics programs.

Young homemakers were well educated. Approximately 90 percent had completed high school, 45 percent reported attending college, and 24 percent had received at least a bachelor's degree. The high rate of college attendance perhaps was due to the availability of a number

of higher educational facilities in the area; three within 30 miles and four more within 60 miles.

Young homemakers generally had some home economics backgrounds from secondary school. Approximately 90 percent had home economics in school, but remembered having mostly clothing and foods experiences. The study showed these same subject matter strengths in homemakers who were past 4-H members.

Family income levels for young families were much higher than the expected per capita income figure of \$7,585. Only 12 percent had incomes under \$8,000. Over 50 percent had incomes above \$14,000, and 27.5 percent had incomes above \$20,000. This may have been due to the higher educational attainment and due to both husband and wife being employed in 56 percent of the families.

More young families owned their homes than was expected. This may have been due to joint incomes that might make home ownership possible.

Homemakers in their late twenties and thirties were more likely to know about Extension or have contact with Extension office programs. Young families who were not involved in some way with programs were not knowledgeable of the Extension educational materials, services, or organizations within Extension.

The data are discussed in relation to the specific objectives of the study. They are as follows:

Objective 1: Participation or Non-Participation

Data show there were young families who were not currently involved in Cooperative Extension educational programs who would

participate. There are others who would not. A variety of factors were related to whether or not an audience chose to participate.

Reasons for non-involvement were somewhat complex and related in some cases to findings in other objectives. Not being invited to attend or to join was the most significant reason given for non-involvement in the Extension Homemakers groups. Lack of awareness of the programs was another reason found and was substantiated by the Doremus (1964), Miller (1973), and McClain (1978) studies.

Child care problems or concerns were a third factor in non-involvement. This also was substantiated by the finding in the McClain (1978) study. Homemakers who have infants and preschool children might choose not to participate, rather than tackle the problem of child care, taking a child, or public opinion.

While there was no significant difference found in employment as a factor of non-involvement, it cannot be overlooked. It will continue to be a barrier for young homemakers who want to be involved in Extension Home Economics. Data showed that over 56 percent of the respondents in this study were employed, the majority full-time. Most jobs prefer full-time employees. Employees must be employed more than half-time to receive any benefits. The situation probably is not going to change, so Extension must seek ways of further involving the employed homemaker along with the homemaker who is not employed.

Objective 2: Programmatic Needs

The study showed there were needs in all areas of home economics. The needs of greatest concern were in food and nutrition, child care and development, financial management, clothing, family relations and

communications, and family health. A lesser concern, home management, was the only subject matter area to be a significant need, particularly for the employed homemakers in Group 2 and the mothers of infants in Group 4. Employed homemakers and mothers of infants and children under age two felt the need for some management and organization information and skills to help better meet their needs of caring for their family and home. This further substantiates the findings related to child care, and the need to reach the employed homemaker. Even though these homemakers may not be able to participate, they can be reached through newsletters and other media to help them meet their needs. Radio and television were not a promising media in Muskogee.

Objective 3: Involvement in Other Activities

Data showed that employment and caring for preschool and infant children were two activities which took much of the homemaker's time. Although found not to be significant, 56 percent of the homemakers in the study were employed. As mentioned in Objective 1, ages of children were of significance in the infant and preschool categories to affect participation or non-participation in other activities.

The study revealed that involvement in church activities and involvement in school-aged children's activities were of significance for homemakers who were participating in Extension programs, but also included many of the homemakers who were not involved. Extension Homemakers generally considered themselves a service to the community and their organization a service group. Young homemakers who were not members were involved more in various miscellaneous activities such as sports or recreational games or involvement in other organizations.

Realizing that these situations may not change, Extension should seek ways of getting information to families other than through traditional meetings. Extension Homemaker membership categories should be extended and new categories of membership created rather than continuing with only meetings which members attend.

Objective 4: Time and Method Preference

Data shows various times were preferred for meetings, if meetings were to be attended. Each group of homemakers differed somewhat in their preference. Meetings were not a preferred method of learning by Extension Homemaker non-members; approximately half of the Extension Homemaker members preferred alternatives to meetings.

The study revealed there are times to avoid for scheduling programs. All seasons presented problems for a few homemakers, but generally summer and winter presented more problems for meeting or for receiving information. Well planned and well publicized programs can be successful in any season.

Findings indicated homemakers received information in a variety of ways. With more educational backgrounds, homemakers relied on printed materials, books, magazines, and pamphlets to seek answers on their own when they had questions or problems. This indicates homemakers are motivated to do self study, although they may not use the most researched resource.

If homemakers asked someone about the question or problem, they generally asked their mothers, other family members, friends, or neighbors for information. Shared experiences and knowledge were of help to young homemakers. This indicates the need for all homemakers

to be knowledgeable and the need to keep researched information flowing out to the public.

An analysis of the data showed homemakers preferred newsletters and printed materials most for receiving information. These were the methods preferred in the Doremus (1964) and McClain (1978) studies. Workshops and shortcourses were the most preferred type of meeting. Newspaper articles and home study lessons were another preference of written information. Extension Homemaker members generally preferred leader lessons to receive their educational information at their meetings.

To reach the traditional meeting oriented Extension Homemaker member, programming can continue in various styles of meetings. To reach the Extension Homemaker who is employed and the non-member who is employed or has small children, programming must be altered to include evening programs and a variety of independent study materials. Newsletters, printed materials distribution, newspaper articles, and home study courses are possible ways to accomplish this.

Recommendations for Further Research

There is a need for further research on programming for the young family, even though findings from this study and other similar studies have added to the knowledge we have about this aged clientele. This was a limited study of young homemakers with varying degrees of participation and non-participation in Muskogee County Oklahoma Cooperative Extension home economics programs. Further studies are needed in other localities to test the validity of conclusions drawn from this study.

Two related questions arise from this study and are suggested for future study: What is the effectiveness of independent learning methods as compared to traditional teaching through meetings, workshops, or shortcourses with a maintained contact with an instructor, and what is the cost-benefit of newsletters and other independent learning materials? It is hoped that other researchers will explore these and other areas in other populations of young families.

Implications

The study data has implications for improving Extension home economics programming for young families in Muskogee County. Information on weaknesses of current program strategies and use of preferred methods named in this study can be used to strengthen existing programs and implement new programs to reach new young family clientele. Implications are written for both professionals and the Extension Homemakers organization.

Two types of learning were preferred by the different clientele. Some clientele want to learn at meetings with a speaker disseminating important information on the subject, or through experience in a workshop. Some clientele would prefer to seek information on their own through using books and other reading resources. Both methods of learning offer challenges to professionals.

Meetings

With the number of dual-earner families increasing, alternatives to meetings should be considered for young homemakers in Muskogee County. For high priority needs, meetings might be one method to

reach an audience. Meeting times may need to be arranged around work schedules for some homemakers to attend. Some programs might be planned to include husbands, if the subject would be of mutual interest to men. Further discussion of conditions under which husbands might become involved in Extension programs are stated later under needs and interests. Programs for employed families would need to be scheduled around a typical work schedule for most young families to attend. Even then, some young families do not have traditional work hours. This implies a need for some educational programs to be offered in the evening or on weekends. It also implies the need to do further programming with independent study, which is discussed as the next subtopic. Avoiding seasonally busy times might aid successful attendance, although some priority programs might be offered successfully then.

Data show the need to consider child care when planning a meeting that will include young families. Young families in their child bearing years may have children that would require child care. In order to assure that young families with children have the opportunity to attend, programs would be offered that include low cost child care, or be offered when low cost mothers-day-out child care programs are available in the community.

Independent Learning

Extension professionals should consider possible conflicts that may prevent young families from attending meetings and provide alternative methods of receiving information. Extension has many excellent printed materials that could be placed as browsing materials in public

waiting areas or be used in home study courses or in independent learning packets. These could be used at the homemaker's convenience if they were developed and made available and if young families were made aware of them.

Independent learning situations were preferred by the reading oriented clientele. Newsletters and newspapers should be utilized more to disseminate information. Independent learning as a possible media in Muskogee County should be explored. As more materials are developed for newsletters, home study lessons, and check out learning packages, evaluation of their effectiveness and ties to Extension should be considered. The cost-benefit figure for doing program newsletters is necessary as costs continue to rise.

Information Resources

Data from the study indicated that today's young families get much information from reading books and magazines. This may be the result of a better educated society. It implies the need for Extension specialists and other professionals to get articles published in current popular magazines that today's young families are reading.

Extension should do this for three reasons: (1) Current popular periodicals were what young homemakers were reading; (2) Extension can provide reliable researched information for this clientele; and (3) Extension could gain added visibility by doing so, which could be helpful for funding support. By writing for current popular periodicals, the audience of young families that Extension now reaches could be expanded.

The study also indicated that homemakers get much information from their mothers, neighbors, and friends. Realizing that not all young families will be reached first hand, Extension needs to continue to provide reliable information and materials to clientele of all ages, so that they can continue to pass along the information.

Evidence was shown that paraprofessional programs were recognized by clientele as being helpful in particular program areas. Clientele may not always associate names of individual paraprofessionals or professionals with Extension, so employees should repeatedly acknowledge the program is from Extension and make recommendations to call or visit the office for other information.

Needs

Needs were present in all of the groups in the study. Previous studies showed different educational needs for young families. This implies that while each clientele group has needs, they may be different in other areas and at other times.

Young families may voice their needs, or a program planning committee that includes young family representatives along with others who understand the young family situation may determine their program needs. Priority needs would be determined and programs planned to meet those needs.

The study revealed that husbands might become involved in some programs. Conditions under which husbands might attend programs were if the subject was of interest and if he had time. As Title IX is incorporated into program audits, this information may be useful in program

development for ways to include more men in Extension home economics programs.

Awareness and Acceptance

Data from this study show that some young families would become involved in Extension Homemaker programs if they were aware of the program and if they were invited or asked and if they were interested in the program subject matter. Approximately half of the homemakers who indicated a preference of becoming involved in Extension Homemakers preferred being involved in a younger group, rather than a group of all ages. McClain (1978) found similar results.

This implies a need for Extension homemakers to do more personal invitations in getting potential young homemakers to attend or join. It also implies the need to conduct a program awareness campaign on what the Extension Homemaker organization is. Young homemakers who want to be in groups of all young homemakers should be encouraged to form groups of their own ages.

Data indicated that a small number of non-members felt Extension homemaker programs were for older women. Since place of residence showed young homemaker members were predominantly rural women, the possibility of the program being perceived as being for rural women must be considered. There may be some misconceptions among young homemakers who think that Extension Homemaker programs are for older rural women. Both professionals and Extension Homemakers should work to change this perception if it does exist.

Extension Homemakers should evaluate where they are and where they want to be in regard to attracting the young homemaker as a member.

Extension homemakers should strive to make their organization more attractive, inviting, interesting, friendly, and open. Changes must be made so that employed homemakers and others with limited time to attend meetings can become members.

Change Image

Information gathered indicated some home economics program perceptions could be stereotyped as cooking and sewing. The backgrounds of young homemakers in the study indicated this was what homemakers remembered of the programs in which they participated when they were growing up. These subject matter areas are important, but other home economics subject matter areas are also. Professionals must strive to change this image by making other home economics subjects interesting and significant enough to be remembered and be of help to the young people in the future. This may be achieved in part by providing the same types of laboratory experiences and learning by doing experiences that have been done in the clothing and foods subject matter areas. Members of 4-H should be educated that Muskogee County Extension has other services and information they can use after they leave 4-H. Graduates of 4-H should be encouraged to become involved in Extension Homemakers.

Professionals should look at their backgrounds in foods and clothing and in other home economics subject matter areas and determine if the other subject matter areas have been taught as effectively as foods and clothing. If other subject matters have not been taught as effectively, then determine whether the teaching background was lacking. If updating needs to be done at the professional level, then it should

be done. Other program areas need to become as strong as foods and clothing.

Home economists should continue to promote all areas of home economics with available media and other organizations as opportunities arise. A public relations and awareness plan should be considered. In programming to meet the needs and interests of young families, professionals have overlapped subject matter areas in the past to teach effectively. For instance, consumer education and buying have been taught in all subject matter areas. Safety and energy aspects likewise have been included in other subject matter areas. This should continue to be done.

In a time when image can be so important in funding and accountability, home economics programs must be shown to be meeting the needs of students, young families, and others at whatever level the program is. The awareness that knowledge of home economics related information can have a preventative effect on potential problems the young family and other families face should be made known to the public and program legitimatizers every opportunity that is possible.

Extension's image has been reputable, but limited. If Extension is to have an image of working with all families, then professionals need to communicate the program and make the public aware of its programs, services, and organizations. Organizations within Extension need to look at updating their image to be attractive to young family clientele and determine if the organization has been stereotyped by past programs and experiences with it. If so, can it meet the challenge of change?

Programming for young families can probably be accomplished through a program planning committee if the committee includes young family representatives along with others who understand the young family situation. Along with determining program needs, committees should look at some alternative program delivery methods, other than meetings for clientele to attend. Independent learning materials seem to be an alternative. With a wealth of printed information available, Extension needs to make people aware of it.

The keys to getting young families involved are to create an awareness of Extension programs and the variety of services and information available, not just in home economics, but in all areas and to design programs that will meet their needs. For this non-traditional audience to participate, we may need to use some non-traditional methods of extending education.

Recommendations

In order to better help young families with the problems they have, this researcher makes the following final recommendations:

1. The Extension Homemakers organizations should study their image and determine if changes need to be made in order to reach the young family, if this is an objective of theirs. The organization should also consider other types of membership for employed homemakers and homemakers with child care problems that have difficulty in attending regular monthly meetings.

2. The Cooperative Extension Service should develop a public awareness plan to make people more knowledgeable of its educational materials and services.

3. Home economists should evaluate their programs and see if reason exists for the stereotyping of home economics as foods and clothing. All subject matter areas should be stressed and strengthened if needed in the various home economics programs.

4. Independent learning packages should be developed, possibly using Extension Homemaker leader lesson materials which have already been developed. A clearinghouse or categorization of leader materials that have been developed would help to utilize existing materials better. Newsletters and other independent learning materials should be evaluated by cost benefit analysis.

5. Extension programs for young families should consider offering child care, either low cost or free, or offering the program when low cost "mother's-day-out" child care is available.

6. This researcher recommends that more studies be made on use of educational methods and transport media for teaching clientele more effectively.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bailyn, B. Education in the Forming of American Society. Chapel Hill, N.C.: The University of North Carolina Press, 1960.
- Barton, A. and Gilchrist, V. "Needs and Interests of Young Homemakers: Living in Two Low Income Housing Projects." Journal of Home Economics, June, 1970, 62, 389-392.
- Best, J. W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, 1977.
- Boyle, P. G. The Program Planning Process With Emphasis on Extension. Madison, Wisconsin: National Agriculture Center for Advanced Study, University of Wisconsin, 1965.
- Compton, N. H. and Hall, O. A. Foundations of Home Economics Research. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Co., 1972.
- Coward, R. T. "Greater Awareness--Extension's Key to Program Success." Journal of Extension, 1978, XVI, 11-17.
- Department of Economic and Community Affairs. Census '80 Oklahoma Population Counts by Age, Race, and Sex. Oklahoma City: Oklahoma State Data Center, December, 1981.
- Doremus, M. Pilot Study of Young Homemakers: Case Studies of Twenty Young Homemakers in Onondaga County, New York State. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell Extension Service, Cornell University, 1964.
- Heard, R. F. "An Analysis of the Problem Identification Process and of Member Contributions of Two Program Planning Sub-Committees in Oconto County, Wisconsin." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1962.
- Johnstone, J. W. and Rivera, R. J. Volunteers for Learning: A Study of the Educational Pursuits of American Adults. Chicago: Aldine Press, 1965.
- Joint Committee Report on Extension Programs, Policies, and Goals. Washington, D.C.: Department of Agriculture and Association of Land-Grant Colleges and Universities, August, 1948.
- Krejcie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 1970, 30, 607-610.

- Leagans, P. J. "A Concept of Needs." Journal of Cooperative Extension, 1964, II(1), 89-96.
- Mann, O. and Fleming, B. "Focus II New Directions for Extension Home Economics." Journal of Home Economics, 1975, 67(2), 22-26.
- McClain, V. T. "Nonformal Education for Young Homemakers." (A comparative study of cooperative extension.) Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Walden University, 1978.
- Miller, M. E. "Extension Study Group Members View Their Clubs and Extension Home Economists." Agriculture and Nature Resources Education Institute. Publication No. 28, Michigan State University, October, 1973.
- O'Connell, T. E. "A Study of the Decision-Making Process of a Program Planning Sub-Committee." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1961.
- Petersen, R. and Petersen, W. University Adult Education: A Guide to Policy. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960.
- Reisbeck, R. F. and Reynolds, J. "Extension is Involved." In C. A. Vines and M. A. Anderson (eds.), Heritage Horizons: Extension's Commitment to People. Madison, Wisconsin: Journal of Extension, 1976.
- Richert, M. R. "A Study of Factors for Consideration in Membership Selection of County Extension Program Planning Committees." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1957.
- Scott, D. et al. "Home Economics New Directions, A Statement of Philosophy and Objectives." (A committee report.) Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association, 1959. In Journal of Home Economics, 1959, 51(8), 679-686.
- Shultz, J. and Riggs, S. "Reaching Young Homemakers." Journal of Extension, Spring, 1972, 1, 33-38.
- Siegel, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1956.
- Smith, L. C. "Young Families in Profile." (Talk and paper presented at Young Family District Workshops.) Muskogee, Oklahoma, Fall, 1974.
- Thompson, A. E. "Identification and Evaluation of Concepts for Competencies of Home Economists in Extension as a Program Organizer." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1967.

- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service. National Extension Homemakers Study: Program Benefits, Leadership Development, and Volunteer Outreach. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, August, 1981.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Extension Service. Reaching and Teaching Families: A Handbook for Extension Staff, ESC-573. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, October, 1973.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census. General Population Characteristics: Oklahoma. (Final report, PC(1)-B38.) Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. Regional Economic Information System. Per Capita Personal Incomes in SMSA's Counties and Independent Cities in Selected Years (Residence Adjusted). Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, April, 1981.
- Voorhees, W. "A Study of the Characteristics and Contributions of County Program Planning Committee Members." Unpublished master's thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1960.
- Wampler, K. W. "A Comparison of the Homemaking Problems of Employed and Non-Employed Homemakers and Members of Home Demonstration Clubs With Implications for County Extension Program Development." Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1963.
- Wooley, R. "The Relationship of Self-Esteem and Selected Concepts of Women's Roles and Lifestyles as Expressed by Members of Extension Homemakers Groups in Okmulgee County." Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1979.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

COVER LETTERS

2912 Williams
Muskogee, Oklahoma
January 14, 1981

Dear Homemaker:

May I ask for 15 to 20 minutes of your time to complete the enclosed questionnaire? I am conducting research on needs and interests of young homemakers like yourself and the program methods you prefer. This research will aid in providing more and better programs for young families in Muskogee County.

In addition to helping me do a better job as Extension Home Economist with the Cooperative Extension Programs, the information you provide will help fulfill my graduate degree requirements at Oklahoma State University. I hope you will take part in this study.

Your name is one randomly selected to represent young homemakers in Muskogee County. I hope you will complete the survey for my research. Numbers are used only to identify those who have responded. Responses will be confidential.

Many of the questions may be answered by checking the appropriate statement. Others required a written answer. Please be as complete and accurate as possible. Disregard any questions which do not apply to your situation or mark "Not Applicable" if this answer is provided.

Thank you for your time and effort in supplying this information. Your cooperation and help is appreciated. The questionnaire should be completed and returned in the envelope by January 28. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Riletta Marshall

Encl.

2912 Williams
Muskogee, Oklahoma
March 12, 1981

Dear Homemaker:

Several weeks ago I sent you a questionnaire on needs and interests of young families. I have not yet received your completed questionnaire. Enclosed is a copy of the questionnaire and a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your response.

If you feel that you can help in this research for my thesis, I would greatly appreciate it. I am in need of a few more responses in order to have an adequate number for the study.

All information will be confidential. Please help with my thesis research and with determining needs of young families in Muskogee County in order to develop more Extension Home Economics programs for young families. As Extension Home Economist for Muskogee County, I am interested in working more with young families.

Your cooperation is appreciated. Please return your completed questionnaire by March 20. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

Riletta Marshall

Encl.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer each statement so that the information most accurately reflects your situation.

1. Age:

<input type="checkbox"/> Under 20	<input type="checkbox"/> 31-35
<input type="checkbox"/> 21-25	<input type="checkbox"/> 36-40
<input type="checkbox"/> 26-30	<input type="checkbox"/> Over 40

2. Education: Please check the highest education completed.

<input type="checkbox"/> 8th grade or less	<input type="checkbox"/> College graduate
<input type="checkbox"/> Some high school	<input type="checkbox"/> Post college work
<input type="checkbox"/> High school graduate	<input type="checkbox"/> Graduate degree
<input type="checkbox"/> Some college	<input type="checkbox"/> Business or trade school, please specify _____

3. Did you have any home economics courses while in junior or senior high school?

yes no if yes, number of years _____

Subject matter areas, check all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/> foods and nutrition	<input type="checkbox"/> child development
<input type="checkbox"/> clothing and textiles	<input type="checkbox"/> home management
<input type="checkbox"/> housing	<input type="checkbox"/> other, please list _____
<input type="checkbox"/> family relationships	_____

4. Did you have any home economics courses while in college?

yes no not applicable (did not attend college)

if yes, approximate number of credit hours _____

Subject matter areas, check all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/> foods and nutrition	<input type="checkbox"/> child development
<input type="checkbox"/> clothing and textiles	<input type="checkbox"/> home management
<input type="checkbox"/> housing	<input type="checkbox"/> other, please list _____
<input type="checkbox"/> family relationships	_____

5. Did you have 4-H Club home economics experiences as a youth?

yes no if yes, number of years _____

Subject matter areas, check all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/> food preparation and nutrition	<input type="checkbox"/> family relationships
<input type="checkbox"/> food preservation	<input type="checkbox"/> child development
<input type="checkbox"/> clothing and textiles	<input type="checkbox"/> home management
<input type="checkbox"/> housing and home improvement	<input type="checkbox"/> other, please list _____

6. Do you have children?

yes no if yes, give number in each age group.

<input type="checkbox"/> under 1 year	<input type="checkbox"/> 12-14 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 1-5 years	<input type="checkbox"/> 15-19 years
<input type="checkbox"/> 6-11 years	<input type="checkbox"/> over 20 years

7. How many hours are you gainfully employed by work in or out of the home? Check number of hours you work each week.

<input type="checkbox"/> none	<input type="checkbox"/> 21-30
<input type="checkbox"/> 1-10	<input type="checkbox"/> 31-40
<input type="checkbox"/> 11-20	<input type="checkbox"/> over 40

8. Type of employment:
- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> clerical | <input type="checkbox"/> executive |
| <input type="checkbox"/> household or public service | <input type="checkbox"/> production |
| <input type="checkbox"/> professional or technical | <input type="checkbox"/> other, please list type of work _____ |
9. Yearly taxable income: (from all sources)
- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Under \$8,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$14,000 to \$15,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$8,000 to \$9,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$16,000 to \$17,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$10,000 to \$11,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> \$18,000 to \$19,999 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> \$12,000 to \$13,999 | <input type="checkbox"/> Over \$20,000 |
10. Place of residence:
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> on a farm | <input type="checkbox"/> In a town of 1,000 to 2,500. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> In the country, not on a farm | <input type="checkbox"/> In a town of over 2,500 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> In a town of 1,000 or less | |
11. Do you own or rent your home:
- Own
- Rent
- Other, please explain _____
12. Type of dwelling:
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Mobile home | <input type="checkbox"/> Condominium |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Single family house | <input type="checkbox"/> Share home with another family |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Apartment | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, describe _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Duplex | |
13. In what kinds of groups, organizations and activities do you regularly participate?
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Church activities | <input type="checkbox"/> Service club or organization |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Childrens school activities | <input type="checkbox"/> Other, describe _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Education for self | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Trade or work related group | |
14. What newspapers do you read regularly? _____
15. Do you read the "home hints" column each Tuesday in the Muskogee paper?
- yes no
- If yes, have you used any information from the column?
- yes no If so, what? _____
- What types of information would you like in the column? _____
16. When you have questions about how to do something, where or to whom do you go for information on:
- Foods and nutrition _____
- Clothing and Fabrics _____
- Consumer education and buying _____
- Home Management _____
- Housing _____
- Home Furnishings _____
- Financial management _____
- Family relations and communication _____
- Child care and development _____
- Family health _____
- Safety _____

17. What were questions of concerns that you had this past year in the areas listed on question 16?

18. What kind of contact have you had with the Cooperative Extension Office and information and programs offered in the past year?

Have requested or picked up literature this past year

Have attended one or more programs offered this year

Am familiar with because of organizations they work with

Family belongs to an organized group they work with

Other, describe _____

None

19. Have you ever been an Extension Homemaker group member?

yes no if yes, how long?

less than 1 year

1 to 3 years

4 to 9 years

10 to 15 years

Over 15 years

20. If "no" to question 19, or if you have been a member, but are no longer, why? Check as many as are appropriate.

group or club disbanded

went to work and group meets while I am working

no other young homemakers are involved in the local group

no one to take care of the children

I had to take the children and felt they were not welcome

did not like it

husband disapproved

requires too much personal involvement

lack of transportation

children are involved in so many things that I don't have the time to commit myself to an organization

no club or group is easily accessible

have never been invited to attend or join

fear or dislike organizations

believe programs are designed for older women

lack of knowledge concerning the program

other, please specify _____

21. If you are not a member, would you be interested in becoming an Extension Homemaker?

yes, in an existing group of all ages

yes, in a new (or existing) group of young homemakers

no

need more information

at a later date

other, please specify _____

22. In what form would you be most interested in receiving home economics information? Check all that apply.
- short courses
 - workshops
 - special interest meetings
 - newsletters
 - newspaper articles
 - Extension homemakers lesson
 - study group
 - Lunch 'N Learn (noon brown bag program)
 - radio program
 - television
 - printed material (fact sheets and bulletins)
 - talkback television classroom activities
 - tele-lecture
 - tele-conference
 - telephone conversation
 - video tape
 - 800 toll-free telephone "Dial a Tip"
 - check out learning packages
 - home study lessons
 - public service announcements on radio and television
 - special correspondance
 - browsing educational materials available in public place such as waiting rooms, laundromats, libraries, etc.
 - other, describe _____
23. For you to attend a non-formal educational program, are child care facilities a necessity?
- necessary
 - desirable
 - not necessary
24. How much would you be willing to pay for child care?
- .50 per child
 - \$1.00 per hour
 - other, specify _____
 - not applicable
25. For you to participate in an educational program, what time of the day is best suited to your needs?
- morning
 - afternoon
 - evening
 - anytime
26. Is there a time in the year or seasons that you could not attend meetings or receive information?
- yes
 - no
- If yes, when?
- Fall
 - Winter
 - Spring
 - Summer
 - Other, specify _____

27. What problems have you had this past year where educational programs may have helped you to a solution? List three to five.

28. If you would be willing to attend programs of interest to you, on what three subjects would you prefer information?

29. Would your husband attend an educational meeting with you?
 yes no not applicable (not married) maybe
Under what conditions might he attend?

APPENDIX C

TABULATED DATA

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please answer each statement so that the information most accurately reflects your situation?

1. Age:
- | | |
|-------------------|-------------------|
| <u>3</u> Under 20 | <u>57</u> 31-35 |
| <u>36</u> 21-25 | <u>18</u> 36-40 |
| <u>72</u> 26-30 | <u>14</u> Over 40 |
2. Education: Please check the highest education completed.
- | | | |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|
| <u>1</u> 8th grade or less | <u>32</u> College graduate | <u>11</u> Business * |
| <u>17</u> Some high school | <u>8</u> Post college work | <u>11</u> Nursing * |
| <u>63</u> High school graduate | <u>8</u> Graduate degree | <u>3</u> Cosmetology * |
| <u>43</u> Some college | <u>* 28</u> Business or trade school, | <u>3</u> Vocational * |
- please specify _____
3. Did you have any home economics courses while in junior or senior high school?
- | | Years |
|---|-----------------------------|
| <u>180</u> yes <u>20</u> no if yes, number of years _____ | <u>1-44</u> |
| Subject matter areas, check all that apply. | <u>2-46</u> |
| <u>174</u> foods and nutrition | <u>68</u> child development |
| <u>172</u> clothing and textiles | <u>62</u> home management |
| <u>58</u> housing | <u>7</u> other, please list |
| <u>73</u> family relationships | <u>first aid</u> |
4. Did you have any home economics courses while in college?
- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| <u>37</u> yes <u>83</u> no <u>73</u> not applicable (did not attend college) <u>7</u> no response | |
| if yes, approximate number of credit hours _____ | <u>Credit Hours</u> |
| Subject matter areas, check all that apply. | <u>2-6 -- 11</u> |
| <u>19</u> foods and nutrition | <u>23</u> child development |
| <u>16</u> clothing and textiles | <u>9</u> home management |
| <u>9</u> housing | <u>5</u> other, please list |
| <u>27</u> family relationships | <u>40-67-2</u> |
5. Did you have 4-H Club home economics experiences as a youth?
- | | Years |
|---|--------------------------------|
| <u>74</u> yes <u>126</u> no if yes, number of years _____ | <u>1--12</u> |
| Subject matter areas, check all that apply. | <u>2--18</u> |
| <u>48</u> food preparation and nutrition | <u>13</u> family relationships |
| <u>28</u> food preservation | <u>8</u> child development |
| <u>59</u> clothing and textiles | <u>11</u> home management |
| <u>17</u> housing and home improvement | <u>2</u> other, please list |
6. Do you have children?
- | | |
|---|-------------------------|
| <u>195</u> yes <u>5</u> no if yes, give number in each age group. | |
| <u>61</u> under 1 year | <u>35</u> 12-14 years |
| <u>115</u> 1-5 years | <u>21</u> 15-19 years |
| <u>95</u> 6-11 years | <u>11</u> over 20 years |
- Number of Children
7. How many hours are you gainfully employed by work in or out of the home? Check number of hours you work each week.
- | | | |
|------------------|-------------------|---------------|
| <u>87</u> none | <u>13</u> 21-30 | <u>4---11</u> |
| <u>131</u> 1-10 | <u>62</u> 31-40 | <u>5---5</u> |
| <u>111</u> 11-20 | <u>14</u> over 40 | <u>6---4</u> |
| | | <u>7---1</u> |
| | | <u>10---1</u> |
| | | <u>11---1</u> |

8. Type of employment:
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <u>33</u> clerical | <u>1</u> executive |
| <u>27</u> household or public service | <u>10</u> production |
| <u>38</u> professional or technical | <u>4</u> other, please list type of work _____ |
9. Yearly taxable income: (from all sources)
- | | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <u>24</u> Under \$8,000 | <u>22</u> \$14,000 to \$15,999 |
| <u>19</u> \$8,000 to \$9,999 | <u>7</u> \$16,000 to \$17,999 |
| <u>18</u> \$10,000 to \$11,999 | <u>18</u> \$18,000 to \$19,999 |
| <u>10</u> \$12,000 to \$13,999 | <u>55</u> Over \$20,000 <u>27</u> no response |
10. Place of residence:
- | | |
|---|---------------------------------------|
| <u>37</u> on a farm | <u>7</u> In a town of 1,000 to 2,500. |
| <u>46</u> In the country, not on a farm | <u>95</u> In a town of over 2,500 |
| <u>12</u> In a town of 1,000 or less | <u>3</u> no response |
11. Do you own or rent your home:
- | | |
|--|--|
| <u>164</u> Own | |
| <u>53</u> Rent | |
| <u>3</u> Other, please explain <u>live with parents or other relatives</u> | |
12. Type of dwelling:
- | | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| <u>27</u> Mobile home | <u>0</u> Condominium |
| <u>164</u> Single family house | <u>2</u> Share home with another family |
| <u>5</u> Apartment | <u>2</u> Other, describe _____ |
| <u>1</u> Duplex | <u>1</u> no response |
13. In what kinds of groups, organizations and activities do you regularly participate?
- | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <u>139</u> Church activities | <u>52</u> Service club or organization |
| <u>96</u> Childrens school activities | <u>24</u> Other, describe _____ |
| <u>34</u> Education for self | |
| <u>14</u> Trade or work related group | |
14. What newspapers do you read regularly? 18 none; 168 Muskogee Phoenix; 24 Tulsa World/Tribune; 4 Oklahoman/Times; 2 Ft. Gibson; 2 Co. News
15. Do you read the "home hints" column each Tuesday in the Muskogee 1 Haskell; 11 other paper?
- 101 yes 67 no
- If yes, have you used any information from the column?
- 59 yes 35 no If so, what? 16 foods; 7 clothing; 7 home mgt.; 5 cons. ed.
- What types of information would you like in the column? _____
- 22 food; 5 clothing; 11 financial mgt; 7 child care/dev.; 14 same
16. When you have questions about how to do something, where or to whom do you go for information on: See responses in Appendix D,
- Foods and nutrition _____ Tables XXX-XXXIII.
- Clothing and Fabrics _____
- Consumer education and buying _____
- Home Management _____
- Housing _____
- Home Furnishings _____
- Financial management _____
- Family relations and communication _____
- Child care and development _____
- Family health _____
- Safety _____

17. What were questions of concerns that you had this past year in the areas listed on question 16? 53 food and nutrition, 45 child care and development, 32 family health, 30 financial management, 23 clothing, 19 housing, 17 consumer education and buying, 16 home management, 16 safety, 14 home furnishings, 12 family relations/communications.
18. What kind of contact have you had with the Cooperative Extension Office and information and programs offered in the past year?
50 Have requested or picked up literature this past year
36 Have attended one or more programs offered this year
34 Am familiar with because of organizations they work with
13 Family belongs to an organized group they work with
22 Other, describe 1 EFNEP, 2 4-H, 2 E.H., 2 past E.H., 4 Weigh Off,
99 None 4 newsletter, 1 arts and craft show, 1 telephone,
1 newscolumn, 3 literature at another time, 1 Welfare.
19. Have you ever been an Extension Homemaker group member?
65 yes 135 no if yes, how long?
25 less than 1 year
19 1 to 3 years
17 4 to 9 years
1 10 to 15 years
0 Over 15 years
20. If "no" to question 19, or if you have been a member, but are no longer, why? Check as many as are appropriate.
6 group or club disbanded
18 went to work and group meets while I am working
18 no other young homemakers are involved in the local group
13 no one to take care of the children
1 I had to take the children and felt they were not welcome
1 did not like it
2 husband disapproved
8 requires too much personal involvement
3 lack of transportation
14 children are involved in so many things that I don't have the time to commit myself to an organization
5 no club or group is easily accessible
50 have never been invited to attend or join
5 fear or dislike organizations
10 believe programs are designed for older women
61 lack of knowledge concerning the program
16 other, please specify 4 work, 5 have no time, 4 busy with church, 1 not interested, 1 with newborn, 1 not aware of EH.
21. If you are not a member, would you be interested in becoming an Extension Homemaker?
18 yes, in an existing group of all ages
14 yes, in a new (or existing) group of young homemakers
40 no
59 need more information
29 at a later date
5 other, please specify later, when she retires, when time permits.
10 no response

22. In what form would you be most interested in receiving home economics information? Check all that apply.

72 short courses
75 workshops
55 special interest meetings
110 newsletters
73 newspaper articles
54 Extension homemakers lesson
15 study group
34 Lunch 'N Learn (noon brown bag program)
17 radio program
38 television
110 printed material (fact sheets and bulletins)
9 talkback television classroom activities
6 tele-lecture
6 tele-conference
10 telephone conversation
5 video tape
50 800 toll-free telephone "Dial a Tip"
46 check out learning packages
56 home study lessons
30 public service announcements on radio and television
16 special correspondence
52 browsing educational materials available in public place such as waiting rooms, laundromats, libraries, etc.
 other, describe _____

23. For you to attend a non-formal educational program, are child care facilities a necessity?

69 necessary
55 desirable
70 not necessary;

24. How much would you be willing to pay for child care?

43 .50 per child
41 \$1.00 per hour
28 other, specify _____
51 not applicable 37 no response

25. For you to participate in an educational program, what time of the day is best suited to your needs?

52 morning 48 afternoon 1 none
82 evening 17 anytime 1 couldn't attend

26. Is there a time in the year or seasons that you could not attend meetings or receive information?

47 yes 124 no 29 no response

If yes, when?

10 Fall 21 Summer
19 Winter 17 Other, specify _____
12 Spring _____

27. What problems have you had this past year where educational programs may have helped you to a solution? List three to five.
48 food and nutrition, 39 child care and development, 34 financial management, 16 clothing, 19 family relations and communications, 15 home furnishings, 14 housing, 13 home management, 11 consumer education and buying, 9 family health, 8 arts/crafts, 6 energy,
 5 safety, 22 other, 14 none.
28. If you would be willing to attend programs of interest to you, on what three subjects would you prefer information?
77 food and nutrition, 50 child care and development, 42 clothing, 32 financial management, 26 home furnishings, 24 arts/crafts, 20 home management, 18 family relations/communications, 17 consumer ed.
29. Would your husband attend an educational meeting with you? 12 garden/landscape, 6 health, 18 other,
23 yes 73 no 5 not applicable (not married) 67 maybe 2 none.
 Under what conditions might he attend? 22 no response
46 subject of interest, 6 subject of interest with other men present,
8 subject of interest and not working, 5 in the evening, 9 not working or busy otherwise, 1 if wive asked him to, 1 if it free, 4 under no condition would the husband attend.

16. Magazine and book titles named as resources:

4 Consumers Guide
2 Consumers Magazine
1 Consumer Digest
2 Consumer Buying Guide
9 Consumer Reports
1 Organic Gardening
1 Apartment Life
3 Parents
1 First Five Years of Life
1 Family Safety Magazine
1 Polly's Pointers
2 Family Circle
2 Woman's Day
1 Good Housekeeping
1 Better Homes and Gardens
1 Simplicity Magazine
1 Singer Sewing Guide
1 Betty Crocker Sewing Guide
1 Better Homes and Gardens Baby Book
1 Better Homes and Gardens Medical Book
1 Ball Canning Book
1 Home furnishings trade publications

Question 17 responses

Food and Nutrition

food and nutrition-6
 food-5
 nutrition-5
 family nutrition-3
 foods-diabetic-2
 buying best buys-3
 inseason buys-1
 managing grocery money-1
 budget meals-2
 cooking different things-3
 diets/dieting-3
 feeding the baby-1
 feeding small children at home-1
 adequate children's diets-3
 calcium requirements for children-1
 vitamins-1
 food preservation-1
 freezing peaches-1
 freezing fruit-1
 canning-4
 use of a pressure cooker-1
 cooking a turkey-1
 gardening-3
 recipes-1
 meals-1

Clothing and Textiles

clothing and fabrics-4
 clothing-2
 fabrics-1
 hemming-1
 sewing-3
 putting in zippers-1
 making and mending clothes-1
 bias plaid skirts-1
 stain removal-1
 fitting a pattern-1

Financial Management

financial management-21
 inflation-1
 health costs-1
 cost of future food and housing-1
 budgeting-1

Family Health

family health-16
 sick children-5
 health care-1
 medical problems-1
 non-prescription drugs-1
 asthma and control-1
 asthma and allergies-1

Housing

housing-10
 home loans-3
 buying a home-2
 cost of remodeling-1
 minor home repairs-1

Home Furnishings

home furnishings-4
 color in the home and fabric-1
 flower arrangement-1
 making drapes-1
 buying drapes-1

Home Management

home management-7
 time management-1
 kitchen storage-1
 avoiding housework-1
 getting husband and children
 to do housework-1
 cleaning carpets-1

Consumer Education

consumer education-10
 consumer education and buying-1
 buying a car-2
 buying clothes and furniture-1
 coupons and refunds

Energy

energy-3
 insulation-1

Safety

safety-5
 child safety-1
 cycle safety-1
 traffic safety-1
 poisonous plants-1
 poison control and antidotes-2
 installing wood burning stove-1
 contamination of food and water-1
 thawed foods when freezer goes
 out-1
 leaving boiled eggs and cream
 pies out of refrigerator
 overnight-1
 using pressure cooker-1 (foods)

Family Health (continued)

childhood speech problems-1
 learning disabilities-1
 children's health-1
 insect control-1

Question 17 responses continued

Family Relations and Communication

family relations and communication-5
family relations-1
communication with children-1
breakdown in communication-1
communication with teenage daughter-1
home entertainment-1
healthy home atmosphere-1
education of our children-1
emotional problems-1

Child Care and Development

child care and development-15
child care-6
child development-9
child development norms-1
baby care-1
newborn care-1
pregnancy-1
pregnancy norms and needs-1
fetal development-1
prenatal care-1
coping with and training a two-year-old-1
toilet training-1
ten year olds-1
thirteen year olds-1
rebellion in a 12 year old-1
being overly strict or permissive-1
finding responsible baby sitters-1
raising a child-1
sex education-1

Miscellaneous

household concerns-1
all areas listed had some problems-2
all areas but housing had some problems-1
keeping up with research-1
correspondence course for accounting and
bookkeeping-2
none-5

Question 27 responses

Food and Nutrition

food and nutrition-2
 food-3
 nutrition-4
 shopping for food-5
 budget meals-2
 meal preparation-1
 meal planning-3
 cooking ideas-1
 food planning-1
 cooking in a rut-1
 new cooking-1
 bread making-2
 drying food-1
 canning-10
 pickles-1
 freezing-4
 using a pressure cooker-1
 microwave cookery-4
 weigh-off-1
 diet-3
 overeating-1
 appealing low calorie foods-1
 dieting after the baby comes-1
 supper-1

Clothing and Textiles

clothing and textiles-1
 clothing-1
 making a dress/clothes making-2
 sewing-3
 altering-1
 pattern alteration-1
 tailoring-1
 refresher in sewing-1
 mending-1
 buying clothes-1
 laundry-1
 cheaper to buy or make clothing-1

Financial Management

financial management-8
 managing and saving money-4
 shortcuts in cutting costs-1
 financial problems-1
 financial information-1
 financial matters-1
 budgeting-3
 stretching the dollar-1
 bookkeeping-1
 bookkeeping for the farm-1

Financial Management (cont.)

bills-1
 bank account management-1
 living with inflation-1
 estate planning-1
 income tax-2

Housing and Home Furnishings

housing-5
 decorating around and installing
 a wood stove-1
 home decorating-1-5
 wall papering-1
 remodeling a house-1
 redoing old home-1
 home maintenance-1
 home improvement-1
 heating home-1
 tips on saving energy-1
 insulation-1
 sewing projects for the nursery-1
 building-1
 floor care-lineoleum-1
 owning 1st home-1
 house plans-1
 home financing-1
 putting in a yard--soil prep.-1
 landscaping-1
 flower and shrubbery care-1
 horticulture problems-1
 household pests-1

Home Management

home management-3
 disorganization-2
 clutter-1
 cleaning tips-1

Home Arts and Crafts

creative stitchery-1
 quilting-3
 flower arrangements-1
 crochet-3
 knitting-2
 Christmas gifts-1
 economical gifts-1
 sewing Christmas gifts-1
 gifts and gift wrapping-1
 Christmas decorations-1

Question 27 responses continued

Consumer Buying and Education

buying furniture-2
 consumer buying and educ.-2
 furniture repair-1
 buying household goods-1
 buying appliances-1

Family Relationships and Communication and Child Development

family relationships-4
 problems with school-aged children-1
 coping with 2 year old-1
 coping with a newborn-1
 family communications
 teen daughter-1
 husband-1
 mother-daughter-1
 child relationships-2
 coping with an ill parent-1
 aging parents-1
 living with an alcoholic-1
 child psychology-1
 child guidance-1
 child development-6
 coping with children-2
 basic children's discipline-4
 child to college-1
 speech therapy-1
 rebellion-1
 behavior-1
 adolescence-1
 newborn care-1
 child care-9
 family leisure-1
 family management-1
 preteen foster child-1
 avoiding depression-1
 handling stress-1
 working with children-1
 understanding busing-1
 natural family planning-1
 sex education for girls/
 contraception?-2

Miscellaneous

first aid-1
 healthful hints-2
 medical care-1
 safety-2
 beauty and you-1
 grooming for junior high girls-1
 buying a new car-1

Miscellaneous (cont.)

car care-1
 auto maintenance and repairs-1
 services of Oklahoma-1
 getting a job-1
 time management (8-5 job)-4
 gardening-9
 insect control-1
 cattle raising tips-2
 horses-1
 poultry-2
 no real problems-1
 couldn't think of any-1
 not applicable-5
 none-12

Question 28 Responses

Food and Nutrition

food and nutrition-17
food-4
cooking-18
new ways of cooking-1
new recipes with what is on hand-1
food preparation-4
nutrition-7
diet cookery-1
foreign cookery-1
microwave cookery-5
recipes-1
meal planning-2
economical meals-1
budget meals-1
food shipping money management-4
conserving foods-1
food preservation-1
drying food-2
canning-13
freezing-7
jelly-jam-marmalades-1
bread making-1
cake decorating-1
cuts of meat-1
food and water storage-1
making meals more exciting-1

Clothing and Textiles

clothing and fabrics-6
sewing and fabrics-1
sewing projects-1
sewing jeans heavy denim-1
sewing for children-1
clothing alteration to finished garment-1
tailoring-1
stretch-and-sew-1
sewing-23
making children's clothes-1
clothing-7
any new tips new technology-1
clothing skills-1
sewing specialty things-1

Consumer Education and Buying

consumer education and buying-6
consumer tips-1
consumer education-2
getting best buys on a fixed income-1
buying conservatively-1
consumer information-1
buying household goods-1

Question 28 Responses Continued

Housing, Home Arts, Home Furnishings

home-2
 housing-4
 decorating inexpensively-2
 decorating-9
 redecorating for novice and untalented-1
 budget ideas-1
 home interiors-1
 redecorating-wallpaper, paint selection, etc.-1
 basic carpentry-home maintenance-1
 inexpensive remodeling-1
 remodeling bathroom-1
 home improvement-2
 financing-3
 household programs-1
 home furnishings-8
 furniture refinishing-2
 furniture reupholstery-1
 flower arrangement-1
 energy saving-2
 landscaping-2
 household pests-1
 lawn and gardening-1
 gardening-9
 growing vegetables-mulching-1
 decorating with houseplants-1
 houseplants-2
 low maintenance landscaping and house plants-1
 arts and crafts-7
 tole painting-1
 painting-1
 making from throwaways-1
 quilting-3
 needlepoint-1
 crochet-5
 needlework-1
 knitting-1
 Christmas decorations
 homemade gifts and articles-1

Home Management

home management-12
 quick easy methods of cleaning-3
 time management-1
 housework efficiency(job, house, family)-2
 household hints-2

Question 28 Responses Continued

Financial Management

financial planning and management-6
 financial management-3
 money management-5
 budgeting money-10
 estate planning-1
 shortcuts on saving money-1
 getting most for money-1
 home finances-saving money-1
 household business-1
 financial matters-1
 bills-1
 bookkeeping-1
 tax management-1
 inflation fighting-1

Family Relationships, Communication, and Child Development

family relationships-8
 husband-1
 communications-teen daughter-1
 family communications-1
 family-1
 living with an alcoholic-1
 family vacations on a budget-1
 raising children-2
 children-2
 parent child relationships-1
 foster care-1
 child care-22
 babysitting service-1
 child development-21
 growth-1
 child behavior-1
 birth to 12 years-1
 anger-1
 peer pressure-1
 adolescence-1
 talented gifted children-1
 raising teenagers-1
 discipline-1
 patience-1
 child psychology-1
 child learning and health concepts-1
 working with young children-1

Health

grooming-1
 family health-2
 health-2
 health and beauty-1

Question 28 Responses Continued

Miscellaneous

safety-2
Oklahoma services-1
4-H-1
how to find work-1
clerical-1
education-2
art-1
animal husbandry-1
car care-1
homemaking in general-1
most all subject matter areas-1
self betterment-1
self sufficiency-1
horses-1
small animals-1
cattle-1
don't know-1
not applicable-1
none-2

APPENDIX D

TABLES

TABLE XXX
 RANKING OF GROUP 1 HOMEMAKERS' INFORMATION
 SOURCES FOR HOME ECONOMICS

Source *	Subject Matter Area	Food and Nutrition	Clothing and Textile	Consumer Education and Buying	Home Management	Housing	Home Furnishings	Financial Management	Family Relations and Communication	Child Care and Development	Family Health	Safety	Total
self	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
mother		5	7	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	1	-	17
husband		-	1	2	2	2	2	6	3	-	1	-	19
other family member		2	4	-	-	-	-	-	1	2	1	-	10
friend/neighbor		3	3	3	3	2	4	1	2	3	3	2	29
church/minister		-	-	1	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	-	4
library		5	3	3	3	2	2	-	-	1	1	-	20
doctor		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	20	2	28
health department		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	4	7	1	12
O. S. U. Extension home economist/aide		9	3	3	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	25
extension homemaker		5	5	2	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	33
banker		-	-	-	-	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	4
policeman/fireman		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
newspaper		1	4	9	4	5	4	2	3	1	1	5	40
magazines		4	4	6	3	1	5	4	3	3	2	3	38
books		17	5	5	6	4	6	3	3	11	8	5	73
labels/tags/package information		1	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	4
department store/related business		-	2	2	-	3	5	2	-	-	-	-	14
professional friend		-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
like and can afford		-	1	1	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	3
catalogs		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
classes/seminars		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
nowhere		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
community center		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
school		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
television		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0

*Rankings are shown for 11 subject matter areas; therefore, no percentages are shown for the table and totals will equal more or less than 100 percent.

TABLE XXXI
 RANKING OF GROUP 2 HOMEMAKERS' INFORMATION
 SOURCES FOR HOME ECONOMICS

Source *	Subject Matter Area	Food and Nutrition	Clothing and Textiles	Consumer Education and Buying	Home Management	Housing	Home Furnishings	Financial Management	Family Relations and Communication	Child Care and Development	Family Health	Safety	Total
self		-	4	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	16
mother		4	10	1	6	3	4	3	4	4	3	3	45
husband		1	-	2	2	-	-	7	1	1	-	-	14
other family member		2	5	1	5	5	3	4	1	4	4	1	35
friend/neighbor		3	7	4	2	3	4	3	5	1	3	2	37
church/minister		1	1	1	1	-	1	2	9	1	-	1	18
library		1	-	3	1	-	1	-	1	1	-	1	9
doctor		1	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	8	16	2	29
health department		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	1	1	-	4
O. S. U. Extension home economist/aide		5	1	3	2	2	3	2	3	2	3	3	29
extension homemaker		-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2
banker		-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	4
policeman/fireman		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
newspaper		3	3	5	2	3	4	2	1	3	3	5	34
magazines		7	6	14	5	5	9	2	6	3	4	7	68
books		22	7	10	5	4	3	4	3	11	8	10	87
labels/tags/package information		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
department store/related business		1	3	-	-	6	2	3	-	1	2	-	18
professional friend		2	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	1	-	-	5
like and can afford		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
catalogs		-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
classes/seminars		1	1	-	1	-	-	-	1	1	-	1	6
nowhere		1	-	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	-	-	8
community center		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
school		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
television		-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1

*Rankings are shown for 11 subject matter areas; therefore, no percentages are shown for the table and totals will equal more or less than 100 percent.

TABLE XXXII

RANKING OF GROUP 3 HOMEMAKERS' INFORMATION
SOURCES FOR HOME ECONOMICS

Source *	Subject Matter Area	Food and Nutrition	Clothing and Textile	Consumer Education and Buying	Home Management	Housing	Home Furnishings	Financial Management	Family Relations and Communication	Child Care and Development	Family Health	Safety	Total
self		3	3	3	4	3	3	6	3	3	3	3	34
mother		4	5	2	4	2	2	2	2	4	3	2	32
husband		-	-	-	2	2	-	4	1	-	1	1	11
other family member		3	5	2	2	2	1	3	3	5	3	2	31
friend/neighbor		4	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	4	2	2	22
church/minister		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	2	-	-	8
library		1	-	2	1	1	-	-	1	1	1	-	8
doctor		1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6	16	3	26
health department		1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
O. S. U. Extension home economist/aide		3	1	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	5
extension homemaker		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
banker		-	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	4
policeman/fireman		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
newspaper		2	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	18
magazines		6	6	10	6	5	15	4	8	11	6	7	84
books		20	9	6	7	6	4	3	5	13	9	8	90
labels/tags/package information		-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1
department store/related business		1	-	-	-	3	1	4	-	-	-	-	9
professional friend		-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
like and can afford		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
catalogs		-	-	-	-	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	2
classes/seminars		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
nowhere		-	1	1	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	4
community center		1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	2
school		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
television		1	-	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	11

*Rankings are shown for 11 subject matter areas; therefore, no percentages are shown for the table and totals will equal more or less than 100 percent.

TABLE XXXIII
 RANKING OF GROUP 4 HOMEMAKERS' INFORMATION
 SOURCES FOR HOME ECONOMICS

Source*	Subject Matter Area	Food and Nutrition	Clothing and Textile	Consumer Education and Buying	Home Management	Housing	Home Furnishings	Financial Management	Family Relations and Communication	Child Care and Development	Family Health	Safety	Total
self		1	2	3	5	3	6	5	4	1	1	5	36
mother		7	7	4	7	4	2	3	3	6	3	3	49
husband		-	-	-	3	2	1	6	1	-	-	-	13
other family member		5	4	4	4	3	4	2	2	5	2	1	36
friend/neighbor		5	5	3	3	2	3	2	2	2	1	1	29
church/minister		1	-	-	-	-	-	-	8	1	1	-	11
library		2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	3	-	2	15
doctor		3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	19	26	2	51
health department		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	2	-	6
O. S. U. Extension home economist/aide		3	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	14
extension homemaker		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
banker		-	-	1	1	1	1	3	-	-	-	-	7
policeman/fireman		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
newspaper		1	2	4	14	5	3	1	-	-	-	4	34
magazines		8	8	15	7	7	11	5	5	7	8	8	89
books		20	5	5	7	9	8	7	9	12	11	11	104
labels/tags/package information		1	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
department store/related business		1	5	-	-	4	3	2	-	-	-	-	15
professional friend		3	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
like and can afford		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
catalogs		-	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	1
classes/seminars		-	-	-	1	-	-	1	1	-	-	1	4
nowhere		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
community center		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
school		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0
television		-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2

*Rankings are shown for 11 subject matter areas; therefore, no percentages are shown for the table and totals will equal more or less than 100 percent.

VITA |

Riletta Smith Marshall

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: EXPRESSED NEEDS OF YOUNG FAMILIES IN MUSKOGEE COUNTY FOR
COOPERATIVE EXTENSION HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS

Major Field: Home Economics Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Sentinel, Oklahoma, June 7, 1943, the daughter of Alva and Sue Smith of Lone Wolf, Oklahoma. Married Ernest Marshall on January 24, 1968. Two children: daughter, Ava Dawn, born on January 10, 1974; daughter, Tammy Lynn, born on February 5, 1976.

Education: Graduated from Lone Wolf High School, Lone Wolf, Oklahoma, in May, 1961; received Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, in January, 1965; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree at Oklahoma State University in May, 1982.

Professional Experience: Home Demonstration Agent, 4-H, Muskogee County, Extension Home Economist, Okmulgee County, Extension Home Economist, Muskogee County, Oklahoma.

Professional Organizations: Member, American Home Economics Association, Oklahoma Home Economics Association, National Association of Extension Home Economists, Oklahoma Association of Extension Home Economists, and Soroptimists International.