

UTILIZATION OF THE FAMILY LIVING BASIC CORE
CURRICULUM AMONG HIGH SCHOOL VOCATIONAL
HOME ECONOMICS FAMILY LIVING
INSTRUCTORS

By

CYNTHIA LOUISE WARD

"

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1973

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
December, 1980



UTILIZATION OF THE FAMILY LIVING BASIC CORE
CURRICULUM AMONG HIGH SCHOOL VOCATIONAL
HOME ECONOMICS FAMILY LIVING
INSTRUCTORS

Thesis Approved:

Margaret S. Callum

Thesis Adviser

Lora Coey

Athea Wright

Norman D. Ruskam

Dean of the Graduate College

PREFACE

Evaluation should be a constant process in education. The major purpose of this study is to investigate the utilization of the Family Living (Sawatzky, 1978) basic core curriculum among the Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living as a two-semester course in secondary schools. It is hoped that the results of this study will be beneficial to the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education in working with the family living instructors and during the revision process of this basic core curriculum guide.

The author wishes to express gratitude to her major thesis adviser, Dr. Margaret S. Callisen, for her guidance, patience, and reassurance during this study. Appreciation is extended to committee members, Dr. Lora Cacy and Dr. Althea Wright, for their contributions toward the completion of this study.

A special thank you is expressed to Joyce Sawatzky, Assistant Coordinator of the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center (CIMC), Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, for suggesting that this particular project be undertaken for this thesis study. A thank you also goes to the CIMC for their guidance and support in collection of the data. Appreciation is expressed to Debbie Truitt, Home Economics Curriculum Specialist, CIMC, for her assistance in this study. A very special thanks to the 116 instructors participating in the study and to Mrs. Sharon K. Phillips for typing the final copy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose and Objectives.	3
Research Questions.	4
Assumptions	4
Limitations	5
Definition of Terms	5
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	7
Acceptance of Commercial Texts in Family Living	8
Educational Curriculum Guides	9
Teacher's Role in Developing Materials.	10
Process of Developing Materials	10
Teacher Acceptance of Oklahoma Home Economics Curriculum Guides	11
Evaluation.	13
Summative and Formative Evaluation.	14
Importance of Evaluation.	15
Summary	15
III. RESEARCH PROCEDURES.	17
Research Design Type.	17
Selection of the Population	17
Development of the Instrument	18
Collection of Data.	18
Analysis of Data.	19
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA.	20
Introduction.	20
Description of Population	21
Age.	21
Vocational Home Economics Teaching Experience.	22
Years Degrees Received	22
Degree Majors.	24
Recency of Course Work	25
Specialized Training in Family Living.	26
Family Living Classes Taught	28
Family Living Enrollment	28
Comparison of Male and Female Enrollment	29

Chapter	Page
Utilization of <u>Family Living</u> Basic Core Curriculum.	31
Teaching Time <u>Family Living</u> was Utilized	32
Utilization of Units of Instruction.	34
Reasons Taught	38
Reasons Not Taught or Partly Taught.	47
Utilization of Components.	66
Availability of Student Materials.	69
Inservice and Revision Needs of <u>Family Living</u> Basic Core Curriculum	70
Inservice Training Needs	70
Future Revision Needs.	73
Future Curriculum Guide Committees	74
Summary	75
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	78
Summary	78
Findings and Conclusions.	79
Utilization of <u>Family Living</u> Basic Core Curriculum	79
Inservice and Revision Needs of <u>Family Living</u> Basic Core Curriculum.	81
Recommendations	81
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	84
APPENDIXES.	86
APPENDIX A - PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENT.	87
APPENDIX B - INSTRUMENT AND CORRESPONDENCE	89
APPENDIX C - ADDITIONAL DATA ABOUT PARTICIPANTS.	99
APPENDIX D - COMMENTS ABOUT UNIT COMPONENTS BY PARTICIPANTS	101

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Ages as Reported by Participants.	21
II. Years of Experience Teaching Vocational Home Economics. .	23
III. Years Degrees Were Received by Participants	23
IV. Degree Majors Reported by Participants.	25
V. Recency of College Course, Non-Credit Class, Workshop, or Seminar Completed in Any Area.	27
VI. Specialized Training in Family Living by Participants . .	28
VII. Number of Family Living Classes Taught by Participants. .	29
VIII. Total Male and Female Enrollment in Family Living Pro- grams as Reported by Participants	30
IX. Comparison of Male and Female Enrollment in Family Living Programs as Reported by Participants.	31
X. Percentage of Teaching Time <u>Family Living</u> Basic Core Curriculum Was Utilized	33
XI. Participants' Utilization of <u>Family Living</u> Basic Core Curriculum Units of Instruction	35
XII. Ranking of Units of Instruction by Percentage of Partic- ipants Reporting 60-100 Percent Utilization	37
XIII. Reasons Units Were Taught as Reported by Participants . .	39
XIV. Reasons Units Were Not Taught or Only Partly Taught as Reported by Participants.	48
XV. Participants' Utilization of <u>Family Living</u> Basic Core Components.	68
XVI. Availability of Individual <u>Family Living</u> Curriculum Guides for Students	70
XVII. <u>Family Living</u> Basic Core Curriculum Inservice Training Needs	71

Table	Page
XVIII. Future Revision Needs of the <u>Family Living</u> Basic Core Curriculum.	74
XIX. Participants' Willingness to Serve on a Curriculum Guide Committee	76
XX. Number of Years at Present School as Reported by Participants	100
XXI. Semester Hours Completed Beyond Degrees as Reported by Participants	100

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation, defined by Webster (1974) is "to judge or determine the worth or quality of" (p. 484). Charles R. Wright (1968) had the following comments to make concerning evaluation:

Whenever men spend time, money, and effort to help solve social problems, someone usually questions the effectiveness of their actions. Sponsors, critics, the public, even the actors themselves, seek signs that their program is successful (p. 197).

Evaluating personal actions and events is a part of daily living and should be a constant process. Evaluation also has an important part in education, and John W. Best (1977) upholds this view in the following remarks:

Evaluation is . . . seeking to determine the merits of a particular educational product, process, or program in terms of carefully defined and agreed-upon objectives or values. Evaluation implies some judgment of the effectiveness, social utility, or desirability of the product, process, or program (p. 13).

Family living, an area of vocational home economics, has the same needs concerning its instructional materials. According to the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education Research and Evaluation Unit (1980), these figures are indicative of students enrolled in family living courses during these specified years:

<u>School Year</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
1973-74	1520	1485
1974-75	1755	1588
1975-76	2294	1789

<u>School Year</u>	<u>Males</u>	<u>Females</u>
1976-77	3080	2247
1977-78	3033	2556
1978-79	2498	2391
1979-80	2608	2781

Increased numbers of students seem to demand improved qualities of instructional materials. In Kerckhoff's (1973) article concerning commercial materials and texts in the family living area, responses from a national sample of teachers are discussed. He concluded in this article that teachers are dissatisfied with commercial teaching materials. Assuming this national survey is representative of the family living area, current and flexible instructional materials are needed, those allowing for supplementing written material with local materials and resources. An example of such an instructional material is the Family Living (Sawatzky, 1978) basic core curriculum developed by the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center (CIMC) at the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. The Curriculum Materials In-State Price List (1978) identified the contents of the Family Living (Sawatzky, 1978) basic core curriculum.

Twenty-two units in the following areas: Vocational Planning, Consumerism, Human Development, Parenthood Education, Clothing, Foods, and Housing. Designed for the 11th or 12th grade student with no more than one year of home economics instruction [sic] (p. 5).

Other Oklahoma home economics curriculum guides have been developed by the CIMC and evaluated by teachers. Results of two evaluations can be found in Drummond's (1976) and Hollenback's (1975) master's theses.

The above noted research shows evidence that there is a demand not only for current, flexible instructional materials in the family

living area, but also for an evaluation of educational materials. Thus, there is a need to determine the utilization of the Family Living (Sawatzky, 1978) basic core curriculum as a teaching resource, the utilization of the sections and each unit of instruction, and the utilization of the individual unit components within the units of instruction by the Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living as a two-semester course in secondary schools.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study is to investigate the utilization of the Family Living (Sawatzky, 1978) basic core curriculum among the Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living as a two-semester course in secondary schools. The objectives of this study are as follows:

1. To assess the utilization of the Family Living basic core curriculum as a teaching resource among the Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living.
2. To assess the utilization of the seven sections of the Family Living basic core curriculum and each unit of instruction by the Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living.
3. To assess the utilization of the Family Living basic core curriculum's individual unit components within the units of instruction by the Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living.

4. To make recommendations for in-service training programs for more effective utilization of the Family Living basic core curriculum.
5. To make recommendations for the revision of the Family Living basic core curriculum.

Research Questions

The research questions for this study are as follows:

1. What is the approximate percentage of time you follow the Family Living basic core curriculum in your present teaching?
2. What percent of each of the 22 units in Family Living have you taught or do you plan to teach?
3. What percentage of time did you use each of the nine basic core components?
4. What are the sections in Family Living for which you feel a need for in-service training programs?
5. How often would you like for the Family Living basic core curriculum guide to be revised?

Assumptions

The assumptions for this study are as follows:

1. Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living as a two-semester course will use the basic core curriculum as a guide, supplementing it with available materials and resources, therefore localizing it to suit the needs and interests of students and community.

2. The Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living as a two-semester course that are participating in this study, provide a total sample.
3. The participants will be truthful and will devote the proper amount of time in completing the instrument in order to give reliable results.

Limitations

The participants in the study were limited to instructors who:

1. Teach family living as a two-semester course in high school vocational home economics departments in Oklahoma.

Definition of Terms

The terms and definitions relevant to this study are as follows:

Acceptance is, according to Webster (1976), "to receive with consent; to make a favorable response to; to receive favorably something offered" (pp. 6-7).

Components of a unit of instruction include objectives, suggested activities, information sheet, assignment and/or job sheets, transparency master, test, and answers to test" (CIMC, 1977, p. 6).

Family Living is an area of vocational home economics for both males and females in the 11th and/or 12th grade with no more than one year of previous vocational home economics. An objective of family living is ". . . to prepare for combining the roles of homemakers and wage earners" (Operations and Procedures Manual, 1977, p. 107). The contents are:

including but not limited to, consumer education, food and nutrition, family living and parenthood education,

child development and guidance, housing and home management (including resource management), and clothing and textiles (p. 107).

Family Living Basic Core Curriculum is a publication

intended as a base from which the teacher can motivate, localize, and personalize in order to prepare students for their future multiple roles as they relate to homemaking (Tuttle and Johnson, 1978, p. v).

Localize, according to the CIMC (1977), is to "make unit of instruction relevant to community" (p. 6).

Unit of Instruction is, according to the CIMC (1977), "materials and/or information necessary for one or more class periods for the teaching-learning process in order to reach the unit objective" (p. 5).

Utilization is "the total process of using curriculum by localizing, personalizing, and supplementing core content," according to Truitt (personal communication, 1980).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This review of literature is examining, in part, the availability and acceptance of the commercial textbooks being used in high school family living courses and the apparent need for more, varied, and up-to-date instructional materials. Educational curriculum guides are defined and the characteristics of curriculum users are discussed. In states such as Oklahoma, teachers have an opportunity to be committee members, deciding what material will go into the curriculum guides. The development process used in Oklahoma is explained. Among those attempting to provide teachers with new and up-to-date instructional materials is the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center (CIMC) at the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. One publication is the Family Living (Sawatzky, 1978) basic core curriculum. Previously published curriculum guides developed by the CIMC have been evaluated by Oklahoma home economics teachers and the researcher wants to review the CIMC's previous curriculum experience and ability to provide teachers with beneficial instructional materials. Evaluations of Oklahoma home economics basic core curriculum materials have been conducted by Sawatzky (1975), Drummond (1976), Jones (1978), Hollenback (1975), and Rogers (1978) to show teacher usage and acceptance. Finally, to understand evaluation and realize its importance in determining usefulness of instructional materials is to realize the significance of this study.

Acceptance of Commercial Texts in Family Living

Questions and answers have always been an important part of education with teachers as well as students. Among other teacher concerns have been continuous questions regarding instructional materials. Questions asked of a small but select national sample of teachers in the third survey of the Family Life Education Panel were the following:

What commercial teaching materials are being used in high school family life classrooms? Which textbooks . . . ?
 What other teaching aids? How good are these materials?
 What criteria do teachers use in selecting commercial teaching materials? (Kerckhoff, 1973, p. 275).

In acknowledgment of these questions, Kerckhoff (1973) stated that "the best selling commercial teaching aid has been the textbook" in spite of "widespread discontent" and "many critical remarks about family life textbooks in general." Some of the criticisms were "that the books are out of date," "'obsolete,' 'not reflective of the changes in our society,' 'not relevant for today's marriage and family,' . . . 'too restrictive and too inflexible'" (pp. 275-276).

In this same study Kerckhoff (1973) remarked:

When teachers rated a textbook highly, they did so for such reasons as, It is objective; that is, it does not preach at the kids. It is comprehensive-has a lot of important topics. It is not too difficult to read. The cartoons and pictures are good. The students like the book. It has graphs, charts, and much informative data. It shows black and white people in the illustrations. It has good case studies. It does not talk down to students, does not insult their intelligence. It includes good suggested exercises and activities (p. 277).

Furthermore, Kerckhoff (1973) noted teachers' critiques and suggestions regarding commercial teaching materials.

Basically, their responses indicated that they simply want more of what is already available, but that they want it

to be less expensive and more up-to-date and relevant to today's world. . . . Commercial materials should include suggestions for the teacher-discussion questions, role playing ideas, bibliographies, and suggestions for activities which will help the students learn more (p. 280).)

Educational Curriculum Guides

The curriculum guide has been one tool utilized by educators for the purpose of providing teachers with current instructional materials. Zenger and Zenger (1973) defined an educational curriculum guide in the following terms:

An educational curriculum guide is an instructional aid that facilitates the teaching/learning process. Rather than prescribe material, it suggests desirable content. It includes important objectives, content, and concepts as well as a variety of learning experiences, teaching aids, instructional resources, and evaluation techniques (p. 1).

In order for a class to have received full benefit of any curriculum guide, it had to have been taught by an instructor who believed in it. Characteristics of a curriculum user were discussed by Eshelby (1978) when he stated that "The typical user is a classroom instructor who teaches in a relatively large school system in a classroom that utilizes a typical setting along with some individualized instruction" (p. 65).

He noted that the average length of teaching experience was more than eight years. The typical user is looking for instructional material with transparency masters. Instructional aids such as slide/type and filmstrip/cassette presentations are also of benefit to teachers. Eshelby went on to explain that "The instructor wants to have a basic core of instructional material provided and wants the state office to give him or her this material" (p. 65). It is the responsibility of the instructor to localize curriculum material to fit their

community. It was stated in the article by Eshelby that

. . . it would be preferred that a curriculum committee suggest which materials are to be used by a state.

The materials sought by curriculum users should (a) include a course outline, (b) be presented on a unit of instruction approach, (c) include an instructional analysis, (d) be stated in specific performance objectives, (e) include tests and answers, and (f) be developed from a task analysis . . . (p. 65).

Teacher's Role in Developing Materials

Curriculum materials have been provided for vocational teachers in the public school. Unlike the textbook, many curriculum materials have been developed in the state where they are utilized. Bruce (1971) had these comments concerning their development:

Teachers today need many kinds of curriculum materials-- curriculum guides, teaching units, course outlines, teacher handbooks, and audiovisual aids (slides, filmstrips, charts, films, transparencies, etc.) to support the written materials.

A key principle is to develop materials that will be used. And to make sure they are used, it is important to involve a number of people in developing them . . . (p. 49).

Like comprehensive planning for curriculum development, planning for the development and use of curriculum materials requires the involvement of a number of individuals: the teacher, state director, teacher educator, subject-matter specialist, and representatives from business and industry. . . .

We feel that this approach to the development and use of curriculum materials has helped our vocational education programs meet the needs of a vast majority of people in the state (p. 50).

Process of Developing Materials

In order for vocational education programs to meet needs and to have continuity statewide, certain knowledge and skills should be taught

at each level of a program. Griffith (1979) stated that "in order to choose, develop and integrate materials to build an effective course of study, the teacher needs outside help" (p. 2). This assistance should come from a source where several different people have input into the development of the materials. Griffith (1979) explained the development process in Oklahoma in the following terms:

In Oklahoma, a committee approach is used in developing instructional materials. For each priority area, a committee is selected to work with the curriculum specialists and writers to plan, review, and validate the instructional materials publication. These people include vocational teachers, teacher educators, program supervisors, and representatives from business and industry.

These committees must be made up of teachers who will be using the materials to be developed and representatives from business and industry who know what the end product must know and be able to do (pp. 7-8).

Teacher Acceptance of Oklahoma Home Economics

Curriculum Guides

Sawatzky (1975), in her study of "A Comparison of Acceptance and Usefulness of Home Economics I, Basic Core by Workshop Participants and Non-Workshop Participants" (p. ii), commented at the conclusion of her study ". . . that the majority of vocational consumer and homemaking teachers of Home Economics I in Oklahoma do accept Home Economics I, Basic Core as the basic teaching resource for the course (Objective 1)" (p. 56).

Drummond (1976), in her study of the use of the Home Economics I, Basic Core by teachers, stated:

. . . that the majority of the vocational consumer and homemaking teachers of Home Economics I in Oklahoma do teach the majority of the areas and the units in Home Economics I, Basic Core either in their entirety or in part (Objective 1) (p. 66).

She went on to comment that Career Exploration, Housing and Home Furnishings, and Consumer Education were the three areas that teachers used least. Drummond (1976) also remarked that over half of the teachers found the components of the units of instruction to be ". . . 'useful' to 'highly useful,' with the exception of the Tests component" (p. 67). Teachers commented that the Tests measured the student's ability to memorize the information. They, however, found the two components, Specific Objectives and Information Sheets, to be "highly useful" (p. 67).

Jones (1978), in her study entitled "Oklahoma Home Economics Teachers' Perceptions of Sex-Role Stereotyping in the Home Economics I Basic Core Curriculum Guide" (p. ii) commented that "The greatest majority of the teachers and the select panel agree that the Home Economics I Basic Core curriculum guide is 'rarely' stereotyped" (p. 53). Jones also added that by ". . . using established guidelines, it is possible to develop curriculum materials which teachers perceive to be relatively free of sex-role stereotyping" (p. 53).

Hollenback (1975) conducted a study for the purpose of determining Oklahoma teacher acceptance of the Home Economics II Basic Core Curriculum. She concluded that the teachers had accepted this basic core and that they ". . . were finding the various aspects of the format, such as assignment sheets, information sheets, job sheets, etc., to be helpful and useful in their teaching" (p. 73). She found that teachers were using this basic curriculum in other classes where the information was needed, as well as in HE II. As a result of research, Hollenback found that teachers have to have ". . . a general knowledge of curriculum development and design. They were very much interested

in participating or having their peers participate in the curriculum writing committee activities" (p. 73). Instead of teachers being inhibited by the core curriculum, she found they were using ". . . it as a guide and supplementing it with other interesting and informative materials" (p. 73).

Rogers (1978), in her study of the use of the Home Economics II, Basic Core by Oklahoma vocational home economics teachers, drew the conclusions that the majority of the teachers were using in total each of the units of instruction. Those units that had shown the greatest total use were Pastry, Yeast Breads, Garment Construction, and Labeling and Textiles. The units used least, in total, included Middle Childhood, Buying Practices, Business Etiquette, Progress on the Job, and Inspection and Grading.

It can be determined from research by Sawatzky (1975), Drummond (1976), Jones (1978) Hollenback (1975), and Rogers (1978) that Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors have accepted these CIMC publications.

Evaluation

"'Evaluation' is a word we all use; therefore, we all think we know what it is." This statement was made by Braden and Walker (1978) in an article regarding the understanding of evaluation. They went on to state: "In reality, evaluation has so many different meanings that when we say it, hear it, write it, or read it, we cannot be sure that the other person is using our meaning" (p. 19). Rowntree (1974) defined the term by saying, "Evaluation is the means whereby we

systematically collect and analyse information about the results of a student's encounter with a learning experience" [sic] (p. 130).

Rowntree's (1974) definition of evaluation includes factors that Braden and Walker (1978) have also included as steps in their "process of evaluation" (p. 20). They described this evaluation process by stating: "In step one, we always collect information. . . . In step two, the information is always analyzed. . . . And in step three, judgment is always passed . . ." (p. 20).

Evaluation has its function in the field of education. Concerning this statement, Rowntree (1974) made the following remark, "The chief function of evaluation is to improve the effectiveness of our teaching" (p. 137).

Summative and Formative Evaluation

Zais (1976) discussed two types of evaluation, summative and formative, in a recent text. He noted that "Summative evaluation . . . is conducted in order to obtain a comprehensive assessment of the quality of a completed curriculum." He added that . . . "summative evaluation ordinarily takes place at the completion of the curriculum development process and provides a terminal judgment on the completed product in overall, general terms" (p. 381).

Concerning formative evaluation, he stated that it ". . . is conducted during the curriculum development process for the additional purpose of providing data that can be used to 'form' a better finished product" (p. 381).

Importance of Evaluation

According to Lessinger (1971), American educators should be held more responsible for evaluating programs. He made the comment that "Today, too many young Americans leave school without the tools of learning, an interest in learning, or any idea of the relationships of learning to jobs" (p. 7). He went on to state that "Now, the educational establishment--right down to the local level--is being asked ever more insistently to account for the results of its program" (p. 7).

It was the opinion of Popham (1973) that "possibly the most pervasive theme in the nation's educational enterprise . . . revolves around the desirability of rigorously evaluating the quality of our instructional activities" (p. 7). He further stated that those interested in education believe "that those designing and operating instructional systems have an ethical responsibility to discover how well their instruction has worked" (p. 7). Kerckhoff (1960) explained that evaluation research is not anything new; however, "it is only within the past few decades that organized research efforts with careful methodologies have been utilized for this purpose" (p. 187).

Summary

The researchers' objective in this review of literature was to point out educators' continual need to evaluate instructional materials. Research showed widespread dissatisfaction with instructional materials in the family living area. Educational curriculum guides, utilized by educators for the purpose of providing current instructional materials and the characteristics of a curriculum user were discussed.

Involvement from teachers as well as a number of other individuals in the development of these curriculum materials have made them more usable. The CIMC's previous success in developing curriculum materials for Oklahoma home economics teachers was evidenced through studies by Sawatzky (1975), Drummond (1976), Jones (1978), Hollenback (1975), and Rogers (1978). The Family Living (Sawatzky, 1978) basic core curriculum was yet another contribution to Oklahoma home economics education. Evaluation, a common term, was defined and two types of evaluation, summative and formative, were discussed. As pointed out through research on evaluation, educators need to be held more responsible for the quality and the results of instructional materials. Through evaluation, the strengths and weaknesses of instructional materials can be detected and the necessary revisions made, thereby upgrading instructional materials in the family living area.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH PROCEDURES

This chapter described the research procedures used in this study. An explanation of the research design type, selection of the population, development of the instrument, collection of data, and analysis of data was included.

Research Design Type

The type of research design used for this study was descriptive. Best (1977) stated that descriptive research was

concerned with conditions or relationships that exist, opinions that are held, processes that are going on, effects that are evident, or trends that are developing. It is primarily concerned with the present (p. 116).

In descriptive research "the researcher does not manipulate the variables or arrange for events to happen" (p. 117). Since this research was concerned with discovering the actual use of the Family Living (Sawatzky, 1978) basic core curriculum, the questionnaire and the rating scale were chosen to execute the descriptive research.

Selection of the Population

In 1978-79 there were approximately 400 vocational home economics instructors in the comprehensive high schools in Oklahoma, with approximately 120 teaching family living as a two-semester course. The reporting high schools that had a total enrollment of 200 students

or less equaled 52.59 percent. Concerning the remaining 55 high schools or 47.41 percent of the total, 24 or 20.69 percent had a total enrollment between 201 and 500 and 17 or 14.65 percent reported over 500 students. The names of the schools in the study were obtained from the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, Home Economics Division. A total invited sample of vocational home economics instructors teaching family living as a two-semester course in Oklahoma secondary schools was chosen.

Development of the Instrument

The researcher patterned the questionnaire and the rating scale for this research after those developed by Drummond (1976) for her master's thesis (see Appendix A for letter of permission). In this study the use of areas, units of instruction, and basic core components were evaluated in the Home Economics I, Basic Core curriculum. Drummond's (1976) questionnaire was adapted from a set of questionnaires developed by the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center of the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education used for surveying teacher use of the Basic Core Curriculum for Vocational Agriculture. For this study a combination of the open- and closed-type questionnaire was used for determining the utilization of the sections and each unit of instruction and a rating scale was used to determine the utilization of the individual unit components within the units of instruction (see Appendix B).

Collection of Data

The data presented were gathered from vocational home economics

instructors teaching family living as a two-semester course in Oklahoma secondary schools. Copies of the instrument (see Appendix B) were mailed to 181 teachers in April, 1979. After the first mailing, 96 teachers or 53 percent responded. On April 27, 1979, 85 postcards (see Appendix B) were mailed to the teachers that had not responded. As a result of the second mailing, 18 questionnaires were received, resulting in a total of 114 questionnaires, or a 63 percent return. On May 25, 1979, a third mailing consisting of another instrument, complete with a self-addressed, stamped return envelope was sent to the 67 teachers who failed to respond. As a result of the third and final mailing, 27 questionnaires were received, resulting in a total of 141, or a 78 percent return. The instruments received but not usable totaled 25. Of the 25 responses, 18 teachers noted that family living was not taught as a two-semester course in their high schools, four did not use the Family Living basic core curriculum materials, two stated that they had not taught the course that year, and one noted that their school no longer offered family living. A total of 116 instruments out of the 141 received were usable, resulting in a 64.1 percent usable return.

Analysis of Data

The collected data for this study were coded and transferred to computer cards. They were analyzed to get percentages and frequencies. Tables were constructed to illustrate information from the instruments.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to investigate the utilization of the Family Living (Sawatzky, 1978) basic core curriculum among the Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living as a two-semester course in secondary schools.

To achieve this purpose, the following objectives were identified:

1. To assess the utilization of the Family Living basic core curriculum as a teaching resource among the Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living.
2. To assess the utilization of the Family Living basic core curriculum's sections and each unit of instruction by the Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living.
3. To assess the utilization of the Family Living basic core curriculum's individual unit components within the units of instruction by the Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living.
4. To make recommendations for in-service training programs for more effective utilization of the Family Living basic core curriculum.

5. To make recommendations for the revision of the Family Living basic core curriculum.

Description of Population

The participants in this study consisted of the 116 vocational home economics instructors teaching family living as a two-semester course in Oklahoma secondary schools. Tables I through IX present personal information concerning the participants. For additional personal data see Appendix C.

Age

The participants in this study were a relatively young group. The ages of the participants ranged from 21 to 51 and over. More than one-half, 61 or 52.59 percent, of the instructors were in the category of 21-30 years of age. The number of instructors between 21 and 40 years old totaled 85 or 73.28 percent of the total (Table I).

TABLE I
AGES AS REPORTED BY PARTICIPANTS

	Ages			51 and Over	No Response	Total
	21-30	31-40	41-50			
Number of Responses	61	24	19	11	1	116
Percent of Responses	52.59	20.69	16.38	9.48	.86	100

Vocational Home Economics Teaching Experience

Table II gives evidence of a large number of instructors with 10 or less years of experience teaching vocational home economics. These findings can be supported from the figures in Table I, where it was reported that the age group receiving over 50 percent of the total responses was in the 21-30 category. Thus, instructors between the ages of 21 and 30 would be those having taught 10 years or less. The years of teaching experience of the participants in this study ranged from 1 to 35. Those having taught 1 to 5 years totaled 56, or 48.28 percent. The number of teachers in this 1 to 5 year group lacked two, or 1.72 percent, representing one-half of the instructors that teach family living as a two-semester course in Oklahoma secondary schools. Those having taught 10 years or less totaled 85, or 73.28 percent of the total. It is readily apparent and understandable that as years of service increased, the number of teachers generally decreased. In this study there was only one exception. The 21-25 category had one more teacher than the 16-20 category.

Years Degrees Received

The years that the Bachelor of Science degree was received by the participants in this study ranged from 1940 through 1978, with 58 or 50 percent receiving their degree between 1971-78. The responses recorded in Table III correlate with the responses from Tables I and II. Table I illustrated that 52.59 percent of the instructors in this study were between the ages of 21 and 30. Table II gave evidence that 73.28 percent of the total number had taught vocational home economics 10 years or less. Therefore, it is probable that the group of instructors

in this study would have received their Bachelor of Science degree 10 years previous to the collection of this data.

TABLE II
YEARS OF EXPERIENCE TEACHING VOCATIONAL
HOME ECONOMICS

	<u>Years of Experience</u>							Total
	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	
Number of Responses	56	29	11	7	8	3	2	116
Percent of Responses	48.28	25	9.48	6.03	6.90	2.59	1.72	100

TABLE III
YEARS DEGREES WERE RECEIVED BY PARTICIPANTS

	<u>Bachelor of Science Degree</u>		<u>Master of Science Degree</u>	
	N	%	N	%
1971-80	58	50.00	13	11.21
1961-70	24	20.69	9	7.76
1951-60	16	13.79	2	1.72
1940-50	9	7.76	0	0
No Response	<u>9</u>	<u>7.76</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>79.31</u>
Total	116	100.00	116	100.00

On the Master's level, the participants received their degree between 1958-79 with 13 or 11.21 percent receiving their Master of Science degree between 1973-79. However, according to the figures in Table III, the largest response to the year the Master of Science degree was received was in the "No Response" category, with a total of 92 or 79.31 percent of the total. This response indicated that 79.31 percent had not completed a Master's degree. It must also be noted that the wording of the question did not produce results indicating the number that was currently enrolled in the Master's program, only the number that had completed the program.

Degree Majors

The participants' majors in the Bachelor of Science and Master of Science degrees are illustrated in Table IV. It should be noted that only two different majors were completed by those pursuing the Bachelor of Science degree with 108 or 93.11 percent of the responses in one major, Home Economics Education. In the Master of Science degree program, six different majors had been pursued. Home Economics Education received 14 of the 24 responses from those with a Master of Science degree. The two responses placed in the category "Other" included an ME in Education and a Master of Teaching with a Business Education emphasis.

The remaining 92 responses were in the "No Response" category. A remark by this researcher concerning Table III also applies when discussing the previous 92 responses. These responses indicated that 79.31 percent had not completed a Master's degree. It must also be

noted that the wording of the question did not produce results indicating the number that was currently enrolled in the Master's program, only the number that had completed the program.

TABLE IV
DEGREE MAJORS REPORTED BY PARTICIPANTS

	<u>Bachelor of Science Degree</u>		<u>Master of Science Degree</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Home Economics Education	108	93.11	14	12.07
Family Relations and Child Development	0	0	2	1.73
Home Economics-- Guidance	0	0	1	.86
Guidance and Counseling	0	0	2	1.72
Education	0	0	2	1.73
Secondary Education	1	.86	0	0
Secondary Administration	0	0	1	.86
Other	0	0	2	1.72
No Response	<u>7</u>	<u>6.03</u>	<u>92</u>	<u>79.31</u>
Total	116	100.00	116	100.00

Recency of Course Work

The recency of credit and/or non-credit courses taken by participants in this study is illustrated in Table V. According to the policies of the Home Economics Division, Oklahoma State Department of Vocational

and Technical Education, vocational home economics teachers must renew their vocational teaching certificate every five years by completing six credit hours from an institution granting a vocational teaching certificate. This could be the explanation for more of the participants having completed credit than non-credit courses. With the exception of one participant, three-fourths of the respondents, 86 or 74.14 percent, had completed their most recent college course in any area during 1978-79. The number having completed a college course was 111 out of 116, or 95.69 percent in comparison to 62 out of 116 or 53.45 percent having completed a non-credit class, workshop, or seminar. The largest response by participants in the category of recency of a non-credit class, workshop, or seminar completed was that of "No Response" with a total of 54 or 46.55 percent.

Specialized Training in Family Living

According to the figures in Table VI, 90 participants or 77.59 percent of those in this study reported having no specialized training in the family living area beyond the required hours for a Bachelor of Science degree in Home Economics Education. The 24 participants or 20.69 percent responding positively had taken a variety of courses including those in the following areas: family relationships, marriage, sex education, and child development. Some of the participants listed such specialized training as having a special education certificate, had worked with adults with special needs, worked on curriculum development for sex education, helped revise Colorado curriculum in Family Relationships in 1956, and three reported Master's degrees in family living and/or family relations and child development. The two

participants were placed in the "Other" category because the specialized training reported was either in an area other than Home Economics or the training was received other than in an educational institution. The specialized training reported by one of the participants was a counseling certificate and the other reported actual experience in raising children.

TABLE V
 REGENCY OF COLLEGE COURSE, NON-CREDIT CLASS,
 WORKSHOP, OR SEMINAR COMPLETED
 IN ANY AREA

	<u>Recency of College Course Completed</u>		<u>Recency of Non-Credit Class, Workshop, or Seminar Completed</u>	
	N	%	N	%
1979	16	13.79	9	7.76
1978	70	60.35	39	33.62
1977	14	12.07	9	7.76
1976	7	6.03	2	1.72
1975	2	1.73	1	.86
1974	0	0	1	.87
1973	1	.86	0	0
1972	1	.86	1	.86
No Response	<u>5</u>	<u>4.31</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>46.55</u>
Total	116	100.00	116	100.00

TABLE VI
SPECIALIZED TRAINING IN FAMILY LIVING
BY PARTICIPANTS

	Specialized Training			Total
	Yes	No	Other	
Number of Responses	24	90	2	116
Percent of Responses	20.69	77.59	1.72	100

Family Living Classes Taught

According to the figures in Table VII, a large number of the participants in this study were in the same category. It was reported that 95, or 81.90 percent of the participants had one family living class in their daily teaching schedule. The number in this category was larger than all the other categories with a combined total of 21 or 18.10 percent.

Family Living Enrollment

Table VIII is designed to show the number of students, both male and female, enrolled in the family living programs in this study. It is noted that 82 schools, or 70.69 percent, had an enrollment of 20 students or less in the family living program. Table VIII shows evidence to support these figures. It indicates that 81.90 percent of the participants had one family living class in their daily teaching schedule. Therefore, it could be expected that the total family living

enrollment would be 20 or less students (see Table IX). In Table VIII, all remaining categories combined to total 34, or 29.31 percent, with four schools, 3.45 percent each containing between 81-100 students.

TABLE VII
NUMBER OF FAMILY LIVING CLASSES TAUGHT
BY PARTICIPANTS

Number of Classes	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
1	95	81.90
2	15	12.93
3	4	3.45
4	1	.86
5	<u>1</u>	<u>.86</u>
Total	116	100.00

Comparison of Male and Female Enrollment

Table IX is designed to compare the male and female enrollment in the family living programs in this study. Compiled data showed the number of males ranged from 0 to 42 in comparison to the female enrollment of 0 to 82. According to the figures in Table IX, an enrollment of 6-10 students was the response given most frequently in both the

male and female categories. There is supporting evidence of these findings in Tables VII and VIII. In Table VII, 81.90 percent of the participants reported teaching one family living class in their daily schedule. Table VIII showed that 70.69 percent had an enrollment of 20 or fewer students in their family living programs. These figures from Tables VII and VIII give supporting evidence of the enrollment of 6-10 students per family living program as being the size most prevalent in both the male and female categories.

TABLE VIII

TOTAL MALE AND FEMALE ENROLLMENT IN FAMILY LIVING PROGRAMS AS REPORTED BY PARTICIPANTS

Number of Students*	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
1-20	82	70.69
21-40	17	14.66
41-60	10	8.62
61-80	2	1.72
81-100	4	3.45
No Response	<u>1</u>	<u>.86</u>
Total	116	100.00

*The researcher chose intervals of 20 for Table VIII, because according to the policies of the Home Economics Division, Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, the maximum enrollment in vocational home economics classes is 100 students. Therefore, with five classes daily, the average sized class would be 20 students.

TABLE IX
 COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE ENROLLMENT
 IN FAMILY LIVING PROGRAMS AS REPORTED
 BY PARTICIPANTS

Total Number of Students in Program	Males		Females	
	N	%	N	%
1-5	33	28.45	23	19.83
6-10	37	31.90	25	21.55
11-15	15	12.93	22	18.96
16-20	8	6.90	11	9.49
21-25	3	2.59	3	2.58
26-30	5	4.31	3	2.59
31-35	2	1.72	6	5.17
Over 35	2	1.72	4	3.45
No Males or Females*	9	7.76	17	14.66
No Response	<u>2</u>	<u>1.72</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.72</u>
Total	116	100.00	116	100.00

*The "No Males or Females" category refers to the programs that had an enrollment entirely of one sex. The nine responses of no males in the family living program were the nine programs composed of female students only; the 17 responses of no females were the 17 programs composed entirely of males.

Utilization of Family Living Basic

Core Curriculum

Tables X through XVI indicate utilization of the Family Living basic core curriculum by the 116 participants in this study.

Teaching Time Family Living was Utilized

The percentage of teaching time that Family Living was utilized by participants is divided into categories illustrated by Table X. It is recommended by the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center (CIMC), Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, that curriculum guides be utilized by instructors approximately 60 percent of their teaching time and the remaining 40 percent be used localizing, personalizing, and supplementing the curriculum materials. A total of 76 instructors, 65.52 percent of those in this study, utilized Family Living over 50 percent of their teaching time. The number of instructors using it 50 percent or less was 38 or 32.76 percent of the total. Some of the comments, both positive and negative, made by the participants that used the core curriculum over 50 percent of their teaching time included, "Very valuable, especially since this is my first time to teach boys," "I think the guide is excellent!" "Good plan," "I find it along the basic line I had been following before the curriculum was developed," and "More than we could cover or did cover first time in use." Additional comments were: "Very helpful; a lot of paper work; needs to be backed up with textbooks," "Very good--a big help," and "Sometimes too elementary." Within these categories five respondents commented that they supplemented or substituted the core curriculum information with materials they had, magazines, textbooks, with example, Personal Adjustment, Marriage and Family Living given. The comment made by one of these five respondents was that they added more to the foods section.

TABLE X
 PERCENTAGE OF TEACHING TIME FAMILY LIVING
 BASIC CORE CURRICULUM WAS UTILIZED

Percentage of Teaching Time	Number of Responses	Percent of Responses
Less than 10	10	8.63
10-20	6	5.17
21-30	6	5.17
31-40	9	7.76
41-50	7	6.03
51-60	6	5.18
61-70	15	12.93
71-80	19	16.38
81-90	17	14.65
91-100	19	16.38
No Response	<u>2</u>	<u>1.72</u>
Total	116	100.00

The following comments were given by some of the 38 respondents in the categories of 50 percent or less utilization: "My course was developed before the core curriculum and some of it fits our local resources and interests more; therefore, it supplements the core," "I teach a Consumer Unit for four weeks that is not in the curriculum --films, tapes, booklets," "I use mostly my own ideas," and "Use for reference and fact sheet or for opinion sheets." "Most of my students had had Home Economics, some as much as three years and enrolled in Home Economics IV," "My school did not purchase for 1978-79."

"School will not provide/make students buy curriculums," "Too much like Home Economics I curriculum." "I have excellent textbooks I have worked up presentations using prior to core curriculum being utilized--I use it more in Home Economics II, [sic]" and "I do a lot of things similar to what's in the curriculum but I had other things worked up," were additional comments from these respondents.

Utilization of Units of Instruction

The evaluation of the seven sections of Family Living and the units of instruction in each section was included in Part B of the instrument. In each section the participants checked what percent of the unit had been taught or that they planned to teach. It is apparent from Table XI that overall each unit in Family Living had a high percentage of the unit taught by most of the participants in this study. In Table XII the units of instruction were ranked by percentage of participants reporting 80-100 plus 60-79 percent utilization. The unit Meal Planning and Table Service ranked the highest with 68.10 percent and Clothing Selection with 45.69 percent ranked the lowest of the 22 units. There were only three units, Special Occasions, Clothing Care, and Clothing Selection, that were used by less than 50 percent of those participants.

In order to determine their utilization by sections from the percentage of participants reporting 60-100 percent utilization, the mean (average) was computed. The percentage of participants that used between 60-100 percent of each unit, shown in Table XII, was totaled and then divided by the number of units in each section. The sections were ranked by determining the mean: (1) Section C -

TABLE XI
 PARTICIPANTS' UTILIZATION OF FAMILY LIVING
 BASIC CORE CURRICULUM UNITS
 OF INSTRUCTION

Units	Percentage of Unit Taught										No Response	
	80-100		60-79		40-59		20-39		0-19		N	%
	N*	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%		
<u>Section A - Vocational Planning</u>												
I-Career Planning	56	48.28	8	6.89	8	6.90	3	2.58	27	23.28	14	12.07
II-Securing a Job	56	48.28	12	10.34	12	10.35	5	4.31	16	13.79	15	12.93
III-Career Success	52	44.83	10	8.62	11	9.48	7	6.04	20	17.24	16	13.79
<u>Section B - Consumerism</u>												
I-Managing Financial Resources	53	45.69	15	12.93	12	10.34	5	4.31	14	12.07	17	14.66
II-Buying Practices	53	45.69	17	14.65	13	11.21	6	5.17	14	12.07	13	11.21
III-Using Banking Services	57	49.14	16	13.79	9	7.76	8	6.90	17	14.65	9	7.76
IV-Establishing Credit and Obtaining Loans	55	47.41	19	16.38	11	9.48	3	2.59	20	17.24	8	6.90
V-Financial Security	44	37.93	21	18.10	11	9.48	6	5.17	22	18.97	12	10.35
<u>Section C - Human Development</u>												
I-Personal Development	52	44.82	16	13.80	10	8.62	6	5.17	20	17.24	12	10.35
II-Personal Relationships	57	49.14	16	13.79	9	7.76	7	6.04	16	13.79	11	9.48

TABLE XI (Continued)

Units	Percentage of Unit Taught										No Response	
	80-100		60-79		40-59		20-39		0-19			
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
<u>Section D - Parenthood Education</u>												
I-Lifestyles	52	44.83	12	10.34	9	7.76	5	4.27	28	24.18	10	8.62
II-Pregnancy and Childbirth	55	47.42	11	9.48	10	8.62	6	5.17	23	19.83	11	9.48
III-Infant Care	57	49.14	10	8.62	10	8.62	4	3.45	24	20.69	11	9.48
IV-Parent-Child Re- lationships	60	51.72	10	8.62	8	6.90	3	2.58	23	19.83	12	10.35
<u>Section E - Clothing</u>												
I-Clothing Selection	38	32.76	15	12.93	17	14.66	5	4.31	26	22.41	15	12.93
II-Clothing Care	38	32.75	18	15.52	15	12.93	3	2.59	25	21.55	17	14.66
<u>Section F - Foods</u>												
I-Meal Planning and Table Service	66	56.90	13	11.20	9	7.76	8	6.90	11	9.48	9	7.76
II-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	60	51.72	11	9.48	13	11.21	8	6.90	12	10.34	12	10.35
III-Food Preparation	63	54.31	10	8.62	10	8.62	8	6.90	14	12.07	11	9.48
IV-Special Occasions	46	39.66	11	9.48	13	11.21	7	6.03	24	20.69	15	12.93
<u>Section G - Housing</u>												
I-Housing Selection	47	40.52	17	14.65	10	8.62	12	10.35	11	9.48	19	16.38
II-Selection/Maintenance of Home Furnishings	40	34.48	21	18.11	8	6.89	13	11.21	15	12.93	19	16.38

*N=Number; %=Percent

Human Development, (2) both Section B - Consumerism and Section F - Foods, (3) Section D - Parenthood Education, (4) Section A - Vocational Planning, (5) Section G - Housing, and (6) Section E - Clothing.

TABLE XII
RANKING OF UNITS OF INSTRUCTION BY PERCENTAGE OF
PARTICIPANTS REPORTING 60-100 PERCENT
UTILIZATION*

Units	Rank	Percent of Participants
Meal Planning and Table Service	1	68.10
Establishing Credit and Obtaining Loans	2	63.79
Using Banking Services	4.5	62.93
Personal Relationships	4.5	62.93
Food Preparation	4.5	62.93
Kitchen Utensils and Tools	6	61.20
Buying Practices	7.5	60.34
Parent-Child Relationships	7.5	60.34
Securing a Job	10.5	58.62
Managing Financial Resources	10.5	58.62
Personal Development	10.5	58.62
Infant Care	12	57.76
Pregnancy and Childbirth	13	56.90
Financial Security	14	56.03
Career Planning	16.5	55.17
Lifestyles	16.5	55.17
Housing Selection	16.5	55.17
Career Success	18	53.45
Selection/Maintenance of Home Furnishings	19	52.59
Special Occasions	20	49.14
Clothing Care	21	48.27
Clothing Selection	22	45.69

*See Table XI.

Reasons Taught

Part B of the instrument included four suggested reasons that units of instruction were taught. The participants checked the reason(s) that applied to their situations and were asked for any comments that they felt needed to be made about the units. Table XIII indicates the reason or combination of reasons that the participants checked for teaching each of the 22 units in the Family Living basic core curriculum. Each of the seven sections and the units within that section are on separate pages within the continuing table. A study of Table XIII reveals that the participants checked "Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students" as the number one reason for teaching each of the 22 units. "Used Because it is Available But Feel it Does Not Meet Students' Needs" was the participants' number two choice of reasons, "Used Due to Lack of Other Materials" was third with "Pressured by Administration to Use Unit" checked the least number of times. For reporting purposes, four additional categories were added to Table XIII because some participants checked more than one reason for teaching each unit, by choosing various combinations of reasons one through four. The combinations chosen by the participants are listed on the table. The combination of reasons one and three was used more than any of the other combinations. Reasons two and three and reasons two and four were not listed because these combinations were not chosen by any of the participants. The number of participants preferring not to check any one reason or combination of reasons were recorded in the category, "No Response."

TABLE XIII
REASONS UNITS WERE TAUGHT AS REPORTED
BY PARTICIPANTS

Reasons Unit Was Taught	<u>Section A-Vocational Planning</u>					
	<u>I-Career Planning</u>		<u>II-Securing a Job</u>		<u>III-Career Success</u>	
	N*	%*	N	%	N	%
1. Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students	57	49.14	58	50.00	56	48.28
2. Pressured by Administration to Use Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Used Due to Lack of Other Materials	2	1.72	2	1.73	2	1.72
4. Used Because it is Available But Feel it Does Not Meet Students' Needs	2	1.73	5	4.31	3	2.59
5. Combination of Reasons 1 and 2	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Combination of Reasons 1 and 3	1	.86	1	.86	2	1.72
7. Combination of Reasons 1 and 4	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Combination of Reasons 3 and 4	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. No Response	54	46.55	50	43.10	53	45.69

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Reasons Unit Was Taught	Section B-Consumerism									
	I-Managing Financial Resources		II-Buying Practices		III-Using Banking Services		IV-Establishing Credit & Ob- taining Loans		V-Financial Security	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students	53	45.69	57	49.14	65	56.03	60	51.72	53	45.69
2. Pressured by Administration to Use Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Used Due to Lack of Other Materials	0	0	2	1.72	0	0	1	.86	1	.86
4. Used Because it is Available But Feel it Does Not Meet Students' Needs	2	1.73	4	3.45	2	1.73	3	2.59	4	3.45
5. Combination of Reasons 1 and 2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Combination of Reasons 1 and 3	1	.86	1	.86	2	1.72	1	.86	1	.86
7. Combination of Reasons 1 and 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Combination of Reasons 3 and 4	1	.86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. No Response	59	50.86	52	44.83	47	40.52	51	43.97	57	49.14

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Reasons Unit Was Taught	Section C-Human Development			
	I-Personal Development		II-Personal Relationships	
	N	%	N	%
1. Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students	47	40.51	51	43.96
2. Pressured by Administration to Use Unit	1	.87	1	.86
3. Used Due to Lack of Other Materials	2	1.72	2	1.73
4. Used Because it is Available But Feel it Does Not Meet Students' Needs	4	3.45	5	4.31
5. Combination of Reasons 1 and 2	0	0	0	0
6. Combination of Reasons 1 and 3	1	.86	1	.86
7. Combination of Reasons 1 and 4	0	0	0	0
8. Combination of Reasons 3 and 4	0	0	0	0
9. No Response	61	52.59	56	48.28

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Reasons Unit Was Taught	Section D-Parenthood Education							
	I-Lifestyles		II-Pregnancy & Childbirth		III-Infant Care		IV-Parent-Child Relationships	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students	54	46.56	53	45.69	55	47.41	56	48.27
2. Pressured by Administration to Use Unit	0	0	0	0	1	.86	1	.86
3. Used Due to Lack of Other Materials	0	0	0	0	1	.87	1	.87
4. Used Because it is Available But Feel it Does Not Meet Students' Needs	1	.86	1	.87	1	.86	1	.86
5. Combination of Reasons 1 and 2	0	0	1	.86	0	0	0	0
6. Combination of Reasons 1 and 3	1	.86	1	.86	1	.86	1	.86
7. Combination of Reasons 1 and 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Combination of Reasons 3 and 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. No Response	60	51.72	60	51.72	57	49.14	56	48.28

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Reasons Unit Was Taught	Section E-Clothing			
	I-Clothing Selection		II-Clothing Care	
	N	%	N	%
1. Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students	41	35.34	36	31.03
2. Pressured by Administration to Use Unit	1	.87	1	.87
3. Used Due to Lack of Other Materials	2	1.72	2	1.72
4. Used Because it is Available But Feel it Does Not Meet Students' Needs	4	3.45	3	2.59
5. Combination of Reasons 1 and 2	0	0	0	0
6. Combination of Reasons 1 and 3	0	0	1	.86
7. Combination of Reasons 1 and 4	1	.86	1	.86
8. Combination of Reasons 3 and 4	0	0	0	0
9. No Response	67	57.76	72	62.07

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Reasons Unit Was Taught	Section F-Foods							
	I-Meal Plan- ning and Table Service		II-Kitchen Uten- sils and Tools		III-Food Prep- aration		IV-Special Occasions	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students	66	56.90	60	51.72	61	52.58	50	43.10
2. Pressured by Administration to Use Unit	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Used Due to Lack of Other Materials	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	.87
4. Used Because it is Available But Feel it Does Not Meet Students' Needs	2	1.72	3	2.59	2	1.73	1	.86
5. Combination of Reasons 1 and 2	0	0	0	0	1	.86	0	0
6. Combination of Reasons 1 and 3	0	0	1	.86	1	.86	1	.86
7. Combination of Reasons 1 and 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. Combination of Reasons 3 and 4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. No Response	48	41.38	52	44.83	51	43.97	63	54.31

TABLE XIII (Continued)

Reasons Unit Was Taught	<u>Section G-Housing</u>			
	<u>I-Housing Selection</u>		<u>II-Selection/Maintenance of Home Furnishings</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1. Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students	44	37.93	42	36.20
2. Pressured by Administration to Use Unit	2	1.73	2	1.73
3. Used Due to Lack of Other Materials	2	1.72	2	1.72
4. Used Because it is Available But Feel it Does Not Meet Students' Needs	4	3.45	4	3.45
5. Combination of Reasons 1 and 2	0	0	0	0
6. Combination of Reasons 1 and 3	0	0	0	0
7. Combination of Reasons 1 and 4	0	0	0	0
8. Combination of Reasons 3 and 4	0	0	0	0
9. No Response	64	55.17	66	56.90

*N=Number; %=Percent

Comments from several participants supporting their use of the Family Living basic core curriculum are recorded in the following sections:

Section A - Vocational Planning. The respondent taught 80-100 percent of all units in the section and checked "Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students." This comment was added, "I am using the entire unit to (1) evaluate it for myself, (2) delete what isn't suitable, and (3) delete what is taught in classes other than Home Economics."

Section B - Consumerism. The respondent taught 80-100 percent of all units in the section and checked "Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students." This comment was added, "I am using the entire unit to (1) evaluate it for myself, (2) delete what isn't suitable, and (3) delete what is taught in classes other than Home Economics."

Section C - Human Development. "I was very pleased with this section and the section on Parenthood Education. They were definitely needed in my community."

Section D - Parenthood Education. "I was very pleased with this section and the section on Parenthood Education. They were definitely needed in my community." "Well organized units."

Unit II - Pregnancy and Childbirth. "Advisory Committee also thought should be taught." This respondent checked as reasons that unit was taught "Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students" in addition to "Pressured by Administration to Use Unit."

Reasons Not Taught or Partly Taught

In addition to the reasons for teaching the units, Part B of the instrument also included 12 suggested reasons that the units of instruction were not taught or only partly taught. The participants were asked to check the reason(s) that applied to their particular situations and for any comments concerning the units. Table XIV indicates the reason or combination of reasons that the participants checked for not teaching or only partly teaching each of the 22 units in Family Living. Each of the seven sections and the units within that section are on separate pages within the continuing table. A study of Table XIV indicates that the participants checked "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials" as the number one reason for not teaching or only partly teaching each of the 22 units. The remaining reasons are ranked (2) "Other Units had a Higher Priority," (3) "Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics," (4) "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community," (5) "Too Elementary," (6) "Personal Background Weak in Subject," (7) "Facilities and Equipment Unavailable," (8) "Need More Detailed Teaching Guide," (9) both "Content Too Difficult for Student" and "No Available Resources," (10) "Not Needed in This Community," (11) the four combinations of reasons listed in Table XIV, and (12) "Unit Shows Sex Stereotyping." The researcher wanted to note that not one person checked "Unit Shows Sex Stereotyping" on any of the 22 units in the Family Living basic core curriculum. For reporting purposes, four additional categories were added to Table XIV because some participants checked more than two reasons for not teaching or only partly

TABLE XIV

REASONS UNITS WERE NOT TAUGHT OR ONLY PARTLY
TAUGHT AS REPORTED BY PARTICIPANTS

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	<u>Section A-Vocational Planning</u>					
	<u>I-Career Planning</u>		<u>II-Securing a Job</u>		<u>III-Career Success</u>	
	<u>N*</u>	<u>%*</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1. Other Units had a Higher Priority	15	33.33	11	32.35	12	32.43
2. Content Too Difficult for Student	0	0	0	0	0	0
3. Too Elementary	1	2.22	1	2.94	2	5.41
4. Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community	1	2.22	0	0	0	0
5. Not Needed in This Community	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Personal Background Weak in Subject	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Need More Detailed Teaching Guide	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. No Available Resources	1	2.22	1	2.94	1	2.70
9. Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials	8	17.78	5	14.71	6	16.22
10. Unit Shows Sex Stereotyping	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	2	4.44	0	0	1	2.70

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	Section A-Vocational Planning (Cont.)									
	I-Career Planning		II-Securing a Job		III-Career Success					
	N	%	N	%	N	%				
12. Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics	17	37.78	16	47.06	14	37.84				
13. Combination of Reasons 1, 2, and 6	0	0	0	0	0	0				
14. Combination of Reasons 1, 3, and 12	0	0	0	0	0	0				
15. Combination of Reasons 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11	0	0	0	0	1	2.70				
16. Combination of Reasons 2, 7, and 12	0	0	0	0	0	0				

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	Section B-Consumerism									
	I-Managing Financial Resources		II-Buying Practices		III-Using Banking Services		IV-Establishing Credit & Ob- taining Loans		V-Financial Security	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Other Units had a Higher Priority	8	27.59	9	23.69	8	20.51	8	21.05	14	31.82
2. Content Too Difficult for Student	1	3.45	1	2.63	0	0	1	2.63	1	2.27
3. Too Elementary	1	3.45	1	2.63	1	2.56	1	2.63	1	2.27

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	Section B-Consumerism (Cont.)									
	I-Managing Financial Resources		II-Buying Practices		III-Using Banking Services		IV-Establishing Credit & Ob- taining Loans		V-Financial Security	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
4. Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Not Needed in This Community	0	0	0	0	1	2.56	0	0	0	0
6. Personal Background Weak in Subject	1	3.45	3	7.89	2	5.13	3	7.89	5	11.36
7. Need More Detailed Teach- ing Guide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.27
8. No Available Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Preferred Using Person- ally Developed or Other Materials	10	34.48	14	36.84	11	28.21	14	36.84	11	25.00
10. Unit Shows Sex Stereoe- typing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	0	0	1	2.63	0	0	0	0	1	2.27
12. Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics	7	24.14	9	23.69	15	38.46	11	28.95	9	20.46

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	<u>Section B-Consumerism (Cont.)</u>										
	<u>I-Managing Financial Resources</u>		<u>II-Buying Practices</u>		<u>III-Using Banking Services</u>		<u>IV-Establishing Credit & Ob- taining Loans</u>		<u>V-Financial Security</u>		
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	
13. Combination of Reasons 1, 2, and 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2.27
14. Combination of Reasons 1, 3, and 12	0	0	0	0	1	2.56	0	0	0	0	0
15. Combination of Reasons 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Combination of Reasons 2, 7, and 12	1	3.45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	<u>Section C-Human Development</u>										
	<u>I-Personal Development</u>				<u>II-Personal Relationships</u>						
	N		%		N		%				
1. Other Units had a Higher Priority	7		20.00		7		22.58				
2. Content Too Difficult for Student	2		5.71		1		3.23				
3. Too Elementary	0		0		0		0				
4. Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community	10		28.57		7		22.58				

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	Section C-Human Development (Cont.)			
	I-Personal Development		II-Personal Relationships	
	N	%	N	%
5. Not Needed in This Community	0	0	0	0
6. Personal Background Weak in Subject	0	0	0	0
7. Need More Detailed Teaching Guide	1	2.86	1	3.23
8. No Available Resources	0	0	0	0
9. Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials	14	40.00	14	45.16
10. Unit Shows Sex Stereotyping	0	0	0	0
11. Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	0	0	0	0
12. Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics	1	2.86	1	3.23
13. Combination of Reasons 1, 2, and 6	0	0	0	0
14. Combination of Reasons 1, 3, and 12	0	0	0	0
15. Combination of Reasons 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11	0	0	0	0
16. Combination of Reasons 2, 7, and 12	0	0	0	0

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	Section D-Parenthood Education							
	I-Lifestyles		II-Pregnancy and Childbirth		III-Infant Care		IV-Parent-Child Relationships	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Other Units had a Higher Priority	9	27.27	5	13.89	9	29.03	8	30.77
2. Content Too Difficult for Student	0	0	1	2.78	0	0	0	0
3. Too Elementary	1	3.03	0	0	1	3.23	0	0
4. Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community	12	36.36	16	44.44	9	29.03	6	23.08
5. Not Needed in This Community	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6. Personal Background Weak in Subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Need More Detailed Teaching Guide	1	3.03	1	2.78	1	3.23	1	3.85
8. No Available Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials	10	30.30	12	33.33	10	32.26	10	38.46
10. Unit Shows Sex Stereotyping	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	<u>Section D- Parenthood Education (Cont.)</u>							
	<u>I-Lifestyles</u>		<u>II-Pregnancy and Childbirth</u>		<u>III-Infant Care</u>		<u>IV-Parent-Child Relationships</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
11. Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	0	0	1	2.78	1	3.23	1	3.85
12. Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13. Combination of Reasons 1, 2, and 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. Combination of Reasons 1, 3, and 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15. Combination of Reasons 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16. Combination of Reasons 2, 7, and 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	<u>Section E -Clothing</u>							
	<u>I-Clothing Selection</u>		<u>II-Clothing Care</u>					
	N	%	N	%				
1. Other Units had a Higher Priority	21	48.84	22	52.38				
2. Content Too Difficult for Student	0	0	0	0				

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	Section E-Clothing (Cont.)			
	I-Clothing Selection		II-Clothing Care	
	N	%	N	%
3. Too Elementary	2	4.65	1	2.38
4. Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community	0	0	0	0
5. Not Needed in This Community	0	0	0	0
6. Personal Background Weak in Subject	0	0	0	0
7. Need More Detailed Teaching Guide	1	2.33	2	4.76
8. No Available Resources	0	0	0	0
9. Preferred Using Personally De- veloped or Other Materials	16	37.21	13	30.95
10. Unit Shows Sex Stereotyping	0	0	0	0
11. Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	0	0	1	2.38
12. Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics	3	6.98	3	7.14
13. Combination of Reasons 1, 2, and 6	0	0	0	0

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	<u>Section E-Clothing (Cont.)</u>			
	<u>I-Clothing Selection</u>		<u>II-Clothing Care</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
14. Combination of Reasons 1, 3, and 12	0	0	0	0
15. Combination of Reasons 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11	0	0	0	0
16. Combination of Reasons 2, 7, and 12	0	0	0	0

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	<u>Section F-Foods</u>							
	<u>I-Meal Plan- ning and Table Service</u>		<u>II-Kitchen Uten- sils & Tools</u>		<u>III-Food Prep- aration</u>		<u>IV-Special Occasions</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
1. Other Units had a Higher Priority	6	28.57	9	31.03	8	30.77	17	50.00
2. Content Too Difficult for Student	0	0	1	3.45	0	0	0	0
3. Too Elementary	2	9.52	6	20.69	2	7.69	0	0
4. Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Not Needed in This Community	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5.88

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	Section F-Foods (Cont.)							
	I-Meal Plan- ning and Table Service		II-Kitchen Uten- sils & Tools		III-Food Prep- aration		IV-Special Occasions	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
6. Personal Background Weak in Subject	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7. Need More Detailed Teach- ing Guide	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8. No Available Resources	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9. Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Ma- terials	10	47.62	10	34.48	14	53.85	13	38.24
10. Unit Shows Sex Stereotyping	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11. Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
12. Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics	3	14.29	3	10.34	2	7.69	2	5.88
13. Combination of Reasons 1, 2, and 6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
14. Combination of Reasons 1, 3, and 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
15. Combination of Reasons 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	<u>Section F-Foods (Cont.)</u>							
	I-Meal Plan- ning and Table Service		II-Kitchen Uten- sils & Tools		III-Food Prep- aration		IV-Special Occasions	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
16. Combination of Reasons 2, 7, and 12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	<u>Section G-Housing</u>			
	I-Housing Selection		II-Selection/Maintenance of Home Furnishings	
	N	%	N	%
1. Other Units had a Higher Priority	13	34.21	13	32.50
2. Content Too Difficult for Student	0	0	0	0
3. Too Elementary	1	2.63	1	2.50
4. Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community	0	0	0	0
5. Not Needed in This Community	0	0	1	2.50
6. Personal Background Weak in Subject	2	5.26	2	5.00
7. Need More Detailed Teaching Guide	0	0	0	0

TABLE XIV (Continued)

Reasons Not Taught or Only Partly Taught	Section G-Housing (Cont.)			
	I-Housing Selection		II-Selection/Maintenance of Home Furnishings	
	N	%	N	%
8. No Available Resources	3	7.89	3	7.50
9. Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials	17	44.74	18	45.00
10. Unit Shows Sex Stereotyping	0	0	0	0
11. Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	1	2.63	1	2.50
12. Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics	1	2.63	1	2.50
13. Combination of Reasons 1, 2, and 6	0	0	0	0
14. Combination of Reasons 1, 3, and 12	0	0	0	0
15. Combination of Reasons 1, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 11	0	0	0	0
16. Combination of Reasons 2, 7, and 12	0	0	0	0

*N=Number; %=Percent

teaching each unit. The combination of reasons 1 through 12 that were chosen by the participants are listed in the table.

Comments from participants on reasons the units of instruction were not taught or only partly taught are recorded by sections in the following:

Section A-Vocational Planning. "Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics," was checked by two respondents with these comments, "Taught in another class, so I did not repeat. But would definitely teach this" and "All this year students had Work Orientation where this material was covered in depth."

Section B-Consumerism. Unit III-Using Banking Services. Respondent checked "Other Units had a Higher Priority," "Too Elementary," and "Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics," as three reasons that the unit was not taught or only partly taught and added, "Repeat of Home Economics II."

Unit IV-Establishing Credit and Obtaining Loans and Unit V-Financial Security. There were two respondents that checked, "Other Units had a Higher Priority" and commented on lack of time.

Unit V-Financial Security. "Other Units had a Higher Priority" was checked by one respondent with comment, "No Time." "Personal Background Weak in Subject" was checked by another respondent and "Time Factor" was again commented on. The second respondent had also checked "Used Due to Lack of Other Materials" under "Reasons Unit was Taught" (Table XIII). One respondent marked "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials" on all five units and added, "I do most all

of the things covered in many of the units but have other good materials. The curriculum guide is quite good; it is simply a matter of a teacher getting too caught up in four preparations every day to change and utilize all available materials. I doubt if I will ever be able to have copies for each student. I have a very small department, no room to store them, no money to purchase them and the students resent their size."

Section C-Human Development. Respondent checked "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community" on all units in section. The statement was added, "Family Living this year was mostly boys--administration felt it was best not to cover these units. I plan to teach Home Economics III and IV girls."

Unit I-Personal Development. There were four respondents that made comments concerning Unit I. Respondent number one checked "Other Units had a Higher Priority" and remarked, "Ran short of time." Another respondent checked "Content Too Difficult for Student" and added, "Too few girls/class not even enough." The third respondent marked "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community" and stated "My administration will not allow." Respondent number four marked "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials" on Unit I but commented on both Units I and II, "Used outside source to eliminate some misunderstandings--but generally okay."

Unit I-Personal Development and Unit II-Personal Relationships. Respondent marked "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community" on Units I and II and added, "The group of boys I had in this

class were not ready for some of this unit." Concerning both units, another marked "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials," and added, "We use the Married Life book by Riker."

Unit II-Personal Relationships. This respondent checked "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community" and commented, "Had resource people come teach."

Section D-Parenthood Education. Respondent checked "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community" on all units in section. The statement was added, "Family Living this year was mostly boys-- administration felt it was best not to cover these units. I plan to teach to Home Economics III and IV girls."

Unit I-Lifestyles. "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community" was checked by one respondent with comment, "The group of boys I had in this class were not ready for some of this unit."

Unit I-Lifestyles and Unit II-Pregnancy and Childbirth. There were two respondents that checked "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community" and added, "administration decision" and "Not in mixed classes."

Unit II-Pregnancy and Childbirth. There were two respondents that commented on this unit. One marked "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community" and stated, "Boys class only." The other respondent checked, "Content Too Difficult for Student" and added, "Boys Too Immature."

Unit I-Lifestyles, Unit II-Pregnancy and Childbirth, and Unit III-Infant Care. Another respondent checked "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community" and added, "Had resource people come teach."

Unit II-Pregnancy and Childbirth and Unit III-Infant Care. There were two respondents that also commented on these two units. Respondent number one checked "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community" with remark, "administration decided." The second respondent marked "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials" but stated on all units, "Used outside source to eliminate some misunderstandings but generally okay."

Unit IV-Parent-Child Relationships. "Other Units had a Higher Priority," was checked by a respondent with comment, "Students did not want to do unit."

Four Units of Section D. There were four respondents to this questionnaire that had remarks dealing with all four units in Section D. Respondent number one marked "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community," and added, "In mixed classes," and "I used these in the Home Economics III classes." Another respondent checked "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials," with remark, "Use Planned Parenthood, MOD, Health Department, and Family Planning." Respondents three and four checked "Other Units Had a Higher Priority" and commented on the time factor, with one of these respondents referring particularly to Unit I-Lifestyles. This respondent remarked on her male students' ages in relation to Unit II-Pregnancy and Childbirth

and remarked "put other units on higher priority" concerning Unit III-Infant Care and Unit IV-Parent-Child Relationships.

Section E-Clothing. "Other Units had a Higher Priority" was checked by one respondent on all the units in the section and this statement added, "The majority of Family Living females had already had some home economics." A second respondent added this remark concerning all the units, "Area taught in Home Economics mini courses for juniors and seniors." Another respondent marked "Other Units had a Higher Priority" on all units in the section and commented on the time factor.

Unit I-Clothing Selection. "Too Elementary" was checked by a respondent with comment, "Students tested out at 90% or above on units checked as too elementary." "Other Units Had a Higher Priority" was marked by three respondents and on both units these remarks were added, "Don't go into clothing much in Family Living, do in other classes," "with the small class we had garment construction," and "ran out of time." Another respondent checked "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials" on both units and added, "Did not have time with actual sewing construction."

Section F-Foods. "Other Units Had a Higher Priority" was checked by one respondent on all the units in the section and this statement was added, "The majority of Family Living females had already had some home economics." A second respondent added this remark concerning all the units, "Area taught in Home Economics mini courses for juniors and seniors."

Unit I-Meal Planning and Table Service and Unit II-Kitchen Utensils and Tools. Respondent checked "Too Elementary" and stated, "Students tested out at 90% or above on units checked as too elementary."

Unit II-Kitchen Utensils and Tools, Unit III-Food Preparation, and Unit IV-Special Occasions. "Other Units had a Higher Priority," was marked by one respondent concerning these three units and added, "These units are too much a repeat of Home Economics II."

Unit IV-Special Occasions. There were two respondents that checked "Other Units had a Higher Priority" with comment, "Not enough time," and "Parts used for boys--but parts are too formal for boys." The second respondent also marked "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials."

Four Units of Section F. There were two respondents that commented on all four units. Respondent number one checked "Other Units had a Higher Priority" and added, "Used the Home Economics I Curriculum." The other respondent marked "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials," stating "Many of the materials were similar information to handouts from the other core curriculums."

Section G-Housing. A respondent marked "Other Units had a Higher Priority" on all units in the section and commented on the time factor. "Other Units had a Higher Priority" was checked by one respondent on all the units in the section and this statement was added, "The majority of Family Living females had already had some home economics." A second respondent added this remark concerning all the units, "Area taught in Home Economics mini courses for juniors and seniors."

Unit II-Selection/Maintenance of Home Furnishings. "Facilities and Equipment Unavailable" was checked and respondent added, "So many school activities at end of school, it was hard to complete Housing Section. I will push harder, earlier, next year." There were two respondents that marked "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials" on both units and commented, "Many of the materials were similar information to handouts from the other core curriculums" and "Some students are in Home Economics and I want to avoid repetition."

Seven Sections of Family Living. There was one respondent that commented on all 22 units in the Family Living basic core curriculum. "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials," was checked on all units. The statement was added, "We have a good program we use--it is similar to core--but we like it. Don't get me wrong, I think the core is very good--excellent in fact--but much of it is like ours."

Utilization of Components

Part C of the instrument involved the evaluation of the utilization of the unit components by the participants in this study. The components of a unit in a basic core curriculum are the different parts that compose a unit. Depending on objectives, the unit components will include some or all of the following: unit objectives, specific objectives, suggested activities, information sheets, transparency masters, job sheets, assignment sheets, tests, and test answers.

The participants were to indicate the percent of time that they used each component. As shown in Table XV, all nine unit components were utilized by the participants a high percentage of the time. Considering the number of participants utilizing the components 60-100 percent of the time, they are ranked (1) information sheets, (2) test answers, (3) tests, (4) assignment sheets, (5) specific objectives, (6) both unit objectives and job sheets, (7) suggested activities, and (8) transparency masters. Suggested activities, according to Table XV, was the only component that indicated a larger number of participants in a category other than in either the 60-79 or 80-100 category.

The participants were asked to comment on the unit components if they did not find them useful. These comments are summarized by component.

Unit Objectives. Specific Objectives. On the unit objectives and the specific objectives were comments indicating teacher usage but not much student usage. The researcher felt that the unit objectives and the specific objectives were used indirectly in participants teaching more than directly with students (see Appendix D). Several remarks were made by participants that they should utilize objectives more.

Suggested Activities. When suggested activities were not used, according to comments, it was because either the resources were not available, time was not available to prepare activities, or they preferred their own materials.

TABLE XV
 PARTICIPANTS' UTILIZATION OF FAMILY LIVING
 BASIC CORE COMPONENTS

Components	Percentage of Time Used											
	80-100		60-79		40-59		20-39		0-19		No Response	
	N*	%*	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Unit Objectives	47	40.52	34	29.31	10	8.62	6	5.17	16	13.79	3	2.59
Specific Objectives	53	45.69	32	27.59	12	10.34	3	2.59	12	10.34	4	3.45
Suggested Activities	24	20.69	47	40.52	31	26.72	7	6.04	4	3.44	3	2.59
Information Sheets	78	67.24	22	18.97	5	4.31	3	2.58	4	3.45	4	3.45
Transparency Masters	34	29.31	36	31.03	13	11.21	5	4.31	22	18.97	6	5.17
Job Sheets	36	31.03	45	38.80	21	18.10	5	4.31	5	4.31	4	3.45
Assignment Sheets	42	36.21	45	38.79	18	15.52	2	1.72	4	3.45	5	4.31
Tests	65	56.03	25	21.56	8	6.89	3	2.59	11	9.48	4	3.45
Test Answers	74	63.79	18	15.52	8	6.90	1	.86	9	7.76	6	5.17

N=Number; %=Percent

Information Sheets. Several participants stated that it was hard to make the information sheets interesting to students.

Transparency Masters. When the transparency masters were not utilized, it was due to the lack of proper equipment or suitable facilities.

Job Sheets. The participants not using the job sheets remarked on their appropriateness. They mentioned some were too elementary and some too difficult. The time factor was also mentioned by several participants.

Assignment Sheets. When the assignment sheets were not used, it was because the instructors could not justify the time spent for the knowledge of skills gained. Several participants mentioned that proper resources were not available in relation to the assignment sheets.

Tests. Test Answers. The main comments on the components, tests, and test answers, was that instructors preferred making their own tests. They indicated that the tests from Family Living required too much memorization. A participant indicated that the test answers were helpful for the parts of the tests that were utilized.

For a compiled list of the comments, see Appendix D.

Availability of Student Materials

Table XVI notes the availability of individual copies of the Fam-ily Living curriculum guide for each student during classroom hours. Over half of the 116 participants, 77 or 66.38 percent, reported

individual curriculum guides for students' use. The remaining 39 or 33.62 percent did not have available individual copies for students.

TABLE XVI
 AVAILABILITY OF INDIVIDUAL FAMILY LIVING
 CURRICULUM GUIDES FOR STUDENTS

	<u>Curriculum Availability</u>		Total
	Yes	No	
Number of Responses	77	39	116
Percent of Responses	66.38	33.62	100

Inservice and Revision Needs of Family
Living Basic Core Curriculum

Inservice Training Needs

In Table XVII participants responded as to whether or not they needed inservice training in each of the seven sections of the Family Living basic core curriculum. The number of instructors not expressing a need for inservice training was larger in each section than those expressing a need. Consumerism, Section B, received the largest response for needing more inservice training with a total of 53 or 45.69 percent. In the six remaining sections, less than one-third of the total number of the participants responded positively toward

a need for inservice training in Vocational Planning, Section A; Human Development, Section C; and Parenthood Education, Section D; and one-fourth or fewer in Clothing, Section E; Foods, Section F; and Housing, Section G.

TABLE XVII
FAMILY LIVING BASIC CORE CURRICULUM
 INSERVICE TRAINING NEEDS

Sections	Participants Needing Inservice Training		Participants Not Needing Inservice Training	
	N	%	N	%
A. Vocational Planning	35	30.17	81	69.83
B. Consumerism	53	45.69	63	54.31
C. Human Development	31	26.72	85	73.28
D. Parenthood Education	35	30.17	81	69.83
E. Clothing	13	11.21	103	88.79
F. Foods	12	10.35	104	89.65
G. Housing	29	25.00	87	75.00

Several participants commented on the different sections of the curriculum guide in relation to inservice training needs. These comments have been grouped by sections:

Section A-Vocational Planning. "I need a career emphasis session--our school has career education as a class." "More on careers aiding students in choosing what they want to do."

Section B-Consumerism. "Very unprepared to teach consumerism." "Personal background is weak. Inservice training would help" (participant was also referring to Section G-Housing). "Need suggestions on how to liven up these units for a senior class" (participant was also referring to Section G-Housing).

Section C-Human Development. "I would like to know the ways other family living teachers handle these units as well as get any new ideas" (participant was also referring to Section D-Parenthood Education, Section E-Clothing, and Section F-Foods).

Section D-Parenthood Education. "More instruction on available help for teaching the class."

Section E-Clothing. "Difficult to find materials for males."

Section F-Foods. "More is needed in what types of food to prepare or study (have been using HE I and HE II for this)." "Food and Housing because of health, cost of living, and continued inflation."

All Sections of Family Living. These three comments concerned all sections. "Need extra supplemental materials for all (examples: crossword puzzles, word finds, bulletin board ideas, etc.)." "How to motivate student to use core in all areas." "It depends on the inservice training available."

Future Revision Needs

Table XVIII is designed to show how often Family Living should be revised according to the 116 instructors in this study. It is suggested by 90.52 percent of the participants that the basic core curriculum guide be revised every three to five years. Indicating revision every three years were six of 47 instructors that responded so because it was needed this often for the material to remain current and up-to-date. There was one instructor that felt this statement was especially true for the consumerism section and one felt this section should be updated every year. Additional comments by three instructors responding to revision every three years were, "Things change and new material would need to be added," "If I were to use it--needs to keep up with social changes," and "If needed." Those that responded most frequently to having the Family Living basic core curriculum revised every five years included 58 instructors, or 50 percent. Comments by five of these instructors included, "It is one of the best guides, but good to take a look at every five years," "To update," "Maybe one guide could be revised each year on a rotation basis!", "At least," and "I really don't know how often it should be--ideally every three years." Revision of this curriculum guide every eight years was responded to by four instructors or 3.45 percent. One respondent commented, "Basic information given; wouldn't need to be revised as often." Revision every 10 years was indicated by two instructors or 1.72 percent of the total 116. There were no comments from either respondent. According to the figures in Table XVIII, five or 4.31 percent did not respond to the question; however, three did

comment. These comments included, "Whenever need arises," "Doesn't matter," and "No opinion." The remaining two neither responded to the question nor commented on it.

TABLE XVIII
FUTURE REVISION NEEDS OF THE FAMILY LIVING
BASIC CORE CURRICULUM

	Years				No Response	Total
	3	5	8	10		
Number of Responses	47	58	4	2	5	116
Percent of Responses	40.52	50.00	3.45	1.72	4.31	100

Future Curriculum Guide Committees

The participants' willingness to serve on future curriculum guide committees, according to Table XIX, was encouraging. From the 64 participants answering "Yes," 17 made comments. There were five that commented on their willingness to serve on a curriculum guide committee through such remarks as, "I helped with the original Home Economics I core and enjoyed that," "I've never served on a committee, but I would like to so I can see how these curriculum guides are developed," "I think it would be interesting and challenging," "I would very

much enjoy," and "Would love to." There were two participants that commented on the value of the update, five comments involved the time factor; four of these included, "If the time could be worked out right," "After 1981," "Yes, except I hope to retire in five years," and "The only problem is I am 'retiring' at the end of this year to devote full time to my husband and four sons"; and five made random comments including, "But I'm no expert!" "I find this class is very worthwhile to work with," and "If I used the core curriculum I'd be glad to evaluate it but my school won't be buying them since we have money in texts for this class." According to the instrument, eight of the 18 participants responded "No" to the question for one of four reasons: children, not enough teaching experience, health problems, and lack of time. Commenting were nine participants of the 34 that responded "Undecided" on whether or not to serve on a curriculum guide committee gave basically the same comments as participants responding negatively. Of the nine, four indicated time as a factor; two indicated children; two indicated lack of qualification and teaching experience; and one simply commented, "possibly."

Summary

Based on the data in this study, 65.52 percent of the participants in this study utilized Family Living over 50 percent of their teaching time. Each of the 22 units had a high percentage of the unit taught by most of the participants. The unit, Meal Planning and Table Service ranked the highest and Clothing Selection ranked the lowest of the units in Family Living by percentage of participants reporting 60-100

percent utilization. The three units, Special Occasions, Clothing Care, and Clothing Selection were used by less than 50 percent of those participants. When determining the utilization by sections, from the percentage of participants reporting 60-100 percent utilization, Section C-Human Development ranked first and Section E-Clothing, last. The number one reason that the participants checked for teaching each of the 22 units was, "Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students." The number one reason for not teaching or only partly teaching the units was "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials," with not one person checking "Unit Shows Sex Stereotyping" on any of the units.

TABLE XIX

PARTICIPANTS' WILLINGNESS TO SERVE ON
A CURRICULUM GUIDE COMMITTEE

	Yes	No	Undecided	Total
Number of Responses	64	18	34	116
Percent of Responses	55.17	15.52	29.31	100

According to the research completed, all nine unit components were utilized by the participants a high percentage of the time. The information sheets ranked first and transparency masters last, by participants utilizing the components 60-100 percent of the time. Chapter V will present the summary, findings and conclusions, and recommendations related to this study.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The major purpose of this study was to evaluate the utilization of the Family Living basic core curriculum among the Oklahoma vocational home economics instructors teaching family living as a two-semester course in secondary schools. The objectives included assessing the utilization of Family Living as a teaching resource, assessing the utilization of the seven sections and units of instruction within each section, and the utilization of the unit components. The inservice and revision needs of Family Living was included in the objectives for more effective utilization of the core curriculum.

The literature was reviewed to examine the availability and acceptance of commercial textbooks being used in the family living area and the need for more, varied, and up-to-date materials. Educational curriculum guides were defined and characteristics of the curriculum user were discussed. The process of development and the teacher's role in the development of curriculum materials were researched. The home economics publications of the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center (CIMC), Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, that have previously been evaluated to show teacher usage and acceptance were reviewed. To continuously upgrade

instructional materials is one of the functions of evaluation and the responsibility of educators. These and other areas concerning evaluation were reviewed.

A descriptive type of research was used for this study. Instruments were mailed to 181 vocational home economics instructors in Oklahoma. There was a 78 percent return from the instructors; 64.1 percent of which were usable responses.

The instrument included three parts: Part A dealt with personal information about participants, Part B was the evaluation of the seven sections of Family Living and the units of instruction within each section, and Part C included the evaluation of the unit components. Additional information about participants and comments by participants are reported in Appendixes C and D.

Findings and Conclusions

Utilization of Family Living Basic

Core Curriculum

It can be concluded that most of the units in Family Living had a high percentage of the unit taught by participants in this study. The unit Meal Planning and Table Service ranked the highest with 68.10 percent, according to the percentage of participants reporting 60-100 percent utilization. The unit Clothing Selection, with 45.69 percent, ranked the lowest of the 22 units. In determining utilization by sections from the percentage of participants reporting 60-100 percent utilization, Section C-Human Development, ranked first with Section E-Clothing, ranking the lowest of the seven sections.

A majority of the instructors in this study utilized Family Living over 50 percent of their teaching time. The number of instructors that taught it over 50 percent totaled 65.52 percent, with 32.76 percent using it 50 percent or less.

Participants chose units on the basis of how well they met the needs of their students. "Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students" was the number one reason for teaching the 22 units in Family Living. The other reasons on the questionnaire, listed according to their frequency of responses, included "Used Because it is Available but Feel it Does Not Meet Students' Needs," "Used Due to Lack of Other Materials," and "Pressured by Administration to Use Unit."

The participants checked "Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials" the most frequent number of times as the reason for not teaching or only partly teaching the units. Prior to the publication of Family Living, the program was taught without state developed material. Therefore, the teachers had to develop their own resources. It was concluded that when units were not taught it was because they preferred their own previously developed teaching materials. Other reasons listed according to their frequency of responses included "Other Units Had a Higher Priority," "Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics," "Decided it was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community," "Too Elementary," "Personal Background Weak in Subject," and "Facilities and Equipment Unavailable." The remaining five reasons received 10 or fewer responses from the participants. "Unit Shows Sex Stereotyping" was the only category that did not receive even one response concerning reason(s) that any of the units were not taught or only partly taught.

Based on the number of participants utilizing the nine unit components in Family Living 60-100 percent of the time, it can be concluded that participants found them useful a high percentage of the time. According to replies from participants, the information sheets ranked the highest followed by test answers, tests, assignment sheets, specific objectives, both unit objectives and job sheets, suggested activities, and transparency masters.

Inservice and Revision Needs of Family
Living Basic Core Curriculum

In each section of Family Living, the number of instructors indicating no need for inservice training was more frequent than those indicating a need. Consumerism, Section B, with 45.69 percent, received the largest response for needing more inservice training. In the six remaining sections, less than one-third responded positively toward inservice training in Vocational Planning, Section A; Human Development, Section C; and Parenthood Education, Section D, and one-fourth or fewer in Clothing, Section E; Foods, Section F; and Housing, Section G.

The Family Living basic core curriculum should be revised every three to five years according to 90.52 percent of the participants in this study. According to the 116 participants, 55.17 percent are willing to serve on future curriculum guide committees.

Recommendations

Upon completing the review of literature, conducting the research, and analyzing the data, the following recommendations are made:

1. The Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center (CIMC) should continue to develop curriculum materials to include improved suggested activities to aid the teacher.

2. Instructors from across the state should continue to participate in the curriculum development process. The review of literature indicates that the more an instructor is involved in the development of a curriculum guide, the better they utilize it. With teacher input, the materials should continue to meet the needs of Oklahoma students of various backgrounds.

3. The CIMC should continue to develop transparencies to support the written materials. Research reports findings to support this statement.

4. The CIMC should continue to develop materials free of sex stereotyping. According to the review of literature this was possible and according to the data from this study, it became a reality.

5. During the revision process, the three units, Special Occasions, Clothing Care, and Clothing Selection, should receive special consideration since less than 50 percent of the participants reporting 60-100 percent utilization benefited from these units.

6. Section E-Clothing was the section the least used from the percentage of participants reporting 60-100 percent utilization; therefore, major revision is recommended.

7. There are still some administrators who need to be encouraged to allow the study of Human Development and Parenthood Education in all family living classes.

8. Instructors need to be encouraged to discuss with administrators the need for basic audio-visual equipment so that the transparency masters can be used properly to supplement curriculum materials.

9. Instructors need to receive more training through curriculum workshops in the benefits of having students know unit objectives and specific objectives in each unit.

10. The materials in the job sheets need to be carefully reviewed. Some instructors are not using the job sheets because they do not feel they are of benefit to the student.

11. Data indicates that there are some administrators that need to be encouraged to allow funds for purchasing Family Living curriculum guides for individual student use during classroom hours.

12. Quality inservice training through curriculum workshops should be provided to instructors in the area of Consumerism.

13. The Family Living basic core curriculum should be considered for revision at least every five years.

14. The curriculum guide committee members chosen need to be rotated since so many instructors are willing to serve. The review of literature supports the statement concerning acceptance of curriculum material with increased teacher involvement.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Best, J. W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Braden, R. A., and Walker, A. D. Understanding evaluation: coping with a communication problem. Audiovisual Instruction, 1978, 23(8), 19-20.
- Bruce, H. H., Jr. Providing curriculum materials for a total program of vocational education. American Vocational Journal, 1971, XLVI, 49-50.
- Burnett, J. Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education Research and Evaluation Unit, 1980. (Personal Communication.)
- Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center Staff. Curriculum Materials In-State Price List. Stillwater, Okla.: Curriculum Instructional Materials Center, 1978.
- Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center Staff. Teaching Units of Instruction. Stillwater, Okla.: Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center, 1977.
- Drummond, M. J. Teacher use and perceived usefulness of components of the Oklahoma Home Economics I, Basic Core. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1976.
- Eshelby, D. The complete curriculum user. Voc Ed, 1978, 53(8), 64-68.
- Griffith, D. Oklahoma Curriculum Development. Stillwater, Okla.: Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center, 1979.
- Hollenback, R. A. An evaluation of Home Economics II Basic Core Curriculum by vocational consumer and homemaking teachers in Oklahoma. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1975.
- Jones, P. A. Oklahoma home economics teachers' perceptions of sex-role stereotyping in the Home Economics I Basic Core Curriculum guide. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1978.
- Kerckhoff, R. K. Evaluating family life education. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 1960, 6(3), 187-191.

- Kerckhoff, R. K., and the Family Coordinator Family Life Education Panel. Commercial teaching materials used in high school family life courses. The Family Coordinator, 1973, 22, 275-283.
- Lessinger, L. M. Accountability for results: a basic challenge for America's schools. In L. M. Lessinger and R. W. Tyler (Eds.), Accountability in Education. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing, 1971.
- Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. Operations and Procedures Manual. Stillwater, Okla.: Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education, 1977.
- Popham, W. J. Evaluating Instruction. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1973.
- Rogers, V. E. The influence of selected variables on teachers' use of the Oklahoma Home Economics II, Basic Core. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1978.
- Rowntree, D. Educational Technology in Curriculum Development. London: Harper and Row, Ltd., 1974.
- Sawatzky, J. Family Living. Stillwater, Okla.: Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center, 1978.
- Sawatzky, S. J. A. A comparison of acceptance and usefulness of Home Economics I, Basic Core by workshop participants and non-workshop participants. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1975.
- Truitt, D. Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center, September, 1980. (Personal communication.)
- Tuttle, F., and Johnson, N. Foreword. In J. Sawatzky and the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education (Eds.), Family Living. Stillwater, Okla.: Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center, 1978.
- Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary. Springfield, Mass.: G. and C. Merriam, 1976.
- Webster's New World Dictionary of the American Language. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1974.
- Wright, C. R. Evaluation research. In D. L. Sills (Ed.), International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences. New York: The Macmillan Company and the Free Press, 1968.
- Zais, R. S. Curriculum: Principles and Foundations. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, Inc., 1976.
- Zenger, W. F., and Zenger, S. K. Writing and Evaluating Curriculum Guides. Belmont, Calif.: Lear Siegler, Inc./Fearon, 1973.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

PERMISSION TO USE INSTRUMENT

Cynthia L. Ward
4117 Apollo Drive
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73129

Dear Cynthia,

Your study on the teacher acceptance of the Family Living Basic Core Curriculum sounds interesting and informative. Since it is so new, a study like this should prove beneficial in planning in-service programs to make the curriculum more useable.

Please consider this letter my permission to adapt the basic format used in my questionnaire on the use and acceptance of the Home Economics I: Basic Core to your study.

I will be interested in learning the results of your survey and I am sure it will be helpful for further revision recommendations.

Sincerely,



Mary Jo Drummond
201 South Arrington
Stillwater, Oklahoma

APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT AND CORRESPONDENCE



OKLAHOMA STATE DEPARTMENT OF VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION

FRANCIS TUTTLE, DIRECTOR • 1515 WEST SIXTH AVE., • STILLWATER, OKLAHOMA 74074 • A.C. (405) 377-2000

March 23, 1979

Dear Vocational Home Economics Teacher:

I am writing a thesis entitled, "Utilization of the Family Living Basic Core Curriculum Among High School Vocational Home Economics Family Living Instructors." Since this is the first year that the guide has been available, I know each one of you will be interested in its usage by teachers throughout the state. Therefore, I need each of your responses to this instrument. It will take approximately 45 minutes of your time to complete.

Part A of the instrument is the Curriculum Data Information Form. These are questions dealing with personal information about your particular teaching experience and your experience using the Family Living basic core curriculum.

Part B is the evaluation of the sections and units of instruction. You will find the seven sections of the Family Living basic core curriculum and the units of instruction included in each section. In each of the sections check what percent of the unit you have taught or plan to teach. To the right of the unit check the reasons that apply to your particular situation. Please make any comments that you feel need to be made about the unit.

Part C is the evaluation of the utilization of the unit components. You are to circle a number from 1 to 5 indicating the percent of time the component is used. If you are not using the component, please comment on why you do not find the component useful.

The results of this study will be available to the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education for revision purposes.

I know this is a very busy time of the year and I would like to thank you for taking your time to complete this instrument.

Sincerely yours,

Cynthia L. Ward

Cynthia L. Ward
Family Living Teacher, Del City High School
Graduate Student, Oklahoma State University

Margaret S. Callsen
Margaret S. Callsen, Ph.D
Associate Professor
Home Economics Education

Joyce

Joyce Sawatzky
Asst. Coordinator
CIMC

CURRICULUM DATA INFORMATION FORM

Part A

Personal Information:

1. Is your Family Living class taught as a two-semester course?
(Circle one)

YES

NO

(If answer is no, there is no need to complete questionnaire.
However, please return the instrument.)

2. Total number of years you have taught vocational home economics

3. Number of years at present school _____
4. Approximate number of students enrolled in grades 9-12 in the
high school building where you are presently teaching _____
5. Number of Family Living classes you teach _____
6. Total number of students enrolled in Family Living _____
Number of male _____ Number of female _____
7. Vocational supervisory district in which your school is located:
(Circle one)
- | | | | | | |
|----|----|---|---|----|----|
| NW | SW | E | C | SE | NE |
|----|----|---|---|----|----|
8. Age: (Circle one) 21-30 31-40 41-50 51 and over
9. What year did you obtain your B.S. degree? _____
Major _____
10. How many semester or quarter hours have you completed beyond a
B.S. degree? _____ semester hours and/or _____ quarter
hours.
11. If you have an M.S. degree, what year was it completed? _____
Major _____
12. How many semester or quarter hours have you completed beyond an
M.S. degree? _____ semester hours and/or _____
quarter hours.
13. Do you have any specialized training in the family living area
beyond the required hours for a B.S. degree in Home Economics

Education? If so, please name the course/courses and the total number of semester or quarter hours that have been completed.

14. When did you complete your last college course in any area?

15. When did you complete your last non-credit class, workshop, or seminar in any area? _____

16. Please circle the approximate percentage of time you follow the Family Living basic core curriculum in your present teaching:

Less than				
10%	10-20%	21-30%	31-40%	41-50%
51-60%	61-70%	71-80%	81-90%	91-100%

Comments: _____

17. Does each student in your class have access to their own curriculum guide while in the classroom? _____

18. Check those sections for which you feel a need for inservice training programs.

Comments:

- ____ Section A-Vocational Planning _____
- ____ Section B-Consumerism _____
- ____ Section C-Human Development _____
- ____ Section D-Parenthood Education _____
- ____ Section E-Clothing _____
- ____ Section F-Foods _____
- ____ Section G-Housing _____

19. How often would you like for the Family Living basic core curriculum guide to be revised? (Circle one)

Every: 3 years 5 years 8 years 10 years

Comments: _____

20. Would you be willing to serve on a committee appointed to revise a basic core curriculum guide? (Circle one)

YES NO UNDECIDED

Comments: _____

Part B: Evaluation of the utilization of the Family Living basic core curriculum's sections and units of instruction.

Directions: Listed below are the seven sections in the Family Living basic core curriculum and the units of instruction included in each section. First, check the percent of the unit that you have taught or plan to teach. Secondly, check ALL the reasons that apply to your situation. Please comment on reasons you may have that are not listed or that you feel further explain the reasons that you checked.

<u>Section and Unit Number</u>	<u>What Percent of the Unit Have You Taught or Do you Plan to Teach?</u>				
	<u>80-</u> <u>100%</u>	<u>60-</u> <u>79%</u>	<u>40-</u> <u>59%</u>	<u>20-</u> <u>39%</u>	<u>0-</u> <u>19%</u>
<u>Section A-Vocational Planning</u>					
<u>I-Career Planning</u>					
<u>II-Securing a Job</u>					
<u>III-Career Success</u>					
<u>Section B-Consumerism</u>					
<u>I-Managing Financial Resources</u>					
<u>II-Buying Practices</u>					
<u>III-Using Banking Services</u>					
<u>IV-Establishing Credit and Obtaining Loans</u>					
<u>V-Financial Security</u>					
<u>Section C-Human Development</u>					
<u>I-Personal Development</u>					
<u>II-Personal Relationships</u>					
<u>Section D-Parenthood Education</u>					
<u>I-Lifestyles</u>					
<u>II-Pregnancy and Childbirth</u>					
<u>III-Infant Care</u>					
<u>IV-Parent-Child Relationships</u>					
<u>Section E-Clothing</u>					
<u>I-Clothing Selection</u>					
<u>II-Clothing Care</u>					
<u>Section F-Foods</u>					
<u>I-Meal Planning and Table Service</u>					
<u>II-Kitchen Utensils and Tools</u>					
<u>III-Food Preparation</u>					
<u>IV-Special Occasions</u>					
<u>Section G-Housing</u>					
<u>I-Housing Selection</u>					
<u>II-Selection/Maintenance of Home Furnishings</u>					

Part B (Continued)

Section and Unit Number	Reasons Unit Was Taught				Reasons Unit Was Not Taught or Only Partly Taught											
	Unit Effective in Meeting Needs of Students	Pressured by Administration to Use Unit	Used Due to Lack of Other Materials	Used Because it is Available But Feel it Does not Meet Students' Needs	Other Units Had a Higher Priority	Content Too Difficult for Students	Too Elementary	Decided it Was Best Not to Teach Unit in This Community	Not Needed in This Community	Personal Background Weak in Subject	Needed More Detailed Teaching Guide	No Available Resources	Preferred Using Personally Developed or Other Materials	Unit Shows Sex Stereotyping	Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	Unit is Already Taught in an Area Other Than Home Economics
Section E-Clothing I-Clothing Selection																
II-Clothing Care																
Section F-Foods I-Meal Planning and Table Service																
II-Kitchen Utensils and Tools																
III-Food Preparation																
IV-Special Occasions																
Section G-Housing I-Housing Selection																
II-Selection/Maintenance of Home Furnishings																

Part B (Continued)

<u>Section and Unit Number</u>	<u>Comments</u>
<u>Section A-Vocational Planning</u>	
I-Career Planning	
II-Securing a Job	
III-Career Success	
<u>Section B-Consumerism</u>	
I-Managing Financial Resources	
II-Buying Practices	
III-Using Banking Services	
IV-Establishing Credit and Obtaining Loans	
V-Financial Security	
<u>Section C-Human Development</u>	
I-Personal Development	
II-Personal Relationships	
<u>Section D-Parenthood Education</u>	
I-Lifestyles	
II-Pregnancy and Childbirth	
III-Infant Care	
IV-Parent-Child Relationships	
<u>Section E-Clothing</u>	
I-Clothing Selection	
II-Clothing Care	
<u>Section F-Foods</u>	
I-Meal Planning and Table Service	
II-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	
III-Food Preparation	
IV-Special Occasions	
<u>Section G-Housing</u>	
I-Housing Selection	
II-Selection/Maintenance of Home Furnishings	

Part C: Evaluation of the Utilization of the Family Living, basic core components.

1. Circle a number from 1 to 5 indicating your utilization of the following unit components. If you do not find the components useful, please comment why.

<u>Number</u>	<u>Percentage of Time You Used Component</u>
5	80-100%
4	60-79%
3	40-59%
2	20-39%
1	0-19%

	5	4	3	2	1	Reasons 3, 2, or 1 Were Checked
a) Unit Objectives	5	4	3	2	1	
b) Specific Objectives	5	4	3	2	1	
c) Suggested Activities	5	4	3	2	1	
d) Information Sheets	5	4	3	2	1	
e) Transparency Masters	5	4	3	2	1	
f) Job Sheets	5	4	3	2	1	
g) Assignment Sheets	5	4	3	2	1	
h) Tests	5	4	3	2	1	
i) Test Answers	5	4	3	2	1	

Dear Teacher,

Just a note to remind you to please complete the instrument I sent concerning the teacher utilization of the Family Living basic core curriculum. In order to complete my study with accurate and state wide results, I need everyone's response.

If you have already returned your questionnaire, please disregard.

Thank you,



Cynthia L. Ward
Family Living Teacher, Del City High School
Graduate Student, Oklahoma State University

APPENDIX C

ADDITIONAL DATA ABOUT PARTICIPANTS

TABLE XX
 NUMBER OF YEARS AT PRESENT SCHOOL
 AS REPORTED BY PARTICIPANTS

	1-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	21-25	26-30	31-35	Total
Number of Responses	69	24	10	9	1	1	2	116
Percent of Responses	59.48	20.69	8.62	7.76	.86	.87	1.72	100

TABLE XXI
 SEMESTER HOURS COMPLETED BEYOND DEGREES
 AS REPORTED BY PARTICIPANTS

	Bachelor of Science Degree		Master of Science Degree	
	N	%	N	%
0 Hours	22	18.97	95	81.90
1-15 Hours	42	36.20	10	8.62
16-30 Hours	23	19.83	9	7.76
31 and Over	<u>29</u>	<u>25.00</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1.72</u>
Total	116	100.00	116	100.00

APPENDIX D

COMMENTS ABOUT UNIT COMPONENTS BY PARTICIPANTS

Unit Objectives

"I am usually trying to cover as much material as I possibly can and since the objectives are covered again in the information sheets, I seldom go over them ahead of time."

"Only briefly presented to students as 'What You Will Learn.'"

"This is more for my benefit and not the students'."

"Had a hard time working with objectives. I feel they could be more useful with a little more planning on my part."

"Added own objectives."

"I do not read the objectives to my students each time. I use the core, but not always in sequence."

"Not as useful to students."

"Takes too much time."

"I usually forget about looking at them."

"Did not use the material that much."

"Do not make every student make 85%."

Specific Objectives

"Jr. and Sr. can be informed in a brief manner as to what they will be learning."

"I glance over them, but I usually have no time to make them up in a bulletin board or something like that."

"Don't use as part of unit but I refer to them."

"Should use more often."

"They are so nearly stated on the information sheets."

"Not gone over as much due to lack of time and feel of repetition with use of information sheets."

"Too much on repeating of objectives. Too fine a line between them."

Specific Objectives (Continued)

"It is hard for me to get students excited about the objectives."

"Did not use the material that much."

Suggested Activities

"Helpful in Lesson Plans."

"I used quite a few of the activities--they are good."

"Good ideas--but materials are not always available."

"Depending on unit, some units--used all, other units--used few."

"Used student suggestions."

"Used other activities."

"Have own plans and activities."

"I sometimes add my own, more relevant to this community."

"Own ideas."

"Found others."

"Use according to availability of resources."

"Some were not available."

"I do not have the material suggested to use."

"Do not always have resource people in that area or equipment available."

"Some resources not available."

"Often don't have resources or time to get them together."

"Small community and some things aren't available for us to use."

"When not used, it is because films or materials were not available."

"Time resources not always available."

"Not enough time to prepare or resources weren't available in my area."

Suggested Activities (Continued)

"Did not have enough time or my own activities were more usable."

"Time element or not suitable."

(Another participant mentioned time as a factor.)

"Not usually usable or creative (innovative) suggestions and ideas."

"Not all are feasible in this area."

"Need to fit my situation."

Information Sheets

"I use them, but as objectives are so closely stated, so are the outline sheets. Many points overlap and some are so detailed, they leave out common sense."

"Students would not use them. I gave notes--at least they had to write them down."

"Difficult to make interesting."

"Used these as supplemental."

"In some units, have other material developed for additional information."

Transparency Masters

"The ones included are good--but could use more."

"Used as information sheets more than transparencies."

"Substituted other visuals."

"Room needs to be darkened and too much trouble for only 1-2 transparencies."

"My room can't be darkened."

"Lack of school facilities."

"No way to reproduce transparencies."

Transparency Masters (Continued)

"Transparency machine at our school--terrible."

"Little access to overhead or transparency materials. Would love to use them."

"Usually do not have needed equipment."

"Do not have equipment to duplicate."

"Access to proper running projector difficult."

"Because of equipment shortage."

"No overhead available."

"Audio-visual equipment limited."

"Equipment not easily available."

"Do not have a machine to make them."

"What overhead materials used were my own developments."

"Do not have--use films and filmstrips I have or ordered."

"Supplies not always available at school."

"Not available."

"Do not have."

"I have not as yet made any."

"Didn't have them--lack of time."

"Because students had sheets--lack of time."

"Some aren't useful to me."

Job Sheets

"Used mainly as home experiences--recipes."

"All resources not available."

"Usually too difficult to find necessary supplies."

"Sometimes there isn't adequate facilities to do them."

Job Sheets (Continued)

"Lack of time, some not appropriate."

"Not always appropriate for community and not enough time for all activities."

"Did not have enough time or my own activities were more usable."

"Same as assignment sheets--some are busy work for time involved--others are excellent."

"Make my own to fit our school."

"Some were not practical for location."

"Some are not suitable or I do not feel necessary."

"Many were too simple and kind of worthless."

"Sometimes too elementary."

"Boring."

Assignment Sheets

"Because of so many activities in our school, I do not always use all of the assignment sheets. Sometimes I use the blue sheets as the assignments."

"Some are good--some are just busy work."

"All resources not available."

"Some of the assignment sheets were not possible because resources were not available."

"Did not have enough time or my own activities were more usable."

"Too elementary a lot of the time."

"Elementary busy work."

"Some are too elementary."

"Felt some were too difficult and some too simple or didn't have enough time."

"Very often so vague I can't justify having students stumbling through the work."

Assignment Sheets (Continued)

"Too much busy work on some--others are good. Some involve too much time for what they gain from the activities."

"Many are too insignificant--or over minute details. Repetitious."

"In some units, have other material developed for additional information."

Tests

"I use tests as study guides and type my own test usually."

"I add personal information so I use the test as a guide."

"Because of the time element or delete some information I use only part of the test and answer sheets" [sic].

"Too parroting."

"Not personalized enough."

"Simple memorization--I make my own."

"Too long and wordy--too much to remember."

"Added or changed when added objectives or deleted."

"Use many of my own materials. Have to revise to fit objectives taught. A lot is memory work and not as much application of principles."

"Use own tests."

"I do not always test over each unit and then I construct my own tests."

"Would prefer to make my test."

"I like to make and give my own tests."

"Prefer making my own."

"Tests could be better--too easy."

"Too elementary."

Test Answers

"Are time consuming to grade. Sometimes certain tests are easier to grade if a test paper is marked in another color and used for reference when grading."

"Very helpful for part used."

"Used on basis of questions asked."

"Prefer making my own."

VITA

Cynthia Louise Ward

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: UTILIZATION OF THE FAMILY LIVING BASIC CORE CURRICULUM AMONG
HIGH SCHOOL VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS FAMILY LIVING INSTRU-
CTORS

Major Field: Home Economics Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Weatherford, Oklahoma, August 13, 1952, the
daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Clyde L. Ward.

Education: Graduated from Washington High School, Washington, Ok-
lahoma, in May, 1970. Received a Bachelor of Science degree
in Home Economics Education from Oklahoma State University,
December, 1973; completed requirements for the Master of Sci-
ence degree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1980.

Professional Experience: Home Economics teacher, Muskogee, Okla-
homa, January, 1974-May, 1974; Home Economics teacher, Moun-
tain View, Oklahoma, 1974-1976; Home Economics teacher, Del
City, Oklahoma, 1976-October 1979; District Supervisor, Home
Economics Division, Oklahoma State Department of Vocational
and Technical Education, Stillwater, Oklahoma, October, 1979
to present.

Organizational Memberships: American Vocational Association; Okla-
homa Vocational Association; American Home Economics Associa-
tion; Omicron Nu.