

PREFERRED TEACHING METHODS WITH MALE STUDENTS
PRESENT IN SECONDARY HOME ECONOMICS

By

PHYLLIS ANNE STRATTON

Bachelor of Science in Home Economics
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1976

Bachelor of Science in Home Economics
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
1978

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, 1979

Thesis
1979
S911p
cop. 2



PREFERRED TEACHING METHODS WITH MALE STUDENTS
PRESENT IN SECONDARY HOME ECONOMICS

Thesis Approved:

Ledge J. Coffey

Thesis Adviser

Elaine Jorgensen

Althea Wright

Norman A. Deuker

Dean of the Graduate College

1043069

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have contributed to the completion of this work. Some contributed wisdom and guidance; others financial support, love, and understanding; and for some it was just saying the right encouraging words at times when they were needed the most.

First, I want to extend my sincere appreciation to the members of my committee, Dr. Bettye Gaffney, Dr. Elaine Jorgenson, and Dr. Althea Wright, for their guidance, wisdom, and support. Special appreciation is extended to the chairman of my committee, Dr. Bettye Gaffney, whose encouragement and seemingly endless supply of interest, time, and patience, during the busiest times for herself, led to this researcher getting herself in gear and completing this work. Appreciation is extended to Dr. William Warde for assisting in the development of the questionnaire used in this study and in the statistical programming and analysis of the gathered data. A special thank you is extended to Mr. Laverne Steiner, vice president of the "Go Ye Mission", in Tahlequah, Oklahoma, for the excellent printing of the questionnaire and other materials used in this study.

Sincere and heart-felt appreciation is extended to members of my family:

To my parents for instilling in me, as they have in all their children, the desire for and the importance of continuing my education as far as I thought I should and could; to my parents for having faith in me and my capabilities as a person and as a student; and to my

parents for raising me with love and understanding in a happy and secure home atmosphere.

To daddy who has always encouraged me to attempt anything I thought I could do, whether the end results were all that great or not--at least I could say that I had tried. And to daddy for his unselfish financial support--not only for my college education, but for my straight smile, unknocked knees, and all the treasured memories from the annual family camping vacations he always seemed to manage to finance. Finally, to daddy for discussing subjects with me in a manner most men only use with their sons or other men.

To mamma for being my best friend--instead of hanging on to the relationship we established as mother and young daughter, our relationship was allowed to develop and to grow as we both grew a little older and a little wiser. And, to mamma for being a patient listener when I would go on and on about some idea I had. Finally, to mamma for her patience and understanding during all the years her children were in college and money was at times in short supply.

To my brothers, George and David, who at different times during the past year have been understanding roommates. Childhood relationships between each of my brothers and myself were strengthened and re-established on a lasting adult level because of this living experience. A special thank you is extended to George who helped me through the drafting of this work, his knowledge and explanation of statistics, and the use of his typewriter are invaluable to me.

To my sister, Sarah, what can I say about an 11 year old who means the world and everything to me. Sarah provides those special moments that mean so much to me now and ones that will be cherished for a

lifetime. Her presence in my family has kept not only myself, but every member of my family, young at heart.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose and Objectives	4
Hypothesis and Research Question	5
Assumptions and Limitations	5
Definitions	6
Procedures	7
Summary	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
Introduction	10
Historical Review	10
Degree of Male Participation	10
Content of Courses Offered	12
Rationale for Male Participation in Home Economics	16
Factors Influencing Male Participation	19
Legislative Actions	19
Changes in Society	23
Teaching Co-educational Home Economics	26
Characteristics of Male Students	26
Teaching Methods	27
Related Research	29
Summary	31
III. RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES	32
Introduction	32
Type of Research	32
Population and Sample Plan	33
Instrumentation	34
Demographic Information of Sample Teachers Information Regarding the Status of Male Participation	35
Preferred Teaching Methods	37
Teacher Input	38
Pretesting the Instrument	40
Collection of Data	40
Statistical Analysis	41
Summary	42

Chapter	Page
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	43
Introduction	43
Description of Sample	43
Analysis of Hypothesis and Research Question	55
Teacher Input Questions	67
Summary	74
V. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	75
Introduction	75
Purpose and Objectives	76
Hypothesis and Research Question	76
Limitations	77
Population and Sampling	77
Instrument Design	78
Data Collection	78
Statistical Analysis	79
Results and Conclusions	79
Recommendations	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY	81
APPENDIXES	86
APPENDIX A - INSTRUMENT USED IN STUDY	87
APPENDIX B - CORRESPONDENCE	94
APPENDIX C - RESPONSES TO QUESTION 27	97
APPENDIX D - RESPONSES TO QUESTION 28	105
APPENDIX E - TEACHER COMMENTS	113

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Sample Representation by District	44
II. Total Length of Teaching Experience	46
III. Teaching Experience in Co-educational Classes	47
IV. Respondents' Approximate Ages	48
V. Reasons Why Males Enrolled in Home Economics Programs	49
VI. Respondents' School and Community Involvement	50
VII. Years Taught in Present Teaching Position	51
VIII. Comparison of Male and Female Performances	54
IX. Age Levels of Males in Secondary Home Economics Classes	55
X. Favored Subjects in Co-educational Classes	56
XI. Chi Square Value Reflecting Relationships Between Teachers Needing Assistance with Male Students and Males Enrolling for an Easy "A"	59
XII. Chi Square Values Reflecting Relationships Between Teachers Needing Assistance with Male Students and Males Enrolling Due to Personal Interest	59
XIII. Chi Square Value Reflecting Relationships Between the Number of Available Conferences Dealing with Male Students in Home Economics and the Age of the Respondents	61
XIV. Chi Square Value Reflecting Relationships Between the Number of Available Conferences Dealing with Male Students in Home Economics and Males Enrolling Due to Teacher Recruitment	62
XV. Chi Square Value Reflecting Relationships Between the Number of Available Conferences Dealing with Male Students in Home Economics and Males Enrolling Due to Other Reasons	63

Table	Page
XVI. Chi Square Value Reflecting Relationships Between the Number of Available Conferences Dealing with Male Students in Home Economics and Teachers Attending Professional Organizations	64
XVII. Chi Square Value Reflecting Relationships Between the Number of Available Conferences Dealing with Male Students in Home Economics and Teachers Attending Pep Rallies	65
XVIII. Chi Square Value Reflecting Relationships Between the Number of Available Conferences Dealing with Male Students in Home Economics and Teachers Attending Band or Chorus Concerts	66
XIX. Preferred Teaching Methods Used in a Laboratory Situation	68
XX. Preferred Teaching Methods Used in a Theory Situation	69
XXI. Most Immediate Help Teachers Would Like Provided to Deal with Male Students	70
XXII. Informational Sources Teachers Use to Solve Teaching Problems Encountered with Males	71
XXIII. Locations Where Teachers Would Like to Receive Teaching Information Concerning Males	72
XXIV. Information that Would be Useful for Teacher Preparation	73

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Male participants are not a new phenomenon in home economics. What is new is the present rate of male participation in secondary home economics. The visibility of young men in home economics has noticeably increased in the last decade (Dowell and Greenwood, 1975).

The inclusion of males in secondary home economics programs can be recorded as early as 1907. The number of male participants in home economics has grown from a scattered few in 1907, to "6,000" in 1936 (Straub, 1938, p. 557), to an estimated "63,075" in 1959 (Coon, 1962, p. 35), and finally to "700,000 male students" in 1974 (Swope, 1974, p. 7). Estimates for the 1975-76 enrollment figures indicates that over "1,000,000 boys" are participating in home economics programs (Lawson, 1977, p. 216).

Many reasons could be given for this increase, but two stand out as directly influencing the growing number of young men enrolling in secondary home economics. One reason is the Education Amendments of 1972, and the other is the social climate of the United States.

The Education Amendments of 1972, especially Title IX--Prohibition of Sex Discrimination, have in many ways affected the educational system in the United States. Title IX states in part that:

No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or

activity receiving Federal financial assistance (United States Statutes at Large, 1973, p. 373).

Regulations to implement Title IX became effective on July 21, 1975.

These provisions "delineate how institutions may provide equal education . . . for both sexes" (Sinowitz, 1975, p. 110). Compliance to these provisions have been instrumental in freeing the American educational system from practicing sex discrimination in its schools. With varying degrees, all areas of education have been affected by the amendments, especially vocational home economics. Co-educational classes will become "the rule in . . . home economics and other subjects that have been traditionally divided by the sexes" (Mathews, 1974, p. 20). Vocational home economics teachers can no longer segregate the students in their programs. All course offerings have to be open for enrollment to both sexes. Extensive processes of evaluation and revision are underway in vocational home economics programs to comply with the regulations of Title IX. The changes that are occurring in secondary vocational home economics programs due to Title IX regulations are making it more accessible, legally, to potential male participants.

While regulations implementing Title IX are forcing many doors in education to be opened, the social climate in the United States has created a demand that the doors for educational equity be opened and that they remain that way. Lawson (1977) states that the "present social climate is probably more conducive than it has ever been to the approval of male participation in home economics" (p. 222). The "removal of sex barriers in terms of acceptable behavior and/or jobs, and an emphasis on the multiple roles for the sexes has been a great contributing factor" (Dowell and Greenwood, 1975, p. 4).

Alternate life styles and changing roles of men and women in the American society make it more important than ever that boys and men gain competency in many areas of daily living once thought to be strictly the female role and, therefore, off limits to them (Swope, 1974). According to Baker (1971), not only is "homemaking increasingly approached as a joint husband-wife enterprise, but the demands of parenthood are now leading to the view that 'mothering' is also a joint mother-father task" (p. 47). As male involvement in homemaking and parenting increases, so too, will the demand for formal training in these areas. Home economics can help men and women develop abilities that they can use in nontraditional and changing roles, enabling them to see themselves functioning successfully and comfortably in new ways (Harriman, 1977). Swope (1974) believes that "now is the time to educate men for the responsibilities they will face in living successful lives, as individuals and as family members" (p. 7).

As vocational home economics programs become more accessible legally and more desirable socially to males, they are undergoing changes to accommodate their broadening audience. Total home economics programs are being evaluated and revised in order to offer courses that are less female oriented and more human oriented.

After secondary vocational home economics programs are revised in order to become more human oriented and relevant to today's young men and women, how then are the concepts of these courses being transmitted from lesson plans to their intended audiences? Have the evaluation and revision of content and curricula also included the teaching methods used to convey the concepts of the content? What teaching methods are proving to be successful in co-educational classes? Are there teacher

characteristics that are conducive to teaching successful co-educational home economics classes? Answers to these questions could produce useful suggestions for home economics teacher training in regards to teaching male students, as well as female students, the concepts of home economics. Dowell and Greenwood (1975) report that there is "very little scientific research existing to document the differences teachers should expect when working with boys as compared to girls" (p. 9). A study is needed to determine what influences males have had on teaching method selection and use in secondary vocational home economics programs and to see if there are implications for teacher training.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study is to determine preferred teaching methods used when males are present in secondary vocational home economics classes and to consider the implications of the findings for teacher training. The following objectives are developed as guides for this study:

1. Assess the effect of selected variables on teaching success of co-educational secondary home economics classes.
2. Identify preferred teaching methods used in specific learning situations when home economics courses are co-educational.
3. Make recommendations based on the findings of this study for inservice training and for preparatory service training in vocational home economics teacher education and for further research in this area.

Hypothesis and Research Question

In order to accomplish the objectives of the study, one null hypothesis and one research question are used:

Hypothesis--There will be no significant relationship between teaching successful co-educational secondary home economics classes and (1) length of teaching experience, (2) total teacher involvement in school and community activities, (3) age, and (4) method of procuring male students.

Research Question--Will there be preferred teaching methods used in specific learning situations when home economics courses are co-educational?

Assumptions and Limitations

The following are the assumptions to this study:

1. It is assumed that the selected sample will be willing to participate.
2. It is assumed that the respondents are truthful in completing the instrument.
3. It is assumed that the time periods set up for responses will allow for a high rate of return.

The following are the limitations of this study:

1. The study is limited to vocational home economics teachers in the state of Oklahoma.
2. The study is limited to voluntary responses to an instrument from a sample group.
3. The study is limited to home economics programs that have had male participation in them since the 1975-76 term.

4. The study is limited to the accuracy of the Home Economics Annual State Reports in compiling the population group.
5. The study is limited to the various interpretations of the Title IX regulations and the degree of compliance to them in vocational home economics programs throughout the State.

Definitions

Alternate life style: a way of life or style of living that reflects the attitudes and values of an individual who breaks with tradition in search of fulfillment and satisfaction in interpersonal relationships.

Competency: the state or quality of being capable or competent; skilled or have the ability to perform a given task.

Consumer and homemaker education:

consists of instructional programs, services, and activities at all educational levels for the occupation of homemaking including, but not limited to, consumer education, food and nutrition, family living and parenthood education, child development and guidance, housing and home furnishing, home management, and clothing and textiles (Vocational home economics education: the legislative aspects, 1976, p. 34).

Family living: an upper level secondary vocational home economics course designed to help students prepare for the multiple roles of family life (Oklahoma Vocational Home Economics Curriculum Guide for Family Living, 1978, p. vii).

Homemaker: "anyone who contributes to the running of a household and the bond of love in family relations" (Moriarty, 1979, p. 223).

Occupational home economics education:

consists of instructional programs, services, and activities for preparation for employment in occupations utilizing the knowledge and skills of home economics from the areas

identified in consumer and homemaking education (Vocational home economics education: the legislative aspects, 1976, p. 34).

Parent education: "purposeful training in preparation for the responsibilities of parenthood" (Coward and Kerckhoff, 1978, p. 24).

Status of male participation in vocational home economics: describes the current male population in Oklahoma's vocational home economics programs--the enrollment size, the types of courses offered to male students, subjects or topics male students like and consider relevant, the performance of male students as compared to the performance of female students, and the age level of males enrolled.

Teaching method: "a technique for promoting pupil learning . . . techniques are selected according to the purposes, goals, interests, and abilities of the group and according to the ability of the teacher to use them" (Williamson and Lyle, 1961, p. 202).

Teaching success: rated on the basis of those teachers who did not indicate that they needed help with teaching boys in their classes and those who attended available educational offerings concerning males in home economics.

Vocational home economics education:

prepares for the occupations of homemaking and for employment in occupations utilizing home economics concepts and skills, it consists of two types of programs--Consumer and Homemaking Education and Occupational Home Economics Education (Vocational home economics education: the legislative aspects, 1976, p. 34).

Procedures

The following procedure was used to determine the preferred teaching methods used in co-educational home economics classes. The independent

variables included selected teacher characteristics variables and specific learning situations in co-educational home economics courses.

The population for this study included the certified teachers who are presently teaching in vocational home economics programs which have had males enrolled at least since the 1975-76 term in the State of Oklahoma. A stratified proportional random sample was drawn from the population group to represent the population in this study. A list of the population was compiled from Annual Reports obtained from the Home Economics Division of the State Department of Vocational Education for Oklahoma in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

An instrument to determine the preferred teaching methods used in co-educational home economics classes was constructed by the researcher. The researcher developed the instrument to assess the effect of selected teacher characteristics on teaching success of co-educational classes. Two open response questions were formulated to give the researcher insight into the possible positive and negative aspects of teaching co-educational classes.

The instrument, a letter of transmittal, and a return stamped envelope were mailed to the stratified proportional random sample of teachers. A follow-up notice was made with unresponsive sample members at the end of the allotted return time.

The data were interpreted following the statistical analysis. Recommendations and conclusions were made according to the results of the analyses.

Summary

The present Chapter organized the research problem, stated the

research purpose and objectives, hypothesis, research question, assumptions and limitations, and definitions; and briefly reported the research procedure. Chapter II gives a review of the literature which serves as a foundation for the study. Complete procedures for the study are given in detail in Chapter III.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This review of literature provided a background for this study. The review included a historical review of male participation in home economics, factors influencing male participation in home economics, teaching co-educational home economics, and related research.

Historical Review

Degree of Male Participation

Many people, both within and outside the profession of home economics, felt that the inclusion of males in secondary home economics was a pioneering move of the 1970's. However, the first reported exchange class between shop and home economics occurred in 1907 (Lawson, 1977).

Reports of boys in homemaking classes were scattered from 1900 to 1930. One of the first boys' classes was at the Oregon Agriculture College in 1908 (Van Liew, 1936). Accounts of special courses for young men in the 1910's were located on college campuses. Cooking or "camp cookery" was a popular class and was taught to young men at colleges in Colorado, Idaho, Minnesota, and Washington (Langworthy, 1913). Exchange classes between home economics and predominantly male courses--shop, manual training, and agriculture--were popular in the 1920's. The first

required home economics class for boys was established at Central High School in Tulsa, Oklahoma (Kauffman, 1930). Enrollment in the class had reached "251 students" by 1925 (Lawson, 1977, p. 215). By the late 1920's, home economics classes for boys were no longer a novel idea and almost every state had teachers who were teaching boys as well as girls. According to the United States Bureau of Education, instruction for boys in home economics was being offered in "42 states with more than 7,000 boys enrolled" (Kissen, 1930, p. 29).

It was not until "the 1930's that an unprecedented growth and interest in boys home economics at the high school level took place" (Lawson, 1977, p. 215). Male involvement in home economics had become so common in the 1930's that, in 1936, The American Home Economics Association formed the "Committee on Home Economics for Boys". The committee was "to determine what objectives could be accomplished, what content was to be given to boys and girls together, and what must be done with separate groups" (Straub, 1936, p. 539). The committee was to determine the total number of home economics classes for boys and the total enrollment of these classes. Questionnaires were sent to state home economics supervisors. Their responses reported "200 home economics classes . . . with a total enrollment of 6,000" (Straub, 1938, p. 557).

The growth of male participation in home economics continued in the 1940's and 1950's. In 1956, Anthony reported that enrollment figures showed that over a 10-year period the number of boys enrolled in high school homemaking classes had more than doubled. By 1954, "26,490 boys" were in day classes of homemaking (p. 327). Coon (1962) conducted a comprehensive national study of home economics in the public schools. Her findings showed that more than "one percent of all the boys or an

estimated 63,075 were enrolled in home economics in the secondary schools" (p. 35).

The 1960's and 1970's were periods of growth for male participation in secondary home economics. In 1970, "13 percent" of the total enrollment in vocational home economics was males (Hunt, 1972, p. 31). By 1972, "39,024 boys comprised 14 percent of the total enrollment of 280,263 in vocational home economics programs at the high school level" (Division of Vocational and Technical Education, 1973, p. 14). Male enrollment in home economics continued to grow and in 1974 "700,000 males were enrolled in junior and senior high home economics programs" (Swope, 1974, p. 7). Estimates indicated that in 1975-76 "15 percent of the total number of students aged 13-18 years enrolled in home economics programs in the United States were boys" (Lawson, 1977, p. 216). Although small, both percentage-wise and in absolute terms (1,264,000), the degree of participation of males in home economics was at an all time high and showing a positive trend for the future (Lawson, 1977). The 1979 enrollment figures for the State of Oklahoma reflect that positive trend, "4,481 boys" were enrolled in vocational home economics programs throughout the State (Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education Information Services Center, 1979, computer print-out).

Content of Courses Offered

Throughout the history of male participation in secondary home economics, the courses offered have had various names and contents. The ideal course, in 1913, included subject matter that was of equal interest to both men and women. Content included ventilation, heating and

lighting, clothing selection, personal hygiene, and the relative value and use of foods (Langworthy, 1913). An all male foods class was offered at New Albany, Indiana, in 1919. Topics included in the course were food adulteration, sanitary handling of foods (particularly milk), sanitation of public places, responsibility of the consumer, and mental hygiene (Langworthy, 1927).

Exchange classes between home economics and shop or agriculture were typical in the 1920's. The boys in exchange classes learned basic principles in home economics--serving and eating meals properly, food selection, manners, and economic management. Girls were taught how to drive a nail, replace a washer, and repair an electric iron (Livingstone, 1925). Home economics was incorporated into existing classes in the late 1920's. Senior boys received home economics instruction through United States history classes and through physical education classes.

The first required home economics program for boys was started at Central High School in Tulsa, Oklahoma, in 1925. The course was called "Home Crafts for Boys" and its aims were to

teach the high school boy those fundamental principles of homemaking which would make him a more worthy member of the home and of society, and to develop an appreciation of his own responsibility to his home and to his family (Kissen, 1930, p. 64).

Kissen further reported that the course in Tulsa was divided into 10 units: nutrition, duties of the host, textiles and clothing, interior decoration, household management, the family, its function and value, health, child care, and community interests--physical, social, and educational.

Boys in the early 1930's were requesting courses with units in clothing budgets, care of clothing, selection of materials and textile

testing, nutrition, planning and serving meals, duties of a host, first aid, preparing food for the sick, duties of a member of a family, and use of labor-saving devices in the home (Kauffman, 1930). Exchange classes were common in the early 1930's. Warwick High School in New York had such a class between home economics and industrial arts. The course was titled "Home Citizenship", "the name homemaking, it was feared would not appeal to sturdy red-blooded boys" (Radder and Baker, 1933, p. 182). Boys' instruction included first aid, personal cleanliness, manners, home duties, selection of foods, and preparation of simple meals. Girls were taught the names and uses of common tools, finishing and refinishing, and the care and use of electrical apparatus (Radder and Baker, 1933).

Other than exchange classes, boys were taught home economics in special classes just for males and in classes with girls. The home economics classes with boys and girls sometimes included units in foods, clothing, home furnishings, home management, child care, and family relationships (Van Liew, 1936). An experiment in teaching mixed classes of boys and girls was conducted at Central High School in Tulsa, Oklahoma, in 1936. Six classes were combined for the "purpose of studying those phases of homemaking which are of mutual interest to boys and girls" (Firth, 1937, p. 151). The students studied family life, home financing, house planning, building, furnishing, and management. These subjects were selected for the course after the needs and interests of "240 participating students were considered" (Firth, 1937, p. 151).

Course titles and contents were as varied and numerous as the teachers who taught them in the 1930's. In an effort to organize and to formulate a consistent curriculum for boys' homemaking classes, "The

Committee on Home Economics for Boys" suggested six units. These included: "(1) Clothing, (2) Foods, (3) Home and Family Life, (4) Child Care, (5) Home and Household Management, and (6) Home and the Community" (Straub, 1936, p. 540).

World War II affected the growth of male participation in home economics in the 1940's. Classes were created to fill-in the personnel gaps created by the war. The majority of secondary schools offered basic homemaking education courses planned to meet the needs of boys as well as girls. Some courses were organized for boys only, others served as a basic introductory course for boys and girls. These courses included units in "family economics, personal appearance, family and social relationships, selection and care of clothing, and essentials of food preparation" (Homemaking Education in Secondary Schools of the United States, 1947, p. 2).

Co-educational classes gained popularity in the 1950's. Units in combined classes included "personal relationships and family relationships, family financial planning, child guidance, and clothing selection" (Anthony, 1956, p. 327). Boy-girl home economics classes were designed to "aid young people, both of whom are employed, to eat well and wisely, and to gain stability in marriage through shared tasks which they can enjoy" (Ellis, 1958, p. 19).

Many schools were offering classes for boys and girls in family life during the 1960's. Although there was great variety in content of the courses, all placed emphasis upon the family. Various titles were given to these courses, "Modern Living, Social and Family Problems, Personal and Family Living, Family and Community Living, Marriage Course, Better

Home and Family Living, and Social and Economic Problems of the Home" (Williamson and Lyle, 1961, p. 212).

The passage of the Sex Discrimination Act, in 1972, made it necessary for all home economics courses that were federally funded to be co-educational. "Segregated home economics courses for boys and girls were no longer appropriate" (Dowell and Greenwood, 1975, p. 16). Co-educational home economics classes were becoming commonly known as "Family Living" in the 1970's. The Oklahoma Vocational Home Economics Curriculum Guide for Family Living (1978) stated that, "Family Living classes were designed for 11th and 12th grade students, with no more than one year of previous vocational home economics" (p. vii). Units included in the Guide were: Vocational Planning, Human Development, Parenthood Education, Clothing, Foods, and Housing.

Rationale for Male Participation in Home Economics

Support for young men in home economics classes was evident as early as 1913. Speaking to the third annual meeting of the American Association for Study and Prevention of Infant Mortality, C. F. Langworthy (1913) stated that "it should be apparent to all that a large proportion of the subject matter which would be included in the ideal course (home economics) is of equal interest to both men and women" (p. 239). Greer (1919) believed that training in certain phases of home economics was important for young men. Considering the housing shortages after World War I, she felt that an understanding of the maintenance of proper sanitary conditions of the home was important.

The potential of home economics education for enriching the quality of family life was the one consistent rationale for male participation in home economics. Many reports were based on the belief that a "subject dealing so vitally with life, the home, and home problems should at least be available to both sexes" (Lawson, 1977, p. 216). Kissen (1930) believed that a boy who "understood the function of the home, his personal responsibilities as a member of his household, and the best way to attain and maintain a happy and successful home, was sure to become a desirable citizen" (p. 29).

Interest in home economics departments to the development of classes for men and boys grew in the 1920's. Livingstone (1925) thought it was "only fair that the other half of the human family should profit by much of the information which was given with great care and efficiency to women and girls" (p. 434). Public interest in homemaking classes for boys was aroused as numerous magazine articles appeared in the late 1920's. Nothing in home economics seemed to "catch public attention so surely as the fact that boys and men sometimes studied it, even asked for courses in it" (Home economics for boys, 1927, p. 146). The popularity of the idea of parental education and its "connotation that the male as well as the female parent may have an influence on the developing offspring, gave a news value to boys studying food selection" (Home economics for boys, 1927, p. 146).

While novel and newsworthy in the 1920's, strong convictions in favor of homemaking classes for boys had grown among educators in the 1930's. It was felt that "boys needed a knowledge of home economics in order to insure a happy life" (Kissen, 1930, p. 29). The depression brought so many "drastic changes in the social and economics phases of

home life, that men had not only become far more interested, but they realized that there was a need for knowledge and were asking for help in family relations" (Mack, 1933, p. 104).

Co-educational classes were formed in the 1930's "for the purpose of studying those phases of homemaking that were of mutual interest to boys and girls" (Firth, 1937, p. 151). These classes were the "beginning of the notion that homemaking in the broader sense was a joint responsibility of men and women" (Lawson, 1977, p. 216).

The leading educators and home economists of the 1950's generally agreed that "home economics training for high school boys was desirable and practical" (Harper and Russell, 1955, p. 17). Co-educational classes stressed family relations: "men and women were partners in homemaking and both needed assistance with preparation for home and family living" (Ellis, 1958, p. 18). Training in co-operative living among family members in child care, guidance, family spending, and other areas of family living were provided in co-educational home economics (Anthony, 1956).

Shifting sex roles and changing values in the 1970's made "it imperative that co-educational homemakers share in the learning process" (Dowell and Greenwood, 1975, p. i). Young men in the 1970's were no longer satisfied with their traditional male role of "breadwinner", they expressed "need and desire to be knowledgeable in the various areas of consumer and homemaking education" (Adams, 1971, p. F48). Co-educational classes placed emphasis on child development and parent education in an "effort to reduce child abuse and neglect" (Spitze, 1977, p. 9). Parenthood education tried to "increase parental influence on their children's

behavior by making the parents more effective in guiding their children's behavior" (Coward and Kerckhoff, 1978, p. 26).

Factors Influencing Male Participation

Legislative Actions

The passage of the Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 "produced a continuous appropriation for vocational education in agriculture, in trades and industry, and in homemaking and for teacher training in each of these fields" (Roberts, 1965, p. 131). Vocational education was designed to prepare people for occupations in which they could find useful employment. Its purpose was to give training for increased efficiency in useful employment in the trades and industry, agriculture, commerce, and home economics (Barlow, 1976).

Since the passage of the Smith-Hughes Act, Congress has passed a number of acts effecting various aspects of vocational education. Among these were amendments and extension of the Smith-Hughes Act, acts concerned with "vocational rehabilitation, surplus equipment, war training and reconversion, manpower development, and laws providing additional funds for vocational education" (Roberts, 1965, p. 131).

The Vocational Education Act of 1963 provided, for the first time, funds for the preparation for "gainful employment in occupations involving knowledge and skills in home economics subjects" (United States Statutes at Large, 1964, p. 411). The Act was designed to "extend and develop new programs of vocational education, encourage research and experimentation, and provide work study programs to enable youth to continue vocational education" (Roberts, 1965, p. 136).

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 provided "new opportunity for vocational education to serve a larger segment of the population as these persons prepared to enter the labor force or to gain mobility in the labor force" (Barlow, 1976, p. 85). The 1968 Amendments continued to support both aspects of vocational home economics programs-- consumer and homemaking education and occupational training. Grants were provided to states on a matching funds basis and according to state plans. These grants were to

assist states in conducting vocational education programs for persons of all ages, in all communities of the states, to insure that education and training programs for career vocations were available to all individuals who desired and needed such education (United States Statutes at Large, 1969, p. 1072).

The 1968 Amendments provided funds to states on a matching basis for "Consumer and Homemaking Education". The funds were to be used to support consumer and homemaking education programs in local schools to insure quality in those programs. The requirements for local programs for youth and adults were:

1. The program will encourage greater consideration of the social and cultural conditions and needs, especially in economically depressed areas;
2. The program will encourage preparation for professional leadership in home economics and consumer education;
3. The program will be designed for youth and adults who have entered or are preparing to enter the work of the home;
4. The program will be designed to prepare such youth and adults for the role of homemaker or to contribute to their employability in the dual role of homemaker and wage earner; and
5. The program will include consumer education as an integral part thereof (Amendments and acts, 1972, p. 32).

Vocational home economics faced new challenges and opportunities in offering relevant instructional programs that prepared "youth and adults for the dual role of homemaker-wage earner and for occupations that

offered services to individuals and families" (Amendments and acts, 1972, p. 32).

The degree of male participation in vocational home economics was reinforced by the passage of Title IX--Prohibition of Sex Discrimination of the Education Amendments of 1972. The law stated in part:

No person in the United States shall on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance (United States Statutes at Large, 1973, p. 373).

Regulations to implement Title IX went into effect on July 21, 1975. These provisions affected some "16,000 public school systems" (Sinowitz, 1975, p. 110). The law banned sex discrimination technically in only school districts that were receiving federal money in one form or another. Steinhilber (1974) thought it was clear that the Department of Health, Education and Welfare "planned to interpret the law broadly enough so virtually all school districts in the country were included" (p. 20). School districts had to comply with the regulations of the amendment or risk losing all federal funds.

A provision of the law required self-review by institutions by July 21, 1976. Institutions had to identify existing policies and practices that were improper and illegal and take whatever steps were necessary to correct them. Single-sex classes at all levels were forbidden, except for separate but comparable sessions for elementary and secondary school students during times when human sexuality was taught (Sinowitz, 1975, p. 110). Co-educational classes had to become the rule in physical education, shop, home economics, and other subjects that were traditionally divided by sex (Mathews, 1974, p. 20).

In compliance to the regulations, possible practices of sex discrimination in secondary home economics programs were sought. Home economics teachers were urged to evaluate their existing programs. Dobry (1977) presented guideline questions to assist teachers in identifying possible sex discrimination practices in their programs. Teachers were to ask themselves if there was sex discrimination in

course requirements for graduation, course titles, course prerequisites and/or admission standards, course requirements for passing, course recruitment, extra-curricular activities, or required regulation for students on the basis of pregnancy, marital or parental status (pp. 154-155).

Subtle means of sex discrimination had to be identified and omitted just as overt practices were before a program was free of sex biases. Examination of words, actions, teaching materials and teaching environments used by the teacher could reveal unconscious practices of sex-biases (Dobry, 1977). As overt and subtle practices of sex discrimination were eliminated from home economics programs, they became more accessible to young men.

The 1976 Education Amendments to the Vocational Act of 1963 placed "heavy emphasis on the need to reduce sex discrimination in vocational education" (Richardson, 1977, p. 162). Federal funding for consumer and homemaking education programs was seriously questioned but public support convinced Congress to reinstate it through vocational education (Home economics insider, 1979).

The Amendments of 1976 called for the National Institute of Education (NIE) to conduct a study to determine whether federally funded programs were following the priorities outlined by Congress in the 1976 Amendments. The priorities included

serving populations that can especially benefit from programs--like the disadvantaged and handicapped, males and

economically depressed community members--to provide them with training in parenthood education, home resource management, nutrition education, and consumer education (Home economics insider, 1979, p. 30a).

The study was designed to determine what was actually happening in vocational home economics programs. It was conducted to find out "whether programs do prepare both men and women for dual roles as homemakers and consumers and to what extent the content was oriented to the future rather than to the past" (Home economics insider, 1979, p. 30a).

Changes in Society

While home economics was becoming more accessible legally for males, changes, problems and stresses in the American society were influencing the desirability of home economics to males. Montgomery (1977) reported societal complexities confronting people in the late 1970's:

spiralng divorce rates, unwanted pregnancies, peer group authoritarianism, sex-role changes, growing segregation of generations, increased participation of women in the work force, an array of consumer and environmental issues, electronic taste makers, and a growing dependency of the family on outside-of-the-home institutions and agencies (p. 211).

To combat these changes, problems and stresses, the harmony and stability of modern families hinged on the "dynamics of personal interaction, not on the performance of stereotyped role functions nor even on the quality of the traditional skills brought into a marriage" (Baker, 1969, p. 371). Many persons were no longer content to follow the dictates of tradition for tradition's sake. People--individuals, couples, and families--were searching for meaning in life and "questioning the value of traditional patterns of living and family life" (Cole, 1977, p. 242).

According to Davis and Johnson (1977), individuals, married couples and families were beginning to function in a wide variety of masculine-feminine patterns. Changes in family structure and life style brought about changing patterns of family interaction and changing expectations. Whether by choice or necessity, increasing numbers of adults were finding that they had to "fulfill roles traditionally defined as appropriate only for members of the opposite sex" (Harriman, 1977, p. 11). Many couples adequately fulfilling the former functional role of their sexes were frustrated in their marriages "simply because they did not possess the skills essential for living together in the intense interaction of marriage" (Baker, 1969, p. 372). Anytime there was a "change in family roles, stress could develop because of the lack of role definitions, due to their rarity in the past" (Davis and Johnson, 1977, p. 76).

The increasing number of mothers working away from home resulted in more fathers finding it necessary to become more involved with the family. This increase in male participation in families created the "need to understand the role of fathers in the family beyond that of 'breadwinner'" (Wingert, 1978, p. 76). Baker (1969) felt that "men needed training for parenthood just as much as women did" (p. 372). Parent education for both parents could prepare them for the responsibilities of parenthood. Persons could learn "appropriate and effective strategies for responding to children and could develop skills to increase parenting effectiveness" (Coward and Kerckhoff, 1978, p. 24).

According to Szinovacz (1979), "availability and relative skills of family members rather than sex-stereotyped roles were considered major determinants of how they divided housework" (p. 43). The blurring of sexual distinctions resulted in a "new understanding of what it means to

be male or female with major emphasis on what it means to be human" (Baker, 1971, p. F74). Aldous (1977) believed that men and women have "equal responsibility to be homemakers--in the creation of their family's nest, that place where families feel sheltered from the turmoil of the world" (p. 15).

While opportunities for individual variations in life styles continued to expand, it seemed "probable that the family would remain for the foreseeable future the most fulfilling heterosexual association and primary agency for socializing the young" (Baker, 1971, p. F74). The skills involved in family life were important to everyone--regardless of sex--and as men became more actively involved as homemakers, they realized the positive outcomes of taking home economics to master these skills (Thurston, 1977).

Shifting sex-roles made career selection less restrictive. Career education in home economics programs could influence more young men to become home economists. Baker (1971) felt that boys had to be "introduced early to the notion that marriage and family were as much the responsibility of men as of women" (p. F74). Otherwise, no significant change in the public image or male interest in home economics would occur. Longworth (1971) believed that more males would enroll in home economics if some of the teachers were men. He felt that males could make a "very important contribution to the image that home economists were attempting to build" (p. F47). Male home economists would provide alternative role models for other males. These men would "publicly be seen as being professionally concerned with those matters of domestic consumption and management which previously were stereotyped as female interests" (Gough, 1977, p. 213). Men should be encouraged to pursue

advanced training in all areas of home economics and informed of available opportunities for employment (Baker, 1969). If these steps were taken, more qualified men could be lured into home economics. Men in home economics could be advocates for the expanding roles of men and women and be models for constructive change (Butts, 1977, p. 207).

Teaching Co-educational Home Economics

Characteristics of Male Students

Characteristics of male students had to be considered by home economics teachers while planning co-educational courses. According to Ellis (1958), boys were more enthusiastic about homemaking than girls, they work faster than girls, and they were more flexible. Boys were easier to teach because they had "no preconceived notions about how to do things, a teacher had a chance to teach the right way without having to undo learning of the wrong way" (Ellis, 1958, p. 18). Mack (1933) felt that boys had a greater tendency than girls to carry into their homes the practices they might learn in home economics. Boys required more energy on the part of the instructor "because of their zealotry, but were more interesting to teach and were great fun to work with" (p. 104). Quick (1974) reported that boys exhibited practical approaches to decision-making, a general directness in questions and responses, and a sense of pride in the success of their work. Boys were impatient to complete a project and were strongly competitive in their work.

How a young man sees himself or his masculine self-image should be considered by home economics teachers. Kohlmann (1975b) felt that if a young man could see that an "educational experience would help him

improve his self-image or at least not run counter to what he was attempting to accomplish, he was more likely to take advantage of the opportunities provided" (p. xiv).

Discipline problems in co-educational classes could be avoided if male characteristics were considered carefully. Ellis (1958) stated that "boys could drive a teacher to distraction if they were not kept busy" (p. 18). Harper and Russell (1955) believed that prevention was the cure for all discipline problems. They considered three basic elements important--subject matter should be of interest to boys as well as girls, physical conditions of the classroom and laboratory should be conducive to attentiveness and working, and attitudes of students, teachers and administrators should be favorable to the program.

In co-educational classes, teachers could be expected to observe "student co-operation, leadership qualities, behavior problems, mal-adjustments, timidity, shyness, jealousy, superiority and inferiority complexes" (Firth, 1937, p. 151). Teachers were urged to overcome separate expectations they had for boys and girls. Having "different expectations for males and females they would tend to reinforce traditional sexist patterns" (Farquhar and Mohlman, 1973, p. 518). Assignments in co-educational home economics classes should be attainable by both sexes with similar outcomes.

Teaching Methods

Teaching methods used in secondary home economics were affected by many changes in recent years. Many factors contributed to these changes--advancements in teaching equipment, new concepts introduced into subject areas, refinement of course curriculums, improved textbooks,

availability of resource persons and materials, and student composition of classes. Each of these affected the selection and implementation of teaching methods in secondary home economics classes. While each is important, student composition of classes and its effects on teaching method selection and use were discussed in this section.

Lawson (1977) reported that "home economics teachers consistently expressed anxiety about teaching boys in their classes" (p. 222).

Kohlmann (1975a) believed that many teachers "felt ill-prepared to help boys with their educational needs as related to home and family life" (p. 273). It was believed that boys were hard to interest for a whole year, so techniques had to be varied to maintain their interest (Davidson, 1977).

Teaching methods used in co-educational classes were the same but boys were more alert "so a teacher had to prepare lessons with more thought and place emphasis on phases that would interest the boys as well as the girls" (Kauffman, 1930, p. 139). Any method of teaching could be used effectively with a coed group as long as the situation was informal and friendly. Every "obstacle to freedom of thought and expression should be removed--students should feel at ease, relaxed and free to be themselves" (Williamson and Lyle, 1961, pp. 214-215).

Teaching methods for coed classes should be varied and provide contact with simulated or real experiences. Davidson (1977) suggested "role playing, discussions based on a degree of research, individualized learning packets, games, films, field trips and committee work" (p. 170). In all units, the "goals should include engaging the imagination of the students and eliciting their input wherever possible" (Farquhar and Mohlman, 1973, p. 519). Class activities should be planned with both

sexes in mind. The same concepts may be covered but specific activities could be changed to satisfy needs and desires of all students (Moriarty, 1979).

Dowell and Greenwood (1975) suggested that home economics classes with male participants should include

activity-oriented learning experiences, opportunities for developing and practicing obtained skills, scientific explanation behind a practice or demonstration, course content that is relevant and practical, taking advantage of competitive nature of young men, consideration of the limited experience and knowledge of the boys, try to make sure that materials are male oriented to some degree, a learning environment that is relaxed but structured, and have a teacher who has a sense of humor and can participate in the type of give-and-take typical among teenagers (pp. 9-12).

Timing was considered important in co-educational classes: starting and stopping class on time; spending too much time on one subject invites restlessness and boredom--classes should be planned with various activities to avoid this. Time of day the class was held was felt to be important to consider when planning a co-educational class. The last period of the day was undesirable, scheduling a morning class was worth any extra effort required to arrange it (Harper and Russell, 1955).

Some subjects encountered in co-educational classes could provide a teacher with some uncomfortable moments. Parenting could be taught with a realistic approach--from the standpoint of the teenage parent--that had relevancy and appeal to teenagers. It could be a way of teaching sex education as well as the nurturing of children (Cross, 1979). Treat students as adults when discussing those subjects they are old enough to understand, as some faced the responsibilities of parenthood.

Related Research

A review of research revealed additional studies related to this

research. Kohlmann (1975) conducted a three-year curricular study at Iowa State University to investigate bases for planning curricula appropriate for young men. Experiences of teaching classes involving boys were solicited throughout the continental United States from home economics teachers who were recognized as being successful in working with boys. After the data were collected and studied for implications, a statement of curricular guidelines was made in five areas of home economics. A resource guide was organized incorporating the findings of the study, it was called Home Economics for Young Men: A Teaching Guide.

The National Education Association published a guide for teachers who were planning short courses in home economics programs for eleventh and twelfth grade boys and girls. The objective of the guide, Innovation in Home Economics (1967), was to provide a series of lessons in group problem solving to meet individual needs and interests of high school students.

Bachelor Living: Curriculum Guide for Consumer and Homemaking Education was developed by Durbin and Sutton (1974) for use at the junior high or senior high level. The guide was aimed at teaching young men some of the skills they would need in "home management" whether they live as bachelors or as husbands. The guide was offered as a planning and teaching guide for home economics teachers.

Pruitt (1979) conducted a study, at Oklahoma State University, surveying the likes and dislikes of male students with regard to clothing units taught in Homemaking I vocational home economics classes. Findings of the study indicated that males liked actual sewing, use and care of the sewing machine, and experienced a feeling of pride and self-satisfaction in wearing the finished product. The recommendations of the thesis

(entitled Likes and dislikes of high school males in regard to clothing units in vocational home economics programs in Oklahoma) were to explore various teaching methods used in clothing classes when males are present, identify attitudes of home economics teachers toward males in their classes, and investigate problems encountered by home economics teachers in teaching males.

Summary

Within this chapter related literature was discussed with regards to tracing the growth of male participation in home economics. Literature was discussed that defined the factors influencing the growth and accessibility of home economics to men and boys. Teaching methods used in co-educational home economics classes were discussed through the literature. Finally, related research was found and discussed from the literature.

CHAPTER III

RESEARCH DESIGN AND PROCEDURES

Introduction

The objectives of this study were to assess the effect of selected variables on teaching success in co-educational home economics classes and to identify preferred teaching methods used in specific learning situations in co-educational home economics classes. The purpose of the following chapter was to describe the type of research, the population and sample plan, the instrumentation procedure, the collection of the data, and the statistical analysis of the data.

Type of Research

This study utilized the descriptive type of research design. Best (1977) discussed descriptive design as a study that describes and interprets, and as a research type was primarily concerned with what is. Descriptive design "is 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" (Best, 1977, p. 116). This study gathered information concerning existing conditions (the dependent and independent variables) and examined statistically the relationships among the variables. The study obtained opinions from the sample to be used in examining teacher preparation needs for the education of males

in co-educational home economics classes. The dependent variable in objective one was teaching success of co-educational home economics classes--defined for this study to mean those teachers who did not indicate that they needed help with teaching boys in their classes and those that attended available educational offerings concerning males in home economics. The independent variables were length of teaching experience, total teacher involvement in school and community activities, age, and the method of procuring male students. The dependent variable in objective two was teaching methods and the independent variable was specific learning situations.

Population and Sample Plan

The population for this study included home economics teachers working in vocational programs that met the following criteria: (1) employed in an Oklahoma public school, (2) certified in the State, and (3) enrolled males at least since the 1975-76 term. Annual Reports for 1975-76, 1976-77, and 1977-78 were obtained from the Home Economics Division of the State Department of Vocational Education in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. The home economics programs meeting the population criteria constituted the sample choices. In order to have an accurate representation from the six vocational districts in the State, a stratified proportional percentage was randomly drawn from each vocational district to meet the sample number.

The population represented 240 of the 344 vocational home economics programs in the ~~six~~ vocational districts. The districts and the percentage of the total population were as follows: Northwest, 26 programs (11 percent); Southwest, 47 programs (19 percent); Central, 38 programs (16

percent); East, 34 programs (14 percent); Northeast, 45 programs (19 percent); and Southeast, 50 programs (21 percent).

The sample size of 160 was determined by taking 66 percent of each vocational district in the population. This number was 12 more than what was recommended by Krejcie and Morgan (1977). Their table for determining sample size from a given population suggested a sample size of 148 for a population of 240.

The State Home Economics Supervisor was contacted and informed of the purpose of the research study. The sample members were contacted by letter explaining the purpose of the study and the procedural involvement of the members, and asked for participation in the study. From the responding members, the actual data producing sample was obtained.

Instrumentation

The sample population was surveyed through a self-administered written questionnaire. The instrument was designed to obtain four types of information which identify the dependent and independent variables of the study. This study involved the development and implementation of questions designed to retrieve: demographic information pertaining to vocational home economics teachers, information regarding the status of male participation in vocational home economics, preferred teaching methods in co-educational home economics classes, and requests for assistance with male students and suggestions for teacher training.

A multiple choice format was used in the questionnaire in order to collapse the information for analysis (see Appendix A). Two open response questions were included to allow the respondents an opportunity to candidly express positive and negative aspects of co-educational

classes encountered while teaching. Specific questions were determined through a review of literature and the objectives of this study.

Demographic Information of Sample Teachers

The demographic information questions pertaining to vocational home economics teachers were designed to identify the independent variables of objective one--length of teaching experience, total teacher involvement in school and community activities, age, and method of procuring male students.

Questions one and four determined the length of teaching experience. Question one was concerned with the total length of teaching experience while question four sought the length of experience teaching male students.

Question two identified the years taught in present teaching situation. Due to teacher turnover, the years of teaching experience did not always correspond with years in present teaching situation. Thus, the enrollment figures for a particular program often reflected the work of the teacher as well as her predecessor.

Question three sought the approximate age levels of the respondents according to age brackets. The researcher felt that age brackets would be less offensive than a blunt open-ended question. This question was included because length of teaching experience may not reflect age accurately, considering career interruptions.

Question 11 dealt with the classroom experience or contact with male students during the last three years. The period of three years was chosen because it corresponded with the criteria for the selection of the sample population.

Question 13 sought reasons why males were enrolling in vocational home economics programs, according to the subjective opinions of the respondents. The accuracy of the responses to this question would depend on the degree of awareness of the teachers responding.

Questions 21 and 22 checked total teacher involvement in school and community activities. Question 21 dealt with community and professional organizations in which teachers might belong. This question was included to determine whether teachers' involvement in the community influenced their performance in the classroom. Question 22 dealt with school related activities. Home economics related activities were left out on purpose because they were usually mandatory in vocational home economics programs. This question determined whether respondents were involved in other school activities besides those in home economics.

Question seven sought information about respondents' feelings toward male participation in home economics. This question was included as a check for the other questions in the instrument.

Information Regarding the Status of Male Participation

The demographic information questions regarding the status of male participation in vocational home economics were designed in part to identify the dependent variable in objective one and to obtain information describing the male population in Oklahoma's vocational home economics programs.

Questions 10 and 14 were included to solicit responses that would identify the dependent variable in objective one--teaching successful home economics classes. Question 10 determined the enrollment of

co-educational home economics classes since the 1976-77 term. A chart was provided for the respondents to complete. An increase in male enrollment indicated that a program was successful in retaining males' interest enough to attract more male students into the program. Question 14 identified what types of courses were being provided to male students. Courses that were planned to be co-educational indicated another degree of success. Courses planned for all-male classes indicated untimely progress toward compliance with Title IX regulations, risking the chance of being caught and losing Federal funding for that particular program.

Questions 5, 12, and 17 described the male population in Oklahoma's vocational home economics programs. Question five described the male performances and compared them with female performances. Question 12 sought the age level of the males enrolled in home economics programs. Age appropriate developmental tasks were important considerations in planning curricula for co-educational classes. Question 17 identified which subjects or topics male students liked and considered relevant.

Preferred Teaching Methods

The teaching method questions were designed to identify the independent variable (specific learning situations) and the dependent variable (teaching methods) of objective two. Two specific learning situations were provided along with a list of possible teaching methods from which to choose.

Questions 23 and 24 were designed to identify preferred teaching methods used in a clothing laboratory. A clothing laboratory was used due to a decision made by the researcher. Class composition in

question 23 was co-ed, while the class in question 24 was all female. The learning situations were identical in order to determine whether boys in the classroom affect the selection and use of teaching methods. Both questions were planned for comparative analysis.

Questions 25 and 26 were designed to identify preferred teaching methods in a theory class of consumer education. A consumer education class, based on a unit in banking, was used due to a researcher's decision. Class composition in question 25 was co-ed, while the class in question 26 was all female. The learning situations were identical in order to determine whether boys in the classroom affect the selection and use of teaching methods. Both questions were planned for comparative analysis.

Teacher Input

The teacher input questions were designed in part to identify the dependent variable in objective one and to allow teachers to express educational needs required to conduct co-educational home economics classes. Suggestions for present and future teacher training content and locations were requested in these questions. Positive and negative aspects of co-educational classroom teaching were requested in two open-response questions that concluded the questionnaire.

Questions six, eight, and nine were designed to identify the dependent variable in objective one--teaching success of co-educational home economics classes. Question six determined whether help or assistance was needed in working with male students. If no help was needed, then either a teacher was too proud to admit it or was conducting successful problem-free classes. Questions eight and nine dealt with

the conferences, workshops and seminars which had focused on males in home economics in the last year. Question eight determined how many were available, while question nine determined how many of the available workshops, etc., the respondent had attended. If there were conferences, etc., available on the subject of male students in home economics and a teacher attended them, then a degree of success was noted. It was determined that if teachers reported attending these offerings, then they were attempting to stay alert to new ideas and ways of teaching co-educational classes.

Question 15 identified the most immediate help needed by home economics teachers to better deal with male students. Question 16 determined where home economics teachers were receiving helpful information when teaching problems were encountered by having males in the classroom. Question 18 identified subjects or topics that could cause discomfort while teaching them in mixed company. Ways to overcome uncomfortable feelings were requested at the conclusion of question 18. Question 19 determined the preferred location where teachers could receive helpful information concerning male students and co-educational classes. Question 20 identified useful information to be included in teacher preparation programs or for new teachers who would be working with co-educational classes.

The two open-response questions allowed the teachers to share the positive and negative aspects of having male students in co-educational classes. Question 27 explored the positive aspects experienced by teachers, while question 28 explored the negative aspects encountered by having male students in the classroom.

Pretesting the Instrument

The completed instrument was presented to professors, instructors, committee members, and graduate students in the Division of Home Economics Education during the week of April 16, 1979, at Oklahoma State University. The instrument was examined for clarity of content. Minor working changes were made in accordance with recommendations given by the group. The revised instrument was shown to a statistician on April 25, 1979. Clarity of content was again examined. Question order was reorganized to ease possible tabulation problems. Two questions concerning student enrollment were combined to enhance clarity and facilitate ease in responding. Other minor changes were made in accordance to the statistician's recommendations. After all revisions were made, the instrument was taken to a printer on April 27, 1979.

Collection of Data

One hundred and sixty vocational home economics programs composed the sample population for this study. A list of vocational home economics teachers and their school addresses was supplied by the Division of Home Economics Education at Oklahoma State University. It became clear that many selected programs had more than one teacher. In order to keep everyone happy, questionnaires were sent to every teacher in the selected vocational home economics programs. This practice increased the sample population to 198 teachers.

All sample members were sent the questionnaire developed by the researcher. These questionnaires were coded in the upper right-hand corner with a three digit number. The first digit identified the

district, the second and third digits identified the program. In cases of plural teachers, a letter (either A, B, C, or D) was placed to the right of the third digit in order to identify each teacher in a program. This coding system was used so that follow-up postcards would only be sent to those who had not replied.

A letter of transmittal--explaining the purpose of the study, the procedural involvement of the members, and an offer to share the findings of the study--accompanied the questionnaire. A self-addressed stamped envelope was included for the convenience of the participants. Follow-up postcards were sent to teachers who had not responded 16 days after mailing the questionnaires. (See Appendix B).

Statistical Analysis

The data were collected from the participating sample and the responses were tabulated for the purpose of statistical analysis. The analysis of the data was structured according to the hypothesis and research question stated in Chapter I.

The following hypothesis and research question were tested:

Hypothesis--There will be no significant relationship between teaching successful co-educational secondary home economics classes and (1) length of teaching experience, (2) total teacher involvement in school and community activities, (3) age, and (4) method of procuring male students.

Instrumentation--Teaching success was measured by questions 6, 8, 9, 10, and 14, and the selected variables by the demographic information questions pertaining to sample teachers.

Analysis--Chi Square calculations between demographic information pertaining to the teachers and questions 6, 8, 9, 10, and 14. The .05 significance level was accepted as the confidence level.

Research Question--Will there be preferred teaching methods used in specific learning situations when home economics classes are co-educational?

Instrumentation--Questions 23 and 25 identified the preferred teaching methods in co-educational classes and questions 24 and 26 identified teaching methods used in all female classes.

Analysis--Frequency distributions were used to tabulate the responses then they were compared for results.

Frequency distributions were used to tabulate the responses of the remaining questions. These questions were from the teacher input and the status of male participation sections.

Summary

The present chapter presented the methodology involved in testing the hypothesis and research question. It also contained the explanations of the research design, the population and the sample plan, the instrumentation procedure, the collection of data, and the statistical analysis of the data.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

In purpose, this study was designed to determine what influences males had on teaching method selection and use in secondary vocational home economics programs. In order to accomplish this purpose, the following objectives were formulated:

1. Assess the effect of selected variables on teaching success of co-educational secondary home economics classes.
2. Identify preferred teaching methods used in specific learning situations when home economics classes are co-educational.
3. Make recommendations based on the findings of the study for inservice training and for preparatory service training in vocational home economics teacher education and for further research in this area.

This chapter presents a description of the participating sample, an analysis of the data in accordance with the hypothesis and research question of the study, and the results from the response portions of the questionnaire which were not specified in the hypothesis or research question.

Description of Sample

In this study, the population consisted of 240 vocational home

economics programs in the six vocational districts of Oklahoma. The invited sample was composed of 160 programs randomly drawn in a stratified proportional percentage of two-thirds from each district's population. Each teacher in the 160 programs was included in the study, bringing the sample size to 198. Of the usable responses from the returned questionnaires, 145 represented the participating sample. Two letters of transmittal were returned saying "no boys are in my program at this time," five returned questionnaires stated the same. The participating sample represented 73 percent of the invited teachers and 79 percent of the invited programs. Table I illustrates the participating sample numbers and percentages of the invited sample by district.

TABLE I
SAMPLE REPRESENTATION BY DISTRICT

Vocational District	Invited Sample Number		Participating Sample Number		Percent Participating	
	Program	Teacher	Program	Teacher	Program	Teacher
Northwest	17	19	14	15	82	79
Southwest	31	45	24	31	77	69
Central	25	33	18	22	72	67
East	23	25	17	18	74	72
Northeast	30	35	24	26	80	74
Southeast	34	41	30	33	88	80
TOTAL	160	198	127	145	79	73

The independent variables as identified in the hypothesis were: (1) the length of teaching experience, (2) total teacher involvement in school and community activities, (3) age, and (4) the method of procuring male students. The instrument's demographic information of sample teachers' questions identified the independent variables.

Demographic information questions one and four identified the length of teaching experience. The total length of teaching experience of the respondents was indicated in question one. Approximately 29 percent or 41 respondents had been teaching 6 to 10 years. Eleven or approximately eight percent were first year teachers. Approximately 34 percent had been teaching less than six years, while approximately 31 percent had taught for more than 10 years. (See Table II.)

Question four identified the length of teaching experience in co-educational classes. Approximately 57 percent or 78 teachers had taught co-educational classes for one to three years. Ten or approximately seven percent had taught co-educational classes over 10 years. (See Table III.)

Question three identified the approximate ages of the respondents. Approximately 30 percent or 43 respondents were between 25 and 30 years of age. Sixty or approximately 42 percent were under 30 years of age, while over 56 percent or 81 respondents were over 30 years old. (See Table IV.)

Item 13 sought reasons why males were enrolling in vocational home economics programs. Respondents could select more than one reason they believed to be appropriate. Approximately 65 percent or 90 respondents selected personal interest as the reason males enrolled in home economics programs. Approximately 17 percent selected peer influence or pressure,

TABLE II
TOTAL LENGTH OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Years Taught	Frequency	Percent ^a
1 year	11	7.75
2 years	9	6.39
3 years	14	9.86
4 years	12	8.45
5 years	7	4.93
6 to 10 years	41	28.87
11 to 15 years	19	13.38
16 to 20 years	7	4.93
21 to 25 years	8	5.63
25 or more years	18	9.86
No Response	3	0.00
TOTAL	145	100.00

^aPercentage carried two digits.

TABLE III
TEACHING EXPERIENCE IN CO-EDUCATIONAL CLASSES

Years Taught	Frequency	Percent ^a
1 to 3 years	78	56.52
4 to 6 years	36	26.09
7 to 9 years	14	10.15
10 to 12 years	5	3.62
13 to 15 years	3	2.17
Over 15 years	2	1.45
No Response	7	0.00
TOTAL	145	100.00

^aPercentage carried two digits.

TABLE IV
 RESPONDENTS' APPROXIMATE AGES

Age Brackets	Frequency	Percent ^a
20 to 24 years old	17	12.06
25 to 29 years old	43	30.50
30 to 34 years old	22	15.60
35 to 39 years old	17	12.06
40 to 44 years old	10	7.10
45 to 49 years old	14	9.93
50 to 54 years old	8	5.67
55 or more	10	7.10
No Response	4	0.00
TOTAL	145	100.00

^aPercentage carried two digits.

while approximately 19 percent selected recruitment by the teacher as reasons why males enrolled. (See Table V.)

TABLE V
REASONS WHY MALES ENROLLED IN HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS

Reasons	Frequency	Percent ^a
Personal contact	90	65.21
Other responses	37	26.81
Recruitment by teacher	27	19.56
Peer influence or pressure	23	16.66
An easy "A"	17	12.31
Administrative action--Title IX regulation	14	10.14
No response	7	--
Parental influence	3	2.17
TOTAL	218	--

Questions 21 and 22 reported the respondents total community and school involvement. Question 21 identified the community and professional organizations respondents belonged to. One hundred and eighteen or approximately 87 percent of the participating sample belonged to professional organizations or associations. Church related organizations were attended regularly by 114 or approximately 76 percent of the respondents. Question 22 identified school related activities attended by the sample. School related sporting events and pep rallies had the

highest attendance, with 121 or approximately 87 percent and 110 or approximately 79 percent attending, respectively. P.T.A. or P.T.O. meetings had the lowest attendance with only 21 or approximately 15 percent of the respondents attending. (See Table VI.)

TABLE VI
RESPONDENTS' SCHOOL AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Activity	Frequency
<u>21. Community and Professional Organizations</u>	
Professional organizations	118
Church related organizations	104
Community social organizations	63
Honor society	35
No response	9
Other	5
TOTAL	334
<u>22. School Related Activities</u>	
Sporting events	121
Pep rallies	110
Band or chorus concerts	72
Other	50
P.T.A. or P.T.O. meetings	21
No response	6
TOTAL	380

Other questions in the demographic information of sample teachers section were items 2, 7, and 11. Question two identified the years taught in present teaching situation. Approximately 21 percent or 30 respondents indicated that they had been in the same situation for 6 to 10 years. Eighty-two or approximately 58 percent had been in their teaching situation less than six years, while 30 or approximately 21 percent had been in the same teaching situation over 10 years. (See Table VII.)

TABLE VII
YEARS TAUGHT IN PRESENT TEACHING SITUATION

Years Taught	Frequency	Percent ^a
1 year	23	16.19
2 years	15	10.56
3 years	21	14.78
4 years	13	9.15
5 years	10	7.04
6 to 10 years	30	21.13
11 to 15 years	16	11.27
16 to 20 years	6	4.23
21 to 25 years	6	4.23
26 or more years	2	1.41
No response	3	0.00
TOTAL	145	100.00

^aPercentage carried two digits.

Question 11 identified the classroom experience or contact with male students the respondents encountered in the last three years. Approximately 73 percent or 101 teachers experienced having male students in their co-educational classes. Ten or approximately seven percent had experienced all male classes. Four teachers reported no experience with male students. Two teachers specified other experience with males. Approximately 16 percent or 22 respondents had experienced male students in both all male and co-educational classes.

Respondents expressed feelings toward male participation in home economics in question seven. Approximately 96 percent or 135 respondents felt that males belonged in home economics. Four or approximately three percent of the participating sample felt that males did not belong in home economics.

The dependent variable in the hypothesis--teaching successful co-educational secondary home economics classes--was identified by questions 6, 8, and 9 in the teacher input section and by questions 10 and 14 in the status of male participation section. Teacher input question six asked whether the respondents felt they needed help or assistance in working with male students. If no help was needed, that would indicate some degree of success. Approximately 37 percent or 51 respondents felt they needed help, while 87 respondents or approximately 63 percent indicated that they did not. Seven persons did not respond to the question. As a measure of success, question six identified 87 teachers who were teaching co-educational home economics classes with some degree of success.

Questions eight and nine revealed the availability and attendance of conferences, workshops or seminars in which the subject matter dealt

with males in home economics. Question eight determined the number of available meetings. Approximately 44 percent or 59 respondents reported that none had been available. Seventy-six or approximately 56 percent reported that one to three meetings had been available. Ten people did not respond. Question nine identified the number of conferences, workshops, and seminars in which the subject matter dealt with males in home economics which were attended by the participating sample. Approximately 61 percent or 86 respondents reported that they had attended none. Fifty-four or approximately 39 percent reported attending one to three. Five people did not respond. As a measure of success, only 54 teachers attended the reported one to three meetings that were available or would be considered successful.

Status of male participation questions 10 and 14 were used in defining the dependent variable in the hypothesis--teaching successful co-educational classes. Item 10 identified the enrollment in co-educational classes. Enrollment figures for the last three school terms were examined for significant trends. Figures were so inconsistent from program to program and from year to year that significant trends were not evident. As a measure of success, item 10 could not be used with any degree of confidence.

Question 14 identified the types of courses that were provided to males. Courses planned to be co-educational were considered as another degree of success. The respondents indicated that approximately 85 percent or 116 co-educationally planned courses were offered. Seventeen teachers or approximately 12 percent had males in segregated courses. Approximately nine percent or 13 respondents specified other types of courses were planned for male students.

The remaining questions in the teacher input section are described later in this chapter. The remaining status of male participation questions 5, 12, and 17 described the male population in Oklahoma's vocational home economics programs. The performances of male students were compared with female performances in item five. Approximately 62 percent or 86 respondents felt that the performances of males were about the same as females. (See Table VIII.)

TABLE VIII
COMPARISON OF MALE AND FEMALE PERFORMANCES

Performance Level of Males as Compared to Those of Females	Frequency	Percent ^a
They are better	14	10.14
They are about the same	86	62.31
They are not as good	36	26.08
Other	2	1.44
No Response	7	0.00
TOTAL	145	100.00

^aPercentage carried two digits.

The age levels of males presently enrolled in home economics classes were sought in question 12. Approximately 59 percent or 83 respondents reported that the boys in their classes were between 16 to 18 years of

age. Approximately 26 percent or 36 respondents had male students ranging in age from 12 to 18 years. (See Table IX.)

TABLE IX
AGE LEVELS OF MALES IN SECONDARY HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES

Age Level	Frequency	Percent ^a
12 to 15 years of age	8	5.71
16 to 18 years of age	83	59.28
Both of the above age groups	36	25.71
I have no male students in my classes at this time	13	9.28
Other ages	0	0.00
No Response	5	0.00
TOTAL	145	100.00

^aPercentage carried two digits.

Subjects or topics that male students seemed to relate to and want more information about were identified in question 17. Foods and nutrition was selected by 110 respondents or approximately 80 percent of the participating sample. Family living was second with 68 respondents or approximately 50 percent selecting it. (See Table X.)

Analysis of Hypothesis and Research Question

The formulated hypothesis and research question were tested through

TABLE X
FAVORED SUBJECTS IN CO-EDUCATIONAL CLASSES

Subject	Frequency	Percent ^a
Clothing	28	20.44
Food and Nutrition	110	80.23
Consumer Education	37	27.00
Family Living	68	49.63
Career Orientation	29	21.17
Child Development	25	18.25
Other	7	5.11
No Response	8	0.00
TOTAL	304	100.00

^aPercentage carried two digits.

statistical procedures provided by the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). In the hypothesis, the observed frequencies were compared with the expected frequencies through Chi Square analysis. Significant levels were determined for the statistical procedure at the .05 level of significance.

The hypothesis stated: There will be no significant relationship between teaching successful co-educational secondary home economics classes and (1) length of teaching experience, (2) total teacher involvement in school and community activities, (3) age, and (4) method of procuring male students. Information for analysis was measured through responses from questions six, eight, and nine for the dependent variable; and questions 1, 3, 4, 13, 21, and 22 for the independent variable.

The questions that identified the dependent variable in the hypothesis were:

6. Do you feel you need assistance or help in working with the male students in your co-educational home economics classes?
8. How many conferences, workshops or seminars were available to you in the last year in which the subject matter dealt with males in co-educational home economics classes?
9. How many of the conferences, workshops or seminars in which the subject matter dealt with males in home economics did you attend in the last year?

These questions were compared with the questions that identified the independent variables in the hypothesis. These were:

1. How many years have you taught, including the present year?
3. Which age bracket most nearly fits you?
4. How many years have you taught males in co-educational home

economics classes, including the present year?

13. Why did males enroll in your home economics program?
21. Which of the following types of organizations do you belong to and attend regularly?
22. Which of the following do you attend regularly? (School related activities.)

Each question that identified the dependent variable was analyzed with each question that identified the independent variables. Chi Square calculations were conducted between each item in both sets of questions.

The responses to question six were compared with the responses to questions 1, 3, 4, 13, 21, and 22. The level of significance was more than .05 and unacceptable in all but two of the calculations. Acceptable levels of significance occurred in calculations between responses to question six and two of the possible responses to question 13.

The responses to question six were compared with response "A" of question 13. This was done to determine if there was a relationship between those teachers who indicated needing assistance with male students and their belief that males had enrolled in their classes for an easy "A". (See Table XI.)

The relationship was significant at the .01 level. A majority of the teachers who needed help also indicated that the males in their classes had enrolled thinking the course was an easy "A". But the overall majority or 119 teachers felt that males enrolled in home economics for some other reason than for an easy "A".

The responses to question six were compared with response "F" of question 13. This was done to determine if a relationship existed between those teachers needing assistance with male students and their

belief that males had enrolled in their classes due to personal reasons.

(See Table XII.)

TABLE XI

CHI SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHERS
NEEDING ASSISTANCE WITH MALE STUDENTS AND MALES
ENROLLING FOR AN EASY "A"

Need Help or Assistance	Boys Enrolled for an Easy "A"				n
	Yes		No		
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
Yes	11	6.3	39	43.8	50
No	6	10.8	80	75.3	86
TOTAL	17		119		136

$\chi^2 = 6.52, df = 1, p < .01.$

TABLE XII

CHI SQUARE VALUES REFLECTING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TEACHERS
NEEDING ASSISTANCE WITH MALE STUDENTS AND MALES
ENROLLING DUE TO PERSONAL INTEREST

Need Help or Assistance	Males Enrolled Due to Personal Interest				n
	Yes		No		
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
Yes	26	33.1	24	16.9	50
No	64	56.9	22	29.1	86
TOTAL	90		46		136

$\chi^2 = 7.09, df = 1, p < .007.$

The relationship was significant at the .007 level. A majority or 66.18 percent of the participating sample felt that males enrolled in home economics due to personal interest. Those teachers who did not need help or assistance indicated that the males in their classes had enrolled for some personal interest. It was logical that males who had a personal interest in a class would create fewer problems for the teacher.

The responses to question eight were compared with the responses to questions 1, 3, 4, 13, 21, and 22. Six calculations were significant at the .05 level.

The responses to question eight were compared with the responses to question three. This was done to determine if there was a relationship between the age of the respondents and the awareness of the availability of conferences, etc., dealing with males in home economics. (See Table XIII.)

The relationship between the age of the respondents and the availability of conferences dealing with males in home economics was significant at the .026 level. The 25 to 29 and the 45 to 49 age groups indicated that one to three conferences had been offered in the past year dealing with the subject of males in home economics. (See Table XIII.)

Responses to question eight were compared with response "E" of question 13. This was done to determine if there was a relationship between the awareness of available conferences, etc., dealing with males in home economics classes due to teacher recruitment. (See Table XIV.)

The relationship was significant at the .002 level. Those teachers who reported that the males in their classes enrolled due to recruitment on their part, indicated that they were aware of one to three conferences held in the last year whose subject matter dealt with males in home

TABLE XIII

CHI SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF AVAILABLE
CONFERENCES DEALING WITH MALE STUDENTS IN HOME ECONOMICS
AND THE AGE OF THE RESPONDENTS

Number of Available Conferences	Age of Respondents According to Age Brackets								
	20-24		25-29		30-34		35-39		
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
None	10	7.4	18	18.2	14	9.1	6	6.5	
One to three	7	9.6	24	23.8	7	11.9	9	8.5	
TOTAL	17		42		21		15		

Number of Available Conferences	Age of Respondents According to Age Brackets								n
	40-44		45-49		50-54		55+		
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
None	2	4.3	1	5.2	4	3.0	3	4.3	58
One to three	8	5.7	11	6.8	3	4.0	7	5.7	76
TOTAL	10		12		7		10		134

$$x^2 = 15.86, df = 7, p < .026.$$

economics. The majority of the teachers or 105 felt that males enrolled in their classes due to reasons other than recruitment on their part.

TABLE XIV

CHI SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF AVAILABLE CONFERENCES DEALING WITH MALE STUDENTS IN HOME ECONOMICS AND MALES ENROLLING DUE TO TEACHER RECRUITMENT

Number of Available Conferences	Males Enrolled Due to Teacher Recruitment				n
	Yes		No		
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
None	5	11.9	53	46.1	58
One to three	22	15.1	52	58.9	74
TOTAL	27		105		132

$\chi^2 = 8.90$, $df = 1$, $p < .002$.

Responses to question eight were compared with response "G" of question 13. This was done to determine whether a relationship existed between a teacher's awareness of available conferences, etc., dealing with males in home economics and that teacher's belief that males had enrolled in home economics due to other reasons besides those suggested in the response section of question 13. The other teacher-specified reasons why males enrolled in home economics classes were listed in Appendix E. (See Table XV.)

The relationship was significant at the .041 level. Ninety-six teachers felt that males had enrolled in their classes for other reasons

besides those specified by other teachers in the comment section of question 13. A majority of those teachers who felt that males had enrolled in their home economics classes due to other reasons indicated that there had been no conferences, etc., available to them dealing with males in home economics.

TABLE XV

CHI SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF AVAILABLE CONFERENCES DEALING WITH MALE STUDENTS IN HOME ECONOMICS AND MALES ENROLLING DUE TO OTHER REASONS

Number of Available Conferences	Males Enrolled Due to Other Reasons				n
	Yes		No		
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
None	21	15.8	37	42.2	58
One to three	15	20.2	59	53.8	74
TOTAL	36		96		132

$$x^2 = 4.16, df = 1, p < .041.$$

Responses to question eight were compared with response "D" of question 21. This was done to determine whether a relationship existed between a teacher's awareness of available conferences, etc., dealing with males in home economics and that teacher's attendance at professional organizations. (See Table XVI.)

The relationship was significant at the .003 level. The majority of the teachers who were aware of one to three conferences available

dealing with males in home economics indicated that they belonged to and attended professional organizations.

TABLE XVI

CHI SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF AVAILABLE CONFERENCES DEALING WITH MALE STUDENTS IN HOME ECONOMICS AND TEACHERS ATTENDING PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Number of Available Conferences	Teachers Attending Professional Organizations				n
	Yes		No		
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
None	44	49.5	13	7.5	57
One to three	69	63.5	4	9.5	73
TOTAL	113		17		130

$$x^2 = 8.45, df = 1, p < .003.$$

Responses to question eight were compared with response "B" of question 22. This was done to determine whether a relationship existed between a teacher's awareness of available conferences, etc., dealing with males in home economics and that teacher's attendance at school related activities--in this case, school pep rallies. (See Table XVII.)

The relationship was significant at the .04 level. Those teachers who knew of conferences dealing with males in home economics indicated that they attended school pep rallies. One hundred and five of the participating sample indicated that they attended school pep rallies.

TABLE XVII

CHI SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE NUMBER
OF AVAILABLE CONFERENCES DEALING WITH MALE STUDENTS
IN HOME ECONOMICS AND TEACHERS ATTENDING
PEP RALLIES

Number of Available Conferences	Teachers Attending Pep Rallies				n
	Yes		No		
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
None	41	45.8	17	12.2	58
One to three	64	59.2	11	15.8	75
TOTAL	105		28		133

$$\chi^2 = 4.22, df = 1, p < .04.$$

Responses to question eight were compared with response "C" of question 22. This was done to determine whether a relationship existed between a teacher's awareness of available conferences, etc., dealing with males in home economics and that teacher's attendance at school related activities--in this case, school band or chorus concerts. (See Table XVIII.)

The relationship was significant at the .002 level. Those teachers who indicated that there had been one to three conferences in the last year dealing with males in home economics reported that they had attended band or chorus concerts.

The hypothesis was accepted for the independent variable of length of teaching experience. There was no significant relationship between teaching successful co-educational secondary home economics classes and

the length of teaching experience--either total experience or length of teaching experience in co-educational classes.

TABLE XVIII

CHI SQUARE VALUE REFLECTING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE NUMBER OF AVAILABLE CONFERENCES DEALING WITH MALE STUDENTS IN HOME ECONOMICS AND TEACHERS ATTENDING BAND OR CHORUS CONCERTS

Number of Available Conferences	Teachers Attending Band or Chorus Concerts				n
	Yes		No		
	Observed	Expected	Observed	Expected	
None	21	29.7	37	28.3	58
One to three	47	38.3	28	36.7	75
TOTAL	68		65		133

$$x^2 = 9.16, df = 1, p < .002.$$

The hypothesis was not accepted for the independent variables of total teacher involvement in school and community activities, age, and method of procuring male students. There was a significant relationship between the questions which identified teaching success and a teacher's total involvement in school and community activities, a teacher's age, and reasons why males enrolled in home economics.

The research question asked if there were preferred teaching methods used in specific learning situations when home economics classes were co-educational. Frequencies in questions 23 through 26 were compared.

Response frequencies to questions 23 and 24 were compared to identify preferred teaching methods in co-educational laboratory classes. Frequencies were almost identical in each question. Demonstration might be preferred in co-ed classes. Lecture was used slightly more in all female classes. Educational tours were not selected in either situation. (See Table XIX.)

Response frequencies to questions 25 and 26 were compared to identify preferred teaching methods in co-educational theory classes. Frequencies were nearly the same. Teaching method selection only varied one or two frequencies per method in either situation. Discussion, simulation and games, and educational tours were the preferred teaching methods in each situation. (See Table XX.) Responses revealed no preferred teaching methods used in specific learning situations when home economics classes were co-educational.

Teacher Input Questions

The remaining teacher input questions were 15, 16, 18, 19, 27, and 28. Question 15 identified the most immediate help that teachers would like provided to better deal with males in their classrooms. Approximately 60 percent or 82 respondents indicated that they would like additional materials designed for male students. Instructional methods or techniques for working with males were requested by approximately 39 percent or 54 respondents. (See Table XXI.)

Question 16 sought the sources of information teachers might turn to for help when they encountered teaching problems by having males in their classrooms. Ninety-six teachers or approximately 70 percent of the participating sample indicated that they would turn to other home

TABLE XIX
PREFERRED TEACHING METHODS USED IN A LABORATORY SITUATION

Teaching Method Choice	Frequency	Percent*
<u>23. Co-educational Clothing Laboratory</u>		
Discussion	11	7.85
Simulation and Games	1	.07
Lecture	4	2.85
Case Study	0	.00
Educational Tours	0	.00
Demonstration	135	96.42
Other	8	5.71
TOTAL	159	
<u>24. All Female Clothing Laboratory</u>		
Discussion	13	9.28
Simulation and Games	2	1.42
Lecture	9	6.42
Case Study	1	.71
Educational Tours	0	.00
Demonstration	126	90.00
Other	8	5.71
TOTAL	159	

*Percentage responses will sum to greater than 100 because of multiple response.

TABLE XX

PREFERRED TEACHING METHODS USED IN A THEORY SITUATION

Teaching Method Choice	Frequency	Percent*
<u>25. Co-educational Theory Class--</u>		
<u>Unit on Banking</u>		
Discussion	41	29.28
Simulation and Games	48	34.28
Lecture	25	17.85
Case Study	15	10.71
Educational Tours	48	34.28
Laboratory	19	13.57
Demonstration	15	10.71
Other	17	12.14
TOTAL	228	
<u>26. All Female Theory Class--</u>		
<u>Unit on Banking</u>		
Discussion	46	32.85
Simulation and Games	48	34.28
Lecture	27	19.28
Case Study	13	9.28
Educational Tours	46	32.85
Laboratory	20	14.28
Demonstration	15	10.71
Other	14	10.00
TOTAL	229	

*Percentage responses will sum to greater than 100 because of multiple responses.

TABLE XXI
 MOST IMMEDIATE HELP TEACHERS WOULD LIKE PROVIDED
 TO DEAL WITH MALE STUDENTS

Type of Help	Frequency	Percent*
Added materials designed for male students	82	59.42
Instruction methods or techniques for working with male students	54	39.13
No help is needed, male students are no problem for me	37	26.81
Other	6	4.32
TOTAL	179	

*Percentage responses will sum to greater than 100 because of multiple response.

economics teachers if they encountered problems working with male students. Professional journals were tapped for information by approximately 41 percent or 57 teachers. University courses were the least used sources of information with only approximately nine percent or 13 teachers reporting them as a source where they obtained helpful information concerning teaching problems with males. It should be noted that the availability of other teachers or journals was greater and more accessible than university courses. (See Table XXII.)

TABLE XXII
INFORMATIONAL SOURCES TEACHERS USE TO SOLVE TEACHING
PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED WITH MALES

Source of Information	Frequency	Percent*
Professional journals	57	41.30
Co-workers other than home economics teachers	47	34.05
Other home economics teachers	96	69.56
Workshops, conferences, seminars, etc.	52	37.68
University courses	16	11.59
Other	13	9.42
TOTAL	271	

*Percentage response will sum to greater than 100 because of multiple response.

Subjects or topics that might make teachers uncomfortable while teaching them in mixed company were identified in question 18. Approximately 82 percent or 97 teachers reported that there were none. Four teachers reported family living, five--child development, five--clothing, and one--work orientation. Several sample members commented on the question, suggesting ways that they overcame their uncomfortable feeling (Appendix E).

Question 19 sought locations where teachers would like to receive helpful information concerning teaching male students. Approximately 50 percent indicated that they would prefer either university extension courses in their local areas or summer workshops. (See Table XXIII.)

TABLE XXIII

LOCATIONS WHERE TEACHERS WOULD LIKE TO RECEIVE TEACHING
INFORMATION CONCERNING MALES

Location	Frequency	Percent*
University extension courses offered in local area	70	50.72
Summer workshops	71	51.44
University summer courses	17	12.31
University night courses	5	3.62
Other	13	9.42
TOTAL	176	

*Percentage response will sum to greater than 100 because of multiple response.

Question 20 requested what information would be useful to include in teacher preparation programs to help new teachers work with co-educational classes. Approximately 58 percent or 80 respondents felt that motivational techniques designed for use with males would be useful in teacher preparation programs. The results of question 20 indicated that the respondents felt that all of the provided suggestions would be useful in teacher preparation programs. (See Table XXIV.)

TABLE XXIV
INFORMATION THAT WOULD BE USEFUL FOR TEACHER PREPARATION

Type of Information	Frequency	Percent*
Information concerning males and how to work with them	48	34.78
Motivational techniques designed for use with males	80	57.97
Curriculum designed or altered to fit needs of males	65	47.10
Resource materials designed for use with males	55	39.85
Classroom management and control techniques to use in co-educational classes	69	50.00
Other	4	2.89
TOTAL	321	

*Percentage response will sum to greater than 100 because of multiple response.

Responses to question 27--the positive aspects experienced by having male students in co-educational classes--were compiled and can be found in Appendix C. Responses to question 28--the problems encountered by having male students in co-educational classes--were compiled and can be found in Appendix D.

Summary

This chapter presented the results of the study. The chapter contained the description of the participating sample, an analysis of the data in accordance with the stated hypothesis and research question of the study, and the results from the response portions of the questionnaire which were not specified in the hypothesis and research question.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Introduction

Male participation in vocational home economics at the secondary level increased sharply in the early 1970's. Changes in society and the implementation of Title IX regulations contributed to this increase. Some vocational home economics teachers were teaching males in their programs before Title IX. Since the implementation of the Title IX regulations, these teachers and others who were not teaching males were urged to allow open enrollment into their programs. Teachers could no longer segregate boys into classes titled "Bachelor Survival" or some other all male designed class; they had to accept males equally with females in all of their program's classes. This study was designed to determine what was happening in vocational home economics programs which reported co-educational classes. Information gathered through this study might then be shared with existing non-co-educational programs and home economics teacher education programs. This information might inform in-service and pre-service teachers about a segment of the secondary population that was increasing to the point where they should be ready and trained to smoothly incorporate its participation into their programs.

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to determine preferred teaching methods used when males were present in secondary vocational home economics classes and to consider the implications of the findings for teacher training. The objectives were:

1. Assess the effect of selected variables on teaching success of co-educational secondary home economics classes.
2. Identify if there were preferred teaching methods used in specific learning situations when home economics courses were co-educational.
3. Make recommendations based on the findings of this study for inservice training and for preparatory service training in vocational home economics teacher education and for further research.

Hypothesis and Research Question

To accomplish the objectives of the study one null hypothesis and one research question were used:

Hypothesis--There will be no significant relationship between teaching successful co-educational secondary home economics classes and (1) length of teaching experience, (2) total teacher involvement in school and community activities, (3) age, and (4) method of procuring male students.

Research Question--Will there be preferred teaching methods used in specific learning situations when home economics courses are co-educational?

Limitations

Five limitations to this study were recognized. These limitations were:

1. The study was limited to vocational home economics teachers in the State of Oklahoma.
2. The study was limited to voluntary responses to an instrument from a sample group.
3. The study was limited to home economics programs that had male participation in them since the 1975-76 term.
4. The study was limited to the accuracy of the Home Economics Annual State Reports in compiling the population group.
5. The study was limited to the various interpretations of the Title IX regulations and the degree of compliance to them in vocational home economics programs throughout the State.

Population and Sampling

The population for this study included 240 vocational home economics programs which had reported male enrollment since the 1975-76 term. The population was compiled from Annual Reports obtained from the Home Economics Division of the State Department of Vocational Education in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

A stratified proportional percentage was randomly drawn from the population group of programs. The sample was randomly drawn in a proportional 66 percent from each of the six vocational districts in Oklahoma.

Instrument Design

The instrument of the study was developed by the researcher. The instrument was designed to identify the independent and dependent variables in the hypothesis and research question of the study. The independent variables in the hypothesis were length of teaching experience, total teacher involvement in school and community activities, the age of the teacher, and the method of procuring male students into a class. The dependent variable in the hypothesis was teaching successful co-educational secondary home economics classes which was defined for this study to mean those teachers who did not indicate that they needed help with teaching boys in their classes and those that attended available educational offerings concerning males in home economics. The independent variable in the research question was specific learning situations and the dependent variable was teaching methods. The questionnaire was reviewed by faculty and graduate students in the Department of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University. Two open response questions were included to allow respondents an opportunity to express positive and negative aspects of co-educational teaching.

Data Collection

The questionnaire was mailed to 198 teachers in 160 programs which met the population criteria. A follow-up postcard was sent to sample members who did not respond after 16 days. The number of usable responses was 145 teachers in 127 programs which represented 75 percent of the invited teachers in 79 percent of the invited programs.

Statistical Analysis

The data were analyzed utilizing the Statistical Analysis System (SAS). Chi Square procedures and product frequencies comparisons were used to determine relationships as outlined in the hypothesis.

Results and Conclusions

The following results were substantiated by statistical analysis. Analysis indicated that:

1. The amount of teaching experience did not significantly relate to teaching success in co-educational home economics classes. It should be noted that the amount of information gathered for this analysis was too sparse for valid analysis using Chi Square calculations.
2. The total teacher involvement in school and community activities DID significantly relate to teaching success in co-educational home economics classes.
3. The age of a teacher DID significantly relate to teaching success in co-educational home economics classes.
4. The method of procuring male students DID significantly relate to teaching success in co-educational home economics classes.
5. There were not any preferred teaching methods used in specific learning situations in co-educational home economics classes. The same teaching methods were preferred in the specific learning situations provided regardless of class composition.

Recommendations

Further research is needed to determine why those vocational home

economics programs that did not report male enrollment in Annual Reports since the 1975-76 term did not have males. There must surely be reasons why boys were not in those programs and it would be interesting to find out why. A study to determine how boys view their participation in home economics could produce results that would help teachers plan classes that were geared to be relevant to both male and female students. It could also help first year teachers or teachers who were starting a co-educational program know a little of what to expect from boys in their classrooms. Other variables could be explored in further research. An example would be the age level of the students in co-educational home economics classes in relationship to the selection and use of teaching methods. Reorganization of the instrument would be necessary in further research.

Subject matter concerning males in home economics should be included in future workshops, conferences or seminars to help existing teachers work with male students in their programs. The male student and his presence in the classroom should be included in college preparatory classes for teachers. It should be stressed that males are here to stay in home economics at all levels and that everyone should further promote their participation in it. Teachers from the very beginning of their training should realize that they should expect and want males in their classrooms.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, E. High school bachelors break away from tradition. Forecast for Home Economics, 1971, 17(2), F-48, F-78.
- Aldous, J. Women employed: impact on the family. Journal of Home Economics, 1977, 69(5), 14-17.
- Amendments and acts. Journal of Home Economics, 1972, 64(5), 31-32.
- Anthony, H. Boys in the homemaking department. Journal of Home Economics, 1956, 48, 327-330.
- Baker, L. G. The enigma of men in home economics. Journal of Home Economics, 1969, 61, 371-373.
- Baker, L. G. The male role in home economics. Forecast for Home Economics, 1971, 17(2), F-47, F-74.
- Barlow, M. L. 200 years of vocational education 1776-1976--the vocational education age emerges, 1876-1926. Journal of the American Vocational Association, 1976, 51(5), 45-58.
- Bartz, A. E. Basic Statistical Concepts in Education and the Behavioral Sciences. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Burgess Publishing Company, 1976.
- Best, J. W. Research in Education. (3rd ed.) Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1977.
- Butts, B. "Men, the future and home economics" male home economists react. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1977, XX, 206-214.
- Cole, C. L. Perspectives on the family in the year 2000. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1977, XX, 242-248.
- Coon, B. I. Home Economics in the Public Secondary Schools: A Report of a National Study (United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, OE-83101, Circular No. 661). Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1962.
- Coward, R. T. and Kerckhoff, F. G. Parent education in the public schools. Journal of Home Economics, 1978, 70(2), 24-27.
- Cox, C. B. The citizen role of man in family education. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1967, 10(1), 18-23.

- Cross, A. A. Charting the course for consumer homemaking education. Journal of the American Vocational Association, 1979, 54(4), 37-39, 43.
- Davidson, J. S. Coeducational classes stress lifetime skills. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1977, XX, 169-171.
- Davis, S. and Johnson, H. The role of the male homemaker. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1977, XXI, 75-78.
- Division of Vocational and Technical Education. Summary Data, Vocational Education: Fiscal Year 1972 (Department of Health, Education and Welfare OE). Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1973.
- Dobry, A. M. Title IX what's all the fuss about? Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1977, XX, 154-158.
- Dowell, J. H. and Greenwood, B. B. The Masculine Focus in Home Economics. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1975.
- Durbin, A. and Sutton, R. Bachelor Living: Curriculum Guide for Consumer and Homemaking Education. Lexington, Kentucky: Kentucky University Vocational Education Curriculum Development Center, 1974.
- Ellington, C. FHA/HERO serves boys too. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1977, XXI, 79-82.
- Ellis, M. Why we encourage homemaking for boys. Practical Home Economics Teacher Education of CO-ED, 1958, 3(6), 18-19.
- Farquhar, N. and Mohlman, C. Life competence: a non-sexist introduction to practical arts. Social Education, 1973, 37(Oct.), 516-522.
- Firth, M. M. Teaching family relationships to mixed classes. Journal of Home Economics, 1937, 29, 151-153.
- Geddes, E. I. Boys and girls together in a wartime home economics program. Practical Home Economics, 1943, 21, 300-301.
- Gough, N. P. "Men, the future and home economics" male home economists react. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1977, XX, 213.
- Greer, C. C. When, how much, and to whom should home economics be taught? Journal of Home Economics, 1919, XI, 235-241.
- Harper, M. and Russell, E. Coping with boys in homemaking classes. Forecast for Home Economists, 1955, 71(5), 17, 46.
- Harriman, L. C. Changing roles: implications for home economics. Journal of Home Economics, 1977, 69(2), 11-13.
- Home economics for boys. Journal of Home Economics, 1927, 19, 145-150.

- Home economics insider. Journal of the American Vocational Association, 1979, 54(3), 30a-30h.
- Homemaking Education in Secondary Schools of the United States (Federal Security Agency, Office of Education--Vocational Education Division). Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1947.
- Hunt, M. L. Vocational home economics present and future. Journal of Home Economics, 1972, 65(5), 26-31.
- Innovation in Home Economics. Washington, D. C.: National Education Association, 1967.
- Kauffman, T. E. Teaching Problems in Home Economics. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1930.
- Kissen, F. Boys study homemaking. The Parents Magazine, 1930, V(3), 27, 64-65.
- Kohlmann, E. L. Helping young men prepare for changing roles. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1975a, 18, 273-275.
- Kohlmann, E. L. Home Economics for Young Men: A Teaching Guide. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1975b.
- Krejcie, R. V. and Morgan, D. W. Determining sample size for research activities. Education and Psychological Measurement, 1970, 30, 607-610.
- Langworthy, C. F. Home economics work in the United States for men and boys. Journal of Home Economics, 1913, 5, 239-248.
- Lawson, R. J. Tigers amongst the roses: a historical review of home economics for secondary school boys in the United States. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1977, XX, 215-225.
- Lee, E. A. Education for homemaking as a man sees it. Journal of Home Economics, 1930, 22, 352-357.
- Livingstone, H. Home economics for boys in public schools. Journal of Home Economics, 1925, 17, 434-436.
- Longworth, D. S. The male role in home economics. Forecast for Home Economics Teacher Edition of CO-ED, 1971, 17(2), F-47, F-74.
- Mack, F. Evaluation of training for boys in home economics. Practical Home Economics, 1933, XI, 104-124.
- Mathews, J. Opening the door to reform. Compact, 1974, 8(July/August), 19-21.
- Montgomery, J. E. "Men the future and home economics" male home economists react. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1977, XX, 206-214.

- Moriarty, R. Guy--FHA/HERO. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1979, XXII, 223-225.
- Norton, A. Home economics for boys--a bibliography. Practical Home Economics, 1932, 10, 198, 212.
- Oklahoma State Department of Vocational-Technical Education Information Services Unit. Unpublished Enrollment Data for 1978-79 Term. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Computer Print-Out, 1979.
- Oklahoma Vocational Home Economics Curriculum Guide for Family Living. Stillwater, Oklahoma: State Department of Vocational-Technical Education, 1978.
- Position paper--a unified front on vocational home economics--statement from the professional coalition. Journal of the American Vocational Association, 1979, 54(5), 51-53.
- Pruitt, A. F. Likes and dislikes of high school males in regard to clothing units in vocational home economics programs in Oklahoma. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1979.
- Quick, B. G. Boys unlimited are you ready to teach boys? What's New in Home Economics, 1974, XXXVIII(2), 39-41.
- Radder, E. A. and Baker, G. G. Teaching a boy to cook and a girl to sew. Practical Home Economics, 1933, XI, 182.
- Richardson, J. N. The vocational home economics teacher's role in eliminating sexism in the school. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1977, XX, 162-164.
- Roberts, R. W. Vocational and Practical Art Education--History, Development and Principles. (2nd ed.) New York: Harper and Row, 1965.
- Sinowitz, B. E. Title IX, further regulations barring sex bias. Today's Education, 1975, 64(November-December), 110.
- Spitze, The future of secondary home economics. Journal of Home Economics, 1977, 69(2), 7-10.
- Steinhilber, A. W. Here's what the tough new federal rules against sex bias mean for public schools. The American School Board Journal, 1974, 161(August), 20-21.
- Straub, H. K. Report of the committee on home economics for boys. Journal of Home Economics, 1936, 28, 539-540.
- Straub, H. Home economics--for boys. Journal of Home Economics, 1938, 30, 557.
- Swope, M. R. The future: what's in it for secondary school home economics? Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1974, 18, 6-9.

- Szinovacz, M. Women employed: effects on spouses' division of household work. Journal of Home Economics, 1979, 71(2), 42-45.
- Thurston, P. W. Title IX and home economics instruction. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1977, XX, 159-161.
- Van Liew, M. S. Home economics for boys in New York state. Forecast, 1936, 52(4), 102-104, 127, 144.
- Vocational home economics education: the legislative aspects. Journal of Home Economics, 1976, 68(2), 34-35.
- Williamson, M. and Lyle, M. S. Homemaking Education in the High School. (4th Ed.) New York, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1961.
- Wingert, J. The father role: how your students view their fathers. Illinois Teacher of Home Economics, 1978, XXII, 76-78.
- United States Statutes at Large. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Press, 1964.
- United States Statutes at Large. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Press, 1969.
- United States Statutes at Large. Washington, D. C.: United States Government Printing Press, 1973.

APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT USED IN STUDY

CODE _____

Males in Secondary Vocational Home Economics

Co-educational Classes

Directions: For the following questions, please select the ONE answer that is MOST descriptive of yourself and your home economics program. Write the letter of your choice in the blank to the left of the question.

- ____ 1. How many years have you taught, including the present year?
- | | |
|------------|---------------------|
| A. 1 year | F. 6 to 10 years |
| B. 2 years | G. 11 to 15 years |
| C. 3 years | H. 16 to 20 years |
| D. 4 years | I. 21 to 25 years |
| E. 5 years | J. 26 or more years |
- ____ 2. How many years have you taught in your present teaching situation, including the present year?
- | | |
|------------|---------------------|
| A. 1 year | F. 6 to 10 years |
| B. 2 years | G. 11 to 15 years |
| C. 3 years | H. 16 to 20 years |
| D. 4 years | I. 21 to 25 years |
| E. 5 years | J. 26 or more years |
- ____ 3. Which age bracket most nearly fits you?
- | | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| A. 20 to 24 years old | E. 40 to 44 years old |
| B. 25 to 29 years old | F. 45 to 49 years old |
| C. 30 to 34 years old | G. 50 to 54 years old |
| D. 35 to 39 years old | H. 55 or more |
- ____ 4. How many years have you taught males in co-educational home economics classes, including the present year?
- | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|
| A. 1 to 3 years | D. 10 to 12 years |
| B. 4 to 6 years | E. 13 to 15 years |
| C. 7 to 9 years | F. Over 15 years |
- ____ 5. How do the performances of boys compare to the performances of girls in your co-educational home economics classes?
- A. They are better
 - B. They about the same
 - C. They are not as good

- ___ 6. Do you feel that you need assistance or help in working with the male students in your co-educational home economics classes?
- A. Yes
B. No
C. No experience

COMMENTS:

- ___ 7. Do you feel that male students belong in home economics classes?
- A. Yes
B. No
C. No opinion

COMMENTS:

- ___ 8. How many conferences, workshops or seminars were available to you in the last year in which the subject matter dealt with male students in co-educational home economics classes?
- A. Zero
B. 1 to 3
C. 4 to 6
D. More than 6

- ___ 9. How many of the available conferences, workshops or seminars in which the subject matter dealt with male students in home economics did you attend in the last year?
- A. Zero
B. 1 to 3
C. 4 to 6
D. More than 6

- ___ 10. List the approximate enrollment of your co-educational home economics class/classes in the chart below.

		Academic Year		
		1976-77	1977-78	1978-79
MALES				
FEMALES				

Directions: For the following questions, please select the answer(s) that is/are descriptive about yourself and your home economics program. Write the letter(s) of your choice(s) in the blanks to the left of the question. You may record more than one response.

- ___ 11. What classroom experience (contact) have you had in the last three years with male students in your home economics program?
- A. All male classes
 - B. Co-educational classes
 - C. No classroom experience with males
 - D. Other experience, please specify _____
- ___ 12. What is the age level of the male students presently enrolled in your home economics classes?
- A. 12 to 15 years of age
 - B. 16 to 18 years of age
 - C. Both of the above age groups
 - D. I have no male students in my classes at this time
 - E. Other ages, please specify _____
- ___ 13. Why did males enroll in your home economics program?
- A. An easy "A"
 - B. Peer influence or pressure
 - C. Administrative action, Title IX regulations
 - D. Parental influence
 - E. Recruitment on your part
 - F. Personal interest
 - G. Other, please specify _____
- ___ 14. What type(s) of courses are male students taking in your home economics program?
- A. Courses planned for all male students
 - B. Courses planned to be co-educational
 - C. Other courses, please specify _____
- ___ 15. What is the most immediate help you would like provided in order to better deal with male students in your co-educational classes?
- A. Additional materials designed for male students
 - B. Instruction methods or techniques for working with males
 - C. No help is needed, male students are no problem for me
 - D. Other, please specify _____

- ___16. Where do you obtain helpful information concerning teaching problems encountered by having male students in your classroom?
- A. Professional journals
 - B. Co-workers other than home economics teachers
 - C. Other home economics teachers
 - D. Workshops, conferences, seminars, etc.
 - E. University courses
 - F. Other, please specify _____
- ___17. What subjects or topics do your male students seem to relate to and want to gain more information and knowledge about?
- A. Clothing
 - B. Foods and nutrition
 - C. Consumer education
 - D. Family living
 - E. Career orientation
 - F. Child development
 - G. Other _____
- ___18. Are there any subjects or topics that make you uncomfortable when teaching them in mixed company?
- A. Clothing
 - B. Foods and nutrition
 - C. Consumer education
 - D. Family living
 - E. Career orientation
 - F. Child development
 - G. Other _____
- If so, then how do you overcome these uncomfortable feelings?___
- _____
- ___19. Where would you most like to receive helpful information concerning teaching male students?
- A. University extension courses offered in local area
 - B. Summer workshops
 - C. University summer courses
 - D. University night courses
 - E. Other, please specify _____
- ___20. What information do you feel would be useful in the teacher preparation programs to help new teachers who will be working with co-educational classes?
- A. Information concerning the characteristics of male students and how to work with these characteristics
 - B. Motivational techniques designed for use with male students
 - C. Curriculum designed or altered to fit the needs of male students
 - D. Resource materials designed for use with male students
 - E. Instruction in classroom management and control techniques for working with either all male or co-educational classes
 - F. Other, please specify _____

COMMENTS:

- ____ 21. Which of the following types of organizations do you belong to and attend regularly?
- A. Honor society (scholastic, scientific, professional)
 - B. Community social organizations
 - C. Church related organizations
 - D. Professional organizations or associations
 - E. Other, please specify _____
- ____ 22. Which of the following do you attend regularly?
- A. School related sporting events
 - B. School pep rallies
 - C. Band or chorus concerts
 - D. P.T.A. or P.T.O. meetings
 - E. Other school related activities or events, please specify _____
-

Directions: Based on your experience in teaching male students in your classroom, which teaching method or technique would you use and prefer to use in the following situations? Please select the ONE method or technique that you would prefer to use in each of the following situations. Write the letter of your choice in the blank to the left of the question.

Situation A: Laboratory Class

- ____ 23. You are conducting a unit in beginning clothing construction. The class consists of 12 boys and 12 girls. The project they are to complete is a chef's apron that they will use later in a foods unit. What predominant method or procedure would you use to teach this class? Write the letter of your choice in the blank to the left of the question.
- A. Discussion
 - B. Simulation and games
 - C. Lecture
 - D. Case study
 - E. Educational tours
 - F. Demonstration
 - G. Other _____

COMMENTS:

- ____ 24. What predominant method or procedure would you use to teach this same unit if the class consisted only of girls? Write the letter of your choice in the blank to the left of the question.
- A. Discussion
 - B. Simulation and games
 - C. Lecture
 - D. Case study
 - E. Educational tours
 - F. Demonstration
 - G. Other _____

COMMENTS:

Situation B: Theory Class

___ 25. You are teaching a unit on banking. Concepts covered are checking and savings accounts, interest, credit, and record keeping. Your class consists of 12 boys and 10 girls, all juniors and seniors. What predominant method or procedure would you use to teach this class? Write the letter of your choice in the blank to the left of the question.

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| A. Discussion | E. Educational tours |
| B. Simulation and games | F. Laboratory |
| C. Lecture | G. Demonstration |
| D. Case study | H. Other _____ |

COMMENTS:

___ 26. What predominant method or procedure would you use to teach this same unit if the class consisted only of girls? Write the letter of your choice to the left of the question.

- | | |
|-------------------------|----------------------|
| A. Discussion | E. Educational tours |
| B. Simulation and games | F. Laboratory |
| C. Lecture | G. Demonstration |
| D. Case study | H. Other _____ |

COMMENTS:

Directions: Please respond to the following questions in the spaces provided.

___ 27. What positive aspects have you experienced by having male students in your co-educational classes?

___ 28. What problems have you encountered by having male students in your co-educational classes?

APPENDIX B

CORRESPONDENCE



OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

 Department of Home Economics Education
 372-6211, Ext. 486

74074

May 2, 1979

Dear Home Economics Teacher,

I realize that this is coming to you at a busy time, but please take a few minutes to finish reading this letter. Then please take 15 more minutes to fill out and return the enclosed questionnaire by May 15, 1979. A self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

I am Phyllis Stratton, a graduate student, working on a masters degree in Home Economics Education at Oklahoma State University. I need your assistance to complete my research. With your help I want to identify influences of males on teaching method selection and use in co-educational home economics classes.

I am particularly interested in obtaining your responses because your experience with male students makes you a prime source of information. Your sharing will help present, as well as future vocational home economics teachers in co-educational teaching situations.

The increasing enrollment of males in secondary home economics classes makes it desirable for us to know the effect and plan training to meet the needs. This is an effort on our part to identify differences and their implications for teacher training.

Thank you very much for your cooperation and I look forward to sharing my findings with you at your request.

Sincerely,

 Phyllis A. Stratton
 O.S.U. graduate student

 Bettye J. Gaffney
 Thesis Advisor
 Home Economics Education

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**

Department of Home Economics Education

May 18, 1979

Dear Home Economics Teacher,

A few days ago you received a questionnaire --
"Males in Secondary Vocational Home Economics Co-
Educational Classes". I know that you are very
busy but will you please return the questionnaire
by May 25, 1979.

Sincerely,

Phyllis A. Stratton
Phyllis A. Stratton
O.S.U. graduate student

Bettye Gaffney
Bettye Gaffney
Thesis Advisor

APPENDIX C

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 27

Question 27: What positive aspects have you experienced by having male students in your co-educational classes?

I have realized they need everything that is taught in home economics!

They clean-up their mess in the kitchen better than the girls and they plan better.

More like real life.

They add depth because of adding their opinions and it makes a more realistic situation.

It has made the teaching of home economics more realistic.

More realistic approach to family living added discussion.

Having boys in the class is more of a challenge.

I have not had them (boys) in co-ed classes.

They are usually anxious to try anything, are not as particular or scared to try and are very pleased with themselves and their accomplishments.

The males seem to feel they have really accomplished something after they have mastered a concept in food or clothing.

They are very eager to learn, and are very responsive to most teaching methods.

I enjoy their sincerity and joy of satisfaction with their accomplishments.

Their motivation and enthusiasm.

They are very open about everything (sometimes too open), very energetic and enthusiastic.

Usually they are eager to learn how to do things correctly.

They are enthusiastic and seem interested.

More easily motivated. Often have more energy and interest than girls.

Eagerness.

They are more eager to do because it is new and different. Boys don't hold grudges. My teaching had definitely been challenged to teach what's relevant.

Seeing their pleasure at having succeeded with a laboratory project.

They are fun kids, full of life and energy.

They feel great accomplishment when they prepare a dish or meal.

More enthusiasm.

They are eager to be an active part of the homemaking picture.

The thrill of seeing their reaction when they accomplish something.

The male students are more proud of the sewing projects than the girls.
Most of the boys are very interested in home economics.

Teaches family life and cooperation more easily. Gives a feeling of family unity in home economics classes, if ages correspond.

The boys I have had did not like textbook materials--they want up-to-date materials that really relate to their interests.

They are very eager to learn--but don't want to be bothered with a lot of little details.

Makes males and females understand each other better.

Makes other students realize that both men and women have to make a home together.

Males becoming more interested in the home and the aspects of homemaking.

They are just as interested in the family as a unit as the girls are.

Interest in cost of "fixed" living expenses, shared household duties, "two income" families, and child care.

They are interested in foods and child care, and in using money and consumer education to buy cars and furniture, the uses of credit.

I think the boys and girls have both learned to understand each others' feelings better. It has been a good experience.

Many young men have found a talent in sewing and that they really like children--they do benefit from personal finance units.

An awareness (of students) that traditional roles of females and males are flexible and are changing.

Most students are aware of their needs in phases of home economics classes and they try to improve and get the most out of the classes.

They appreciate the opportunity to get some help in the family life area. Male students have shown a real interest in our family living class. Each year I have to ask some to find another class because of our limited space.

Unit material must be relevant, no busy work can be used.

I've learned more about boys and how to deal with them in class-type situations.

Broaden my enthusiasm.

I love teaching co-ed courses, there is always something interesting going on.

How to deal with the males, what they are interested in, how to control and involve the males and girls.

I have become more aware of the fact that boys belong in my classes.

Satisfaction is seeing a male learn.

I thoroughly enjoy having the boys. They really add a lot to the class--enthusiasm, male point of view, etc.

My boys are very interested and help the atmosphere in my classes.

Males usually respond favorably to the class offerings due to the fact they chose to be in the class and find our studies interesting. Females usually act more mature in my classes--when about half of the class are males.

They are more dedicated and their attitude of interest is so that the learning experiences are rewarding to both me and the students.

Girls behave better.

They are usually more cooperative and when they need help they ask, instead of going ahead and doing it.

They try as hard (if not harder) than girls. They like learning about married life, etc.

Family living is my favorite class. They are my most interested classes.

The boys and girls seem to motivate each other to do their best.

They encourage more class participation and cooperation.

Competition is stimulating to group.

They seem very interested. Some are more cooperative than the girls.

Knowing that some males have an interest in home economics through their actions.

We live in a co-educational world and there are very few experiences that are strictly male-female roles. I teach nothing that they don't both need to know.

Very interested in most areas. Good response from parents and from past students.

Better discussion--questions of a wider range. More competition between girls and boys.

They are better at discussion than the girls and move faster through the units.

A fresh and different viewpoint. The males seem to be more honest and outspoken with their opinions.

They add a great deal to the classes by providing more than one side to discussion questions. They have a great deal to offer home economics classes.

We get the male viewpoint during discussion periods, and I think it is important.

In human relations, students hear the male and female point of view.

A more practical approach both sides--point of view--to dating, marriage, etc.

Exposed to male viewpoint. Girls on best behavior when boys are in classroom. Find out home economics not necessarily an easy "A".

Having male point of view.

They have added many different viewpoints when discussing opinion type topics. They are at times a challenge to motivate.

I teach five classes of family living and in those classes boys are really important to make good discussions on family life. It is sharing of ideas of both males and females.

Males contribute much to class discussions.

Males add a positive aspect to discussions in family living. Also keep classes moving at a fast pace.

They do add to the classes. Surprisingly, they are very neat in the kitchen, more so than girls at times.

Wider interest in discussion groups, broader area of interest.

Always get the male and female attitudes about things.

More discussions of varied areas and opinions.

It is often good to have the male point of view in discussions. Some are more interested than girls who I've had in class before.

Males will follow a recipe more closely and try harder in food laboratory--I enjoy learning the male viewpoint on problems of dating, marriage, and parenthood.

They sometimes add a new point of view--they are more apt not to assume they need a certain skill and I must justify the worth of the curriculum more.

Different viewpoint, feelings, and way of doing things.

In personality development units, you get both sides of dating, emotions, etc. I enjoy having boys in class. Most of my boys are in family living and many times I find them more eager to learn than the girls.

Different point of view.

They are very vocal about likes, dislikes, wants, and needs. When the boys want to do something, they want to do it right.

The girls can gain the male students' point of view and not speculate on their opinions.

Attitudes change about marriage, child care, etc.

More discussion and different ideas about problem-solving kinds of activities--advantage in having the opposite sex's point of view.

They add the male opinion and aspect to discussion.

Helps to see both sides of a male-female role in family living and the male point of view in general.

The male student seems to be more anxious to learn. We also get a cross section in points of view. The students understand the opposite sex better when you have this.

Chance to participate in group projects with male point of view.

They stimulate discussion and often add a new idea or viewpoint.

Having the male point of view is good. I don't always agree with them, but different opinions spice up a group discussion.

They are quick thinkers and contribute much to class discussions.

Male point of view on parenting.

Balanced outlook--not all female--more emotions good and bad.

The exchange of ideas when discussing, demonstrating, etc.

I have had very few, family living is sixth hour and has been used as a dumping ground. It has been rescheduled for next year, so I hope to see some improvements.

Males do assignments and tasks in a hurry. You have to have a lot of work to keep them busy.

Male students generally like things to move quickly. They can motivate the girls.

High interest, work quickly.

They follow directions.

Boys learn and complete assignments quicker.

Male students need active doing activities--they are not good listeners but can get much done if they are actually doing it.

I prefer to have all males in one class and all females in another.

None (indicated by three teachers who flatly wrote "none" as a response).

Males if interested do much better than females.

They can achieve as well or better than the average girl. It is interesting to know them as students.

Those who are interested in learning are more sincere than girls.

Some really try (others of course don't) but those who do achieve as well as girls.

Boys saying they really needed to know the information.

It helps "round" the course out by bringing into view all the possible ways content of the course will be used later by students.

They add to the class by comments, know how, etc.

They really are enjoyable--I get along by not getting upset with them--take their teasing and tease back. They are very interesting to work with--in most cases they do fairly good work.

I love teaching the guys, I set up the program for an all male class, two years later we mixed the classes, it's great!

Classes more interesting.

They are much easier to teach. They listen, question, and follow-up when needed. Easier going than girls.

In some classes I have all girls and I have found that in the classes with boys, the girls work harder.

One boy is a second year student. He has a genuine interest and his contributions in our "preparation for marriage" unit were very interesting.

Just to know that I have made it through first year and survived--it can be done.

Most of the boys felt the class was beneficial--mainly foods and nutrition and family relations. The boys have been receptive to the program.

Variety.

They can do well and seem to really appreciate some things girls take for granted. Basically, not much difference.

They are interested if they haven't had home economics courses before.

My boys' class is not co-ed but I have found the classes enlightening and very enjoyable. I have to keep them very busy to cut down on any discipline problems. They are very creative and much better with the sewing machine than I anticipated. They made an apron and a shirt (with collar, yoke, set-in sleeves, cuffs, etc.). They also participated in the annual style show.

I teach family living, these students don't think of the class as "Home Ec.", therefore I don't have the problems that a HE I, II, III, IV would have. It is not stereotyped as a sissy's class. If my male students were treated differently they would act helpless and take advantage of the situation.

APPENDIX D

RESPONSES TO QUESTION 28

Question 28: What problems have you encountered by having male students in your co-educational classes?

My problem, getting used to certain phrases being funny or taken in other ways than meant.

Discipline is more difficult at times.

Discipline problems mostly.

They are louder, not as motivated, more of a discipline problem.

They are harder to discipline.

Perhaps a few more discipline problems but they are really such a delight to have in class, I really don't mind the extra noise, etc.

Discipline.

Discipline and motivation.

Discipline. Senior boys in home economics make it necessary to adopt teaching games. They want to study only cooking, eating, and sex.

Discipline sometimes is a problem, but I realize that most of it is my lack of preparation.

More discipline problems.

Occasionally, they would cause certain discipline problems; but this was due to class size (20 boys and 1 girl) and age range (14-18) mostly.

More activities need to be planned since boys are more active.

Males are more restless and more verbal in general. Some have a problem with self-control.

Cannot have an idle minute. Goals must be clearly stated and obtainable.

Mainly control at times--senior boys are not as mature as senior girls--this can cause problems in mixed classes. The boys seem to need work all the time, they are much louder and more active.

Have to plan more activities and keep them busier.

Must be better prepared for each day of class. Must be able to tolerate a higher noise level.

Noisier, need more material to keep them busy.

Maybe a little more noise and nothing else, it is enjoyable.

More total noise and confusion, more resistant to doing written work, less responsible with supplies and papers. Many helpful materials geared to girls.

Short attention spans.

Attention span short in some units. Teaching methods must differ with the male students.

Some students have been placed in the class because there is no other place and these students usually cause problems.

The majority seem to have been placed here without any real interest in home economics.

Disruptive and/or uncooperative behavior from students who did not choose the course, but were merely scheduled to take it. This caused problems for non-disruptive students as well.

My class is sometimes used as a dumping ground, so I have some dopers, and I don't care attitude kids.

For some males, depending on age, they don't respond as openly in a mixed group or they tend to show-off more.

For a few of the boys, it was all fun and games. I just could not find anything else that interested them.

Not taking the class serious.

Holding their interest in subjects they feel they do not need.

No problem in co-ed, but in the all male class there is the continuous "be quiet", "get to work", "leave him alone" type thing--my all male class is sophomores.

The boys really didn't cause any more problems than the girls did, however, there were lots of giggles from the boys during family living units.

Class is slower--need more motivation--they are not self-motivated. Male students are less respectable than females.

Keeping motivation high.

Work more slowly than girls in laboratory work.

Dressing during clothing section.

We do not have any dressing rooms so the students must leave the room; otherwise, none.

Clothing laboratory--measuring and fitting--dressing facilities a problem.

In clothing units--fitting. Menstruation is sometimes hard to explain. Occasionally, I have the usual "girls chase boys" type situation.

Changing requirements in clothing construction.

Dressing room--only one. Would like to have more interested boys.

I haven't really had problems as such--sometimes I do have to prod them in clothing, but I find the same with girls.

I have no problems. Many people create their own problems by looking for them where they don't necessarily exist. The teacher's attitude toward the class is most important.

To begin with, they expect to cook and eat all year.

Lack of interest in any area other than getting to eat.

Some just want to eat so they enroll, then they cause trouble for the other units while not in foods. Counselors assign me kids other classes don't want.

Some boys (as are some girls) are in the class only to play and eat, think it is an easy grade.

They want to cook and eat!

They would be happy to have food classes all year.

Often the poorer student or different or difficult boy is the one who will enroll in my situation.

Some males are put into home economics classes because they don't fit anywhere else and are discipline problems.

They think it is suppose to be an easy "A". Also, they think they should cook all the time.

Fourteen teachers indicated that they had not encountered any problems with the males in their co-educational classes.

The main problem I have encountered is rowdy behavior. The males seem to have more ways of distracting the rest of the class. This may be due to the individual personalities. Also, when it comes to some units, the males are slow to respond because the units have been traditionally associated with females.

Rowdy--must be doing something all the time.

Males are more rowdy, talk louder, etc.

Talking back, being smart in their talk, getting them settled down to work.

Acting up in class--sticking each other with pins.

Their language sometimes.

More unruly. Never assume they know anything, for many of them this is all very new.

Difficult to quieten down--especially when girls are in the classroom.

Girls act up more than boys. They think nothing applies to them--as they are all going to be bachelor millionaires.

No problems with the males but the females tend to be distracted because of the males.

Girls let boys take male role and vice versa--such as doing the dishes.

Seem to have problems with girls--they prefer all male class at times but no other problem in particular.

Mostly teasing, pranks, etc., not wanting to do their work, ganging together and not doing assignment. If working with girls group, it is easy to let girls do cooking and for them to watch.

No big ones--occasional show-off for the opposite sex.

Girls accepting the boys.

Girls try to show-off and find it hard to believe the guys are going to sew and cook also.

They want to "show-off" too much for the girls in class and some do not want to do clean-up tasks in front of girls.

Older boys in H.E. are distracting to the younger girls. I find that getting materials to interest both boys and girls is sometimes a problem.

In freshman classes--girls can't keep eyes and sometimes hands off.

Tendency for girls to be more talkative.

They can be very disruptive in class and tease the girls, if they are not kept busy.

Girls are not as open with discussion in the presence of males.

My girls work on projects as the boys watch.

The variety of interest in topics. The girls may really be interested in something and the boys aren't.

Girls sometimes respond differently than would otherwise.

Keeping the girls busy.

Girls will not discuss as freely and the boys and girls try to impress each other.

Girls are not as easy to handle with the mixed group.

Boys are more serious about learning experiences in the home economics field when they have no girls in the class, with girls they often "show-off" to cover their interest.

Showing off, not knowing any basic concepts girls normally have some idea about, planning on "no work and all cooking and eating". Further comments: Several years ago I taught varied all boy classes (one special education). They were very eager and interested. Since Title IX, the counselors have felt HEC was a nice place to put guys--look good on records, etc., and have PLACED many discipline problems, low interest students, potential drop-outs, etc., in class. It has not worked out at all and has been a PAIN for the boys involved, girls enrolled and ME. Junior high age should be an all boy class.

No real class problems, except more boys than girls participate in livestock shows and, therefore, are out of class a great deal.

As all-around athletes they are out of class a lot.

None, boys are fun and can contribute much to a classroom situation.

They are rough on equipment and I must provide more materials because they do move faster through it.

The younger boys must have more "hands on" experiences and tend to be more careless where safety is concerned.

Books and curriculums are written mostly for females.

Making fun of certain topics, refusing to do things that are not manly.

Think they shouldn't do certain things because it is "girls stuff". Males put in class because they can't pass anything else.

Apathy, resentment because of their male image they think they must keep up.

If they do not care to learn they really will not work. Image, too feminine.

Some think it is for girls only and they resent other boys telling them so.

Goof-off--won't get serious. Macho--they must not have anything upset the image--peer pressure, aided by our Vo. Ag. teacher who teases them.

No real problems have occurred, I've thoroughly enjoyed teaching co-ed classes. I feel males make a class more interesting.

Nothing serious.

I have not encountered any problems from my boys.

I enjoy working with the boys I have in class and I wish I had more. I have really not encountered any problems at all, not major ones.

No major problems.

I have really not had any problems, their presence has more positive aspects.

So far I've been lucky here, I don't feel I've had any problems that teachers don't deal with in other classes.

Have gotten good response with having boys. A lot of the times the boys bring in really good ideas and help balance the class.

None, I think they enjoy the competition and grades.

They think they should not have to do assignments or other things that are assigned for the female students. General questions over foods for example.

They believe you should do them special favors because they are boys. The four I have this year are in athletics and are very cocky at times, but are very enjoyable.

They hate paperwork.

Some boys do not feel they should have to do the assignments. Some boys are too interested in the girls.

Too large of an enrollment.

The boys surpass the girls to the point that the girls develop a reluctance to improve their skills.

Most recently I have had a class with only boys, so have had no problems with it being co-ed.

They act so silly in class--they intend to slop through things--don't pay attention to detail.

None--except they didn't know as much about foods and sewing--but were willing to learn and worked hard.

None, I like them in it.

Having males with no HEC background in same class with girls who have had one to three years of HEC.

Getting boys to realize the importance of being a homemaker. They seem to think they are in the class just for fun.

I takes more space for boys.

APPENDIX E

TEACHER COMMENTS

Question 5: How do the performances of boys compare to the performances of girls in your co-educational home economics classes?

Comments:

Depends on what we are studying, boys are more perfectionists in the foods lab.

Could go either way--the boys are very particular in foods but so sloppy in clothing.

Boys are about the same on lab assignments and they are not as good on written assignments.

In all boy classes, they are usually better.

Although the girls have had more experience at home, the boys are more "gung-ho" and seem more eager to learn.

The boys are as good in some areas and as a whole do not want to go into depth in most home economics areas.

Question 6: Do you feel that you need assistance or help in working with the male students in your co-educational home economics classes?

Comments:

I can always use help; however, I'm having no specific problems related to the boys.

Males will usually try to push you further and are more of a discipline problem generally.

A teacher needs to move at a much faster pace with boys as a rule than with girls.

There have not been male students in home economics at this school for several years as previous experiences did not work out well. However, there is interest both on my part and the male student population.

Only have boys in family living class, not in consumer homemaking classes.

I only have boys in family living classes.

I organized the bachelor living classes in Oklahoma in 1972---since then numerous others have offered help. Mine was through trial and error and is very successful.

Boys are enthusiastic and excited about learning. Boys are not difficult to work with, just keep them busy.

Materials that relate more to young men.

Usually I only have about five to seven boys at a time.

My situation, I feel, is unique; I had boys forced into my class and the Vo. Ag. teacher ridiculed them.

I need no more help than with female students. I have taught six years in science co-ed classes. Boys seem to respond to the same methods, etc., as girls.

More materials written for co-educational classes.

I feel that I can always use help with any class.

Boys seem to require more activity-type work. They get through with assignments much faster than the girls and cause problems if they are not busy all the time.

At times, I feel I could use help!

There is always room for improvement.

Only during sewing times.

Teaching materials are still needing adapting.

Most classes I have taken were taught by people who had been away from the high school setting for several years--they simply can't relate to the changes in students.

Materials are not abundant and I did not have any at first but I have accumulated enough.

Not assistance--less students.

The boys are able to follow the curriculum guide very well.

I need new ideas, period!

Need ideas in working with boys and girls at the same time.

Finding activities in which the boys will be interested.

Males need more help than girls when they are sewing.

I have only had one male student in with females and that was a night class when I taught at the area school. I now have one entire male class of junior and senior boys--family living.

I enjoy working with both male and female students. I would, however, prefer to have the boys alone and girls alone for homemaking and then bring them together during the junior and senior years for the family living classes.

Four teachers commented that they did not have males in their classes at this time or this year.

Question 7: Do you feel that male students belong in home economics classes?

Comments:

Five teachers commented definitely, most definitely, or very definitely.

In today's world with more mothers and wives working, the males are going to have to fill more roles at home.

Everyone needs the basic skills taught in home economics classes--especially child care and nutrition.

Only for one year.

Not co-educational home economics consumer education classes.

The roles are changing.

Yes, but in separate classes, as the boys let the girls do all the work. In comparison, the girls appear much brighter and the boys slower just because of the experience had at home.

We have more boys than girls enrolled in home economics in a high school of approximately 2,000.

Males need to feel that they are an important part of the family unit. This is one place they can learn.

Everyone is a homemaker.

Some male students do.

If family living wasn't a class offered to boys, I would say yes.

I teach curriculum that they are never exposed to elsewhere that I feel is essential for family life.

I think all boys need a "one-semester basic" course in general home economics and one semester of a combination course of family living and child care.

They would do better in a class just for males or in small mixed classes.

They need home economics the same as girls today, especially when they live by themselves and have to care for themselves.

Depending on the individual boy!

Especially family living classes.

If a student is interested (boy or girl) the student belongs in home economics. All of us will be homemakers.

Only if the classes are not mixed. With junior high age (ninth grade), boys are apt to show-off for the girls and vice versa and makes for discipline problems.

I strongly believe that males and females need to break down old stereotypes of "traditional" male-female roles.

I prefer them in family living--I would prefer not to h-- (unfinished by teacher).

If they take it serious.

Certain classes--family living, work orientation, not Home Economics I or II.

We have ignored the "other half" of marriage or family.

Especially now with our changing live styles.

Yes, I feel males definitely need home economics.

Yes, if--?

Great!

In homemaking or family living classes male students may experience some activities that will help to prepare for their future role as a home-maker with a working wife.

Question 9: How many of the available conferences, workshops or seminars in which the subject matter dealt with male students in home economics did you attend in the last year?

Comments:

I participated at the one during summer conference at Stillwater.

Have attended these classes in past four years but not last year. That is consumer education and family living courses dealing with both sexes.

If you count August conference.

Question 11: What classroom experience (contact) have you had in the last three years with male students in your home economics program? (Other specified experiences.)

Comments:

Two teachers indicated that other experience while student teaching, they had co-educational classes.

Career or work orientation classes.

Servers at junior and senior banquet and mother-daughter banquet.

Male F.H.A. members.

One all-male class and the rest all-female classes.

One or more classes of each.

One class all-male.

Three co-ed and two all-female classes.

Four teachers indicated that their other experience was with family living classes.

Question 13: Why did males enroll in your home economics program?

Comments or other specified reasons:

Home economics for boys here is unique and new.

The boys find it is not an easy "A" but that is the idea they have when they enroll.

Enrolled for an easy "A"--found out otherwise and transferred out.

An easy "A"; they think so before enrolling.

Maybe a fun course, but not an easy "A".

Cooperative home economics work program.

Past reputation of a "no work" class.

They wanted to try it, and some of the other boys have influenced them to take it.

Word of mouth, has become very popular and accepted.

Wanted to be with girls.

Enrolled because of girl friends or girls in the class.

Four teachers indicated that boys enrolled in their classes for a chance to cook and/or eat.

Three teachers reported that they did not know why boys enrolled in their programs. They said things like "Who knows" and "I don't know".

The remaining teachers who indicated other reasons why boys enrolled in their classes felt that it was due to some scheduling procedure.

Lack of other things to take during sixth hour.

Pushed in by counselor.

Limited course selection.

They had no other choice of classes to take.

Wanted out of another class, limited choice of alternatives.

Opposite driver's education.

Class scheduling or worked into schedule.

Needed a credit that hour.

Nothing else open.

Best alternative of classes to take that hour.

Only class offered besides physical education.

Dumping ground--no other class offered.

Needed a one-semester course.

Counselors enrolled them without choice sometimes.

They had rather take home economics than other subjects offered that hour.

Limited schedule--no other place to go.

Only class open to them at that hour.

Question 14: What type(s) of courses are male students taking in your home economics program?

Other courses specified by teachers:

Three teachers specified work orientation classes.

Cooperative home economics.

Basic survival is like basic home economics, girls could take it but it has become known as a guys' class. Family living classes have both girls and boys in them.

None now--were co-educational.

Four teachers specified Home Economics I and/or II.

Eight teachers specified family living courses. One indicated that a family living class was planned for boys. The remaining teachers just reported family living, only one specified that the family living class was co-educational.

Question 15: What is the most immediate help you would like provided in order to better deal with male students in your co-educational classes?

Specified other and comments:

Action ideas and materials. Boys want action.

I have to cover the same material as I would normally.

Resources--co-educational not female slanted.

Materials for males and females together.

I enjoy working with the young men--no problems.

Ideas on how other junior high teachers have gotten boys interested in taking the course.

Effective discipline methods.

Relevant materials for today's teens.

Texts to include both male and female students.

Question 16: Where do you obtain helpful information concerning teaching problems encountered by having male students in your classroom?

Specified other and comments:

There really aren't any problems.

Curriculum from other states before ours become available.

Personal experience.

I have a co-teacher and we discuss such.

Most come from experience and treating males and females as humans.

I have boys of my own and taught other co-ed classes before home economics.

All of the above.

T.E.T. courses dealing with all students.

All of the above--they fit in as students not boys or girls.

Other teachers, administrators.

Listening to them.

They are really no problem for me--I like them in my classes.

Curriculum (core).

Four teachers indicated that they had no problems due to having males in their classrooms.

Question 17: What subjects or topics do your male students seem to relate to and want to gain more information and knowledge about?

Specified other and comments:

Housing.

Personal relations and relationships.

Marriage--result of class survey.

I was amazed at how my boys loved child care units.

Action units.

All of the above.

Parenthood education.

All of the above--they have more difficulty in relating to child development but they are interested--other money management.

Question 18: Are there any subjects or topics that make you uncomfortable when teaching them in mixed company?

Specified others:

Five teachers indicated that sex education made them uncomfortable in mixed classes.

Five teachers indicated that child development made them uncomfortable in mixed classes.

Seven teachers reported that some areas of family living made them uncomfortable in mixed classes.

Other subjects or topics that made teachers uncomfortable while teaching them in mixed classes were human development, personal units, clothing, and personal development.

Question 18 Comments: How teachers overcome uncomfortable feelings created by teaching certain subjects or topics in mixed classes.

Family living--I have not taught this unit but it would make me a little uncomfortable.

Sex education--go ahead anyway as matter of factly as I can.

Family living--not too uncomfortable--when introducing the subject remind them they are pretty mature individuals.

Human development--my boys were too immature for this subject.

Clothing--it is difficult to select construction projects for males that are easy enough and yet something they are interested in making (I grit my teeth and jump in and plan).

Clothing--difficult to encourage the girls--guys usually no problem.

Sex education--sometimes omit or let co-teachers take the male students during this time.

Family living--I try to keep discussions on a fact level.

Family living--I try to keep my cool when the boys get off course.

Family living--I didn't and the girls were not as free to talk about personal things.

Family living--look to see why I'm uncomfortable--face the problem and go on.

Sex education--send the boys to the library to do a report (the male counselor talks to the boys).

Family living--make sure I am prepared and organized--try to be as relaxed as possible.

Clothing--clothing projects selected.

Child development--have them hand in written questions.

Family living--toning down what I would normally teach.

Child development--use speakers to cover some of the subject matter.

Child development--I am not uncomfortable teaching them child development but I strongly emphasize that they do not make off-color remarks.

Child development--usually do not teach it.

Family living--I research the topic and answer the questions truthfully and to the best of my ability.

Child development--to create a good atmosphere and give them trust and confidence.

Personal development--working with students on a professional basis.

Areas of sexuality--I try to word things in ways that won't embarrass me or the students. Some things are better not discussed.

None--I just get started and it goes smoothly.

None--Health Department, Family Planning, and Planned Parenthood come and help break the ice with some units.

Question 19: Where would you most like to receive helpful information concerning teaching male students?

Specified others:

One week workshops.

Magazines and journals.

Other home economics teachers.

Classroom observations of successful programs.

Printed curriculum materials.

Good filmstrips, etc.

Good textbooks for any student.

Mail-outs.

August conferences (suggested by three teachers).

Professional improvement meetings (suggested by four teachers).

Not necessary or I wouldn't (remarks by two teachers).

Question 20: What information do you feel would be useful in the teacher preparation programs to help new teachers who will be working with co-educational classes?

Comments and specified others:

Core curriculum book is boring to boys.

I think all of the above are very important.

Actual work experience or observation as in 3313.

More information on conducting laboratory experience.

All of them--I do not feel that the student teachers I have worked with have had enough information in working with males in home economics classes.

All but especially B (motivational techniques designed for use with male students) and E (instruction in classroom management and control techniques for working with males).

Control techniques are very important--also longer student teaching period.

All of the above.

No! Why would you alter anything for male students? They resent this.

Home economics should be treated as any other class that offers laboratory activities to co-ed groups. Texts should be written as such.

Question 21: Which of the following types of organizations do you belong to and attend regularly?

Specified others:

Historical society.

Hospital auxiliary.

Belong to all.

Delta Kappa Gamma--honorary women's teaching sorority.

A.A.U.W.

Question 22: Which of the following do you attend regularly? (School related activities.)

Specified others:

Junior and senior high graduation.

Home economics activities--F.H.A., Y.H.O., etc. (reported by 17 teachers).

4-H meetings or activities (reported by two teachers).

F.F.A. activities and/or banquets (reported by five teachers).

Banquets--helping with or attending them (reported by nine teachers).

School plays (reported by nine teachers).

Class sponsor (reported by three teachers).

Helping with school proms (reported by three teachers).

Senior activities (reported by four teachers).

Faculty socials (reported by two teachers).

Attend most school activities (reported by seven teachers).

Assemblies (reported by four teachers).

Stock shows.

Dress revues.

I judge the Lead Lody class for F.F.A. stock show each year.

Try to attend all school functions that I possibly can--especially those in which I have students.

Any activity after school that the kids are in--plays, honor society programs, etc.

CTA and OEA meetings.

Parent Awareness Meet.

Carnivals.

We don't have pep rallies, band or chorus, etc.

We don't have a PTO or a PTA.

Question 23: You are conducting a unit in beginning clothing construction. The class consists of 12 boys and 12 girls. The project they are to complete is a chef's apron that they will use later in a foods unit. What predominant method or procedure would you use to teach this class?

Specified others:

Individual help (indicated by four teachers).

Laboratory.

Have them get on the machines and make them.

Visual aids.

Some demonstration but also work with students individually.

Some open question time.

Comments to Question 23:

Might use female students, if they are good in sewing, to help some of the boys--if time prevented me from helping all of them.

It is impossible to use only one technique.

I would first determine their level of proficiency--the age would be a helpful guide.

Demonstration--being able to see what you are supposed to do means more than a thousand words.

I have found out that the boys learn by watching and doing, rather than hearing and doing.

The students seem to learn better if they can watch me do something first.

Demonstration would be used to begin, then a laboratory.

I would not change methods for teaching males or females.

Probably demonstration plus visual aids, plus assistance on individual projects.

Students seem to comprehend more if they are shown how to do something. Procedures must be explained also.

Following individual study of care and use of sewing machine, small sewing equipment, use of pattern, fabric selection, etc., study would be followed by discussion and demonstration as the need arises.

Question 24: What predominant method or procedure would you use to teach this same unit (clothing laboratory) if this unit consisted only of girls?

Specified others:

Individual help (indicated by three teachers).

Laboratory.

Have them read directions then ask for help.

Have them get on the machine and make them.

Some demonstration but also work with students individually.

Some open question time.

Comments to Question 24:

Depends on if they have had a course in home economics prior to family living.

In my experience, males have been the superior sewers.

If time permits, I would use E (demonstration).

Impossible to use only one technique.

I would first determine their level of proficiency--age would be a helpful guide.

I do the same for girls in the beginning home economics with one exception--I do teach girls to use a thimble, and I do not ask boys to use a thimble; however, I probably should.

Question 25: You are teaching a unit on banking. Concepts covered are checking and savings accounts, interest, credit, and record keeping. Your class consists of 12 boys and 10 girls, all juniors and seniors. What predominant method or procedure would you use to teach this class?

Specified others:

Displays and discussion.

I wouldn't use just one method--A, C, and E (Discussion, Lecture, and Educational Tours).

Simulation problems.

A combination of discussion and lecture with book work as practice.

Really both A and D (Discussion and Case Study), you can't really say just one because you need variety.

Practice sets.

Filmstrips and transparencies.

Guest speaker from a bank (indicated by nine teachers).

Comments to Question 25:

I use most of these (methods) in the unit I teach.

I chose simulation and games only if it includes job sheets over each area as well as the games, etc.

Demonstrate how to do, then follow up with a laboratory on actually doing.

I use the method of combining presentation of information then have the students apply it to the study sheets.

With boys I might have a different focal point or motivation--such as buying a car, not that girls don't want to buy cars, I just try to approach from an angle that meets the interest and needs of my students.

Simulation of many real life situations would be used. They would be supplemented by educational tours when possible.

Lecture combined with field trip to a bank, guest speaker from bank and collection agency, case study, discussion, and actual experience of writing checks and balancing a statement.

Each student would have checking with X amount of money and would carry out transactions.

I would lecture and then take them to a bank.

I use a variety of these methods and procedures.

For a unit like this, it would definitely be a combination of methods to be interesting such as discussion, plus simulation, plus demonstration of checks, etc.

Students enjoy educational tours and learn a lot from them.

You just can't leave out very many of these.

I would use the same for co-ed as for girls only.

Question 26: What predominant method or procedure would you use to teach this same unit (on banking) if the class consisted only of girls?

Specified others:

Displays and discussions.

I wouldn't use just one method.

Simulation problems.

Combination of discussion and lecture, with book work as practice.

Practice sets.

Filmstrips and transparencies.

You really can't say just one, because you need variety.

Guest speakers (indicated by six teachers).

Comments on Question 26:

Each student would have checking with X amount of money and would carry out transactions.

I use a variety of these methods and procedures.

I would probably use simulation and games and demonstration.

Students enjoy educational tours and learn a lot from them.

VITA

Phyllis Anne Stratton

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: PREFERRED TEACHING METHODS WITH MALE STUDENTS PRESENT IN
SECONDARY HOME ECONOMICS

Major Field: Home Economics Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Tahlequah, Oklahoma, May 29, 1954, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Howard Stratton.

Education: Graduated from Tahlequah Senior High School, Tahlequah, Oklahoma, in May, 1972; received Bachelor of Science in Home Economics degree in Clothing, Textiles, and Merchandising from Oklahoma State University in May, 1976; received Bachelor of Science in Home Economics degree in Home Economics Education from Oklahoma State University in July, 1978; received certification in secondary Vocational Home Economics from Oklahoma State University in 1978; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree in Home Economics Education at Oklahoma State University in December, 1979.

Professional Experience: Staff of Willham Residence Hall at Oklahoma State University, 1974-76; salesperson at Hinds Department Store in Tahlequah, Oklahoma, summer, 1975; truck driver for hay crew for 12 summers.

Professional Organizations: Member of American Home Economics Association, Oklahoma Home Economics Association, American Association of College and University Women, Omicron Nu, Phi Upsilon, Kappa Delta Phi, Mortar Board, and Who's Who Among College and University Students.