

TEACHER USE AND PERCEIVED USEFULNESS OF
COMPONENTS OF THE OKLAHOMA HOME
ECONOMICS I, BASIC CORE

By

MARY JO DRUMMOND

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1971

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College
of the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
May, 1976

Thesis
1976
D795+
cop. 2

AUG 26 1976

TEACHER USE AND PERCEIVED USEFULNESS OF
COMPONENTS OF THE OKLAHOMA HOME
ECONOMICS I, BASIC CORE

Thesis Approved:

Elaine Jorgenson

Thesis Adviser

Margaret I. Callahan

Jaen Fritchard

N N Burton

Dean of the Graduate College

947520

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Elaine Jorgenson, thesis adviser, for her guidance, assistance, and inspiration throughout this study; to Dr. Margaret Callsen, and Dr. Jack Pritchard, for their advice, constructive review, and assistance in this study.

Without the cooperation of the 113 vocational and consumer home-making teachers in Oklahoma, this study would not have been possible. I would like to express my appreciation to them for taking the time to supply the information for this research.

Recognition is due Mrs. Mildred Lee for her efforts in typing this thesis.

My most sincere and deepest gratitude is extended to my husband, Jack, for his encouragement, patience, and editing expertise which was so willingly given throughout this study. A note of thanks is given to my son, Jim, and daughter, Jan, for their patience and help given throughout my graduate studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Significance of the Study	2
Statement of the Problem	3
Objectives of the Study	3
Assumptions Basic to the Study	4
Limitations of the Study	5
Definition of Terms	5
Procedure of the Study	6
Summary	7
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
Introduction	8
Principles of Curriculum Development	8
Rationale for Curriculum Development	11
Format for Core Curriculum in Oklahoma	14
Research Studies of the Core Curriculum	17
Summary	22
III. METHODOLOGY	24
Introduction	24
Selection of the Population	25
Development of the Instrument	26
Collection of Data	27
Analysis of Data	28
Summary	28
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA	29
Introduction	29
Description of Subjects	30
General Use of Areas and Units	34
Teacher Perceived Usefulness of Components	40
Comparison of Variables	46
Comparison of Variables for the Teacher Perceived Usefulness of Components	55
Summary	63

Chapter	Page
V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	65
Summary	65
Findings and Conclusions	66
Recommendations	70
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	72
APPENDIX A - CORRESPONDENCE AND QUESTIONNAIRE	75
APPENDIX B - COMMENTS ON AREAS AND UNITS	82
APPENDIX C - USE OF AREAS AND UNITS BY VARIABLES	92

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Respondents From Supervisory Districts by Percentage . . .	31
II. Number of Years at Present School	32
III. Number of Students Enrolled in Vocational Home Economics I	32
IV. Approximate Time Core Curriculum Is Followed	33
V. Recommendations for Curriculum Revision	34
VI. Total Response to Use of Areas and Units by Percent . . .	35
VII. Percentage Responses for Reasons Given in the Use of <u>Home Economics I</u> , <u>Basic Core</u> Areas and Units of Instruction	37
VIII. Total Response of Teacher Perceived Usefulness of Components of the Units of Instruction by Percent . . .	41
IX. Percent Responding in Each Area to Variable Teacher Age .	47
X. Percent Responding in Each Area to Variable Years Taught	50
XI. Percent Responding in Each Area to Variable Highest Degree	52
XII. Percent Responding in Each Area to Variable Size of School	53
XIII. Year Last Additional Courses Taken by Percentage	54
XIV. Comparison of the Teacher Perceived Usefulness of Components of the Units of Instruction by Age Groups .	56
XV. Comparison of the Teacher Perceived Usefulness of Components of the Units of Instruction by Years Taught	58
XVI. Comparison of the Teacher Perceived Usefulness of Components of the Units of Instruction by Highest Degree	61

Table	Page
XVII. Comparison of the Teacher Perceived Usefulness of Components of the Units of Instruction by Size of School	62
XVIII. Age Group 21-30 Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	93
XIX. Age Group 31-40 Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	94
XX. Age Group 41-50 Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	95
XXI. Age Group 51 and Above Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	96
XXII. Years Taught 1-4 Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	97
XXIII. Years Taught 5-10 Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	98
XXIV. Years Taught 11-20 Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	99
XXV. Years Taught 21 and Over Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	100
XXVI. Highest Degree - B. S. Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	101
XXVII. Highest Degree - M. S. Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	102
XXVIII. Size of School - Below 99 Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	103
XXIX. Size of School - 100-299 Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	104
XXX. Size of School - 300-499 Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	105
XXXI. Size of School - 500-899 Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	106
XXXII. Size of School - 900 and Above Use of Areas and Units, Percent Responding	107

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The task assumed by the family of programs brought together under the title of "vocational education" is providing occupational education and training needed by individuals to fulfill their roles in today's society (1, p. 360). To be effective, these tools for guidance must change with the times. Innovative changes are underway in vocational curriculum development in Oklahoma. Materials are being developed to serve the needs which educators have been writing volumes about. They will be used by students for whom curriculum is intended.

Since the enactment of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917, home economics has been recognized as an essential program in helping people adapt to societal changes. In the beginning, home economics had focused on the preparation of women for the occupation of homemaking, later expanding to the dual role of preparation of people of all ages not only in the skills of homemaking, but as that of wage earner.

Today, home economics on the secondary level, as stated in the Home Economics I, Basic Core (2), has three major purposes. One is to provide education for homemaking and family life; another is employment in occupations involving home economics, and third, preprofessional education.

In 1968, with the Vocational Education Amendments, came funding for consumer and homemaking education which provided for, among many

services, the development of instructional materials. This has brought about many changes and helped answer questions such as "What should I teach?", "Which curriculum materials should I choose?" and "What knowledge and skills are best for what level?"

The questions have been answered. The Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center (CIMC) at the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education has attempted to organize and standardize a comprehensive program of study for vocational education.

Significance of the Study

In January of 1973, the first basic core curriculum for home economics, Home Economics I, Basic Core, was distributed to the vocational consumer and homemaking teachers in the state of Oklahoma. This basic core was the result of the input of 26 vocational home economics teachers, staff members of the State Department of Vocational Home Economics, and representative staff from four institutions of teacher education in the state of Oklahoma.

Information and suggestions for a freshman level core of basic knowledge and skills were organized by the CIMC curriculum specialists into the Home Economics I, Basic Core. The core includes one or more units of instruction in the areas of career exploration, child development, clothing and textiles, consumer education, food and nutrition, health, housing and home furnishings, and personal and family relations.

The units of instruction within each area include the following components: objectives--both terminal and specific, written in behavioral terms, activities suggested for teacher and students, information

sheets, assignment sheets, job sheets, visual aids, tests, and answers to the test.

Since 1973, teachers have had the opportunity to use the core and to determine its usefulness to their needs and the needs of the students. Since constant revision is required to keep material useful and current (3), this writer feels that a study is needed to provide information to the curriculum specialists that will indicate what areas might need revision and how useful the components of the units of instruction are to the teachers.

Statement of the Problem

This study proposes to assess the extent of teacher use of the Oklahoma Home Economics I, Basic Core by units and teacher-perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction. Further investigation will be conducted to identify selected variables which might influence the use of the core curriculum. The results should serve as a source of information for revision to make the Home Economics I, Basic Core useful in meeting the needs of the students for which it is intended.

Objectives of the Study

The following objectives were formulated in order to deal with the purpose of this study:

1. Determine the use by teachers of the areas and each unit of instruction in the Home Economics I, Basic Core.
2. Determine the general perceived usefulness of the individual components of the units of instruction. (Behavioral

objectives, suggested activities, information sheets, transparency masters, job sheets, assignment sheets, and tests).

3. Determine the effect selected variables--age of teachers, years of experience, highest college degree, recency of course work, and size of school--have on the use of the areas and the teacher-perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction.
4. Share findings with the home economics curriculum specialist at the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center and others to provide input for possible revision.

Assumptions Basic to the Study

For the purpose of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. That vocational consumer and homemaking teachers participating in the study were representative of their peers across the state.
2. That the vocational consumer and homemaking teachers would provide an accurate and honest evaluation of the Home Economics I, Basic Core.
3. The instrument used was adequate in determining home economics teachers' use and perceived usefulness of components of units of instruction of the Home Economics I, Basic Core.
4. That the variables selected for study were those which would be most likely to influence the use of the areas and the perceived usefulness of components of units of instruction in the Home Economics I, Basic Core.

Limitations of the Study

Data analyzed in this study were limited to:

1. The State of Oklahoma.
2. A selected sample of high school teachers in vocational home economics programs.
3. Home Economics I, Basic Core, which has been in use since 1973.
4. Questionnaire type research.
5. The use of Home Economics I, Basic Core by areas and units, and the usefulness of the components of a unit as perceived by the teachers.

Definition of Terms

Area - That body of knowledge and skills of related subject matter: Career exploration, child development, clothing and textiles, consumer education, food and nutrition, health, housing and home furnishings, and personal and family relations.

Behavioral objectives - The statement of behavior that instruction is to produce stated in terms of observable or measurable student performance.

Components of a unit of instruction - Those parts of a unit consisting of behavioral objectives, suggested activities, information sheets, transparency masters, job sheets, assignment sheets, and tests.

Curriculum - The term used to refer to the general overall plan of content materials for a course of study.

Home Economics I, Basic Core - The suggested guideline, ninth grade level, for achievement of the three major purposes for having home economics on the secondary level, "to provide education for home-making and family life, employment in occupations involving home economics, and preprofessional education." (2)

Oklahoma vocational home economics teachers - Those home economics teachers in consumer and homemaking programs meeting the requirements in Oklahoma for Federal reimbursement.

Unit of instruction - The material or instruction for more than a single class period.

Procedure of the Study

The following procedure was used to determine the use by teachers of the areas and units of instruction and the perceived usefulness of components of units of the Home Economics I, Basic Core:

1. A continuing review of literature on the development of vocational curriculum, the format, and studies on the core curriculum, was necessary to stay current and to give meaning to the study.
2. A questionnaire was developed to assess the teacher use of the specific areas and units of instruction and the teacher-perceived usefulness of the components in a unit of instruction.
3. The questionnaire was pre-tested by mailing to a group of five vocational home economics teachers and after analyzing the results, the usefulness of the instrument was evaluated.
4. The finalized questionnaire was then mailed to 177 vocational home economics teachers in Oklahoma.

5. Questionnaire data from 113 respondents was then analyzed by calculating percentages of responses for the use of the specific units and the usefulness of the components to draw conclusions according to the majority of responses. Age of teachers, years of experience, highest college degree, recency of course work, and size of school were then compared in the two parts of the questionnaire to determine the most important variables affecting the general use of the units and perceived usefulness of the components.

6. Conclusions were drawn from the findings and recommendations were made.

Summary

Chapter I has included the statement and objectives of the study, the procedure used to fulfill the objectives, the limitations, and the definition of terms. Chapter II presents a review of current studies on Oklahoma vocational curriculum. Chapter III includes the methodology used to collect the data of the questionnaire and Chapter IV presents the analysis of the data. Summary, conclusions and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

To develop the scope and focus, this study directed specifically at the use of the Oklahoma Home Economics I, Basic Core, a review of literature on Oklahoma vocational curriculum was conducted. However, curriculum development did not begin in Oklahoma, consequently a survey of the history and development of vocational curriculum was reviewed to provide background for the developments which have occurred in Oklahoma. Briefly these reviews and surveys evolved into four general areas: Principles of curriculum development, rationale for curriculum development, format for core curriculum in Oklahoma, and research studies of the core curriculum.

Principles of Curriculum Development

Unruh (4, p. 79) has identified curriculum development as,

. . . a complex process of assessing needs, identifying desired learning outcomes, planning and preparing for instruction to achieve the outcomes, and using the cultural, social, and personal needs and interests that the curriculum is to serve.

More than a decade ago, Taba (5, p. 12) assumed there was an order to curriculum development, and pursuing that order would result in a more thoughtfully planned curriculum--one that was more dynamically

conceived. The order prescribed by Taba follows:

- Step 1: Diagnosis of needs
- Step 2: Formulation of objectives
- Step 3: Selection of content
- Step 4: Organization of content
- Step 5: Selection of learning experiences
- Step 6: Organization of learning experiences
- Step 7: Determination of what to evaluate and of the ways and means of doing it.

Taba further stated, "Curricula are designed so that students may learn." With the varied backgrounds of students, the important step of diagnosis of needs is a necessary one. Tyler (6, p. 8) writes,

The school's efforts should be focused particularly upon serious gaps in the present development of students. Hence, studies that identify these gaps, these educational needs, are necessary studies to provide a basis for the selection of objectives which should be given primary emphasis in the school's program.

Once needs have been assessed, Hatcher (1, p. 104) points out that,

Choosing important goals or objectives and stating them in a meaningful form is one of the most critical aspects of the entire educational process, because goals or objectives are the guide for all other activities.

According to Burns (7, p. 38), behavioral objectives act as a tool which a curriculum processor uses in curriculum development. Through the use of this tool, the student is freed from the traditional dependence on teachers. Objectives stated in behavioral terms lets the students know where they are going so that choices can be made on how they will get there.

Hatcher (1, p. 105) summarizes the works by Benjamin S. Bloom and David R. Krathwohl on the classification of educational goals by pointing out that objectives are categorized under three major headings, or taxonomies: (1) the cognitive domain which is concerned with

remembering, thinking, and problem solving, (2) the affective domain, concerned with behavioral characteristics defined in terms of thoughts, feelings, and actions, and (3) the psychomotor domain, which relates to muscular action resulting from conscious mental activity.

Once the goals or behavioral objectives have been selected, the curriculum developer must then select the content and the learning experiences relevant to the objectives (12). In the organization of learning experiences, Tyler (6, p. 83) points out, "In order for educational experiences to produce a cumulative effect, they must be so organized as to reinforce each other." He gives three major criteria in order to build an effectively organized group of learning experiences. They are: continuity, sequence, and integration.

The last step in the development of curriculum includes the plans that need to be made for evaluation to assure the ends of education have been achieved (13, p. 13). Hatcher (1, p. 39) feels,

If evaluation is to be used effectively, students need to know: (1) how far they are from a goal at the beginning, (2) what progress they are making as they work and where and how improvements can be made, and (3) to what extent they have achieved the goal.

It is also through evaluation that Tyler (6, p. 105) points out, ". . . it is possible to note in what respects the curriculum is effective and in what respects it needs improvement."

Curriculum development, according to Unruh (4, p. 83), ". . . must be a responsive process, constantly extending, expanding, and revising the curriculum." Hatcher (1, p. 322) feels the major purpose in curriculum development is to produce materials which, when used as resources by teachers, will result in programs that better meet the needs of all concerned. These materials will in general (1) provide

stimulating content that is up-to-date, (2) have included all the parts of curriculum material needed by teachers, (3) be easy to use, and (4) present a balanced program.

Rationale For Curriculum Development

In 1917 the major task confronting the Federal Board for Vocational Education was the preparation of instructional material (8, p. 1). Vocational curriculum has kept pace through the years and has been responsive to social changes, such as to the World War I and II and to the depression of the 30's. At first curriculum development was left up to individual teachers. Teacher-education institutions trained teachers to develop their own curriculum materials. But with the advent of World War II, the task became monumental and a number of states organized curriculum laboratories. In 1961, President Kennedy appointed the Panel of Consultants on Vocational Education. The results of the study of this panel recognized the preparation of instructional materials for vocational courses as vital to an effective national program. This report, Education for a Changing World of Work (9, p. 240), recommended that:

1. One or more instructional materials laboratories be established to produce and distribute vocational instructional materials.
 - a. Programmed learning aids, visual aids, and newer methods of the presentation and use of materials should be considered in the production of instructional materials.
 - b. All materials developed should be made available to private publishers for maximum distribution.
2. It be a responsibility of the U. S. Office of Education through the Division of Vocational and Technical Education to:
 - a. Establish and administer instructional materials laboratories through contractual arrangements with

- a state department of education, a college, a university, or a large school district.
 - b. Develop policies for the operation, coordination between the centers, production of materials, and distribution of the materials produced in these centers.
 - c. Finance the operations of these centers.
3. An adequate quantity and appropriate quality of instructional supplies, tools, instruments, and equipment be recognized as essential to good instruction.

The intent of the panel concerning instructional materials development was included in the Vocational Act of 1963 which made possible new types of programs and new program emphasis under the following provisions in the Act:

1. Maintain, extend and improve vocational education
2. Develop new vocational education programs
3. Provide for part-time employment of students while participating in vocational education programs
4. Expand training opportunities for all ages in all communities (1, p. 362).

The actual Act, however, failed to reflect the importance of curriculum development as had been suggested by the original 1961 report.

Curriculum development again came to the attention of the Advisory Council on Vocational Education in 1967. The report, Vocational Education: The Bridge Between Man and His Work (10, p. 3), evolved and the following recommendation was made:

IT IS RECOMMENDED, that there be established two to four centers for curriculum development in vocational education. At present, some 12 curriculum centers are operated by the states, usually in cooperation with universities. Each of these centers has developed curriculum materials for the occupations most commonly taught in vocational education. Very little time or money has been spent on each of these, the result being that we have many poor sets of materials for each of the occupational fields. This would give each school a choice and it would prevent waste and unnecessary duplication.

Probably 10 times as much money has been spent on curriculum materials for physics (taken by 5 per cent of the high school students), as has been spent on the 100 or more occupations usually taught in vocational education.

The Vocational Education Amendments of 1968 made special issue of curriculum development in vocational and technical education. It authorized \$10-million be made available to higher education, state departments of vocational education, and similar agencies with specific directions to the development and dissemination of vocational education curriculum materials, development of standards, evaluation of curriculum materials, and training personnel in curriculum development (8, p. 4).

This legislation provided for federal grants to states

(1) to assist them to maintain, extend, and improve existing programs of vocational education, and (2) to develop new programs of vocational education for persons of all ages in all communities of the state (1, p. 363).

The states are becoming involved in what has been termed as a "silent revolution." Weagraff (11) writes that in 1963 only nine states had curriculum laboratories; however, by 1973 seventeen states had laboratories and eleven others were either in the process of establishing a laboratory or considering such a move. He further points out that three common patterns have emerged in the establishment of curriculum laboratories. One is the large state model, which has a small staff, with few functions other than general management. Its satellite branches have capabilities for design, development, production, testing, and dissemination.

Many states are not large enough to support a large state model, but can designate a staff member in the state department to serve as a curriculum coordinator. "While such curriculum coordination efforts

are laudable, the single-person model is to some extent dysfunctional" (11, p. 47).

Oklahoma, on the other hand, is involved in the third type of curriculum laboratory, the centralized laboratory, which has many advantages. Coordination of staff is easier, since all are housed in one building, and media specialists can be utilized across several program areas. As in most cases, Oklahoma's curriculum laboratory is located near an institution of higher learning, Oklahoma State University, and has access to program expertise and research data.

This type of laboratory offers a full range of services--curriculum development, validation, revision, in-service programs, and production. The Oklahoma Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center (CIMC) has been in operation since June, 1970, with the primary responsibility to "develop and provide quality instructional materials and other ancillary services for all vocational and technical educational personnel in the state." (12)

The approach to curriculum development used by the CIMC has indeed been new and innovative. As Patton (13) points out "the only way change will come about in the classroom is through the use of new and innovative instructional materials."

Format For Core Curriculum in Oklahoma

After an extensive review of various types of curriculum materials, the CIMC developed a format written in behavioral terms for use by the students, where formerly, curriculum materials had been written as teacher guides. Based on Popham's (14, p. 19) theory,

The teacher first specifies precise objectives in terms of pupil behavior. Second, he pre-assesses the learners' behavior with respect to the objectives and, as a result, may modify his objectives. Third, he devises an instructional sequence consistent with the best that is known regarding how pupils learn. Fourth, he evaluates the post-instruction performance of the learners and makes appropriate decisions regarding his instructional sequence and/or the quality of his objectives.

Recognizing that objectives are the most important part of any instructional program (15), the curriculum specialist's primary desire was to state objectives in such a manner as to guide toward content and lend an idea to methodology. As Mager (16, p. 3) points out, "When clearly defined goals are lacking, it is impossible to evaluate a course or program efficiently, and there is no sound basis for selecting appropriate materials, content, or instructional methods."

With objectives stated in behavioral terms, there are no "secrets" kept from the student and the student becomes an active participant in the learning process rather than a passive participant, and this type of learning provides a built in motivational force (5, p. 87). According to Tyler (6, p. 63), "Learning takes place through the active behavior of the student; it is what he does that he learns, not what the teacher does."

Wherein, CIMC desired to develop curriculum materials to be used by students, flexibility in the use of the materials was another goal. The courses of study are divided into units of instruction which provide for ease in revision at any time to make them adaptable to any situation or to any particular school (15). The units of instruction contain both terminal and specific behavioral objectives, and each unit also contains three types of instruction sheets as suggested by Henderson (17). The units contain information sheets written in

outline form providing concise information which in turn leads to guidance for the teacher in developing teaching strategies (18).

The second type of information sheet is in the form of assignment sheets. Both information and assignment sheets guide the student in reaching cognitive objectives with the third type of information sheet, the job sheet, aiding in performance skills development or psychomotor objectives (13).

The units of instruction also contain visual aids or transparency masters which aid in supplementing or enforcing a specific objective (17). Further guidance for teachers in planning activities or visual aids necessary to supplement or enforce, is provided in the suggested activity sheet which is included for each unit of instruction. Important to each unit as a means of measuring the expected change of behavior of the student is the test which has been developed for each unit in relation to the specific objectives of the unit.

Another important aspect of the types of materials provided by the CIMC is the means by which standardization can be developed. Standardization can be important to teachers who wish to avoid overlapping in sequence or gaps in an overall program. Resource materials, such as those produced at the CIMC, can provide a balanced program which will meet the needs of today and tomorrow (1, p. 263). Hauenstein (19, p. 2) states that, "The curriculum needs to be made synonymous with life at a high level of relationship, compatible with the student's level of development."

Vocational education, thus, has become the curriculum centered on students' needs (20). Banathy (21, p. 4) states that, "Education faces the problems of its relevance to the learner and of meeting the

multitudinous needs of society." The CIMC has planned and developed materials for vocational programs that will meet the needs of the student through relevance, and has provided flexibility and standardization to produce a well balanced program.

The key principle, however, is to develop materials that will be used. Bruce (3) writes, in order to make sure that materials are used, "It is important to involve a number of people in developing them." Meek (22) contends that, "Curriculum cannot be separated from instruction and teachers. Vocational teachers must be involved in the planning and validation of curriculum materials." The CIMC has produced materials, involving teachers, specialists, teacher educators, and whenever possible, representative from business and industry in the process. Teacher use of these materials is a part of this study.

Research Studies of the Core Curriculum

Since the Oklahoma vocational curriculum is so new, to this date only a few studies have been conducted evaluating the core curriculum. They began in 1970 when Lucas (23) sought to determine if what was being currently taught by teachers in Vocational Agriculture agreed with the suggested core that was being produced.

Agriculture was the first of the core curriculums to be produced and Lucas hoped to determine if the concept of a standardized curriculum would be accepted. This study was limited to 100 vocational agriculture departments in Oklahoma and two instruments were used. One was to gather information on the selected independent variables of: age of teacher, number of years teaching vocational agriculture, number of years in present school, highest college degree, and

supervisory districts. This section of the instrument was used to determine if any of the independent variables had an effect on the degree of agreement with what the teachers were teaching and the suggested core.

Another portion of the instrument was developed to determine current areas being taught in each of the four years of vocational agriculture. Lucas found that the older vocational agriculture teachers, those over 39, were in greater agreement with the suggested core than the younger teachers. He found that the supervisory district did not have an important effect and that programs in Vocational Agriculture I, II, and III were closely aligned with the suggested core, more so than Vocational Agriculture IV. Along with the higher the age, Lucas found that the higher educational degree had more agreement with the basic core. In this particular study, it did not seem to matter how long the teachers had been in their respective schools. He also found that the teachers had a favorable attitude toward the concept of standardization, and that the teachers considered the core an important resource in the development of their program.

After the first Basic Core Curriculum for Agriculture I was produced and disseminated to the vocational agriculture teachers in Oklahoma, Patton (24) in 1971 chose to measure the usefulness of the basic core and to determine if information in it was adequate or if more or less was needed. He also sought to determine if the core was adaptable to the community. He chose, as Lucas did, to use an attitude scale to evaluate opinions and attitudes toward the basic core. The second part of the instrument constructed by Patton was used to gather personal information that might have a bearing on the attitudes both

favorable and unfavorable to the core curriculum. Patton found that the teachers could and were using the Basic Core Curriculum for Vocational Agriculture I. He found agreement that the material was adequate and that the curriculum approach did not hinder initiative or innovativeness. The teachers agreed that the core could be adapted to the local community. The teachers felt that the students achieved at a higher level using units of instruction and behavioral objectives.

One factor discovered by Patton was that students needed copies of transparency masters to use as information sheets. As a result of this discovery, the basic cores have included transparency masters with units of instruction.

The most recent of the studies on vocational agriculture curriculum was conducted by Gwarzo (25) in 1975. Like the previous two studies, Gwarzo was attempting to determine acceptance and effectiveness of the core, however, the purpose of this study was to determine the possibility of adopting or modifying the core for Nigerian needs. This study showed that the core contents were relevant and adequate and that the core was used approximately 60 per cent of instructor time as it had been intended.

Gwarzo included with his questionnaire a set of questionnaires which had been developed by the CIMC which solicited responses on which units had been taught and which units had not been taught. He hoped through the responses in this set of questionnaires to determine the nature of content of the curriculum as to whether the instructional materials were relevant or not relevant, too advanced or too easy.

In visiting with the vocational agriculture curriculum specialist at the CIMC, it was learned that a set of these questionnaires had been

sent to all the vocational agriculture teachers in the state and that the results of the response to this type of questionnaire had been of help to the curriculum specialist in determining what units were not being taught and some reasons why. This information was deemed vital to a project for revision of the Vocational Agriculture Basic Core Curriculums. Therefore, it did seem to the researcher that this type of approach would be a revealing one for this study being undertaken.

It also became evident to the researcher that if this type of study could be useful for revision purposes, it might be further useful through the comparison of variables as Lucas had done in his study. Would age, or years experience, or highest degree have any effect on what units were taught, or not taught? And this study proposes to answer these questions.

Further review revealed a study had been conducted by Nielson (26) in 1972 which sought to determine the usefulness and effectiveness of Distributive Education II. As in Patton's study, Nielson sought the same general objectives with the additional objective to determine whether the core curriculum was flexible and that if the teachers showed an acceptance of the individual components of a unit. Her findings revealed that the teachers in Distributive Education did accept standardization and felt the core curriculum was adequate for the second level of Distributive Education, that the materials were flexible and easily used, and that there was agreement with most of the components. The teachers did not agree on the usefulness of the information sheets, nor on the method of testing.

Since the study on Distributive Education II revealed some acceptance of the individual components of a unit of instruction, this

researcher felt that perhaps this type of study was needed in home economics. Not as to whether the components were accepted by the teachers in vocational home economics, but rather how the teachers perceived the usefulness of the components to their teaching.

The remaining studies on the core curriculums have been quite recent. One was completed in July of 1975 by Shepperd (27) to determine the general acceptance of the Residential Carpentry Course of Study. Findings in this study, again using an attitude scale, were a high level of general acceptance, the materials were indicated as being adequate and flexible, they were adaptable, and most of the materials were usable without revision. This particular core had been in use since the 1973-74 school year.

Two remaining studies were conducted recently on the home economics basic core curriculum. Hollenback (28) in 1975 sought to ascertain acceptance of the Home Economics II, Basic Core. Other objectives were to determine the extent of use, how knowledgeable teachers were concerning development and design of home economics curriculum, if the approach of curriculum development hinders initiative, and to ascertain the value to students as perceived by the teachers. She chose the use of an opinion and attitude scale in surveying 50 percent of the vocational consumer and homemaking teachers in the state of Oklahoma.

Results of the study revealed the following: That the suggested activity page acts as a stimulus to better lesson planning; that the teachers do make use of transparency masters; over 50 percent indicated unit tests do a good job of measuring student achievement; the assignment sheets are useful and helpful; teachers were responsive to the core as an aid to better teaching; and 99 per cent of the teachers

indicated they can and do use the core in other homemaking classes. Eighty per cent felt that all students should have a copy and that 35.9 per cent participated in inservice curriculum workshops.

The aspect of the effectiveness of curriculum workshops sponsored by the CIMC was the central focus of the most recent study in home economics conducted by Sawatzky (28) and completed in December of 1975. This study sought a comparison of acceptance and usefulness of Home Economics I, Basic Core by curriculum workshop participants and non-workshop participants. Inservice curriculum and management workshops were defined in the study as inservice education instruction that was planned and organized by the CIMC personnel, supervisors of each vocational division, and teacher educators of Oklahoma State University to improve the knowledge, skills, and attitudes of teachers toward curriculum developed by the Center.

Findings indicated that the core was accepted and useful, and that a higher percentage of responses were accumulated by workshop participants on the attitude scale. One recommendation made as a result of this study was

In order to omit certain units, up-date information in certain units, include more job and assignment sheets, and include more illustrations; plans for revision of Home Economics I, Basic Core should include teacher surveys and the expertise of resource people in curriculum and each subject matter included in the core curriculum (29, p. 58).

Perhaps the results of this writer's study will fulfill at least a part of this recommendation.

Summary

An overview of vocational curriculum development, the establishment and purposes of the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center,

and a review of studies on Oklahoma vocational curriculum were included in Chapter II. Chapter III will provide a description of the procedure used for this study.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The major purpose of this study was to assess the extent of teacher use of the Home Economics I, Basic Core curriculum by areas and units and teacher-perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction. Further investigation was conducted to identify selected variables which might influence the use of the core curriculum. It was necessary to incorporate the following objectives in order to deal with this purpose:

1. Determine the use by teachers of the areas and each unit of instruction in the Home Economics I, Basic Core.
2. Determine the general perceived usefulness of the individual components of the units of instruction. (Behavioral objectives, suggested activities, information sheets, transparency masters, job sheets, assignment sheets, and tests)
3. Determine the effect that selected variables--age of teachers, years of experience, highest college degree, recency of course work, and size of school--have on the use of the areas and the teacher perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction.

4. Share findings with the home economics curriculum specialist at the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center and others to provide input for revision.

This chapter, in describing the methodology used, is divided into the following sections: selection of the population, development of the instrument, method employed in collecting data, and an analysis of the data.

Selection of the Population

There are approximately 400 vocational consumer and homemaking teachers in the State of Oklahoma. A sampling was desired for this study of approximately 50 per cent of the teachers. However, since previously cited research was being conducted by Hollenback (28) using 50 per cent of the vocational consumer and homemaking teachers from the six supervisory districts in the state, the 50 per cent remaining provided another sample.

A list of these teachers was obtained from the Oklahoma State University College of Home Economics Division of Home Economics Education. This list was checked against a list distributed by the Home Economics Division of the State Department of Vocational and Technical Education leaving the remaining 50 per cent of the teachers in the state. Further deletions were made which included teachers in part-time and full-time gainful employment--occupational, and teachers in area schools, leaving 177 names constituting a sample to which to submit the questionnaire.

Development of the Instrument

In contrast with other research done on curriculum in Oklahoma, the researcher chose to develop a questionnaire patterned after a set of questionnaires developed by the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center of the Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education to survey teacher use of the Basic Core Curriculum for Vocational Agriculture. This questionnaire solicits responses of which units of instruction have been taught and which units have not been taught. Reason(s) for not teaching any area(s) and unit(s) was to be checked among the reasons included in the questionnaire. The areas and units of the Home Economics I, Basic Core were used in the same format as that questionnaire used to survey vocational agriculture teacher use of the curriculum. Additional reasons were added which had been solicited from various vocational consumer and homemaking teachers during professional meetings and in visiting. (See Appendix A.)

Part B of the questionnaire was developed to evaluate the teacher perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction. The personal information was included in the questionnaire to gather information on the independent variables. The variables selected to be included in the instrument and to be used in comparison to the use of the areas were:

1. Age of the teacher.
2. Number of years teaching vocational home economics.
3. Highest college degree held.
4. Year last additional courses taken.
5. Size of school.

Additional information also was solicited to provide descriptive data.

Before the questionnaire was submitted to the high school vocational consumer and homemaking teachers, it was reviewed by the State Supervisor of Home Economics, the home economics curriculum specialist at the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center, and the researcher's graduate committee. These persons were asked to edit, delete, and comment on any part of the questionnaire that they felt was inappropriate or unnecessary.

The questionnaire was also mailed to a pre-test group of five home economics teachers. The instrument was checked for clarity and understanding of directions, suitability of length, time involved to complete the instrument. Their responses and comments were used to finalize the questionnaire.

Collection of Data

The 177 high school vocational consumer and homemaking teachers selected to participate in the study were mailed a copy of the revised questionnaire which included parts A and B and the personal data information sheet, an introductory letter (see Appendix A), and a stamped self-addressed envelope.

A follow-up card was sent two weeks after the initial mailing of the questionnaires to encourage a greater number of responses. Of the 177 teachers receiving questionnaires, 124 responded. Due to some teachers not teaching Home Economics I and being involved in a field test, 113, or 63.8 per cent, of the questionnaires were useable for the study.

Analysis of Data

Upon return of the questionnaires the responses were hand tabulated and recorded in groups according to the independent variables. Percentages were used to determine the extent of use of the areas and units of instruction and for the perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction.

This procedure was used to determine the most important variables affecting use of the areas and perceived usefulness of components. Tables then were developed to compare percentage responses to each item in Parts A and B.

Additional written comments by the respondents were recorded.

The percentages used in this analysis were found by dividing the number of responses to each item by the number responding in each category.

The remaining personal data items were tabulated and percentages were used in presenting the descriptive data.

Summary

Chapter III has presented the methodology that was used in this study. Sections included were: selection of the population, development of the instrument, method of collecting data employed, and analysis of the data.

CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess the extent of teacher use of the Home Economics I, Basic Core by units and the teacher's perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction. Further investigation was conducted to identify selected variables which might influence the use of the core curriculum.

To accomplish this purpose, the following objectives were formulated:

1. Determine the use by teachers of the areas and each unit of instruction in the Home Economics I, Basic Core.
2. Determine the general perceived usefulness of the individual components of the units of instruction. (Behavioral objectives, suggested activities, information sheets, transparency masters, job sheets, assignment sheets, and tests)
3. Determine the effect selected variables--age of teacher, number of years teaching vocational home economics, highest college degree held, year last additional courses taken, and size of school--have on the use of the areas and the teacher's perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction.

4. Share findings with the home economics curriculum specialist at the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center and others to provide input for possible revision.

The data presented in this chapter were gathered from vocational consumer and homemaking teachers in Oklahoma. Questionnaires were mailed to 177 teachers on April 15, 1975. Of the 177 questionnaires mailed, 124 were returned for a 70 per cent return. Eleven questionnaires were not useable in that the respondents did not teach Home Economics I or were involved in a field test of the Home Economics I, Basic Core. Therefore, of the 124 questionnaires that were returned, 113 were useable in the study for a 63.8 per cent return.

The findings of this study are presented in three sections. The first section presents the teacher use of the units of instruction by areas. The extent of the use was computed by percentages. Percentages throughout the study were rounded off to the nearest tenth, and therefore, may not equal 100 per cent.

The second section is the presentation of the teacher perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction. Perceived usefulness of the components was also computed by percentages.

The third section explains the relationship between selected variables which have an effect on the use of the specific units of instruction and the perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction. A brief description of the subjects precedes the three sections.

Description of Subjects

The subjects of this study included 113 vocational consumer and

homemaking teachers in the state of Oklahoma. Eighty-six of the 113 teachers have Bachelor's Degrees, with 27 holding Master's Degrees. All of the teachers, with the exception of one who did not respond to the question concerning education, indicated they had taken courses within the last five years, with 66.3 per cent of the teachers taking courses as recently as 1974.

More than half, 58.3 per cent, of the responding teachers were from the eastern half of the state. The remaining 41.6 per cent of the teachers were from the western half of the state. Percentages from the supervisory districts are listed in Table I.

TABLE I
RESPONDENTS FROM SUPERVISORY DISTRICTS
BY PERCENTAGE

North- West	South- West	North- East	South- East	West	East	Total
N=15	N=22	N=26	N=28	N=10	N=12	N=113
13.2	19.4	23.0	24.7	8.8	10.6	99.7

Over 50 per cent of the teachers indicated they had been teaching in their present school from one to three years, with 20.3 per cent indicating tenure from eight to sixteen years. Data are given in Table II.

TABLE II
NUMBER OF YEARS AT PRESENT SCHOOL

	Range					Total
	1-3	4-7	8-16	17-22	23-over	
Number	64	18	23	5	2	112
Percent	56.6	15.9	20.3	4.4	1.7	98.5
Not Responding	0.8					

Of the teachers responding to the question concerning number of students, 44.2 per cent indicated that they had up to 30 students enrolled in Home Economics I. There were enrollments of 31 to 60 in Home Economics I for 35.3 per cent of the respondents, with the remainder having enrollments of 61 to over 120 students. (See Table III.)

TABLE III
NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN
VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS I

	Range					Total
	1-30	31-60	61-90	91-120	120-over	
Number	50	40	10	5	7	112
Percent	44.2	35.3	8.7	4.3	6.1	98.6
Not Responding	0.8					

When asked for the approximate time that the Core Curriculum was followed in their classes, 36.2 per cent of the teachers responded that they followed the core from 51 to 75 per cent of the time. A lower percentage, 26.5, indicated that they followed the Core Curriculum 26 to 50 per cent of the time, and 18.5 per cent indicated that they followed the Home Economics I, Basic Core more than 75 per cent of the time. Table IV shows time spent following Core Curriculum.

TABLE IV
APPROXIMATE TIME CORE CURRICULUM IS FOLLOWED

	Range					Total
	Less Than 10%	10-25%	26-50%	51-75%	More Than 75%	
Number	4	15	30	41	21	111
Percent	3.5	13.2	26.5	36.2	18.5	97.5
Not Responding	1.7					

From those who responded to the question, "How often would you like a Curriculum to be revised," 57.5 per cent of the teachers responded "whenever necessary." A percentage of 22.1 recommended every five years, and 18.5 per cent indicated they felt that revision should be made every three years. Frequency of curriculum revision as recommended by the respondents is shown in Table V.

TABLE V
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CURRICULUM REVISION

	3 yrs.	5 yrs.	8 yrs.	10 yrs.	Whenever Necessary	Total
Number	21	25	2	0	65	113
Percent	18.5	22.1	1.7	0	57.5	99.6

General Use of Areas and Units

The questionnaire listed the eight areas and the units of instruction included in each area in the Home Economics I, Basic Core. (See Appendix A.) Teachers were asked to check the areas and the units that they teach or they do not teach including all the reasons that apply.

Clothing and Textiles

An examination of Table VI reveals that the area receiving the highest degree of usage was Clothing and Textiles, with 84 per cent of the respondents checking "yes" they did teach that area. Of those responding, 1.7 per cent indicated they did not teach the area. The units within the area of clothing and textiles receiving the highest degree of usage were "Getting to Know Your Machine," with 88.4 per cent "yes" and 1.7 per cent responding "no" they did not teach the unit; "Small Sewing Equipment," "Use of Commercial Patterns," and "Operating the Sewing Machine" ranked 82.3 per cent and above in usage.

TABLE VI
TOTAL RESPONSE TO USE OF AREAS
AND UNITS BY PERCENT
(N=113)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	42.4	30.0	25.6	1.7
I-Obtaining A Job	46.0	32.7	17.6	3.5
II-Job Success	41.5	34.5	16.8	7.0
III-Home Economics Careers	38.0	31.8	20.3	9.7
B - Child Development	64.6	8.8	19.4	7.0
I-Child Care Services	55.7	15.0	21.2	7.9
II-Behavior and Discipline	67.2	11.5	15.0	6.1
C - Clothing and Textiles	84.0	1.7	11.5	2.6
I-Small Sewing Equipment	85.8	3.5	7.9	2.6
II-Getting to Know Machine	88.4	1.7	6.1	3.5
III-Care of Sewing Machine	77.8	4.4	14.1	1.7
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	82.3	6.1	8.8	2.6
V-Using Commercial Patterns	84.0	3.5	9.7	2.6
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	75.2	7.0	14.1	3.5
D - Consumer Education	48.6	20.3	26.5	4.4
I-Personal Income	47.7	22.1	23.8	6.1
II-Managing Personal Income	46.0	22.1	26.5	5.3
III-Planned Spending	39.5	24.7	20.9	4.4
E-Foods and Nutrition	77.8	00.0	20.3	1.7
I-Eating Activities	68.1	13.2	13.2	5.3
II-Meal Planning	76.9	5.3	14.1	3.5
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	82.3	1.9	14.1	1.7
IV-Using a Recipe	87.6	0.8	7.9	3.5
V-Sanitation	55.7	17.6	18.5	7.9
F - Health	68.1	11.5	15.9	4.4
I-Your Health and Grooming	69.0	12.3	15.0	3.5
II-Health and Your Figure	65.4	11.5	15.9	7.0
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	48.6	20.3	25.6	5.3
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	37.1	34.5	21.2	7.0
II-Personal Living Space	50.4	28.3	13.2	7.9
III-Color	61.0	22.1	12.3	4.4
IV-Furniture Arrangement	46.0	33.6	15.0	5.3
V-Storage in Personal Living	41.5	35.3	15.0	7.9
H - Personal and Family Relations	65.4	12.3	19.4	2.6
I-Peer Relations	69.0	13.2	14.1	3.5
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	63.7	15.0	17.6	3.5
III-Values and Goals	60.1	15.0	19.4	5.3

The unit receiving the lowest percentage of usage, 75.2 per cent, was "Prepare the Machine for Sewing." The reasons checked for not teaching any of the units in the area of clothing textiles, referred to in Table VII, were "Prefer Using Personally Developed Material," which received the highest percentage of responses, 7.0; and second, "Have Better Resource Materials Available," 5.3 per cent.

Foods and Nutrition

The second area receiving the highest percentage of usage was the area of Foods and Nutrition. A high percentage, 77.8, of the teachers checked "yes" they taught the area, 20.3 per cent responded they taught the area "In Part," and no respondents checked "no" they did not teach the area.

"Using A Recipe" was the unit within the area of Foods and Nutrition receiving the highest percentage of usage, 87.6 per cent. The unit receiving the lowest percentage of usage was the unit "Sanitation," with 55.7 per cent responding "yes" and 17.6 per cent responding "no." The majority of reasons for not teaching the unit fell in the category of "Not Enough Time."

Career Exploration and Housing and Home Furnishings

Two areas received approximately the same percentage of response concerning use. The area receiving the lowest percentage of usage was Career Exploration, receiving 34.5 per cent "no" responses, and the area Housing and Home Furnishings with units, "Cleaning Supplies and Equipment," 34.5 per cent "no"; "Storage in Personal Living," 35.3 per

TABLE VII

PERCENTAGE RESPONSES FOR REASONS GIVEN IN THE USE OF HOME
ECONOMICS I, BASIC CORE AREAS AND UNITS OF INSTRUCTION
(N=113)

Area and Unit Number	Reasons Not Taught All or In Part											
	Areas and Units Effective and Meet the Needs of Students	Personal Background Weak in Subject	Content Too Difficult for Student	Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	Not Needed in My Community	Not Enough Time	Too Elementary	No Available Resources	Need More Detailed Teaching Guide	Have Better Resource Materials Available	Prefer Using Personally Developed Material	Others: Specify
Area A - Career Exploration	14.1	0.8	0.8	1.7	-	33.8	-	0.8	-	1.7	0.8	-
I - Obtaining A Job	13.2	-	1.7	3.5	-	17.6	-	-	-	-	0.8	-
II - Job Success	14.1	0.8	0.8	2.6	0.8	17.6	-	-	-	0.8	2.6	0.8
III - Know Yourself and Home Economics Careers	11.5	-	-	1.7	-	21.2	-	0.8	-	0.8	5.3	0.8
Area B - Child Development	7.0	-	-	2.6	-	4.4	-	-	0.8	5.3	0.8	-
I - Child Care Services	13.2	-	0.8	3.5	0.8	8.8	0.8	-	0.8	4.4	1.7	-
II - Behavior and Discipline	15.0	-	0.8	0.8	-	7.0	-	-	0.8	4.4	0.8	-
Area C - Clothing and Textiles	20.3	-	-	0.8	-	-	0.8	-	-	0.8	2.6	-
I - Small Sewing Equipment	23.0	-	-	0.8	-	-	1.7	-	-	0.8	5.3	-
II - Getting to Know Your Machine	23.8	-	-	0.8	-	-	0.8	-	-	2.6	3.5	-
III - Care of the Sewing Machine	20.3	-	-	0.8	-	0.8	1.7	-	-	3.5	5.3	0.8
IV - Operating the Sewing Machine -Unthreaded	22.1	-	-	0.8	-	-	2.6	-	-	3.5	6.1	-

TABLE VII (Continued)

Area and Unit Number	Reasons Not Taught All or In Part											
	Areas and Units Effective and Meet the Needs of Students	Personal Background Weak in Subject	Content Too Difficult for Students	Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	Not Needed in My Community	Not Enough Time	Too Elementary	No Available Resources	Need More Detailed Teaching Guide	Have Better Resource Materials Available	Prefer Using Personally Developed Material	Others: Specify
Area C (Continued)												
V - Using Commercial Patterns	23.0	-	-	0.8	-	0.8	-	-	-	5.3	3.5	0.8
VI - Prepare the Machine for Sewing	18.5	-	-	0.8	-	1.7	2.6	-	-	5.3	7.0	-
Area D - Consumer Education	9.7	0.8	-	1.7	-	16.8	-	-	-	0.8	4.4	0.8
I - Personal Income	15.0	0.8	-	0.8	-	15.9	0.8	-	0.8	0.8	5.3	1.7
II - Managing Personal Income	15.0	0.8	-	3.5	-	15.9	0.8	-	0.8	0.8	6.1	0.8
III - Planned Spending	13.2	0.8	2.6	0.8	0.8	17.6	-	0.8	1.7	1.7	7.0	-
Area E - Foods and Nutrition	10.6	-	-	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	0.8	0.8	-
I - Eating Activities	15.0	-	-	-	-	5.3	1.7	-	-	4.4	2.6	0.8
II - Meal Planning	22.1	-	0.8	-	-	0.8	-	-	0.8	6.1	5.3	-
III - Kitchen Utensils and Tools	25.6	-	0.8	-	0.8	-	1.7	-	-	5.3	1.7	-
IV - Using a Recipe	24.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.7	2.6	-
V - Sanitation	14.1	-	1.7	-	0.8	15.0	0.8	0.8	-	2.6	6.1	-
Area F - Health	8.8	-	-	-	-	1.7	-	-	0.8	3.5	4.4	-
I - Your Health and Grooming	17.6	-	-	-	-	2.6	1.7	-	0.8	12.3	8.8	-
II - Health and Your Figure	16.8	-	-	-	-	2.6	1.7	-	-	11.5	8.8	-

TABLE VII (Continued)

Area and Unit Number	Reasons Not Taught All or In Part											
	Areas and Units Effective and Meet the Needs of Students	Personal Background Weak in Subject	Content Too Difficult for Students	Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	Not Needed in My Community	Not Enough Time	Too Elementary	No Available Resources	Need More Detailed Teaching Guide	Have Better Resource Materials Available	Prefer Using Personally Developed Material	Others: Specify
Area G - Housing and Home Furnishings	7.0	1.7	-	-	-	13.2	0.8	-	-	1.7	0.8	-
I - Cleaning Supplies and Equipment	7.9	2.6	2.6	2.6	0.8	17.6	4.4	1.7	2.6	3.5	4.4	0.8
II - Personal Living Space	15.0	-	0.8	-	-	19.4	0.8	0.8	0.8	3.5	1.7	-
III - Color	15.0	-	2.6	-	-	14.1	-	-	0.8	1.7	0.8	0.8
IV - Furniture Arrangement	13.2	-	0.8	-	0.8	22.1	0.8	0.8	1.7	1.7	0.8	0.8
V - Storage in Personal Living Area	9.7	0.8	0.8	-	2.6	24.7	0.8	0.8	-	2.6	0.8	-
Area H - Personal and Family Relations	12.3	-	-	-	-	6.1	1.7	-	1.7	3.5	3.5	-
I - Peer Relations	16.8	-	-	-	0.8	6.1	0.8	0.8	1.7	2.6	7.9	-
II - Family Privileges and Responsibilities	14.1	-	-	-	0.8	9.7	0.8	0.8	2.6	3.5	9.7	-
III - Values and Goals	12.3	-	0.8	-	0.8	10.6	-	0.8	0.8	3.5	7.0	-

cent; and "Furniture Arrangement," with 33.6 per cent "no." The highest percentage of reasons for not teaching these units was again, "Not Enough Time," and "Prefer Using Personally Developed Material."

Consumer Education

The area, Consumer Education, was third in low percentage of usage. A percentage of 24.7 responded they did not teach "Planning Spending," with 17.6 per cent of the respondents checking "Not Enough Time," and 7.0 per cent responding, "Prefer Using Personally Developed Material."

Teacher Perceived Usefulness of Components

Part B of the questionnaire asked the teachers to circle their evaluation of the usefulness of the components of the units of instruction. The categories were "Highly Useful," "Useful," "Moderately Useful," "Of Some Use," and "Not Useful." The teachers were asked to comment if they did not find the components useful. Table VIII presents the total response of the teacher perceived usefulness of the components.

Terminal Objectives

The largest number of teachers responding, 43.3 per cent, perceived the Terminal Objective component as "Useful," with 29.2 per cent responding "Highly Useful." Of the teachers responding, 4.4 per cent felt that the Terminal Objectives were not useful and gave the following comments:

TABLE VIII
TOTAL RESPONSE OF TEACHER PERCEIVED USEFULNESS OF
COMPONENTS OF THE UNITS OF INSTRUCTION BY PERCENT
(N=113)

Components	Highly Useful	Useful	Moderately Useful	Of Some Use	Not Useful	No Response
Terminal Objectives	29.2	43.3	11.5	8.8	4.4	2.6
Specific Objectives	46.9	34.5	9.7	3.5	2.6	2.6
Suggested Activities	28.3	34.5	18.5	10.3	4.4	3.5
Information Sheets	46.0	31.8	14.1	4.4	0.0	3.5
Transparency Masters	34.5	31.8	11.5	8.8	7.0	6.1
Job Sheets	26.5	36.2	25.6	5.3	2.6	3.5
Assignment Sheets	23.0	46.0	18.5	8.8	0.8	2.6
Tests	24.7	24.7	23.0	15.0	8.8	3.5

"Students paid no attention to them."

"Just overstatement of specific."

"Students don't pay any attention to these."

Some unsolicited comments regarding the usefulness of the Terminal Objectives were:

"When we had to write out objectives, they came in very handy."

"Helped in accountability, but sometimes they seemed too specific."

The Terminal Objectives were perceived by 8.8 per cent of the teachers as being "Of Some Use," commenting:

"85% on tests is not realistic--70-75% would be better."

"Specific objectives are good enough."

Specific Objectives

The Specific Objectives component received the highest degree of perceived usefulness by the respondents. "Highly Useful" was indicated by 46.9 per cent of the teachers and 34.5 per cent responded that they were "Useful." A small percentage, 3.5, felt that they were "Of Some Use," with 2.6 per cent responding they were "Not Useful." Comments were:

"Students paid little attention to them."

"Does not consider the 'slower' students."

Suggested Activities

"Useful" was the rating given by 34.5 per cent of the respondents to the Suggested Activities component, with 28.3 per cent marking "Highly Useful." The Suggested Activities component was "Moderately Useful" to 18.5 per cent of the teachers, which included the

following comments:

"Need more suggestions."

"Say too much of the same thing. Good if they say something different."

"Some activities do not fit needs of students."

A percentage of 10.3 of the respondents indicated that the Suggested Activities component was "Of Some Use," and provided the following comments:

"Need many more. I use other resources for activities of enrichment."

"Need supplementing to meet need of community and to fit our resources."

"Not too many interesting ones mentioned."

A small percentage, 4.4, indicated that the component was not useful and commented:

"Too elementary; not really helpful."

"These are basically common sense and to prepare a lesson, a lot more is involved (film and book resources quite helpful)."

Information Sheets

The Information Sheets component received the second highest degree of perceived usefulness by the respondents. Forty-six per cent indicated "Highly Useful" with one comment, "On the whole--very good." "Useful" was indicated by 31.8 per cent, commenting:

"Needs to be more detailed."

"They are helpful, but students don't like them."

There were no respondents who felt that the Information Sheets

component was not useful. "Of Some Use" was indicated by 4.4 per cent, remarking, "Students tend to dislike them after a while," and "Students hate these."

Transparency Masters

The Transparency Masters component received a high degree of usefulness, 34.5 per cent "Highly Useful" and 31.8 per cent "Useful." However, those teachers who indicated "Not Useful," 7 per cent, gave the following comments:

"Because they are in the student notebook."

"We have no way of running our own transparencies off here at school."

"Equipment availability."

The following comments were provided by 8.8 per cent who felt the component was "Of Some Use":

"Some are too elementary."

"Art could be better."

"Use ones I have prepared."

One of the respondents marking "Moderately Useful" for the Transparency Masters component, remarked, "Should be different from pictures in their student materials."

Job Sheets

The Job Sheets component was rated above 60 per cent for "Useful" and "Highly Useful," with 2.6 per cent of the respondents marking "Not Useful." Comments were: "Too easy at times," and "Way too elementary."

Assignment Sheets

The Assignment Sheets component was rated above 60 per cent "Useful" to "Highly Useful" by the respondents. A percentage of 8.8 indicated "Of Some Use," commenting: "Should be more thought provoking--more challenging" and "Some too simple."

Tests

The Tests component received the lowest rating with less than 50 per cent of the teachers indicating "Useful" to "Highly Useful." Twenty-three per cent rated the Tests component as "Moderately Useful," including the following comments:

"Too much rote memory--some too time consuming in grading for the teacher."

"Tests need improving most! 1. Words to be matched on front and back or two pages. 2. Expected to list as many as 10 in some categories. 3. Need more multiple-choice and fill in blanks. Not so many discussion. 4. Need some problem solving that would use materials, but not items which could be memorized."

"The smart ones pick up the memorization for tests only, slow ones often have trouble with terminology or some test words too similar."

Many comments were included in the 15.0 per cent of those responding who felt that the tests component was "Of Some Use." Some of the comments follow:

"Too much listing."

"Too much rote learning. More true and false, matching vocabulary we need! or choice type questions. More thought provoking rather than memorizing."

"They are not well constructed--too detailed--very difficult to grade."

A percentage of 8.8 of the teachers responded that the Tests component was "Not Useful." The following comments are some that were included:

"A complete repetition of information sheet--no reasoning required of the student."

"Only thing they require of a student is the ability to memorize material."

The remainder of the comments can be found in Appendix B.

Comparison of Variables

The third objective in this study was to determine the effect selected variables--age of teacher, number of years teaching vocational home economics, highest college degree held, year last additional courses taken, and size of school--had on the use of the areas and the perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction.

The first variable used was age of the teacher. The questionnaires were grouped into four categories: age group 21-30, 31-40, 41-50, and 51 and above. Data were tabulated and percentages were determined. Table IX presents the data according to the four age-group categories.

In the area of Career Exploration, the age group indicating the highest degree of usage was the 41-50 age group. The age group indicating the lowest degree of usage, or marking "no" they did not teach the area, was the 31-40 age group. The age group indicating the lowest percentage of "yes" responses was the age group 51 and above. However,

TABLE IX
PERCENT RESPONDING IN EACH AREA TO VARIABLE TEACHER AGE

Area	Age 21-30 N=60				Age 31-40 N=18				Age 41-50 N=19				Age 51 and Above N=16			
	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.
A - Career Exploration	36.6	36.6	21.6	5.0	50.0	38.8	11.1	0.0	52.6	15.7	21.0	10.5	25.0	18.7	50.0	6.2
B - Child Development	65.0	8.3	21.6	5.0	72.2	11.1	11.1	5.5	79.9	10.5	5.2	5.2	37.5	6.2	50.0	6.2
C - Clothing and Textiles	86.6	1.6	10.0	1.6	94.4	0.0	5.5	0.0	89.4	0.0	5.2	5.2	81.2	0.0	18.7	0.0
D - Consumer Education	45.0	25.0	25.0	5.0	55.5	22.2	16.6	5.5	68.4	5.2	21.0	5.2	37.5	12.5	43.7	6.2
E - Foods and Nutrition	75.0	0.0	23.3	1.6	88.8	0.0	5.5	5.5	84.2	0.0	10.5	5.2	56.2	6.2	37.5	0.0
F - Health	66.6	20.0	10.0	3.3	66.6	5.5	22.2	5.5	84.2	0.0	10.5	5.2	56.1	0.0	43.7	0.0
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	45.0	23.3	28.3	3.3	38.8	38.8	22.2	0.0	57.8	10.5	26.3	5.2	18.7	6.2	56.2	18.7
H - Personal and Family Relations	63.3	11.6	21.6	3.3	72.2	11.1	16.6	0.0	73.6	5.2	15.7	5.2	50.0	18.7	31.2	0.0

this age group indicated the highest percentage of responses to "in part" usage of the area and the units.

In the area of Child Development, the age group 41-50 again indicated the highest percentage of "yes" responses, with the age group of 51 and above indicating use of the area and units "in part." The age group 31-40 indicated the highest percentage of "no" responses.

Appendix C includes the percentage of use for the specific units of instruction.

The age group indicating the highest percentage of usage in the area of Clothing and Textiles was the 31-40 age group. Over 90 per cent of the teachers in this group checked "yes" they taught the area.

The lowest percentage of "no" responses was indicated by three age groups--31-40, 41-50, and 51 and above--with not one teacher marking that they did not teach the area. Again the highest percentage of usage of the area "in part" was indicated by the age group 51 and above.

The age group indicating the highest percentage of "no" to the Clothing and Textiles area was the 21-30 age group.

The highest percentage of usage for Consumer Education was indicated by the age group 41-50. Teachers within this age group also had the lowest percentage of "no" responses. Again, the teachers in group 51 and above indicated the highest percentage of "in part" responses.

The area of Foods and Nutrition finds the age group of 41-50 marking the highest percentage of "yes" and the lowest percentage of "no." For the area, the teachers in the age group 51 and above indicated a higher overall percentage of "no" responses.

The age group 41-50 indicated the highest percentage of usage for the area Health, 84.2 per cent. There were no "no" responses in the age group. In the age group 51 and above, 43.7 per cent marked "in part" for the area.

Housing and Home Furnishings received the lowest percentage in usage with the age group 41-50 indicating slightly over 50 per cent "yes." The age group 31-40 indicated a higher percentage, 38.8, of "no" responses in the area than any other age group. Again the higher percentage of "in part" was indicated by the age group 51 and above.

The last area, Personal and Family Relationships, received the highest percentage of usage, or "yes" responses, in the age group 41-50. The age group 51 and above marked the highest percentage of "no" responses.

In summary, the age group 51 and above had the lowest percentage of "yes" responses in the majority of the areas, but the highest percentage of "in part" responses. The age group 41-50 had the lowest percentage of "no" responses in the majority of the areas, with the age group 21-30 indicating a somewhat higher overall percentage of "no" responses for the majority of the areas and the units.

For the second variable, number of years teaching vocational home economics, the respondents were divided into four categories: 1-4 years, 5-10 years, 11-20 years, and 21 and over. Comparisons in Table X reveal that the category 11-20 years teaching experience indicated "no" responses for the majority of the areas. However, this same group indicated a higher percentage of "in part" responses in the majority of the areas.

TABLE X
PERCENT RESPONDING IN EACH AREA TO VARIABLE
YEARS TAUGHT

Area	1-4 Years N=56				5-10 Years N=11				11-20 Years N=15				21 Years and Over N=11			
	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.
A - Career Exploration	33.9	44.6	17.8	3.5	48.3	19.3	32.2	0.0	73.3	6.6	20.0	0.0	36.3	27.2	27.2	9.0
B - Child Development	64.2	8.9	19.6	7.1	64.5	9.6	19.3	6.4	86.6	0.0	6.6	6.6	45.4	18.1	27.2	9.0
C - Clothing and Textiles	83.9	3.5	10.7	1.7	80.6	0.0	16.1	3.2	86.6	0.0	13.3	0.0	81.8	0.0	9.0	9.0
D - Consumer Education	46.4	28.5	19.6	5.3	51.6	16.1	29.0	3.2	60.0	0.0	33.3	6.6	36.3	18.1	36.3	9.0
E - Foods and Nutrition	82.1	0.0	16.0	1.7	80.6	0.0	16.1	3.2	60.0	0.0	26.6	13.3	72.7	0.0	27.2	0.0
F - Health	69.6	19.6	8.9	1.7	67.7	6.4	19.3	6.4	60.0	0.0	33.3	6.6	72.7	0.0	18.1	9.0
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	39.2	28.5	30.3	1.7	41.9	19.3	38.7	0.0	40.0	6.6	33.3	20.0	18.1	18.1	45.4	18.1
H - Personal and Family Relations	62.5	14.2	21.4	1.7	74.1	9.6	9.6	6.4	53.3	13.3	33.3	0.0	63.6	9.0	27.2	0.0

The area receiving a high percentage of "no" responses was Career Exploration, with 44.6 per cent of the teachers with 1-4 years experience indicating they did not teach the area. Housing and Home Furnishings received a high percentage of "no" responses, 28.5 per cent, in the 1-4 year group.

The area receiving a high percentage of usage was Clothing and Textiles with 86.6 per cent "yes" responses, up to 90.0 per cent in the 11-20 years experience group and the 21 and over years experience categories. There were no teachers in these categories indicating "no" responses.

Additional comparisons in use of the areas were made using the highest college degree held by the teachers as a variable. The categories used were bachelor's degree and master's degree. Table XI presents the percentage of "yes" responses to all the areas with differences ranging from 0.7 to 8.8 per cent. "No" responses had similar percentage responses with the exception of three areas: Consumer Education, Health, and Housing and Home Furnishings. Those teachers with a bachelor's degree indicated slightly higher percentage of "no" responses.

A third variable used to compare use of the areas in the Home Economics I, Basic Core was size of school. The categories are as follows: schools with an enrollment below 99, 100-299, 300-499, 500-899, and 900 and above. Data found in relation to this variable is reported in Table XII.

In the area of Career Exploration, the response to "yes" had a low percentage, 19.3, in the 300-499 students category in comparison to the other four categories. A low percentage, 14.2, of "yes" responses in

TABLE XI
PERCENT RESPONDING IN EACH AREA TO VARIABLE
HIGHEST DEGREE

Area	B.S. Degree N=86				M.S. Degree N=27			
	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.
A - Career Exploration	41.8	31.3	25.5	1.1	44.4	25.9	25.9	3.7
B - Child Development	66.2	9.3	16.2	8.1	59.2	7.4	29.6	3.7
C - Clothing and Textiles	83.7	2.3	12.7	1.1	85.1	0.0	7.4	7.4
D - Consumer Education	48.8	23.2	22.0	5.8	48.1	11.1	40.7	0.0
E - Foods and Nutrition	76.7	0.0	22.0	1.1	81.4	0.0	14.8	3.7
F - Health	66.2	12.7	16.2	4.6	74.0	7.2	14.8	3.7
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	47.6	24.4	23.2	4.6	51.8	7.2	33.3	7.2
H - Personal and Family Relations	63.9	11.6	22.0	2.3	70.3	14.8	11.1	3.7

TABLE XII
PERCENT RESPONDING IN EACH AREA TO VARIABLE
SIZE OF SCHOOL

Area	Below 99 Students N=21				100-299 Students N=22				300-499 Students N=31				500-899 Students N=15				900 Students and Above N=24			
	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.	Yes	No	In Part	No Resp.
A - Career Explora- tion	47.6	14.2	33.3	4.7	54.5	27.2	18.1	0.0	19.3	54.8	25.8	0.0	66.6	26.6	6.6	0.0	50.0	16.6	33.3	0.0
B - Child Develop- ment	57.1	4.7	23.8	14.2	68.1	9.0	18.1	4.5	74.1	9.6	12.9	3.2	86.6	13.3	0.0	0.0	58.3	12.5	25.0	4.1
C - Clothing and Textiles	66.6	4.7	23.8	4.7	95.4	0.0	4.5	0.0	80.6	0.0	16.1	3.2	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	83.3	0.0	16.6	0.0
D - Consumer Education	28.5	28.5	33.3	9.5	45.4	22.7	27.2	4.5	54.8	19.3	22.5	3.2	60.0	13.3	26.6	0.0	54.1	16.6	25.0	4.1
E - Foods and Nutrition	66.6	0.0	33.3	0.0	95.4	0.0	4.5	0.0	77.4	0.0	16.1	6.4	86.6	0.0	13.3	0.0	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
F - Health	71.4	4.7	23.8	0.0	77.2	18.1	4.5	0.0	67.7	12.9	12.9	6.4	73.3	6.6	20.0	0.0	62.5	12.5	20.8	4.1
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	42.8	23.8	28.5	4.7	54.5	18.1	27.2	0.0	51.6	19.3	25.8	3.2	53.3	13.3	33.3	0.0	54.1	20.8	16.6	8.3
H - Personal and Fam- ily Relations	66.6	9.5	23.8	0.0	63.6	22.7	9.0	4.5	58.0	19.3	16.1	6.4	73.3	0.0	26.6	0.0	75.0	4.1	20.8	0.0

Comparison of Variables For The Teacher

Perceived Usefulness of Components

In comparing the percentage responses by age groups of the perceived usefulness of the Terminal Objectives component, Table XIV, the age group 31-40 indicated a higher percentage of "Useful" to "Highly Useful," with 50 per cent responding to "Useful" and 38.8 per cent responding to "Highly Useful."

The age group 21-30 had the highest percentage of responses of "Moderately Useful" to "Not Useful." The responses of age groups as to the perceived usefulness of the Specific Objectives component showed little differences, ranging from 36.8 per cent, 41-50 age, to 48.3 per cent, 21-30 age.

The perceived usefulness of the Suggested Activities component according to age groups indicated that the age group 31-40 had the highest percentage of responses to "Useful" and "Highly Useful" and the age group 51 and over had the lowest percentage of responses of "Useful" to "Highly Useful." However, this same age group indicated a higher percentage of responses in the "Useful" to "Highly Useful" categories for the Information Sheets component, with the age group 41-50 indicating the lowest percentage of responses to "Useful" and "Highly Useful."

The Transparency Masters component received high responses from all age groups in the "Useful" to "Highly Useful" categories, however, 18.7 per cent in the age group 51 and over indicated that the Transparency Masters component was "Not Useful." The age group 21-30 indicated the higher percentage of responses to the Job Sheets component in the "Useful" to "Highly Useful" category, with the age group 51 and over

TABLE XIV
COMPARISON OF THE TEACHER PERCEIVED USEFULNESS
OF COMPONENTS OF THE UNITS OF INSTRUCTION
BY AGE GROUPS

		N=60	N=18	N=19	N=16	
Components	Useful- ness	Age	Age	Age	Age	Average Response
		21-30	31-40	41-50	51 & over	
Percent Responding						
Terminal Objectives	5*	25.0	38.8	26.3	37.5	31.9
	4*	38.2	50.0	52.6	43.7	46.2
	3*	13.3	5.5	5.2	18.7	10.7
	2*	15.0	0.0	5.2	0.0	5.1
	1*	6.6	5.5	0.0	0.0	3.0
	no response	1.6	0.0	10.5	0.0	3.0
Specific Objectives	5	48.3	55.5	36.8	43.7	46.1
	4	33.3	27.7	42.1	37.5	35.2
	3	6.6	11.1	10.5	18.7	11.7
	2	5.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	2.6
	1	5.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
	no response	1.6	0.0	10.5	0.0	3.0
Suggested Activities	5	30.0	38.8	21.0	18.7	27.1
	4	35.0	38.8	36.8	31.2	35.5
	3	18.3	16.6	10.5	31.2	19.2
	2	10.0	0.0	15.7	18.7	11.1
	1	5.0	5.5	0.0	0.0	2.6
	no response	1.6	0.0	15.7	0.0	4.3
Information Sheets	5	46.6	55.5	31.5	50.0	45.9
	4	30.0	27.7	36.8	37.5	33.0
	3	15.0	11.1	21.0	6.2	13.3
	2	5.0	5.5	0.0	6.2	4.2
	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	no response	3.3	0.0	10.5	0.0	3.5
Transparency Masters	5	35.0	38.8	26.3	37.5	34.4
	4	31.6	27.7	36.8	31.2	31.8
	3	10.0	27.7	10.5	0.0	12.1
	2	11.6	5.5	10.5	0.0	6.9
	1	6.6	0.0	5.2	18.7	7.6
	no response	5.0	0.0	10.5	12.5	7.0
Job Sheets	5	36.6	16.6	10.5	18.7	20.6
	4	30.0	50.0	42.1	37.5	39.9
	3	21.6	27.7	31.5	31.2	28.0
	2	6.6	0.0	5.2	6.2	4.5
	1	3.3	0.0	0.0	6.2	2.4
	no response	1.6	5.5	10.5	0.0	4.4
Assignment Sheets	5	25.0	33.3	15.7	12.5	21.6
	4	48.3	50.0	42.1	37.5	44.5
	3	13.3	16.6	26.3	31.2	21.8
	2	10.0	0.0	5.2	18.7	8.5
	1	1.6	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4
	no response	1.6	0.0	10.5	0.0	3.0
Tests	5	23.3	38.8	15.7	25.0	25.7
	4	25.0	33.3	10.5	31.2	25.0
	3	25.0	5.5	47.3	6.2	21.0
	2	11.6	11.1	15.7	31.2	17.4
	1	11.6	11.1	0.0	6.2	7.2
	no response	3.3	0.0	10.5	0.0	3.5

* Highly Useful (5), Useful (4), Moderately Useful (3), Of Some Use (2), Not Useful (1).

marking the higher percentage of responses to "Of Some Use" and "Not Useful."

The age group 31-40 felt that the Assignment Sheets component was "Useful" to "Highly Useful" with the age group 51 and over perceiving the Assignment Sheets component as less useful.

Greater variations were indicated in the responses to the perceived usefulness of the Tests component. The age group 31-40 showed the highest percentage of responses in the "Useful" to "Highly Useful" categories, whereas, the age groups 41-50 had over 50 per cent of the respondents indicating that the Tests component was "Moderately Useful" to "Not Useful."

For the variable, number of years teaching experience, the responses in the 11-20 years category, over 80 per cent, perceived the Terminal Objectives component as "Useful" to "Highly Useful." In the 1-4 years teaching experience category, 34.9 per cent of the respondents perceived the Terminal Objectives component as "Moderately Useful" to "Not Useful." However, this same group indicated the highest percentage of "Useful" to "Highly Useful" responses to the Specific Objectives component. (See Table XV.)

The responses to the perceived usefulness of the Suggested Activities component showed about the same percentage for "Useful" to "Highly Useful" in the three categories ranging from 1-4 years to 11-20 years. For the group 21 years and over teaching experience, 36.3 per cent of the teachers responded that the Suggested Activities component was "Of Some Use."

Those teachers with 11-20 years experience indicated that the Information Sheets component was "Useful" to "Highly Useful" with a

TABLE XV
COMPARISON OF THE TEACHER PERCEIVED USEFULNESS
OF COMPONENTS OF THE UNITS OF INSTRUCTION
BY YEARS TAUGHT

		N=56	N=31	N=51	N=11	
		Years Taught				
Components	Useful- ness	1-4	5-10 Percent	11-20 Responding	21 & over	Average Response
Terminal Objectives	5*	28.5	29.0	26.6	36.3	30.1
	4*	37.5	48.3	60.0	36.3	45.5
	3*	12.5	6.4	6.6	27.2	13.2
	2*	12.5	9.6	0.0	0.0	5.5
	1*	7.1	3.2	0.0	0.0	2.6
no response		1.7	3.2	6.6	0.0	2.9
Specific Objectives	5	53.5	38.7	46.6	36.3	43.8
	4	33.9	35.4	26.6	45.4	35.3
	3	5.3	9.6	20.0	18.1	13.2
	2	0.0	12.9	0.0	0.0	3.2
	1	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.3
no response		1.7	3.2	6.6	0.0	2.9
Suggested Activities	5	35.7	16.1	20.0	36.3	27.0
	4	30.3	45.1	46.6	18.1	35.0
	3	17.8	22.5	20.0	9.0	17.3
	2	8.9	9.6	0.0	36.3	13.7
	1	5.3	3.2	0.0	0.0	2.1
no response		1.7	3.2	13.3	0.0	4.6
Information Sheets	5	51.7	35.4	53.3	36.3	44.2
	4	30.3	25.8	40.0	45.4	35.4
	3	12.5	22.5	0.0	18.1	13.3
	2	3.5	9.6	0.0	0.0	3.3
	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
no response		1.7	6.4	6.6	0.0	3.7
Transparency Masters	5	37.5	25.8	33.3	45.4	35.5
	4	32.1	35.4	26.6	27.2	30.3
	3	10.7	12.9	20.0	0.0	10.9
	2	5.3	19.3	0.0	9.0	8.4
	1	7.1	3.2	6.6	18.1	8.8
no response		7.1	3.2	13.3	0.0	5.9
Job Sheets	5	37.5	12.9	13.3	27.2	22.7
	4	30.3	41.9	46.6	36.3	38.8
	3	23.2	29.0	33.3	18.1	25.9
	2	7.1	3.2	0.0	9.0	4.8
	1	0.0	6.4	0.0	9.0	3.9
no response		1.7	6.4	6.6	0.0	3.7
Assignment Sheets	5	28.5	12.9	20.0	27.2	22.2
	4	42.8	58.0	46.6	27.2	43.7
	3	17.8	16.1	20.0	27.2	20.3
	2	8.9	6.4	6.6	18.1	10.0
	1	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	0.8
no response		1.7	3.2	6.6	0.0	2.9
Tests	5	30.3	16.1	26.6	18.1	22.8
	4	23.2	25.8	33.3	18.1	25.1
	3	21.4	22.5	20.0	36.3	25.1
	2	12.5	19.3	13.3	18.1	15.8
	1	8.9	12.9	0.0	9.0	7.7
no response		3.5	3.2	6.6	0.0	3.3

*Highly Useful (5), Useful (4), Moderately Useful (3), Of Some Use (2), Not Useful (1).

93.3 per cent total response. A lower percentage, 61.2, of responses in the same category occurred in the 5-10 years experience category.

A greater percentage of teachers in the 21 and over years experience felt the Transparency Masters component was "Not Useful," whereas, this same group also perceived the Transparency Masters component as "Useful" to "Highly Useful" with the highest percentage of responses.

Over 67 per cent of the respondents in the 1-4 years experience category indicated that the Job Sheets component was "Useful" to "Highly Useful." Eighteen per cent of the respondents in the 21 and over category indicated that the Job Sheets component was "Of Some Use" to "Not Useful."

Over 70 per cent of the respondents in the 1-4 years and 5-10 years categories indicated that the Assignment Sheets component was "Useful" to "Highly Useful." The lower percentage of just over 54 per cent of the teachers in the 21 and over category indicated that the Job Sheets component was "Useful" to "Highly Useful." This same category marked 18 per cent "Of Some Use" to "Not Useful."

Fifty-nine per cent of the teachers in the 11-20 years group perceived the Tests component as "Useful" to "Highly Useful," whereas 36 per cent of the teachers in the 21 and over group felt the Tests component was "Useful" to "Highly Useful."

The higher percentage indicating that the Tests component was "Of Some Use" to "Not Useful" was in the 5-10 years group, with over 31 per cent responding. And in comparison, the 11-20 years category indicated only 13 per cent perceiving the Tests component as being "Of Some Use" with no respondents indicating that the Tests component was "Not Useful."

In comparing the responses of those teachers with a bachelor's degree to the teachers with a master's degree, both groups perceived the usefulness of the Terminal Objectives component somewhat equally, 70.9 per cent "Useful" to "Highly Useful" for bachelor's degree to 77.7 per cent in the master's degree category. However, the teachers with a master's degree indicated a slightly higher negative response to the perceived usefulness of the Specific Objectives component.

Table XVI reveals that those teachers with a master's degree ranked the Transparency Masters component as more useful than did the teachers with a bachelor's degree. The teachers with master's degree, 77.7 per cent, felt that the Transparency Masters were "Useful" to "Highly Useful" compared to 62.7 per cent of the teachers with bachelor's degrees.

Seventy-two per cent of the teachers with bachelor's degrees ranked the Assignment Sheets component as "Useful" to "Highly Useful" as compared to 59.2 per cent of the teachers with master's degrees.

The greatest difference in these two groups was indicated in the perceived usefulness of the Tests component. Over 50 per cent of the teachers with bachelor's degrees ranked the Tests component as "Useful" to "Highly Useful" as compared to 37 per cent of those teachers with master's degrees. Sixty-two and nine-tenths per cent of the teachers with master's degrees perceived the Tests component as being "Moderately Useful" to "Not Useful" compared to 41.7 per cent of teachers with bachelor's degrees.

Table XVII presents a comparison of the last variable, that of size of school. Over 75 per cent of the teachers from schools with enrollment of 100-299 and those teachers from schools with enrollment

TABLE XVI
COMPARISON OF THE TEACHER PERCEIVED USEFULNESS
OF COMPONENTS OF THE UNITS OF INSTRUCTION
BY HIGHEST DEGREE

		N=86	N=27	
		Highest Degree		
Components	Usefulness	B.S. Percent Responding	M.S. Percent Responding	Average Response
Terminal Objectives	5*	27.9	33.3	30.6
	4*	43.0	44.4	43.7
	3*	11.6	11.1	11.4
	2*	8.1	11.1	9.6
	1*	5.8	0.0	2.9
no response		3.4	0.0	1.7
Specific Objectives	5	47.6	44.4	46.0
	4	34.8	33.3	34.1
	3	8.1	14.8	11.5
	2	2.3	7.2	4.8
	1	3.4	0.0	1.7
no response		3.4	0.0	1.7
Suggested Activities	5	30.2	22.2	26.2
	4	32.5	40.7	36.6
	3	18.6	18.5	18.6
	2	10.4	11.1	10.8
	1	4.6	3.7	4.2
no response		3.4	3.7	3.6
Information Sheets	5	45.3	48.1	46.7
	4	30.2	37.0	33.6
	3	15.1	11.1	13.1
	2	4.6	3.7	4.2
	1	0.0	0.0	0.0
no response		4.6	0.0	2.3
Transparency Masters	5	36.0	29.6	32.8
	4	26.7	48.1	37.4
	3	12.7	7.2	10.0
	2	9.3	7.2	8.3
	1	6.9	7.2	7.1
no response		8.1	0.0	4.1
Job Sheets	5	29.0	18.5	23.8
	4	34.8	40.7	37.8
	3	25.5	25.9	25.7
	2	4.6	7.2	5.9
	1	1.1	7.2	4.2
no response		4.6	0.0	2.3
Assignment Sheets	5	25.5	14.8	20.2
	4	46.5	44.4	45.5
	3	16.2	25.9	21.1
	2	6.9	14.8	10.9
	1	1.1	0.0	0.6
no response		3.4	0.0	1.7
Tests	5	29.0	11.1	20.1
	4	24.4	25.9	25.2
	3	20.9	29.6	25.3
	2	12.7	22.2	17.5
	1	8.1	11.1	9.6
no response		4.6	0.0	2.3

*Highly Useful (5), Useful (4), Moderately Useful (3), Of Some Use (2), Not Useful (1).

TABLE XVII
COMPARISON OF THE TEACHER PERCEIVED USEFULNESS
OF COMPONENTS OF THE UNITS OF INSTRUCTION
BY SIZE OF SCHOOL

		N=21	N=22	N=31	N=15	N=24	
		Size of School					
Components	Usefulness	Below 99	100-299	300-499	500-899	Above 900	Average Response
		Percent Responding					
Terminal Objectives	5*	14.2	36.3	32.2	33.3	29.1	29.0
	4*	52.3	40.9	38.7	33.3	50.0	43.0
	3*	14.2	4.5	9.6	26.6	8.3	12.6
	2*	4.7	13.6	12.9	6.6	4.1	8.4
	1*	4.7	4.5	6.4	0.0	4.1	3.9
	no response	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	2.7
Specific Objectives	5	33.3	54.5	51.6	53.3	41.6	46.9
	4	38.0	22.7	35.4	40.0	37.5	34.7
	3	19.0	9.0	6.4	6.6	8.3	9.9
	2	0.0	4.5	6.4	0.0	4.1	3.0
	1	0.0	9.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	2.5
	no response	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	2.7
Suggested Activities	5	33.3	27.2	29.0	40.0	16.6	29.2
	4	33.3	40.9	38.7	6.6	45.8	33.1
	3	14.2	27.2	19.3	20.0	12.5	18.6
	2	4.7	0.0	9.6	26.6	16.6	11.5
	1	4.7	4.5	3.2	0.0	4.1	3.3
	no response	9.5	0.0	0.0	6.6	4.1	4.0
Information Sheets	5	38.0	50.0	45.1	53.3	45.8	46.4
	4	23.8	45.4	32.2	26.6	29.1	31.4
	3	19.0	0.0	16.1	20.0	16.6	14.3
	2	9.5	0.0	6.4	0.0	4.1	4.0
	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	no response	9.5	4.5	0.0	0.0	4.1	3.6
Transparency Masters	5	33.3	50.0	32.2	26.6	29.1	34.2
	4	28.5	31.8	29.0	26.6	41.6	31.5
	3	4.7	4.5	12.9	40.0	4.1	13.2
	2	14.2	0.0	6.4	6.6	16.6	8.8
	1	0.0	9.0	16.1	0.0	4.1	5.8
	no response	19.0	4.5	3.2	0.0	4.1	6.2
Job Sheets	5	23.8	40.9	32.2	20.0	12.5	25.9
	4	23.8	40.9	32.2	40.0	50.0	37.4
	3	38.0	13.6	25.8	33.3	16.6	25.5
	2	4.7	4.5	3.2	6.6	8.3	5.5
	1	0.0	0.0	6.4	0.0	4.1	2.1
	no response	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	8.3	3.6
Assignment Sheets	5	28.5	31.8	22.5	20.0	12.5	23.1
	4	23.8	45.4	48.3	40.0	62.5	44.0
	3	33.3	13.6	16.1	26.6	8.3	19.6
	2	4.7	9.0	12.9	13.3	4.1	8.8
	1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	0.8
	no response	9.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	4.1	2.7
Tests	5	38.0	31.8	19.3	26.6	12.5	25.6
	4	14.2	40.9	25.8	13.3	25.0	23.8
	3	19.0	13.6	19.3	26.6	37.5	23.2
	2	9.5	9.0	16.1	26.6	16.6	15.6
	1	9.5	4.5	16.1	6.6	4.1	8.2
	no response	9.5	0.0	3.2	0.0	4.1	3.4

*Highly Useful (5), Useful (4), Moderately Useful (3), Of Some Use (2), Not Useful (1).

of over 900 perceived the Terminal Objectives component as being "Useful" to "Highly Useful." A percentage of 93.3 of the teachers from schools with enrollment of 500-899 ranked the Specific Objectives component as being "Useful" to "Highly Useful," as compared to 71.3 per cent of the teachers from schools with enrollments of below 99.

The teachers in all of the schools with the exception of one group perceived the Suggested Activities component as being "Useful" to "Highly Useful" with over 60 per cent responding. Teachers, 46.6 per cent, in the 500-899 group felt that the Suggested Activities component was "Useful" to "Highly Useful."

A percentage of 95.4 of the teachers in schools with enrollment of 100 to 299 rated the Information Sheets component "Useful" to "Highly Useful," as compared to 61.8 per cent of the teachers in schools below 99. This same group of teachers in the 100-299 group responded "Useful" to "Highly Useful" with percentages higher than any of the other groups for the remainder of the components, the Transparency Masters, Job Sheets, Assignment Sheets, and the Tests. This same group, with a percentage of 72.7, perceived the Tests component as "Useful" to "Highly Useful," and the remaining groups ranked the Tests component in percentages of 37.5 for schools above 900 to 52.2 per cent for schools with enrollment below 99.

Summary

Chapter IV has provided a detailed presentation and analysis of the data of this study. The subjects of this study included 113 vocational consumer and homemaking teachers in the state of Oklahoma. The two areas receiving the highest degree of usage were Clothing and

Textiles and Foods and Nutrition. The areas receiving the lowest percentage of usage were Career Exploration, Housing and Home Furnishings, and Consumer Education.

The components reportedly receiving the highest percentage of teacher perceived usefulness were the Specific Objectives component and the Information Sheets component. The component with the lowest reported percentage of perceived usefulness was the Tests component.

A higher degree of usage was indicated by those teachers who were older, had more experience, had master's degrees, and were teaching in schools with larger numbers enrolled. These same groups perceived the Tests component as being the least useful. The summary, conclusions, and recommendations of this study will be presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to assess the extent of teacher use of the Home Economics I, Basic Core by units and the teacher perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction. Further investigation was conducted to identify selected variables which might influence the use of the core curriculum.

To accomplish this purpose, the following objectives were formulated:

1. Determine the use by teachers of the areas and each unit of instruction in the Home Economics I, Basic Core.
2. Determine the general perceived usefulness of the individual components of the units of instruction. (Behavioral objectives, suggested activities, information sheets, transparency masters, job sheets, assignment sheets, and tests.)
3. Determine the effect selected variables--age of teacher, number of years teaching vocational home economics, highest college degree held, year last additional courses taken, and size school--have on the use of the areas and the teacher-perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction.

4. Share findings with the home economics curriculum specialist at the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center and others to provide input for possible revision.

A total of 177 teachers were contacted by mail questionnaires. There was an overall 70 per cent return of the questionnaires, with 63.8 per cent useable for the study. The instrument used was constructed in two parts. Part A of the questionnaire solicited responses of which area and units of instruction had been taught and which had not been taught. Reason(s) for not teaching any of the area(s) and unit(s) was to be checked among the reasons included in the questionnaire. Part B of the questionnaire was developed to evaluate the teacher perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction.

Upon return of the questionnaires, the responses were hand tabulated and recorded in groups according to the independent variables. Percentages were used to determine the extent of use of the areas and units of instruction and for the perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction. Personal data items were tabulated and percentages were used in presenting the descriptive data.

Findings and Conclusions

Based on the data gathered in this study, it was determined that the majority of the vocational consumer and homemaking teachers of Home Economics I in Oklahoma do teach the majority of the areas and the units in Home Economics I, Basic Core either in their entirety or in part (Objective 1). It was determined that with the exception of three areas and units within those areas that the percentage of usage

was high, over 60 per cent. The three least used areas were Career Exploration, Housing and Home Furnishings, and Consumer Education. The reason most often given for not teaching these areas and units of instruction was "not enough time."

Furthermore, over 50 per cent of the home economics teachers perceived the components of the units of instruction as "Useful" to "Highly Useful," with the exception of the Tests component. Many of the teachers commented that the tests tended to measure one's ability to memorize. The teachers felt that the Specific Objectives component and the Information Sheets component were "Highly Useful" (Objective 2).

Findings of this study relative to the effect selected variables--age of teacher, number of years teaching vocational home economics, highest college degree held, year last additional courses taken, and size of school--had on the use of the areas and the perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction were compiled. The following is a summary of these findings by variables studied.

Teacher Age

Relative to the variable of teacher age, it was found that the highest percentage of usage of all the areas with the exception of Clothing and Textiles and Foods and Nutrition, was indicated by the teachers in the 41-50 age group. This age group was followed in order by the 31-40 year old group, the 21-30 year old group, and the 51 and above year old group. However, the 51 and above year old group had by far the highest percentage of use of the areas in part.

Comparison of the teacher perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction by age groups revealed that the 31-40 year

old group rated the components as "Useful" to "Highly Useful" with the highest percentage, 77.7, followed by the 21-30 year old group, 51 and over year old group, and the 41-50 year old group. The tests received the highest percentage from the age group 31-40, followed by the 51 and over year old group, 21-30 year old group, and the 41-50 year old group.

Years of Experience

Respondents to the instrument were divided into four categories on the basis of total years experience in teaching vocational home economics. The highest percentage, 55.8, of usage of the areas of the Home Economics I, Basic Core was established by the group who had taught from 11-20 years. The remaining groups followed in this order: 5-10 year group; 1-4 year group; and 21 and over year group. The 21 and over year group indicated the highest overall percentage of usage of the areas in part, with the 11-20 year group having the lowest percentage of non-usage and the 1-4 year group indicating the highest percentage of non-usage of the areas.

Teachers with 1-4 years experience and 11-20 years experience perceived the components of the units of instruction equally as "Useful" to "Highly Useful," followed by the 21 and over years experience, and the 5-10 years experience.

Teachers in the 11-20 years experience group rated the tests as "Useful" to "Highly Useful" with the highest percentage, 59.9, followed by the 1-4 years group, 5-10 years group, and the 21 and over years group.

College Degree

Level of education was chosen as a variable for examination to determine its effect on the use of the areas and the perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction. Of the two levels of education used, the master's degree level indicated the highest percentage of usage in total and in part. There were 86 respondents with bachelor's degrees and 27 with master's degrees.

Both groups perceived the components of the units of instruction equally as "Useful" to "Highly Useful" with high percentages. The tests component was perceived by the bachelor's degree group as more useful than did the teachers with master's degrees.

Size of School

In regard to the establishment of categories of teachers based upon number of enrollment in the school, the group with 500-899 enrollment had the highest percentage of usage, followed by the 100-299 enrollment, 99 and above group, 300-499 group, and below 99 group. The group indicating the highest percentage of usage in part was the below 99 group, followed by 900 and above, 300-499, 500-899, and 100-299.

Teachers in schools with enrollments of 100-299 ranked the components of the units of instruction as "Useful" to "Highly Useful" with the highest percentage, 78.5, followed by schools with enrollments of 300-499, 900 and above, below 99, and 500-899 enrollment. Teachers in schools with the larger enrollment, 500-899 and 900 and above, perceived the tests as less useful than did the teachers from smaller schools.

Recency of Course Work

The findings of this study revealed that the recency of course work was not a factor in the use of the areas and the teacher perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction, since all teachers had taken classes within the past five years.

Recommendations

Findings of this study seem to indicate that certain factors do effect the teacher use of the Home Economics I, Basic Core; therefore, the researcher wishes to offer the following recommendations for consideration by those who are responsible for providing curriculum for vocational programs and by those who are responsible for the training of teachers.

1. There should be increased emphasis on training teachers, pre-service and in-service, to teach Career Exploration, Housing and Home Furnishings, and Consumer Education, and that training should emphasize the planning of time.
2. Provide curriculum in-service workshops for all teachers, especially those with less experience.
3. Study the possibility of revision of unit tests to better meet the needs of the students and teachers using the curriculum.
4. Provide means for evaluation as a basis for revision of curriculum on a three to five year basis or when determined necessary.
5. Continue to involve teachers in the planning and writing of curriculum.

6. Additional research be initiated to survey teachers for recommendations for revision of the specific units of instruction.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Hatcher, Hazel M. and Lilla C. Halchin. The Teaching of Home Economics. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1973.
- (2) Clements, Irene and Judy Coffey. Home Economics I, Basic Core. Stillwater, Oklahoma: Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center, 1972.
- (3) Bruce, Herbert H., Jr. "Providing Curriculum Materials for a Total Program in Vocational Education." American Vocational Journal, XLVI (March, 1971), 49-50.
- (4) Unruh, Glenys G. Responsive Curriculum Development. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1975.
- (5) Taba, Hilda. Curriculum Development: Theory and Practice. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1962.
- (6) Tyler, Ralph W. Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1970.
- (7) Burns, Richard W. and Gary D. Brooks. Curriculum Design in a Changing Society. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Educational Technology Publications, 1970.
- (8) State of California. A Guide for the Development of Curriculum in Vocational and Technical Education. Los Angeles: University of California, Division of Vocational Education, 1969.
- (9) U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Education for a Changing World of Work. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1963.
- (10) U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education. Vocational Education: The Bridge Between Man and His Work. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1968.
- (11) Weagraff, Patrick J. "Curriculum Management at the State Level." American Vocational Journal, XLIX (May, 1974), 47-48.
- (12) State of Oklahoma. "Oklahoma's CIMC--Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center." Stillwater, Oklahoma: Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center, n.d.

- (13) Patton, Bob. "Innovative Instructional Materials for Vocational Agriculture." The Agricultural Education Magazine, XLVI (July, 1973), 12-13.
- (14) Popham, W. James and Eva L. Baker. Establishing Instructional Goals. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.
- (15) Oklahoma State Department of Vocational and Technical Education. "Vocational Education Teachers Get Help." The Oklahoma Teacher, LIII (January, 1972), 25.
- (16) Mager, Robert F. Preparing Instructional Objectives. Palo Alto, California: Fearon Publishers, 1962.
- (17) Henderson, Charles. "Curriculum Management in the Classroom." American Vocational Journal, XLVIII (October, 1973), 32-34.
- (18) Schill, William John. "Teaching to Measurable Objectives--A Vocational First?" American Vocational Journal, XLIX (November, 1974), 98-100.
- (19) Hauenstein, A. Dean. Curriculum Planning for Behavioral Development. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones Publishing Company, 1972.
- (20) Tuckman, Bruce W. "The Student-Centered Curriculum: A Concept in Curriculum Innovation." Educational Technology, IX (October, 1969), 26-29.
- (21) Banathy, Bela H. Developing a Systems View of Education. Belmont, California: Lear Siegler, Inc., Fearon Publishers, 1973.
- (22) Meek, Ronald. "Outside Help for Curriculum Development." American Vocational Journal, XLVIII (November, 1973), 29-31.
- (23) Lucas, Tom M. "The Effects of Selected Variables and Attitudinal Factors in the Adoption of the Basic Core Curriculum for Vocational Agriculture in Oklahoma." (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Stillwater, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, 1970.)
- (24) Patton, Bobby Gene. "A Study to Determine the Acceptance and Usefulness of the Basic Core Curriculum for Vocational Agriculture I in Oklahoma." (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Stillwater, Oklahoma: Oklahoma State University, 1971.)
- (25) Gwarzo, Basiru M. "A Study of the Vocational Agriculture Curriculum for High Schools in the State of Oklahoma, U. S. A., With Implications for Secondary Schools in Nigeria." (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Stillwater, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, 1975.)

- (26) Nielson, Linda Rae. "An Assessment of Teacher Attitudes Relative to the Usefulness and Effectiveness of the Distributive Education II Course of Study in Oklahoma." (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Stillwater, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, 1972.)
- (27) Shepperd, Richard Eugene. "A Study of Teacher Opinions Regarding the Residential Carpentry Course of Study in Oklahoma." (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Stillwater, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, 1975.)
- (28) Hollenback, Ruth Ann. "An Evaluation of Home Economics II Basic Core Curriculum by Vocational Consumer and Homemaking Teachers in Oklahoma." (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Stillwater, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, 1975.)
- (29) Sawatzky, Shirley Joyce A. "A Comparison of Acceptance and Usefulness of Home Economics I, Basic Core by Workshop Participants and Non-Workshop Participants." (Unpublished Master's Thesis, Stillwater, Oklahoma, Oklahoma State University, 1975.)

APPENDIX A

CORRESPONDENCE AND QUESTIONNAIRE

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER

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

74074

April 15, 1975

I am making a study to determine the teacher use of the Home Economics I, Basic Core by areas and units of instruction, as well as the perceived usefulness of the components of the units of instruction. Even though the Home Economics I, Basic Core has many positive aspects, this study is to determine any weaknesses in order to strengthen them.

The results of this study will be shared with the Curriculum and Instructional Materials Center and should be of benefit when the Home Economics I, Basic Core is revised.

Your help and consideration in providing the information in the questionnaire will be valuable as "hands on" feedback for the home economics curriculum specialist. It will be appreciated if you will supply the personal data requested. All information will be held in confidence and will not be released.

A self-addressed, stamped envelope has been enclosed for your use. Your attention to the questionnaire and any additional suggestions will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you for your time and cooperation.

Sincerely,

/s/ Mary Jo Drummond

Mary Jo Drummond, Graduate Student
Home Economics Education
Oklahoma State University

/c/ Elaine Jorgenson

Elaine Jorgenson, Ed.D.
Thesis Advisor
Home Economics Education

MJD:dcz

Enclosures

CURRICULUM DATA
INFORMATION FORM

Personal Information:

Total Number of Years You Have Taught Vocational Home Economics _____

Number of Years at Present School _____

Age: (circle one) 21-30 31-40 41-50 51 and over

B.S. Degree, Year _____

M.S. Degree, Year _____

Highest Degree Achieved _____, Year _____

Year Last Additional Courses Taken _____

Approximate Number of Students Enrolled in School Where Now

Teaching _____

Number of Students Enrolled in Vocational Home Economics I _____

Vocational Supervisory District in Which School is Located:

(circle one) NW W SW NE E SE

Please circle the approximate time you follow the core curriculum in
your present teaching;

Less than 10%	10-25%	26-50%	51-75%	More than 75%
------------------	--------	--------	--------	------------------

How often would you like a curriculum to be revised: (circle one)

3 yrs. 5 yrs. 8 yrs. 10 yrs. Whenever Necessary

Part A Evaluation of the Use of Home Economics I, Basic Core Areas and Units of Instruction.

Directions: Listed below are the eight areas and the units of instruction included in each area in the Home Economics I, Basic Core. Please check the areas and the units that you teach or do not teach, including all the reasons that apply. Please comment for reasons you may have that are not listed, or you feel further explains your reasons checked.

AREA AND UNIT NUMBER	HAVE YOU TAUGHT THE AREA AND THE UNIT			REASONS NOT TAUGHT ALL OR IN PART										COMMENTS		
	YES	NO	IN PART	Areas and Units Effective and Meet the Needs of Students	Personal Background Weak in Subject	Content Too Difficult for Student	Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	Not Needed in My Community	Not Enough Time	Too Elementary	No Available Resources	Need More Detailed Teaching Guide	Have Better Resource Materials Available	Prefer Using Personally Developed Material	Others: Specify	
Area A - Career Exploration																
I - Obtaining A Job																
II - Job Success																
III - Know Yourself and Home Economics Careers																
Area B - Child Development																
I - Child Care Services																
II - Behavior and Discipline																
Area C - Clothing and Textiles																
I - Small Sewing Equipment																
II - Getting to Know Your Machine																
III - Care of the Sewing Machine																
IV - Operating the Sewing Machine - Unthreaded																
V - Using Commercial Patterns																
VI - Prepare the Machine for Sewing																
Area D - Consumer Education																
I - Personal Income																
II - Managing Personal Income																
III - Planned Spending																

Part A Use of Home Economics I,
Basic Core Areas and Units
of Instruction - Continued

AREA AND UNIT NUMBER	HAVE YOU TAUGHT THE AREA AND THE UNIT			REASONS NOT TAUGHT ALL OR IN PART											
	YES	NO	IN PART	Areas and Units Effective and Meet the Needs of Students	Personal Background Weak in Subject	Content Too Difficult for Student	Facilities and Equipment Unavailable	Not Needed in My Community	Not Enough Time	Too Elementary	No Available Resources	Need More Detailed Teaching Guide	Have Better Resource Materials Available	Prefer Using Personally Developed Material	Others: Specify
Area E - Foods and Nutrition															
I - Eating Activities															
II - Meal Planning															
III - Kitchen Utensils and Tools															
IV - Using a Recipe															
V - Sanitation															
Area F - Health															
I - Your Health and Grooming															
II - Health and Your Figure															
Area G - Housing and Home Furnishings															
I - Cleaning Supplies and Equipment															
II - Personal Living Space															
III - Color															
IV - Furniture Arrangement															
V - Storage in Personal Living Area															
Area H - Personal and Family Relations															
I - Peer Relations															
II - Family Privileges and Responsibilities															
III - Values and Goals															

Part B Evaluation of Home Economics I, Basic Core Components.

1. Circle your evaluation of the usefulness of the following unit components on the continuum. Highly Useful (5), Useful (4), Moderately Useful (3), Of Some Use (2), Not Useful (1).

If you do not find the components useful, please comment why.

						Reasons Why Not Useful
a) Terminal objectives	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	_____

b) Specific objectives	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	_____

c) Suggested activities	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	_____

d) Information sheets	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	_____

e) Transparency masters	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	_____

f) Job sheets	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	_____

g) Assignment sheets	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	_____

h) Tests	<u>5</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>	_____

Hi,

This is a reminder that if you have not filled out and returned the questionnaire on your use of the Home Economic I, Basic Core Curriculum, would you please do so as soon as possible. Your input is needed.

If you have returned the questionnaire, please accept our thank you for this valuable information. Your help and cooperation is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Mary Jo Drummond
201 So. Arrington
Stillwater, Oklahoma
74074

APPENDIX B

COMMENTS ON AREAS AND UNITS

AREA A - CAREER EXPLORATION

"The students have completed a career unit in civics in 8th grade."

"Taught in vocational orientation at sophomore level."

"Students have a career class they are required to take other than HE I."

"I also added personal ideas."

"This was used by me with 8th grades in a careers mini class. It was excellent."

"In most of these units I have other resource materials I use along with the guide. I feel some of the units need more detailed information."

"I usually teach career awareness."

"We have no community resources, so it's hard to relate this to students."

"Use in advanced classes."

"I don't feel ninth grade need career exploration and they study it when they're sophomores anyway."

"More difficult than Home Economics II."

"I find all materials very useful and I generally use all of them plus my own, but time is something we don't have to cover everything thoroughly. I would like for the material set up for 9 weeks or semester courses."

"I do not use these in HE I, but I do in other home ec. classes."

II - "Job Success"

"Repetitious."

"Used this unit in the HE III level."

AREA B - CHILD DEVELOPMENT

"Too many age level characteristics. Kids do poor on the tests."

"Use with girls in HE II."

"Feel it is weak, abstract and hard for students to understand."

"Used kindergarten and head start as laboratory for teaching."

II - "Behavior and Discipline"

"Use rules for using discipline and handling problems."

AREA C - CLOTHING AND TEXTILES

"Time allowed to spend on this is much longer than necessary."

"Also add construction unit to section."

"Area needs to be expanded to include fabrics and construction techniques."

"Since no technique terminology is included--how far should we go in I, II, etc., could some basic requirements of garment construction be set up? 7th and 8th grade home economics need some guidelines so that they will not burn students out at grade level."

"Use additional materials."

II - "Getting to Know Your Machine"

"Teach it but may be too repetitious."

V - "Using Commercial Patterns"

"Not well organized, we don't use that type pattern."

VI - "Prepare the Machine for Sewing"

"Would like a job sheet for a pot holder or other simple article."

AREA D - CONSUMER EDUCATION

"This material is very good, but the teacher needs to be creative with outside speakers in order to supplement the units and hold interest."

"Used this in home ec. III level."

"Parts are very elementary, not enough content."

"Does not necessarily meet the needs of low income students."

"I have used this, but don't plan to again. Kids don't get allowances anymore, they just get money as they ask for it, have no money value. Seems more relevant to teach rising prices, compare home made items to ready-made, and evaluate advertising."

"Used as resource material."

"Boring in parts."

"Combine consumer ed with other units."

"Because of time, combine the units in this area with home ec. II consumer ed units at the home ec. II level."

"Use some of this in the different areas. Also some for older group."

I - "Personal Income"

"Too many students get dole unit is ineffective. Students attitude 'I can get money whenever I want. Who needs a budget!'"

AREA E - FOODS AND NUTRITION

"Need lab on eggs, milk."

"I have used all of the materials at one time or another as time and students allow. I enjoy them very much."

"This is used as resource material."

"Not detailed enough for me."

"I use games, pictures, letting the students teach, demonstrations, films, stories, field trips, resource people, etc., to teach each unit. We keep the books in our home ec room. We don't use them every day. Their attitude is, so we get to use our books today? because we usually do something special on the days they use their books. My only objection is that the tests require too much memorization."

"Would like some suggestions as to how to present cooking techniques by groups doing a breakfast, lunch, or by groups doing quick

bread, a milk group food, or other ideas and suggestions. There are none in the curriculum."

I - "Eating Activities"

"Dull."

II - "Meal Planning"

"Work it in with current book I am using."

"This unit could use some sketches or pictures."

V - "Sanitation"

"Of little good for ninth graders."

AREA F - HEALTH

"Taught at 8th grade level."

"Good material but add lots of resources."

I - "Your Health and Grooming"

"Hard to follow--too detailed."

II - "Health and Your Figure"

"Repetitious, dull."

AREA G - HOUSING AND HOME FURNISHINGS

"Taught at sophomore level."

"We also cover it in the 8th grade, don't want to repeat."

"Because of time considered this unit with homemaking II units in housing at homemaking II level."

"I do a whole nine weeks or more with my juniors in housing."

I - "Cleaning Supplies and Equipment"

"Information inappropriate."

III- "Color"

"Too detailed for this level."

"Used it at 10th grade level."

IV - "Furniture Arrangement"

"Prefer this on home ec II level."

V - "Storage in Personal Living Area"

"This area could be expanded."

AREA H - PERSONAL AND FAMILY RELATIONS

"Some case studies and questionnaires could improve this."

"Used as resource material."

"Basically good. You have the freedom to enrich as you think advisable."

I - "Peer Relations"

"Hard for me to relate with books I have."

"I feel a guide on personality development could fit here."

II - "Family Privileges and Responsibilities"

"Not as effective as desired."

"This unit gives responsibilities that are traditional and not at all realistic. I teach it but not as it is presented in the curriculum."

III- "Values and Goals"

"Preferred this in home ec. II."

Additional Comments

"While I may be critical of curriculum materials, they have helped me to improve my teaching by guiding me to know what should be covered at particular level of instruction."

"My girls enjoy their curriculum books. We use many and various techniques in presenting the objectives. We use the test as both study sheet and test."

"I use core as is and supplement then with other materials-- students know what to expect."

"The core curriculum is very good. I find I run out of time; we don't get to do everything."

"I have collected so much over the 28 years that some of the information I already had, but for new and starting teachers much of the curriculum material should be very valuable."

"I like the core curriculum guides, however, I didn't use them as much as I hope to next year. It takes longer to cover the materials than I expect and so I ran out of time. I feel the students would be more interested if the units varied more."

"I think the core curriculums are excellent in some ways, but sometimes the information sheets are too long and too difficult for the students to understand. We need more definite suggestions for activities and resource materials."

"The components are definitely time savers in teacher planning, even though they may have had years of experience they can re-evaluate their materials in this respect."

"At the beginning of my first year of teaching, I was determined not to use them. But a curriculum workshop helped so much. I think we need a class like that workshop in college. I plan to use them next year--because they are so helpful now that I know how to use them better."

"Basically--I think they are good--but not sufficient to be used just by itself. They are a good guide."

Comments on the Perceived Usefulness of the Components

Terminal Objectives

"Highly Useful"

"When we had to write our objectives they came in very handy."

"Useful"

"Helped in accountability, but sometimes they seem too specific."

"Moderately Useful"

"Students complain of the wording that it is all the same."

"Repetitious."

"Useful for accountability."

"Of Some Use"

"85% on tests is not realistic--70-75% would be better."

"A repetition of specific objectives."

"Specific objectives are good enough."

"Not Useful"

"Students paid no attention to them."

"Just overstatement of specific."

"Students don't pay any attention to these."

Specific Objectives

"Of Some Use"

"Students paid little attention to them."

"Not Useful"

"Does not consider the 'slower' students."

Suggested Activities

"Moderately Useful"

"Need more suggestions."

"Say too much the same thing. Good if they say something different."

"Need more."

"Some activities do not fit needs of students."

"Of Some Use"

"Need many more. I use other resources for activities of enrichment."

"Need supplementing to meet need of community and to fit our resources."

"Not too many interesting ones mentioned."

"Not Useful"

"Too elementary; not really helpful."

"These are basically common sense and to prepare a lesson, a lot more is involved (film and book resources quite helpful)."

Information Sheets

"Highly Useful"

"On the whole--very good."

"Useful"

"Needs to be more detailed."

"They are helpful, but students don't like them."

"Moderately Useful"

"Students find boring. I need to add outside information."

"Too repetitious."

"Of Some Use"

"Students tend to dislike them after a while."

"Students hate these."

Transparency Masters

"Highly Useful"

"Why include in notebooks if teachers buy and use them?"

"Useful"

"Some drawings are a bit elementary."

"Moderately Useful"

"Should be different from pictures in their student materials."

"Of Some Use"

"Do not project on screen because students have a copy also."

"Some are too elementary."

"Art could be better."

"Use ones I have prepared."

"Too elementary and don't have resources available."

"Not Useful"

"We have no way of running our own transparencies off here at school."

"Because they are in the student notebook."

"Don't have available overhead that I can use."

"Equipment availability."

Job Sheets

"Useful"

"Some too drawn out."

"Moderately Useful"

"Some are very good--some are too elementary."

"Of Some Use"

"Usually must be done at home. Must use honor system to report."

"Too drawn out."

"Not Useful"

"Too easy at times."

"Way too elementary."

Assignment Sheets

"Useful"

"Some are too elementary, others very good."

"Moderately Useful"

"Some are very good--some are too elementary."

"Of Some Use"

"Should be more thought provoking--more challenging."

"Some too simple."

"Not Useful"

"Too elementary."

Tests

"Highly Useful"

"Test should require less memorizing of subject matter and more application of subject matter."

"Students dislike though."

"Useful"

"Sometimes too much memory work."

"Good but have too many list questions."

"Some are too easy."

"Depend on too much memorization."

"Some are very simple, but they do help the slow student feel they are accomplishing something but the added points."

"Moderately Useful"

"Too much rote memory--some too time consuming in grading for the teacher."

"Use them as work sheets, too difficult for 85%."

"Some parts are good--some call for too much recall."

"Some have too much listing. It certainly saves time however."

"Tests seem too hard for most of my students. Most are, however, socially and culturally deprived, so this may play a part."

"Tests need improving most! One, words to be matched on front and back or two pages. 2. expected to list as many as 10 in some categories 3. need for multiple choice and fill-in blanks. Not so many discussion. 4. Need some problem solving that would use materials but not items which could be memorized."

"The smart ones pick up the memorization for tests only, slow ones often have trouble with terminology or some test words too similar."

"I feel some of the questions could be multiple-choice--not so much listing. It tends to make them memorize--I think."

"They are too detailed."

"I rewrite to my own satisfaction some of the tests in units covered."

"Too detailed."

"Of Some Use"

"Too much listing."

"Some tests are hard for students to understand and answer."

"Too much rote learning. More true and false, matching vocabulary we need! or choice type questions. More thought provoking rather than memorizing."

"Use more as study guides. Students don't like idea of standardized tests--though material on one I make is similar. Also tests just ask students to memorize information sheet and play it back--questions should require more thinking."

"Many times we use the tests as study sheets and I make our own tests to cover additional material--and the tests are in a different form."

"I don't like memory work tests. I feel application of principle is what I want to achieve."

"Tests do not allow student to think for himself and are confusing."

"I use them but I don't like them. Yes they exactly follow the objectives, but they don't have to follow them that close. Some things the students are expected to remember are too picky, too many acceptable answers. Too much paper used, answer sheets and tests could be more compact."

"Applied the test with teacher made test."

"I feel that the core curriculum is too much on the memorization level of knowledge--the tests are based on what one can memorize rather than what one actually knows about. I may be incorrect in this thinking."

"They are not well constructed--too detailed--very difficult to grade."

"Not Useful"

"Require memorizing the information sheets too much!"

"I still like to personalize my tests. Some of the content I go over more thoroughly than others and other ideas I include. I do use some of the tests but I think this could be one method of cutting down."

"Too much memorization."

"Too hard. Rote memory work--doesn't test student's real knowledge--I do use some questions from these--but for major part I create my own test."

"A complete repetition of information sheet--no reasoning required of the student"

"Too much memory work and not enough practical application of knowledge."

"The students do not do very well on these tests since so much of it is recall and also it is repeated in the same words from the information sheet. I use them for study guides."

"Based on exact repetition."

"Only thing they require of student is the ability to memorize."

"Too structured--with 20-25 varied students in each class, I need tests that measure each student more by individual achievement."

APPENDIX C

USE OF AREAS AND UNITS BY VARIABLES

TABLE XVIII
AGE GROUP 21-30 USE OF AREAS AND
UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=60)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	36.6	36.6	21.6	5.0
I-Obtaining A Job	43.3	38.3	13.3	5.0
II-Job Success	40.0	41.6	15.0	3.3
III-Home Economics Careers	33.3	38.3	21.6	6.6
B - Child Development	65.0	8.3	21.6	5.0
I-Child Care Services	63.3	13.3	16.6	6.6
II-Behavior and Discipline	70.0	11.6	13.3	5.0
C - Clothing and Textiles	86.6	1.6	10.0	1.6
I-Small Sewing Equipment	83.3	5.0	10.0	1.6
II-Getting to Know Machine	90.0	3.3	3.3	3.3
III-Care of Sewing Machine	76.6	8.3	13.3	1.6
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	76.6	10.0	11.6	1.6
V-Using Commercial Patterns	88.3	3.3	6.6	1.6
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	71.6	11.6	13.3	3.3
D - Consumer Education	45.0	25.0	25.0	5.0
I-Personal Income	45.0	26.6	23.3	5.0
II-Managing Personal Income	43.3	28.3	23.3	5.0
III-Planned Spending	38.3	28.3	28.3	5.0
E - Foods and Nutrition	75.0	0.0	23.3	1.6
I-Eating Activities	66.6	18.3	13.3	1.6
II-Meal Planning	78.3	5.0	13.3	3.3
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	88.3	0.0	10.0	1.6
IV-Using a Recipe	93.3	0.0	3.3	3.3
V-Sanitation	58.3	20.0	16.6	5.0
F - Health	66.6	20.0	10.0	3.3
I-Your Health and Grooming	68.3	21.6	6.6	3.3
II-Health and Your Figure	68.3	20.0	8.3	3.3
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	45.0	23.3	28.3	3.3
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	40.0	38.3	18.3	3.3
II-Personal Living Space	51.6	31.6	10.0	6.6
III-Color	65.0	25.0	6.6	3.3
IV-Furniture Arrangement	53.3	36.6	5.0	5.0
V-Storage in Personal Living	45.0	40.0	8.3	6.6
H - Personal and Family Relations	63.3	11.6	21.6	3.3
I-Peer Relations	70.0	11.6	13.3	5.0
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	63.3	13.3	18.3	5.0
III-Values and Goals	65.0	13.3	16.6	5.0

TABLE XIX
AGE GROUP 31-40 USE OF AREAS AND
UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=18)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	50.0	38.8	11.1	0.0
I-Obtaining A Job	50.0	38.8	11.1	0.0
II-Job Success	55.5	38.8	5.5	0.0
III-Home Economics Careers	33.3	50.0	11.1	0.0
B - Child Development	72.2	11.1	11.1	5.5
I-Child Care Services	55.5	27.7	16.6	0.0
II-Behavior and Discipline	72.2	16.6	11.1	0.0
C - Clothing and Textiles	94.4	0.0	5.5	0.0
I-Small Sewing Equipment	88.8	5.5	0.0	5.5
II-Getting to Know Machine	94.4	0.0	5.5	0.0
III-Care of Sewing Machine	88.8	0.0	11.1	0.0
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	94.4	5.5	0.0	0.0
V-Using Commercial Patterns	77.7	11.1	11.1	0.0
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	72.2	5.5	22.2	0.0
D - Consumer Education	55.5	22.2	16.6	5.5
I-Personal Income	55.5	27.7	11.1	5.5
II-Managing Personal Income	55.5	22.2	16.6	5.5
III-Planned Spending	38.8	27.7	33.3	0.0
E - Foods and Nutrition	88.8	0.0	5.5	5.5
I-Eating Activities	66.6	5.5	16.6	11.1
II-Meal Planning	77.7	5.5	11.1	5.5
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	77.7	0.0	22.2	0.0
IV-Using a Recipe	83.3	5.5	5.5	5.5
V-Sanitation	55.5	11.1	22.2	11.1
F - Health	66.6	5.5	22.2	5.5
I-Your Health and Grooming	66.6	11.1	22.2	0.0
II-Health and Your Figure	61.1	11.1	22.2	5.5
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	38.8	38.8	22.2	0.0
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	38.8	44.4	16.6	0.0
II-Personal Living Space	44.4	44.4	11.1	0.0
III-Color	50.0	38.8	11.1	0.0
IV-Furniture Arrangement	38.8	55.5	5.5	0.0
V-Storage in Personal Living	38.8	50.0	11.1	0.0
H - Personal and Family Relations	72.2	11.1	16.6	0.0
I-Peer Relations	72.2	16.6	11.1	0.0
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	72.2	11.1	16.6	0.0
III-Values and Goals	66.6	11.1	22.2	0.0

TABLE XX
AGE GROUP 41-50 USE OF AREAS AND
UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=19)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	52.6	15.7	21.0	10.5
I-Obtaining A Job	63.1	10.5	15.7	15.7
II-Job Success	52.6	15.7	15.7	15.7
III-Home Economics Careers	52.6	15.7	10.5	21.0
B - Child Development	78.9	10.5	5.2	5.2
I-Child Care Services	57.8	10.5	26.3	5.2
II-Behavior and Discipline	78.9	10.5	5.2	5.2
C - Clothing and Textiles	89.4	0.0	5.2	5.2
I-Small Sewing Equipment	89.4	0.0	5.2	5.2
II-Getting to Know Machine	84.2	0.0	10.5	5.2
III-Care of Sewing Machine	78.9	0.0	15.7	5.2
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	89.4	0.0	5.2	5.2
V-Using Commercial Patterns	84.2	0.0	5.2	10.5
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	84.2	0.0	10.5	5.2
D - Consumer Education	68.4	5.2	21.0	5.2
I-Personal Income	63.1	5.2	26.3	5.2
II-Managing Personal Income	57.8	5.2	31.5	5.2
III-Planned Spending	57.8	5.2	31.5	5.2
E - Foods and Nutrition	84.2	0.0	10.5	5.2
I-Eating Activities	84.2	5.2	0.0	10.5
II-Meal Planning	84.2	0.0	10.5	5.2
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	73.6	0.0	21.0	5.2
IV-Using a Recipe	89.4	0.0	5.2	5.2
V-Sanitation	52.6	10.5	21.0	15.7
F - Health	84.2	0.0	10.5	5.2
I-Your Health and Grooming	84.2	0.0	10.5	5.2
II-Health and Your Figure	84.2	0.0	10.5	5.2
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	57.8	10.5	26.3	5.2
I- Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	47.3	15.7	26.3	10.5
II-Personal Living Space	63.1	10.5	15.7	10.5
III-Color	52.6	15.7	26.3	5.2
IV-Furniture Arrangement	52.6	15.7	26.3	5.2
V-Storage in Personal Living	42.1	21.0	26.3	10.5
H - Personal and Family Relations	73.6	5.2	15.7	5.2
I-Peer Relations	78.9	5.2	10.5	5.2
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	73.6	10.5	10.5	5.2
III-Values and Goals	63.1	10.5	21.0	5.2

TABLE XXI
AGE GROUP 51 AND ABOVE USE OF AREAS
AND UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=16)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	25.0	18.7	50.0	6.2
I-Obtaining A Job	25.0	31.2	37.5	6.2
II-Job Success	18.7	25.0	31.2	25.0
III-Home Economics Careers	37.5	25.0	31.2	6.2
B - Child Development	37.5	6.2	50.0	6.2
I-Child Care Services	31.2	18.7	37.5	12.5
II-Behavior and Discipline	43.7	6.2	37.5	12.5
C - Clothing and Textiles	81.2	0.0	18.7	0.0
I-Small Sewing Equipment	87.5	0.0	12.5	0.0
II-Getting to Know Machine	81.2	6.2	12.5	0.0
III-Care of Sewing Machine	75.0	6.2	18.7	0.0
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	81.2	6.2	12.5	0.0
V-Using Commercial Patterns	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	81.2	6.2	12.5	0.0
D - Consumer Education	37.5	12.5	43.7	6.2
I-Personal Income	37.5	6.2	37.5	18.7
II-Managing Personal Income	37.5	6.2	43.7	12.5
III-Planned Spending	37.5	12.5	37.5	12.5
E - Foods and Nutrition	56.2	6.2	37.5	0.0
I-Eating Activities	56.2	6.2	31.2	6.2
II-Meal Planning	56.2	6.2	37.5	0.0
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	68.7	12.5	18.7	0.0
IV-Using a Recipe	75.0	0.0	18.7	6.2
V-Sanitation	50.0	18.7	18.7	12.5
F - Health	56.2	0.0	43.7	0.0
I-Your Health and Grooming	56.2	0.0	43.7	0.0
II-Health and Your Figure	56.2	0.0	43.7	0.0
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	18.7	6.2	56.2	18.7
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	25.0	12.5	37.5	25.0
II-Personal Living Space	37.5	12.5	25.0	25.0
III-Color	75.0	0.0	12.5	12.5
IV-Furniture Arrangement	18.7	12.5	43.7	25.0
V-Storage in Personal Living	31.2	18.7	25.0	25.0
H - Personal and Family Relations	50.0	18.7	31.2	0.0
I-Peer Relations	56.2	18.7	25.0	0.0
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	50.0	25.0	25.0	0.0
III-Values and Goals	37.5	25.0	25.0	12.5

TABLE XXII
YEARS TAUGHT 1-4 USE OF AREAS AND
UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=56)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	33.9	44.6	17.8	3.5
I-Obtaining A Job	39.2	46.4	8.9	5.3
II-Job Success	35.7	50.0	8.9	5.3
III-Home Economics Careers	28.5	50.0	14.2	7.1
B - Child Development	64.2	8.9	19.6	7.1
I-Child Care Services	62.5	14.2	17.8	5.3
II-Behavior and Discipline	66.0	14.2	16.0	3.5
C - Clothing and Textiles	83.9	3.5	10.7	1.7
I-Small Sewing Equipment	89.2	5.3	3.5	1.7
II-Getting to Know Machine	92.8	3.5	0.0	3.5
III-Care of Sewing Machine	82.1	7.1	8.9	1.7
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	83.9	7.1	7.1	1.7
V-Using Commercial Patterns	91.0	3.5	3.5	1.7
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	71.4	10.7	14.2	3.5
D - Consumer Education	46.4	28.5	19.6	5.3
I-Personal Income	48.2	28.5	17.8	5.3
II-Managing Personal Income	46.4	30.3	17.8	5.3
III-Planned Spending	39.2	32.1	23.2	5.3
E - Foods and Nutrition	82.1	0.0	16.0	1.7
I-Eating Activities	69.6	16.0	10.7	3.5
II-Meal Planning	60.3	5.3	10.7	3.5
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	91.0	0.0	7.1	1.7
IV-Using a Recipe	94.6	0.0	17.8	1.7
V-Sanitation	60.7	17.8	17.8	3.5
F - Health	69.6	19.6	8.9	1.7
I-Your Health and Grooming	69.6	21.4	7.1	1.7
II-Health and Your Figure	69.6	19.6	7.1	3.5
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	39.2	28.5	30.3	1.7
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	39.2	44.6	14.2	1.7
II-Personal Living Space	55.3	32.1	7.1	5.3
III-Color	58.9	32.1	5.3	3.5
IV-Furniture Arrangement	50.0	44.6	3.5	1.7
V-Storage in Personal Living	48.2	42.8	5.3	3.5
H - Personal and Family Relations	62.5	14.2	21.4	1.7
I-Peer Relations	69.6	14.2	12.5	3.5
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	64.2	16.0	16.0	3.5
III-Values and Goals	64.2	17.8	12.5	5.3

TABLE XXIII

YEARS TAUGHT 5-10 USE OF AREAS AND
UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=31)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	48.3	19.3	32.2	0.0
I-Obtaining A Job	48.3	22.5	29.0	0.0
II-Job Success	41.9	19.3	32.2	6.4
III-Home Economics Careers	38.7	12.9	35.4	12.9
B - Child Development	64.5	9.6	19.3	6.4
I-Child Care Services	41.9	25.8	25.8	6.4
II-Behavior and Discipline	70.9	9.6	12.9	6.4
C - Clothing and Textiles	80.6	0.0	16.1	3.2
I-Small Sewing Equipment	77.4	3.2	12.9	6.4
II-Getting to Know Machine	83.8	0.0	12.9	3.2
III-Care of Sewing Machine	67.7	3.2	25.8	3.2
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	77.4	6.4	9.6	6.4
V-Using Commercial Patterns	70.9	6.4	19.3	3.2
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	80.6	6.4	9.6	3.2
D - Consumer Education	51.6	16.1	29.0	3.2
I-Personal Income	48.3	22.5	25.8	3.2
II-Managing Personal Income	48.3	19.3	29.0	3.2
III-Planned Spending	35.4	22.5	38.7	3.2
E - Foods and Nutrition	80.6	0.0	16.1	3.2
I-Eating Activities	67.7	12.9	16.1	3.2
II-Meal Planning	70.9	6.4	16.1	6.4
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	93.5	3.2	16.1	3.2
IV-Using a Recipe	77.4	6.4	9.6	6.4
V-Sanitation	48.3	19.3	16.1	16.1
F - Health	67.7	6.4	19.3	6.4
I-Your Health and Grooming	64.5	6.4	19.3	9.6
II-Health and Your Figure	58.0	6.4	22.5	12.9
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	41.9	19.3	38.7	0.0
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	38.7	35.4	22.5	3.2
II-Personal Living Space	48.3	32.2	16.1	3.2
III-Color	74.1	12.9	12.9	0.0
IV-Furniture Arrangement	48.3	32.2	19.3	0.0
V-Storage in Personal Living	38.7	38.7	19.3	3.2
H - Personal and Family Relations	74.1	9.6	9.6	6.4
I-Peer Relations	74.1	12.9	6.4	6.4
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	70.9	9.6	12.9	6.4
III-Values and Goals	67.7	6.4	19.3	6.4

TABLE XXIV
YEARS TAUGHT 11-20 USE OF AREAS AND
UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=15)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	73.3	6.6	20.0	0.0
I-Obtaining A Job	73.3	6.6	13.3	6.6
II-Job Success	73.3	6.6	13.3	6.6
III-Home Economics Careers	66.6	13.3	6.6	13.3
B - Child Development	86.6	0.0	6.6	6.6
I-Child Care Services	80.0	0.0	13.3	6.6
II-Behavior and Discipline	80.0	0.0	13.3	6.6
C - Clothing and Textiles	86.6	0.0	13.3	0.0
I-Small Sewing Equipment	86.6	0.0	13.3	0.0
II-Getting to Know Machine	86.6	0.0	13.3	0.0
III-Care of Sewing Machine	86.6	0.0	13.3	0.0
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	86.6	0.0	13.3	0.0
V-Using Commercial Patterns	80.0	0.0	13.3	6.6
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	73.3	0.0	26.6	0.0
D - Consumer Education	60.0	0.0	33.3	6.6
I-Personal Income	60.0	0.0	33.3	6.6
II-Managing Personal Income	53.3	0.0	40.0	6.6
III-Planned Spending	53.3	0.0	40.0	6.6
E - Foods and Nutrition	60.0	0.0	26.6	13.3
I-Eating Activities	60.0	0.0	26.6	13.3
II-Meal Planning	66.6	0.0	33.3	0.0
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	53.3	6.6	40.0	0.0
IV-Using a Recipe	73.3	0.0	26.6	0.0
V-Sanitation	40.0	6.6	33.3	20.0
F - Health	60.0	0.0	33.3	6.6
I-Your Health and Grooming	66.6	0.0	33.3	0.0
II-Health and Your Figure	60.0	0.0	33.3	6.6
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	40.0	6.6	33.3	20.0
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	26.6	6.6	53.3	13.3
II-Personal Living Space	40.0	13.3	33.3	13.3
III-Color	60.0	6.6	26.6	6.6
IV-Furniture Arrangement	40.0	6.6	40.0	13.3
V-Storage in Personal Living	26.6	13.3	46.6	13.3
H - Personal and Family Relations	53.3	13.3	33.3	0.0
I-Peer Relations	53.3	13.3	33.3	0.0
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	53.3	13.3	33.3	0.0
III-Values and Goals	46.6	13.3	40.0	0.0

TABLE XXV
YEARS TAUGHT 21 AND OVER USE OF AREAS
AND UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=11)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	36.3	27.2	27.2	9.0
I-Obtaining A Job	27.2	27.2	36.3	9.0
II-Job Success	18.1	36.3	18.1	27.2
III-Home Economics Careers	36.3	27.2	27.2	9.0
B - Child Development	45.4	18.1	27.2	9.0
I-Child Care Services	45.4	18.1	9.0	27.2
II-Behavior and Discipline	45.4	18.1	18.1	18.1
C - Clothing and Textiles	81.8	0.0	9.0	9.0
I-Small Sewing Equipment	90.9	0.0	9.0	0.0
II-Getting to Know Machine	81.8	0.0	9.0	9.0
III-Care of Sewing Machine	72.7	0.0	9.0	18.1
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	81.8	0.0	9.0	9.0
V-Using Commercial Patterns	90.0	0.0	9.0	0.0
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	81.8	0.0	9.0	9.0
D - Consumer Education	36.3	18.1	36.3	9.0
I-Personal Income	27.2	18.1	36.3	18.1
II-Managing Personal Income	27.2	18.1	45.4	9.0
III-Planned Spending	36.3	27.2	36.3	0.0
E - Foods and Nutrition	72.7	0.0	27.2	0.0
I-Eating Activities	72.7	9.0	0.0	18.1
II-Meal Planning	81.8	0.0	9.0	9.0
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	90.9	0.0	0.0	9.0
IV-Using a Recipe	90.9	0.0	0.0	9.0
V-Sanitation	45.4	18.1	9.0	27.2
F - Health	72.7	0.0	18.1	9.0
I-Your Health and Grooming	81.8	0.0	18.1	0.0
II-Health and Your Figure	72.7	0.0	18.1	9.0
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	18.1	18.1	45.4	18.1
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	27.2	36.3	18.1	18.1
II-Personal Living Space	54.5	27.2	9.0	9.0
III-Color	54.5	36.3	9.0	0.0
IV-Furniture Arrangement	36.3	36.3	18.1	9.0
V-Storage in Personal Living	45.4	36.3	9.0	9.0
H - Personal and Family Relations	63.6	9.0	27.2	0.0
I-Peer Relations	81.8	9.0	9.0	0.0
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	63.6	27.2	9.0	0.0
III-Values and Goals	45.4	27.2	18.1	0.0

TABLE XXVI
HIGHEST DEGREE - B. S. USE OF AREAS
AND UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=86)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	41.8	31.3	25.5	1.1
I-Obtaining a Job	46.5	34.8	15.1	3.4
II-Job Success	41.8	36.0	16.2	5.8
III-Home Economics Careers	34.8	36.0	20.9	8.1
B - Child Development	66.2	9.3	16.2	8.1
I-Child Care Services	56.9	15.1	18.6	9.3
II-Behavior and Discipline	67.4	12.7	11.6	8.1
C - Clothing and Textiles	83.7	2.3	12.7	1.1
I-Small Sewing Equipment	84.8	4.6	8.1	2.3
II-Getting to Know Machine	88.3	2.3	6.9	2.3
III-Care of Sewing Machine	79.0	5.8	13.9	1.1
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	82.5	6.9	9.3	1.1
V-Using Commercial Patterns	86.0	3.4	8.1	2.3
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	73.2	9.3	15.1	2.3
D - Consumer Education	48.8	23.2	22.0	5.8
I-Personal Income	50.0	24.4	19.7	5.8
II-Managing Personal Income	47.6	24.4	22.0	5.8
III-Planned Spending	40.6	26.7	26.7	5.8
E - Foods and Nutrition	76.7	0.0	22.0	1.1
I-Eating Activities	65.1	15.1	15.1	4.6
II-Meal Planning	75.5	5.8	15.1	3.4
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	84.8	1.1	12.7	1.1
IV-Using a Recipe	89.5	1.1	8.1	1.1
V-Sanitation	58.1	18.6	18.6	4.6
F - Health	66.2	12.7	16.2	4.6
I-Your Health and Grooming	67.4	13.9	15.1	3.4
II-Health and Your Figure	63.9	12.7	16.2	6.9
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	47.6	24.4	23.2	4.6
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	39.5	40.6	15.1	4.6
II-Personal Living Space	50.0	32.5	11.6	5.8
III-Color	60.4	24.4	10.4	4.6
IV-Furniture Arrangement	47.6	36.0	11.6	4.6
V-Storage in Personal Living	43.0	38.3	11.6	6.9
H - Personal and Family Relations	63.9	11.6	22.0	2.3
I-Peer Relations	68.6	12.7	15.1	3.4
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	63.9	13.9	18.6	3.4
III-Values and Goals	61.6	13.9	19.7	4.6

TABLE XXVII

HIGHEST DEGREE - M. S. USE OF AREAS
AND UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=27)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	44.4	25.9	25.9	3.7
I-Obtaining A Job	44.4	25.9	25.9	3.7
II-Job Success	40.7	29.6	18.5	11.1
III-Home Economics Careers	48.1	18.5	18.5	14.8
B - Child Development	59.2	7.4	29.6	3.7
I-Child Care Services	51.8	14.8	29.6	3.7
II-Behavior and Discipline	66.6	7.4	25.9	0.0
C - Clothing and Textiles	85.1	0.0	7.4	7.4
I-Small Sewing Equipment	88.8	0.0	7.4	3.7
II-Getting to Know Machine	88.8	0.0	3.7	7.4
III-Care of Sewing Machine	74.0	0.0	14.8	11.1
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	81.4	3.7	7.4	7.4
V-Using Commercial Patterns	77.7	3.7	14.8	3.7
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	81.4	0.0	11.1	7.4
D - Consumer Education	48.1	11.1	40.7	0.0
I-Personal Income	40.7	14.8	37.0	7.2
II-Managing Personal Income	40.7	14.8	40.7	3.7
III-Planned Spending	37.0	18.5	44.4	0.0
E - Foods and Nutrition	81.4	0.0	14.8	3.7
I-Eating Activities	77.7	7.2	7.2	7.2
II-Meal Planning	81.4	3.7	11.1	3.7
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	74.0	3.7	18.5	3.7
IV-Using a Recipe	81.4	0.0	7.4	11.1
V-Sanitation	48.1	14.8	18.5	18.5
F - Health	74.0	7.2	14.8	3.7
I-Your Health and Grooming	74.0	7.2	14.8	3.7
II-Health and Your Figure	70.3	7.4	14.8	7.2
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	51.8	7.2	33.3	7.2
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	29.6	14.8	40.7	14.8
II-Personal Living Space	51.8	14.8	18.5	14.8
III-Color	62.9	14.8	18.5	3.7
IV-Furniture Arrangement	40.7	25.9	25.9	7.2
V-Storage in Personal Living	37.0	25.9	25.9	11.1
H - Personal and Family Relations	70.3	14.8	11.1	3.7
I-Peer Relations	70.3	14.8	11.1	3.7
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	62.9	18.5	14.8	3.7
III-Values and Goals	55.5	18.5	18.5	7.2

TABLE XXVIII

SIZE OF SCHOOL - BELOW 99 USE OF AREAS
AND UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=21)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	47.6	14.2	33.3	4.7
I-Obtaining A Job	57.1	23.8	9.5	9.5
II-Job Success	47.6	23.8	4.7	23.8
III-Home Economics Careers	38.0	28.5	14.2	19.0
B - Child Development	57.1	4.7	23.8	14.2
I-Child Care Services	61.9	9.5	14.2	14.2
II-Behavior and Discipline	57.1	9.5	19.0	14.2
C - Clothing and Textiles	66.6	4.7	23.8	4.7
I-Small Sewing Equipment	71.4	14.2	9.5	4.7
II-Getting to Know Machine	71.4	4.7	14.2	9.5
III-Care of Sewing Machine	66.6	9.5	19.0	4.7
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	66.6	14.2	14.2	4.7
V-Using Commercial Patterns	76.1	4.7	9.5	9.5
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	52.3	23.8	19.0	4.7
D - Consumer Education	28.5	28.5	33.3	9.5
I-Personal Income	28.5	33.3	28.5	9.5
II-Managing Personal Income	28.5	28.5	33.3	9.5
III-Planned Spending	28.5	28.5	28.5	14.2
E - Foods and Nutrition	66.6	0.0	33.3	0.0
I-Eating Activities	71.4	9.5	14.2	4.7
II-Meal Planning	66.6	4.7	28.5	0.0
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	80.9	0.0	19.0	0.0
IV-Using a Recipe	85.7	0.0	14.2	0.0
V-Sanitation	57.1	14.2	23.8	4.7
F - Health	71.4	4.7	23.8	0.0
I-Your Health and Grooming	71.4	9.5	19.0	0.0
II-Health and Your Figure	71.4	4.7	19.0	4.7
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	42.8	23.8	28.5	4.7
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	28.5	38.0	23.8	9.5
II-Personal Living Space	42.8	33.3	19.0	4.7
III-Color	57.1	23.8	9.5	9.5
IV-Furniture Arrangement	42.8	38.0	14.2	4.7
V-Storage in Personal Living	38.0	42.8	14.2	4.7
H - Personal and Family Relations	66.6	9.5	23.8	0.0
I-Peer Relations	71.4	9.5	19.0	0.0
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	66.6	14.2	19.0	0.0
III-Values and Goals	66.6	14.2	14.2	4.7

TABLE XXIX

SIZE OF SCHOOL - 100-299 USE OF AREAS
AND UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=22)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	54.5	27.2	18.1	0.0
I-Obtaining A Job	54.5	31.8	13.6	0.0
II-Job Success	50.0	31.8	18.1	0.0
III-Home Economics Careers	54.5	27.2	13.6	4.5
B - Child Development	68.1	9.0	18.1	4.5
I-Child Care Services	68.1	22.7	4.5	4.5
II-Behavior and Discipline	72.7	13.6	9.0	4.5
C - Clothing and Textiles	95.4	0.0	4.5	0.0
I-Small Sewing Equipment	95.4	0.0	4.5	0.0
II-Getting to Know Machine	95.4	0.0	4.5	0.0
III-Care of Sewing Machine	90.9	4.5	4.5	0.0
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	95.4	4.5	0.0	0.0
V-Using Commercial Patterns	86.3	4.5	9.0	0.0
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	90.9	4.5	4.5	0.0
D - Consumer Education	45.4	22.7	27.2	4.5
I-Personal Income	40.9	22.7	31.8	4.5
II-Managing Personal Income	36.3	27.2	31.8	4.5
III-Planned Spending	36.3	27.2	31.8	4.5
E - Foods and Nutrition	95.4	0.0	4.5	0.0
I-Eating Activities	72.7	13.6	13.6	0.0
II-Meal Planning	81.8	0.0	13.6	4.5
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	90.9	0.0	9.0	0.0
IV-Using a Recipe	95.4	0.0	4.5	0.0
V-Sanitation	63.6	9.0	22.7	4.5
F - Health	77.2	18.1	4.5	0.0
I-Your Health and Grooming	77.2	18.1	4.5	0.0
II-Health and Your Figure	77.2	18.1	4.5	0.0
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	54.5	18.1	27.2	0.0
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	50.0	22.7	22.7	4.5
II-Personal Living Space	63.6	22.7	9.0	4.5
III-Color	77.2	18.1	0.0	4.5
IV-Furniture Arrangement	45.4	36.3	13.6	4.5
V-Storage in Personal Living	54.5	27.2	9.0	9.0
H - Personal and Family Relations	63.6	22.7	9.0	4.5
I-Peer Relations	63.6	22.7	9.0	4.5
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	59.0	22.7	13.6	4.5
III-Values and Goals	63.6	18.1	13.6	4.5

TABLE XXX
 SIZE OF SCHOOL - 300-499 USE OF AREAS
 AND UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
 (N=31)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	19.3	54.8	25.8	0.0
I-Obtaining A Job	25.8	51.6	19.3	3.2
II-Job Success	22.5	51.6	22.5	3.2
III-Home Economics Careers	22.5	58.0	12.9	6.4
B - Child Development	74.1	9.6	12.9	3.2
I-Child Care Services	58.0	16.1	22.5	3.2
II-Behavior and Discipline	67.7	9.6	19.3	3.2
C - Clothing and Textiles	80.6	0.0	16.1	3.2
I-Small Sewing Equipment	90.3	0.0	6.4	3.2
II-Getting to Know Machine	87.0	0.0	6.4	6.4
III-Care of Sewing Machine	74.1	3.2	16.1	6.4
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	80.6	3.2	9.6	6.4
V-Using Commercial Patterns	90.3	0.0	6.2	3.2
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	80.6	3.2	9.6	6.4
D - Consumer Education	54.8	19.3	22.5	3.2
I-Personal Income	58.0	22.5	16.1	3.2
II-Managing Personal Income	58.0	22.5	16.1	3.2
III-Planned Spending	45.1	29.0	25.8	0.0
E - Foods and Nutrition	77.4	0.0	16.1	6.4
I-Eating Activities	64.5	12.9	9.6	12.9
II-Meal Planning	77.4	3.2	9.6	9.6
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	77.4	6.4	6.4	9.6
IV-Using a Recipe	83.8	0.0	6.4	9.6
V-Sanitation	64.5	12.9	9.6	12.9
F - Health	67.7	12.9	12.9	6.4
I-Your Health and Grooming	67.7	12.9	12.9	6.4
II-Health and Your Figure	67.7	12.9	12.9	6.4
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	51.6	19.3	25.8	3.2
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	35.4	25.8	29.0	9.6
II-Personal Living Space	48.3	22.5	12.9	16.1
III-Color	67.7	16.1	12.9	3.2
IV-Furniture Arrangement	54.8	22.5	16.1	6.4
V-Storage in Personal Living	41.9	29.0	16.1	12.9
H - Personal and Family Relations	58.0	19.3	16.1	6.4
I-Peer Relations	58.0	22.5	9.6	9.6
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	58.0	19.3	12.9	9.6
III-Values and Goals	54.8	19.3	16.1	9.6

TABLE XXXI
 SIZE OF SCHOOL - 500-899 USE OF AREAS
 AND UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
 (N=15)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	66.6	26.6	6.6	0.0
I-Obtaining A Job	53.3	20.0	26.6	0.0
II-Job Success	60.0	26.6	13.3	0.0
III-Home Economics Careers	46.6	26.6	20.0	6.6
B - Child Development	86.6	13.3	0.0	0.0
I-Child Care Services	60.0	13.3	26.6	0.0
II-Behavior and Discipline	80.0	13.3	0.0	6.6
C - Clothing and Textiles	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
I-Small Sewing Equipment	93.3	0.0	6.6	0.0
II-Getting to Know Machine	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
III-Care of Sewing Machine	93.3	0.0	0.0	6.6
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	93.3	0.0	6.6	0.0
V-Using Commercial Patterns	100.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	80.0	0.0	13.3	6.6
D - Consumer Education	60.0	13.3	26.6	0.0
I-Personal Income	66.6	13.3	20.0	0.0
II-Managing Personal Income	60.0	13.3	26.6	0.0
III-Planned Spending	46.6	20.0	33.3	0.0
E - Foods and Nutrition	86.6	0.0	13.3	0.0
I-Eating Activities	80.0	0.0	13.3	6.6
II-Meal Planning	86.6	0.0	13.3	0.0
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	80.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
IV-Using a Recipe	93.3	0.0	6.6	0.0
V-Sanitation	46.6	26.6	13.3	13.3
F - Health	73.3	6.6	20.0	0.0
I-Your Health and Grooming	73.3	6.6	20.0	0.0
II-Health and Your Figure	60.0	6.6	26.6	6.6
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	53.3	13.3	33.3	0.0
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	46.6	20.0	26.6	6.6
II-Personal Living Space	46.6	13.3	33.3	6.6
III-Color	46.6	6.6	40.0	6.6
IV-Furniture Arrangement	40.0	13.3	40.0	6.6
V-Storage in Personal Living	33.3	20.0	40.0	6.6
H - Personal and Family Relations	73.3	0.0	26.6	0.0
I-Peer Relations	80.0	0.0	20.0	0.0
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	73.3	6.6	20.0	0.0
III-Values and Goals	73.3	6.6	20.0	0.0

TABLE XXXII

SIZE OF SCHOOL - 900 AND ABOVE USE OF AREAS
AND UNITS, PERCENT RESPONDING
(N=24)

Areas and Units	Yes	No	In Part	No Response
A - Career Exploration	50.0	16.6	33.3	0.0
I-Obtaining A Job	50.0	25.0	16.6	8.3
II-Job Success	41.6	29.1	20.8	8.3
III-Home Economics Careers	37.5	12.5	41.6	8.3
B - Child Development	58.3	12.5	25.0	4.1
I-Child Care Services	33.3	20.8	33.3	12.5
II-Behavior and Discipline	62.5	12.5	16.6	8.3
C - Clothing and Textiles	83.3	0.0	16.6	0.0
I-Small Sewing Equipment	79.1	0.0	16.6	0.0
II-Getting to Know Machine	91.6	0.0	8.3	0.0
III-Care of Sewing Machine	66.6	0.0	25.0	8.3
IV-Operating Sewing Machine	79.1	0.0	16.6	4.1
V-Using Commercial Patterns	66.6	4.1	29.1	0.0
VI-Prepare Machine for Sewing	66.6	0.0	29.1	4.1
D - Consumer Education	54.1	16.6	25.0	4.1
I-Personal Income	45.8	16.6	25.0	12.5
II-Managing Personal Income	45.8	16.6	29.1	8.3
III-Planned Spending	41.6	16.6	37.5	4.1
E - Foods and Nutrition	75.0	0.0	25.0	0.0
I-Eating Activities	54.1	20.8	20.8	4.1
II-Meal Planning	75.0	12.5	12.5	0.0
III-Kitchen Utensils and Tools	75.0	0.0	20.8	4.1
IV-Using a Recipe	79.1	4.1	12.5	4.1
V-Sanitation	41.6	20.8	29.1	8.3
F - Health	62.5	12.5	20.8	4.1
I-Your Health and Grooming	58.3	12.5	20.8	8.3
II-Health and Your Figure	50.0	12.5	20.8	16.6
G - Housing and Home Furnishings	54.1	20.8	16.6	8.3
I-Cleaning Supplies & Equipment	29.1	41.6	16.6	12.5
II-Personal Living Space	50.0	29.1	8.3	12.5
III-Color	54.1	29.1	8.3	8.3
IV-Furniture Arrangement	41.6	37.5	8.3	12.5
V-Storage in Personal Living	37.5	37.5	12.5	12.5
H - Personal and Family Relations	75.0	4.1	20.8	0.0
I-Peer Relations	83.3	4.1	12.5	0.0
II-Privileges & Responsibilities	70.8	8.3	20.8	0.0
III-Values and Goals	54.1	12.5	29.1	4.1

VITA

Mary Jo Drummond

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: TEACHER USE AND PERCEIVED USEFULNESS OF COMPONENTS OF THE
OKLAHOMA HOME ECONOMICS I, BASIC CORE

Major Field: Home Economics Education

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Sapulpa, Oklahoma, September 9, 1930, the daughter of Kenneth and Lucille Harrison. Married Jack Drummond on May 9, 1952.

Education: Graduated from Sapulpa High School, Sapulpa, Oklahoma, in May, 1948. Received a Bachelor of Science degree from Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma, with a major in Home Economics Education, January, 1971. Completed requirements for the Master of Science degree in May, 1976.

Professional Experience: Started teaching Vocational Home Economics at Yale, Oklahoma, in August, 1971, and taught there until May, 1973; Vocational Home Economics Teacher at C. E. Donart High School, Stillwater, Oklahoma, from August, 1973 to the present.

Professional Organizations: Omicron Nu; Phi Upsilon Omicron; Phi Kappa Phi; American Home Economics Association; Oklahoma Home Economics Association; American Vocational Association; Oklahoma Vocational Association; National Education Association; Home Economics Education Association; Oklahoma Education Association; Stillwater Education Association.