

EVALUATION OF COURSE OBJECTIVES OF THE HOME MANAGEMENT
RESIDENCE COURSE BY STUDENTS 1961
AND GRADUATES 1967

By

VERNA CATER AUXIER

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1959

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, 1967

OKLAHOMA
STATE UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

JAN 9 1968

EVALUATION OF COURSE OBJECTIVES OF THE HOME MANAGEMENT
RESIDENCE COURSE BY STUDENTS 1961
AND GRADUATES 1967

Thesis Approved:

Honore McKinney

Thesis Adviser

Bertland M. Means

N. N. Durham

Dean of the Graduate College

658311

PREFACE

The study explored the objective structure of home management, with specific reference to the home management residence course, in an effort to determine degree of course objective attainment. Evaluation was accomplished thru the cooperation of individuals who had the home management residence course.

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to Dr. Florence McKinney for assistance and guidance in completing the study. Indebtedness and appreciation are expressed to Dr. Ilse H. Wolf for continuous encouragement and assistance during the first stage of the study.

Gratitude is also extended to Mrs. Gertrude McAllister Means for her cooperation and encouragement during the formative stages of the study.

The writer is appreciative of the contributions made by the Home Economics Education Department, and specifically Dr. June Cozine, for assistance in structuring the data collection instrument.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	3
Needs for the Study	4
II. PROCEDURES USED FOR DEVELOPING THE STUDY	7
Review of Literature	15
III. ANALYSIS OF DATA	24
Group I Analysis	25
Group II Analysis	44
Comparison of Group I and Group II	58
IV. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS	66
BIBLIOGRAPHY	69
APPENDIX	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Percent Comparison of Single and Married Students in Group I in Relation to Goal Attainment	26
II. Percent Comparison of Group I Transfer and Non-Transfer Students in Relation to Goal Attainment	31
III. Percent Comparison of Group I Home Economics Education Majors and Other Majors in Relation to Goal Attainment	36
IV. Percent Comparison of Group II Married and Single Students in Relation to Goal Attainment	45
V. Percent Comparison of Group II Transfer and Non-Transfer Students in Relation to Goal Attainment	49
VI. Percent Comparison of Group II Home Economics Education Majors and Other Majors in Relation to Goal Attainment	54
VII. Percent Comparison of Group I and Group II in Relation to Goal Attainment	59
VIII. Percent Comparison of Most Worthwhile Home Management House Experiences Group I and Group II	64
IX. Percent Comparison of Least Worthwhile Home Management House Experiences Group I and Group II	65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Educators who want to keep their programs in higher education both purposeful and functional have realized the need for serious, planned, and concentrated study of their programs. Periodic evaluations must be a part of the plan. During the past ten years the administrators and faculty of the Division of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University have been engaged in self study and curriculum revision. Department staff members have participated in the broad overall effort as well as concentrated on the offerings in their own areas. It has also been recognized that it is desirable for students to participate in both the evaluating of the present program as well as in planning for the future.

The study reported by this researcher is a part of this total effort and is directed toward the area of home management, with specific reference to the residence course. This study was done at two points in time. The first part was done in 1961 while the writer was a graduate assistant in the home management residence course. She lived in one of the home management laboratory units and was the adviser for approximately one half of the students involved in this study. During 1961 she also participated as a faculty member in the discussion of curriculum plans and objectives.

The second point in time was six years later; i.e. spring semester

1967. The same group of students was contacted by the writer by letter. She asked them to respond to the same questionnaire which had been used by them at the time they completed the course. Thus this research study permits the writer to compare the evaluation of the course in terms of its objectives at the time the students completed the course and six years later.

Of the 427 institutions responding to the United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare survey regarding home management residence experiences 74.4 percent maintained home management houses or apartments (13). The 1961 biennial survey indicated that it is typical among colleges and universities to require home economics education majors, and those students preparing for employment in the Cooperative Extension Service to enroll in a home management course and live in the residence house or apartment for a specified period of time. More than one-half of these institutions required students majoring in general home economics to live in the residence house, and almost one-third required such residence for students majoring in foods, nutrition, and dietetics.

In recent years the importance of the ability to manage effectively is becoming more widely recognized. Many educational leaders in home economics, who have long accepted the teaching of personal and home management as one of the basic subject matter areas in this field of study, are now recommending increased emphasis on home management. Due to changing socio-economic conditions the responsibilities of homemakers are changing or shifting emphasis. Not only are more women combining a gainful outside career with homemaking, but the home itself has changed largely from a center of production to one of consumption.

An increasing number and variety of goods and services previously produced in the home are now purchased commercially. The formerly isolated rural family has changed to the present mobile, suburban city dweller. New methods of transportation and communication have opened hundreds of opportunities for a large variety of different activities to youth and adults alike, until the tempo of life has been speeded up with an overcrowding of innumerable activities. According to Nickell and Dorsey (24):

The changes in modern life are reflected in the management of the home. The changed attitudes toward authority and toward the place of women and children in society have brought many new problems in family relationships and in the use of family resources. The change in the home from a producing to a consuming unit not only increases the managerial problems concerning the use of human and material resources of the family but also requires different methods of meeting the problems. New knowledge is needed by homemakers if these problems are to be solved with satisfaction to all.

The present-day family is forced to consider its needs carefully and to choose wisely if it wishes to get the greatest return from its resources. The process of management then does not change but becomes a rational method of dealing with change.

Statement of the Problem

The central or over-all problem of this study is to explore the contributions of the home management residence at Oklahoma State University in the attainment of the over-all objectives of the Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics.

To contribute to the solution of this problem these five sub-purposes or problems were identified:

1. To determine whether or not the objectives of the department are in harmony with the over-all objectives of the college of

which it is a part, and with currently accepted purposes within the field of home economics.

2. To ascertain student evaluation with regard to their progress toward departmental objectives while enrolled in the residence course.
3. To explore student opinion with regard to making the residence course more functional.
 - a. To arrive at a composite view of what activities the students consider most worthwhile or least valuable.
 - b. To obtain student opinion with regard to pre-requisites.
 - c. To get information about student attitudes toward the residence course.
4. To compare subjective evaluation of the residence course for different groupings of students, such as married and single.
5. To make recommendations, based on the results of the study, for (a) facilitating the further development of the teaching of home management and (b) carrying out additional studies and research.

Needs for the Study

Critical interest in education has steadily increased in the past few years. At no time in history has there been such wide discussion of educational issues as is now taking place. This widespread concern on the part of lay people as well as educators shows a diversity of ideas related to all aspects of the educational process - objectives, content, and methods of teaching, including evaluation. All areas of education, from the primary through the post-graduate level, are being

evaluated in the light of new and accelerated scientific, technological, socio-economic, and political developments and their effect on the individual and the family. Likewise, education is being evaluated from the standpoint of cost with relation to its intrinsic value.

In the curriculum improvement program at Oklahoma State University, personal and home management has been generally accepted as an integral part of education for home and family life. Nevertheless, opinions differ with regard to the ways management should be taught. Special questions are directed toward the necessity of the home management residence course for teaching home management effectively. The value of group living with guidance in a home-like situation, for the development of the ability to maintain satisfying human relations, manage a home, and master homemaking tasks seems obvious. In spite of this, the low teacher-student ratio, the large number of married students, most of whom have their own homes in the community, and the difficulty of finding advisers with the necessary professional training and personal attributes, point to the desirability for sound evaluation of this experience.

An exploration of research related to the home management residence course indicated that it may be organized generally into the following categories:

1. Organization and procedures for the residence course.
2. Surveys to determine size and scope of the program at the college level.
3. Evaluation by faculty and students of goal attainment. These are related primarily to manipulative skills.
4. History of the development of the home management residence as a means of teaching management.

Research with regard to student reaction to goal attainment and opinions about the experience is limited. It seemed desirable that

student opinion with regard to their experiences in the management house be obtained to supplement faculty study and thought on the issue.

Hohenhaus (11), at the conclusion of a study concerning student faculty perceptions of the home management residence course stated:

The present study points up several factors which would justify specific studies. The first relates to the goal structure of the home management residence which appears to be weak. The under-emphasis upon the management of family resources revealed in the findings raises several questions meriting further investigation: Is there a need for re-evaluating the home management residence in terms of its function in the home economics curriculum? Should residence goals and course content be re-appraised? How well do the stated goals correspond to the actual experiences provided in the residence?

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES USED FOR DEVELOPING THE STUDY

Although educators agree that evaluation by students and faculty is an integral part of good teaching, there are not, as yet, generally accepted and consistent criteria and methods for evaluation of the success or failure of the home management residence course (32). In order to develop an instrument for student evaluation of the home management house experience, the method by which this could be most logically approached was discussed with the staff members of the Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics, and other home economics faculty members. The location and study of existing research and the opinions of authorities in educational evaluation led to the conclusion that, in order to make an appraisal of this educational experience, the objectives of the departmental offerings must be clearly defined. The faculty of the department had developed nine objectives as its contribution to the common requirements of home economics majors, and these had been generally accepted by the faculty as a whole as contributing to the attainment of over-all division objectives. It seemed reasonable to determine student progress toward these objectives, particularly that attributable to the residence course.

Due to the lack of available and reliable methods of appraising student progress toward pre-determined goals, student opinion with regard to their progress toward these goals was solicited. This was

accomplished through the use of a questionnaire which included structured and open end questions concerning the residence course.

In order to arrive at an evaluation of the accomplishments for any course, objectives or goals for the course must be clearly defined. Schleh (29), in discussing pure management principles used as a guide for developing objectives in home management, has listed as the first step the laying out of central goals toward which all accomplishment should progress. To define and measure goal attainment, rather than activities, is the primary premise upon which this study is based.

The American Home Economics Association (31) has defined the basic steps essential in planning a curriculum as:

1. The setting up of objectives and their interpretation into behavior outcomes.
2. The determining of the learning needed to achieve the objectives.
3. The selecting of educational experiences for acquiring the learning needed.
4. The deciding upon ways of measuring the extent to which the learning has been acquired.

As justification for the use of the basic objectives selected as the goal toward which the home management course would move, it was decided that the goals of home economics would be traced from the focal point of the American Home Economics Association to the Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics at Oklahoma State University.

In a statement of philosophy and objectives prepared by the Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics by the American Home Economics Association (23) in June of 1959, the following statement was made:

Home economics is the field of knowledge and service primarily

concerned with strengthening family life through:

1. Educating the individual for family living
2. Improving the services and goods used by families
3. Conducting research to discover the changing needs in individuals and families and the means of satisfying these needs.
4. Furthering community, national, and world conditions favorable to family living.

The Division of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University, in formulating general objectives for curriculum development, listed four overall objectives: (1959)

- I. Establishing and maintaining a home which contributes effectively to furthering individual and family well being.
- II. Establishing and maintaining satisfying human relationships (individual, family and community).
- III. Increasing competence in self-direction for satisfying personal, family and community living.
- IV. Contributing to the optimum mental and physical health for self and others.

It would appear that the general objectives of the Division of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University are in harmony with the philosophy outlined by the American Home Economics Association.

In order to coordinate student behavior and departmental objectives, the goals of the Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics at Oklahoma State University are more specific. They are:

- I. Grow in the managerial abilities essential for satisfying personal and family living.
- II. Grow in judgment in deciding on the standard of living desired for self and family which is in harmony with one's philosophy of life.
- III. Increase understanding of the significance of socio-economic trends and technological developments in this and other countries for effective home management.

- IV. Increase the understanding of and the ability to apply the principles and procedures of financial management in personal and family living.
- V. Understand and apply the principles necessary for effective selection, operation, care, and arrangement of equipment in the home, and its relation to the well-being of the family.
- VI. Develop increasing competence as a consumer of goods and services for personal, family and community well-being.
- VII. Grow in the ability to make reasoned, intelligent decisions (in order to attain personal, family and societal goals).
- VIII. Grow in the ability to use work simplification as a tool of personal and home management.

The American Home Economics Association statement of philosophy and objectives lists twelve competencies to which home economics contributes. Crandall has (4) stated that in six of these, a major responsibility rests upon those of us primarily concerned with management.

Special competencies are these:

1. To establish values which give meaning to personal, family, and community living; select goods appropriate to these values.
2. To make and carry out intelligent decisions regarding the use of personal, family, and community resources.
3. To establish long-range goals for financial security and work toward their achievement.
4. To plan consumption of goods and services - including food, clothing, and housing - in ways that will promote values and goals established by the family.
5. To purchase consumer goods and services appropriate to an overall consumption plan and wise use of economic resources.
6. To perform the tasks of maintaining a home in such a way that they will contribute effectively to furthering individual and family goals.

Each college department of home economics today is challenged to develop the best possible educational program for its particular situation. The necessity for thoughtful appraisal of an educational program is a continuing need in a world of accelerated change and increasing pressure. Only by such appraisal can the excellence of a

program be maintained and changes be intelligently made.

Spafford (30), writing on the fundamentals in teaching has stated that curriculum planning, whether of the entire school of home economics or of a specific field, takes its direction from the philosophy of those who are responsible for the program. This will determine the learning which is considered to be most worthwhile, the kind of educational experiences that will be provided, and the ways in which learning is to be evaluated. It is postulated that four basic steps are essential in planning a curriculum: the setting up of objectives and their interpretation into behavior outcomes; the determining of the learning needed to achieve the objectives; the selecting of educational experiences for acquiring the learning needed; and the deciding upon ways of measuring the extent to which the learning has been acquired.

The specific objectives set up within an area will be influenced by the needs of those being educated and by the needs of society; the experiences used in achieving the objectives will be influenced by the resources available.

Development of the questionnaire used in this study was the result of an intensive study of existing practices for the teaching of home management, in the light of departmental philosophy, as it relates to the subject matter area. The departmental objectives were used as the basis for development of sub-objectives relating directly to goal attainment for the residence course. The instrument, in increasing developmental form, was tested by students currently in residence at the management houses. This practice led to numerous changes, which reflected student thinking on implementation of goal achievement for the residence course. It is axiomatic that the objectives of a

curriculum should be clearly defined, that deciding upon ways in which learning is to be appraised is an important part of curriculum building, and that student appraisal of their own growth is an important part of learning and of program evaluation. This concept of curriculum building formed the basis upon which the departmental faculty built the framework of goals for the Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics.

The instrument, in its final form, was appraised by a member of the Department of Home Economics Education who is consultant for evaluation in the College of Home Economics.

The structured portion of the questionnaire was used to obtain student evaluation of progress toward goals in the residence course. Open-end questions were asked to gain further information concerning the residence experience. The terms "much", "some", and "little", used to designate these categories of accomplishment for goal attainment, were used to arrive at relative, not absolute values.

The questionnaire was submitted in 1961 to all students who had been enrolled in the home management residence course during the 1960-61 academic year. Seventy-six students were enrolled in the course during this period and sixty-two (81.58 percent) returned the completed questionnaire.

During the spring term of the 1966-67 academic year the same questionnaire was submitted to the original list of students who had participated in the original survey. Addresses for these students who would have ordinarily graduated within one year after being enrolled in the residence course were obtained through the cooperation of the Home Economics Alumni Association of Oklahoma State University. No addresses

were available for five of the original seventy-six, and four were now living outside of the United States. Of the resultant sixty-seven questionnaires mailed, five were returned by the Post Office Department as undeliverable. Thirty-three, or 53.23 percent of the questionnaires were completed and returned.

Evaluation of course objectives of the home management residence course by a group of students who had completed the experience, and re-evaluation six years later by the same group after graduation from Oklahoma State University is expected to result in some insight into student and graduate subjective evaluation of attitudes toward individual and group attainment of departmental objectives for the management residence course.

The numerically designated values of three, two, and one which have been assigned to the "much", "some", and "little", categories will be used to arrive at individual and group arithmetic mean scores of objective achievement.

Division of groupings for achievement, expressed in percentage of individuals designating "much", "some", and "little" objective achievement for the various course objectives and sub-objectives, is expected to indicate whether or not there is an appreciable difference in the learning experience of the residence course for married and single students, home economics education and other majors, and students who have obtained credits toward the degree exclusively at Oklahoma State University and those who transferred to the university from other institutions.

Analysis of the questionnaire in its first submission and comparison of responses in the questionnaire submitted six years later to the

same group of individuals will of necessity require several assumptions. The original list of students comprised the total enrollment during a full academic year in the home management residence course. It is assumed that no self-selective process was operating during that time and that this group of students is representative of the average students then enrolled in the home economics options requiring residence course enrollment. It is further assumed that the randomness of the first sample and the second are similar if not parallel. It is also assumed that level of retention of subject matter and ability of recall in this particular group of individuals is normally distributed. Analysis of the questionnaire from the standpoint of two points in time is expected to show whether or not there is any appreciable difference in individual and group opinions related to objective achievement for the home management residence course over time.

Review of Literature

A review of literature relating to the subject of home management residence courses per se revealed that one of the earliest comprehensive studies was undertaken by Judy in 1929, and was designed to determine past, present, and most desirable practices used in the teaching of home management through the home management residence. One of the aims of her study was to formulate policies or objectives for future use in administering the residence course.

The data collection instrument, in the form of a questionnaire designed to obtain information on past and present home management instructions, was submitted to one hundred institutions offering a four-year curriculum in home economics. Sixty-eight of the institutions contacted responded, and forty-one of these institutions indicated that they used a management house residence as a laboratory for the teaching of home management.

A board of experts, as well as those instructors participating in the study, expressed the opinion that emphasis should be placed on development of a professional attitude toward homemaking, and the use of management to enhance family and community welfare.

Further analysis indicated that in the past emphasis had been placed on manipulative skills and dissemination of information dealing with performance of specific household tasks. Indications were, that although the instructors believed in theory that less emphasis should

be placed on skills, this was not necessarily put into practice at the time of the study.

In 1947 Elliott (8) initiated an analysis of home management education at the college level. The study was concerned primarily with the philosophy, aims, and content of the home management residence course.

The first of two questionnaires was submitted to colleges with home management residence programs, and contained questions concerned primarily with physical set-up of the management house and the manipulative processes used. Forty-two percent (106) of those contacted responded.

A second questionnaire, based on analysis of textbooks and management course outlines, plus information obtained from the first questionnaire, was sent to the original respondents. Replies were received from sixty-two percent of the second group.

Elliott reported that approximately two-thirds of the participants endorsed the philosophy that management is a way of life and a means of achieving the highest values from human relations. Although the participant believed that the major objective of the resident program was wise use of resources, implementation suggested emphasis on skills. Ranking of subject matter areas, in order of their importance, were as follows: efficient management, time and energy management, philosophy, finance, housing, health, recreation, the family car, and clothing. The study showed that home management house residents received very little experience in the handling of money, and very little was being done to provide management experiences at various income levels. Analysis of the findings indicated that the majority of the residences operated on a relatively rigid and inflexible procedure, which was instigated by

the faculty member acting as adviser.

In 1945 Alice Hircher Mace initiated a study at Oklahoma State University to investigate the level of learning experienced by students living in the home management houses. The study, conducted during the years 1945 to 1948, used as a data collecting instrument a questionnaire administered to one hundred seniors in four departments of home economics; Home Economics Education, Household Arts, Household Science, and Home Life. Students completed the questionnaires on entering the course in household administration, previous to their residence in the home management house. The questionnaire consisted primarily of general information regarding background and experiences of students in performing homemaking activities, and the degree of skill and feeling of security they felt they had attained.

Mace's study did not progress beyond the point of administering the initial questionnaire, however, the data obtained was used by Long (17) in 1948 as the basis for a study of implications for curriculum building in home economics.

Conclusions drawn by Long indicated that homemaking activities were experienced at home rather than at school in the majority of cases. Implications for further study of time and energy conservation were very strong, as few students indicated experience in this area. Consumer economics and buying practices were also considered to be areas in which more work could be done.

McKinney (18), hypothesizing that the residence course in home management provided opportunities to elevate the experience of associated life to the level of awareness, where they would take on the character, for the participants, of consciously designed experiences to promote

democratic insight and behavior, used the home management residence experiences as the vehicle to test her hypothesis. All planning was done through the medium of small group councils. Evidence of attitude changes toward democratic values and procedures was collected through use of Point of View Inventory, personally phrased statements of one's own philosophy of homemaking, and activity progress logs which were completed by each student during each period of the homemaking experience.

Evidence of change through the use of the point of view inventory at the beginning and end of the residence period was inconclusive. The personally formulated statements of homemaking philosophy, written at the beginning and end of the period indicated that democratic growth had occurred. The activity progress logs and the Homemaker's Rating Scale, used for self evaluation, indicated willingness to rate oneself and a continuing rate of growth as homemakers, both of which can be considered to be evidences of democratic behavior.

A secondary function of this study was the exploration of the relationship of house advisers to the character of the home management residence experiences. The investigator wanted to know whether house advisers had had special training in the creation and promotion of democratic experiences and whether they accept responsibility for developing democratic growth in students.

Results of the study show that trained advisers are more democratic in determining policies relating to the course than are untrained advisers. However, untrained advisers use procedures which are more democratic.

Helbrook (12), in a study of management problems of home management house students, undertook to determine the number and kind of management

problems occurring in the residence course. Both students and advisers participated in the study, which was carried out at Purdue University in 1956. The researcher attempted to pinpoint areas of work in the home management houses to which greater attention might be given by advisers, to find situations which students consider to be problems and how these compare with the advisers list, and to set up a file of information on management problems to be placed in the management houses.

Results indicated that lists of problems, and their percentage of occurrence and order of incidence was essentially the same for both students and advisers. Use and care of equipment was the most prevalent problem, with housekeeping procedures, time management, preparation and service of food, small equipment and group living occurring in decreasing order and percentage of incidence.

Hohenhaus (11) conducted a study to ascertain faculty and student perceptions of the home management residence. Her hypothesis postulated that there was no significant difference between faculty and students with respect to:

- A. Perceived goals of the home management residence course
- B. Interpretation of home management residence activities, and
- C. Educational importance attributed to the home management residence.

Educational institutions in the central region having a four year home economics program offering the home management residence course were surveyed. Persons contacted were administrators, home management residence advisers, and students enrolled in the residence course. Both students and faculty members were asked to rate the residence course in relation to other laboratory courses. An overwhelming majority

(98.6 percent) of the faculty, and 88.9 percent of the students rated the home management residence course as equal to or more valuable than other laboratory courses. On the basis of the analysis of the data the hypothesis of equal faculty and student perception of the home management residence was rejected.

Cumulative evidence implied that when the management of resources was emphasized as a goal in the activities of the home management residence course students attributed greater educational importance to the course. Moreover, the findings suggested that when students were aware of activities related to the development of personal relationships they were further convinced of the value of the residence program.

Robbins (28), working toward evaluation of the home management courses at Montana State College in 1962, used two groups of individuals to obtain managerial scores. One group consisted of graduates of the home economics department and the other was made up of wives of students enrolled in the college. Completed questionnaires were received from 100 graduates and fifty-one wives of students. The tests compared the managerial scores of the two groups in the areas of human resource management, material resource management, and work simplification. A test for significance at the five percent confidence level showed the mean scores of all areas to be higher for home economics graduates than for student wives. A greater portion of home economics graduates than of student wives indicated frequent application of work simplification principles to work both inside and outside the home.

Dopson (7), seeking to determine whether the home management residence course was attempting to meet the needs of the home economics students in relation to some of the social and economic changes and

technological developments which influence all aspects of American life, surveyed students who had taken the course from September 1959, to August 1961. From a total of 133 questionnaires, 88 or sixty-seven percent were returned. Analysis showed that the majority of the former residents considered the home management residence course as one of the most valuable home economics courses in the curriculum. The following suggestions were made in relation to course content: more information and experience in time, money and energy management; additional information and experience in selection, use and care of home furnishings, furniture and household equipment; greater emphasis on human values and successful group living; better methods for groups and individuals in evaluation; more realistic, up-to-date experiences similar to home experiences; additional house meetings, individual conferences and more class lectures.

The central purpose of the work done by Desi (6) was to develop an instrument which would measure the image of home management in two groups of Iowa State University graduates; home economics majors and non-home economics majors. Random sampling of graduates from 1956 through 1960 were mailed questionnaires.

The test instrument consisted of an agreement-disagreement inventory of fifty items and a polar-concept section of twenty-two sets of adjectives describing home management. Responses were received from 57 percent of the home economics majors and 58 percent of the non-home economics majors. Responses of seven members of the home management faculty were used to develop a key for scoring responses of the group.

Analysis revealed that the image of home management held by home economics graduates was much more like that of the faculty than was that

of the non-home economics alumni. Item analysis indicated that the items in both the agreement-disagreement inventory and the polar-concept section were associated with the general content of home management rather than with any one element such as goals and values, resources, or phases of the process. An analysis of variance indicated that the revised instrument was reasonably sensitive in revealing differences in the image of home management held by individuals. There were no significant differences in responses of the alumni when classified by age, marital status, or employment experience.

Mau (20), investigating the cognitive objectives of home management programs at the undergraduate level, contacted 397 home management professors and received an eighty-two percent response to her questionnaire. A set of taxonomy-classified cognitive objectives was proposed for the development of undergraduate home management courses, and the respondents were asked to rate them according to their essentiality toward the teaching of home management. Of the fifty objectives, 17 were rated as essential by the majority. Twelve of the essential objectives described intellectual abilities; three were comprehension objectives, two dealt with application, none related to analysis, three related to synthesis, two were in relation to evaluation, and seven were knowledge objectives.

Among the fifty objectives, application was rated by the respondents as the most essential class; analysis and synthesis each rated less essential than knowledge, and less than half as essential as application. Knowledge was rated averagely more essential than the five more complex classes.

The findings of this study would suggest that the home management

curriculum be studied with regard to the development of subject matter leading to more complex cognitive behavior. Analysis also indicated that teachers in the home management area of home economics need to examine their choices of learning and evaluation experiences relevant to application, analysis, and synthesis objectives.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

During the year 1961, the writer served on a graduate assistantship as resident adviser for one of the home management residence units. She participated at faculty meetings where objectives of the course, the department and the division were discussed and developed. From these discussions and from the literature, the questionnaire used in this study was developed.

The questionnaire (Appendix) contains eight major objectives with 45 sub-objective statements incorporated under these. At the end of the course each student was asked to indicate a degree of goal attainment in terms of "much", "some", or "little". The responses of individual students to the questionnaire could not be identified but through general information asked student responses could be identified in terms of major of the student, whether or not all course work had been taken at Oklahoma State University or some transferred from another institution, and marital status. The questionnaire also contained some open end questions which sought to identify "most worthwhile" and "least worthwhile" experiences in the residence course.

A similar questionnaire was sent to the same group of graduates six years later. The analysis of data is concerned primarily with differences which exist between selected groups in relation to course objective attainment for the home management residence course. The

students contributing data collected in 1961 will be referred to as Group I and those from whom data was collected in 1967 as Group II. Within each group student comparisons are made between single and married, transfer and non-transfer, home economics education majors and other majors in home economics, and the two groups are compared.

Group I Analysis

Group I consists of 62 responses, 81.59 percent of all students who had been enrolled in the home management residence course during the 1960-61 academic year. Forty-six of this group were single and sixteen were married. Comparison of student evaluation of course objective attainment for these two groups (Table I) shows a consistently higher percentage of single students than married students who felt they accomplished much toward course objectives. The widest divergence occurred in Objective VI, relating to the development of increasing competence as a consumer of goods and services, and shows 47.38 percent of the single students in contrast to 30.00 percent of the married students who felt the experiences in the home management house had contributed much to this objective. Objective VIII, concerning growth in the ability to use work simplification as a tool of personal and home management, shows a similarly wide difference in the scoring of the two groups, with 51.62 percent of the single students and only 34.37 percent of the married students checking the "much" category.

Only in the category of applying the principles necessary for effective selection, operation, care, and arrangement of equipment do the married and single students agree on how much the home management course

TABLE I

PERCENT COMPARISON OF SINGLE AND MARRIED STUDENTS IN GROUP I
IN RELATION TO GOAL ATTAINMENT

I. Managerial ability growth*	Much		Some		Little	
	Single**	Married**	Single	Married	Single	Married
1. Varying conditions*	65.21	50.00	23.95	37.50	10.86	12.50
2. Decision making	56.52	43.75	36.95	50.00	06.55	06.25
3. Clarifying values	36.95	25.00	45.65	43.75	17.39	31.25
4. Personal values	43.48	50.00	43.48	31.25	13.04	18.75
5. Flexible standards	54.34	56.25	34.78	31.25	10.86	12.50
6. Management process	67.39	37.50	28.26	43.75	04.34	18.75
7. Creativity	52.17	43.75	28.26	37.50	19.56	18.75
8. Alternate resources	45.65	50.00	47.82	37.50	06.52	12.50
9. Abilities and attitudes	63.04	56.25	30.43	31.25	06.52	12.50
II. Standard of living						
10. Critical thinking	50.00	31.25	45.65	37.50	04.34	31.25
11. Different standards	60.86	62.50	32.61	18.75	06.52	18.75
12. Responsibilities	63.04	68.75	34.78	25.00	02.17	06.25

TABLE I (Continued)

13. Realistic goals	54.34	62.50	34.78	25.00	10.86	12.50
14. Philosophy of life	32.61	18.75	43.48	62.50	23.95	18.75
<hr/>						
III. Socio-economic trends						
<hr/>						
15. Realistic interpretation	04.34	06.25	23.95	31.25	71.73	62.50
16. Open mind	28.26	25.00	47.82	37.50	23.95	37.50
17. On being informed	34.78	18.75	47.82	50.00	17.39	31.25
<hr/>						
IV. Financial management						
<hr/>						
18. Identify problems	56.52	56.25	39.15	37.50	04.34	06.25
19. Influential factors	71.73	56.25	19.56	25.00	08.69	18.75
20. Cooperative activity	73.91	56.25	17.39	31.25	08.69	12.50
21. Plans and records	73.91	68.75	21.73	12.50	04.34	18.75
22. Increasing satisfactions	45.65	37.50	47.82	56.25	06.52	06.25
23. Real value of money	47.82	18.75	43.48	43.75	08.69	37.50
24. Harmony	58.69	56.25	34.78	31.25	06.52	12.50
25. Different standards	69.56	43.75	26.08	50.00	04.34	06.25

TABLE I (Continued)

V. Selection, operation, care							
26.	Manufacturer's guide	45.65	56.25	47.82	25.00	06.52	18.75
27.	Functional features	52.19	50.00	36.95	37.50	10.86	12.50
28.	Work simplification	54.34	43.75	39.15	37.50	06.52	18.75
29.	Skillful use	52.17	50.00	41.30	50.00	06.52	0
30.	Effect of arrangement	56.52	62.50	28.26	25.00	15.21	12.50
VI. Consumer competence							
31.	Necessary knowledge	65.21	50.00	30.43	37.50	04.34	12.50
32.	Better consumer	54.34	31.25	41.30	56.25	04.34	12.50
33.	Comparative values	54.34	31.25	43.40	50.00	02.17	18.75
34.	Reasons for choices	34.78	12.50	56.52	56.25	08.69	31.25
35.	Individualistic choice	28.26	25.00	60.86	25.00	10.86	50.00

TABLE I (Continued)

VII. Decision making						
36. Logical process	43.48	37.50	45.65	31.25	10.86	31.25
37. Positive attitude	47.82	50.00	39.15	31.25	13.04	18.75
38. Self direction	54.34	43.75	32.61	43.75	13.04	12.50
39. Responsibility	73.91	56.25	26.08	43.75	0	0
40. Analytical actions	45.65	68.75	45.65	12.50	08.69	18.75
41. Self confidence	56.52	43.75	36.95	43.75	06.52	12.50
VIII. Work simplification						
42. Applied	69.56	56.25	21.73	31.25	08.69	12.50
43. Practices	45.65	25.00	39.15	56.25	15.21	18.75
44. Application framework	50.00	37.50	39.15	31.25	10.86	31.25
45. Analysis of results	41.30	18.75	41.30	43.75	17.39	37.50

* For complete statement see questionnaire in appendix.

** Total single = 46 Total married 16

contributed toward the objectives listed, with 52.50 and 52.17 percent respectively appearing in the "much" category. Responses for both groups were similarly different in the category referring to little accomplishment, with fewer of the single than the married students showing little goal accomplishment.

Analysis of the data related to transfer and non-transfer students in Group I, with twenty-two transfer and forty non-transfer students (Table II), indicate that the two groups agree essentially on Objective I, relating to growth of managerial abilities, with 52.01 percent of the transfer students and 51.66 percent of the non-transfer students indicating that the experience in the home management house contributed much toward this objective. Objective III, regarding increase in understanding of the significance of socio-economic trends and technological developments (transfer 24.24 percent and non-transfer 20.00 percent); Objective IV, ability to apply the principles and procedures of financial management (transfer 55.11 percent, non-transfer 60.94 percent); and Objective VIII, ability to use work simplification (transfer 44.31 percent and non-transfer 48.75 percent) indicate little difference between the two groups in relation to objective attainment.

There were evident differences of opinion, however, in relation to Objective II, growth in judgment in deciding on the standard of living desired for self and family which is in harmony with one's philosophy of life, transfer students showing 45.45 percent and non-transfer students showing 54.50 percent goal attainment in the "much" category. Objective V, concerning effective selection, operation, care and arrangement of equipment (transfer 57.27 percent non-transfer 49.50 percent); Objective VI, concerning consumer competence (transfer 29.99 percent non-transfer

TABLE II

PERCENT COMPARISON OF GROUP I TRANSFER AND NON-TRANSFER
STUDENTS IN RELATION TO GOAL ATTAINMENT

I. Managerial ability growth*	Much		Some		Little	
	N-Trans.**	Trans.**	N-Trans.	Trans.	N-Trans.	Trans.
1. Varying conditions*	60.00	63.63	25.00	31.81	15.00	04.54
2. Decision making	55.00	50.00	42.00	36.36	02.50	13.63
3. Clarifying values	37.50	27.27	42.50	50.00	20.00	22.72
4. Personal values	50.00	36.36	37.50	45.45	12.50	18.18
5. Flexible standards	60.00	45.45	30.00	40.90	10.00	13.63
6. Management process	52.50	72.72	37.50	22.72	10.00	04.54
7. Creativity	47.50	54.54	30.00	31.81	22.50	13.63
8. Alternate resources	47.50	45.45	42.50	50.00	10.00	04.54
9. Abilities and attitudes	55.00	72.72	35.00	22.72	10.00	04.54
II. Standard of living						
10. Critical thinking	45.00	45.45	47.50	36.36	07.50	18.18
11. Different standards	67.50	50.00	25.00	36.36	07.50	13.63
12. Responsibilities	70.00	54.54	27.50	40.90	02.50	04.54

TABLE II (Continued)

13. Realistic goals	55.00	59.09	32.50	31.81	12.50	09.09
14. Philosophy of life	35.00	18.18	40.00	63.63	25.00	18.18
<hr/>						
III. Socio-economic trends						
<hr/>						
15. Realistic interpretation	07.50	0	27.50	22.72	65.00	77.27
16. Open mind	22.50	36.36	50.00	36.36	27.50	27.27
17. On being informed	27.50	36.36	55.00	36.36	17.50	27.27
<hr/>						
IV. Financial management						
<hr/>						
18. Identify problems	60.00	50.00	35.00	45.45	05.00	04.54
19. Influential factors	70.00	63.63	17.50	27.27	12.50	09.09
20. Cooperative activity	72.50	63.63	17.50	27.27	10.00	09.09
21. Plans and records	75.00	68.68	15.00	22.72	10.00	09.09
22. Increasing satisfactions	50.00	31.81	45.00	59.09	05.00	09.09
23. Real value of money	42.50	36.36	45.00	40.90	12.50	22.72
24. Harmony	57.50	59.09	35.00	31.81	07.50	09.09
25. Different standards	60.00	68.18	32.50	31.81	07.50	0

TABLE II (Continued)

V. Selection, operation, care							
26. Manufacturer's guide	40.00	63.63	50.00	27.27	10.00	09.09	
27. Functional features	47.50	59.09	37.50	36.36	15.00	04.54	
28. Work simplification	52.50	50.00	40.00	36.36	07.50	13.63	
29. Skillful use	52.50	50.00	45.00	40.90	02.50	09.09	
30. Effect of arrangement	55.00	63.63	30.00	22.72	15.00	13.63	
VI. Consumer competence							
31. Necessary knowledge	65.00	54.54	27.50	40.90	07.50	04.54	
32. Better consumer	55.00	36.36	37.50	59.09	07.50	04.54	
33. Comparative values	62.50	22.72	30.00	72.72	07.50	04.54	
34. Reasons for choices	35.00	18.18	57.50	54.54	07.50	27.27	
35. Individualistic choice	32.50	18.18	52.50	50.00	15.00	31.81	

TABLE II (Continued)

VII. Decision making						
36. Logical process	52.52	22.72	35.00	54.54	12.50	22.72
37. Positive attitude	50.00	45.45	42.50	31.81	07.50	22.72
38. Self direction	60.00	36.36	37.50	31.81	02.50	31.81
39. Responsibility	75.00	59.09	25.00	40.90	0	0
40. Analytical actions	50.00	54.54	42.50	27.27	07.50	18.18
41. Self confidence	57.50	45.45	32.50	50.00	10.00	04.54
VIII. Work simplification						
42. Applied	65.00	68.18	25.00	22.72	10.00	09.09
43. Practices	40.00	40.90	40.00	50.00	20.00	09.09
44. Application framework	50.00	40.90	32.50	45.45	17.50	13.63
45. Analysis of results	40.00	27.27	37.50	50.00	22.50	22.72

* For complete statement see questionnaire in appendix.

** Total non-transfer = 40 Total transfer = 22

50.00 percent); and Objective VII, on decision making (transfer 43.93 non-transfer 57.50 percent) all showed appreciable difference between the evaluation of the transfer and non-transfer students with regard to goal accomplishment.

In a comparison of thirty-seven home economics education majors and twenty-five majors in other areas of home economics, results indicate a consistently higher percentage of other majors than home economics education majors (Table III) expressed the opinion that the experience in the home management house contributed much to the objectives of the course. Objective V, concerning the effective selection, operation, care and arrangement of equipment showed the widest difference, with home economics education majors indicating 43.78 percent and other majors indicating 64.80 percent in the category showing much goal accomplishment. Objectives I, VII, and VIII all showed differences in percentage of individuals checking the "much" category in excess of fifteen percent.

In answer to the question, "What experiences in the home management house were most worthwhile to you?", indications are that the value of the experience depended upon the viewpoint of the student and her felt needs. Food budgeting for different cost levels rated highest, with seventeen responses. Entertaining was next with thirteen responses, with many of the students stating that these experiences resulted in a greater feeling of confidence in regard to social skills and poise. Twelve responses related to work simplification techniques, while ten referred to food preparation, over-all management experiences, meal planning, written records and group living. Group planning, critical evaluation and use of equipment were each listed three times,

TABLE III

PERCENT COMPARISON OF GROUP I HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION MAJORS AND OTHER MAJORS
IN RELATION TO GOAL ATTAINMENT

I. Managerial ability growth*	Much		Some		Little	
	H.E.E.**	Other**	H.E.E.	Other	H.E.E.	Other
1. Varying conditions*	51.35	76.00	35.13	16.00	13.51	08.00
2. Decision making	43.24	68.00	48.65	28.00	08.10	04.00
3. Clarifying values	27.02	44.00	51.35	36.00	21.62	20.00
4. Personal values	37.84	56.00	45.95	32.00	16.21	12.00
5. Flexible standards	51.35	60.00	37.84	28.00	10.54	12.00
6. Management process	54.05	68.00	37.84	24.00	08.10	08.00
7. Creativity	51.40	48.00	29.73	32.00	18.92	20.00
8. Alternate resources	40.54	56.00	48.65	40.00	10.54	04.00
9. Abilities and attitudes	48.65	80.00	40.54	16.00	10.54	04.00
II. Standard of living						
10. Critical thinking	43.24	48.00	40.54	48.00	16.21	04.00
11. Different standards	62.16	60.00	27.02	32.00	10.54	08.00
12. Responsibilities	59.46	72.00	35.13	28.00	05.40	0

TABLE III (Continued)

13. Realistic goals	51.35	64.00	37.84	24.00	10.54	12.00
14. Philosophy of life	27.02	32.00	56.75	36.00	16.21	32.00
<hr/>						
III. Socio-economic trends						
<hr/>						
15. Realistic interpretation	05.40	04.00	16.21	40.00	78.37	56.00
16. Open mind	18.92	40.00	40.54	52.00	40.54	08.00
17. On being informed	32.43	28.00	40.54	60.00	27.02	12.00
<hr/>						
IV. Financial management						
<hr/>						
18. Identify problems	64.86	44.00	29.73	52.00	05.40	04.00
19. Influential factors	59.46	80.00	27.02	12.00	13.51	08.00
20. Cooperative activity	64.86	76.00	24.32	16.00	10.54	08.00
21. Plans and records	72.97	72.00	16.21	24.00	10.54	04.00
22. Increasing satisfactions	37.84	52.00	54.05	44.00	08.10	04.00
23. Real value of money	29.73	56.00	48.65	36.00	21.62	08.00
24. Harmony	56.75	60.00	32.43	36.00	10.54	04.00
25. Different standards	62.16	64.00	29.73	36.00	08.10	0

TABLE III (Continued)

V. Selection, operation, care							
26. Manufacturer's guide	43.24	56.00	48.65	32.00	08.10	12.00	
27. Functional features	48.65	56.00	35.13	40.00	16.21	04.00	
28. Work simplification	40.54	68.00	43.24	32.00	16.21	0	
29. Skillful use	35.13	76.00	56.75	24.00	08.10	0	
30. Effect of arrangement	51.35	68.00	27.02	28.00	21.62	04.00	
VI. Consumer competence							
31. Necessary knowledge	54.05	72.00	35.13	28.00	10.54	0	
32. Better consumer	45.95	52.00	45.95	44.00	08.10	04.00	
33. Comparative values	45.95	52.00	45.95	44.00	08.10	04.00	
34. Reasons for choices	24.32	36.00	54.95	60.00	21.62	04.00	
35. Individualistic choice	21.62	36.00	48.65	56.00	29.73	08.00	

TABLE III (Continued)

VII. Decision making						
36. Logical process	40.54	44.00	35.13	52.00	24.32	04.00
37. Positive attitude	35.13	68.00	48.65	24.00	16.21	08.00
38. Self direction	43.24	64.00	37.84	32.00	18.92	04.00
39. Responsibility	64.86	76.00	35.13	24.00	0	0
40. Analytical actions	45.95	60.00	37.84	36.00	16.21	04.00
41. Self confidence	48.65	60.00	45.95	28.00	05.40	12.00
VIII. Work simplification						
42. Applied	59.46	76.00	27.02	20.00	13.51	04.00
43. Practices	35.13	48.00	45.95	40.00	18.92	12.00
44. Application framework	37.84	60.00	40.54	32.00	21.62	08.00
45. Analysis of results	35.13	36.00	40.54	44.00	24.32	20.00

* For complete statement see questionnaire in appendix.

** Total home economics education majors = 37 Total other majors = 25

whereas laundry, cleaning processes, and household standards were listed once each.

More than one-half of the students indicated that living and working as a group had contributed toward understanding different standards and appreciation of individual differences.

In answer to the question, "What experiences in the home management house were least worthwhile to you?", the completed questionnaires showed that the majority of responses could be listed under the categories of laundry, general cleaning, food preparation, dishwashing and group meetings. General cleaning was the activity considered to be least valuable by the largest number of students, with twenty-eight responses. Food preparation and dishwashing was the next activity considered least valuable. Laundry, meetings, written plans, hostess functions, marketing, and "rehashing" of values and goals were listed once each as experiences of little value. Eleven students did not list any experiences as least worthwhile whereas twelve students added the comment that all experiences were of value to them. A few explained further, that though the experience may not have been of value to them because they had already developed the necessary understanding and ability it could not be eliminated as the task was part of housekeeping.

Several of the students who listed housekeeping tasks as of least value explained that the reason was that they preferred doing it in their own homes or that they had to repeat the same job at home.

In discussing the question concerning more preparation before entering the home management residence, the majority of students indicated that they felt their preparation to be adequate. Those listing areas in which they felt they would have benefitted by more preparation,

listed food management, home management and equipment.

Responses regarding suggestions for improving the home management experience indicate that the students had given the question some thought and their suggestions were as a whole related to areas currently being considered by the faculty of the home management department. Many expressed the opinion that having the course less structured would result in more managerial experience for the student. The word "realistic" was used by many of the students when referring to suggested changes. A more permissive attitude toward experimentation and deviation from already established standards was listed by the majority. A reduction in the amount of work required was suggested by elimination of the noon meal at the residence, shorter periods of residence, purchase of equipment such as dishwashers, garbage disposal units, and more functional table linens.

All of the married students indicated that they felt some other method of fulfilling the requirements of the residence course for students who were married should be offered. Using the homes of the students was the most common suggestion, however one suggested that the course be waived, another that it be optional, and two suggested that if the course continued to be required for teacher certification, that the married student not be required to participate in all meal and social functions, but do a special problem to take the place of these activities.

Use of the twice weekly meetings for work simplification demonstrations, new consumer information, guest speakers, and reviews of such things as table service, laundry and cleaning procedures, were suggested.

A number of the students suggested that more preparation, in the form of several regular class meetings, be given just prior to entrance into the residence course. In these meetings objectives and standards could be established by the students.

Tabulation of responses to the question, "What undergraduate courses do you think were especially valuable in preparing you for the residence course?" showed that the largest number was in the home management category, with forty-six responses. Forty-one responses were for some form of meal planning or table service, while twenty-eight listings were in food preparation, ranging from the basic courses through quantity cooking and meat preparation. Household equipment appeared twelve times, and economics, psychology and family relations courses each appeared once.

In answer to the question, "In which of the following activities for which the student group is responsible would you like to have had more student participation?", the majority of the respondents indicated that they felt they had participated sufficiently in these activities. Approximately one-third suggested more student participation in organization of work, while setting goals, making financial plans, and evaluation were listed by approximately one-fourth of the students.

In an effort to arrive at student attitude toward the home management residence course they were asked to check a list of attitudes describing their feeling about the residence course prior to living in the house. Attitudes and number of students checking each were:

Anticipation of the opportunity to manage a home situation . .	15
Desire to strengthen some homemaking abilities	21

Feeling of insecurity	20
Appreciation for new experiences in human relations	23
Apprehension due to inadequate or misinformation	31
Fear of excessively heavy load	24
Desire to evaluate own abilities	11

In answer to the question "Did your attitude change after having lived in the house, and if so, how?" Sixty percent of the students reported positive attitude changes toward the following:

1. Misinformation before taking the course
2. Feeling of inadequacy and insecurity in homemaking abilities
3. Excessively heavy load
4. Repetition of what had been learned before
5. Unfavorable teacher attitude
6. Lack of freedom

Another student attitude question asked: "In your opinion, could the experiences gained in the home management house be obtained from other courses offered in the Division of Home Economics? If so, where and when?" Two-thirds of the students answered that they did not feel that the experiences gained could be gained anywhere other than in the home management house. Seven failed to answer the question, and nine said yes, they felt the experiences could be gained elsewhere. In answering the where and when portion of the question suggestions that meal planning and table service courses be expanded to include more individual problems, planning and marketing; equipment courses could include work simplification; and that the home management lecture course could be supplemented by laboratory experiences. A suggestion was made that married students could be given advanced standing

examinations to establish credit.

Group II Analysis

Analysis of the data for single (23) and married (10) students (Table IV) in Group II shows that in only one category, that dealing with the standard of living, does the single group show a lower percentage of individuals indicating the "much" objective accomplishment (single 10.86 percent, married 15.00 percent). Objective VII, growth in the ability to make reasoned, intelligent decisions, indicates that both groups are in agreement with approximately 25 percent showing much accomplishment, 40 percent showing some accomplishment and 33 percent showing little accomplishment. In all other categories the single group indicate consistently higher percentages of single students than married students reporting much objective accomplishment.

Comparison of transfer and non-transfer students in Group II (Table V) indicates relative agreement between the two groups for Objective I, growth in managerial abilities; Objective II, deciding on a standard of living desired; and Objective VII, growth in ability to make reasoned, intelligent decisions. Objective III, dealing with increased understanding of the significance of socio-economic trends and technological developments, shows that approximately 75 percent of the non-transfer students indicate much or some accomplishment, while the transfer students show only 33 percent in this category. In all other objectives the transfer students show a considerably higher percentage of responses in both the "much and "some" categories than do the non-transfer students.

Analysis of differences between home economics education majors

TABLE IV

PERCENT COMPARISON OF GROUP II MARRIED AND SINGLE STUDENTS
IN RELATION TO GOAL ATTAINMENT

I. Managerial ability growth*	Much		Some		Little	
	Single**	Married**	Single	Married	Single	Married
1. Varying conditions*	39.12	10.00	43.47	50.00	17.39	40.00
2. Decision making	39.12	0	47.82	60.00	13.04	40.00
3. Clarifying values	21.73	10.00	43.47	40.00	34.78	50.00
4. Personal values	17.39	30.00	39.12	30.00	43.47	40.00
5. Flexible standards	30.43	10.00	47.82	50.00	21.73	40.00
6. Management process	26.08	20.00	65.21	30.00	08.68	50.00
7. Creativity	26.08	10.00	52.16	60.00	21.73	30.00
8. Alternate resources	13.04	10.00	47.82	60.00	39.12	30.00
9. Abilities and attitudes	34.78	40.00	47.82	40.00	17.39	20.00
II. Standard of living						
10. Critical thinking	17.39	20.00	52.16	50.00	30.43	30.00
11. Different standards	34.78	50.00	52.16	20.00	13.04	30.00
12. Responsibilities	56.52	80.00	34.78	20.00	08.68	0

TABLE IV (Continued)

13. Realistic goals	34.78	50.00	43.47	30.00	21.73	20.00
14. Philosophy of life	13.04	30.00	47.82	40.00	39.12	30.00
<hr/>						
III. Socio-economic trends						
<hr/>						
15. Realistic interpretation	0	0	30.43	30.00	69.56	70.00
16. Open mind	21.73	30.00	21.73	40.00	56.55	30.00
17. On being informed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____ ***
<hr/>						
IV. Financial management						
<hr/>						
18. Identify problems	26.08	20.00	52.16	60.00	21.73	20.00
19. Influential factors	39.12	40.00	43.47	30.00	17.39	30.00
20. Cooperative activity	39.12	30.00	39.12	50.00	21.73	20.00
21. Plans and records	34.78	30.00	34.78	50.00	30.43	20.00
22. Increasing satisfactions	21.73	20.00	65.21	70.00	13.04	10.00
23. Real value of money	17.39	10.00	56.52	50.00	26.08	40.00
24. Harmony	30.43	20.00	47.82	40.00	21.73	40.00
25. Different standards	30.43	10.00	34.78	60.00	34.78	30.00

TABLE IV (Continued)

V. Selection, operation, care							
26.	Manufacturer's guide	52.16	40.00	39.12	40.00	08.68	20.00
27.	Functional features	56.52	40.00	34.78	40.00	08.68	20.00
28.	Work simplification	30.43	30.00	60.78	70.00	08.68	0
29.	Skillful use	43.47	40.00	47.82	50.00	08.68	10.00
30.	Effect of arrangement	30.43	20.00	56.52	70.00	13.04	10.00
VI. Consumer competence							
31.	Necessary knowledge	60.78	40.00	30.43	40.00	08.68	20.00
32.	Better consumer	65.21	30.00	13.04	40.00	21.73	30.00
33.	Comparative values	47.82	10.00	30.43	50.00	21.73	40.00
34.	Reasons for choices	34.78	20.00	39.12	40.00	26.08	40.00
35.	Individualistic choice	21.73	10.00	47.82	60.00	30.43	30.00

TABLE IV (Continued)

VII. Decision making							
36. Logical process	21.73	10.00	52.16	60.00	26.08	30.00	
37. Positive attitude	04.34	10.00	52.16	40.00	43.47	50.00	
38. Self direction	26.08	10.00	34.78	50.00	39.12	40.00	
39. Responsibility	34.78	50.00	39.12	20.00	26.08	30.00	
40. Analytical actions	17.39	30.00	52.16	40.00	30.43	30.00	
41. Self confidence	34.78	40.00	30.43	30.00	34.70	30.00	
VIII. Work simplification							
42. Applied	47.82	30.00	34.78	40.00	17.39	30.00	
43. Practices	30.43	20.00	56.52	50.00	13.04	30.00	
44. Application framework	26.08	10.00	47.82	70.00	26.08	10.00	
45. Analysis of results	34.78	20.00	39.12	40.00	26.08	40.00	

* For complete statement see questionnaire in appendix.

** Total single students = 23 Total married students = 10

*** Item deleted from second questionnaire.

TABLE V

PERCENT COMPARISON OF GROUP II TRANSFER AND NON-TRANSFER STUDENTS
IN RELATION TO GOAL ATTAINMENT

I. Managerial ability growth*	Much		Some		Little	
	N-Trans.**	Trans.**	N-Trans.	Trans.	N-Trans.	Trans.
1. Varying conditions*	27.77	33.33	44.44	46.66	27.77	20.00
2. Decision making	22.22	33.33	55.55	46.66	22.22	20.00
3. Clarifying values	22.22	13.33	33.33	53.33	44.44	33.33
4. Personal values	16.66	26.66	33.33	40.00	50.00	33.33
5. Flexible standards	16.66	33.33	55.55	40.00	27.77	26.66
6. Management process	22.22	26.66	50.00	60.00	27.27	13.33
7. Creativity	16.66	26.66	61.11	53.33	22.22	20.00
8. Alternate resources	16.66	06.66	33.33	73.33	50.00	20.00
9. Abilities and attitudes	38.88	33.33	38.88	53.33	22.22	13.66
II. Standard of living						
10. Critical thinking	27.77	06.66	44.44	60.00	27.77	33.33
11. Different standards	38.88	40.00	38.88	46.66	22.22	13.33
12. Responsibilities	55.55	73.33	44.44	13.33	0	13.33

TABLE V (Continued)

13. Realistic goals	33.33	46.66	38.88	40.00	27.77	13.33
14. Philosophy of life	27.77	06.66	27.77	66.66	44.44	26.66
<hr/>						
III. Socio-economic trends						
<hr/>						
15. Realistic interpretation	05.55	0	88.88	20.00	05.55	80.00
16. Open mind	33.33	13.33	22.22	33.33	44.44	53.33
17. On being informed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____***
<hr/>						
IV. Financial management						
<hr/>						
18. Identify problems	16.66	33.33	61.11	46.66	22.22	20.00
19. Influential factors	22.22	60.00	50.00	26.66	27.77	13.33
20. Cooperative activity	27.77	46.66	44.44	40.00	27.77	13.33
21. Plans and records	22.22	46.66	38.88	40.00	38.88	13.33
22. Increasing satisfactions	22.22	20.00	61.11	73.33	16.66	06.66
23. Real value of money	11.11	20.00	61.11	46.66	27.77	33.33
24. Harmony	27.77	26.66	38.88	53.33	33.33	20.00
25. Different standards	22.22	26.66	33.33	53.33	44.44	20.00

TABLE V (Continued)

V. Selection, operation, care						
26. Manufacturer's guide	50.00	46.66	44.44	33.33	05.55	20.00
27. Functional features	44.44	60.00	44.44	26.66	11.11	13.33
28. Work simplification	27.77	33.33	66.66	60.00	05.55	06.66
29. Skillful use	44.44	40.00	44.44	53.33	11.11	06.66
30. Effect of arrangement	16.66	40.00	72.22	46.66	11.11	13.33
VI. Consumer competence						
31. Necessary knowledge	50.00	60.00	33.33	33.33	16.66	06.66
32. Better consumer	44.44	66.66	22.22	20.00	33.33	13.33
33. Comparative values	22.22	53.33	38.88	33.33	38.88	13.33
34. Reasons for choices	22.22	40.00	33.33	46.66	44.44	13.33
35. Individualistic choice	16.66	20.00	33.33	73.33	50.00	06.66

TABLE V (Continued)

VII. Decision making						
36. Logical process	11.11	26.66	50.00	60.00	38.88	13.33
37. Positive attitude	11.11	0	38.88	60.00	50.00	40.00
38. Self direction	22.22	20.00	33.33	46.66	44.44	33.33
39. Responsibility	33.33	46.66	38.88	26.66	27.77	26.66
40. Analytical actions	27.77	13.33	38.88	60.00	33.33	26.66
41. Self confidence	44.44	26.66	16.66	46.66	38.88	26.66
VIII. Work simplification						
42. Applied	33.33	53.33	33.33	40.00	33.33	06.66
43. Practices	16.66	40.00	55.55	53.33	27.77	06.66
44. Application framework	11.11	33.33	55.55	53.33	33.33	13.33
45. Analysis of results	16.66	46.66	50.00	26.66	33.33	26.66

* For complete statement see questionnaire in appendix.

** Total non-transfer students = 18 Total transfer students = 15

*** Item deleted from second

and majors in other areas of home economics (Table VI) show a consistently higher percentage of home economics majors in both the "much" and "some" categories except for Objective III, where approximately one-third of the home economics majors show evidence of goal accomplishment in the two higher ratings, while one half of the other majors are listed in these ratings. The largest differences occur in Objective IV, application of the principles and procedures of financial management (home economics education majors 32.50 percent, other majors 12.56 percent); Objective VI, competence as a consumer (home economics education majors 45.60 percent, other majors 17.50 percent); and Objective VIII, use of work simplification (home economics education majors 36.99 percent, other majors 09.38 percent) indicating much objective accomplishment. The difference in percentage of responses in the "little" column also indicate consistently higher percentage of other majors represented.

Suggestions from Group II for improving the course show little change over time except for the addition of several items. The use of more processed or prepared foods was suggested by two of the respondents. It was suggested that the course be structured to relate more to the problems encountered in starting a home for two, perhaps with two students in an apartment. Two students suggested having a child to care for. Several suggestions were made concerning ways to impress upon the students the actual value of the experiences at the time they were in the house; having graduates talk to the students, show more directly how the house experience will relate to a future home, teaching the process of management with the emphasis on process rather than vehicle for teaching the process.

TABLE VI

PERCENT COMPARISON OF GROUP II HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION MAJORS AND OTHER
MAJORS IN RELATION TO GOAL ATTAINMENT

I. Managerial ability growth*	Much		Some		Little	
	H.E.E.**	Other**	H.E.E.	Other	H.E.E.	Other
1. Varying conditions*	32.00	25.00	48.00	37.50	20.00	37.50
2. Decision making	28.00	25.00	44.00	75.00	28.00	0
3. Clarifying values	16.00	25.00	44.00	37.50	40.00	37.50
4. Personal values	20.00	25.00	36.00	37.50	44.00	37.50
5. Flexible standards	28.00	12.50	48.00	50.00	24.00	37.50
6. Management process	32.00	0	52.00	62.50	16.00	37.50
7. Creativity	24.00	12.50	48.00	87.50	28.00	0
8. Alternate resources	12.00	12.50	60.00	25.00	28.00	62.50
9. Abilities and attitudes	36.00	37.50	48.00	37.50	16.00	25.00
II. Standard of living						
10. Critical thinking	20.00	12.50	52.00	50.00	28.00	37.50
11. Different standards	48.00	12.50	40.00	50.00	12.00	37.50
12. Responsibilities	72.00	37.50	24.00	50.00	04.00	12.50

TABLE VI (Continued)

13. Realistic goals	36.00	50.00	44.00	25.00	20.00	25.00
14. Philosophy of life	12.00	37.50	52.00	25.00	36.00	37.50
<hr/>						
III. Socio-economic trends						
<hr/>						
15. Realistic interpretation	04.00	0	24.00	37.50	72.00	62.50
16. Open mind	20.00	37.50	28.00	25.00	52.00	37.50
17. On being informed	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____***
<hr/>						
IV. Financial management						
<hr/>						
18. Identify problems	32.00	0	48.00	75.00	20.00	25.00
19. Influential factors	48.00	12.50	32.00	62.50	20.00	25.00
20. Cooperative activity	40.00	25.00	36.00	62.50	24.00	12.50
21. Plans and records	40.00	12.50	36.00	50.00	24.00	37.50
22. Increasing satisfactions	24.00	12.50	64.00	75.00	12.00	12.50
23. Real value of money	20.00	0	52.00	62.50	28.00	37.50
24. Harmony	32.00	12.50	44.00	50.00	24.00	37.50
25. Different standards	24.00	25.00	48.00	25.00	28.00	50.00

TABLE VI (Continued)

V. Selection, operation, care						
26. Manufacturer's guide	48.00	50.00	40.00	37.50	12.00	12.50
27. Functional features	56.00	37.50	36.00	37.50	08.00	25.00
28. Work simplification	36.00	12.50	60.00	75.00	04.00	12.50
29. Skillful use	52.00	12.50	44.00	62.50	04.00	25.00
30. Arrangement effect	28.00	25.00	64.00	50.00	08.00	25.00
VI. Consumer competence						
31. Necessary competence	60.00	37.50	32.00	37.50	08.00	25.00
32. Knowledge	60.00	37.50	20.00	25.00	20.00	37.50
33. Comparative values	44.00	12.50	32.00	50.00	24.00	37.50
34. Reasons for choices	40.00	0	36.00	50.00	24.00	50.00
35. Individualistic choices	24.00	0	56.00	37.50	20.00	62.50

TABLE VI (Continued)

VII. Decision making						
36. Logical process	24.00	0	56.00	50.00	20.00	50.00
37. Positive attitude	08.00	0	52.00	37.50	40.00	62.50
38. Self direction	20.00	25.00	48.00	12.50	32.00	62.50
39. Responsibility	48.00	12.50	20.00	75.00	32.00	12.50
40. Analytical actions	24.00	12.50	48.00	50.00	28.00	37.50
41. Self confidence	36.00	37.50	36.00	12.50	28.00	50.00
VIII. Work simplification						
42. Applied	48.00	25.00	36.00	37.50	16.00	37.50
43. Practices	32.00	12.50	52.00	67.50	16.00	25.00
44. Application framework	28.00	0	48.00	75.00	24.00	25.00
45. Analysis of results	40.00	0	28.00	75.00	32.00	25.00

* For complete statement see questionnaire in appendix.

** Total home economics majors = 25 Total other majors = 8

*** Item deleted from second questionnaire.

Comparison of Group I and Group II

Comparison of the two groups of responses indicate that responses to the questionnaire when it was submitted the first time in 1961 are consistently higher than responses to the questionnaire submitted in 1967. Group I tabulations indicate that 49.71 percent of responses indicated much accomplishment toward goal attainment, whereas Group II shows 29.33 for this category. The first questionnaire elicited responses from 37.32 percent of the group for some accomplishment and only 12.97 percent for little accomplishment. Responses for Group II show 42.50 percent for some accomplishment and 28.26 percent for little accomplishment. (Table VII).

Using the arbitrary assigned numerical values of three, two and one for the "much", "some", and "little" categories, individual scores for the structured section of the questionnaire were computed for both groups. To arrive at a measure of central tendency, the arithmetical means were computed. The mean score for Group I was 107, with a range of scores from a low of 68 to a high of 135. The individual scores are normally distributed, slightly skewed to the right, or higher score values.

The mean score for Group II was 88.65, with a range of scores from a low of 47 to a high of 129. Frequency distribution indicates a normally distributed, slightly skewed to the left or lower end of the scale polygram.

The widest difference between the two groups appeared in Objective IV, increasing the understanding of and the ability to apply the principles and procedures of financial management, Group I showed 58.86

TABLE VII
 PERCENT COMPARISON OF GROUP I AND GROUP II IN
 RELATION TO GOAL ATTAINMENT

I. Managerial ability growth*	Much		Some		Little	
	Group I**	Group II**	Group I	Group II	Group I	Group II
1. Varying conditions*	61.29	30.30	27.41	45.45	11.29	24.24
2. Decision making	53.22	27.27	40.32	51.51	06.45	21.21
3. Clarifying values	33.87	18.18	45.16	42.42	20.96	39.39
4. Personal values	45.16	21.21	40.32	36.36	14.51	42.42
5. Flexible standards	54.83	24.24	33.87	48.48	11.29	27.27
6. Management process	59.67	24.24	32.25	54.54	08.16	21.21
7. Creativity	50.00	21.21	30.64	57.57	19.35	21.21
8. Alternate resources	46.77	12.12	45.16	51.51	08.16	36.36
9. Abilities and attitudes	61.29	45.45	30.64	45.45	08.16	18.18
<hr/>						
II. Standard of living						
10. Critical thinking	45.16	18.18	43.54	51.51	11.29	30.30
11. Different standards	61.29	39.39	29.03	42.42	09.67	18.18
12. Responsibilities	64.51	63.63	32.25	30.30	03.22	06.06

TABLE VII (Continued)

13. Realistic goals	56.45	39.39	32.25	39.39	11.29	21.21
14. Philosophy of life	29.03	18.18	48.38	45.45	22.58	36.36
<hr/>						
III. Socio-economic trends						
<hr/>						
15. Realistic interpretation	04.83	03.03	25.80	27.27	69.35	69.69
16. Open mind	27.41	24.24	45.16	27.27	27.41	48.48
17. On being informed	30.64	_____	48.38	_____	20.96	_____***
<hr/>						
IV. Financial management						
<hr/>						
18. Identify problems	56.45	24.24	38.70	54.54	04.83	21.21
19. Influential factors	67.74	39.39	20.96	39.39	11.29	21.21
20. Cooperative activity	69.35	36.36	20.96	42.42	09.67	21.21
21. Plans and records	72.58	33.33	19.35	39.39	08.16	27.27
22. Increasing satisfactions	43.54	21.21	50.00	66.66	06.45	12.12
23. Real value of money	40.32	15.15	43.54	54.54	16.12	30.30
24. Harmony	58.06	27.27	33.87	45.45	08.16	27.27
25. Different standards	62.90	24.24	32.25	42.42	04.83	33.33

TABLE VII (Continued)

V. Selection, operation, care						
26. Manufacturer's guide	48.38	48.48	41.93	39.39	09.67	12.12
27. Functional features	51.61	51.51	37.06	36.36	11.29	12.12
28. Work simplification	51.61	30.30	38.70	63.63	09.67	06.06
29. Skillful use	51.61	42.42	43.54	48.48	04.83	09.09
30. Arrangement effect	58.06	27.27	27.41	60.60	14.51	12.12
VI. Consumer competence						
31. Necessary competence	61.29	54.54	32.35	33.33	06.45	12.12
32. Knowledge	48.38	54.54	45.16	21.21	06.45	24.24
33. Comparative values	48.38	36.36	45.16	36.36	06.45	27.27
34. Reasons for choices	29.03	30.30	56.45	39.39	14.57	30.30
35. Individualistic choices	27.41	18.18	51.51	51.51	20.96	30.30

TABLE VII (Continued)

VII. Decision making						
36. Logical process	41.93	18.18	41.93	54.54	16.12	27.27
37. Positive attitude	48.38	06.06	38.70	48.48	12.90	45.45
38. Self direction	51.61	21.21	35.48	39.39	12.90	39.39
39. Responsibility	69.35	39.39	30.64	33.33	0	27.27
40. Analytical actions	51.61	21.21	37.09	48.48	11.29	30.30
41. Self confidence	52.22	36.36	38.70	30.30	08.16	33.33
VIII. Work simplification						
42. Applied	66.12	42.42	24.19	36.36	09.67	21.21
43. Practices	40.32	27.27	43.54	54.54	16.12	18.18
44. Application framework	46.77	21.21	37.09	54.54	16.12	24.24
45. Analysis of results	35.48	30.30	41.93	39.39	22.58	30.30

* For complete statement see questionnaire in appendix.

** Total Group I = 62 Total Group II = 33

*** Item deleted from second questionnaire.

percent of the students in the "much" column, whereas Group II listed only 27.65 percent in this category. Objective VII, concerning growth in the ability to make reasoned, intelligent decisions, also shows a difference in the two groups of approximately thirty percent. For all of the objectives, the responses from Group II show lower goal attainment than the responses from Group I.

Responses to the question concerning the most worthwhile experiences (Table VIII) indicate a shift of emphasis over time, with a higher percentage of graduates listing food budgeting for different cost levels than students. Work simplification, food preparation and time management are not considered to be as worthwhile to the individuals as they were six years ago. Social functions, overall management experiences, meal planning and group living experiences show little change.

In the least worthwhile experience list general cleaning remains at the top of the list with 24 percent of both groups placing it in this position. Emphasis on food preparation and dishwashing as least worthwhile has decreased appreciably, with only 09.09 percent of Group II responding in comparison to 19.35 percent of Group I. (Table IX).

TABLE VIII

PERCENT COMPARISON OF MOST WORTHWHILE HOME MANAGEMENT
HOUSE EXPERIENCES GROUP I AND GROUP II

Experience	Group I	Group II
Food budgeting for different cost levels	29.03	42.42
Social functions	20.97	18.18
Work simplification	19.35	06.06
Food preparation	17.74	06.06
Time management	17.74	06.06
Overall management experiences	17.74	18.18
Meal planning	17.74	18.18
Written records	17.74	0
Group living	17.74	18.18
Group planning	04.84	09.09
Critical evaluation	04.84	06.06
Use of equipment	04.84	06.06
Laundry procedures	01.61	0
Cleaning procedures	01.61	0
Household standards	01.61	0
Decision making	0	06.06
Different standards	0	06.06

TABLE IX
 PERCENT COMPARISON OF LEAST WORTHWHILE HOME MANAGEMENT
 HOUSE EXPERIENCES GROUP I AND GROUP II

Experience	Group I	Group II
General cleaning	24.21	24.24
Dishwashing	19.35	09.09
Laundry	17.74	15.15
Group meetings	09.67	06.00
Written plans	01.61	09.09
Social functions	01.61	09.09
Marketing	01.61	0
Demonstrations	01.61	0
Work simplification	0	03.03
Money management	0	03.03
Different food levels	0	03.03

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

This study was designed primarily to obtain student evaluation with regard to their progress toward departmental objectives while enrolled in the home management residence course, and re-evaluation of the course objective attainment by the same group of individuals six years later. Secondary functions of the study were to compare subjective evaluation of the residence course for different groupings of students, such as married and single; and to explore student opinion with regard to the value of experiences pertaining to the residence course.

Students enrolled in the home management residence course during the 1960-61 academic year were asked to complete a questionnaire consisting of eight major objectives and forty-five sub-objectives, and open end or free response questions. The same group of individuals were contacted six years later and asked to respond to a similar questionnaire. Approximately eighty-five percent of the students completing the questionnaire and seventy-five percent of the graduates responded that they had experienced "much" or "some" goal attainment in the home management residence course. Tabulation of the data indicate that there is some difference in the perceived objective attainment for students grouped according to marital status, major area of home economics, and whether or not they obtained all their undergraduate work at Oklahoma

State University or transferred work from another institution. Indications are that some factors external to the home management residence course could be responsible for these differences of subjective evaluation by the different groupings of students.

The proportion of students in the different categories varies slightly from Group I to Group II and this difference could be one of the factors influencing the difference in responses from these groups. Group I consisted of 25.81 percent married, 74.19 percent single; 35.48 percent transfer, 64.52 percent non-transfer; 59.68 percent home economics majors and 40.32 percent other home economics majors. Group II consisted of 30.30 percent married, 69.70 percent single; 45.45 percent transfer, 54.54 percent non-transfer; 75.75 percent home economics majors and 24.24 percent other home economics majors.

More than three-fourths of the students considered the home management residence course to be unique, and the experiences gained difficult if not impossible to duplicate in other courses.

Food budgeting for different cost levels was listed as the most worthwhile experience at the end of the course (Group I) and six years later (Group II) social functions, overall management experiences, group living and meal planning were all high on the list of most worthwhile activities, and the percentage of responses was approximately the same for both groups. Work simplification, food preparation, time management, and written records, all of which ranked relatively high in the first response, dropped appreciably in Group II, with written records not listed at all.

Heading the list for least worthwhile activity for both groups was general cleaning. Food preparation and dishwashing, ranked second by

Group I, elicited less than half as many responses from Group II.

Laundry was considered to be one of the least worthwhile experiences by both groups.

The students felt that the requirements for married students for the home management residence course should be re-examined. Actually, in the time since the students were graduated, some changes and adaptations of the requirements for married students have been made. The writer has no way of knowing to what extent the graduates in the second group of respondents were aware of these changes.

Responses from both groups indicate that more student participation in establishing objectives for the course, setting standards, and deciding on the manner in which these experiences could be implemented, ranked high in the lists of suggestions for improvement of the home management residence course. Presently, indications are that the residence advisers are willing and able to participate with the students in planning and setting standards for the course.

Implications from the study indicate that further thought on the part of home management residence advisers be given to teaching techniques used to implement student understanding of course objectives. Further indications are that a more democratic relationship between the student and the teacher could result in greater learning on the part of the student. The departmental faculty, in considering curriculum revisions, need to examine different types of provisions than those in use in 1961 in fulfilling the requirements of the residence course. This re-examination is especially indicated for the students who are married and maintaining their own households at the time they are enrolled for the home management residence course.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- (1) Alexander, Margaret, and Alberta Hill. "New Directions Guide Program Planning." Journal of Home Economics, LII (February, 1960), 83.
- (2) Ayers, Irma. "New Directions in Action." Journal of Home Economics, LII (September, 1960), 502.
- (3) Bode, Boyd Henry. The Confusion in Present Day Education. New York: D. Appleton Century Company, 1933.
- (4) Crandall, Elizabeth Walbert. "New Exploration in Home Management." Journal of Home Economics, LII (October, 1960), 637.
- (5) Davis, Jean. "Nonresident Home Management for Married Students." Journal of Home Economics, LII (January, 1960), 20-22.
- (6) Desai, Jyoti Ambelai. "Development of an Instrument of Measuring the Image of Home Management." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Iowa State University, 1962.
- (7) Dopson, Elizabeth. "Social and Economic Trends as They Affect the Home Management Residence." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama, 1962. Journal of Family Economics and Home Management, Washington, D. C.: American Home Economics Association, III (June, 1963), p. 18.
- (8) Elliott, Eileen Elizabeth. "An Analysis of Home Management Education in Colleges and Universities." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Missouri, 1947.
- (9) Gross, Irma H. Measuring Home Management. Michigan: Agricultural Experiment Station, Circular Bulletin 211, March, 1958.
- (10) Hall, Olive A. Research Handbook for Home Economics Evaluation. Minneapolis: Burgess Publishing Company, 1962.
- (11) Hohenhaus, Helen Stephens. "Faculty and Student Perceptions of the Home Management Residence." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1959.

- (12) Holbrook, Betty Janet. "Management Problems of Home Management House Students." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Purdue University, 1956.
- (13) Home Economics in Institutions Granting Bachelor's or Higher Degrees 1961-62. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Miscellany No. 42, 1963.
- (14) Jones, Erna Beatrice. "Analysis of Principles and Generalizations for Curriculum Making in Higher Education with Implications for Home Economics." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Cornell University, 1959.
- (15) Judy, Helen Elizabeth. Trends and Needs of Home Management. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1929.
- (16) Lemons, Lois Purdin. "The First Fifty Years of Growth and Development in Home Economics at the Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1950.
- (17) Long, Deborah Nancy. "Homemaking Experiences of College Home Economics Seniors and Their Implications for Curricula." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1948.
- (18) McKinney, Florence Elizabeth. "The Role of the Home Management Residence Experience in Educating for Democracy." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1948.
- (19) Malone, Carl C., and Lucile H. Malone. Decision Making and Management for Farm and Home. Iowa: Iowa State College Press, 1958.
- (20) Mau, Helen Elizabeth Dickin. "An Investigation of Cognitive Objectives for College Undergraduate Home Management Programs." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, 1965. Journal of Family Economics and Home Management, Washington, D. C.: American Home Economics Association, IV (June, 1965), 15-16.
- (21) Melville, Joyce. "A Comparison of Time and Money Saving Factors in Meal Preparation in Home Management Houses at Purdue University." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Purdue University, 1955.
- (22) Morgan, Etoile Jo. "A Study of Value and Goal Convictions in the Residence Course in Home Management." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Texas Women's University, 1962.

- (23) New Directions. Washington, D. C.: American Home Economics Association, Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics, 1959.
- (24) Nickell, Paulena, Jean Muir Dersey, and Marie Budolfson. Management in Family Living. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1959.
- (25) Perch, Louise Watson. "Home Economics: Trends and Developments, 1909-52." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1955.
- (26) Personius, Catherine J. "Objectives and Philosophy of Home Economics Research." Journal of Home Economics, LI (February, 1959), 94-96.
- (27) Read, Katherine H. "The Role of the Resident Adviser." Journal of Home Economics, LI (April, 1959), 267-70.
- (28) Robbins, Patricia Johnson. "An Evaluation of the Montana State College Home Management Courses." Unpublished Master's Thesis, Montana State College, Bozeman, Montana, 1962. Journal of Home Economics and Home Management, Washington, D. C.: American Home Economics Association, II (June, 1963), 20-21.
- (29) Schleh, E. C. "Management by Objective: Some Principles for Making it Work." Management Review, XLVIII (November, 1959), 26-33.
- (30) Spafford, Ivol. Fundamentals in Teaching Home Economics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1956.
- (31) Spafford, Ivol, ed. Home Economics in Higher Education. Washington, D. C.: American Home Economics Association, 1949.
- (32) Stafford, Paul Michael. "Communication as the Basis for A Dichotomous Classification of Managerial Work." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1960.

APPENDIX

OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS

STILLWATER

DEPARTMENT OF HOME MANAGEMENT,
EQUIPMENT, AND FAMILY ECONOMICS

May 20, 1961

Dear

In an effort to improve the present curriculum, the College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University is making a serious appraisal of the present program, particularly of the required courses. One of these courses is Home Management 423, Home Management House Residence.

In order to help with this effort, and as a part of the requirement for my master's degree, I am studying student evaluation of the residence course, because student reaction is a major consideration in determining the worth of a course. For this reason the attached questionnaire is presented to you.

Will you please check each of the statements and answer each of the questions thoughtfully and honestly? Individual responses will not be identifiable, but since a high percentage of responses is necessary for the success of the study, follow-up letters will need to be sent to those not returning the questionnaire.

Would you please place your completed questionnaire in the attached envelope and place it in my mail drawer in room H113, and ask Mrs. Gleason to check your name off the list? We need your answer by Wednesday, May 24th.

May I express my appreciation for your cooperation in this study. I feel that each of you will have a valuable contribution to make in this student evaluation.

Very sincerely,

Verna Cater Auxier
Graduate Assistant

YOUR EVALUATION OF YOUR ACHIEVEMENT IN THE
HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE COURSE

To what extent did the experiences in the home management house contribute to the objectives listed here? In answering the questionnaire, would you approach each subordinate objective from the standpoint of actual house experience, as shown in the following example:

1. Grow in understanding of the problems of homemaking under varying conditions and economic levels.

Example: Was the practice of operating the house on high, moderate, and low budgets of value to you? Did you recognize some of the problems encountered when holidays, special activities or illness of group members required that plans be changed?

Please keep in mind that it is goal achievement which we are attempting to evaluate, rather than the specific activity through which this was accomplished.

-1-

I. Grow in the managerial abilities essential for satisfying personal and family living.

1. Grow in understanding of the problems of homemaking under varying conditions and economic levels?
2. Increase your ability to make decisions in planning for the use of resources to attain your goals?
3. Increase your ability to clarify values for yourself and/or the group?
4. Become cognizant of the fact that personal value systems are basic to decision making?
5. Become more aware of the fact that standards can be flexible and are to be adjusted to fit changing conditions?
6. Increase your ability to see the management process as a means of satisfying individual and group goals?
7. Become more creative in using available resources?
8. Become more aware of the alternate uses of your available resources?
9. Recognize that resources consist of not only time, energy, money, and other material goods, but also abilities and attitudes?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE

II. Grow in judgment in deciding on the standard of living desired for self and family which is in harmony with one's philosophy of life.

10. Increase your ability to think critically on your desired standard of living?
11. Recognize that different individuals, for various reasons, may have different standards?
12. Become aware of some of the responsibilities of each member of a group to the welfare and satisfactions of the group as a whole?
13. Realize more clearly that goals must be realistic if satisfaction is to be achieved?
14. Increase your ability to see the relationship between philosophy of life and standard of living?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE

III. Increase understanding of the significance of socio-economic trends and technological developments in this and other countries for effective home management.

- 15. Interpret more realistically the significance of the socio-economic trends and technological developments in this and other countries?
- 16. Become aware of the fact that an open mind is necessary if you and your family are to gain from these advances?
- 17. Recognize the necessity for being informed about trends and developments, as they relate to the home?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE

IV. Increase the understanding of and the ability to apply the principles and procedures of financial management in personal and family living.

- 18. Identify some of the problems of financial management, and work toward their solution?
- 19. Recognize some of the factors which influence financial management, such as availability of time, energy, and money?
- 20. Become more fully aware of the fact that good financial management is a cooperative activity for a group such as a family?
- 21. Become increasingly aware of the fact that plans and records facilitate good financial management?
- 22. Recognize that financial management can be instrumental in increasing group satisfactions?
- 23. Gain more insight into the real value of money when applied to want satisfaction?
- 24. Realize that there should be harmony between goals and expenditures?
- 25. Become aware of the fact that you can buy different standards of living on the same monetary income?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE

V. Understand and apply the principles necessary for effective selection, operation, care, and arrangement of equipment in the home, and its relation to the well-being of the family.

- 26. Learn to refer to the manufacturer's guide supplied with your equipment?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE

- 27. Become more conscious of the features that make equipment functional?
- 28. Develop, or see the relationship between work simplification and equipment used for a task?
- 29. Gain understanding of the relationship between skillful use of equipment and its value to you in the home?
- 30. Recognize the effect of the arrangement of small and large equipment on its value in work simplification?

MUCH	SOME	LITTLE

VI. Develop increasing competence as a consumer of goods and services for personal, family and community well-being.

- 31. Realize that the acquisition of knowledge is necessary for making intelligent consumer choice?
- 32. Increase the knowledge, understandings, and abilities which will make you a better consumer?
- 33. Gain experience in the ability to weigh and compare values in the selection and use of consumer goods and services?
- 34. Gain a better understanding of the reasons for your choices in the consumer area?
- 35. Move toward more individualistic choices in the consumption area?

MUCH	SOME	LITTLE

VII. Grow in the ability to make reasoned, intelligent decisions(in order to attain personal, family and societal goals).

- 36. Become increasingly familiar with decision making as a logical process.
- 37. Gain a more positive attitude in relation to decision making?
- 38. Progress toward intelligent self-direction and independent action?
- 39. Grow in willingness to accept the responsibility for your decisions and actions?
- 40. Become more analytical in evaluation of past decisions and resultant actions?

MUCH	SOME	LITTLE

	Much	Some	Little
41. Gain more self confidence in decision making?			
VIII. Grow in the ability to use work simplification as a tool of personal and home management.			
	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
42. Recognize that work simplification can be applied to the majority of homemaking tasks?			
43. Become familiar with practices which are assumed to be time and energy conserving?			
44. Grow in understanding of the possibility for application of work simplification within the framework of existing home facilities?			
45. Gain experience in analyzing the results of work simplification techniques to determine the degree of accomplishment?			

Are you a transfer student? _____ How many hours transferred? _____

Age _____ Marital Status _____ Major _____

What undergraduate courses do you think were especially valuable in preparing you for the residence course? _____

In what areas of home economics, if any, do you think that you would have benefitted from more preparation? _____

What experiences in the home management house were most worthwhile to you?
Explain _____

What experiences in the home management house were least worthwhile to you?
Explain _____

What suggestions do you have that would help make the experience of living in the home management house more valuable? _____

In which of the following activities for which the student group is responsible would you like to have had more student participation?

Setting goals _____ Planning special events _____

Organization of work _____ Making financial plans _____

Rotation of duties _____ Evaluation _____

Which of the following attitudes best describes your feeling about the residence course prior to living in the house?

1. Anticipation of the opportunity to manage a home situation _____
2. Desire to strengthen some homemaking abilities _____
3. Feeling of insecurity _____
4. Appreciation for new experiences in human relations _____
5. Apprehension due to inadequate or misinformation _____
6. Fear of excessively heavy load _____
7. Desire to evaluate own abilities _____
8. Others _____

Did your attitude change after having lived here, and if so, how?

In your opinion, could the experiences gained in the home management house be obtained from other courses offered in the Division of Home Economics?

If so, where and when? _____

**OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY • STILLWATER**

Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Economics
FR 2-6211, Ext. 342

February 7, 1967

At the time that you were a student at Oklahoma State University you participated with me in a student evaluation of the home management residence course, in which you were asked to express your opinion on the extent to which the experiences in the home management house contributed to the objectives listed for the course.

Recognizing that the ultimate worth of any subject matter can best be evaluated in the light of its incorporation into a living situation, we feel that you would want to participate in an evaluation of the course from a longitudinal standpoint. The study will be unique, nothing of this nature having been done up to the present time.

Individual responses will not be identifiable, but since a high percentage of responses is necessary for the success of the study, the envelopes will be marked. Then should a follow-up letter be necessary, we will have a record of persons to contact a second time. Would you please complete the questionnaire and return it in the enclosed envelope immediately?

May I express my appreciation for your cooperation in this study. I feel that each of you have made a valuable contribution in the original study and will wish to participate in its completion.

Very sincerely,

Verna Cater Auxier
Graduate Student

Florence McKinney
Thesis Adviser

YOUR EVALUATION OF YOUR ACHIEVEMENT IN THE
HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE COURSE
OKLAHOMA STATE UNIVERSITY

At the time you were enrolled in the residence course were you

Married _____ Single _____ Divorced _____ Widowed _____ Separated _____?

How old were you? _____.

Were you a transfer student? _____ How many hours transferred? _____

What was your major? _____

Now, as you think back over your experiences in the home management house, what experiences do you consider most worthwhile? Explain

What experiences in the home management house were least worthwhile to you? Explain _____

In retrospect, what suggestions do you have that would help make the experience of living in the home management house more valuable?

In which of the following activities for which the student group was responsible would you like to have had more student participation?

Decision making _____ Work simplification _____

Examining alternatives _____ Use of non-human resources _____

Use of human resources _____ Setting goals _____

Setting standards _____ Organization _____

-2-

III. Increase understanding of the significance of socio-economic trends and technological developments in this and other countries for effective home management.

15. Interpret more realistically the significance of the socio-economic trends and technological developments in this and other countries?
16. Become aware of the fact that an open mind is necessary if you and your family are to gain from these advances?

MUCH	SOME	LITTLE

IV. Increase the understanding of and the ability to apply the principles and procedures of financial management in personal and family living.

18. Identify some of the problems of financial management, and work toward their solution?
19. Recognize some of the factors which influence financial management, such as availability of time, energy, and money?
20. Become more fully aware of the fact that good financial management is a cooperative activity for a group such as a family?
21. Become increasingly aware of the fact that plans and records facilitate good financial management?
22. Recognize that financial management can be instrumental in increasing group satisfactions?
23. Gain more insight into the real value of money when applied to want satisfaction?
24. Realize that there should be harmony between goals and expenditures?
25. Become aware of the fact that you can buy different standards of living on the same monetary income?

MUCH	SOME	LITTLE

V. Understand and apply the principles necessary for effective selection, operation, care, and arrangement of equipment in the home, and its relation to the well-being of the family.

26. Learn to refer to the manufacturer's guide supplied with your equipment?
27. Become more conscious of the features that make equipment functional?

MUCH	SOME	LITTLE

-3-

- | MUCH | SOME | LITTLE |
|------|------|--------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
28. Develop, or see the relationship between work simplification and equipment used for a task?
29. Gain understanding of the relationship between skillful use of equipment and its value to you in the home?
30. Recognize the effect of the arrangement of small and large equipment on its value in work simplification?
- VI. Develop increasing competence as a consumer of goods and services for personal, family and community well-being.
- | MUCH | SOME | LITTLE |
|------|------|--------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
31. Realize that the acquisition of knowledge is necessary for making intelligent consumer choice?
32. Increase the knowledge, understanding, and abilities which will make you a better consumer?
33. Gain experience in the ability to weigh and compare values in the selection and use of consumer goods and services?
34. Gain a better understanding of the reasons for your choices in the consumer area?
35. Move toward more individualistic choices in the consumption area?
- VII. Grow in the ability to make reasoned, intelligent decisions (in order to attain personal, family and societal goals).
- | MUCH | SOME | LITTLE |
|------|------|--------|
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
36. Become increasingly familiar with decision making as a logical process.
37. Gain a more positive attitude in relation to decision making?
38. Progress toward intelligent self-direction and independent action?
39. Grow in willingness to accept the responsibility for your decisions and actions?
40. Become more analytical in evaluation of past decisions and resultant actions?
41. Gain more self confidence in decision making?

VIII. Grow in the ability to use work simplification as a tool of personal and home management.

MUCH SOME LITTLE

- 42. Recognize that work simplification can be applied to the majority of homemaking tasks?
- 43. Become familiar with practices which are assumed to be time and energy conserving?
- 44. Grow in understanding of the possibility for application of work simplification within the framework of existing home facilities?
- 45. Gain experience in analyzing the results of work simplification techniques to determine the degree of accomplishment?

	MUCH	SOME	LITTLE
42.			
43.			
44.			
45.			

At the present time are you Married _____ Single _____ Divorced _____
 widowed _____ Separated _____ Employed: full time _____ part time _____?

What use have you made of the experiences you had in the home management house?

In my own home _____

Professionally _____

in elementary school teaching _____

in high school teaching _____

home economist in business _____

other (specify) _____

VITA

Verna Cater Auxier

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: EVALUATION OF COURSE OBJECTIVES OF THE HOME MANAGEMENT
RESIDENCE COURSE BY STUDENTS 1961 AND GRADUATES 1967

Major Field: Home Management, Equipment and Family Economics

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Durant, Oklahoma, December 19, 1918,
the daughter of Charles William Cater and Annie Lee
Masoner Cater.

Education: Attended grade school and high school in Durant,
Oklahoma, graduated from Durant High School in 1936;
attended Northeastern Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical
College 1955-57; received the Bachelor of Science degree
from Oklahoma State University, with a major in Home Economics
Education, in August, 1959; completed the requirements for the
Master of Science degree in May, 1967, at Oklahoma State
University.

Professional Experience: Home economics teacher, Bartlesville,
Oklahoma, September 1959 to June, 1960. Graduate assistant,
Department of Home Management, Equipment, and Family Econ-
omics, Oklahoma State University, June, 1960 to September,
1961. Instructor, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana,
September, 1962 to June, 1966.

Professional Organizations: Kappa Delta Pi, Education Fraternity,
and Phi Upsilon Omicron, Home Economics Fraternity.