

OPINIONS CONCERNING HOME MANAGEMENT
OF A SELECTED GROUP OF HOMEMAKERS

By

BETTY JUNE HULL BAILEY

Bachelor of Science

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1964

Submitted to the faculty of the Graduate School of
the Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
August, 1965

University of California
Department of Anthropology

Thesis
1965
B1540
cop. 2

Department of Anthropology
University of California
Berkeley, California

Department of Anthropology
University of California
Berkeley, California

Department of Anthropology
University of California
Berkeley, California

NOV 24 1965

OPINIONS CONCERNING HOME MANAGEMENT
OF A SELECTED GROUP OF HOMEMAKERS

Thesis Approved:

Elise H. Wall

Thesis Adviser

Harold D. Lewis

J. H. Brown
Dean of the Graduate School

592684

PREFACE

A review of studies concerned with opinions related to home management revealed few that presented the opinions of home makers. None was concerned with the way the homemaker's opinion of management relates to those of her friends. It was believed that a study with a selected group of homemakers would provide information of importance for the teacher of home economics. After an analysis of instruments used in other studies, one was selected, modified and incorporated into an interview schedule. It is hoped the findings of this study can be of use in future studies and in the teaching of Home Management.

The writer wishes to express her gratitude and appreciation to Dr. Ilse H. Wolf, Professor and Head of the Home Management, Equipment and Family Economics Department, for her valuable guidance. Sincere appreciation is expressed to Dr. Florence McKinney for reading the thesis and offering valuable advice. An expression of indebtedness is extended to Miss Gertrude McAllister, Miss Sue Herndon and Miss Frances Brown for their willingness to serve as a jury, to the women in Stillwater who so graciously gave their time to the interviewer, and to my family whose forbearance made this thesis possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of the Problem	5
Scope and Limitations	7
Need for the Study	8
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE	11
III. METHOD OF PROCEDURE	21
IV. DATA AND FINDINGS	25
Presentation of Homemaker's Response to Open end Questions	25
Analysis of Home Management Ratings Made by Homemakers	37
Summary of Findings	53
V. RECOMMENDATIONS	57
BIBLIOGRAPHY	64
APPENDIX A	68
APPENDIX B	76

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Statements From Respondents to Part I, Section A of the Interview Schedule	26
II. Statements From Respondents to Part I, Section B of the Interview Schedule	32
III. Scores on Rating Devices of 75 Homemakers	38
IV. Home Management Scores By Homemakers Who Had Home Economics in High School and College	40
V. Home Management Ratings by Homemakers Who Did Not Attend College	41
VI. Home Management Ratings By Homemakers Who Have 1 or 2 Children	42
VII. Home Management Scores by Homemakers Who Have 3-5 Children	43
VIII. Home Management Ratings by Homemakers Who Had 3 or 4 Years of Home Economics in High School	45
IX. Home Management Ratings by Homemakers Who Had 1 or 2 Years of Home Economics in High School	46
X. Home Management Ratings by Homemakers Who Did Not Have Home Economics in High School	47
XI. Home Management Ratings by Homemakers Who Had Home Economics in High School	49
XII. Home Management Ratings by Homemakers Who Had Home Economics in College	50
XIII. Home Management Ratings by Homemakers Who Attended College But Had No Home Economics in College	51
XIV. Home Management Ratings by Homemakers Who Have Had No Formal Home Economics Training	52
XV. Home Management Scores by 75 Homemakers	54

Table	Page
XVI. Most and Least Liked Tasks Reported by Homemakers	55
XVII. Description of Homemaker	56
XVIII. Responses to Rating Scale by 75 Homemakers	59
XIX. Responses to Rating Scale by Homemakers According to the Number of Children under 13 in Their Families . . .	109
XX. Responses to Rating Scale by Homemakers According to the Number of Years of High School Home Economics	113
XXI. Responses to Rating Scale by Homemakers According to Study of High School Home Economics	117
XXII. Responses to Rating Scale by Homemakers According to Their Study of Home Economics in College	121
XXIII. Responses to Rating Scale by Homemakers According to Their Study of High School and College Home Economics . . .	125

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Each year technological developments bring new equipment, services, and products into the home. These new developments often result in the reduction of opportunities for the family to grow in unity through shared tasks. Reduction in the amount of work to be done in the home increases the amount of leisure time enjoyed by each member of the family. There seems to be a tendency for individual family members to spend this leisure time in activities away from the home. This new type family, identified by a diversity of interests, presents fresh problems for the homemaker. In light of these new problems women in the United States seem to need clarification of the changes that have occurred in their roles as homemakers.

Instead of being a producer of the goods and services required by the family, the homemaker has become responsible for guiding the family in the selection and use of goods and services produced by someone else. In other words, her role is becoming primarily a managerial one.

Currently home management is thought of as the integration of all aspects of family living. The homemaker who assumes the managerial role for her family undertakes the responsibility of guiding her family toward (a) clarifying values and goals, (b) identifying problems and becoming aware of obstacles, (c) assessing resources and guiding their allocation, (d) gathering information in order to make decisions, (e) weighing alternatives when decisions are necessary, (f) choosing and formulating

plans in order to achieve the desired outcome, (g) expediting plans, (h) evaluating the results of plans, (i) guiding the family toward the acceptance of the outcomes of past decisions, and (j) helping each member of the family to become aware of his place in the total structure of the family.

Some of the earliest teachings of home management stressed the skills necessary to maintain a home. Ellen H. Richards, (3) Catherine Beecher (2) and Isabel Bevier (2) emphasized the importance of habits, order, sanitation, economy, and use of time as basic to effective home-making. As early as 1929, Helen Judy Bond, (31) in her study of needs and trends in home management, found evidence that elements of family and community relationships were being included in courses classified as Home Management; however, the study of Rettig (41) in 1963 showed little evidence that the lay public considered these interpersonal relations as a part of home management. There was some evidence that the public studied was aware of values and goals as a part of home management but the study seemed to show that home management continues to be interpreted as the use of resources. These findings seem to substantiate the claim by Gross and Crandall (22) that many misconceptions about the nature of home management continue to exist.

According to present day thinking the fundamental purpose of home management is the achievement of family goals. Although a stereotype of a "good" manager, that is, one who places emphasis upon efficiency and perfection, may exist it is not in keeping with the present day philosophy of home management which places primary emphasis upon family goals. The possibility of the existence of a stereotype should be considered because it may influence the homemaker's ideas about what she should do or be if

she is to be considered an effective manager. This image which in most cases is unattainable becomes a part of the homemaker's ideal self.

According to Jourard (30) every individual has three selves, a real self, a public self, and an ideal self. The real self is the person as he actually exists; the public self is the person he wants others to accept; the ideal self is defined as the person's image or concept of what he thinks he ought to be. It is believed that as the ideal self moves closer to the real self the individual experiences a decreasing amount of frustration.

Much of the current literature directed toward the feminine reader seems to emphasize the unhappiness that the United States woman experiences in her role of full-time homemaker. Betty Friedan, in the Feminine Mystique, (16) points to the increasing number of homemakers who seem to suffer from "housewife's fatigue", a type of fatigue that is not the result of overwork, lack of sleep, or poor physical condition. Van Bortel (44) in her comparison of home management between upper lower and upper middle class homemakers reported evidence of fatigue in the upper middle class women although these homemakers had a total daytime and night rest of over eight hours a day. Gross and Crandall (21) refer to this tired feeling which seems to have a psychological rather than physiological origin, as psychological fatigue, due to either boredom or frustration. Boredom fatigue creates within the worker feelings of restlessness, a desire to quit and an increased sensitivity to the unpleasant aspects of a task. Although the ability to work is not impaired the person is reluctant to continue to do so. This relationship between attitude toward a task and feelings of fatigue was supported by Maloch's (33) study of the characteristics of most and least liked household tasks. She found

that tiredness was mentioned as an important quality of least liked tasks although it was not accepted as a characteristic of the task.

Frustration fatigue results from a conflict situation within the individual. (9) If the struggle is prolonged, fatigue may result, real physiological fatigue, accompanied by symptoms of weakness and limpness. Bartley and Chute (3) explain that aside from being unpleasant these symptoms are frequently taken as tokens of inadequacy for activity. The American woman seems exceptionally vulnerable to conflict situations because the role of homemaker encompasses such a diversity of tasks and responsibilities. Wife, mother, friend, confidant, arbiter of differences, laundress, chauffeur, cook, hostess, these and many more are the roles that absorb in kaleidoscope fashion the minutes of the homemaker's day. How to determine which comes first, how to accomplish all that must be done and how to maintain standards that are satisfying to herself and her family are decisions that can be a source of frustration within the homemaker.

As the home has changed from a production unit to a consumption unit the number of potential conflict situations seemingly has increased. The use of packaged cake mixes is a good example. The homemaker may realize that the use of a package mix will help her to meet her busy schedule by conserving time and energy. In some instances its use may afford a monetary saving also. (25) Regardless of these favorable arguments, the homemaker may experience feelings of guilt when she chooses to use a mix if she believes she is not working as hard for her family as she might or should. If she is skilled in cake baking techniques, she may also realize that she has sacrificed quality in the product which she serves her family. Increased understanding of the way in which effective home management can

provide a framework for dealing with conflict situations may help the homemaker gain confidence in her ability to assume her managerial role. (22) The home economist should be able to help the homemaker gain this understanding.

If home economists are aware of the opinions and images of home management prevalent among homemakers they may be able to direct their efforts toward presenting the concepts of home management in such a way that the homemaker may feel secure in her ability to manage her home effectively. If the homemaker is able to achieve enough insight to understand that an image based upon a stereotype has little meaning in relation to individual family goals she may be able to accept the managerial ability of her real self.

Home management should be taught so that homemakers gain self confidence in their managerial ability; through increased understanding of the meaning, purposes, and procedures of management. Only then can they grow in managerial skill and gain the assurance which comes from succeeding.

This study was undertaken to learn more about the way homemakers interpret management, what they consider to be the characteristics of effective and ineffective management, and how they view themselves in their role as home managers.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The initial phase of this study was a review of literature. One of the purposes of this review was to become familiar with research methods that have been used by persons investigating home management.

It appears that much of the home management research has been concerned with two student groups; the single ones living in the home management

residence house, and newly married students. There seems to be a need for additional research with the more experienced homemaker group. The present exploratory study of homemakers has been undertaken because it is believed that their opinions of themselves as home managers may contribute meaningful information for use in the classroom, the laboratory, and ultimately in the home. (6)

The central problem was to determine the opinions held by a selected group of homemakers residing in Stillwater, Oklahoma concerning their roles as home managers.

Four sub-problems were also identified for this study: (a) To become aware of the elements of home management that homemakers seem to believe are an important part of the managerial role. (b) To ascertain how each member of a selected group of homemakers rated herself as a home manager. (c) To determine how the individual members of this group of homemakers rated themselves on a check list of managerial skills. (d) To determine whether according to authorities in the field, the homemakers had more or less managerial ability than they believed. These assumptions were the basis for two hypotheses for this study. (a) Each homemaker had a mental picture of herself as a manager. (b) This mental picture was related to her evaluation of other homemakers with whom she has had contact and to her conception of effective and ineffective management. (c) Her opinion of herself will be revealed through a planned interview.

The hypotheses were:

(a) The mental impressions revealed by homemakers concerning what constitutes an effective manager will contain similar identifiable elements.

(b) For the greater part of the sample the self evaluation

scores will be lower than the scores received on the rating scale.

SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS

This study was limited to full time married homemakers living with their husbands and having children under thirteen years of age. According to Holmes (27) there are differences between the way employed and non-employed homemakers manage. Similarly, the homemaker who lives alone has a managerial role that differs from that of the woman who shares the role with her husband. Because the managerial function of the homemaker tends to change after the children are old enough to assume an appreciable amount of responsibility for themselves and for the management of the home this sample was restricted to homemakers having children under thirteen.

Because it was feared that possession of a stereotype of home economists might influence the way homemakers responded to the interviewer it was decided to select as a sample only those homemakers who had had some previous contact with home economists and could therefore, be presumed to have less bias in their responses. This decision was based upon the assumption that understanding is gained through association.

It is an accepted fact that a Home Economist is a person having a college degree in the study of home economics. According to Kahl (32) it would be safe to assume that the sample selected for this study is predominantly middle-class because of their association with college educated people including home economists.

.....We have in America today a growing upper-middle class of college-educated, prosperous people who are technicians, professionals, managers and businessmen.....They tend to interact a great deal in the community but almost wholly with their own kind.

Consideration of the image or self concept of middle class homemakers is a concern of this study because a number of writers and researchers have shown that it is largely the middle class and generally the educated homemaker who considers her role as homemaker inadequate for a feeling of self-fulfilment.

NEED FOR THE STUDY

The delegates in the 1964 conference on home management which was held at Michigan State University mentioned in their summary the urgent need for research into the meaning of "good" home management. (6) Present day homemakers seem to have a mental picture of "good" home management which is very different from that possessed by the women of a generation or two ago. The research recommendation made at Michigan State University seems to infer that there is a need to understand how this mental picture has changed with the passing of time.

Research has been done to determine some of the methods homemakers use to manage their homes but little investigation has been made into what homemakers believe constitutes "good" or effective home management. The term effective seems to be in keeping with present concepts of home management. In order to avoid the impression that value judgements are being made the term effective management will be used instead of "good" management throughout this study. Home management concepts presently stress the importance of families learning to adjust to changes in modes of living. Clearly defining family values, determining family goals, and using sound decision making techniques to allocate family resources is emphasized in order to contribute to the optimal development of each family member.

Maloch made a study to determine the characteristics of the most and least liked household tasks. (33) Although this study identified the characteristics of specific tasks no attempt was made to ascertain how these tasks relate to the homemaker's conception of what constitutes an effective homemaker.

Home Economists concerned with the home management process may profit from insights into what homemakers believe to be effective management. Wilbert Moore (35) seems to pinpoint the advantages which may be gained through this knowledge when he says,

.....Widespread recognition that human performance falls short of perfection may lead to the acceptance of more "realistic" standards, but this development is itself a significant change.

Acknowledgement of the social changes that occur through time may help the Home Economist to present the concepts of home management in such a way that the students and the homemakers with whom she has worked will be able to realize that practices based upon traditional ways of doing tasks may be unrealistic for the present mode of living. This realization may help the homemaker to reduce the tension producing gap between what she is able to do and what she believes she should do. It is believed that a reduction in tension may result in a reduction of psychic fatigue. (9)

New knowledge of what homemakers believe to be effective home management may also aid home economists in these other ways: (a) The findings from such insight may point up the need for new studies in the area of home management; (b) New data may indicate that home management education should be re-evaluated in light of needs reflected in the mental pictures of effective management; (c) The findings concerning homemakers' concepts of effective home management could be used to evaluate the managerial

process used in home management residence houses.

Possibly the greatest advantage to be gained from this and other studies which may follow it is the awareness of the need for creating harmony between home economics education and the mental pictures of effective management possessed by homemakers. Kenneth Boulding (5) seems to emphasize the importance of this harmony in his remarks on teaching.

This business of teaching.....that of cooperating with the students own inward teacher whereby the students image may grow in conformity with that of his outward teacher.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A review of literature was made in accordance with the following objectives. (a) To become better acquainted with past and present research in the area of home management. (b) To select a method of evaluating home management suitable for the present study. (c) To trace the development of home management philosophy in order to gain understanding of present day concepts.

Literature from the area of social sciences was reviewed in order to gain insight into the problems related to this study.

In 1899, the delegates to the first Lake Placid conference on home economics delineated a number of problems that had implications for home management. This conference, one of ten, formed the basis for the establishment of the American Home Economics Association. Although recognition of the importance of home management to home economics has been continuous since this first conference there have been many changes in its interpretation and emphasis.

Early in the twentieth century home management concepts strongly reflected the changes brought about in homes by new rapid technological developments. Ideas of scientific management borrowed from the business world were very evident in the writings of this era. This article from The Outlook, seems typical of many that appeared in periodicals of the time:

Scientific management.....It is a science based on definite principles, and these principles can be applied as well to the management of the home as to the management of business enterprises. (24)

Another article, this one written by a woman, declared:

Scientific management includes efficiency in production, economy in operation, and as a system is effectively applicable not only to the home with no employee, but to the individual who cares to apply it to herself.... Efficiency is the elimination of all waste, and the power to produce the effect intended active, competent power. Science is the best known way, and management means to guide, not force. Surely so far this all applies to the household. (37)

As domestic employees left to work in factories, homemakers were faced with a new problem and home economists were eager to help find new answers. In the same year that the forementioned articles appeared, the American Home Economics Association published its first syllabus. The need for clarification of terms was acknowledged and an attempt was made to define the areas of concern for home economics. Home management was one of these concerns and received attention under the title of "Household and Institute Management". The following definition was supplied:

The theory and art of combining and managing food, clothing, and shelter and the direction of activities so as to best promote the economic, sanitary, and esthetic interests of the individual and family or other group in order to minister to their highest satisfaction within the sphere of the household or institution. (43)

Later in the century the writings of the Gilbreths' were to influence the interpretation of effective home management. Mrs. Gilbreth (17) sought ways in which ideas gained from time and motion studies could be adapted to the management of the home. These efforts made by Mrs. Gilbreth and her associates were recognized by Katherine Fisher (15) of the Good Housekeeping Institute. Speaking before the first International Management Congress in which persons from the United States were invited

to participate she remarked:

The business of housekeeping and household management can not well be viewed from the same angles as an industrial undertaking, for the home is primarily a living center rather than a work center; and human relationships, and not housework, make the home. It is a workshop where personalities are in the making, as well as meals, and this must be taken into account in any discussion of household management questions.

Another development paralleled the growth of interest in applying scientific management principles to the management of the home. This was an attempt by educators to include in home economics courses elements of scientific management. These early attempts to meet the needs of students living in a technological age resulted in Home Management becoming the "dumping ground" for all subject matter that seemed alien to the classic foods and clothing offerings. At first these new home economics courses were presented in the form of lectures. Later laboratories, or "practice houses", were established where students could learn and apply homemaking skills. It is believed that the first laboratories were provided about the time of World War I. (22)

In 1929 Helen Judy (Bond) (31) recognized the wide variations in subject matter offered in home management courses. Because she realized the need to define the area of study she attempted to determine the trends and needs of home management by questioning home economics teachers distributed among one hundred different land grant colleges, state universities, state teachers colleges, women's colleges, and technical schools. From this study she identified trends that seemingly had remained a constant part of home management offerings: (a) to teach the appreciation, care and function of the home so that it may be efficiently managed and contribute to the happiness of the family and community; (b) to establish efficiency in the organization and operation of the home; (c) to teach

problems of home management in such a way as to eliminate drudgery and unnecessary waste of time, energy and money in performing the tasks in the home. Judy's study seemed to give impetus to research in the area of home management. Most of it concerned the use of resources. Not until the late 1939's was over-all management investigated. At this time the primary concern of management research was in the area of values and goals. (21)

In 1940 Warren (46) studied homemakers use of time in relation to management in farm households. Particular attention was given to the attitudes of homemakers toward certain tasks. Attitudes, likes or dislikes, seemed to influence the amount of time the homemaker spent at the task.

In an attempt to determine the effects of the quality of management on family living Dickens (11) did a study in 1943. Dickens defined the term "good" manager as one who is able to set goals and accomplish ends, has a fund of information and uses it in solving problems, conserves resources, recognizes signs of quality, uses money to advantage, possesses skill in household tasks, and shares responsibilities with other members of the family. A "poor" manager was defined as one who had difficulty in formulating goals, does not have a fund of knowledge or is not able to use what she has, is wasteful of resources, does not recognize signs of quality, spends money unwisely, lacks skill in household tasks, and is too ready to do what others in the family should or might do. Data for determining the managerial ability of these homemakers was obtained by an inventory of family record books. Homemakers were rated average or above average. The above average homemakers seemed to rate especially high in these abilities: (a) in planning the use of resources so that

family goals might be realized; (b) in providing a means for development of family members; (c) in using money to advantage for their families. This study concluded that below average managers were not successfully defined.

In 1945 Cushman (8) published Management in Homes, in which she suggested that a richer home management experience could be provided by cooperating with local homemakers in the community. Her plan employs the case study method with homes in the community being used for laboratory experience.

Three years later Gross (20) developed a device for scoring home management. In an attempt to determine how they managed and how they felt about managing she interviewed 382 Michigan homemakers. The women were of various ages and economic levels. Since some were from the village and some from the farms the sources of their incomes were varied. The information these women gave concerning their managerial practices and their reasons for the practices were divided into six parts for study and measurement: (a) use of time and energy, (b) use of money (c) household production, (d) conservation of goods, (e) looking to the future, and (f) incentives for home management. It was found that there was little difference in the managerial scores of village or farm homemakers or whether they had a large or small family. Managerial scores tended to increase with educational level. It was also found that older homemakers had better total scores until they reached late middle life. The middle economic group rated higher in incentives for home management and in household production. The lower and middle economic groups were better than others in managing money. The findings from this study provided the material for Everett and Gross' "A Home Management Yardstick" (12) This

yardstick was designed to give homemakers who had children living at home a quick method of evaluating themselves.

The study done by Van Bortel and Gross (44) in 1951 provided a benchmark in the history of home management research because it was one of the first research projects in the field of home management to use the interdisciplinary approach. It combined methods and principles from the areas of home management, sociology, psychology and social anthropology. The main concern of this study was the investigation of similarities and differences among upper-lower and upper-middle class homemakers with regard to use of time, the influences of goals and values upon managerial activities, the managerial practices used, the ideas they had about what it means to be a homemaker and the satisfactions and dissatisfactions they received from their roles as homemakers. Van Bortel classified the activities of homemakers into these six mutually exclusive roles: manager, housewife, family member, mother, wife, and individual. She defined the role of manager as being concerned with planning, budgets, menus, work schedules, shopping lists, shopping, banking, and the supervision of employed help.

Upper middle class homemakers conceived of management as being mental while upper lower class homemakers seemed to conceive of it as being physical or concerned with health. Both groups considered efficiency to be a virtue.

When asked, "What would you say a good homemaker was like?" the upper middle group defined a good homemaker in terms of maintaining satisfactory family relations while the upper lower group conceived of a good homemaker as being one concerned with the use of non-human resources.

Managerial ability as a characteristic of a homemaker was mentioned

least and seemingly was not considered an important characteristic of a good homemaker by either group.

The study by Wittler (47) in 1952 reflected the concern with decision making that has characterized home management research since World War II. Wittler used the Michigan State Home Management Yardstick which she altered in accordance to needs determined through pre-testing. Information gained was classified as time and energy, money, conservation, and other practices and problems. Homemakers in this study seemed aware of the value of planning but felt their plans needed to be flexible in order to meet the demands of family and farm living.

McKee (34) was concerned with the demands of the family when he explained:

.....as a central goal-value home management is interested in developing the kind of atmosphere or setting in a home which enables all the people in that home, old and young, to grow into mature and healthy persons - physically, emotionally, intellectually, socially, spiritually. Put another way, home management seeks to create the conditions which will allow each person in the home to become the kind of person he is capable of becoming.

In 1959 the American Home Economics Association Committee on Philosophy and Objectives published Home Economics, New Directions, (28) in which it was stated:

We believe that the clearest new direction for home economics is to help people identify and develop certain fundamental competencies that will be effective in personal and family living regardless of the particular circumstances of the individual or family.

Twelve fundamental competences were listed, six of which are in the area of home management. One concerns values, one decisions, and four the management process.

Also in 1959, Nickell and Dorsey's (36) revised textbook for college students was published. Strong emphasis was placed on the decision making

process and the integrative characteristic of home management. Of particular relevance for this study is the authors' outline and definition of qualities making for effective management: (a) Intelligence - intellect put to work. (b) Enthusiasm - conviction of the significance of the undertaking. (c) Imagination - the ability to recall facts and ideas and to rearrange them in new patterns or relationships. (d) Judgement - that quality which enables one to weigh fairly the various facts in a situation and to see the problem in relation to other problems to be faced. (e) Perseverance - the combination of courage and patience. (f) Adaptability - the ability to adjust to change. (g) Self Management - emotional control adequate to stand up to stress and strain.

In 1961 Maloch (33) used a combination of open-end questions, specific questions and a 5-interval rating scale to determine the most liked and least liked tasks of a group of urban homemakers. Cooking, cleaning, and washing were given most frequently as most liked; cleaning and ironing as least liked.

During the French Lick Conference on Concepts, the participants working in the home management area agreed upon the importance of four concepts in teaching home management: Organization, values and goals, use of resources, and decision making.

In this same year Desai (10) attempted to develop an instrument to measure the images of home management held by university graduates. She was interested in determining the similarities and differences in the images held by graduates who had majored in home economics and of those who had not. The research method chosen by Desai combined open-end statements with polar concepts. Answers to the open end statements related to "good" or "poor" management and were ultimately classified by a jury

into five elements of management: (a) goals and values, (b) resources, (c) planning, (d) controlling, and (e) evaluating. She found that non-home economics graduates disagreed with the polar concept statements more often than did home economics graduates. She concluded that this was probably due to education or differences in images of home life in general.

Two new concepts were apparent in Gross and Crandall's (22) revised textbook for college home management students; home managements is a mental process; process has definite, successive steps. Emphasis on decision making and the management process is evident in the authors' definition of management:

Home management consists of a series of decisions making up the process of using family resources to achieve family goals. The process consists of three more or less consecutive steps, planning; controlling the various elements of the plan while carrying it through, whether it is executed by oneself or by others; and evaluating results preparatory to future planning.

Bratton (6) disagreed with the process concept of Gross and Crandall because she thought it had not been fruitful in research. She suggested that there were proficiencies or skills outside of the management process that homemakers need if they are to implement the process. She believed that home management research should be designed to answer these questions: (a) What are some management proficiencies? (b) What do "good" managers do well and how do they do it? (c) What is "good" management and how can we make some progress toward measuring it? (d) Does what we teach in home management have anything to do with increasing the satisfactions of families living in homes? (e) Are the satisfactions families find in their homes in any way related to how the home is operated and how decisions are made?

The most recent study reviewed was by Rettig. (44) She used an item inventory technique in order to determine the ways in which her lay-public revealed an awareness of home management. Both men and women were included

in her lay-public which she defined as those persons having had contact with professionally employed home economists in business, extension, high school and college teaching, and dietetics. About three-fourths of the respondents mentioned home management as an element of their total image of home economics. It was expected that there would be differences between the male and female responses but this was not proven true. Differences between the groups seemed to be due to the type of home economist with whom they had been associated.

This review of literature has shown that the ideals of home management have changed little through the years although emphasis and methods of implementation have passed through several stages. Home management began as a dumping ground, passed to a discipline concerned with maximizing family satisfactions through the efficient use of resources, reemphasized its concern for people by enlarging its study of values and goals, searched for a conceptual framework, and is presently concerning itself with the relationship between values and decision making. The last few studies reviewed seem to point toward the beginning of a new phase, one concerned with the totality rather than the components of effective home management.

CHAPTER III

METHOD OF PROCEDURES

The review of literature revealed that in past studies of home management the interview technique had been successful in producing a high number of useable responses. (23) It was also believed that since opinions were the main concern these could be more readily obtained by interview than by questionnaire.

In order to develop a suitable interview schedule for this study it was necessary to consider these points: (a) The clarification of the problem, the development of the purposes and the formulation of the hypotheses and underlying assumptions. (b) The kinds of instruments that have been used in the past in closely related studies. (d) The time and ability of the researcher.

A major problem of this study was to identify the elements of management that homemakers believed were an important part of the managerial role. Recently Desai (10) and Rettig (41) had successfully employed the open-end statement technique to secure an opinion item inventory. It was decided to test this technique in the present study.

Another concern of this study was to ascertain how each member of this selected group of homemakers rated herself as a home manager. It was recognized that the self concept of the individual is closely related to his concept of others. (14) For this reason the respondent was asked to rate a friend who managed effectively, a friend who did not manage effectively and finally herself. (26)

In order to compare the homemaker's rating of herself as a manager with the opinions of authorities in the area it was decided to select a home management self-rating device rather than develop one for this study. Several rating devices that are used to rate students were reviewed in order to find one that was widely recognized, dealt with managerial activities within the home, was within the understanding of the homemaker to be interviewed and met the time limitations of the interviewer.

It was decided to adapt Gross and Crandall's Short Rating Scale For Home Management. (22) (Permission was obtained from both authors and the publisher.) One slight change was made under section V. B. Do you have definite long term plans for:. The addition of a separate section dealing with family provision for retirement seemed timely in light of the present trend toward early retirement. The pattern of scoring established by the authors of the scale was retained. In section V. B. Do you have definite long-term plans for:, the section score was maintained by assigning smaller scores to each question in the section. It was expected that characteristics of the homemaker may affect her responses to the questions on the interview schedule. These characteristics are: (a) the number of children under thirteen, (b) the range of the ages of these children, (c) the amount of home economics training the homemaker received in high school, (d) the amount of home economics training the homemaker received in college, (e) whether or not home management was studied, (f) whether or not the homemaker received satisfaction from being a homemaker (g) the homemaker's favorite homemaking activity, and (h) the homemaker's least liked activity. It was decided that the sample would be drawn from a population comprised of full time (not gainfully employed) homemakers with children under thirteen in Stillwater who had had some contact with

graduate home economists. Rettig (41) had used a similar method in her study which was the third portion of an image study done at Iowa State University. The sample selected by this method is referred to in the Iowa study as a relevant public. It was believed this method would be within the cost and time limitations of the investigator.

Names of home economists were obtained through membership lists of five professional organizations: (a) Oklahoma State University Home Economics Alumni Association, (b) Oklahoma Home Economics Association, (c) Oklahoma Dietetics Association, (d) Oklahoma State University employees in resident teaching and in extension, (e) Phi Upsilon Omicron Alumni. From these five sources a list of home economists living in Stillwater was compiled for each of three vocational groups, namely, home economists in college teaching (73 members), home economists in business (7 members), and home economists who are full-time homemakers (183 members). Since the business group with seven members was the smallest group, seven was used as the random number and a total of 51 home economists was drawn. Each of these was contacted by letter and asked to provide four names of homemakers with whom she had associated and who met the criteria set up for the study. Thirty-three of the 51 home economists provided names of 132 homemakers. After duplications had been eliminated 103 names remained.

In order to handle the data received from Part I of this study the responses were categorized: (a) Performance of homemaking tasks, (b) Managerial abilities, (c) Concern for family well being, (d) Guidance and care of children, (e) Use of resources, (f) Awareness of values and goals and a concern for standards, (g) Sociability, (h) Community participation, (i) Description of homemaker, (j) Self development, (k) Non-relevant statements. Three persons were asked to judge the categorization of the responses

to the open end questions. The jury was composed of two members of the Home Management Department and a staff member from the Home Management Department at another university.

Data from Parts II and III were tabulated for each of the variables. Data were treated arithmetically.

CHAPTER IV

DATA AND FINDINGS

In the first section of the questionnaire each homemaker interviewed was asked to describe a friend whom she considered an effective manager; one who was less effective (ineffective) and finally to rank herself along with each of her friends on a managerial scale. The scale ranged from one to ten with one being low and ten high. The questions were open ended. No limits were placed upon the number of descriptive terms the homemakers might use.

Creative, energetic and efficient were the descriptive terms most often used by the homemakers when they characterized friends who were effective managers. Because these ratings are from a hierarchy "most often" is used to describe the three top-ranking items, but there were many more responses in each category that were named a fewer number of times. The question that elicited this response was "Can you think of a friend who is what you would call a good (effective) manager? What is she like? (Appendix A). The elements of management listed most frequently as "things she does," were: plans, has an awareness of values and goals, and participates in community activities. (Table I) Evaluation was mentioned only twice. When the questions "Can you think of another friend who doesn't manage well? and What is she like?" were asked, the answers showed so little agreement among the statements that a hierarchy could not be established. (Table II) The kinds of statements primarily concerned the personality structure and were beyond the scope of this study.

TABLE I

STATEMENTS FROM RESPONDENTS TO PART I, SECTION A.
OF THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

These relate to the homemaker who manages effectively.

I. Performance of Homemaking Tasks:

Keeps up with her work.
Works rapidly.
Skilled at homemaking tasks.
Is a good cook.
Paints and repairs the house.
Sews beautifully. (19)*
Does flower arrangements.
Gardens.
Knits.
Bakes.
Efficient housekeeper. (2)
Keeps home well decorated through own efforts.
Does own work.

33II. Managerial Abilities:A. Planning

Schedules her work. (26)
Plans so things are always in place.
Plans for the use of her time.
Is always prepared for emergencies.
Is alert to new developments.
Plans her work. (29)
Plans work centers.
Plans so she retains control of the family situation.
Thinks ahead. (21)
Makes menus.
Manages the little extras.
Informed.
Plans casually.
Organizes well.
Seeks facts and information.
Uses flexible schedule.
Sticks to plans.
Knowledge of good techniques.
Plans are flexible.
Plans her day.

95B. Controlling

Trains the family to help.
Her family helps. (24)

25

TABLE I (continued)

<p>C. <u>Evaluating</u></p> <p>Evaluates a situation to determine action. Limits social life. (2)</p>	<p><u>3</u></p>
<p>D. <u>Organization</u></p> <p>Organizes her storage well. Keeps thing in order. (2) Well organized. (8) Everything in its place. Dovetails work.</p>	<p><u>13</u></p>
<p>III. <u>Concern for Family Well-being:</u></p> <p>Husband seems happy. The family is happy. Keeps a pleasant cheerful atmosphere in the family. Concentrates upon family needs. Puts husband first. Provides a culturally rich home. Many family activities in home. Devoted to family. Interest is more in home. Ready to go with husband. Takes children on outings. Puts family first. Interested in home, children and husband. Puts family first - self last. Helps husband with his work - keeps business books. Busy with the family. Very concerned with children.</p>	<p><u>17</u></p>
<p>IV. <u>Guidance and Care of Children:</u></p> <p>Good mother. (5) Children mind. Manages her children well. Gives much attention to children. Takes an active part in the children's activities. (3) Keeps the children well. Spends time with children. Quiet, but firm with children. Takes children on outings. Skilled at child care.</p>	<p><u>16</u></p>

TABLE I (continued)

 V. Use of Resources:

Home doesn't absorb all of her time, does much church work.
 Spends money to buy time, etc., hires ironing done. (9)
 Is time and motion conscious.
 Observant of time and labor saving techniques. (2)
 Budgets her time. (9)
 Is a careful buyer.
 Budgets the money.
 Shops for specials.
 Plans to shop monthly at discount stores for drug items.
 Manages the little "extras".
 Uses money wisely.
 Shops wisely.
 Stays within family means.
 Hunts bargains.
 Buys in season.
 Good shopper.
 Budgets time and money
 Uses equipment well.
 Chooses equipment to help.
 Good manager of resources.

38
 VI. Awareness of Values and Goals and a Concern for Standards:

Puts first things first. (7)
 Is aware of good work techniques.
 Keeps house in order. (4)
 House is nice and clean. (15)
 Keeps self and children well groomed.
 Keeps house clean. (2)
 Keeps work up to date.
 Able to determine what comes first.
 Objective in family relations.
 Keeps work caught up.
 Children well groomed.
 Always neat. (2)
 Not too meticulous, "Clean house nice but not most important."
 Looks nice, always.
 Keeps a nice house.
 Doesn't emphasize small things.
 Well groomed.
 Sees goals and values.
 Has goals and sticks to them.
 People more important than things.
 Keeps home lovely.

46

TABLE I (continued)

 VII. Sociability:

Does for self, children and friends.
 Active socially.
 Entertains a lot.
 Entertains well. (4)
 Is a lovely hostess.
 Good hostess (3)
 Interested in other people.
 Entertains. (6)
 Time for friends.
 Plays bridge.
 Entertains often.
 Visits a great deal.
 Entertains easily.

23
 VIII. Community Participation:

Teaches Sunday school. (3)
 Has outside activities. (8)
 Home doesn't absorb all of her time. Does much church work.
 Helps other people.
 Takes part in community affairs such as PTA and church.
 Idea of citizenship is strong.
 Has time for extra activities, never seems to say "no".
 Active outside the home in Scouts and in Church. (3)
 Active in church work and in scouting. (24)
 Joins many organizations.
 Substitute teaches.
 Takes part in school affairs.

46
 IX. Description of Homemaker:

Helpful.
 Good all around worker.
 Easygoing.
 Very active. (2)
 Does everything graciously.
 Is relaxed. (3)
 Pleasant and fun. (4)
 Is efficient (15)
 Young, friendly, outgoing.
 Good housekeeper.
 Is a perfectionist.
 Is flexible.
 Always willing to help others.
 Is a thoughtful person.
 Is efficient in things you can see.
 Is methodical.

TABLE I (continued)

IX. Description of Homemaker: (continued)

Has a warm personality.
Is creative. (5)
Has high energy level. (8)
Enthusiasm.
Loves music.
Able to do everything with ease.
Takes things in her stride, stays calm.
Has a happy attitude.
Enjoys the role of homemaker. (3)
Likes to clean but not to cook.
Likeable.
Intense and excitable at times.
Particular.
Manages to live graciously.
Generous.
Shares.
Works rapidly. (2)
Businesslike.
Unemotional.
Capable.
Does everything well.
Seems to need little sleep.
Sweet, uncomplaining, pleasant, calm.
People bring troubles and problems to her.
Does own work.
Critical.
Goes a lot.
Homebody.
Able to consider others.
Dependable.
Tense.
Short tempered.
Striving.
Ambitious. (2)
Extrovert.
Listens well.
Intelligent.
Tidy.
Takes pride in a days work.
Has an attitude of doing things easily.
Good housekeeper.
Meticulous.
Thorough.
Flexible.
Not very happy.
Very rigid.
Not social.

TABLE I (continued)

 IX. Description of Homemaker: (continued)

Industrious.
 Creative.
 Satisfied.
 Energetic.
 Ambitious.
 Orderly.
 Clean.
 Gay.
 Carefree.
 Systematic.
 Self-centered.
 Even tempered.
 Individual.
 Busy all of the time.
 Keeps a good perspective.
 Not calm with family.
 Even cheerful disposition.

65
 X. Self-Development:

Reads.
 Golfs and plays bridge.
 Golfs and bowls.
 Keeps up with new things.
 Goes to school.
 Takes time for self.
 Disciplines self.
 Has time to paint.
 Does other activities.
 Lots of outside interests.

10
 XI. Non-Relevant Statements from Part I., Section A.:

Teaches piano.
 Has children.
 Cooks in large quantities.
 Newly wed, in late 30's.
 Is a home economics grad.
 Is a veterinarian's wife.
 Taught a charm course and English.
 Husband travels.
 Works in evening hours.
 Lives alone.
 Works.

11

 *Number in parentheses refer to times statement was repeated.

TABLE II

STATEMENTS FROM RESPONDENTS TO PART I, SECTION B.
OF THE INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

These relate to the homemaker who has trouble managing effectively.

I. Performance of Homemaking Activities:

Unskilled.
Unprepared.
Cooks well.
Sews.
Likes to cook but not clean.

5

II. Managerial Abilities:

A. Planning

Doesn't plan. (6)*
Takes on too many activities.
Her meals are unplanned.
Lacks foresight.
No Schedules.
Plans to do too many things. (3)
Too scheduled.
Seems to lack foresight.
Has no routine in the home.
Borrows constantly.
Poor planners.

18

B. Controlling

Children don't help.
Loses control of the home situation.
Seem unable to concentrate on more than one thing at a time.

3

C. Evaluating

Doesn't seek knowledge before attempting new task.

1

D. Organizing

Disorganized.(6)
Poorly organized.
Too organized.
Starts too many things at a time.

9

TABLE II (continued)

 III. Concern for Family Well-being:

Is nervous and upset with family.
 Unable to manage interpersonal relations in family.
 Too many outside interests - no time left for family.
 Husband and children not cooperative.

 IV. Guidance and Care of Children:

Not interested in children's activities.
 Children aren't trained to help.
 Children look neglected.
 Is a good mother.
 Ineffective as a mother.
 Children cause undue worry.
 Doesn't carry through on instructions to children.
 Children are extremely happy.
 Takes part in all of children's activities.
 Neglects children.
 Puts children first. (2)
 Children undisciplined.
 Good mother. (2)
 Doesn't manage the children well.
 Cannot adjust to children.
 Children are unhappy.
 Neglects cleanliness of children.
 Baby is unkept and dirty.
 Spends much time on children.
 Poor at managing children.
 Puts too much responsibility upon children with guidance.
 Gives children much attention.

28

 V. Use of Resources:

Doesn't manage time. (2)
 Never on time.
 Seems to spend all of time on a single interest.
 Generous with time - never refuses to take part in children's activities.
 Manages time poorly. (2)
 Wastes time. (2)
 Doesn't allow time to do necessary work.
 Doesn't get up early.
 Doesn't schedule time.
 Spends too much time making decisions.
 Doesn't allot time properly.
 Watches movies too late.
 Shows fatigue.
 Attempts to take part in too many activities and over extends her physical energy.

TABLE II (continued)

 V. Use of Resources: (continued)

Pushes self.
 Tired.
 Doesn't stick to budget.
 Spends money unwisely.
 Buys impulsively.
 Poor shopper.
 Doesn't know the value of money.
 Poor at managing money.
 Hires the cleaning done.
 Money seems ill-managed.

29
 VI. Awareness of Values and Goals and Concern for Standards:

House untidy. (5)
 Not interested in home and housekeeping. (15)
 Doesn't keep work up. (3)
 Always late. (5)
 House is tidy.
 No interest in own appearance, children first.
 No goals.
 House is cluttered.
 Puts wrong things first.
 Children and the house are unkept.
 House not clean. (6)
 Poor housekeeper. (7)
 Poor housekeeper - messy. (5)
 Puts own likes first. (5)
 Doesn't like to stay home.
 Enjoys other things more than homemaking. (3)
 Too clean.
 House is a wreck.
 Unable to put first things first. (2)
 Values - non-flexible.
 Too much of a perfectionist.
 Doesn't like to clean.
 Doesn't keep house well.
 Lives day to day.
 Over emphasis on details.
 Over critical
 Unreliable.
 Perfectionist.
 Feels other things are more important than cleaning.
 Eat out of pans in which food was cooked.
 Good housekeeper.
 Lacks self-discipline.
 Better to others than to family.
 House is immaculate.
 Too routinized.

83

TABLE II (continued)

 VII. Sociability:

Lots of outside activities.
 Koffee Klatches
 Tries to keep home, but would rather visit.
 Rather be out with people.
 Entertains well.
 A good hostess.
 Does lots for others.

7
 VIII. Community Participation:

Active in Church.
 Does too much outside of the home.
 Takes part in community activities.

3
 IX. Description of Homemaker:

Likes to read and lets house go. (2)
 Lovable. (3)
 Unaware of inefficiency.
 Scatter-brained.
 Nervous.
 Upsets easily. (3)
 Worrier. (3)
 Impatient.
 Unable to cope with being a homemaker.
 Untidy personally.
 Complains of illness constantly.
 Frustrated.
 Outgoing.
 Easy going and affable.
 Not likeable.
 Carefree.
 Stays calm.
 Naive.
 Unrealistic. (2)
 Materialistic.
 Complains.
 Procrastinates. (2)
 Little details worry her. (2)
 Unable to make decisions.
 Thoughtful.
 Unhappy. (2)
 Self-centered.
 Discontented.
 Too rigid.
 Excitable.
 Seems to be afraid of new tasks.

TABLE II (continued)

 IX. Description of Homemaker: (continued)

Easily distracted.
 Unable to stick with one task. (2)
 Disinterested. (3)
 Capable.
 Happy.
 Fun.
 Not relaxed. (2)
 Upset by interruptions.
 Creates crises out of small things.
 Lazy and fat.
 Defeatist.
 Non-participant.
 Friendly and relaxed. (3)
 Personally well groomed.
 Thinks, rather than acts.
 Lives vicariously.
 Unable to make decisions.
 Has a wealth of training and money, but seems uncertain.
 Seems to be unhappy - on the defensive.
 Unable to take initiative.
 Relies heavily upon husband.
 Lovable, does much for others.
 Seems not to accept role as wife and mother.
 Immature. (3)
 Easy going, does for others before herself.
 Can't say "no" to any request.
 Emotionally immature.
 Seems to create own problems.
 Too efficient.
 Emotional.
 Cheerful, good disposition.
 Insecure, immature, indecisive.
 Leaves decisions to husband.
 Works all of the time, not lazy.
 Seems unable to give of herself.

85X. Self-Development:

Has no respect for self.

1XI. Non-Applicable:

Constant crisis in daily living.
 Teaches art.
 Works out of the home.

3

 *Number in parentheses refers to times statement was repeated.

Statements in answer to the question "Can you list two or three things that this friend (ineffective) does that prevent her from managing well?" were primarily concerned with awareness of values and goals, use of resources (particularly the misuse of the resource time), and guidance and care of children. The description of the ineffective home manager by these homemakers seemed to indicate the predominant characteristic was disinterest in homemaking.

The positive aspect of the open-end section of the interview schedule produced more relevant statements that could be tabulated than did the negative portion.

The second part of this study dealt with the way homemakers evaluated themselves as managers. As was explained earlier the highest possible score was ten and the lowest score one. It was expected that the self rating scores would be closely related to the estimated scores of effective and ineffective homemakers. In most instances this proved true. In order to determine what this relationship might be the mid-point between the mean scores for effective and ineffective managers were determined and the amount that the self rating scores and the scores on the rating scale varied from this mid-point between the means was calculated. (Table III) This determined the relationship between the way the homemaker rated herself with no structuring for her opinion and the way she rated herself on the Gross and Crandall structured self-rating device. (Appendix A) For purposes of clarity the self-rating scores will be referred to as S scores and the rating scale scores will be referred to as R scores. (Table III)

The scores that showed the least variation (0.4) were for the total group and the group that had home economics in high school and college. In all instances the S scores of the homemakers were lower than the R

TABLE III

SCORES ON RATING DEVICES OF 75 HOMEMAKERS

Group	\bar{X}	\bar{X}_1	$\frac{\bar{X} + \bar{X}_1}{2} = \text{M.P.}$	\bar{S}	$ \text{M.P.} - \bar{S} $	\bar{R}	$ \bar{R} - \bar{S} $
Total	88.5	39.6	64.1	64.5	0.4	84.9	20.4
1 or 2 Children	88.2	41.3	64.8	63.7	1.1	85.3	21.6
3-5 Children	89.5	37.0	63.3	66.5	3.2	84.2	17.7
1-2 years of High School H. Ec.	90.3	43.1	65.7	67.1	1.4	86.7	19.6
3-4 years of High School H. Ec.	87.1	38.1	62.6	67.8	5.2	85.1	17.3
Had H. Ec. in High School	89.2	41.5	65.4	67.4	2.0	86.1	18.7
No H. Ec. in High School	86.7	39.5	63.1	58.7	4.4	82.0	23.3
No College	86.7	40.9	63.8	61.4	2.4	81.2	20.2
No H. Ec. in College	89.4	45.0	67.2	65.6	1.6	85.9	20.3
H. Ec. in College	88.1	37.9	63.0	64.8	1.8	85.0	20.2
H. Ec. in High School & College	88.9	38.9	68.9	68.5	0.4	86.8	18.3
No H. Ec. at all	87.9	40.7	64.3	61.3	3.0	83.0	21.7

\bar{X} = Mean Score of Effective Homemaker

\bar{X}_1 = Mean Score of Ineffective Homemaker

$\frac{\bar{X} + \bar{X}_1}{2}$ = M.P. Mid point of the mean difference of X and X_1

\bar{S} = Mean Score on Self Rating Score

\bar{R} = Mean Score on Rating Scale

scores. (Table III) The least difference between \bar{R} - \bar{S} scores was for the homemakers who had three to four years of high school home economics (17.3%) the greatest difference (33.3%) was for homemakers with no home economics in high school. (Table III) The least variance (0.4) was found in the group that had home economics in high school and college. On the R scale these had a mean score of 86.8, a range of 65-98 and the mid-point was 81.5. Fifteen (75%) of the scores fell above the mid-point and five (25%) below. (Table IV)

The mean S score for this group who had home economics in High School and College was 68.5. The range was 40-90, the mid-point 65. Thirteen (65%) scores fell above, one (5.0%) was around five, six (25%) below. The modal score was 70. The mean difference between S and R was 18.3.

Those homemakers who did not attend college (Table V) had a mean score on the R scale of 81.2, a range of 75-97, and the mid-point was at 86. Two scores, (14.3%) fell on the mid-point, eight (57.2%) below and four (28.6%) above. The mode was 77.

On the S scale these homemakers who did not attend college had a mean score of 61.4. The scores ranged from 40-90 with the mid-point at 75. Two (14.3%) scores fell at this mid-point, three (21.4%) fell above and nine (64.3%) below. The modal score was 50. The mean difference between R and S for this group of homemakers who did not attend college was 20.2.

The number of children seemed to have little effect on the Rating Scale Scores of homemakers in this study; (Tables VI and VII) the range and mean score was the same for both groups. On the self rating the homemakers with 1 or 2 children had a lower mean (63.7) score than did the homemakers with 3 - 5 children (66.5%)(Appendix B)

TABLE IV
HOME MANAGEMENT SCORES BY HOMEMAKERS WHO HAD HOME
ECONOMICS IN HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	6	0	0	9
81 - 90	7	0	2	7
71 - 80	4	0	2	2
61 - 70	2	2	10	2
51 - 60	0	2	4	0
41 - 50	0	3	1	0
31 - 40	0	3	1	0
21 - 30	0	3	0	0
11 - 20	0	3	0	0
1 - 10	0	2	0	0
	<u>N = 19*</u>	<u>N = 18**</u>	<u>N = 20</u>	<u>N = 20</u>
	<u>X̄ = 88.9</u>	<u>X̄ = 38.9</u>	<u>X̄ = 68.5</u>	<u>X̄ = 86.8</u>
	MO = 90	MO = ***	MO = 70	MO = ***
	R = 70-100	R = 10-70	R = 40-90	R = 65-98

*Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

***Multi-modal.

TABLE V
HOME MANAGEMENT RATINGS BY HOMEMAKERS WHO
DID NOT ATTEND COLLEGE

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	4	0	0	1
81 - 90	3	0	1	6
71 - 80	4	0	2	7
61 - 70	0	0	2	0
51 - 60	0	1	3	0
41 - 50	1	4	5	0
31 - 40	0	3	1	0
21 - 30	0	1	0	0
11 - 20	0	2	0	0
1 - 10	0	0	0	0
	<u>N = 12*</u>	<u>N = 11**</u>	<u>N = 14</u>	<u>N = 14</u>
	$\bar{X} = 86.7$	$\bar{X} = 40.9$	$\bar{X} = 61.4$	$\bar{X} = 81.2$
	MO = 80, 100	MO = 50	MO = 50	MO = 77
	R = 50-100	R = 20-60	R = 40-90	R = 75-97

* Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

TABLE VI
HOME MANAGEMENT RATINGS BY HOMEMAKERS
WHO HAVE 1 or 2 CHILDREN

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	17	0	0	18
81 - 90	16	0	2	21
71 - 80	12	0	7	9
61 - 70	4	5	18	4
51 - 60	0	3	11	0
41 - 50	0	13	11	0
31 - 40	0	9	2	0
21 - 30	1	9	0	0
11 - 20	0	5	1	0
1 - 10	0	3	0	0
	$N = 50^*$	$N = 47^{**}$	$N = 52$	$N = 52$
	$\bar{X} = 88.2$	$\bar{X} = 63.7$	$\bar{X} = 63.7$	$\bar{X} = 85.3$
	$MO = 100$	$MO = 50$	$MO = 70$	$MO = 84$
	$R = 30-100$	$R = 10-70$	$R = 20-90$	$R = 65-98$

*Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.
**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

TABLE VII
HOME MANAGEMENT SCORES BY HOMEMAKERS
WHO HAVE 3 - 5 CHILDREN

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	9	0	1	7
81 - 90	5	0	2	6
71 - 80	6	0	4	9
61 - 70	0	1	6	1
51 - 60	0	3	2	0
41 - 50	1	1	7	0
31 - 40	0	5	1	0
21 - 30	0	5	0	0
11 - 20	0	4	0	0
1 - 10	0	1	0	0
	N = 21*	N = 20**	N = 23	N = 23
	\bar{X} = 89.5	\bar{X} = 37.0	\bar{X} = 66.5	\bar{X} = 84.2 .
	MO = 100	MO = 30,40	MO = 70	MO = ***
	R = 50-100	R = 10-70	R = 40-100	R = 65-98

*Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

***Multi modal.

The greatest difference (5.2) was apparent in the scores of homemakers who had three to four years of high school home economics. (Table VIII) The mean score on the S scale was 67.8; the range was 50-80 and the mid-point 65. Six (33.3%) scores fell below the mid-point and twelve (66.7%) were above. The mode was 70 and the mean difference between \bar{S} and \bar{R} was 17.3.

On the R scale the group with three to four years of home economics had a mean score of 85.1. The range was 70-98, and the mid-point was at 84. Seven (38.9%) of the scores fell above the mid-point of the range, eight (44.5%) below, and one (5.6%) was on it.

The homemakers who had one or two years of home economics in high school (Table IX) had a variation of 1.4. The mean score for this group on the R scale was 86.7; the range was 65-98; the mid-point was 81.5. Ten (28.6%) of the scores fell below the mid-point and 25 (71.4%) fell above. The modal score was 84.

On the S scale the group with one or two years of home economics had a mean score of 67.1; the range was 40-100, and the mid-point was at 70. Thirteen (37.2%) of the scores fell on 70, eight (22.8%) fell above, and 14 (40.0%) fell below. The modal score was 70.

The homemakers who had no home economics in high school had a variation of 4.4. (Table X) The mean score for this group on the R scale was 82.0. The range was 66-95; the mid-point was at 80.5. Thirteen (59.1%) of the scores fell above the mid-point and nine (41.0%) below. The modal score was 85.

The mean S score for the group who had no home economics in high school was 58.7. The range was from 20-80; the mid-point was 50. Seven (31.8%) scores fell on fifty, 12 (54.6%) fell above and three (13.6%)

TABLE VIII

HOME MANAGEMENT RATINGS BY HOMEMAKERS WHO HAD 3 or 4 YEARS
OF HOME ECONOMICS IN HIGH SCHOOL

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	3	0	0	6
81 - 90	7	0	0	6
71 - 80	6	0	5	5
61 - 70	1	3	7	1
51 - 60	0	0	3	0
41 - 50	0	4	3	0
31 - 40	0	1	0	0
21 - 30	0	2	0	0
11 - 20	0	4	0	0
1 - 10	0	2	0	0
	$\overline{N} = 17^*$	$\overline{N} = 16^{**}$	$\overline{N} = 18$	$\overline{N} = 18$
	$\overline{X} = 87.1$	$\overline{X} = 38.1$	$\overline{X} = 67.8$	$\overline{X} = 85.1$
	MO = 90	MO = 20,50	MO = 70	MO = 86
	R = 70-100	R = 10-70	R = 50-80	R = 70-98

*Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.
**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

TABLE IX

HOME MANAGEMENT RATINGS BY HOMEMAKERS WHO HAD 1 or 2 YEARS
OF HOME ECONOMICS IN HIGH SCHOOL

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	16	0	1	14
81 - 90	8	0	4	13
71 - 80	5	0	3	6
61 - 70	3	0	13	2
51 - 60	0	6	5	0
41 - 50	1	9	8	0
31 - 40	0	9	1	0
21 - 30	0	6	0	0
11 - 20	0	1	0	0
1 - 10	0	1	0	0
	<u>N = 33*</u>	<u>N = 32**</u>	<u>N = 35</u>	<u>N = 35</u>
	<u>\bar{X} = 90.3</u>	<u>\bar{X} = 43.1</u>	<u>\bar{X} = 67.1</u>	<u>\bar{X} = 86.7</u>
	<u>MO = 100</u>	<u>MO = 50</u>	<u>MO = 70</u>	<u>MO = 84</u>
	<u>R = 50-100</u>	<u>R = 10-60</u>	<u>R = 40-100</u>	<u>R = 65-98</u>

*Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

TABLE X

HOME MANAGEMENT RATINGS BY HOMEMAKERS WHO DID
NOT HAVE HOME ECONOMICS IN HIGH SCHOOL

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	7	1	0	5
81 - 90	6	0	0	8
71 - 80	6	0	3	7
61 - 70	1	3	4	2
51 - 60	0	0	5	0
41 - 50	0	1	7	0
31 - 40	0	4	2	0
21 - 30	1	6	0	0
11 - 20	0	4	1	0
1 - 10	0	1	0	0
	$\bar{N} = 21^*$	$\bar{N} = 20^{**}$	$\bar{N} = 22$	$\bar{N} = 22$
	$\bar{X} = 86.7$	$\bar{X} = 39.5$	$\bar{X} = 58.7$	$\bar{X} = 82.0$
	M0 = 100	M0 = 30	M0 = 50	M0 = 95, 93, 85, 83
	R = 30-100	R = 10-100	R = 20-80	R = 66-95

*Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

fell below.

Homemakers who had home economics in high school (Table XI) had a variation of 2.0. On the R scale the mean score was 86.1. The range was 65-98; the mid-point was 81.5. Seventeen (32.1%) of the scores fell below and 36 (67.9%) above. The modal score was 84.9.

On the S scale the homemakers who had home economics in high school had a mean score of 87.4. The range was 40-100; the mid-point at 70. Twenty (37.7%) fell on 70, thirteen (24.6%) of the scores were above the mid-point and 20 (37.7%) were below. The mode was 70.

The variation for homemakers who had home economics in college (Table XII) was 1.8. Their mean score on the R scale was 85.0. The range was 66-98; the mid-point 82.5. Seventeen scores (62.9%) fell above and ten (37.1%) below. The modal score was 93.

On the S scale the mean score for the college with home economics group was 64.8. The range was 40-90; the mid-point 65. Fifteen (55.6%) of the scores fell above the mid-point and 12 (44.4%) below. The modal score was 70.

There was little difference in the scores on the R scale for homemakers who had attended college but had not taken home economics in college (Table XIII) from the scores of homemakers who had taken home economics in college (Table XII).

The variation for homemakers who had no home economics training (Table XIV) was 3.0. The mean score on the R scale was 83.0. The range was from 65-95. Ten (66.7%) of the scores fell above the mid-point and five (33.4%) fell below. The modal scores were 95 and 85.

On the S scale this non-home economics oriented group had a mean score of 61.3. The scores ranged from 20-100; the mid-point was 60.

TABLE XI
HOME MANAGEMENT RATINGS BY HOMEMAKERS WHO
HAD HOME ECONOMICIS IN HIGH SCHOOL

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	19	0	1	20
81 - 90	15	0	4	19
71 - 80	11	0	8	11
61 - 70	4	3	20	3
51 - 60	0	6	8	0
41 - 50	1	13	11	0
31 - 40	0	10	1	0
21 - 30	0	8	0	0
11 - 20	0	5	0	0
1 - 10	0	3	0	0
	<u>N = 50*</u>	<u>N = 48**</u>	<u>N = 53</u>	<u>N = 53</u>
	<u>X = 89.2</u>	<u>X = 41.5</u>	<u>X = 67.4</u>	<u>X = 86.1</u>
	<u>MO = 100</u>	<u>MO = 50</u>	<u>MO = 70</u>	<u>MO = 84,94</u>
	<u>R = 50-100</u>	<u>R = 10-70</u>	<u>R = 40-100</u>	<u>R = 65-98</u>

*Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

TABLE XII

HOME MANAGEMENT RATINGS BY HOMEMAKERS WHO
HAD HOME ECONOMICS IN COLLEGE

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	8	0	0	11
81 - 90	8	0	1	8
71 - 80	7	0	4	5
61 - 70	3	2	10	3
51 - 60	0	2	6	0
41 - 50	0	4	4	0
31 - 40	0	5	2	0
21 - 30	0	5	0	0
11 - 20	0	4	0	0
1 - 10	0	2	0	0
	<u>N = 26**</u>	<u>N = 24**</u>	<u>N = 27</u>	<u>N = 27</u>
	<u>X̄ = 88.1</u>	<u>X̄ = 37.9</u>	<u>X̄ = 64.8</u>	<u>X̄ = 85.0</u>
	<u>M0 = 90,100</u>	<u>M0 = 30,40</u>	<u>M0 = 70</u>	<u>M0 = 93</u>
	<u>R = 70-100</u>	<u>R = 10-70</u>	<u>R = 40-90</u>	<u>R = 65-98</u>

*Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

TABLE XIII

HOME MANAGEMENT RATINGS BY HOMEMAKERS WHO ATTENDED COLLEGE
BUT HAD NO HOME ECONOMICS IN COLLEGE

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	14	1	1	13
81 - 90	10	0	2	13
71 - 80	6	0	5	6
61 - 70	2	4	12	2
51 - 60	0	3	4	0
41 - 50	0	6	9	0
31 - 40	0	6	0	0
21 - 30	1	8	0	0
11 - 20	0	3	1	0
1 - 10	0	2	0	0
	<u>N = 33*</u>	<u>N = 33**</u>	<u>N = 34</u>	<u>N = 34</u>
	<u>X = 89.4</u>	<u>X = 45.0</u>	<u>X = 65.6</u>	<u>X = 85.9</u>
	<u>MO = 100</u>	<u>MO = 30</u>	<u>MO = 70</u>	<u>MO = ***</u>
	<u>R = 30-100</u>	<u>R = 10-100</u>	<u>R = 20-100</u>	<u>R = 65-98</u>

*Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

***Multi-modal.

TABLE XIV

HOME MANAGEMENT RATINGS BY HOMEMAKERS WHO HAVE HAD
NO FORMAL HOME ECONOMICS TRAINING

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	5	0	1	3
81 - 90	4	0	0	7
71 - 80	3	0	2	4
61 - 70	0	3	3	1
51 - 60	0	0	4	0
41 - 50	0	2	3	0
31 - 40	0	2	1	0
21 - 30	1	4	0	0
11 - 20	0	3	1	0
1 - 10	0	0	0	0
	$\bar{N} = 14^*$	$\bar{N} = 14^{**}$	$\bar{N} = 15$	$\bar{N} = 15$
	$\bar{X} = 87.9$	$\bar{X} = 40.7$	$\bar{X} = 61.3$	$\bar{X} = 83.0$
	MO = 100	MO = 30.0	MO = 60.0	MO = 95.85
	R = 30-100	R = 20-70	R = 20-100	R = 65-95

*Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.
**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

Ten (66.7%) fell above the mid-point and five below (33.3%).

For the entire sample, (Table III and Table XV) the variation was 0.4 which verifies the assumption that the mental pictures homemakers have of themselves as managers are related to their evaluation of other homemakers with whom they have had contact.

Because only seven of the homemakers interviewed had had home management as a course in college, data from these homemakers was not analyzed separately. The seven homemakers were a part of the college-home economics educated group.

Since there is much in current literature about the homemaking role of women, the interviewer asked about satisfactions, likes, and dislikes of the homemakers in this study. Each homemaker was asked to name her one most liked and one least liked homemaking task. Ironing was reported most often as the least liked activity (36%) and cooking (33.3%) was the most liked. Cleaning was in second place (20%) for least liked and fifth (4.0%) for most liked activity. Sewing ranked second as most liked. (32.0%) (Table XVI)

Another question that was asked by the interviewer to help identify the homemakers in her study related to the careers of husbands. Fifty-two (69.3%) of the husbands were in professional type occupations, 23 (30.7%) were in non-professional categories. (Table XVII) The professional group consisted of physicians, lawyers, clergymen and teachers. The non-professional group was made up of persons in business, in managerial positions and in skilled trades such as carpentry and brick laying.

TABLE XV

HOME MANAGEMENT SCORES BY 75 HOMEMAKERS

Range of Scores	Effective Homemanager	Ineffective Homemanager	Self Rating Score	Rating Scale Score
91 - 100	26	1	1	25
81 - 90	21	0	4	27
71 - 80	17	0	11	18
61 - 70	5	6	24	25
51 - 60	0	6	13	20
41 - 50	1	14	18	20
31 - 40	0	14	3	20
21 - 30	1	14	0	20
11 - 20	0	9	1	20
1 - 10	0	4	0	20
	<u>N = 71*</u>	<u>N = 68**</u>	<u>N = 75</u>	<u>N = 75</u>
	$\bar{X} = 88.5$	$\bar{X} = 39.6$	$\bar{X} = 64.5$	$\bar{X} = 84.9$
	MO = 100	MO = 30, 40, 50	MO = 70	MO = 93
	R = 30-100	R = 10-100	R = 20-100	R = 65-98

*Four (5.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

**Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers failed to respond.

TABLE XVI

MOST AND LEAST LIKED TASKS REPORTED BY HOMEMAKERS

Most Liked Tasks*	No. times Mentioned	%	Least Liked Tasks*	No. times Mentioned	%
Cooking	25	33.3	Ironing	27	36.0
Sewing	24	32.0	Cleaning	15	20.0
Child rearing	7	9.3	Dusting	5	6.7
Decorating	6	8.0	Cooking	5	6.7
Cleaning	3	4.0	Doing dishes	5	6.7
Family group activities	3	4.0	Cleaning the range	2	2.7
Baking	1	1.3	Washing wood work	2	2.7
Entertaining	1	1.3	Cleaning closets	1	1.3
Washing clothes	1	1.3	Sewing	1	1.3
Canning fruit and vegetables	1	1.3	Planning meals	1	1.3
Refinishing furniture	1	1.3	Sweeping	1	1.3
			Defrosting	1	1.3
			Making beds	1	1.3
			Daily routine tasks	1	1.3
			Folding clothes	1	1.3
			"Eternal picking up"	1	1.3
			Shopping for groceries	1	1.3

*Two (2) homemakers (2.66%) reported no favorite task.

*Four (4) homemakers (5.33%) reported they had no least liked task.

TABLE XVII
DESCRIPTION OF HOMEMAKER

Characteristics	#	%
A. Number of Homemakers Having Children Under Thirteen:		
1. One child	19	25.3
2. Two children	33	44.0
3. Three children	18	24.0
4. Four children	4	5.3
5. Five children	1	1.3
B. Number of Homemakers Who Had Home Economics in High School:		
0. None	22	29.3
1. One year	17	22.7
2. Two years	18	24.0
3. Three years	11	14.7
4. Four years	7	9.3
C. Number of Homemakers Who Did Not Have Home Economics in High School:	22	29.3
D. Number of Homemakers Who Attended College But Did Not Have Home Economics in College:	34	45.3
E. Number of Homemakers Who Had Home Economics in College:	27	36.0
F. Number of Homemakers Who Had Home Management in College:	7	9.3
G. Number of Homemakers Who Did Not Attend College:	14	18.7
H. Number of Homemakers Having Home Economics in High School and College:	20	26.6
I. Number of Homemakers Who Have Had no Formal Training in Home Economics:	15	20.0
J. Number of Homemakers Who Gain Satisfaction From Being a Homemaker:	72	96.0
K. Career of Homemakers Husband:		
1. Professional	52	69.3
2. Non-professional	23	30.7

CHAPTER V

RECOMMENDATIONS

The homemakers in this study said they gained satisfaction from being homemakers. However, since few of these women rated themselves in the upper one-third on the self-rating scale, they must believe they do not meet their managerial goals. These goals were revealed by each homemaker interviewed through her description of a friend who manages effectively. Planning, creativity, and efficiency were related to an awareness of values and goals, and community participation. The concept of an effective manager, as she was described by the group, is one who is efficient, energetic, creative and who does planning. She is aware of values and goals and realizes her responsibility to the community in which she lives.

The image of an effective home manager for this group is not characterized by manipulative skills. This finding differs from that of Rettig (41) who found that the most frequent references to elements of management by her lay-public concerned resources and manipulative skills. She also found few references to values and goals.

The negative aspects of effective home management mentioned by the respondents substantiated the conclusion of Dickens (11) that ineffective home managers were difficult to define. Bratton (6) has recommended that more research be done into what constitutes "good" management. This research might also provide a means of evaluating ineffective management.

The technique used in this study to secure the individual's self

evaluation seems worthy of further use. Research among persons who had no home economics background would be valuable because it would remove some of the bias that was apparent in this study. The analysis of data from the present study showed that those women who had home economics training were able to estimate their managerial ability more accurately than those who had no training. This ability seems to point to some success in home economics teaching.

It is believed that an instrument that allowed more elaborate answers might give a truer picture of the respondents' managerial skill. The one used in this study forced a choice between yes or no.

The number of homemakers who mentioned energy as an important characteristic of an effective home manager implied an awareness of fatigue as a limiting factor to managerial ability. In view of the responses questions pertaining to fatigue should be included in any further study.

The study of Wittler (47) showed a high percentage of community participation by Iowa homemakers (85.5%). The present study revealed the same is true of these homemakers (86.7%).

Forty percent of her homemakers reported planning regularly; 61.3% of the homemakers in the present study reported they had a work plan. (Table XVIII) Reports of the responses of homemakers to individual items on the rating scale are included in Tables XIX through XXIII, Appendix B.

The work or task liked least by the homemakers was ironing, the one liked most was cooking. (Table XVI) Maloch (33) found the same to be true with the use of one of her instruments.

Although conclusions drawn from this study may be applied only to this sample it is hoped that information gained from it will arouse interest in doing further research concerned with the opinions of homemakers

TABLE XVIII
RESPONSES TO RATING SCALE BY 75 HOMEMAKERS

Questions	Yes	%	No	%
A. Are goals and purposes important for yourself and your family?				
1. Do you have any toward which you are working?	68	90.7	7	9.3
2. Are they more concerned with people than with things?	59*	78.7	9**	12.0
B. How do you make decisions?				
1. Do you find several alternatives when making important decisions?	67	89.3	8	10.7
2. Do you take time to weigh alternatives?	67**	89.3	5**	6.7
C. How do you rate on time planning?				
1. Do you have a work plan?	46	61.3	29	38.7
2. Do you plan to get enough rest and sleep to be reasonably free of fatigue?	55	73.3	20	26.7
3. Do you plan leisure time activities for yourself and with your family?	63	84.0	12	16.0
D. How do you rate on money planning?				
1. Do you plan how you will use current income?	59	78.7	16	21.3
2. Do you plan for saving?	59	78.7	16	21.3
3. Are plans 1 and 2 made by and agreed to by the family?	67	89.3	8	10.7
4. Do you know how to find the cost of credit?	55	73.3	20	26.7
5. Do you keep financial records?	73	97.3	2	2.7

TABLE XVIII (continued)

Questions	Yes	%	No	%
E. Do you have definite long-term plans for:				
1. Education of children?				
a. Any plans?	63	84.0	12	16.0
b. Made by all concerned including children?	46***	61.3	19***	25.3
2. Checking on health of family?				
a. Regular physical examinations?	65	86.7	10	13.3
b. Regular dental examinations?	66	88.0	9	12.0
3. Improved financial status?				
a. Home ownership?	65	86.7	10	13.3
b. Investments?	52	69.3	23	30.7
c. Insurance?	74	98.7	1	1.3
4. Retirement?				
a. Annuities?	53****	70.7	21****	28.0
b. Others?	72****	96.0	2****	2.7
5. Developing family spiritually?				
a. Church attendance?	72	96.0	3	4.0
b. Other?	75	100.00	0	0.0
6. Developing family socially?				
a. Within family group?	68	90.7	7	9.3
b. Sharing family life with others?	69	92.0	6	8.0
c. Community service?	65	86.7	10	13.3

TABLE XVIII (continued)

Questions	Yes	%	No	%
F. Do you check your plans while carrying them out?				
1. Have you set up methods for checking progress of plans?				
a. Time plans?	55	73.3	20	26.7
b. Financial plans?	66	88.0	9	12.0
c. Other plans?	63	84.0	12	16.0
2. Do you make conscious changes in light of:				
a. Immediate goals?	69	92.0	6	8.0
b. Resources still available?	69	92.0	6	8.0
c. Long term goals?	64	85.3	11	14.7
G. How well do you control plans for materials and goods in the household?				
1. Do you purchase goods carefully?				
a. Food?	54	72.0	21	28.0
b. Equipment?	73	97.3	2	2.7
c. Furniture?	71	94.7	4	5.3
d. Clothing?	66	88.0	9	12.0
2. Do you use materials carefully after you have them?				
a. Food?	56	74.7	19	25.3
b. Equipment?	67	89.3	8	10.7
c. Furniture?	70	93.3	5	6.7
d. Clothing?	69	92.0	6	8.0

TABLE XVIII (continued)

Questions	Yes	%	No	%
H. Do you evaluate your plans after they are finished?				
1. Do they usually work out?				
a. Time plans?	46	61.3	29	38.7
b. Financial plans?	65	86.7	10	13.3
c. Other plans?	65	86.7	10	13.3
2. Do you try to understand why plans that do not work out were unsuccessful?	64	85.3	11	14.7

*Seven (9.3%) of the 75 homemakers did not respond.

**Three (4.0%) of the 75 homemakers did not respond.

***10 (13.3%) of the 75 homemakers did not respond.

****One (1.3%) of the 75 homemakers did not respond.

as they relate to home management.

From this study it is possible to conclude that the homemakers in this community manage more effectively than they believe; the opinions they had concerning effective and ineffective home management are not dominated by ideas of budgets, plans, cooking or sewing although these elements were present.

It seems that the greatest service home management teaching can do for these homemakers is to project an awareness of their capabilities that will enable them to gain confidence and satisfaction from realizing they are effective managers of their homes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, J. Stacy. Interviewing Procedures. A Manual for Survey Interviews. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press, 1958.
2. Baldwin, Keturah E. The AHEA Saga. Washington, D. C.: American Home Economics Association, 1949.
3. Bartley, S. Howard, and Eloise Chute. Fatigue and Impairment in Man. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1947, pp. 5-56.
4. Bayton, James A. Psychological Research in Home Management Problems. Washington, D. C.: Federal Extension Service, U.S.D.A., 1960.
5. Boulding, Kenneth E. The Image. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 1956.
6. _____. Conceptual Frameworks: Process of Home Management. Washington, D. C.: American Home Economics Association, 1964.
7. _____. Conference on Teaching Home Management. Washington, D. C.: American Home Economics Association, 1962.
8. Cushman, Ella M. Management in Homes. New York: Macmillan Co., 1945.
9. Davis, D. Russell. "Satiation and Frustration as Determinants of Fatigue." Fatigue. Ed. W. F. Floyd and A. T. Welford. London: H. K. Lewis & Co., Inc., 1953. pp. 179-182.
10. Desai, Jyoti Ambelai. Development of an Instrument to Measure Images of Home Management. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University of Science and Technology, 1962.
11. Dickens, Dorothy. Effects of Good Household Management in Family Living. Bulletin 380. Mississippi Agricultural Experiment Station, May, 1943.
12. Everett, Esther, and Irma H. Gross. A Home Management Yardstick, A device for Measuring Achievement in Home Management. Station Folder 7. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, January, 1947.
13. Ferber, Robert. "Research on Household Behavior." The American Economic Review, LII (March, 1962), p. 19.

14. Festinger, Leon. "Wish, Expectation and Group Standards as Factors Influencing Level of Aspiration." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology. XXXVII (1942), pp. 184-200.
15. Fisher, Katherine A. "Managing the Home." Good Housekeeping LXXXVIII (June, 1929), pp. 90-91 and 184.
16. Friedan, Betty. The Feminine Mystique. New York: Dell, 1964.
17. Gilbreth, Lillian. The Homemaker and Her Job. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1927.
18. Gilbreth, Lillian M., Orpha Mae Thomas, and Eleanor Clymer. Management in The Home. New York: Dodd, Mead and Co., 1955.
19. Grady, Ethyl R. "Management and Mental Health." Journal of Home Economics, LIV (April, 1962), p. 267.
20. Gross, Irma H. "Measuring Home Management." Circular Bulletin 211. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, (March, 1958).
21. Gross, Irma H. "Research in Home Management." Journal of Home Economics, LI (April, 1959), pp. 260-263.
22. Gross, Irma H. and Elizabeth W. Crandall. Management For Modern Families. 2nd. Ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
23. Gross, Irma H., A. Aiken, T. Tor dt and E. Zweimer and W. Baten. A Study of Three Methods of Research in Home Management. Technical Bulletin 171, East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station, 1940.
24. Guernsey, John B. "Scientific Management in the Home." The Outlook, CXII (April 13, 1912), pp. 821-25.
25. Harp, Harry and Denis F. Dunham, "Comparative Costs to Consumers of Convenience Foods and Home-Prepared Foods." Washington, D. C.: Economic Research Service, United States Department of Agriculture, 1963.
26. Hilgard, Ernest R. "The Human Dimension in Teaching." The College and University Bulletin, XVII (March 15, 1965), pp. 1-3.
27. Holmes, Emma G. Job-Related Expenditures and Management Practices of Gainfully Employed Wives in Four Georgia Cities. Washington, D. C.: United States Department of Agriculture Home Economics Research Report No. 15, (February, 1962).
28. _____. Home Economics, New Directions: A Statement of Philosophy and Objectives. Washington, D. C.: The American Home Economics Association, (June 1959).

29. Johnson, Glenn L. Managerial Concepts for Agriculturalists. Station Bulletin 619. Lexington, Kentucky: Kentucky Agricultural Experiment Station. (July 1954)
30. Jourard, Sidney M. Personal Adjustment. 2nd Ed. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1963.
31. Judy, Helen Elizabeth (Bond). Trends and Needs in Home Management. Contribution to Education No. 365, New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1929.
32. Kahl, Joseph A. The American Class Structure. New York: Rinehart & Co., Inc., 1957, pp. 184-217.
33. Maloch, Francille. Properties and Characteristics of Most and Least Liked Household Tasks. Memoir 384. Ithaca New York: Agricultural Experiment Station, Cornell University College of Home Economics, (July 1963).
34. McKee, William W. Values in Home Management. Prodeedings of a Conference on Values and Decision-making in Home Management. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State University, 1955.
35. Moore, Wilbert E. Social Change. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc., 1963.
36. Nickell, Paulena and Jean M. Dorsey. Management in Family Living. 2nd. Ed. New York: John Wiley, 1950.
37. Pattison, Mrs. Frank A. "Scientific Management in Homemaking." American Academy of Political and Social Sciences, LVIII (July, 1913), pp. 96-100.
38. Perkins, N., W. Beyer and L. Bane. A Survey of Some Fatigue Problems of Rural Homemakers. Bulletin 514. Urbana, Illinois: Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Illinois, (1945).
39. Richards, Ellen H. The Cost of Living as Modified by Sanitary Science. 3rd. Ed. New York: John Wiley, 1899.
40. Riebel, L. Jeanne. "Philosophy of Management." Journal of Home Economics, LII (January, 1960), p. 16.
41. Rettig, Kathryn Dalbey. Images of Home Economics Held by Relevant Iowa Publics. Ames, Iowa: Unpublished Master's thesis, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, 1963.
42. Spreigel, W. R. and Clark Meyers. The Writings of the Gilbreths. Homewood, Illinois: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1953, pp. 69-212.
43. _____. Syllabus of Home Economics. Baltimore, Maryland: American Home Economics Association, 1913.

44. Van Bortel, Dorothy Greey, and Irma H. Gross. A Comparison of Home Management in Two Socio-Economic Groups. Technical Bulletin 240. East Lansing, Michigan: Michigan State College Agricultural Experiment Station, (April, 1954).
45. Warner, Wilma. "Home Management at Lake Placid." Journal of Home Economics, ILVI (December, 1954), pp. 716-718.
46. Warren, Jean. Use of Time in its Relation to Home Management. Bulletin 734. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, 1940.
47. Wittler, Waneta A. Development of a Method of Identifying Home Management Problems of Farm Families. Ames, Iowa: Unpublished Master's thesis, Iowa State University of Science and Technology, 1952.

A P P E N D I X A

Dear _____ :

Presently, as a master degree candidate, I am engaged in a study to determine some of the opinions of Stillwater homemakers concerning Home Management.

It is believed that the opinions of homemakers who have had some contacts with home economists will be more relevant to this study than will the opinions of homemakers who have had no association with graduate home economists. Would you please help me to secure a relevant sample by listing the names, addresses, and telephone numbers of four homemakers with whom you have had contact? A random sampling technique was used to select your name and others from a list of graduate home economists who live in Stillwater.

It is important that the homemakers whom you list meet these criteria: (1) full time homemakers, (2) married, living with husband, (3) resides in Stillwater, (4) at least one child under thirteen years of age.

When I receive your list of four names I will telephone the homemakers and arrange for interviews. The data needed is impersonal and all information will be kept confidential. (In a pretest situation these interviews took only thirty minutes or less.)

It is important that I complete this portion of my study by the end of this semester so I would appreciate having your list by May 3. This enclosed form and addressed envelope are for your convenience.

Thank you for your kind help.

Sincerely,

Request Approved

Major Advisor

Graduate Student

I have had some contact with the following Stillwater homemakers.

Name	Address	Telephone No.
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		

Signed _____

Return to:

INTRODUCTION:

I am sure that you are aware of recent articles in women's magazines dealing with the role of the American homemaker. This study is an attempt to understand how the women of Stillwater feel about being home managers.

PART I.

- A. 1. Can you think of a friend who is what you would call an effective manager? What is she like?
2. Could you list three or four things that your friend does that seem to help her manage so well?

+

-

Plans	
Budgets	
Schedules	
Family helps	
Other	

- B. 1. Can you think of another friend who doesn't manage well? What is she like?
2. Can you list two or three things that this friend does that prevent her from managing well?

+

-

1. _____	_____
2. _____	_____
3. _____	_____

PART II.

On a scale from one to ten, with ten being high, where would you rate friend A? Where would you rate friend B? Where would you rate yourself?

1. _____	3. _____	5. _____	7. _____	9. _____
2. _____	4. _____	6. _____	8. _____	10. _____

PART III.

All homemaking activities are important; however it is recognized that the degree of importance attached to an activity varies with the individuals involved. This rating scale is an attempt to determine which activities are important to you.

	Yes	No
A. Are goals and purposes important for yourself and your family?		
1. Do you have any toward which you are working?		
2. Are they more concerned with people than with things?		
B. How do you make decisions?		
1. Do you find several alternatives when making important decisions?		
2. Do you take time to weigh alternatives?		
C. How do you rate on time Planning?		
1. Do you have a work plan?		
2. Do you plan to get enough rest and sleep to be reasonably free of fatigue?		
3. Do you plan leisure time activities for yourself and with your family?		
D. How do you rate on money planning?		
1. Do you plan how you will use current income?		
2. Do you plan for saving?		
3. Are plans 1 and 2 made by and agreed to by the family?		
4. Do you know how to find the cost of credit?		
5. Do you keep financial records?		
E. Do you have definite long-term plans for:		
1. Education of children.		
a. Any plans?		
b. Made by all concerned including children?		
2. Checking on health of family?		
a. Regular physical examination?		
b. Regular dental examination?		

	Yes	No
3. Improved financial status?		
a. Home ownership?		
b. Investments?		
c. Insurance?		
4. Retirement?		
a. Annuities?		
b. Others?		
5. Developing family spiritually?		
a. Church attendance?		
b. Other?		
6. Developing family socially?		
a. Within family group?		
b. Sharing family life with others?		
c. Community service?		
F. Do you check your plans while carrying them out?		
1. Have you set up methods for checking progress of plans?		
a. Time plans?		
b. Financial plans?		
c. Other plans?		
2. Do you make conscious changes in light of:		
a. Immediate goals?		
b. Resources still available?		
c. Long term goals?		
G. How well do you control plans for material and goods in the household?		
1. Do you purchase goods carefully?		
a. Food?		
b. Equipment?		
c. Furniture?		
d. Clothing?		
2. Do you use materials carefully after you have them?		
a. Food?		
b. Equipment?		
c. Furniture?		
d. Clothing?		
H. Do you evaluate your plans after they are finished?		
1. Do they usually work out?		
a. Time plans?		
b. Financial plans?		
c. Other plans?		

2. Do you try to understand why plans that do not work out were unsuccessful?

Yes	No

PART IV

Although no names are used in this study it is important to know a little about homemakers who have been kind enough to help with this investigation. The answers to the following questions will supply the personal data needed

1. How many children under thirteen years of age have you? _____
2. What is the range of ages of your children? _____
3. Did you have any home economics courses in high school? _____
4. If the answer to # 3 is Yes how many years of Home Economics or Homemaking did you take? _____
5. Did you attend college? _____
6. Did you have any home economics courses in college? _____
7. If the answer to # 6 is Yes was Home Management taken? _____
8. Do you gain satisfaction from being a homemaker? _____
9. What is your favorite homemaking activity? _____
10. What homemaking activity do you like least? _____
11. What is your husband's occupation? _____

From: Gross, Irma H. and Elizabeth Walbert Crandall Management For Modern Families, 2nd Ed., New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Permission to use granted by authors and publisher.

Dear Miss _____.

The first portion of my study for my M. S. degree deals with the positive and negative elements of management that are listed by homemakers in response to open end statements A and B of my interview form. I am enclosing a copy of the form.

It was necessary to reduce the responses received to a manageable number so they were placed in ten categories. I am assuming that any one individual's judgement concerning what a respondent meant by his answer would be biased; therefore, I will need the help of three staff members to serve as a jury to determine whether or not the respondents items have been placed in suitable categories. Agreement between two of the jury on the placement of an item will be accepted.

I am hoping that you will be willing to serve on this jury. I am trying to finish this entire study by July 15th so I will appreciate having your completed form as soon as possible.

Thank you so much for your help.

Sincerely,

DIRECTIONS

Please note that both positive and negative responses are placed in the same column. It is believed that either is an indication of the respondent's opinion concerning the homemaker's role as home manager.

1. Please place your initials in the upper right hand corner of each sheet.
2. If you agree with the placement of the statement please check the "agree" column.
3. If you disagree with the placement of the item please check the "disagree" column and indicate in the column provided for this purpose your preferred placement.

I will be glad to answer any questions you might have if you will call me at FR2-9287.

A P P E N D I X B

STATEMENTS FROM PART I, SECTIONS B-1 AND B-2
OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Doesn't manage time.

House untidy.

Likes to read and lets house go.

Not interested in home and housekeeping.

Never on time.

Doesn't keep work up.

Seems to spend all of time on a single interest.

Lovable.

Generous with time. Never refuses to take part in children's
activities.

Always late.

Manages time poorly.

House is tidy.

Has no respect for self.

No interest in own appearance. Children first.

Wastes time.

No goals.

Unaware of inefficiency.

Not interested in children's activities.

Whole family is always late.

Doesn't manage time.

Disorganized.

House is cluttered.

Disorganized.

Scatter-brained.

Reads a lot.

Puts wrong things first.

Always late.

Children and the house are unkept.

Nervous.

Upsets easily.

Worrier.

Impatient.

Doesn't stick to budget.

Doesn't use time wisely.

Doesn't plan.

Unable to cope with being a homemaker.

Doesn't care about home.

House not clean.

Untidy personally.

Constant crisis in daily living.

Self-centered, puts own interest first.

Complains of illness constantly.

Takes on too many activities.

Is nervous and upset with family.

Frustrated.

Outgoing.

Spends money unwisely.

Easy going and affable.

Shows fatigue.

Children aren't trained to help.

Careless in personal appearance.

Poor housekeeper.

Children look neglected.

House is cluttered.

Does not care about home.

Not likeable.

Poor housekeeper, messy.

House is messy.

Doesn't allow time to do necessary work.

Not interested in home making.

Teaches art.

Is a good mother.

Lots of outside activities.

Poorly organized.

Artistic, but not interested in general homemaking.

House is cluttered.

Doesn't like to keep house.

Puts own likes first.

House is untidy.

Carefree.

Relaxed.

Doesn't care about her home.

Does what she want to do.

House is untidy.

Doesn't like to cook, uses quick foods.

Works out of the home.

Stays calm.

Her meals are unplanned.

Ineffective as a mother.

Doesn't like to stay home.

Doesn't like house work.

Home is messy.

Lacks foresight.

Lacks plans.

Buys impulsively.

Unskilled.

Unprepared.

Naive.

Unrealistic.

Materialistic.

Complains.

Procrastinates.

Little details worry her.

Children cause undue worry.

Unable to make decisions.

Thoughtful.

Cooks well.

Unhappy.

Self-centered.

Doesn't enjoy homemaking.

Enjoys other things more than homemaking.

Unhappy.

Too organized.
Discontented.
Too rigid.
Too clean.
Excitable.
Disorganized.
Immature.
Seems to be afraid of new tasks.
Manages her time poorly.
Procrastinates.
Fusses over small details.
Doesn't get up early.
Watches movies too late.
Koffe Klatches.
Poor shopper.
Doesn't know the value of money.
Doesn't carry through on instructions to children.
Good hearted.
Tries to keep home, but would rather visit.
Doesn't schedule time.
Spends too much time visiting.
Happy.
Children are extremely happy.
Takes part in all children's activities.
House is a wreck.
Easily distracted.
Unable to stick with one task.

Unable to put first things first.

Values non-flexible.

Doesn't like to keep home.

Disinterested.

Capable.

Neglects children.

Attempts to take part in too many activities and over extends
her physical energy.

Happy.

Puts children first.

Terrible house keeper-house not clean.

No schedules.

Sews.

Unable to put first things first.

Plans to do too many things.

Pushes self.

Children don't help.

Fun.

Extrovert.

Not organized.

Wastes time.

Always late.

Not relaxed.

Easily upset.

Too much of a perfectionist.

Too scheduled.

Upset by interruptions.

Doesn't want to keep home.

Worrier.

Creates crises out of small things.

Spends too much time making decisions.

Unable to concentrate on single thing.

Tired.

Doesn't like house work.

Poor at managing money.

Children undisciplined.

Loyal, sincere, happy, relaxed.

Puts children first.

Poor housekeeper.

Lazy and fat.

Works out of the home.

Doesn't like to clean.

House is very messy.

Likes to cook, but not clean.

Rather be out with people.

Seems to lack foresight.

Unorganized.

Doesn't seek knowledge before attempting new task.

Does only what she likes to do.

Hires the cleaning done.

Good mother.

Entertains well.

Disinterested.

Indifferent, unrealistic, defeatist.

Nonparticipant.
Doesn't manage the children well.
House dirty.
Doesn't keep house well.
Friendly and relaxed.
Personally well groomed.
Doesn't like house work.
Is a sloppy housekeeper, house is dirty.
Cannot adjust to children.
Has no routine in the home.
Thinks, rather than acts.
House is not clean.
Lives day to day.
Happy, doesn't worry.
Has no plans.
Always late.
A disorganized tense personality.
Has no plans.
Impulsive buyer.
Is a worrier.
Lives vicariously.
Over emphasis on details.
Unable to make decisions.
Can't keep work done.
Spends too much time planning.
Disorganized.
Starts too many things at a time.

Over critical.

Has a wealth of training and money, but seems uncertain.

Children are unhappy.

Unreliable.

Perfectionist.

Feels other things are more important than cleaning.

Relaxed.

A good hostess.

Home is untidy.

Seems to be unhappy, on the defensive.

Doesn't discipline children.

Buy what they want, impulse buyers.

Borrow constantly.

Poor planners.

Unable to take initiative.

Eats out, doesn't like to cook.

Perfectionist.

Relies heavily upon husband.

Puts own interests first.

Active in church.

Neglects cleanliness of children.

Unable to accept role as mother and wife.

House is mess.

Baby is unkept and dirty.

Eat out of pans in which food is cooked.

Puts people above things.

Lovable, does much for others.

Never caught up at home.
Spends much time on children.
Seems not to accept role as wife and mother.
Immature.
Never plans.
Can't manage money.
Doesn't like housekeeping.
Easy going, does for others before herself.
Fails to put first things first.
Can't say no to any request.
Tries to do more than she can do.
Poor at managing children.
Good housekeeper.
Excitable-eternal state of crisis.
Attempts too many things.
Other things are more important than housework.
Poor housekeeper.
Lacks self discipline.
Emotionally immature.
Better to others than to family.
Rebellious against the feminine role.
Does too much outside the home.
Too much responsibility upon children without guidance.
Seems to create own problems.
Worrier.
Too efficient.
Unable to manage interpersonal relations in family.

Emotional.

Cheerful, good disposition.

Loses control of home situation.

Gives children much attention.

Insecure, immature, indecisive.

No plans.

Leaves decisions to husband.

Uninterested in home work.

Seems unable to concentrate on more than one thing at a time.

Doesn't allot time properly.

Home disorderly.

Dislikes housework.

Takes part in community activity.

House badly kept.

House not clean.

Spends unwisely.

Works all of the time, not lazy.

Does lots for others.

Excellent mother.

Poor housekeeper.

Money seems ill managed.

Husband and children not cooperative.

House is immaculate.

Seems unable to give of herself.

Children regimented.

Children seem unhappy.

Too routinized.

Too many outside interests.

No time left for family.

Lovable.

ANSWERS TO PART I, SECTIONS A-1 and A-2
OF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

These answers are listed in the order in which they were stated during the interview situation.

Helpful.

Good all around worker.

Teaches Sunday School.

Easy going.

Good mother.

Children mind.

Has outside activities.

Husband seems happy.

Budgets the money.

Is a careful buyer.

Puts first things first.

Is very active.

Does for self, children and friends.

Does everything graciously.

Is relaxed.

The family helps.

The family is happy.

Keeps a pleasant, cheerful atmosphere in the family.

Home doesn't absorb all her time, does much churchwork.

Is pleasant and fun.

Reads.

Spends money to buy time, i.e., hires ironing done.
Is efficient.
Is time and motion conscious.
Is young, friendly, outgoing.
Teaches piano.
Schedules her work.
Good housekeeper.
Good mother.
Keeps up her work.
Organizes her storage well.
Active socially.
Entertains a lot.
Has children.
Golfs and plays bridge.
Hires help.
Plans so things are always in place
Keeps things in order.
Is efficient.
Is a perfectionist.
Plans for the use of her time.
Schedules her work.
Shops wisely.
Takes advantage of sales.
Concentrates on family needs.
Entertains well.
Schedules her work.
Is aware of good work techniques.

Manages her children well.

Is flexible.

Works rapidly.

Is always prepared for emergencies.

Always willing to help others.

Is a thoughtful person.

Plans her day.

Skilled at homemaking tasks.

Is alert to new developments.

Is efficient in things you can see.

Golfs and bowls.

Not active in community affairs.

Has no college education, but reads a lot.

Is time and motion conscious.

Helps other people.

Is efficient.

Keeps house in order.

Schedules her work

Trains the family to help.

Cooks in large quantities.

Is methodical.

Active in the church and community.

Keeps up with new things.

Is a good mother.

Plans her work.

Budgets money.

Newly wed, in late 30's.

Goes to school.

Entertains well.

House is nice and clean.

Is a home economics graduate.

Plans.

Her family helps.

Is a good cook.

Has five children.

Is a Veterinarian's wife.

Taught charm course and English.

Is a lovely hostess.

Active in church and community activities.

Plans her work.

Keeps self and children well groomed.

Spends money to save time.

Hires some work done.

Has a warm personality.

Active in church.

Rises very early.

Schedules her work.

Family helps.

Keeps house clean.

Keeps work up to date.

Entertains well.

Gives much attention to children.

Takes time for self.

Has time for community activities and church work.

Plans ahead.

Puts husband first.

Uses equipment well.

Has children.

Very efficient.

Good mother.

Takes part in community affairs, such as PTA and church.

Idea of citizenship is strong.

Entertains well.

Provides a culturally rich home.

Schedules work.

Hires help.

Is creative.

Has a high energy level.

Paints and repairs the house.

Budgets.

Sews beautifully.

Observant of time and labor saving techniques.

Uses equipment well.

Energetic.

Friendly.

Good hostess.

High energy level.

Enthusiasm.

Gardens and does flower arrangements.

Loves music.

Plans.

Has a work schedule.

Plans work centers.

Excellent cook.

Able to do everything with ease.

Able to determine what comes first.

Has time for extra activities, never seems to need to say no.

Plans.

Schedules.

Spends money to buy time.

Has children.

Takes things in her stride, stays calm.

Active in the community.

Has a high energy level.

Interested in other people.

Plans so she retains control of the family situation.

Objective in family relations.

Schedules time.

Evaluates a situation to determine action.

Keeps work caught up.

Active outside the home in scouts and church.

Effective mother.

Stays calm.

Scheduled her work.

Organized.

Has a happy attitude.

Enjoys the role of homemaker.

Entertains.

Active in the community.

Children well groomed.

Takes an active part in the children's activities.

Plans.

Budgets her time.

Schedules her work.

Disciplines herself.

Always neat.

Keeps the children well.

Likes to clean, but not cook.

Three children.

Active in church work and in scouting.

Happy.

Not too meticulous, "Clean house nice, but not most important."

Family helps.

Uses appliances well.

Calm.

Has a cooperative family.

Active in church.

Schedules her work.

Family helps.

Spends money to buy time.

Likeable.

Intense and excitable at times.

Plans.

Schedules work.

Thinks ahead.

Markets wisely.

Has children.

Husband travels.

Looks nice, always.

High energy level.

Works with church and youth groups.

House is always tidy.

Many family activities in home.

Budgets her time.

Family helps.

Sews.

Outgoing, friendly.

Neat.

Organized.

Family helps.

Is a good housekeeper.

Takes part in community activities.

Sews.

Well organized.

Spends time with children.

Outgoing.

Plans for time.

Schedules work.

Takes part in community activities.

Active in community work.

Budgets time.

Family helps.

Sews.

Entertains.

Works in evening hours.

Particular.

Relaxed.

Organized.

Schedules work.

Entertains.

Good housekeeper.

Manages to give graciously on an extremely small income.

Entertains.

Generous.

Shares.

Plans.

Budgets.

Sews.

Shops for specials.

Friendly, attractive, contented, secure, sincere.

Enjoys managing home.

Keeps informed, seeks information.

Active in church.

Not a social climber.

Gardens.

Sews.

Entertains.

Has time to go, lots of community activities.

Family helps with house work.

Works rapidly.

Friendly.

Outgoing.

Devoted to family.

Family helps with housework.

Plans for use of time.

Takes part in Community affairs.

Good cook.

Gardens.

Businesslike.

Unemotional.

Capable.

Does everything well.

Active.

Has outside activities.

Seems to need little sleep.

Budgets time.

Schedules work.

Sews.

Marvelous cook and housekeeper.

Uses cleaning lady once a week.

Outgoing.

Plans to shop monthly at discount stores for drug items.

Plans work.

Makes menus.

Manages the little extras.

Shops specials.

Uses money wisely.

Sweet, uncomplaining, pleasant, calm.

Many involvements in community affairs.

Time for friends.

People bring troubles and problems to her.

Schedules her work.

Family helps with work.

Has relaxed attitude.

Puts first things first.

Willing.

Helpful.

Always does for other people.

Lives alone.

Plans.

Good manager of resources.

Does own work.

Has time to paint.

Active in church work.

Has three children.

Family helps.

Sews.

House always tidy.

Perfectionist.

Critical.

Goes a lot.

Sews.

Joins many organizations.

Friendly.

Homebody.

Able to consider others.

Plans.

Sews.

Efficient.

Helpful.

Dependable.

Plans time.

Family helps.

Does other activities.

Tense.

Short tempered.

Striving.

Ambitious.

Plans.

Family helps.

Keeps house clean.

Goes to school.

Calm.

Organized.

Keeps a nice house.

Sews.

Golfs.

Has a Bible class.

Plays bridge.

Entertains.

Plans.

Family helps.

Puts first things first.

Doesn't emphasize small things.

Outgoing.

Fun.

Extrovert.

Friendly.

Works.

Plans time.

Schedules Work.

Family helps.

Organized.

Creative.

Listens well.

Intelligent.

Sews creatively.

Plans.

Good cook.

Entertains often.

Quiet, but firm with children.

Manages time for herself.

Substitute teaches.

Works in the church.

Plans.

Family helps.

Sews.

Puts first things first.

Has four children.

Tidy.

Well organized.

Sweet.

Manages children well.

Helps with the scouts.

Takes part in school affairs.

Budgets.

Schedules.

Bakes.

Sews.

Efficient.

Shops wisely.

Takes pride in a days work.

Plans.

Sews.

Cans.

Cooks well.

Knits.

Has an attitude of doing things easily.

Plans.

Schedules.

Family helps.

Well groomed.

Good mother.

Takes part in community activities.

Good hostess.

Plans for the use of time.

Schedules

Good housekeeper

Everything in its place.

Has three children.

Meticulous.

Stays calm.

Active in community affairs.

Schedules.

Family helps.

Thorough.

Puts first things first.

Has four children.

House always clean.

Visits a great deal.

Schedules.

Family helps.

Chooses equipment to help.

Active in church.

Active in church.

Interests more in home.

Schedules.

Keeps house tidy.

Happy disposition.

Active in community affairs.

Seems calm.

Flexible.
Family helps.
Not very happy.
Very rigid person.
Not social.
Schedules.
Puts first things first.
Well organized.
Informed.
Stays within family's means.
Industrious.
Creative
Satisfied.
Plans ahead.
Hunts bargains.
Buys in season.
Energetic.
Ambitious.
Lots of outside interests.
Orderly.
Clean.
Plans ahead.
Pleasant.
Happy.
Ready to go with husband.
Takes children on outings.
Time for outside activities.

Plans.

Puts family first.

Sews.

Good cook.

Skilled at child care.

Creative.

Flexible.

Sees goals and values.

Plans.

Budgets time and money.

Sews.

Gay.

Carefree.

Systematic.

Interested in outside activities.

Good hostess.

Self centered.

Plans casually.

Organizes well.

Interested in home, children, and husband.

Puts family first, self last.

Seeks facts and information.

Plans.

Uses flexible schedules.

Pleasant.

Sweet.

Takes part in community projects.

Takes time for childrens activities.

Helps husband with his work. Keeps business books.

Neat and clean.

Even tempered.

Sticks to plans.

Has schedule.

Has goals and sticks to them.

Gets up early.

Schedules.

Limits social life.

Individual.

Plans.

Budgets time and money.

Schedules.

People more important than things.

Keeps things in order.

Entertains easily.

Keeps home well decorated through own efforts.

Friendly and outgoing.

Limits social activities.

Plans to manage time.

Family helps.

Sews.

Keeps home lovely.

Busy all of the time.

Enjoys her work.

Busy with family.

Takes time for self.
Takes part in community affairs.
Plans.
Family helps.
Thinks ahead.
Spends money to buy time.
Invests in equipment.
Time to do things for church.
Highly energetic.
Creative.
Taught Sunday School.
Budgets time.
Sews for entire family.
Bakes.
Puts first things first.
Very concerned with children.
Active in children's affairs.
Plays bridge.
Den mother.
Energetic.
Homebody, not a joiner.
Plans.
Budgets, frugal.
Buys specials.
Good shopper.
Schedules.
Efficient house keeper.

Does own work.

Knowledge of good techniques.

Keeps a good perspective.

Happy personality.

Plans.

Schedules.

Not calm with family.

Energetic.

Works fast.

Efficient.

Dovetails work.

Calm.

Even, cheerful disposition.

Plans ahead.

Plans are flexible.

Has outside activities.

Sews.

TABLE XIX

RESPONSES TO RATING SCALE BY HOMEMAKERS ACCORDING TO THE
NUMBER OF CHILDREN UNDER 13 IN THEIR FAMILIES

Questions	Homemakers who have one or two children No. = 52				Homemakers who have three to five children No. = 23			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A. Goals and purposes:								
1. Any?	47	90.4	5	9.6	21	91.3	2	8.7
2. People-things?	43*	82.7	4*	7.7	16**	69.6	5**	21.8
B. Decision making:								
1. Find alternatives?	48	92.3	4	7.7	19	82.6	4	17.4
2. Weigh?	47***	90.4	4***	7.7	21	91.3	2	8.7
C. Time planning:								
1. Work plan?	32	61.5	20	38.5	14	60.9	9	39.1
2. Rest?	38	73.0	14	27.0	17	73.9	6	26.1
3. Leisure?	40	76.9	12	23.1	23	100.0	0	0
D. Money planning:								
1. Plan for use?	40	76.9	12	23.1	19	82.6	4	17.4
2. Plan for saving?	44	84.6	8	15.4	15	65.2	8	34.8
3. Plans by family?	48	92.3	4	7.7	19	82.6	4	17.4
4. Cost of credit?	38	73.0	14	27.0	17	73.9	6	26.1
5. Keep records?	51	98.1	1	1.9	22	95.7	1	4.3

TABLE XIX (continued)

Questions	Homemakers who have one or two children No. = 52				Homemakers who have three to five children No. = 23			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
E. Long-term plans:								
1. Education:								
a. Any?	45	86.5	7	13.5	18	78.2	5	21.8
b. Children share?	31****	59.4	14****	26.8	15*****	65.2	5*****	21.8
2. Health:								
a. Physical?	44	84.6	8	15.4	21	91.3	2	8.7
b. Dental?	44	84.6	8	15.4	22	95.7	1	4.3
3. Financial status:								
a. Home ownership?	46	88.5	6	11.5	19	82.6	4	17.4
b. Investments?	36	69.3	16	30.7	16	69.6	7	30.4
c. Insurance?	51	98.1	1	1.9	23	100.0	0	0.0
4. Retirement:								
a. Annuities?	36***	69.2	15***	28.9	17	73.9	6	26.1
b. Others?	50***	96.2	1***	1.9	22	95.7	1	4.3
5. Spiritual development:								
a. Church attendance?	49	94.2	3	5.8	23	100.0	0	0.0
b. Other?	52	100.0	0	0.0	23	100.0	0	0.0
6. Social development:								
a. Family?	42	80.8	10	19.2	23	100.0	0	0.0
b. Others?	48	92.3	4	7.7	21	91.3	2	8.7
c. Community?	45	86.5	7	13.5	22	95.7	1	4.3

TABLE XIX (continued)

Questions	Homemakers who have one or two children No. = 52				Homemakers who have three to five children No. = 23			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
F. Controlling plans:								
1. Progress:								
a. Time plans?	38	73.0	14	27.0	17	73.9	6	26.1
b. Financial plans?	45	86.5	7	13.5	21	91.3	2	8.7
c. Other plans?	44	84.6	8	15.4	19	82.6	4	17.4
2. Change:								
a. Immediate goals?	47	90.4	5	9.6	22	95.7	1	4.3
b. Available resources?	48	92.3	4	7.7	21	91.3	2	8.7
c. Long-term?	44	84.6	8	15.4	20	87.0	3	13.0
G. Controlling Materials:								
1. Purchasing:								
a. Food?	39	75.0	13	25.0	15	65.2	8	34.8
b. Equipment?	51	98.1	1	1.9	22	95.7	1	4.3
c. Furniture?	50	96.2	2	3.8	21	91.3	2	8.7
d. Clothing?	46	88.5	6	11.5	20	87.0	3	13.0
2. Using:								
a. Food?	40	76.9	12	23.1	16	69.6	7	30.4
b. Equipment?	45	86.5	7	13.5	22	95.7	1	4.3
c. Furniture?	48	92.3	4	7.7	22	95.7	1	4.3
d. Clothing?	47	90.4	5	9.6	22	95.7	1	4.3

TABLE XIX (continued)

Questions	Homemakers who have one or two children No. = 52				Homemakers who have three to five children No. = 23			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
H. 1. Evaluation:								
a. Time plans?	32	61.6	20	38.4	14	60.9	9	39.1
b. Financial plans?	44	84.6	8	15.4	21	91.3	2	8.7
c. Other plans?	49	94.2	3	5.8	16	69.6	7	30.4
2. Understanding	44	84.6	8	15.4	20	87.0	3	13.0

*Five (9.6%) of 52 homemakers did not respond.

**Two (8.7%) of 23 homemakers did not respond.

***One (1.9%) of 52 homemakers did not respond.

****Seven (13.5%) of 52 homemakers did not respond.

TABLE XX

RESPONSES TO RATING SCALE BY HOMEMAKERS ACCORDING TO THE
NUMBER OF YEARS OF HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS

Questions	Homemakers having 2 yrs. of H. Ec. in High School No. = 35				Homemakers having over 2 yrs. of H. Ec. in High School No. = 18			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A. Goals and purposes:								
1. Any?	33	94.3	2	5.7	17	94.4	1	5.6
2. People-things?	27*	77.1	6*	17.2	16	88.9	2	11.1
B. Decision making:								
1. Find alternatives?	30	85.7	5	14.3	15	83.3	3	16.7
2. Weigh?	32**	91.4	2**	5.7	16***	88.9	1***	5.6
C. Time planning:								
1. Work plan?	21	60.0	14	40.0	9	50.0	9	50.0
2. Rest?	29	82.8	6	17.2	12	66.7	6	33.3
3. Leisure?	30	85.7	5	14.3	16	88.9	2	11.1
D. Money planning:								
1. Plan for use?	25	71.4	10	28.6	17	94.4	1	5.6
2. Plan for saving?	29	82.8	6	17.2	14	77.8	4	22.2
3. Plans by family?	32	91.4	3	8.6	14	77.8	4	22.2
4. Cost of credit?	30	85.7	5	14.3	15	83.3	3	16.7
5. Keep records?	35	100.0	0	0.0	17	94.4	1	5.6

TABLE XX. (continued)

Questions	Homemakers having 2 yrs. of H. Ec. in High School No. = 35				Homemakers having over 2 yrs. of H. Ec. in High School No. = 18			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
E. Long-term plans:								
1. Education								
a. Any?	30	85.7	5	14.3	14	77.8	4	22.2
b. Children share?	25****	71.4	7****	20.0	10*****	55.6	4*****	22.2
2. Health:								
a. Physical?	29	82.8	6	17.6	18	100.0	0	0.0
b. Dental?	32	91.4	3	8.6	18	100.0	0	0.0
3. Financial Status:								
a. Home ownership?	28	80.0	7	20.0	17	94.4	1	5.6
b. Investments?	26	74.3	9	25.7	14	77.8	4	22.2
c. Insurance?	35	100.0	0	0.0	17	94.4	1	5.6
4. Retirement:								
a. Annuities?	25**	71.4	9**	25.7	13	72.2	5	27.8
b. Others?	33**	94.3	1**	5.7	18	100.0	0	0.0
5. Spiritual development:								
a. Church attendance?	34	97.1	1	2.9	18	100.0	0	0.0
b. Other?	35	100	0	0.0	18	100.0	0	0.0
6. Social development:								
a. Family?	33	94.3	2	5.7	16	88.9	2	11.1
b. Others?	33	94.3	2	5.7	17	94.4	1	5.6
c. Community?	31	88.6	4	11.4	15	83.3	3	16.7

TABLE XX. (continued)

Questions	Homemakers having 2 yrs. of H. Ec. in High School No. = 35				Homemakers having over 2 yrs. of H. Ec. in High School No. = 18			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
F. Controlling plans:								
1. Progress:								
a. Time plans?	26	74.3	9	25.7	15	83.3	3	16.7
b. Financial plans?	31	88.6	4	11.4	17	94.4	1	5.6
c. Other plans	29	82.4	6	17.6	16	88.9	2	11.1
2. Change:								
a. Immediate goals?	32	91.4	3	8.6	16	88.9	2	11.1
b. Available resources?	33	94.3	2	5.7	16	88.9	2	11.1
c. Long-term goals?	31	88.6	4	11.4	15	83.3	3	16.7
G. Controlling materials:								
1. Purchasing:								
a. Food?	28	80.0	7	20.0	12	66.7	6	33.3
b. Equipment?	35	100.0	0	0.0	17	94.4	1	5.6
c. Furniture?	34	97.1	1	2.9	17	94.4	1	5.6
d. Clothing?	30	85.7	5	14.3	17	94.4	1	5.6
2. Using:								
a. Food?	25	71.4	10	29.6	16	88.9	2	11.1
b. Equipment?	33	94.3	2	5.7	16	88.9	2	11.1
c. Furniture?	33	94.3	2	5.7	17	94.4	1	5.6
d. Clothing?	32	91.4	3	8.6	18	100.0	0	0.0

TABLE XX. (continued)

Questions	Homemakers having 2 yrs. of H. Ec. in High School No. = 35				Homemakers having over 2 yrs. of H. Ec. in High School No. = 18			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
H. 1. Evaluation:								
a. Time plans?	23	65.7	12	34.3	12	66.7	6	33.3
b. Financial plans?	29	82.4	6	17.6	15	83.3	3	16.0
c. Other plans?	30	85.7	5	14.3	17	94.4	1	5.6
2. Understanding:	28	80.0	7	20.0	17	94.4	1	5.6

*Two (5.7%) of 35 homemakers did not respond.

***One (2.9%) of 35 homemakers did not respond.

***One (5.6%) of 18 homemakers did not respond.

****Three (8.6%) of 35 homemakers did not respond.

*****Four (22.2%) of 18 homemakers did not respond.

TABLE XXI

RESPONSES TO RATING SCALE BY HOMEMAKERS ACCORDING TO
STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL HOME ECONOMICS

Questions	Homemakers having H. Ec. in High School No. = 53				Homemakers not having H. Ec. in High School No. = 22			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A. Goals and purposes:								
1. Any?	50	94.3	3	5.7	18	81.8	4	18.2
2. People-things?	43*	81.2	7*	13.2	16**	72.7	2**	9.1
B. Decision making:								
1. Find alternatives?	45	85.0	8	15.0	22	100.0	0	0.0
2. Weigh?	48***	90.6	3***	5.7	19****	86.4	2****	9.1
C. Time planning:								
1. Work plan?	30	56.6	23	43.4	16	72.7	6	27.3
2. Rest?	41	77.4	12	22.6	14	63.6	8	36.4
3. Leisure?	46	86.8	7	13.2	17	77.3	5	22.7
D. Money planning:								
1. Plan for use?	42	79.2	11	20.8	17	77.3	5	22.7
2. Plan for saving?	43	81.2	10	18.8	16	72.7	6	27.3
3. Plans by family?	46	86.8	7	13.2	21	95.5	1	4.5
4. Cost of credit?	41	77.4	12	22.6	14	63.6	8	36.4
5. Keep records?	51	96.2	2	3.8	22	100.0	0	0.0

TABLE XXI (continued)

Questions	Homemakers having H. Ec. in High School No. = 53				Homemakers not having H. Ec. in High School No. = 22			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
E. Long-term plans:								
1. Education:								
a. Any?	44	83.0	9	17.0	19	86.4	3	13.6
b. Children share?	35****	66.1	11	20.8	11****	50.0	8****	36.4
2. Health								
a. Physical?	47	88.7	6	11.3	18	81.8	4	18.2
b. Dental	50	94.3	3	5.7	16	72.7	6	27.3
3. Financial status:								
a. Home ownership?	45	85.0	8	15.0	20	90.9	2	9.1
b. Investments?	40	75.4	13	24.6	12	54.6	10	45.4
c. Insurance?	52	98.1	1	1.9	22	100.0	0	0.0
4. Retirement:								
a. Annuities?	38****	71.7	14****	26.4	15	68.2	7	31.8
b. Others?	51****	96.2	1****	1.9	21	95.5	1	4.5
5. Spiritual development:								
a. Church attendance?	52	98.1	1	1.9	20	90.9	2	9.1
b. Other?	53	100.0	0	0.0	22	100.0	0	0.0
6. Social development:								
a. Family?	49	92.5	4	7.5	19	86.4	3	13.6
b. Others?	50	94.3	3	5.7	19	86.4	3	13.6
c. Community?	46	86.8	7	13.2	19	86.4	3	13.6

TABLE XXI (continued)

Questions	Homemakers having H. Ec. in High School No. = 53				Homemakers not having H. Ec. in High School No. = 22			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
F. Controlling plans:								
1. Progress:								
a. Time plans?	41	77.4	12	22.6	14	63.6	8	36.4
b. Financial plans?	48	90.6	5	9.4	18	81.8	4	18.2
c. Other plans?	45	85.0	8	15.0	18	81.8	4	18.2
2. Change:								
a. Immediate goals?	48	90.6	5	9.4	21	95.5	1	4.5
b. Available resources?	49	92.5	4	7.6	20	90.9	2	9.1
c. Long-term goals?	46	86.8	7	13.2	18	81.8	4	18.2
G. Controlling materials:								
1. Purchasing:								
a. Food?	40	75.4	13	24.6	14	63.6	8	36.4
b. Equipment?	52	98.1	1	1.9	21	95.5	1	4.5
c. Furniture?	51	96.2	2	3.8	20	90.9	2	9.1
d. Clothing?	47	88.7	6	11.3	18	86.4	4	13.6
2. Using:								
a. Food?	41	77.4	12	22.6	15	68.2	7	31.8
b. Equipment?	49	92.5	4	7.5	18	81.8	4	18.2
c. Furniture?	50	94.3	3	5.7	20	90.9	2	9.1
d. Clothing?	50	94.3	3	5.7	19	86.4	3	13.6

TABLE XXI (continued)

Questions	Homemakers having H. Ec. in High School No. = 53				Homemakers not having H. Ec. in High School No. = 22			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
H. 1. Evaluation:								
a. Time plans	35	66.1	18	33.9	11	50.0	11	50.0
b. Financial plans?	44	83.0	9	17.0	21	95.5	1	4.5
c. Other plans?	46	86.8	7	13.2	19	86.4	3	13.6
2. Understanding	45	85.0	8	15.0	19	86.4	3	13.6

*Three (5.7%) of 53 homemakers did not respond.

**Four (18.2%) of 22 homemakers did not respond.

***Two (3.8%) of 53 homemakers did not respond.

****One (4.5%) of 22 homemakers did not respond.

*****Seven (13.2%) of 53 homemakers did not respond.

*****Three (13.6%) of 22 homemakers did not respond.

*****One (1.9%) of 53 homemakers did not respond.

TABLE XXII

RESPONSES TO RATING SCALE BY HOMEMAKERS ACCORDING TO
THEIR STUDY OF HOME ECONOMICS IN COLLEGE

Questions	Homemakers who attended but had no college H. Ec. No. = 34				Homemakers who had H. Ec. in college No. = 27				Homemakers who did not attend college No. = 14			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A. Goals and purposes:												
1. Any?	33	97.1	1	2.9	22	81.5	5	18.5	13	92.8	1	7.1
2. People=things?	30*	88.3	3*	8.8	20**	74.1	2**	7.4	9****	64.3	4****	28.6
B. Decision making:												
1. Find alternatives?	32	94.1	2	5.9	25	92.6	2	7.4	10	71.4	4	28.6
2. Weigh?	32	94.1	2	5.9	24*****	88.8	2*****	7.4	11*****	78.7	1*****	7.1
C. Time planning:												
1. Work plan?	21	61.8	13	38.2	17	62.9	10	37.1	8	57.2	6	42.8
2. Rest?	25	73.6	9	26.4	20	74.1	7	25.9	10	71.4	4	28.6
3. Leisure?	29	85.3	5	14.7	24	88.8	3	11.1	10	71.4	4	28.6
D. Money planning?												
1. Plan for use?	26	76.5	8	23.6	21	77.8	6	22.2	12	85.7	2	14.3
2. Plan for saving?	25	73.6	9	26.5	23	85.3	4	14.8	11	78.7	3	21.4
3. Plans by family?	32	94.2	2	5.9	24	88.8	3	11.1	11	78.7	3	21.4
4. Cost of credit?	27	79.4	7	20.6	23	85.3	4	14.8	5	35.7	9	64.3
5. Keep records?	34	100.0	0	0.0	26	96.3	1	3.7	13	92.8	1	7.1

TABLE XXII (continued)

Questions	Homemakers who attended but had no college H. Ec. No. = 34				Homemakers who had H. Ec. in college No. = 27				Homemakers who did not attend college No. = 14			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
E. Long-term plans:												
1. Education:												
a. Any?	31	91.2	3	8.8	21	77.8	6	22.2	11	78.7	3	21.4
b. Children share?	20***	58.8	8***	23.6	18***	66.7	6***	22.2	8***	57.2	5***	35.7
2. Health:												
a. Physical?	31	91.2	3	8.8	22	81.5	5	18.5	12	85.7	2	14.3
b. Dental?	31	91.2	3	8.8	23	85.3	4	14.8	12	85.7	2	14.3
3. Financial status?												
a. Home owner- ship?	33	97.1	1	2.9	20	74.1	7	25.9	12	85.7	2	14.3
b. Investments?	27	79.5	7	20.6	15	55.6	12	44.4	10	71.4	4	28.6
c. Insurance?	34	100.0	0	0.0	26	96.3	1	3.7	14	100.0	0	0.0
4. Retirement:												
a. Annuities?	24	70.6	9*	26.5	17	62.9	10	37.1	12	85.7	2	14.3
b. Others	33	97.1	1	2.9	27	100.	0	0.0	13***	92.8	0***	0.0
5. Spiritual development:												
a. Church attendance?	32	94.2	2	5.9	26	96.3	1	3.7	14	100.0	0	0.0
b. Other?	34	100.0	0	0.0	27	100.0	0	0.0	14	100.0	0	0.0
6. Social development:												
a. Family?	30	88.3	4	11.8	21	77.8	6	22.2	14	100.0	0	0.0
b. Others?	31	91.2	3	8.8	25	92.6	2	7.4	13	92.8	1	7.1
c. Community?	28	82.4	6	17.6	25	92.6	2	7.4	14	100.0	0	0.0

TABLE XXII (continued)

Questions	Homemakers who attended but had no college H. Ec. No. = 34				Homemakers who had H. Ec. in college No. = 27				Homemakers who did not attend college No. = 14			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
F. Controlling plans:												
1. Progress:												
a. Time plans?	25	73.6	9	26.5	19	70.3	8	29.6	11	78.7	3	21.4
b. Financial plans?	30	88.3	4	11.8	23	85.3	4	14.8	13	92.8	3	21.4
c. Other plans?	33	97.1	1	2.9	19	70.3	8	29.6	11	78.7	3	21.4
2. Change:												
a. Immediate goals?	31	91.2	3	8.8	27	100	0	0.0	11	78.7	3	21.4
b. Available resources?	31	91.2	3	8.8	26	96.3	1	3.7	12	85.7	2	14.3
c. Long-term goals?	31	91.2	3	8.8	22	81.5	5	18.5	11	78.7	3	21.4
G. Controlling materials:												
1. Purchasing:												
a. Food?	25	73.6	9	26.5	18	66.7	9	33.3	11	78.7	3	21.4
b. Equipment?	33	97.1	1	2.9	26	96.3	1	3.7	14	100.0	0	0.0
c. Furniture?	33	97.1	1	2.9	25	92.6	2	7.4	13	92.8	1	7.1
d. Clothing?	32	94.2	2	5.9	22	81.5	5	18.5	12	85.7	2	14.3
2. Using:												
a. Food?	29	85.3	5	14.7	16	59.3	11	40.7	11	78.7	3	21.4
b. Equipment?	33	97.1	1	2.9	21	77.8	6	22.2	13	92.8	1	7.1
c. Furniture?	32	94.2	2	5.9	24	88.8	3	11.1	14	100.0	0	0.0
d. Clothing?	33	97.1	1	2.9	23	85.3	4	14.8	13	92.8	1	7.1

TABLE XXII (continued)

Questions	Homemakers who attended but had no college H. Ec. No. = 34				Homemakers who had H. Ec. in college No. = 27				Homemakers who did not attend college No. = 14			
	Yes		No		Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
H. 1. Evaluation:												
a. Time plans?	21	61.8	13	38.2	13	48.2	14	51.8	12	85.7	2	14.3
b. Financial plans?	31	91.2	3	8.8	22	81.5	5	18.5	12	85.7	2	14.3
c. Other plans?	30	88.2	4	11.8	23	85.3	4	14.8	12	85.7	2	14.3
2. Understanding:	30	88.3	4	11.8	24	88.8	3	11.1	10	71.4	4	28.6

*One (2.9%) of 34 homemakers did not respond.

**Five (18.5%) of 27 homemakers did not respond.

***One (7.1%) of 14 homemakers did not respond.

****One (3.7%) of 27 homemakers did not respond.

*****Two (14.2%) of 14 homemakers did not respond.

*****Six (17.6%) of 34 homemakers did not respond.

*****Three (11.1%) of 27 homemakers did not respond.

TABLE XXIII

RESPONSES TO RATING SCALE BY HOMEMAKERS ACCORDING TO THEIR
STUDY OF HIGH SCHOOL AND COLLEGE HOME ECONOMICS

Questions	Homemakers who had H. Ec. in High School and College No. = 20				Homemakers who have had no formal training in H. Ec. No. = 15			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
A. Goals and purposes:								
1. Any?	18	90.0	2	10.0	14	93.3	1	6.7
2. People=things?	15	75.0	5	25.0	12*	80.0	2*	13.3
B. Decision making:								
1. Find alternatives?	19	95.0	1	5.0	14	93.3	1	6.7
2. Weigh?	18	90.0	2	10.0	11**	73.3	2**	13.3
C. Time planning:								
1. Work plan?	13	65.0	7	35.0	13	86.7	2	13.3
2. Rest?	16	80.0	4	20.0	10	66.7	5	33.3
3. Leisure?	18	90.0	2	10.0	12	80.0	3	20.0
D. Money planning:								
1. Plan for use?	14	70.0	6	30.0	10	66.7	5	33.3
2. Plan for saving?	17	85.0	3	15.0	10	66.7	5	33.3
3. Plans by family?	18	90.0	2	10.00	15	100.0	0	0.0
4. Cost of credit?	17	85.0	3	15.0	8	53.3	7	46.7
5. Keep records?	19	95.0	1	5.0	15	100.0	0	0.0

TABLE XXIII (continued)

Questions	Homemakers who had H. Ec. in High School and College No. = 20				Homemakers who have had no formal training in H. Ec. No. = 15			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
E. Long-term plans:								
1. Education:								
a. Any?	17	85.0	3	15.0	12	80.0	3	20.0
b. Children share?	13	65.0	7	35.0	9	60.0	6	40.0
2. Health:								
a. Physical?	18	90.0	2	10.0	12	80.0	3	20.0
b. Dental?	19	95.0	1	5.0	11	73.3	4	26.7
3. Financial status:								
a. Home ownership?	19	95.0	1	5.0	13	86.7	2	13.3
b. Investments?	15	75.0	5	25.0	7	46.7	8	53.3
c. Insurance?	15	75.0	5	25.0	15	100.0	0	0.0
4. Retirement:								
a. Annuities?	14	70.0	6	30.0	12	80.0	3	20.0
b. Others?	15	75.0	5	25.0	15	100.0	0	0.0
5. Spiritual development:								
a. Church attendance?	19	95.0	1	5.0	15	100.0	0	0.0
b. Other?	20	100.0	0	0.0	15	100.0	0	0.0
6. Social development:								
a. Family?	18	90.0	2	10.0	14	93.3	1	6.7
b. Others?	18	90.0	2	10.0	13	86.7	2	13.3
c. Community?	16	80.0	4	20.0	14	93.3	1	6.7

TABLE XXIII (continued)

Questions	Homemakers who had H. Ec. in High School and College No. = 20				Homemakers who have had no formal training in H. Ec. No. = 15			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
F. Controlling plans?								
1. Progress:								
a. Time plans?	12	60.0	8	40.0	10	66.7	5	33.3
b. Financial plans?	18	90.0	2	10.0	13	86.7	2	13.3
c. Other plans?	17	85.0	3	15.0	12	80.0	3	20.0
2. Change:								
a. Immediate goals?	17	85.0	3	15.0	10	66.7	5	33.3
b. Available resources?	18	90.0	2	10.0	13	86.7	2	13.3
c. Long-term?	18	90.0	2	10.0	13	86.7	3	20.0
G. Controlling materials:								
1. Purchasing:								
a. Food?	18	90.0	2	10.0	10	66.7	5	33.3
b. Equipment?	19	95.0	1	5.0	14	93.3	1	6.7
c. Furniture?	18	90.0	2	10.0	14	93.3	1	6.7
d. Clothing?	16	80.0	4	20.0	13	86.7	2	13.3
2. Using:								
a. Food?	19	95.0	1	5.0	11	73.3	4	26.7
b. Equipment?	19	95.0	1	5.0	14	93.3	1	6.7
c. Furniture?	20	100.0	0	0.0	13	86.7	2	13.3
d. Clothing?	13	65.0	7	35.0	14	93.3	1	6.7

TABLE XXIII (continued)

Questions	Homemakers who had H. Ec. in High School and College No. = 20				Homemakers who have had no formal training in H. Ec. No. = 15			
	Yes		No		Yes		No	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
H. 1. Evaluation:								
a. Time plans?	13	65.0	7	35.0	9	60.0	6	40.0
b. Financial plans?	17	85.0	3	15.0	14	93.3	1	6.7
c. Other plans?	16	80.0	4	20.0	12	80.0	3	20.0
2. Understanding:	17	85.0	3	15.0	13	86.7	2	13.3

*One (6.7%) of 15 homemakers did not respond.

**Two (13.3%) of 15 homemakers did not respond.

VITA

Betty June Hull Bailey

Candidate for the Degree of
Master of Science

Thesis: OPINIONS CONCERNING HOME MANAGEMENT OF A SELECTED GROUP OF
HOMEMAKERS

Major Field: Home Management, Equipment and Family Economics

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born at Marysville, California, July 23, 1923,
the daughter of Delbert E. and Gladys Lorene Bird Hull.

Education: Attended public schools in Watsonville, California;
graduated from Watsonville Joint Union High School in 1941;
received the Bachelor of Science Degree from Oklahoma State
University with a major in Home Economics Education, in
May 1964; completed requirements for the Master of Science
Degree, 1965.

Professional experience: None

Professional organizations: Oklahoma Home Economics Association,
American Home Economics Association, Phi Upsilon Omicron.