A study determined computer research and exemplary project needs in home economics education, identified such projects, and analyzed the relationship of research and exemplary project needs to projects identified. The questionnaire instructed respondents to describe their perceptions of research needs and exemplary project needs related to computers in home economics education and to identify and describe computer-related research and exemplary projects completed, underway, or planned in home economics education. The 381 responses (out of a possible 809) included 218 questionnaires and 163 follow-up postcards. Of the 218 respondents, 77% were teacher educators, 15% state supervisors, and 8% "other." The most frequently cited perceived research needs related to the concepts of computers and learning and instructional software. The most frequently perceived exemplary project needs were computers and learning and instructional software. Analysis of research projects described indicated that action research studies were the most common, that the most common research subjects were inservice home economics teachers, and that most projects were comprehensive in content covered. Analysis of exemplary projects described showed that most provided inservice for teachers and dealt with software or courseware applications at the secondary level. In general, the directions of research projects identified were consistent with needs identified by professionals. The exemplary projects described appeared to be progressing toward stated needs for such programs. Appendixes include summary tables and the survey instrument. The attached supplements to this report consist of two lists of respondent names (including institutions and addresses) and two sets of outline descriptions for the research and exemplary projects respectively. (YLB)
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INTRODUCTION

What are research and exemplary project needs related to computers in home economics education? What research and exemplary projects are being conducted? With the rapid increases in computer use in home economics education and their projected future applications, these are questions asked by many professionals in the field.

As a result, the American Vocational Association Home Economics Division Research Committee formed a subcommittee on computers in home economics education. The first task of this group was to assess the state of the art of home economics education computer research and exemplary projects. The major purpose of this exploratory study was to identify what is being done and what needs to be done in order to provide a basis for greater directed effort within the field.

The objectives of this study were:

(1) to determine computer research and exemplary project needs in home economics education.

(2) to identify computer research and exemplary projects completed, underway, and planned in home economics education.

(3) to analyze the relationship between research and exemplary project needs to projects identified.

A research project was defined as any project which included a research component as identified by the respondent. An example would be an inservice needs assessment. An exemplary project was defined as any project which did not include a stated research component, but was significant beyond the local community. Examples of exemplary projects would include software development or an inservice education model.

This report begins with a description of the project method as related to the instrument and sample. Separate sections are included on respondent perceived needs, and research and exemplary projects conducted. Each section includes a separate discussion of the data analysis procedures and the findings. A separate section is included comparing research and exemplary project needs with actual projects reported. Finally, conclusions and recommendations are provided.
METHOD

Instrument

A questionnaire was developed focusing on the major objectives. First, respondents were instructed to use an open-ended format to describe their perceptions of research needs and exemplary project needs related to computers in home economics education. Second, they were asked to describe computer related research and exemplary projects completed, underway, or planned in home economics education. For each of the projects listed, respondents were requested to provide a description of the project, including: contact person and position, project purpose, research subjects (or audience) addressed, content area addressed, and products.

Sample

Questionnaires were sent in February, 1984, to the 640 teacher educators identified in the 1983 National Directory of Vocational Home Economics Teacher Educators and the 179 state supervisors identified through the U.S. Department of Education. One month after questionnaire distribution, follow-up postcards were sent to non-respondents. Postcards allowed respondents to check: if they had no information to contribute at the time of the survey, or if another staff member actively involved in the area had completed the questionnaire. Of the 819 surveys in the initial mailing, 10 surveys were returned indicating that the person was no longer at that address. This reduced the total possible respondents to 809.

Of the 809 possible respondents, 381 (47%) responses were received. Respondents represented 48 states, 2 territories, and the District of Columbia. Teacher educators represented 45 states and 190 (67%) of the 285 colleges and universities surveyed. State supervisors represented 37 states, two territories, and the District of Columbia. It was concluded that because the respondents represented a broad geographical distribution, sufficient sample was present for assessing the state of the art.

The 381 responses included 218 questionnaires and 163 follow-up postcards. Of the follow-up postcards, 131 respondents indicated that they had no information to contribute and 32 indicated that another staff member actively involved in this area had completed the survey. It was concluded from this response that, at the time of the survey, many teacher educators and state supervisors lacked sufficient background and involvement to respond to the survey. Indeed, the comment was frequently made: "I haven't had enough background to answer the questionnaire."

The 218 respondents to the questionnaire included 167 (77%) teacher educators, 33 (15%) state supervisors, and 18 (8%) "other" (Table 1). The "other" category primarily referred to titles
Table 1

Professional Positions of Questionnaire Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Professional Title</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>218</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

other than teacher educator and state supervisor; this included state consultants and department chairpersons of teacher education programs.
RESPONDENT PERCEPTIONS OF NEEDS

Procedure for Analysis

The first area of the questionnaire, respondent perception of research and exemplary project needs, was subjected to a content analysis. The content categories identified for both research and exemplary project needs were parallel relating to five major concepts: computer literacy of teachers, computers and learning, instructional software, instructional management, and computers in the home (Figure 1). Across these five concepts, 21 subconcepts were identified. Because of the low number of responses to instructional management, no subconcepts were identified. Responses to each item were coded according to the concept and subconcept addressed. In addition, responses were coded accordingly if respondents did not respond, or indicated limited or no knowledge to respond.

Responses from teacher educators, state supervisors, and others were combined for reporting. Frequencies were calculated; data were reported separately for research and exemplary project needs from the most to least frequently cited concepts. Within concepts, data were reported from most to least frequently reported subconcepts. It should be noted that since the questions were open-ended, reported frequencies did not necessarily represent all those respondents who may have felt that a concept (or subconcept) represented a need. Respondent comments were included in the discussion to further describe perceived needs.

Findings and Discussion

Research Needs

For research needs, 190 (87%) respondents answered the question; 12 (6%) did not respond to the question; and 16 (7%) indicated limited or no knowledge to respond. In total, respondents listed 351 responses as research needs (Table 2).

The greatest number of responses related to the concept of computers and learning (n=154 responses, or 43% of the responses). Within this concept, respondents identified eight subconcepts. The need most frequently cited was for research comparing the effectiveness of instructional methods (n=48). One respondent described this as establishing whether computers do a better job than existing methods and why. The second most frequently cited subconcept was an assessment of the current use of computers at the secondary level (n=39). An analysis of use across home economics content areas and within FHA/HERO was included in this area.

Respondents also indicated a need for guidelines to integrate computers into curriculum (n=20). An area of respondent concern was in determining the role of computers in the home economics
Figure 1
Concepts and Subconcepts
Identified As Computer Research and Exemplary Project Needs
In Home Economics Education

Concept I: Computer literacy of teachers

Current skills and attitudes
Competencies needed
Preservice education
Inservice education

Concept II: Computers and learning

Current use at the secondary level
Current use at the post-secondary level
Availability of computers
Learning theories and computer use
Guidelines for integration into curriculum
Comparison of effectiveness of instructional methods
Use with special groups
Needs assessment

Concept III: Instructional software

Current availability
Guidelines for development
Software evaluation
Needs assessment

Concept IV: Instructional management

Concept V: Computers in the home

Impact/effect of computers on individuals/families
Cost benefit of computer use
User characteristics
Current hardware/software uses
Needs assessment
Table 2
Computer Research Needs
In Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Need</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computers and learning (t=154)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of effectiveness of instructional methods</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use at the secondary level</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for integration into curriculum</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning theories and computer use</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use with special groups</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of computers</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use at the postsecondary level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional software (t=104)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for development</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current availability</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computers in the home (t=46)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/effect of computers on individuals/families</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current hardware/software uses</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost benefit of computer use</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User characteristics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Computer literacy of teachers (t=37)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice education</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current skills and attitudes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies needed</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice education</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instructional management (t=10)</strong></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of responses to a subconcept.
t = Total number of responses to a concept area.
classroom, including the "fit" and "non-fit" with varying conceptions of curriculum. A consistent theme in responses was an emphasis in home economics curriculum on "high tech" as well as "high touch" aspects.

An analysis of learning theories and computer use was another area of respondent concern (n=18). One respondent described this research need as the theoretical foundation for curriculum change in home economics education. Other research needs within this concept area related to use with special groups (n=14), availability of computers (n=7), needs assessment (n=5), and current use at the postsecondary level (n=3).

The second most frequently cited concept related to instructional software (n=104, or 30% of the responses). Responses in this area included four subconcepts. Within this concept, guidelines for development received the most responses (n=43). Many respondents who cited this as a research need also commented on the lack of quality software.

Current availability of software was identified as a research need (n=27). Respondents consistently identified dietary analysis and personal finance as areas where a number of software programs were available.

Respondents also cited software evaluation as a research need (n=21). In addition, software needs assessment was identified as a research need (n=13). Specific needs by home economics content areas were also described; these needs included simulations in parenting and family relations, and housing related programs using graphics. Others cited the need for an integrated curriculum; this would include texts, workbooks, software, and other supplementary materials related to units of instruction.

Research needs related to computers in the home was the third most frequently cited concept (n=46, or 13% of the responses). Within this concept, five subconcepts were identified. The most frequently cited need in this area related to the impact/effect of computers on individuals and families (n=25). Other research needs in this area included current hardware and software uses (n=9), needs assessment (n=6), cost benefit of computer use (n=4), and user characteristics (n=2).

Computer literacy of teachers was the fourth most frequently cited concept (n=37, or 11% of the responses). Included in this area were four subconcepts: inservice education (n=13), current skills and attitudes (n=9), competencies needed (n=9), and preservice education (n=6). Respondents consistently identified the need for effective methods to move undergraduates, graduates, teacher educators, and state supervisors into the computer mainstream.
Instructional management was the fifth most frequently cited concept \((n=10, \text{ or } 3\% \text{ of the responses})\). Research needs within this area included a comparison of the time effectiveness of instructional management software and conventional clerical methods. Other needs included the effect of increased feedback on student learning and an analysis of the amount of time actually available to cover concepts.

Exemplary Project Needs

For exemplary project needs, 156 (72\%) respondents suggested needs; 49 (22\%) did not respond to the item; and 13 (6\%) indicated limited or no knowledge to respond. In total, 196 exemplary project needs were identified (Table 3). Fewer respondents completed this question and as a result, fewer total exemplary project needs were identified. In general, exemplary project needs paralleled the order and type which were listed as research needs.

Computers and learning was the most frequently cited concept \((n=72, \text{ or } 37\% \text{ of the responses})\). The need for curriculum integration guidelines was the subconcept most often reported \((n=20)\); respondents had specific suggestions relating to what this should include and how this should be done. Specifically, respondents identified the need for a curriculum using computers in secondary consumer and homemaking education classes; this would include teaching about home computer use. The need for the identification of the model classroom with the computer integrated into the curriculum was also cited. Respondents also suggested the need for exemplary projects showing how teachers have successfully integrated the computer into the curriculum.

Other needs which related to computers and learning included: comparison of the effectiveness of instructional methods \((n=14)\), current use at the secondary level \((n=12)\), relationship of learning theories to computer use \((n=7)\), needs assessment \((n=6)\), availability of computers \((n=6)\), use with special groups \((n=4)\), and current use at the postsecondary level \((n=3)\).

Instructional software was the second most frequently cited concept \((n=67, \text{ or } 34\% \text{ of the responses})\). The area cited most often was the need for software development guidelines \((n=36)\). Needs suggested by respondents primarily centered on quality assurances. For example, some respondents described the need for software field testing prior to availability; others suggested the need for a home economics education software clearinghouse.

The remaining three subconcepts were identified by respondents as follows: current availability \((n=16)\), software evaluation \((n=9)\), and needs assessment \((n=6)\). Respondents had specific suggestions for software program needs; these included: home economics programs using a game format (not simulations); programs to promote mental, social, and emotional development of children;
Table 3
Computer Exemplary Project Needs
In Home Economics Education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exemplary Project Need</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Computers and learning (t=72)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for integration into curriculum</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of effectiveness of instructional methods</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use at the secondary level</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning theories and computer use</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of computers</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use with special groups</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current use at the post secondary level</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructional software (t=67)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidelines for development</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current availability</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computer literacy of teachers (t=26)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inservice education</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice education</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competencies needed</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current skills and attitudes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computers in the home (t=18)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User characteristics</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact/effect of computers on individuals/families</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current hardware/software uses</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Instructional management (t=10)

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

n = Number of responses to a subconcept

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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exercise programs, energy conservation programs; and family budget programs. Respondents also identified the need for increased availability of software through the development of user networks, and the sharing of non-copyrighted software at professional meetings.

Computer literacy of teachers was the third most frequently cited concept (n=26, or 13% of the responses). Areas of need included: inservice education (n=8), preservice education (n=7), competencies needed (n=6), and current skills and attitudes (n=5). A consistent need identified was for teacher educators to provide leadership within this area. One respondent commented on the need to address how to work the computer into an already crowded teacher education curriculum. Others commented on the need to spend time in inservice and preservice education on both experiencing computer technology and exploring its meaning in our lives.

Computers in the home was the fourth most frequently cited concept (n=18, or 9% of total). Exemplary project needs related to: user characteristics (n=10), impact/effect of computers on individuals and families (n=4), needs assessment (n=3), and current hardware/software uses (n=1).

Instructional management accounted for 10 responses (5% of total responses). Examples related to actual teacher use in managing classes or the department.
RESEARCH AND EXEMPLARY PROJECTS

Procedure for Analysis

Research and exemplary projects described by respondents were analyzed separately. For each, projects were content analyzed according to five areas: contact person's professional position, project purpose, research subjects (or audience) addressed, content area addressed, and products. Classifications for each of these areas were determined based on responses to the questionnaire checklist section and an analysis of respondent project descriptions.

For both research and exemplary projects, frequencies and percentages were reported for the classifications within each area. Classifications were presented and discussed from those most to least often reported within the areas.

Two cautions must be considered in analyzing the data and generalizing the results. First, research and exemplary projects reported were described by project contact persons or home economics educators who had some knowledge of the project. Since, in some cases, information about the research or exemplary project was provided by someone other than the project contact person, the completeness or accuracy of the information provided could vary.

Second, because of the interrelatedness of home economics education with other content specialties, several respondents included project descriptions which were from a broader home economics or vocational education context. While most projects appeared to have some relationship to home economics education, in a few instances, the relationship was less clear.

All project descriptive data were included in the findings and discussion. In areas where the information was incomplete, the information was classified as "not specified".

Summary tables of research and exemplary projects reported are included in Appendix A and Appendix B respectively. For each project, information was listed as to state of origin, purpose of the project, research subjects (or audience) addressed, content area addressed, and products. A separate document identifying the contact person and address for each project is available upon request from the authors. This also was sent to each of the 50 state supervisors.

Findings and Discussion

Research Projects

A total of 38 research projects were described by 28 professionals. Of the contact persons listed, seven contact
Table 4
Research Projects:
Positions of Contact Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University faculty member</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary level home economics teacher</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State education specialist</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension specialist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of research studies with contact person in the position described.

Of the 38 studies, 18 (47%) were in progress, 14 (39%) were completed, and 6 (16%) were planned.

The contact persons represented five categories of professional positions (Table 4). University faculty members were reported most often as contact persons (n=19, or 61%); secondary level home economics teachers were the next greatest number represented (n=5, or 16%). Other professional groups included state education specialists, graduate students, and an extension specialist.

Project descriptions provided by respondents indicated that the research conducted represented seven research purposes (Table 5). Action research studies were the most common (n=15, or 39%) projects. These studies primarily included workshops and courses designed to teach computer literacy or computer applications, and generally were accompanied by data collection on attitude, knowledge, or skill development gains resulting from instruction. Software evaluation, which was the focus of seven studies (18%), was the second most common type of study. Five additional studies (18%) were classified as descriptive; these studies used attitude questionnaires, a Q-sort, interviews, and observations to provide information about research subjects. Needs assessments and surveys were the primary research objectives of four studies (10%). Software development was the purpose of four studies (10%).
Table 5
Research Projects:
Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Action</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Descriptive</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment/survey</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media effectiveness</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature review</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of research projects addressing each purpose.

Two studies (5%) were categorized as "media effectiveness" research. In each, the computer was used as an instructional medium to teach home economics subject matter; pretests and posttests were used to examine changes in knowledge, skills, and/or attitudes. Respondent descriptions of media effectiveness research projects indicated that comparative data on the effectiveness of other media in teaching the same subject matter were not collected. Thus, the studies were classified as media effectiveness studies rather than media comparison studies.

Thirty-seven research projects focused on subjects in nine areas; the description of the remaining project did not specify research subjects (Table 6). The most common research subjects were inservice home economics teachers. Sixteen research studies (44% of the projects reported) focused on secondary level home economics teachers' needs, skills, attitudes, knowledge, or competencies. These studies included both homemaking teachers and occupational home economics teachers.

The evaluation of computer software was the focus of nine studies (25%). Preservice home economics teachers or undergraduate students were research subjects in four studies (11%). Typical
Table 6
Research Projects:
Subjects Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inservice home economics teachers</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software programs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice teachers/undergraduates</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension educators</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary students</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural homemakers</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool children</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer-related literature</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects not specified</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of research studies using sample indicated. Multiple responses were permitted.

Audiences of home economics instruction (secondary students, rural homemakers, families, and preschool children) were the subjects in four studies (11%). The remaining two research projects focused on extension educators and on computer related literature.

Content areas addressed by each research project generally included several areas within home economics (Table 7). If three or more home economics content areas were identified, it was assumed that the content spanned the comprehensive consumer and homemaking education program. Most projects (n=24, or 68%) were identified as comprehensive in content covered. When a single content area was addressed, the area most frequently identified was child development and family relationships (n=4, 11%).

Research products ranged from data collected through
Table 7
Research Projects:
Content Area Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive consumer and homemaking</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child development and family relations</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and nutrition</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home management and family economics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles and clothing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational education</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer impact</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of research projects addressing content area.

Various research instruments to the development of computer software programs, curriculum materials, and workshops or graduate courses. The wide distribution of products indicated that investigators had a variety of research objectives which were not tied exclusively to producing empirical generalizations through experimental research methodology.

The most common products of research were inservice or preservice workshops and courses (n=14, or 37%), gain scores on attitude, skills, or knowledge tests (n=10, or 26% of the research projects), software programs (n=9, or 24%), software evaluation (n=8, or 21%), and needs assessments or surveys (n=6, or 16%) (Table 8). Five studies (13%) produced data collected in descriptive research. The remaining studies produced theses or dissertations, written curriculum, a competency exam, and a literature review/conceptual paper.

Exemplary Projects

Forty-two exemplary projects were identified by 38 respondents. Of these projects, 15 (36%) were completed; 21 (50%) were in
Table 8
Research Projects:
Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inservice/preservice workshops or courses</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research findings from knowledge/attitude/skill tests</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software programs</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software evaluation reports</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessments/surveys</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collected in descriptive research</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theses or dissertations</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum materials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency exam</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review of literature/conceptual paper</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of research studies with product indicated. Multiple responses were permitted in this section.

progress; and 2 (5%) were planned. In the 34 projects where professional titles for project directors were indicated, 24 were university faculty, seven were high school home economics teachers, and six were state, regional or city supervisors (Table 9).

Half of the projects (n=22) indicated multiple purposes, while the remaining half (n=20) listed a single purpose (Table 10). The project purposes from those most to least frequently reported were software evaluation, curriculum development, impact of technology on the family, software development, needs assessment, computer literacy, and network development.

Most projects (60%) provided inservice for teachers and dealt with software or courseware applications at the secondary level (62%) (Table 11). The next most common audience was preservice education (33%). Postsecondary and adult education each were the
Table 9
Exemplary Projects:
Positions of Contact Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position Title</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University faculty member</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary level home economics teacher</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State, regional or city supervisor</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of exemplary projects with contact person in the position described.

Table 10
Exemplary Projects:
Purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Single Purpose n</th>
<th>Multiple Purpose n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on family</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer literacy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network development</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of exemplary projects with single or multiple purposes. Multiple responses were permitted.
Table 11
Exemplary Projects:
Audience Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audience</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary level home economics students</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice home economics teachers</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservice home economics teachers/ undergraduates</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postsecondary level home economics students</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult education participants</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of exemplary projects addressing audience. Multiple responses were permitted.

The focus of 21% of the projects.

Content addressed by each project generally included several areas within home economics. Comprehensive consumer and homemaking education accounted for 24 (57%) projects, while occupational home economics education was addressed in 11 projects (26%) (Table 12).

When a single content area was addressed by a project, the areas most frequently addressed were food and nutrition (n=10, or 23%), child development and family relations (n=7, or 17%), and home management and family economics (n=4, or 10%). The content areas least frequently addressed were housing, home furnishings, and equipment (n=2, or 5%), and textiles and clothing (n=1, or 2%).

Five projects were identified as "not home economics related". These included other areas which were identified as utilities for instructional management, office management, and programming applications in preschool and mathematics class settings.

Although only 13 projects indicated software development as a major purpose, 17 projects indicated that some software or
Table 12
Exemplary Projects:
Content Area Addressed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive consumer and homemaking</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational home economics education</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food and nutrition</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child development and family relations</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home management and family economics</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, home furnishings, equipment</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles and clothing</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not home economics related</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of exemplary projects addressing content described. Multiple responses were permitted.

courseware had been developed as a result of the project (Table 13) (Appendix C). Information on the developed products was most often available only through the project director, or individual software developer; however, one courseware package was available commercially through an educational materials agency. The next most frequently described products were software evaluation and inservice/preservice workshops or courses.
## Table 13

Exemplary Projects:

### Products

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Product</th>
<th>n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Software programs</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inservice/preservice workshops or courses</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software selection criteria</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer managed instruction</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published articles</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database of inservice needs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum materials</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network survey</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = Number of exemplary projects with product indicated. Multiple responses were permitted in this section.
RELATIONSHIP OF NEEDS TO PROJECTS CONDUCTED

Research Projects

In general, the directions of research projects identified were consistent with needs identified by professionals. There were areas, however, where many respondents indicated an area as a research need, yet a limited number of projects were identified.

The greatest concentration of research activity was in the area of developing inservice for home economics teachers. Other popular objectives were evaluating software and developing preservice training. Such research projects were reflective of the immediate need to train teachers to use computers and to provide materials for their use.

While software evaluation and inservice/preservice education were identified as research needs, the needs identified by the largest number of respondents related to two concept areas: computers and learning, and instructional software. In particular, the subconcept identified by the most respondents was the need for a comparison of the effectiveness of instructional methods. From a review of the projects reported, only three studied the effectiveness of the computer as an instructional medium; no studies were identified which compared the computer with other instructional media.

The need for software development guidelines was also recognized by a large number of respondents. While guidelines may be outcomes of projects designed to develop or evaluate software, no such guidelines were identified as outcomes of the projects reported. As further research projects are developed, including studies comparing the effectiveness of the computer with other instructional methods, such guidelines are needed. The development and publication of guidelines is needed to provide a basis for the development of a greater number of quality software programs in home economics education.

Other research needs identified by a large number of respondents included an analysis of current use of computers and software in home economics education, and the identification of guidelines for implementing computers in the home economics curriculum. At the time of the study, few studies analyzed current use; no research studies were identified which provided guidelines for using computers in home economics instruction. This may be reflective of the infant nature of the phenomenon at the time of the study. As more home economics programs integrate computer applications, it becomes increasingly important to identify and analyze characteristics of model programs. Such data in combination with other research can serve as a basis for the development of guidelines for integrating computers in home economics.
Many respondents also identified the need for research to analyze the impact of computers on individuals and families. Only two studies were reported which focused specifically on homemakers. One dealt with use of the computer as an individualized instruction medium to teach nutrition concepts to rural homemakers. The other used a case study approach to examine the effects of the microcomputer on family relationships within the home. While it is recognized that other professions are involved in the analysis of the computer's effect on the home, home economics educators can and should provide leadership in this area.

Exemplary Projects

The exemplary projects described appeared to be progressing toward stated needs for such programs. When projects appeared to have multiple purposes, integrating technology into the home economics curriculum was a popular goal. Often the same respondents who described exemplary projects involving curriculum development were those who stressed the need to continue in this direction.

Evaluation of existing software was the most often described purpose of the exemplary projects. Criteria were developed in the evaluation process; the results of evaluation were shared with project participants and in some cases with other home economics educators. However, only one project included a reproducible document resulting from the project. It is possible that stated project needs for the comparison of effectiveness of instructional methods, learning theories, and with special groups were included in software evaluation criteria of several projects; or, the continued need to address these concerns may indicate that at present the field has not yet progressed to the point of evaluating more critically the software available.

Software development was a purpose of many projects. Just less than half identified some software product resulting from the project. For the most part, these products were not yet available to other home economics educators. The "under-development" status of several projects, and the descriptions of "short programs", "refinement of earlier work", and "adapting programs for use in the classroom" led the researchers to conclude that many efforts were still in the seminal stages.

The distinction made between "software" and "courseware" often found in the literature might well apply to the examination of these exemplary project products. The finding that more projects included software development than projects identifying software development as a major purpose, and that some respondents were reluctant to classify their own efforts as "model programs" although their peers did identify them as such, supports the belief that home economics educators were quickly gaining the skills necessary to utilize computer technology in the classroom.
However, a compendium of suitable courseware products from which to select is not yet available.

When funding information was included in project descriptions, the amounts were very limited (under $5000). Funds were often used to purchase hardware and software, to provide stipends for workshop participants, or extended pay for workshop leaders. Little evidence was included to suggest that computer programmers or educational software developers were hired to facilitate software development. The inservice emphasis of the projects, and goal of computer literacy (including programming skills) for the project audience may provide some explanation for the apparent hesitancy to make the software products available on a large scale.

Finally, it appeared that a recognition of the need to develop networks of computer-using home economics educators was beginning to be realized. Comments that software lending libraries were established or recommended, that public-domain software was shared, and that individual software developers were willing to informally share their work with others all supported the desire for network development. Although only two projects specifically included network development, perhaps it was an underlying motivation of several project directors and workshop participants to expand their contacts with other computer-using home economics educators.
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In conclusion, the field of home economics education is moving quickly toward addressing and maximizing the potential impact of computers. Considerable activity has been initiated in the field through both research and exemplary project efforts.

Initial research and exemplary project efforts at the time of the survey have concentrated primarily on inservice for home economics teachers. Other areas in which considerable activity has been initiated included the development and evaluation of secondary level software applications. These emphases on teacher inservice and software development/evaluation were concluded to be natural outcomes of the immediate concern that home economics teachers and programs are involved in the technology explosion.

Further needs for research and exemplary projects must be addressed in order for the field to realize the full potential of the computer in home economics education. As a result of this national survey of research and exemplary projects in home economics education, five needs have been identified. The first three needs relate to content directions for research and exemplary projects. The last two needs relate to organization and administration of projects.

First, the computer's effectiveness as an instructional medium in comparison with other forms of media needs to be addressed. No studies in home economics education were identified which focused on this area. Without a sufficient base to analyze instructional effectiveness, computers may be used to teach home economics content simply because the computer is currently a popular learning tool. The long term implication is that the computer may become less popular with students because it is not used in its most effective sense. In addition to developing research in the field, home economics educators can draw upon research findings on computer effectiveness from other fields, such as education.

A second need is to develop home economics curriculum integrating computer applications. There was some evidence to suggest that this was beginning to happen at the time of the survey. Home economics curriculum integrating computer applications would include an analysis of "high tech" as well as "high touch" applications. Specific directions for curriculum would include: using the computer as a learning tool, analyzing technological applications in the home, and analyzing the meaning of technology in personal and family life. Such a curriculum should identify applications to comprehensive consumer and homemaking education, as well as the development of specialized course(s) concentrating on technological applications to personal and family life. Possible approaches to addressing this need would include the identification and analysis of model programs.

Third, guidelines for software development in home economics
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education need to be identified. Consistently, respondents identified concerns for quality software assurances. There is evidence to support that this need was beginning to be addressed. Preliminary efforts in many states included an analysis of software that was available. Software development guidelines would also need to be based on an understanding of the effectiveness of the computer as an instructional medium.

Fourth, individuals initiating projects in this area should consider focusing projects on one or two main objectives. A natural tendency in developing a project in a new area is to develop more objectives than often can be reasonably achieved considering available resources.

Fifth and finally, some organization and coordination of computer research and exemplary project activities in home economics education is needed. From a review of the projects conducted, several projects had similar objectives and, as a result, produced similar outcomes. Some duplication of effort is reflective of the infant nature of the area, and, of course, is necessary. Since in many cases funding was limited, the field could benefit by some organization and coordination of activity. This project is an initial effort to achieve that end.
## APPENDIX A

Research Projects: Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Purpose of Project</th>
<th>Research Sample</th>
<th>Product #1</th>
<th>Product #2</th>
<th>Content Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0504</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Competency exam</td>
<td>Software program</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0601</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Evaluation, report</td>
<td>Software program</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0601</td>
<td>CO</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Pre-post findings</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Software program</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>CDFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Secondary students</td>
<td>Curriculum</td>
<td>Software applications</td>
<td>F/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Pre-post findings</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Preschoolers</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Pre-post findings</td>
<td>CDFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Software program</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Inservice workshop</td>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Preservice teachers</td>
<td>Workshops/ courses</td>
<td>Pre-post findings</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Pre-post findings</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2101</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>CDFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2306</td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>Media effectiveness</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td>Software program</td>
<td>Pre-post findings</td>
<td>T/C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Media effectiveness</td>
<td>Rural homemakers</td>
<td>Software program</td>
<td>Pre-post findings</td>
<td>F/N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Purpose of Project</td>
<td>Research Sample</td>
<td>Product #1</td>
<td>Product #2</td>
<td>Content Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403</td>
<td>MN</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Extension agents</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Pre-post findings NS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Pre-post findings Comp. HE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2504</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Extension agents</td>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>Software program</td>
<td>Home Mgt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2504</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Undergraduates</td>
<td>Workshop/Course</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Home Mgt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2803</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Evaluation report</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Descriptive research</td>
<td>Secondary students</td>
<td>Research findings</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3601</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Pre/Inservice teacher</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Pre-post findings Comp. HE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3605</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Evaluation/Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Needs assessment data</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3902</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Descriptive research</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Dissertation</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3902</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3902</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Evaluation/Needs Assessment</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Needs assessment data</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3902</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Review of literature</td>
<td>Literature on Computer Use</td>
<td>Literature review Recommendations</td>
<td>Voc. Ed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3903</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Evaluation report</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>CDFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3904</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Evaluation report</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4103</td>
<td>SC</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Evaluation report</td>
<td>Software programs</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4201</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Purpose of Project</td>
<td>Research Sample</td>
<td>Product #1</td>
<td>Product #2</td>
<td>Content Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4202</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Descriptive research</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Research findings</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4706</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Descriptive research</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Research findings</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4902</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Evaluation report</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4903</td>
<td>WV</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>Evaluation report</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5009</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>Inservice teachers</td>
<td>Needs assessment data</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. H.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5012</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>MS Thesis</td>
<td>Family Groups</td>
<td>Research findings</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Computer Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5012</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Action research</td>
<td>Graduate students</td>
<td>Course</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:**
- NS : Not specified
- CDFR : Child Development and Family Relations
- F/N : Foods and Nutrition
- Home Mgt. : Home Management
- T/C : Textiles and Clothing
- Comp. HE: Comprehensive Home Economics
## APPENDIX B
### Exemplary Projects: Summary Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Purpose of Project</th>
<th>Product #1</th>
<th>Product #2</th>
<th>Content Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0104</td>
<td>AL</td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Computer managed instruction</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0301</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Computer entrepreneurship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0302</td>
<td>AZ</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>TC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0507</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>State roadshow</td>
<td>Community College workshop</td>
<td>Comp. HE, OHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0702</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0702</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0702</td>
<td>CT</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>CDFR, FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>ID</td>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401</td>
<td>IL</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>CDFR, Preschool Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503</td>
<td>IN</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE, OHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602</td>
<td>IA</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1706</td>
<td>KS</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>KY</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Published articles</td>
<td>Comp. HE, Math</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907</td>
<td>LA</td>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>Data base of in-service needs</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE, OHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Purpose of Project</td>
<td>Product #1</td>
<td>Product #2</td>
<td>Content Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>ME</td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Training workshops</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE, OHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2101</td>
<td>MD</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Model inservice project</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE, Inst. Mgt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>Training application</td>
<td>Workshop for teachers</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE, Dept. Mgt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>CDFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2602</td>
<td>MO</td>
<td>One week course</td>
<td>Course syllabus</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2807</td>
<td>NE</td>
<td>Impact on families</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Classroom management</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3202</td>
<td>NM</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3302</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Food service curriculum</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>OHE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3304</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Software program</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3601</td>
<td>OH</td>
<td>Workshop</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3701</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Impact on family</td>
<td>Short demo. programs</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3706</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Energy consumption unit</td>
<td>HMFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3708</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>13 software programs</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3901</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Purpose of Project</td>
<td>Product #1</td>
<td>Product #2</td>
<td>Content Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3903</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Master's paper</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3904</td>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Booklet of evaluations</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4201</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Network survey</td>
<td>Survey results</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4202</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Networking</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4301</td>
<td>TN</td>
<td>Needs assessment</td>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>CDFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4504</td>
<td>UT</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>Software development</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4604</td>
<td>VT</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4704</td>
<td>VA</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>FN, HMFE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5005</td>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>Software evaluation</td>
<td>Software selection criteria</td>
<td>Comp. HE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Abbreviations:**
- **NS:** Not Specified
- **CDFR:** Child Development and Family Relations
- **FN:** Foods and Nutrition
- **HHFE:** Housing, Home Furnishings, and Equipment
- **HMFE:** Home Management and Family Economics
- **TC:** Textiles and Clothing
- **Comp. HE:** Comprehensive Home Economics
- **OHE:** Occupational Home Economics
- **Inst. Mgt:** Instructional Management
# APPENDIX C
Software Produced by Exemplary Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject/Title</th>
<th>In Process</th>
<th>Complete</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational Home Economics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Careers in home economics education</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free enterprise in the classroom</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entrepreneurship</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience simulator to provide experience in hotel/motel/hospitality careers</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food and Nutrition</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrient density diet analysis</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs in nutrition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What I usually eat (food intake assessment device for elementary students)</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyze school lunch menus from 45-item list</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutritive values of foods</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet analysis based on RDA's</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Textiles and Clothing</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fantastic fibers</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human Development</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading readiness program for pre-school</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family crisis/stress and child development</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumer Economics and Resource Management</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The problem of energy consumption</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four management programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost estimate for painting interior walls</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Home Economics Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four home economics programs</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short demonstration programs for home economics classes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs in all areas, non-commercial</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructional management by computer based teacher education</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eight programs of program instruction and quizzes</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computers and the elderly</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D
Survey Instrument

TO: Teacher Educators and State Supervisors
Vocational Home Economics Education

The AVA Home Economics Division Standing Research Committee has formed a Subcommittee on Computer Research in Home Economics Education. One of the first tasks of this subcommittee is to assess the "state of the art" of research and exemplary projects related to computers in home economics education. This assessment will provide a basis for facilitating communication and for stimulating further research and creative efforts in the field.

Please complete the enclosed "National Survey on Computer Research and Exemplary Projects in Home Economics Education" by March 15. If you know a colleague who has been directly involved, feel free to forward a copy of the survey to her/him to complete. If you have not had a research or exemplary project, complete only page 1 and return. In accordance with human subjects guidelines, filling out the questionnaire implies consent to participate in the survey.

This study is being supported in part by the U.S. Department of Education through the Vocational Home Economics Education annual program of work. If you have questions or comments about the survey, please contact either of us or subcommittee members Cheryl Hausafus, Iowa State University (515-294-5307) or Dawn Anderson, the Pennsylvania State University (814-863-3860).

We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Glinda B. Crawford
Subcommittee Chairwoman
Home Economics and Nutrition
University of North Dakota
P.O. Box 8273
Grand Forks, ND 58202
701-777-2539

Bertha G. King
Education Program Specialist
Vocational Home Economics Education
OVAE-DVES-PSB ROB #3, Rm. 5652
Washington, D.C. 20202
202-245-9786
NATIONAL SURVEY OF RESEARCH AND EXEMPLARY PROJECTS
ON COMPUTERS IN HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION

Return by March 15 to: Glinda B. Crawford
Home Economics and Nutrition
University of North Dakota
P.O. Box 8273
Grand Forks, ND 58202

Questionnaire completed by:

Check: (1) ___ Teacher Educator (0)
_____ State Supervisor (1)
_____ Other (Describe) (2)

Name __________________________________________
Address _________________________________________
_________________________ Phone__________________

I would like a copy of the project report. CODE 

I. Describe your perception of research needs related to computers and home economics education.

II. Describe your perception of exemplary project needs relative to computers and home economics education. (Not listed above)

III. Are you aware of model secondary, postsecondary, or adult programs in which home economics educators are teaching a course or courses on computer applications to individuals and/or families.

Check: (22) ___ No (0) ____ Yes (1)

If Yes, list the following information for up to three:

Educator's name
Position
Address
Phone
Brief description

34
IV. This section requests information on projects related to computers in home economics education. This would include:

Projects in homemaking or occupational home economics education.

Projects in Comprehensive Consumer & Homemaking Education or in Specialized areas (e.g., nutrition, child development)

Projects completed, in progress, or planned.

If you are reporting on more than one project, please make additional copies of pages 2 and 3 to complete. In addition, if you know a colleague who should report on a computer project because of its implications for home economics education, please duplicate these pages for her/him to complete and return.

A. Project Title:

B. Level:
   (Check all that apply)
   (23) ___ Elementary education
   (24) ___ Secondary education
   (25) ___ Postsecondary education
   (26) ___ Adult education
   (27) ___ Preservice education
   (28) ___ Inservice education
   (29) ___ Other

C. Area:
   (Check all that apply)
   (30) ___ Child development and family relations
   (31) ___ Food and nutrition
   (32) ___ Home management and family economics
   (33) ___ Housing, home furnishings, equipment
   (34) ___ Textiles and clothing
   (35) ___ Occupational Home Economics Education
   (36) ___ Comprehensive: Consumer & Homemaking Ed.
   (37) ___ Other (describe)

D. Type of Project:
   (Check all that apply)
   (38) ___ Needs assessment
   (39) ___ Software development
   (40) ___ Curriculum development
   (41) ___ Software evaluation
   (42) ___ Impact of technology on the family
   (43) ___ Other (list)

E. Project Status:
   (44) ___ Completed (0)
   ___ In Progress (1)
   ___ Planned (2)

F. Contact person:
   Name
   Position
   Role in project
   Phone
   Address
G. Did software result from this project?  
   (45) No (0)  
   Yes (1)  
   If Yes, describe software and availability.

H. Was this a research project?  
   (46) No (0)  
   Yes (1)  
   If Yes,  
   Did the research findings relate to attitude/knowledge/skills of participants?  
   (47) No (0)  
   Yes (1)  
   NA (2)  
   Was a pre-post analysis done?  
   (48) No (0)  
   Yes (1)  
   NA (2)

I. Project Description: (Include objectives, methods, results, recommendations, completion date. Also, attach supporting material if desired.)

Thanks for your help!
Home Economics Education

Computer Research and Exemplary Projects:

SUPPLEMENTS

Supplement 1: Research Projects: Respondents............1
Supplement 2: Research Projects: Descriptions............2
Supplement 3: Exemplary Projects: Respondents............15
Supplement 4: Exemplary Projects: Descriptions............16

NOTES: Data for projects are presented by a four digit code. The respondent who provided information about the project and the project contact person are identified; in some cases, the respondent was not identified as the project contact person.

For further information about this national survey, contact either of the three authors:

Glinda B. Crawford
Home Ec. & Nutr.
Univ. of N.D.
Grand Forks, ND 58502

Daun M. Anderson
Home Economics
Univ. of Texas-Austin
Austin, TX 78712

Cheryl O. Hausafus
Home Ec. Ed.
Iowa State Univ.
Ames, IA 50011

This project was completed with consultation and technical assistance from Bertha G. King, Education Program Specialist, Office of Vocational and Adult Education, Division of Vocational Education, Occupational Program Branch, U.S. Department of Education.

1985
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### Supplement 1

#### Research Projects: Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>State Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0504</td>
<td>Ruby L. Trow</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>CA State Poly. Univ.</td>
<td>3801 W. Temple</td>
<td>Pomona</td>
<td>CA 91748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0601</td>
<td>Valerie Sorenson</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Univ. of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>McKeen Hall, Room 405</td>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td>CO 80639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0601</td>
<td>Valerie Sorenson</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Univ. of Northern Colorado</td>
<td>McKeen Hall, Room 405</td>
<td>Greeley</td>
<td>CO 80639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701</td>
<td>Katherine Brophy</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>Dept. of Education</td>
<td>HGC, P. O. Box 2219</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>CT 06145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0701</td>
<td>Katherine Brophy</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>Dept. of Education</td>
<td>HGC, P. O. Box 2219</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>CT 06145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301</td>
<td>Laura Hiller</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>University of Idaho</td>
<td>School of Home Economics</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>ID 83843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401</td>
<td>Kathryn W. Smith</td>
<td>Professor of Home Ec</td>
<td>Illinois State University</td>
<td>Department of Home Economics</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>IL 61761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Virginia M. Slimmer</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Murray State University</td>
<td>Department of Home Economics</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>KY 40207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803</td>
<td>Virginia M. Slimmer</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Murray State University</td>
<td>Department of Home Economics</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>KY 402071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1906</td>
<td>Daisy H. Daniels</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Northeast Louisiana Univ.</td>
<td>32 Ricker Hall</td>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>ME 04938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Carolyn Drugge</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>University of Maine</td>
<td>200 W. Baltimore St.</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>MD 21201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2306</td>
<td>Mary Krieger</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Eastern Michigan Univ.</td>
<td>108 Roosevelt Bldg.</td>
<td>Ypsilanti</td>
<td>MI 48197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403</td>
<td>Jerry M. McClelland</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>325 Vocational Ed. Bldg.</td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>MN 55108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2403</td>
<td>Jerry M. McClelland</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>325 Vocational Ed. Bldg.</td>
<td>St. Paul</td>
<td>MN 55108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501</td>
<td>Kay Clayton</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Univ. of So. Mississippi</td>
<td>School of Home Economics</td>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
<td>MS 39040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2504</td>
<td>Sara Jordan</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Delta State University</td>
<td>P.O. Box 3273</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>MS 38733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2504</td>
<td>Sara Jordan</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Delta State University</td>
<td>P.O. Box 3273</td>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>MS 38733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2504</td>
<td>Sara Jordan</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Wayne State College</td>
<td>Home Economics Dept.</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>NE 68787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2504</td>
<td>Sara Jordan</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Wayne State College</td>
<td>Box 3470</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>NM 88003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>Cathleen T. Love</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>New Mexico State Univ.</td>
<td>Home Economics Dept.</td>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>OH 44555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>Cathleen T. Love</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>New Mexico State Univ.</td>
<td>Box 3470</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>NM 88003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3201</td>
<td>Cathleen T. Love</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>New Mexico State Univ.</td>
<td>Home Economics Dept.</td>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>OH 44555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Youngstown State Univ.</td>
<td>65 South Front St.-912</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH 43215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Youngstown State Univ.</td>
<td>65 South Front St.-912</td>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>OH 43215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301</td>
<td>Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State Univ.</td>
<td>206 Rackley</td>
<td>University Park</td>
<td>PA 16802</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Supplement 2

Research Projects: Descriptions

0504
Respondent: Ruby L. Trom
CA State Poly. Univ.
3801 W. Temple
Pomona CA 91768

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Purpose of Project: Software development
Project Status: 3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Undergraduates

Product #1: Competency exam
Product #2: Software program
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: Occ. HE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes

0601
Respondent: Valerie Sorenson
Univ. of Northern Colorado
McKee Hall, Room 405
Greeley CO 80639

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Purpose of Project: Software evaluation
Project Status: 3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Software

Product #1: Eval. report
Product #2: Software program
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: No
Pre-Post Analysis?: No

0601
Respondent: Valerie Sorenson
Univ. of Northern Colorado
McKee Hall, Room 405
Greeley CO 80639

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status: 3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Inservice hrs.

Product #1: Workshop
Product #2: Pre-post findings
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes
0701
Respondent: Katherine Brophy
Dept. of Education
HGC, P. O. Box 2219
Hartford CT 06145
Contact Person: Kathleen Gilligan
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Tomlinson Jr. High
Unquowa Road
Fairfield CT 06430

Purpose of Project: Software development
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Software.

Product #1: Software. program
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1:CompanyName
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: No
Pre-Post Analysis?: No

0701
Respondent: Katherine Brophy
Dept. of Education
HGC, P. O. Box 2219
Hartford CT 06145
Contact Person: Beverly Coyle
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
14 Mohawk Drive
Norwalk CT 06851

Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Secondary students

Product #1: Curriculum
Product #2: Software. applictns.
Content Area #1: F/N
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: No

1301
Respondent: Laura Miller
University of Idaho
School of Home Economics
Moscow ID 83843
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.

Product #1: Workshop
Product #2: Pre-post findings
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: NS*
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes
1401
Respondent: Kathryn W. Smith
Illinois State University
Normal, IL 61761

Contact Person: Elizabeth Stickman
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Lyons Township High School
100 S. Brainard, North Campus
LaGrange, IL 60525

Purpose of Project: Software development
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Preschoolers
Product #1: Software
Product #2: Pre-post findings
Content Area #1: COFR
Content Area #2: Preschool education
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes

1803
Respondent: Virginia M. Slimmer
Murray State University
Department of Home Economics
Murray, KY 42071

Contact Person: Judith Payne
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Murray State University
Department of Home Economics
Murray, KY 42071

Purpose of Project: Software development
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Software
Product #1: Software program
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes

1803
Respondent: Virginia M. Slimmer
Murray State University
Department of Home Economics
Murray, KY 42071

Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: Planned
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.
Product #1: Inservice workshop
Product #2: Needs assess.
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes
1906
Respondent: Daisy H. Daniels
Northeast Louisiana Univ.
Department of Home Economics
Monroe LA 71209
Contact Person: Ann Kapp
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Northeast Louisiana Univ.
Department of Home Economics
Monroe LA 71209
Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Preservice tchrs.
Product #1: Workshops/courses
Product #2: Pre-post findings
Content Area #1: NS
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes

2003
Respondent: Carolyn Drugge
University of Maine
32 Ricker Hall
Farmington ME 04938
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.
Product #1: Workshops
Product #2: Pre-post findings
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: Occ. HE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes

2101
Respondent: Louis A. Tanney
Maryland Dept. of Ed.
200 W. Baltimore St.
Baltimore MD 21201
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.
Product #1: Workshops
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: CDFR
Content Area #2: F/N
Content Area #3: Housing/Home Manage.
Changes in K/A/S?: No
Pre-Post Analysis?: No
Purpose of Project: Media effectiveness
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): NS

Product #1: Software program
Product #2: Pre-post findings
Content Area #1: T/C
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes

Purpose of Project: Media effectiveness
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Rural homemakers

Product #1: Software program
Product #2: Pre-post findings
Content Area #1: F/N
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes

Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Extension agents

Product #1: Workshop
Product #2: Pre-post findings
Content Area #1: NS
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: No
2501
Respondent: Kay Clayton
Univ. of So. Mississippi
School of Home Economics
Hattiesbug, MS 39406
Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.
Product #1: Workshops
Product #2: Pre-post findings
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes

2504
Respondent: Sara Jordan
Delta State University
P.O. Box 3273
Cleveland, MS 38733
Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Extension agents
Product #1: Needs assess. data
Product #2: Sftware. program
Content Area #1: Home Mgt.
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes

2504
Respondent: Sara Jordan
Delta State University
P.O. Box 3273
Cleveland, MS 38733
Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Undergraduates
Product #1: Workshop/Course
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Home Mgt.
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes
Respondent: LaVera Roehnildt
Wayne State College
Home Economics Dept.
Wayne, NE 68787

Purpose of Project: Software evaluation
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Software

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Product #1: Eval. report
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: No
Pre-Post Analysis?: No

Respondent: Cathleen T. Love
New Mexico State Univ.
Box 3470
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: Planned
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Product #1: Software evaluation
Product #2: Workshop
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: Occ. HE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes

Respondent: Cathleen T. Love
New Mexico State Univ.
Box 3470
Las Cruces, NM 88003

Purpose of Project: Descriptive research
Project Status-3/84: Planned
Research Subject(s): Secondary students

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Product #1: Research findings
Product #2: Workshop
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: Occ. HE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes
3601
Respondent: Dorothy West
Youngstown State Univ.
Home Economics Dept.
Youngstown OH 44555

Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: Planned
Research Subject(s): Pre/Inservice tchr

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

3605
Respondent: Joanna Kister
65 South Front St.-912
Columbus OH 43215

Purpose of Project: Eval./Needs Assess.
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

3902
Respondent: Daun Anderson
Pennsylvania State Univ.
204 Rackley
University Park PA 16802

Purpose of Project: Descriptive resrch.
Project Status-3/84: In Progress
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.

Contact Person: Daun Anderson
NOTE: NEW ADDRESS (as of 9/84)

Univ. of Texas/Austin
239 Gearing Hall
Austin TX 78712

Contact Person: Daun Anderson
NOTE: NEW ADDRESS (as of 9/84)

Product #1: Workshop
Product #2: Pre-post findings
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: No
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes
Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.

Product #1: Workshops
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes

Purpose of Project: Eval./Needs Assess
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.

Product #1: Needs assess. data
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: No

Purpose of Project: Review of lit.
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Lit. on Comp. Use

Product #1: Lit. review
Product #2: Recommendations
Content Area #1: Voc. Ed.
Content Area #2: HEEd
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: No
Pre-Post Analysis?: No
3903
Respondent: Susan F. Weis
Pennsylvania State Univ.
203 Rackley Building
University Park PA 16802

Purpose of Project: Evaluation
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Sftwre.

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

3904
Respondent: Helen B. Hovis
Indiana Univ. of PA
108 Ackerman Hall
Indiana PA 15705

Purpose of Project: Sftwre. evaluation
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Sftwre.

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

4103
Respondent: Patricia E. Hoepfl
117 1/2 N. Main St.
Anderson SC 29621

Purpose of Project: Sftwre. evaluation
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Sftwre.

Contact Person: Emily Wiggins
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Clemson University
240 P & AS Building
Clemson SC 29631

Product #1: Eval. report
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: No
Pre-Post Analysis?: No

Product #1: Eval. report
Product #2: Sftwre. programs
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: Yes
4201
Respondent: Brenda M. Bak
Division of Voc. Ed.
Kniep Building
Pierre SD 57501
Purpose of Project: Needs assess.
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.
Product #1: Needs assess. data
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: No

4202
Respondent: Edna Page Anderson
South Dakota State Univ.
H-H 305, Box 2279A
Brookings SD 57006
Purpose of Project: Descriptive resrch.
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.
Product #1: Research findings
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: No

4706
Respondent: Daisy Cunningham
Virginia Tech Univ.
211 Lane Hall
Blacksburg VA 24061
Purpose of Project: Descriptive resrch.
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.
Product #1: Research findings
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: No
Respondent: Elaine J. Preece
2920 Birch Avenue
Pt. Pleasant, WV 25550

Purpose of Project: Software evaluation
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Software.

Product #1: Eval. report
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: Occ. HE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: No
Pre-Post Analysis?: No

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Respondent: Robin White
Building #6, Room B243
Charleston, WV 25305

Purpose of Project: Software evaluation
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Software.

Product #1: Eval. report
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: Occ. HE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: No
Pre-Post Analysis?: No

Contact Person: Elaine Preece
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Respondent: Beatrice Petrich
Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison
Home Economics Building
Madison, WI 53706

Purpose of Project: Needs assess.
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Inservice tchrs.

Product #1: Needs assess. data
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: N
5012
Respondent: Linda Brucker
Univ. of Wisconsin-Stout
125 Home Economics Building
Stout WI 54751

Purpose of Project: MS Thesis
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Research Subject(s): Family groups
Product #1: Research findings
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Cmptr. Impacts
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: Yes
Pre-Post Analysis?: No

5012
Respondent: Linda Brucker
Univ. of Wisconsin-Stout
125 Home Economics Building
Stout WI 54751

Purpose of Project: Action research
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Research Subject(s): Graduate students
Product #1: Course
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comp. HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: NS*
Pre-Post Analysis?: NS*
# Supplement 3

## Exemplary Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code Respondent</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>St Zip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0104 Lillie R. Mays</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Tuskegee Institute</td>
<td>Dept. of Voc. Ed.</td>
<td>Tuskegee</td>
<td>AL 36088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0301 Mary Lewkowitz</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td>1535 West Jefferson</td>
<td>Phoenix</td>
<td>AZ 85007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0302 Doris Manning</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td>5790 Placita Esplendora</td>
<td>Tucson</td>
<td>AZ 85718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0507 Colleen M. Carr</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Ohlone College</td>
<td>P. O. Box 3909</td>
<td>Fremont</td>
<td>CA 94539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0702 Katherine Brophy</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>Dept. of Educ.</td>
<td>HGC, P. O. Box 2219</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>CT 06145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0702 Katherine Brophy</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>Dept. of Educ.</td>
<td>HGC, P. O. Box 2219</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>CT 06145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0702 Katherine Brophy</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>Dept. of Educ.</td>
<td>HGC, P. O. Box 2219</td>
<td>Hartford</td>
<td>CT 06145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1301 Laura Miller</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>Univ. of Idaho</td>
<td>School of Home Econ.</td>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>ID 83843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1401 Kathryn W. Smith</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Illinois State Univ.</td>
<td>Dept. of Home Econ.</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>IL 61761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1503 B. Jeanette Miller</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Ball State Univ.</td>
<td>Dept. of Home Econ.</td>
<td>Muncie</td>
<td>IN 47306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1602 Alyce M. Fanslow</td>
<td>Professor</td>
<td>Iowa State Univ.</td>
<td>219 MacKay Hall</td>
<td>Ames</td>
<td>IA 50011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1704 Carole Oberle</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>State Dept. of Educ.</td>
<td>120 East 10th</td>
<td>Topeka</td>
<td>KS 66612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1803 Virginia M. Slimmer</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Murray State Univ.</td>
<td>Dept. of Home Econ.</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>KY 42071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1907 Barbara Moore</td>
<td>Assoc. Professor</td>
<td>Murray State Univ.</td>
<td>Dept. of Home Econ.</td>
<td>Murray</td>
<td>KY 42071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2101 Louise A. Tanney</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>HE Occ. Resource Ctr</td>
<td>32 Ricker Hall</td>
<td>Farmington</td>
<td>ME 04938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2501 Kay Clayton</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>Univ. of So. Mississippi</td>
<td>200 West Baltimore Street</td>
<td>Baltimore</td>
<td>MD 21201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2601 Paula Hartsfield</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>Elem. &amp; Sec. Educ.</td>
<td>P. O. Box 400</td>
<td>Hattiesburg</td>
<td>MS 33406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2602 Carol E. Kellett</td>
<td>Department Chair</td>
<td>Centr Missouri St. Univ.</td>
<td>3901 Lincoln</td>
<td>Jefferson City</td>
<td>MO 65102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2807 Melinda Holcombe</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td>131 Home Econ. Bldg.</td>
<td>Warrensburg</td>
<td>MO 64093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3101 Margaret Charters</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>New Mexico St. Univ.</td>
<td>Box 3470</td>
<td>Lincol</td>
<td>NE 68583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3202 Laine Renfro</td>
<td>State Supervisor</td>
<td>State Dept. of Educ.</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td>Las Cruces</td>
<td>NM 88003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3301 Margaret Charters</td>
<td>Supervisor/Chief Studies</td>
<td>Syracuse University</td>
<td>224 St. John's Hall</td>
<td>Kinderhook</td>
<td>NY 12501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3302 Shirley E. Greenwald</td>
<td>City Supervisor</td>
<td>Bureau of Home Econ.</td>
<td>347 Baltic Street, Room 304</td>
<td>Brooklyn</td>
<td>NY 11201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3304 Arline Rubin</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>City of Home Econ.</td>
<td>175 West 12 Street</td>
<td>New York City</td>
<td>NY 10011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3401 Dorothy West</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>Youngstown State Univ.</td>
<td>HE Dept., Cushwa Hall</td>
<td>Youngstown</td>
<td>OH 44555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3701 Donna Boyd</td>
<td>Instructor</td>
<td>East Central Univ.</td>
<td>2204 Foster Drive</td>
<td>Ada</td>
<td>OH 45810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3706 Anna M. Gorman</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Oklahoma State Univ.</td>
<td>183 NEW</td>
<td>Stillwater</td>
<td>OK 74078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3708 Nevaleen Seltin</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td>Box 452</td>
<td>Wakita</td>
<td>OK NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3901 Marilyn S. Prehm</td>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>Pennsylvania St. Univ.</td>
<td>212 Rackley Building</td>
<td>University Park PA 16802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3903 Susan F. Weis</td>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Pennsylvania St. Univ.</td>
<td>208 Rackley Building</td>
<td>University Park PA 16802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3904 Helen B. Hovis</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Indiana Univ. of Penn.</td>
<td>107 Ackerman Hall</td>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>PA 15705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4102 Edna Paige Anderson</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Head, Home Econ. Educ.</td>
<td>IN 305, Box 2275A</td>
<td>Brookings</td>
<td>SD 57006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4301 Gearldean Johnson</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Tennessee State Univ.</td>
<td>Dept. of Home Econ.</td>
<td>Nashville</td>
<td>TN 37203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4504 Jan M. Humes</td>
<td>Teacher Educator</td>
<td>Utah State University</td>
<td>UMC 29</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>UT 84322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4601 Catherine Desaults</td>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>Harwood Union H. S.</td>
<td>RFD 1 Box 790</td>
<td>Moretown</td>
<td>VT 05660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4704 Cynthia Mayo</td>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Virginia State Univ.</td>
<td>Box M</td>
<td>Petersburg</td>
<td>VA 23803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5005 Laurie Hittman</td>
<td>Home Econ. Coordinator</td>
<td>NS*</td>
<td>725 West Park Avenue</td>
<td>Chippequa Falls</td>
<td>WI 54729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NS* = Not Specified
Supplement 4

Exemplary Projects: Descriptions

0104
Respondent: Lillie R. Mays
Tuskegee Institute
Dept. of Voc. Ed.
Tuskegee AL 36088
Purpose of Project: Curriculum dev.
Product #1: Computer managed instr.
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Education
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

0301
Respondent: Mary Lewkowitiz
NS*
1535 West Jefferson
Phoenix AZ 85007
Purpose of Project: Entrepreneurship
Product #1: Software development
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Computer entrepreneurship
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

0302
Respondent: Doris Manning
NS*
5790 Placita Esplendor
Tucson AZ 85718
Purpose of Project: Software development
Product #1: Software development
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: TC
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Contact Person: Elizabeth Hruby
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

NS*
2202 West Window Rock Drive
Tucson AZ 85745
0507
Respondent: Colleen M. Carr
Consone College
P. O. Box 3909
Fremont CA 94539
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Purpose of Project: Software evaluation
Project Status-3/84: Compl. & planned
Product #1: State Roadshow
Product #2: Community College Workshop
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: Occupational HE
Content Area #3: Implementation training.

0702
Respondent: Katherine Brophy
Dept. of Educ.
HGC, P. O. Box 2219
Hartford CT 06145
Contact Person: Ruth Wodock
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Purpose of Project: Software development
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Product #1: Software development
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

Danbury H. S.
Clapboard Road
Danbury CT 06810

0702
Respondent: Katherine Brophy
Dept. of Educ.
HGC, P. O. Box 2219
Hartford CT 06145
Contact Person: Irene Talitsky
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Purpose of Project: Software evaluation
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Product #1: NS*
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: FN
Content Area #2: Hsg/housing, furn. & equip.
Content Area #3: NONE

Bolton H. S.
Brandy Street
Bolton CT 06040
Respondent: Katherine Brophy
Dept. of Educ.
HGC, P. O. Box 2219
Hartford CT 06145

Purpose of Project: Needs assessment
Project Status-3/84: In progress

Product #1: NS*
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: FN
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

Contact Person: Beverly Coyle
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Respondent: Katherine Brophy
Dept. of Educ.
HGC, P. O. Box 2219
Hartford CT 06145

Purpose of Project: Software evaluation
Project Status-3/84: Completed

Product #1: NS*
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: CDFR
Content Area #2: FN
Content Area #3: NONE

Contact Person: Betty Scott
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Amity Sr. H. S.
Newton Road
Woodbridge CT 06525

Respondent: Laura Miller
Univ. of Idaho
School of Home Econ.
Moscow ID 83843

Purpose of Project: Workshops
Project Status-3/84: In progress

Product #1: Software evaluation
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Respondent: Kathryn W. Smith</th>
<th>Purpose of Project: Software development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illinois State Univ.</td>
<td>Project Status-3/84: Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Home Econ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normal IL 61761</td>
<td>Product #1: Software development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Product #2: NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content Area #1: CDFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content Area #2: Preschool Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content Area #3: NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Contact Person: Elizabeth Anne Stickman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lyons Township H. S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100 S. Brainard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>La Grange IL 60525</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Respondent: B. Jeanette Miller</th>
<th>Purpose of Project: Software evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ball State Univ.</td>
<td>Project Status-3/84: Planned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dept. of Home Econ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muncie IN 47306</td>
<td>Product #1: NS*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Product #2: NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content Area #2: Occupational HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Content Area #3: NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Contact Person: Dr. Audrey Finn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Respondent: Alyce M. Fanslow</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Iowa State Univ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>219 MacKay Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ames IA 50011</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Contact Person: Same as respondent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Purpose of Project: Software development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Project Status-3/84: Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product #1: Software development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Product #2: NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Area #1: FN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Area #2: NONE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Content Area #3: NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1706
Respondent: Carole Oberle
State Dept. of Educ.
120 East 10th
Topeka KS 66612
Purpose of Project: Software evaluation
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Product #1: Software evaluation document
Product #2: None
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: None
Content Area #3: None
Contact Person: Marilyn Meyer
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Mission School
6649 Lamar
Shawnee Mission KS 66202

1803
Respondent: Virginia M. Slimmer
Murray State Univ.
Dept. of Home Econ.
Murray KY 42071
Purpose of Project: Workshop
Project Status-3/84: Planned
Product #1: Software development
Product #2: None
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: None
Content Area #3: None
Contact Person: Mrs. Judith Payne
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Murray State Univ.
Dept. of Home Econ.
Murray KY 42071

1803
Respondent: Virginia M. Slimmer
Murray State Univ.
Dept. of Home Econ.
Murray KY 42071
Purpose of Project: Workshop
Project Status-3/84: Completed & Planned
Product #1: Software development
Product #2: Published articles
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: Math teachers
Content Area #3: None
Contact Person: Mrs. Judith Payne
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Murray State Univ.
Dept. of Home Econ.
Murray KY 42071
1907
Respondent: Barbara Moore
Purpose of Project: Needs assessment
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Louisiana State Univ.
School of Voc. Educ.
Baton Rouge LA 70803
Product #1: Data base of inservice needs
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: Occupational HE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

2003
Respondent: Carolyn Drugge
Purpose of Project: Curriculum dev.
Project Status-3/84: In progress
HE Occ. Resource Ctr
32 Ricker Hall
Farmington ME 04938
Product #1: Training workshops
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: Occupational HE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

2101
Respondent: Louise A. Tanney
Purpose of Project: Software evaluation
Project Status-3/84: In progress
State Dept. of Educ.
200 West Baltimore Street
Baltimore MD 21201
Product #1: Model inservice project
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: Teacher mgt. utilities
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
2501
Respondent: Kay Clayton

Univ. of So. Mississippi
School of Home Econ.
Hattiesburg MS 39406

Purpose of Project: Training appl.
Project Status-3/84: In progress

Product #1: Workshop for teachers
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: Management of HE Dept.
Content Area #3: NONE

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

2601
Respondent: Paula Hartsfield

Elem. & Sec. Educ.
P. O. Box 480
Jefferson City MO 65102

Purpose of Project: Curriculum development
Project Status-3/84: In progress

Product #1: NS*
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: CDFR
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

Contact Person: Ms. Carolyn Dubucki
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Flornisant Jr. Coli.
NS*
St. Louis MO NS*

2602
Respondent: Carol E. Kellett

Cntl Missouri St. Univ.
250 Grinstead
Warrensburg MO 64093

Purpose of Project: One week course
Project Status-3/84: Planned

Product #1: Course syllabus
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

Contact Person: Helen M. Ball
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Cntl. Missouri St. Univ.
231 Grinstead
Warrensburg MO 64093
2007
Respondent: Melinda Holcombe
Purpose of Project: Impact on families
Project Status-3/84: In progress
NS*
131 Home Econ. Bldg.
Lincoln NE 68583
Product #1: NS*
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: NS*
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Cheryl Fedje
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Univ. of Wisc.-Madison
Home Econ. Bldg.
Stevens Point WI 53706
3201
Respondent: Cathleen T. Love
Purpose of Project: Classroom mgt.
Project Status-3/84: Planned
New Mexico St. Univ.
Box 3470
Las Cruces NM 88003
Product #1: Sftware evaluation
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
3222
Respondent: Laine Renfro
Purpose of Project: Sftware evaluation
Project Status-3/84: Completed
State Dept. of Educ.
NS*
Sante Fe NM 87501
Product #1: Sftware evaluation
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: FN
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Dr. Peggy Brown
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Western New Mexico Univ.
Home Econ. Education
Silver City NM 85061
3301
Respondent: Margaret Charters
Syracuse University
224 Slocum Hall
Syracuse, NY 13210
Purpose of Project: Curriculum dev.
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Product #1: Software, development
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

3302
Respondent: Shirley E. Greenwald
Bureau of Home Econ.
347 Baltic Street, Room 304
Brooklyn, NY 11201
Purpose of Project: Curriculum dev.
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Product #1: Food service curriculum
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Occupational HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

3304
Respondent: Arline Rubin
NS*
175 West 12 Street
New York City, NY 10011
Purpose of Project: Software, development
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Product #1: Software, program
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: FN
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Dr. Lorraine Sirota
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Brooklyn College
Bedford Ave. & Avenue H
Brooklyn, NY 11210
3601
Respondent: Dorothy West
Youngstown State Univ.
HE Dept., Cushwa Hall
Youngstown OH 44555
Purpose of Project: Two credit workshop
Project Status-3/84: Planned
Product #1: Software development
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

3701
Respondent: Donna Boyd
East Central Univ.
2204 Foster Drive
Ada OK 74826
Purpose of Project: Impact on family
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Product #1: Short demo progs. for class
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

3706
Respondent: Anna M. Gorman
Oklahoma State Univ.
143 HEW
Stillwater OK 74078
Purpose of Project: Curriculum dev.
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Product #1: Sftware. development
Product #2: Energy consumption unit
Content Area #1: Home mgmt./Fam. econ.
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Respondent: Nevaleen Selat  
Box 452  
Wakita  
Purpose of Project: Software, development  
Project Status-3/84: Completed  
Product #1: 13 software programs  
Product #2: NONE  
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE  
Content Area #2: NONE  
Content Area #3: NONE  
Contact Person: Carolyn Colton  
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Bristow High School  
Bristow  

Respondent: Marilyn S. Prehm  
Pennsylvania St. Univ.  
212 Rackley Building  
University Park PA 16802  
Purpose of Project: Software, development  
Project Status-3/84: Completed  
Product #1: Software refinement  
Product #2: NONE  
Content Area #1: FN  
Content Area #2: NONE  
Content Area #3: NONE  
Contact Person: Margaret P. Ezell  
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Pennsylvania St. Univ.  
207 Armsby Building  
University Park PA 16802  

Respondent: Susan F. Weis  
Pennsylvania St. Univ.  
203 Rackley Building  
University Park PA 16802  
Purpose of Project: Software, evaluation  
Project Status-3/84: In Progress  
Product #1: Master's paper  
Product #2: NONE  
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE  
Content Area #2: NONE  
Content Area #3: NONE  
Contact Person: Same as respondent  
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
3904
Respondent: Helen B. Hovis
Indiana Univ. of Penn.
108 Ackerman Hall
Indiana PA 15705
Purpose of Project: Software evaluation
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Product #1: Booklet of evaluations
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: Teacher mgmt. utilities
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

4201
Respondent: Brenda M. Bak
Dvsn of Voc. Educ. on Kneip Bldg.
Pierre SD 57501
Purpose of Project: Network survey
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Product #1: Survey results
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

4202
Respondent: Edna Page Anderson
South Dakota St. Univ.
HN 305, Box 2275A
Brookings SD 57006
Purpose of Project: Networking
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Product #1: Software development
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE
Contact Person: Julie Bell
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
Respondent: Gearldean Johnson
Tennessee State Univ.
Dept. of Home Econ.
Nashville TN 37203

Purpose of Project: Needs assessment
Project Status-3/84: Planned
Product #1: Proposal
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: CDFR
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Respondent: Jan Winters
Utah State University
MC 29
Logan UT 84322

Purpose of Project: Software Development
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Product #1: Software, development
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)

Respondent: Catherine Desautels
Harwood Union H. S.
RFD 1 Box 790
Mor:town VT 05660

Purpose of Project: Software Evaluation
Project Status-3/84: In progress
Product #1: Software, evaluation
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)
4704
Respondent: Cynthia Mayo
Purpose of Project: Software Evaluation
Project Status-3/84: Completed
Virginia State Univ.
Box M
Petersburg VA 23803
Product #1: Software
Product #2: NONE
Content Area #1: FN
Content Area #2: Home Mgt. Fam. Econ.
Content Area #3: NONE
Changes in K/A/S?: NS*
Pre-Post Analysis?: NS*

5005
Respondent: Laurie Hittman
Purpose of Project: Curr. Development
Project Status-3/84: In Progress
NS*
725 West Park Avenue
Chippepa Falls WI 54729
Product #1: Software Evaluation
Product #2: Software selection criteria
Content Area #1: Comprehensive HE
Content Area #2: NONE
Content Area #3: NONE

Contact Person: Same as respondent
NOTE: IDENTIFIED BY RESPONDENT (ABOVE)