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Executive Summary

Rapid change is characteristic of modern society. The study of home economics plays a vital role in change assimilation, as it teaches individuals to live and function within that society. However, social changes place a burden on home economics educators, who must address the concerns of a new life-style: the breakdown of the family unit; the need to conserve resources, including time; and the blurring of gender roles. Thus, home economics education is an important area of research in the 1980s.

This publication, the fifth edition of a review and synthesis of research in home economics education, covers the period from 1979 through 1985. Materials cited were taken from the ERIC database, the Comprehensive Dissertation Index, and the professional journals. Announcements were widely distributed to solicit additional research results, and help was received from the American Vocational Association (AVA) Home Economics Division Research Committee.

Selection criteria were used to limit materials presented in this review. These criteria include the following:

- Documented validity - i.e., reliability of measurement
- Appropriateness of observation and analysis
- Quality of sampling design and sample response rate
- Innovative or interdisciplinary approach
- Critical or emerging subject matter

Some materials included do not meet all criteria; most of these report on research in an emerging issue area that does not yet have a large research base.

This publication covers the following aspects of home economics education: (1) administration (supervision, enrollment, and public image); (2) professional roles; (3) needs and characteristics of learners; (4) curriculum (nature, content, and structure); (5) instruction (higher education, consumer and homemaking, and occupational); (6) evaluation; (7) entrepreneurship; and (8) recommendations for further research.

Effective leadership is needed to guide home economics programs through this era of change. Recent research has focused on what makes a home economics administrator effective, resulting in the following list of characteristics: (1) professional expertise and activity; (2) interpersonal skills; (3) experience; (4) network involvement; (5) positive personal qualities; (6) self-development; and (7) time management. Differences were found in traits of male and female administrators.
Little research has been done in the past five years on supervisory practices in home economics education. That which has been done focused on teacher supervision of student teachers in home economics.

Enrollment, on the other hand, has been subject to noticeable change and thus is the subject of much research. Trends show that enrollment in home economics education programs is declining, however, the proportion of males in home economics is increasing. Recruitment activity must change to respond to these challenges. Early reports are positive; public image studies have revealed that knowledge of home economics programs leads to more involvement and more positive perceptions of the discipline.

Increasingly, home economics educators need to be aware of their perceptions of others and of themselves. For example, the “others” may be students who are foreign, disadvantaged, or males in a consumer and homemaking class. Teachers must ensure that they are providing a bias-free, positive education to all clients.

Research has also focused on teachers’ perceptions of themselves in the home economics field. Are they satisfied with their job? Are they politically active? Do they contribute to the profession? Do they consider themselves professionals? These questions and others were treated in recent surveys. Not surprisingly, the answers vary according to a subject’s age, terminal degree, marital status, and many other variables. All answers, however, have important implications for the future of the discipline.

Although numerous recent studies have focused on home economics learners, most research concerns specific populations and cannot be generalized. However, one study, using the Class of 1972 national data base, found that former home economics learners generally possess a positive attitude toward self that increases over time.

While most recent curriculum research continues to use the empirical-analytical research to explain or predict the nature, content, and structure of home economics education, significant studies have been done using interpretive and critical science research frameworks. Researchers have uncovered meanings underlying curriculum decisions and have suggested new possibilities for home economics curriculum.

Studies on instruction in home economics higher education and in occupational homemaking have focused on needed competencies for teachers and teacher educators. Some identified necessary competencies, while others looked at how competencies can be developed. In the area of consumer and homemaking programs, instruction research had many focuses, including instructional strategies, media, content-based reading, and classroom environment.

Researchers conducting program evaluation studies have tracked and described the status quo regarding responsiveness of consumer and homemaking programs to the 1976 Education Amendments, the characteristics of home economics programs and learners, and the impact of home economics programs on learners. Many studies have developed evaluation instruments in such areas as food planning and preparation, parenting, and practical reasoning.

Entrepreneurship as an emerging topic in home economics education is highlighted. Researchers are investigating the characteristics and problems of female small business owners.

The final chapter reviews areas needing research. For some of these questions, the research base is small, while for others, it is nonexistent. Topics needing further research include the following:
- Administration—especially sex equity in administration, supervision at state, district, and local levels
- Enrollment, recruitment, and image
- Program structure and organization
- Preparation of home economics educators for changing roles and responsibilities
- Needs and characteristics of learners—studies that can be generalized to other populations
- Preservice home economics education
- Implementation techniques for current curriculum and content
- Curriculum research and program evaluation on legislature thrusts in consumer and homemaking as well as focus on other content areas and special audiences
- Curriculum research using the critical science theoretical framework
- Instrumentation

Home economics education research has increased in both quality and quantity in the past few years. The AVA Home Economics Division Research Committee provides leadership and support for research in home economics education. Educators can take pride in their recent efforts, but they must keep moving the profession forward to match the rapid pace of change in modern society.

Introduction

This review and synthesis of home economics education research is the fifth in a series of state-of-the-art papers written primarily for researchers and graduate students. This edition covers the period from 1979 through 1985. The research presented is relevant to home economics teacher education, consumer and homemaking education and occupational home economics programs in the junior and senior high schools, postsecondary and outreach programs for adults, and area vocational schools.

Materials located through the ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education were reviewed; the Comprehensive Dissertation Index (Dissertation Abstracts) and the professional journals were searched for research information. In addition, letters to major universities offering graduate programs in home economics education and announcements at professional meetings requested important research. Assistance was also sought from the American Vocational Association's Home Economics Division Research Committee. However, the completeness of the collection is not presumed.

Since many studies were reviewed, selection criteria were essential. Some of the same guidelines used in the 1979 publication were followed: documentation of the validity and reliability of the measurement instruments; appropriateness of observation methods and quality of sampling design; proportion of the sample responding; and appropriateness of analysis. In addition, innovative research designs, interdisciplinary approaches, and research on critical or emerging issues in home economics education were considered. Guidelines established for inclusion in the review favored those studies investigating important problems in an innovative manner, those that presented data beyond a single school or district, those that illustrated a continuity of research, those that tended to conceptualize problems, and those that fulfilled the recommendations of the 1979 edition. Negative or inconclusive results were not a barrier to inclusion. Some studies that did not meet the established criteria but that explored areas in which little research existed were also included.

The major categories of this review and synthesis are administration, which includes such topics as leadership, enrollment, recruitment, and image; professional role, including job satisfaction, career alternatives, and selected characteristics of professionals; needs and characteristics of learners, including abilities and attitudes; instruction in home economics education in higher education as well as consumer and homemaking and occupational programs at the secondary level; curriculum, which includes conceptualization as well as design and implementation; and evaluation of programs and instruction as well as instrumentation development. The review also includes a section on entrepreneurship and finally, recommendations for future research directions.
Administration of Home Economics Programs

Effective administration is critical for the success of home economics programs. A number of researchers such as Belck and Meszaros (1984), Bronk (1979), Chapman (1983), Czaplewski (1981), Diehn (1982), Hallquist (1982), Harb (1980), and Johnston (1982) have examined the characteristics, attitudes, and practices of home economics administrators. The means by which home economics leadership was developed was studied by Baugher and Kellett (1983), Belck and Meszaros (1984), Bronk (1979), Harb (1980), and Inana (1983).

Several commonalities can be identified among the results of such research. Effective high-status leaders and administrators are characterized as (1) having a high degree of expertise and being active in contributing to the profession through professional organizations, publishing, acting as change agents, or conducting research (Belck and Meszaros 1984; Bronk 1979; Czaplewski 1981; Harb 1980); (2) having highly developed social skills, communication skills, interpersonal relationship skills, and leadership skills (Belck and Meszaros 1984; Chapman 1983; Czaplewski 1981; Diehn 1982; Harb 1980; Johnston 1982); (3) being older and more experienced (Braun 1983; Bronk 1979; and Hallquist 1982); (4) being involved in networking, mentoring, and role-modeling relationships (Belck and Meszaros 1984; Bronk 1979; Harb 1980; and Inana 1983); (5) exhibiting highly developed personal qualities such as enthusiasm, energy, motivation, fairness, patience, and flexibility (Czaplewski 1981; Harb 1980); (6) being highly educated and involved in continuing self-development through formal and informal means (Hallquist 1982; Inana 1983; Warta 1982); and (7) being well-organized and effective in managing their time (Belck and Meszaros 1984; Czaplewski 1981).

Gender appears to be correlated with a number of commonalities. For example, Bronk (1979) found that female vocational leaders were younger, more likely to be single, had fewer children, spent more time on household duties, submitted fewer articles for publication, subscribed to fewer professional journals, worked in lower-level positions, and had fewer years of job experience than their male colleagues. Johnston (1982) identified gender as a significant variable in conflict management and sources of conflict in home economics. Harb (1980) found that the majority of female home economics administrators believed they had been promoted more slowly and had to work harder and be more highly qualified than their male counterparts. Hallquist (1982) discovered significant differences on 20 of 22 deterrents to women's roles in education and that female administrators tended to be less traditional than males. These studies illustrate that certain characteristics differed between male and female administrators.

Huston (1983) used a Delphi technique with home economics administrators in higher education to identify six major issues in home economics: clientele served, profession versus discipline, nomenclature, core requirements, international relations, and accreditation of programs.
Supervisory Practices

Very few studies related to supervisory practices in home economics education appear to have been completed within the past 5 years. Those that were identified focus on supervision of student teachers rather than on supervision of home economics programs and classes. Mary Anne Smith's (1981) study indicated no significant relationships between leadership style and supervisor effectiveness. Weade (1980) observed language usage between cooperating teachers in conference with student teachers to see if a relationship existed between the cooperating teacher's general style of handling information and use of language in the conference. While the sample was small in this qualitative study, a pattern of relationship between supervisory style and conceptual level was indicated. Three supervisory styles were identified: lecturing style, prescriptive style, and peer-tutoring style. The researcher recommended conferencing skill training for both cooperating teachers and student teachers. The curriculum of student teaching was illuminated through the hermeneutic interpretive research approach (Hultgren 1982, 1985). Existential descriptions were used by the teacher educator-researcher for understanding and helping student teachers develop authenticity and autonomy. Such descriptions were used to help them understand their situation and responsibility, see their own possibilities as teachers, facilitate their emergence as teachers rather than focusing on performance, and meet anxiety "head on" as a means for self-realization.

Enrollment and Recruitment

Harper and Davis' (1986) recent report on degrees granted in home economics indicated increases in all areas except home economics and home economics education. Other studies report such enrollment trends as (1) a decline in total enrollment in all home economics programs in higher education with a more rapid decline in home economics education than in other areas, and (2) an increasing proportion of male student enrollment in all home economics programs excluding home economics education at the higher education level (Bortz and Dillon 1982; Burge 1983; Hall, Wallace, and Lee 1983; Hughes, Rougvie, and Woods 1980; Lamason 1979; and Tippett and Clawson 1984). These trends suggest a need for recruitment efforts in home economics.

The most recent statistics on enrollment in consumer and homemaking education indicate that approximately 3.9 million students are being served. Of those served 11 percent represent racial minorities whereas approximately 43 percent are males. Although secondary enrollment has declined overall, consumer and homemaking continues to serve approximately 20 percent of high school youth (National Center for Education Statistics 1983).

Johnson (1984) reported that recruitment activity is increasing. Further, most recruitment efforts include such strategies as career and visitation days, personal contacts, brochures and posters, visits to high schools, state conferences of youth organizations, working with alumni, parent contacts, and letters (Blinn and Blair 1985; Coleman 1983; Hall, Wallace, and Lee 1983; and Johnson 1984).

Blinn and Blair's (1985) comparison of home economics education recruitment materials with those of business and foods, nutrition, and dietetics showed that home economics education sent more booklets while business sent more brochures. Business materials contained more pictures of males while foods and dietetics showed more pictures of females. No significant differences were found in the cost of the materials by area or level. Effectiveness of the brochures was not studied.

In a survey of home economics students at 27 colleges throughout the South, Aadland et al. (1983) studied influences on and reasons for choosing the home economics major. Results indicated...
that students majoring in home economics education participated more in campus organizations, were graduates of small high schools, and participated more in Future Homemakers of America (FHA) than students in other majors. Choice of major was influenced by a brother/sister, a county 4-H agent, or especially by a high school home economics teacher. The major reason for choosing their major was “to help others.” Stout et al. (1980) reported that a high school course or high school teacher was the primary factor in the decision to select home economics education as a major in college. Further, black students were more influenced by 4-H, FHA, and by having had home economics classes than were their white peers. Purnell (1980) and Wyatt (1979) found parents were the greatest influence on subject selection.

Attitudes toward sex equity can affect enrollment and recruitment. Sex equity has been addressed by several researchers (Drew, Jones, and Siegel 1981; Griffin and Kelly 1979; Griffin, Heatherly, and Cotton 1981; Haymore, Caputo, and Peterson 1983; Mears and Clements 1983; and Nies and Griggs 1980). There were varying degrees of consensus in the findings. For example, Nies and Griggs (1980) and Drew, Jones, and Siegel (1981) found significant differences in attitudes toward Title IX and its results. Mears and Clements (1983) found contradictions between teachers’ belief in equality and their encouragement of more female than male students to enroll in home economics. Burge and Cunningham (1983) found that international students held a favorable attitude toward both sexes enrolling in home economics.

Public Relations, Public Perceptions, and Image

Studies with parents, community members, and legislators revealed that the more people knew about secondary home economics programs, the more involved they were with them, and the more positive were their perceptions, images, and relationships with the programs (Brink 1984; Ley 1984; Love 1983). Brink’s (1984) study further revealed that legislators believed secondary home economics programs should be offered throughout childhood and adolescence and that nutrition and resource management were the most appropriate concepts taught, while sexual development and adjustment as a family member were ranked least appropriate.

Hall (1983) found that three collection methods yielded similar results of public perception of home economics extension programs. Content analysis was performed on oral reports from public forums, written statements from volunteer respondents, and responses from questionnaires, resulting in the finding that the public holds positive views of home economics extension programs and believes that nutrition education, money management, and family relations programs should have high priority.
Several researchers examined the professional roles and responsibilities of home economics educators in a variety of settings. The need for home economics educators to be aware of their perceptions of others has been found to be increasingly important as society becomes more pluralistic and international in its perspective.

Frazier (1985) found that home economists from the elementary, secondary, and adult section of the American Home Economics Association (AHEA) have relatively high levels of global/cosmopolitan awareness. In Fortey's (1981) survey of senior high school teachers, the teachers of the culturally diverse indicated a need to learn about their students’ language, diet, costuming, social patterns, and ethics in order to provide learning experiences and an environment for developing self-concept.

Additionally, home economics educators’ gender role attitudes have been found to make a difference in program offerings and opportunities for clients. Studies indicated that younger teachers exhibited more liberal gender role attitudes than did older teachers, that gender was not related to job satisfaction, that teaching experience was not correlated with attitudes toward social change, that teachers with more positive attitudes toward their own sexuality taught more sexuality topics and viewed their own education as adequate, and that teachers perceived limited support for sexuality education in their schools (Morgan, Stewart, and Martin 1981; Schultz and Boyd 1984; Schultz, Boyd, and Fanslow 1983; Weiner and Clawson 1984).

Job satisfaction indicators may be of concern in professional role socialization and growth. Studies indicate lower job satisfaction among vocational home economics teachers who are married and have children. Economics was a major reason for remaining in such careers (Light and Hanson 1983; Martin and Light 1984). Felstehausen (1983) found a negative relationship between childbearing and job performance among secondary home economics teachers. Extension agents reported that the enjoyment and the absorbing nature of their career affected their family in a positive way (Felstehausen 1985). Home economics educators in careers other than teaching and extension indicated that their careers were self-fulfilling, despite low pay (Dohner 1985a). Muncrief (1979) found that secondary teachers’ years of experience were positively associated with success and career satisfaction. Weiner and Clawson’s (1984) study indicated less satisfaction when the secondary teacher had a master’s degree over a bachelor’s degree. Albers’ (1981) interviews with secondary teachers uncovered such sources of teacher job satisfaction as patterns of interaction with administrators and values and beliefs of teachers.

A home economics educator’s political activity, another part of the professional role found to be important by researchers, is influenced by later life experiences, graduate study, experience with politicians and public figures, professional affiliation and colleagues, the perception of political activity as part of the job, and employer expectation (Cummings 1983; Enders and Fanslow...
Vickers (1985) found that three out of four AHEA members describe themselves as politically inactive or observers. The most frequent forms of political activity are voting; writing to legislators; contributing money; contacting agencies; working with groups; telephoning; attending political activities, social events, and public hearings; canvassing door to door; preparing testimony; forming groups to study issues; arranging public meetings; writing articles; and assuming public office. Jacobson's (1985) study included interviews of a small sample of professional home economics teachers. The case studies evolving from the interviews gave insight into how professionals develop specific skills to prepare for political activity and the role of a public policy participant.

Another group of researchers found the continuing growth of home economics professionals and factors that inhibit or contribute to this growth to be important to the professionalism of the home economist. For example, Amos and Nelson's (1979) study indicated that New York home economics teachers believed teaching is a profession, identified with other home economists, and believed common commitment is important to the profession. Their views of home economics as a profession seemed to be influenced by their families' support of their career choice, parental support of curricular decisions, years of professional experience, teaching as a first career, and journal reading (Amos and Nelson 1979; Douglas 1983). Dohner (1985a) found that the majority of home economics educators in careers other than teaching and extension did not identify with home economics and did not remain affiliated with home economics organizations.

AHEA's membership survey showed its members were employed (in rank order) in education, business, cooperative extension, nonprofit organizations, government, industry, and self-employed. Results for men were the same except that cooperative extension and business were reversed. Results for women were the same except that cooperative extension and business were reversed. Home economics education graduates in alternative careers held professional/specialist positions in sales and marketing; personnel/human resource training; and public relations/communications (Dohner 1985a). Numerous studies have been published and data are also available about major and degree, location of employment, job function, full-time/part-time/volunteer positions, minority membership, international experience, and income (Andrews 1984; Dear 1983; Enders and Fanslow 1981a,b; Ethangatta and Beavers 1984; Fanslow et al. 1980; Jorgenson et al. 1983; Townsley et al. 1984).

Lambert and Clayton (1984) found that 50 percent of the 1982-1983 land-grant home economics education graduates were employed in alternative careers, while one-third of the institutions indicated they specifically prepared students for alternative careers. Home economics education graduates indicated they were partially prepared by their teacher education institutions for skills they needed in their alternative careers (Dohner 1985b). Rossmann, Parsons, and Holman (1983) identified the following skills that employers of those in alternative careers might expect: organizing, planning, managing, decision making, educating, and persuading.

Home economics education faculty indicated that college faculty should have a comprehensive current and historical view of home economics and that graduate students should be provided with an interdisciplinary orientation to home economics (Kreutz 1981). Higher education faculty were designated as the significant other persons in AHEA members' professional development. This relationship is usually begun during a master's program and continued throughout the professional career (Inana 1981).

Brown (1985), Jax (1981), and Vincenti (1982) suggested that self-examination as a profession of who we are, what we value, and what changes are needed is important for establishing a basis for the advancement of the profession.
Draper, Shaner, and Roscoe (1982) and Gill (1983) found that major, years of undergraduate affiliation, and amount of activity (highest number from home economics education) in home economics were the best predictors of continued professional affiliation. However, undergraduate home economics students at the University of Illinois indicated strong to moderate interest in a home economics career and little projected interest in AHEA membership. These juniors had strong interest in work participation upon graduation. This interest gave way to emphasis on marriage and family at age 30 (McCormick 1980).

Findings from studies addressing the needs and interests of first-year home economics teachers revealed that (1) their greatest need is student motivation, (2) the most helpful source for professional development was meetings to share ideas with other teachers, (3) top support needs were others' acceptance of the subject matter they teach and praise and positive support, and (4) working in mainstreamed settings was difficult (Ellis and Ellis 1982; Sinder 1985). Two case studies provided examples from interviews of home economics teachers' first socializing experiences in schools. These case studies showed how teachers develop models for performing as teachers and suggest further ways to facilitate teacher socialization (Block 1983; Swanson and Copa 1984).

International/intercultural awareness and competence of home economics teachers are the subject of several studies (Fortey 1981; Frazier 1985; Goosens-Conlon 1983). Intercultural concepts were being incorporated into higher education units in the United States (Hertzer and Wall 1984). However, only four units reported having an international major, minor, or emphasis area within home economics, and only three units reported required or elective home economics courses.

Making contributions to the profession of home economics both through direct service and research to expand the knowledge base upon which the profession is built has been identified as a critical role of the professional home economist by several researchers. The Kelly (1982) and Bowen (1979) studies about the characteristics of home economics and vocational education researchers provided insights into the kinds of characteristics that correlate with high research productivity. These included having a doctoral degree, being in the home economics education area, being professionally experienced, actively seeking research experiences in graduate school and in employment, being mentored by a well-known researcher, having large networks of research colleagues, and having supportive experiences. Bowen's survey of teacher educators in the 1890 schools and in selected non-1890 institutions indicated that the majority of educators professed a moderate to strong interest in conducting research. However, most had never written and submitted an article for publication, and none was knowledgeable enough about research skills to serve as a consultant. In addition, Kelly found that less productive researchers identified more with teaching, stayed longer in teaching positions, and sought further academic work to improve their teaching competence. Keiser (1984) identified the need for broader leadership and administrative support for research, programs with more futuristic and holistic approaches that are grounded in a theoretical base, and better prepared personnel. These reflect solutions similar to those suggested by Horn and Nickols (1982) in response to concerns arising from recent major studies. Similarly, such authors as McBreen (1984), Norton and Wall (1984), Volker and Deacon (1982), Wallace and Hall (1984), and others cite numerous examples of the benefits of home economics research but express the need for new approaches and models and better cost-effectiveness for future research work.

The level of home economics education research currently being conducted and the characteristics that enable home economics education researchers to be successful give rise to the question of how home economics education faculty can be more effectively assisted to produce successful
research. Various authors including Couch, Haley, and Asher (1984) cite the need for inservice programs to improve skills in the acquisition and management of research funds as well as the importance of administrative support for such faculty development. Hawthorne, Woodburn, and Powell (1984) also cited the importance of administrative support in encouraging, facilitating, and giving priority to research to contribute to the knowledge base of the profession. Norton and Wall (1984), Plihal, Strom, and Williams (1985), Volker and Deacon (1982), and Wallace and Hall (1984) additionally emphasized the importance of a researcher's personal initiative, drive, and interest for development of further knowledge as most critical to ensure success.
Needs and Characteristics of Learners

Numerous studies focused on home economics learners in secondary programs and in higher education. Although many studies cannot be generalized to other populations, nevertheless they represent important research for particular populations and purposes. Stout et al. (1980) found that while black undergraduate home economics majors came from significantly lower socioeconomic origins than their white peers, both races perceived home economics as an opportunity for upward social mobility. Purnell (1980) reported that 77.8 percent of Utah State University's home economics students had taken high school home economics courses. White (1985) found that students at Ohio State University who participated in home economics student organizations and in field work had a significantly greater positive image of home economics than students who did not participate. Further, she found a positive relationship between professional commitment and the image of home economics. Home economics education majors held a significantly more positive image of home economics than other majors did. Family relations and human development majors had the highest mean score for professional commitment. Hughes (1984), using the national data base of the Class of 1972, studied 2,500 female high school graduates with no further education, and found that although life goals had shifted over the years, job stability and success remained high throughout the time. All graduates in Hughes' groups had a positive attitude toward self that increased over the years.

Lutz (1983) found that secondary student attitudes toward the teacher reflected a significantly high positive relationship with achievement. In Susan R. Smith's (1981) correlational study, senior high school home economics students were found to have significantly higher self-control than freshman home economics students on the two behaviors of self-confidence (calmness self-control) and ability to solve problems (insight self-control). Students who had high self-esteem had more self-control behavior.

In studying the attitudes of high school students toward home economics, Dohner (1979, 1983) found that the extent of cooperative goal structuring use in the classrooms of home economics middle/junior high teachers was significantly correlated to the attitudes learners had toward the subject of home economics. Learners in grades 5 through 7 had a positive increase in their attitudes toward home economics in cooperative goal settings. Female learners had significantly more positive attitudes toward home economics than males.

Further, Mercier and Hughes (1981) found that high school females held more favorable attitudes toward family planning education than did males. Mensah, Schultz, and Hughes (1983) found that Iowa secondary students expressed their strongest needs as planning and decision making, parenting and child care, and adolescent social development.

Erickson (1981) analyzed attitudes and values held by junior and senior high students in northwestern Ohio home economics classes. Students' attitudes toward education reflected the level of education attained by parents.
In Yoakum's (1981) study, a positive relationship was found between student estimate of teacher concern scores and out-of-class teacher/student contacts. Student contact that involved special effort and time was perceived as evidence of teacher concern more than routine teacher contacts.

Osborn (1979) reported that the most meaningful rewards to students were intrinsic rewards of earning affection and respect and the personal satisfaction of reaching a goal and receipt of praise, compliments, and “thank-yous.” The type of recognition was found to be an individual matter, with teachers misjudging students' value of intrinsic over extrinsic rewards. Using the same instrument, Slowik (1980) studied the relationship of locus of control and preference of recognition of high school members and nonmembers of Future Homemakers of America (FHA). She found that high school members and nonmembers of FHA both preferred intrinsic rewards but that FHA members had significantly more internal locus of control than did nonmembers.

Growel (1985) found a positive relationship between recognition preference and locus of control. College senior home economics majors had more external locus of control than sophomores, leading the researcher to suggest that steps might be taken through instructional strategies and appropriate reinforcement to move students toward more internal locus of control.
Curriculum

Curriculum research questions are concerned with the nature, content and organization of home economics education programs at all educational levels. However, most curriculum research has focused on the secondary level, with little attention given to elementary/middle school or post-secondary curricular questions. While the preponderance of recent curriculum research shows the continuing use of the empirical-analytical research framework to explain or predict the nature, content, or organization of home economics education, significant studies were conducted by researchers utilizing interpretive (hermeneutical) research frameworks (Hultgren 1982; Kister 1981; Moeller 1982; Way 1982, 1983a, 1984; Weade 1984) and critical science research frameworks (Baldwin 1984; Brown 1985; Eyestone 1982; Toami 1981; Vincenti 1981). These interpretive and critical studies operationalize the concepts proposed by Brown and Paolucci (1979). Using these frameworks, researchers have uncovered meanings underlying curricular decisions and suggest new possibilities for home economics curriculum.

Nature of Home Economics Curriculum

What is the nature of home economics curriculum? The nature of parenthood education curriculum guides for secondary students was the focus of Eyestone's (1982) study. Her critique showed that desired outcomes for clients, content components, and instructional strategies were included in the guides, but little attention was given to a philosophy regarding the content of parenthood education or community and evaluation studies. A variety of parenthood education concepts was taught with differing perspectives.

A normative question—what should be the nature of home economics education—was addressed by Baldwin (1984), Brown (1985), Eyestone (1982), Kister (1981), MacCleave-Frazier and Murray (1983), Toami (1981), and Vincenti (1981). Using the critical science mode of inquiry and the dialectical reasoning method, these researchers made the assumptions, aims, values, and inconsistencies explicit, thus providing a basis for conceptualizing new and more coherent models and theories for the profession and its curriculum.

Utilizing Habermas' critical social theory, Kister (1981) examined the homemaking tasks identified through DACUM (Developing a Curriculum) occupational analysis by Abt and associates (1968) and concluded that empirical-rational, hermeneutic, and critical science perspectives should guide home economics curriculum frameworks. Kister then proposed a conceptual framework model adapted from Brown (1978, 1980) and Brown and Paolucci (1979). Baldwin (1984), using Habermas' theory, critiqued and reconstructed the theoretical frameworks of three curriculum guides, including the guide developed with Kister's recommendations. Her analysis indicated that these curriculum models were not based on adequately established theoretical frameworks or
that they inconsistently implemented theory. Like Kister, she recommended a critical theory for home economics education, and formulated a set of questions for developing adequate theoretical frameworks for future home economics curriculum. Similarly, Toami (1981) found inconsistencies among the assumptions underlying Egyptian home economics education program materials, and made recommendations for Egyptian home economics education programs.

Two critical investigations of the history of home economics revealed complementary conclusions with implications for home economics curriculum. Vincenti (1981, 1982) identified and examined the stability of written professional ideals, beliefs, and values. In an extensive study of the practical-intellectual heritage of home economics, Brown (1985) found conflicting and ambiguous aims; divergent views of knowledge underlying the approaches to subject matter; an individualistic and subjective approach to concepts, norms, and beliefs resulting in ambiguous concepts being adopted from the mass culture; and “contradiction between what is said and what is done in practice” (p. 927). She concluded that “[t]he strength of home economics ... lies in the sincerity of concern ... for the individual and the family [and] in democratic ideals,” but that “[h]ome economics has been handicapped by an anti-intellectual attitude among its members” (p. 954). Both Vincenti and Brown drew similar conclusions, especially concerning inconsistencies and overemphasis of the field on empirical science, and called for dialogue among members.

Several studies identified standards and content for specific home economics programs. A conceptual framework for a secondary nutrition and foods semester course was developed from values placed on nutrition concepts by homemaking teachers, teacher educators, and nutrition professors (Hallman and Jones 1982). Using an interdisciplinary team, Skinner et al. (1985) developed an integrative nutrition education framework for preschool through grade 12. Clothing and textile curriculum was the focus of three studies. Texas home economics teachers, students, and parents ranked wardrobe planning, clothing selection, construction, purchase, care, and alterations as most important to be taught (Glosson, Khan, and Peterson 1981). Status and qualitative research approaches were used by MacCleave-Frazier and Murray (1983) to reconceptualize clothing curriculum in consumer-homemaking programs. Illustrative curriculum materials were organized around practical problems and questions of families; appropriate systems of family action, necessary cognitive processes, and supporting topics, concepts, and perspectives were developed; and teacher competencies needed for such a program were identified. Program and performance standards were validated for four postsecondary textile and clothing occupational areas: fashion merchandising, fashion design, apparel, and window treatment services (Beavers and Beery 1979). Child development national standards for vocational home economics were also validated (Mangad 1984).

Besides home economics content, mathematics, science, and thinking processes have also become the focus of home economics curriculum research. Mathematics (Rosenfeld and Holsey 1985) and science competencies (Holsey and Rosenfeld 1985), assumed to be associated with consumer-homemaking education competencies, were identified by teams of science, mathematics, and vocational home economics teachers. Reasoning, logical, and mathematical skills in home economics curricula were examined. Small percentages of college students were found to use formal reasoning consistently: 25 percent (Contesto 1981) and 17 percent (Franz, MacDonald, and Grocott 1985). When analyzing books and ads for their misleading content, using nutrient labels, and evaluating nutrition issues, these students scored significantly better than students not using formal reasoning. When formal reasoning development was included in the curriculum through experiences based on Piagetian theory, significant gains were achieved in the use of formal reasoning (Contesto 1981). The findings of Contesto and of Franz, MacDonald, and Grocott indicate that low levels of cognitive functioning may be predictive of poor performance and that these concepts/processes need to be included in home economics curriculum.
Content of Home Economics Curriculum

Elementary, secondary, and higher education programs were examined in a number of studies to determine the content being taught. Family life concepts taught by elementary teachers were found by Bakalars (1980) and Bakalars and Petrich (1983) to be structured around (1) learning about self and others, (2) family and society interacting, (3) developing as a family member, and (4) adolescence, yet none of the factors was taught to a great extent and factors 2 and 4 were seldom or never taught. Human sexual development concepts were not overtly present and those indirectly related were seldom taught.

The content of secondary vocational consumer and homemaking programs was investigated in a national study by Hughes, Rougvie, and Woods (1980). Data indicated that 120 topics listed on the survey instrument were being taught in approximately two-thirds of the participating schools, for boys (20 percent) and girls (80 percent). Food and nutrition topics were included most frequently, followed in descending order by family relations, clothing and textiles, child development/parenting, consumer education and management, and housing/home furnishings/equipment. This was substantiated by other researchers (Burge 1983; Mears, Ley, and Ray 1981; Parsons 1980). Decision making in each of the subject matter areas was included in more than three-fourths of all participating schools. Contextual factors, such as governmental agencies and services and legislation affecting individuals and families, community child care services, and economics topics (e.g., inflation and recession) were also taught.

Implicit home economics content in the learning environment was revealed through five studies. Although home economics textbooks examined for sex bias were found to be generally neutral in orientation, sex bias was reflected in language usage, sex stereotypic pictures, and emphasis on gender role behaviors and expectations (Weis 1979). Prime-time television programs, assumed to be socialization agents according to social learning theory, were found to contain behaviors related directly to concepts taught in secondary consumer education programs (Way 1982, 1983b, 1984). Overall, an almost equal amount of nutritious and less nutritious food was seen in television programs, but the nutritional quality shown differed significantly according to specific food-related behaviors, television network and program type, and characters' employment and marital status (Way 1983b). In the television programs examined, twice as many negative as positive consumer choice behaviors were portrayed (Way 1982). However, no significant differences were found in the nature of consumer behaviors portrayed in prime-time television according to selected program and character variables (Way 1984). Dail and Way (1985) found that television fathers were somewhat more active as parents than were mothers and that both were portrayed in traditional ways, even though many more nontraditional than traditional family structures were represented. Television children responded differently to performance of parental roles and to childrearing patterns according to the sex of the parent.

Structure of Home Economics Curriculum

Research data were used to organize home economics curriculum. For example, data from national field tests of three nutrition and food-related tests (Fanslow, Brun, and Hausafus 1979; Fanslow, Gilmore, and Brun 1984a, 1984b) were used to guide the grade-level placement of nutrition concepts/generalizations for elementary grades (Fanslow, Njus, and Gilmore 1984).
Curriculum for early adolescents was the concern of two studies. Home tasks were examined for those most frequently performed by sixth-, seventh-, and eighth-grade students, and implications for curriculum were proposed (Smith 1984). Crawford, Botine, and Newhart (1985) used data from a concerns checklist to develop a junior high home economics life skills scope and sequence for 5 options for 9- to 36-week programs. The researchers found that highest ranking junior high student concerns were understanding friends, parents, other family members, and the opposite sex, and getting others to listen to them; they recommended that the concerns checklist be used to determine students' concerns as a basis for local programs. Similarly, the problems and concerns of home and family life identified by Kister (1981) arose from two sources: the family and conditions in society. These included divorce, family conflict, missing qualities in relationships, illness and death, adolescent concerns such as drug use and teenage pregnancy, family economic resources, work-jobs, societal-peer pressure, television, and pressured life-styles. Kister suggested the need to organize home economics curriculum around perennial/practical problems, value themes, and related technical tasks/skills.

One study provided support for integrating home economics concepts. Since both current and former home economics students perceive consumer education concepts in home economics subject matter areas as more useful than consumer education taught in consumer education alone, Bell and Durr (1981, 1982) concluded that basic consumer education concepts should be interfaced with subject matter. The findings of Hughes, Rougvie, and Woods (1980) suggested that these concepts are more likely integrated in home economics courses than taught in a separate, secondary vocational home economics consumer education course.

Factors Affecting Curriculum Content and Design

The examination of factors affecting curriculum content and design is a new research thrust. Learning style categories were found to be significantly related to three factors representing diverse systems of action (MacCleave-Frazier 1985). Educators with high intuitive and observational factor scores had high scores on the factor defined as evaluation and analysis of family problems, while educators with high pragmatic scores favored technically oriented approaches to curriculum planning. Highly analytical and intuitive educators favored evaluative/analytical and interpretive approaches to home economics curriculum.

Regardless of psychological type, home economics educators involved in one curriculum development project (Weade 1984) agreed on the content to be included in home economics curriculum, but subtle qualitative distinctions in the manner of describing curricular content were found to be related to psychological type. Educators who preferred sensing over intuition also preferred creating learning environments associated with technical curriculum designs.

The academic preparation of teachers was found to influence home economics concepts taught. Family life education teachers with a home economics preparation were more likely to address communication, decision making, marriage, and family issues than their colleagues from health, physical education, and nursing (Koblinsky, Weeks, and Cook 1985). Human sexuality topics were taught to a significantly greater degree following a one-day inservice workshop (Schultz and Torrie 1984a), and family life concepts were most likely included by teachers who had had coursework in family studies and human development (Bakalars 1980; Bakalars and Petrich 1984). Yet, the specific perceptions of teachers regarding family were not related to their educational background (Fanning 1981). Furthermore, Wisconsin home economics teachers varied in
their perceptions of four conceptual frameworks of family and appeared to use a multiple-conceptual orientation to family.

From an examination of the implicit moral education beliefs/concepts of home economics teachers, Moeller (1982) found that the majority followed primarily a character development or moral analysis approach, rather than using values clarification, avoidance, or eclectic approaches; teachers who had participated in family focus reasoning workshops were most likely to use a moral analysis approach. These home economics teachers showed a much higher level of principled moral thinking than the average adult, but varied in their beliefs about the aims of education and home economics, including beliefs about moral/value education and their moral education teaching behaviors and practices. Fanning's (1981) and Moeller's (1982) studies appear to substantiate Brown's (1985) assertion that home economists have individualistic approaches to concepts, and this results in ambiguous concepts and varied practice.

Factors associated with curriculum choices were investigated for 4-H members (Hesler 1982) and adults (Crase, Carlson, and Kontos 1981; Osborn and Avery 1979). Participation of 4-H teen leaders was positively related to family members' perceptions of child and family conflict, but family cohesion and participation were not related (Hesler 1982). One situational and six developmental variables (e.g., marital status and values associated with work) were found to predict enrollment of adult women in daytime home economics continuing education programs, but the developmental variables were the most effective predictors (Osborn and Avery 1979). Expectant parents were found to have a high need for age-specific parenting information while parents of children had a low need and preferred pediatricians, teachers, counselors, and other parents to traditional parent educators for their advice (Crase, Carlson, and Kontos 1981). Recommendations for 4-H curriculum designs included features that attract different family types, strengthen father-child relationships, facilitate independent experiences, and accommodate varied and reasonable levels of parent time and resource input (Hesler 1982). Osborn and Avery (1979) suggested that the vocational orientation of adult home economics students be used in recruitment and curriculum planning.

Considering the complexity of curriculum work, a combination of research approaches seems most appropriate for home economics curriculum research. These studies reveal progress toward enhancing understanding and providing direction to home economics curriculum planning and practices. Several innovative and helpful research methodologies were used by interpretive and critical curriculum researchers: imaging (Kister 1981), focus groups (MacCleave-Frazier and Murray 1983), content analysis (Way 1983a), tape-recorded dialogue and phenomenological descriptions (Hultgren 1982), and an adaptation of an ethnoscience methodology—self-interviews using a structured interview schedule and audiotaping (Moeller 1982).
Instruction in Home Economics Education

Higher Education Instruction

Several studies focused on identification of competencies of home economics educators. Eves (1985) identified knowledge and skill competencies needed by an effective teacher educator and listed 22 learning experiences appropriate for acquiring such competencies. Competencies related to the educative process ranked high while nonteaching competencies ranked lower.

Harvey's (1982) comparison of home economics teachers and teacher educators revealed no differences between the two groups with respect to the competencies considered necessary for teaching in secondary schools. Dewald-Link (1980) identified a number of human development competencies related to preservice teacher education either as subject matter to be taught or as concepts of development that teachers need to know to plan, teach, and evaluate educational experiences for their students.

Other studies have focused on how competencies can be developed. Martin and Fanslow's (1980) experimental study with four groups was designed to test live versus videotape and practice versus no practice using demonstration and laboratory teaching strategies. The findings revealed a significant difference between student live and videotape demonstration presentations with videotape performance being superior. Clayton's (1981) results indicated that students who learned about Future Homemakers of America/Home Economics Related Occupations (FHA/HERO) using the in-class chapter method perceived themselves to be (1) better prepared to integrate a chapter of FHA/HERO into the home economics program, (2) more knowledgeable about the organization, and (3) more confident about their abilities to use a variety of materials and methods.

Researchers also studied approaches varying in degree of structure in learning environments. Williams' (1980) investigation of the relationship between two educational approaches varying in degree of structure and the integration and application of knowledge by preservice teachers varying in conceptual level revealed no significant differences associated with conceptual levels and criterion-measured achievement. However, preservice teachers in moderately structured learning environments scored significantly higher on knowledge level items, whereas those in the highly structured environment scored significantly higher on integration and application of knowledge. Cummings and Bell (1979) found that college students who selected student-directed instruction were more self-directed, although no significant differences were found with regard to overall mean attitudinal gains from pre- to posttest. The teacher-directed group gained significantly in cognition from pre- to posttest when all nine competency areas in the study were considered. This contradicts previous research by these researchers; however, this was the first time sample size exceeded 100.
Finally, Mayer (1982) found that a self-instructional module was effective for teaching pre-service and graduate students the fundamental components of value reasoning. Appert’s (1982) results from a non-sexbiased nutrition education module with 31 preservice home economics teachers showed positive changes in attitude toward teaching nutrition to adolescents.

A study designed by Clayton (1984) produced information regarding the relationship of role preference to teaching effectiveness during student teaching. The term “teaching effectiveness” was used in this study to refer to the student teachers’ skill in applying subject matter knowledge; in planning, organizing, and evaluating; and in managing the classroom environment. The term “overall student teaching performance” was used to include instructional skills as well as the student teacher’s personal, professional, and interpersonal skills. The summary strengthens the conclusion of other studies involving student teachers from a variety of other fields: teaching effectiveness appears to be associated with preference for the advice-information giver role; the two most frequently preferred roles are motivator and counselor; and the least preferred roles are disciplinarian and referrer.

Consumer and Homemaking Instruction

Cargin and Williams (1984) examined the relationship between student-oriented or subject matter-oriented philosophies held and teaching strategies used by secondary home economics teachers and found that teachers identified slightly more with student-oriented as opposed to subject matter-oriented philosophies. However, the strategies used by teachers did not clearly relate to the philosophies with which they identified themselves. Lecture, laboratory, demonstration, group discussion, and case studies (in rank order) were the most frequently used strategies, while less frequently used strategies were recording activities, dramatization, simulation/games, and individualized learning packets.

Glosson and Bowers (1981) assessed postsecondary vocational home economics instructors’ needs for instructional materials and media and found group discussion, questioning, lab, lecture, and reading assignments were preferred techniques. Textbooks, handouts, chalkboard, 16 mm films, and filmstrips were preferred instructional media and materials.

Durr and Bell (1980) surveyed current mainstreaming problems that Texas vocational homemaking teachers encountered in the classroom and identified services and materials available in implementing a “mainstreaming” program. A manual including guidelines and materials for mainstreaming in the regular home economics program was then developed.

Crawford, Anderson, and Hausafus (1985) surveyed home economics teacher educators to determine computer research and exemplary projects. Data indicated considerable activity regarding research and projects and resulted in five identified needs: (1) determination of computer effectiveness as an instructional medium as compared to other forms of instruction, (2) development of home economics curriculum integrating computer applications, (3) identification of guidelines for developing software, (4) focus of projects on one or two main objectives, and (5) organization and coordination of research and projects in the field. When Faircloth, Clawson, and Godwin (1985) compared the effectiveness of computer-assisted instruction (CAI) versus supervised reading for teaching consumer education, they found high school students learned more consumer education concepts by studying via computer.
The recent back-to-basics movement has stimulated some research about how home economics teachers can help students with reading. Ellis (1986) found that Oregon home economics teachers agreed they could teach reading in their curriculum without infringing on the subject matter, but that they needed adequate training to use content-area reading strategies. Workshop participants used reading strategies significantly more than the control group. Galloway (1984) investigated and described high school literature-based curricula as a means of making home economics curricula more germane to students. She found that, with teacher stimulation and motivation, students will read more books than they ordinarily read.

Several studies dealt with secondary classroom environment and teacher behaviors. Shelley (1980) examined the effects of low, moderate, and high environmental structure on knowledge recall and application skill while considering students' conceptual levels. Class structure did affect the posttest measures in all instances, but the interaction of class structure and student conceptual level was not significant. When Schmidt (1982) studied the relationships of teachers' verbal behaviors to students' perceptions of teacher concern, she found students' perceptions of their teachers' level of concern for them as individuals were positively related to the teachers' verbal behaviors.

Schultz and Torrie (1984b) evaluated an instructional approach for parenthood education in mainstreamed home economics classrooms. Results indicated increased learning for normal, mentally handicapped, and learning disabled students. Worktexts, pairing, and small group activities were perceived as most helpful by students. Adamszek (1985) implemented and evaluated a classroom management model for teaching that grouped hearing-impaired students according to their learning styles. All students accomplished the clothing construction course objectives, but learning style groups demonstrated varying amounts of time on task. The model was deemed effective for use by experienced teachers of hearing-impaired students.

Abdullah (1985) also explored the relationship of teacher classroom behaviors and classroom variables to student time on task in foods laboratory. More dominant teacher behaviors, such as interacting with small groups, monitoring and assessing progress, and providing for student practices seemed to relate most highly to students' engaged time during which they were expected to achieve the objectives. Data also revealed that students were on task about four-fifths of the time, but only about one-third of the time were students actually carrying out food preparation processes.

### Occupational Home Economics Instruction

The following research studies related to the preparation of occupational teachers confirmed that such programs are based on needed occupational competencies and identified teacher competencies. Glosson and Schrock (1985) identified competencies and subcompetencies held in common by food technology, food service, supervision, nursing home food service, and restaurant management. Glosson, Horridge, and Timmons (1985) identified essential competencies common to secondary and postsecondary programs in clothing/textile technology and occupational programs. Beery (1980) also identified and validated 16 competencies needed for entry-level and 51 needed for mid-management positions in fashion merchandising as perceived by business personnel and postsecondary educators. Educators and business personnel agreed on the importance of all competencies at mid-management level and 16 at the entry level.
Browning's (1981) comparison showed general agreement by teachers, teacher educators, and vocational consultants on occupational teacher competencies common to all areas of home economics. Kreutzer's (1984) study validated Browning's (1981) 69 competencies and produced 17 factors that reorganized the competencies into a priority ranking of the components of the occupational home economics teaching role. When compared with the High School Occupational Home Economics section of the Standards for Vocational Home Economics Education (Griffin and Clayton 1981), these factors suggest a more focused role for occupational home economics teachers than that which the standards established. Browning's (1981) survey of state directors revealed eight different occupational home economics teacher certification patterns in the nation and a trend toward more competency-based teacher education.

Wilson (1983) and Way and Dougherty (1983) focused on teachers' perceptions of competencies needed or perceptions of preparedness in planning, developing, and implementing quality occupational home economics programs, and also the extent to which they possess those competencies. Teachers felt well prepared generally. Additionally, most felt preparation should occur at both the preservice and inservice levels.

Bell and Glosson (1984) concluded that home economics education majors need to achieve a large number of identified competencies to be qualified to teach occupational home economics. Martin and Quilling (1985) found that training related to planning, implementation, and evaluation was needed at both the preservice and inservice levels and that there were evident differences in training needs among preservice, secondary, postsecondary, and adult personnel.

Other researchers studied occupational instruction, techniques, or methods. Fanslow and Compton (1985) examined the effect of a short entrepreneurial career exploration unit on achievement and attitude of students in consumer homemaking and occupational home economics programs. This instruction resulted in significant gains in achievement and some changes in attitude for both groups, but students in occupational home economics programs were more aware of small business opportunities than consumer and homemaking students.

Although Finley's (1979) evaluation of the case study method to increase decision-making skills showed that the case studies had no apparent effect on the change in scores for the two standardized tests measuring decision making, most students responded favorably to the case study method of instruction and requested its continued use in the final food systems management course.

In a study of the importance of cognitive and behavioral competencies, Berg (1981) concluded that both cognitive and behavioral approaches used in a food service bakery unit resulted in an increase in both students' knowledge and understanding of principles and performance.

An important part of instruction in occupational home economics is the development of employment skills, confidence in self, and professional image. Out-of-classroom experiences meet these needs and, in fact, are required in some jobs for certification or credentialing. Sanders' (1981) study of the effects of occupational home economics clothing programs on the development of employment skills revealed no significant differences between the experimental group (graduates of occupational industrial sewing programs) and control group (no prior industrial sewing experience) in length of employment, tardiness or absenteeism, length of on-the-job training, ability to meet production schedules, quality of work, and reasons for leaving or for being terminated.

For teacher training, Crook (1979) designed, implemented, and evaluated an instructional packet that could relate work experience and course assignments without close supervision by a
teacher educator. Using an experimental design, Levy (1980) measured the effects of field experience education with regard to self-esteem, self-confidence, and professional self-esteem and self-confidence. Results of these two studies indicated that instructional packets were an effective method of relating work experience and class work and that field experiences can contribute to the personal and professional development of college students.

At the secondary level, Norman-Nunnery (1984) analyzed the relationships among occupational experiences, professional preparedness, and student outcomes. Significant differences did not exist for teachers' professional preparedness based on amounts of occupational experience nor for selected characteristics. A significant difference existed for enrollees' knowledge, attitudes, and behaviors based on teachers' occupational experience. Overall, the range of teachers' occupational experience that produced positive student outcomes was between 1,000 and 3,000 hours. This optimal range of occupational experience would positively influence learning attitude formation and behaviors of enrolled and graduated students.

Redick et al. (1984) examined the relationship of time allocation to student achievement, performance, and time on task. The findings from a quasi-experimental study indicated that reducing the time frame by 25 percent did not significantly affect achievement, performance, or time on task of students enrolled in occupational community and home programs.

Very little research seems to have been done in the area of use or evaluation of instructional materials for occupational home economics. Bouie's (1983) comparison of three inservice delivery systems showed that, although many of the participants were using the materials, the level of use and the level of satisfaction were higher for both the teleconference and workshop than for the direct mail participants. Direct mail was considered the least satisfactory in several categories. Although few research studies relating to HERO have been located, Babich (1982) found that Arizona HERO participants scored significantly higher on a career maturity attitude scale and competence test than non-HERO counterparts. They also had a better employment record and were more likely to have pursued further education.
Evaluation

Program Evaluation

Researchers who have conducted program evaluation studies have delineated the status of (1) the responsiveness of consumer and homemaking programs to the 1976 Education Amendments, (2) the characteristics of home economics programs and learners, and (3) the impact of home economics programs upon learners. This delineation has in turn provided a basis for further program development.

For example, Drew, Jones, and Siegel (1981), Mears and Ray (1981), and Rossmann and Parsons (1980) completed studies to evaluate the responsiveness of programs to legislation. Drew, Jones, and Siegel (1981) found that all six content areas listed in the 1976 legislation were offered. Greatest enrollment was in food and nutrition and textiles and clothing courses while lowest enrollment was in consumer education. However, consumer education content was often taught in other consumer and homemaking (C&H) courses. Additionally, the researchers identified indicators of responsiveness. "Adult living" secondary programs and adult outreach programs focused on content identified in the legislation. Adult enrollment increased 59 percent since 1978 and male enrollment tripled between 1972 and 1977. Educationally disadvantaged and elderly persons comprised most of the special populations served, although handicapped learners are also included. State administrative services and secondary teacher inservice programs were found to promote responsiveness. Rossmann and Parsons (1980) similarly found that food preparation and nutrition and clothing and textiles had greater enrollment than other subject areas; slightly more than one-fourth of the students were male.

The impact of consumer and homemaking programs was evaluated in a variety of studies. Mears and Ray (1981) analyzed pilot test data as a first step in the National Follow-up/Longitudinal Study of Vocational Consumer and Homemaking. Scores differed by state, size of community, size of home economics program, number of home economics courses taken, number of comprehensive courses taken, employment, ownership of a car, and selected types of insurance.

Perau and Ley (1984) analyzed Nebraska data that were contributed to the Mears and Ray (1981) compilation. Their findings differed from those of Mears and Ray. Significant differences in scores were found for gender, school size, class rank, handicapped, and disadvantaged classifications with lower scores obtained by males and lower ability students.

Although home economics students in Bullard's (1979) study did not have scores different from non-home economics students on home economics-related areas of a minimal competency test, other researchers have identified differences attributed to home economics. For example, Sutter (1985) found that the home economics program prepared students for independent living.
and family life, encouraged potential dropouts to stay in school, contributed to the overall vocational education strategy for the state, and was related to the intent of the legislation. Link's (1980) study of home economics curriculum effects showed significant increases in self-esteem from pre- to posttest.

Crawford's (1981) study revealed that three years after graduation students identified foods, spending money wisely, time management, personal development and relationships, housing, and clothing as ways home economics courses had assisted them. Other impact studies centered on the specific thrusts identified in the 1976 amendments: consumer education, nutrition, parenthood/child development, and special audiences. The significance of the impact of consumer education programs, for example, was found by researchers such as Crawford and Hughes (1984), Hellums and Gorman (1984), and Stokes (1982) to be influenced by such factors as prior consumer education instruction and experience, age, student motivation, background, and school size, although all the consumer education programs evaluated had a positive impact on student knowledge scores.

Nutrition-related impact studies show similar results. For example, the Baltimore City Public Schools (1982) results indicated that students needed further nutrition information, although posttest scores were significantly higher than pretest scores. In addition, differences were noted relative to nutrition opinions and food preferences. Byrd-Bredbenner, O'Connell, and Shannon's (1982) study of the impact of junior high nutrition curriculum revealed that experimental groups in grades 7-9 had significantly improved knowledge scores. Attitude scores changed little except for grade 9, and little improvement was seen in food behavior scores.

Researchers such as Dittman and Anderson (1982), Gritzmacher (1982), Gritzmacher et al. (1982), McClelland (1984), Schultz and Sand (1982), Shannon and Watts (1982), Shoemaker (1983), Tulloch (1982), Zeolla (1980), and Zeolla and Gritzmacher (1982) also identified similar impacts among programs related to family relationships and human development; most students in such programs showed gains in knowledge about the subject after participation. Gritzmacher et al.'s (1982) study further revealed significant results in child development/parenting effectiveness for state, treatment, state by treatment, pretest-posttest (pp), pp by state, pp by treatment, and pp by state by treatment. Additionally, Dittman and Anderson (1982), Schultz and Sand (1982), Shannon and Watts (1982), and Zeolla and Gritzmacher's (1982) studies of parenthood education effectiveness revealed positive impacts on factors related to parenting practices, the decision to have children, pregnancy, and birth with students enrolled in child development courses having more favorable attitudes than students not enrolled.

Several researchers evaluated the attitudes and perceptions of home economics students to determine the impacts that were being made. Bell and Durr (1983) found statistically significant differences among currently enrolled students and among two groups of students who graduated earlier in all subject matter areas except family living and child development. Former students had higher mean ratings than current students in all areas except child development and family living. The rank order of perception of usefulness of consumer education concepts for the three groups was similar for the top four subject matter categories: child development, home management, housing and home furnishings, and food and nutrition (1975-1979 graduates reversed categories 3 and 4). Variables significantly related to students' perceptions were enrollment status, community size, homemaking courses, sex by enrollment, enrollment by community size, and enrollment by sex by homemaking courses by community size.

Mears, Ley, and Ray (1981) and Summers (1981) examined teacher perceptions as well. They found that teachers perceived such topics as family relationships and human development, foods and nutrition, and consumer education and management as being especially important and that
home economics teachers were concerned about students, enthusiastic about programs, committed
to teaching, knowledgeable about subject matter, and skilled in interpersonal relationships. Such
attitudes were identified as important contributions to the effectiveness of home economics
programs.

Other researchers have produced "status reports" related to the impact of a variety of home
economics related programs. A recent U.S. Department of Agriculture report (1980) stated that
about 10 percent of the adult population participated at least once in some aspect of Extension
home economics and nutrition programs. More than four million youth participated in one or
more activities during 1976. Approximately 10 percent of the people in rural areas are served
through community and rural development programs in agriculture, home economics, and 4-H.

Way, Kellett, and Fanning (1985) identified factors associated with achievement of the
national purposes of Future Homemakers of America (FHA) through a national random sample
of chapters. Advisor positive preparedness factors were understanding FHA goals, purposes,
facts, philosophy, and policies; carrying out chapter adviser responsibilities; defining home eco-
nomics goals and purposes in relation to youth groups; and dealing with feedback from chapter
members. Adviser preparedness was related to having a Master's degree, being black, years of
teaching and advising experience, chapter size, chapters with male members, and chapter par-
ents. Chapter purposes achieved to a greater extent than others were self-development, youth-
adult understanding, multiple roles of men and women, and decision making.

Way and Kniep's (1982) study revealed that FHA/HERO advisors were more positive than
students in their opinion that all eight purposes of the organization were achieved. The study indi-
cated that purposes related to youth-adult understanding, home economics careers, and multiple
roles were being achieved to a greater extent than others.

Ralston et al. (1984), and Stewart (1984) all found that student perceptions related to the value of
their education in home economics and its application to their lives after graduation were very
positive. Long (1985), Ralston et al. (1984), Stewart (1984), and others additionally cited such fac-
tors as faculty strengths, program quality, and program flexibility as especially important for
producing such positive views on their preparation for professional success.

Instrument Development

Instrument development has been the focus of several studies (Cunningham et al. 1981;
Fanslow, Brun, and Hausafus 1981; Fanslow, Pease, Gilmore, and Brun 1982; Gilmore, Fanslow,
and Brun 1985; Van Buren and Fanslow 1985). Fanslow et al. (1982) constructed nutrition evalua-
tion instruments. A series of inventories to assess food behaviors of students in grades 1 to 6 was
designed to measure the objective—promotion of healthful food habits, by using appropriate
methods in selecting, preparing, and eating food. The inventories had Kuder-Richardson 20 reliabil-
ity coefficients of .75 and above. The Nutrition Achievement Tests (NATS) for the elementary
grades were also developed and validated to measure physiological facts, nutrients, food handling,
life cycle, social/psychological aspects of food, food technology, and nutrition and society.
Spearman-Brown reliability coefficients ranged from .71 to .87. A food intake performance
device, "What I Usually Eat," was validated for fourth- and sixth-grade students.

A food purchasing inventory for use with fifth- and sixth-grade students was developed to
measure the food purchasing behaviors of food quality, labeling, and shopping techniques through
The Kuder Richardson 20 reliability coefficient for fifth graders was .82 and .83 for sixth graders.

Cunningham et al. (1981) developed a multidimensional measure of nutrition beliefs—the Comprehensive Assessment of Nutrition Knowledge, Attitudes, and Practices (CANKAP). Tests were designed, piloted, and validated for five student levels and six adult groups. Cronbach's Alpha for knowledge items was above .70, while the Alpha range for attitude and practice scales was great.

McClelland and Hughes (1982) developed a procedure for evaluating parenthood education through the use of the "Rating Scale for Parenting Behaviors" (RSPB) and a parent behaviors interview schedule. The RSPB, composed of 10 items each on a 5-point continuum, focused on parents' awareness of the child's development and reasons for parents' actions, and had interrater reliability of .83 to .98.

Loyd and Redick (1984) developed a cognitive objective-based testing system for the family relations unit in the West Virginia Adult Roles and Functions Curriculum. The items were validated as to domain level in relation to 19 identified objectives. Item format was multiple choice, true-false, and matching. Teachers designed tests using the item bank, and after administering them to students, returned the tests for analysis. Criteria for item inclusion were a minimum discrimination index of .20 and difficulty index below .80. Internal consistency reliability coefficients ranged from .47 to .90 with the majority .70 or above. Of the 278 items in the bank, 161 had appropriate difficulty and discrimination indices. Teachers agreed or strongly agreed that the items were appropriate for measuring course content and they were positive about all aspects of the testing system.

Based upon the results of Loyd's (1981) study through which the feasibility and format of a testing system were determined, Bradfield (1980) developed and revised an item bank for use with the parenting unit of the adult roles and functions curriculum in West Virginia. Of the 400 items, 317 were retained as written and 40 were revised. Reliability for 20 teacher-designed tests using the item bank ranged from .06 to .87 with 13 tests above .70.

Fedje, Champoux, and Holcombe (1981) prepared child development/parenting, nutrition, and consumer education instruments for mildly mentally handicapped students enrolled in vocational home economics courses. Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients for the three tests ranged from .52 to .80 for the revised tests. The tests, particularly the child development/parenting test, differentiated between the mildly handicapped students who were enrolled and not enrolled in specified courses. The nutrition and consumer education test results revealed that mildly handicapped students who had not taken the course had higher scores than those who had taken the course. Tillman (1983) developed an instrument to measure consumer education concepts of academically handicapped and regular students. Four iterations of the instrument resulted in the last test having 40 multiple-choice items and a Kuder Richardson 21 reliability coefficient of .68.

Tarte (1983) developed the Housing Practical Reasoning Evaluation (HPRE-I), which measured students' knowledge and comprehension of practical reasoning, and HPRE-II, which measured ability to apply practical reasoning. The Kuder Richardson 20 internal consistency coefficient was .83 for HPRE-I and inter-rater reliability using Pearson procedures for five open-ended problems was .65. Construct validity was established by correlating scores on the Ennis Cornell Critical Thinking Test with the HPRE-II scores and yielded coefficients of .61 and .62 for two raters.
Manifold (1984) developed an instrument to measure decision-making skill level and stage of consumer-homemaking students who had and did not have practical reasoning instruction. Content validity was established by a panel of judges and interrater reliability using Pearson r was .80 and .94. ANOVA showed statistically significant differences between instructional conditions, students, and problems but not the interactions. Skill level and skill stage means were higher in all three problem areas for students who had instruction in practical reasoning.
Entrepreneurship

Entrepreneurship is a new topic in home economics education literature. Researchers have addressed fundamental questions that have implications for curriculum. Research in Iowa has been conducted by Compton (1981) and Reed and Fanslow (1984). Compton compared businesses and background characteristics of 175 female and 144 male entrepreneurs. She found that female small business owners earned less money, started with less capital, and had lower gross receipts than male small business owners. Men had more years of managerial experience than women before starting a small business. Women were older than men when they started their first business. Both males and females indicated major business problems were reducing fixed costs, meeting government regulations, and choosing employees. Men identified more problems than did women.

Reed and Fanslow's (1984) study of household task performance by husbands, wives, and children in families with entrepreneurial women showed that female small business owners spent an average of 19 hours per week doing household work, which differs from the 38 hours per week that employed women spent according to other studies. Husbands averaged 7.7 hours per week doing household work, while other studies indicate 11 hours per week. Children averaged 6.6 hours of household work per week, while another study indicated 15.4 hours per week. An average of 5 hours per week by household help was acquired by 38 percent of the female entrepreneurs. Absence or presence of children did not make a difference in amount of household help obtained. Female entrepreneurs had primary responsibility for tasks done daily and weekly, while their husbands largely did tasks monthly or seasonally. Family demands have implications for entrepreneurship curricula.

Gammell (1982) identified traits that may lead to success for women in small businesses and supporting influences through eight in-depth case studies. She found small businesswomen ranked determination, ambition, and human relations as the three most important traits necessary for success in small business. They also cited self-discipline. Support came from the husband, the owner's father and mother, and employees.

Gritzmacher (1986) compared 25 female entrepreneurs and 25 female managers. Annual income for entrepreneurs was in the $20,000-$24,999 range, while managers' income ranged from $25,000-$29,999. Average family income for both groups was in the same category, $55,000-$59,999. Success was defined by 48 percent of the entrepreneurs and 20 percent of the managers as making money, staying in business, and growing. Sixty percent of the entrepreneurs and 92 percent of the managers identified benefits to the woman as personal satisfaction, accomplishment, recognition, and personal growth.

Gritzmacher, Stafford, and Smith (1986) compared the costs of working for women owners of home-based businesses and women employed in the same jobs outside the home. The sample was
composed of individuals in the occupations of child care worker, seamstress, office worker, and consulting professional. Responses were sought from home-based business owners and employees (eight groups). Statistically significant differences emerged on wardrobe costs with higher costs occurring for women employed outside the home. No differences were found for the costs of services, travel, entertainment, organizations, and education, and total indirect costs.
Recommendations for Further Research

This section is organized using the same conceptual framework as the body of the paper. Research needs associated with the topics are identified, and additional research needs cited by other home economics educators are included. The efforts of the AVA Home Economics Division Research Committee to advance the status of home economics education research are then addressed.

Topics for Additional Research

Administration of Home Economics Programs

While more research has been done in the past five years than in previous years concerning administration, enrollment, recruitment, and image (little research on these types was reported by Nelson in 1979), continued effort is needed in these areas. More research is needed that will address administration specific to home economics at all levels and to the preparation of administrators through home economics education programs. Strategies that will enable female administrators to compete equitably with male counterparts need to be addressed. Studies of the impact on home economics when home economists move into central administration and public office are needed. Studies on each of these topics would increase the research base needed for decision making related to home economics education.

No studies were reported that address issues related to supervision of home economics programs on the state, district, or local levels. Those responsible for supervision at these levels provide leadership for program direction and funding. Also, additional data are needed to assist educators in effective supervision of student teachers.

No studies were found that deal with program structure and organization, sequencing, and articulation. Studies related to this in both higher and secondary education would assist professionals in designing well-articulated and effective home economics education programs.

Concern for enrollment, recruitment, and image in home economics education is evident in the literature. While some studies on these topics have been reported, further research is needed to provide a sound basis on which to develop public relations programs and specifically recruitment strategies.
Professional Roles

Questions still arise concerning how best to socialize home economics educators for their many roles and responsibilities. While some of the available descriptive studies help guide this socialization, qualitative studies may reveal what is needed to facilitate change and provide greater understanding of the socialization process.

Needs and Characteristics of Learners

Many of the studies dealing with needs and characteristics of learners cannot be generalized to other populations due to their small samples, narrow geographic representations, and newly developed instruments. Data bases need to be developed that educators can access when seeking generalizable information on home economics clients. Cooperative research efforts using representative samples across states would facilitate the ability to generalize findings. Of particular interest would be studies of such home economics education clientele as the “hard-to-teach, hard-to-reach,” handicapped, elderly, adults, pregnant teens, and young homemakers.

Curriculum

Many needs are evident in curriculum. In spite of significant efforts to encourage our publics to view home economics content as “other than” foods and clothing, these two topics are most frequently offered in home economics programs (Hughes, Rougvie, and Woods, 1980). Home economics teacher educators and state supervisors continue to encourage the offering of concepts related to more critical issues such as those identified in the legislation, i.e., parenting, consumer education, and nutrition, as well as thinking skills, a current emphasis in education. Research is needed to find strategies to reform programming so this might be accomplished.

Curriculum research has been conducted using empirical, interpretive, and critical science approaches in home economics education. While important studies have been completed, continued work is needed using the critical science theoretical framework.

Instruction

Little research has been conducted regarding preservice home economics education instruction. Because preservice instruction is a major function of home economics educators, these data would be most useful in advancing programming. More information on how best to prepare educators for specific roles such as program design and development, evaluation, public relations, and advising would assist in more efficient programming. Nelson (1979) cited a lack of research on providing vicarious experiences with disadvantaged learners. With extensive use of field experiences in teacher education programs, the need has changed. Personnel development for working with handicapped learners was and continues to be an expressed need. Information is needed on assessing instructional strategies and their impact on student achievement and attitudes.

No studies were found that could provide information about instructional effects on students in home economics education majors who were taking supporting home economics courses with students in other majors. Research of an interdisciplinary nature would provide useful data about instructing home economics education students in a manner that would encourage the integration...
of knowledge from these courses with teacher education courses. The route of interdisciplinary research is also attractive because of the often small numbers of home economics education majors in institutions and because teacher educators who also instruct in the content areas could benefit directly from such knowledge.

The lack of research focusing on the instructional components of home economics education programs is a weak link in the chain of research on curricular approaches, instruction, and characteristics of students. Studies are needed to identify effective implementation techniques for a variety of current curricular approaches and content in home economics programs. Particular emphasis could be given to determining effective instructional strategies that lead to the development of higher-level thinking skills. Research that more clearly relates philosophical position to effective instruction and programming would be useful. Future research in instruction might examine ways to adapt instructional strategies to include computer use, to evaluate competency attainment, and to relate teacher preparedness to success. In occupational programs, the development of student entrepreneurial skills could be assessed.

Evaluation

The majority of curriculum research and program evaluation has dealt with topics designated in the Vocational Education Act of 1976. Thus, many studies were done on the instruction, implementation, and evaluation of consumer education, parenting, and nutrition programs. Nelson's (1979) review and synthesis contained little information on program evaluation. She recommended multiple evaluations to increase credibility of conclusions about effectiveness. While progress has been made, additional efforts are needed in the areas designated in the legislation, securing aggregate data across states, and obtaining data in other content areas of home economics. Research team efforts are needed to focus on such areas as work and the family. Nelson cited a need that still has not been met for creating model programs of adult education. Further research is needed on various aspects of adult education to provide impetus for programming in this potential growth area. Nelson identified the need for followup of persons completing occupational training into work situations; this remains a need. Another need is to determine long-term effects of curriculum on learners. Efforts have started with the followup/longitudinal study of vocational consumer and homemaking students, but more work is needed.

As one reviews the research in home economics education, it becomes readily apparent that instrumentation is a critical need. In almost all studies data collection devices are constructed. Because of the inconsistencies in variables measured as well as the lack of strength of the instrument, it is increasingly difficult to aggregate data from several studies or to synthesize results. Efforts could be taken to collect effective instruments that would be readily accessible to researchers. In addition, valid and reliable devices may need to be constructed and their use encouraged in cooperative research in and among states, thus strengthening the knowledge base for the field.

Recommendations from Other Researchers

Hall, Wallace, and Lee (1983) stated that, as the research indicates, home economics programs are changing. As a result, preservice and inservice needs of home economics educators need to be addressed in such areas as subject matter methods, curriculum development, history and philosophy, educational principles and learning behaviors, nonformal education and innovative teaching
strategies, FHA/HERO, mainstreaming, and field experiences. This review substantiates this charge.

Green (1984) recommended that priority be given by the home economics profession to assessing the status of home economics research regularly, supporting interdisciplinary research, building comprehensive data base systems, sponsoring professional development on issues in research administration, promoting cost-effectiveness studies, disseminating and utilizing research results more effectively, capitalizing on the profession's research strengths, and including the research process as a part of the undergraduate curriculum. Each of these suggestions would be equally important to home economics education as to the total profession.

Redick and Loyd (1986) conducted a survey to determine research priorities for home economics education. Using topics suggested by the AVA Home Economics Education Research Committee, they developed an instrument asking respondents to rate each topic in terms of priority and to rank those topics that most needed to be researched. Respondents included research committee members as well as home economics education researchers who had published or presented research at national meetings in 1984 and 1985. The topics identified were as follows: long-term effects of home economics education programs on learners; the impact of home economics programs on school, home, and community; teaching for the development of higher-order thinking skills; changes in achievement, behavior, and attitudes resulting from home economics education programs; contribution of home economics education to lifelong learning skills, including basic skills, reasoning skills, and higher-order thinking skills; work and family relationship; factors influencing students to enroll in home economics programs; business and home economics education linkages; needs and characteristics of clientele including the elderly, adults, pregnant teens, and young homemakers; assessment of models for delivering home economics programs to adults; and assessment of models for home economics teacher education programs.

Several authors addressed research needs for vocational education that have implications for home economics education. Phelps and Hughes (1986) suggested the following as needed research in vocational education: incorporation of basic skills, improvement of teacher education, work and family, equity, field-based learning, and longitudinal study of students. Hughes (1983) identified the following as directions for vocational education research: the relationship and interrelationship of student interest and ability, family and community, education patterns, and work environment with the acquisition and use of skills for employment; effect of the family on work and work on the family and ways to help students plan for both; teacher performance over time; preparation for emerging jobs; cooperation with industry; emphasis on development of human potential, especially thinking and judgment; use of data from national surveys to address questions of policy; development of complementary local studies; effects of differing amounts of kinds of consumer and homemaking education. David (1983) identified seven research areas where investigation is needed: (1) research on the employment (demand) site of the education and work relationship; (2) experience-based approaches to learning about work; (3) attitudinal factors related to getting and progressing in a job and attitudes toward vocational and career education; (4) federal funding of education and the relationships among federal, state, and local government policies and programs affecting education and work; (5) equality of educational opportunities; (6) research on competency testing, minimum competency standards, and the credentialing process; and (7) career guidance and counseling. This review substantiates the need for home economics education research in these areas identified as vocational education research needs.

Researchers need to consider using emerging qualitative research methodologies, such as ethnographic techniques, case studies, and field studies as well as meta-analysis (Schultz 1985a) and national data bases. Multisite qualitative studies need to be considered along with the varying processes of data reduction.
The AVA Research Committee

The AVA Home Economics Division Research Committee was organized in 1978 for the purpose of identifying, promoting, and conducting research in home economics education with emphasis on regional and national studies ("American Vocational Association Home Economics Committee Minutes" 1980-1986). Membership of the committee is by appointment with members representing teacher educators, supervisors, and teachers. The American Home Economics Association, the U.S. Department of Education, and the Home Economics Education Association also have representation. The 21-member committee, which has been chaired by Ruth Hughes, Elizabeth Simpson, and Sharon Redick respectively, functions through a subcommittee structure.

The subcommittee chairs are members of the research committee with subcommittee membership open to all interested persons. Nelson (1979) cited the need for more pooling of resources, collaboration of efforts, and formalized networking in promoting research efforts as possible goals for this committee. Success of the subcommittees in achieving these goals is evidenced through the research and progress reports published and presented at national meetings. Nelson, Ray, and Gritzmacher respectively provided leadership for a national followup/longitudinal study of graduates of consumer and homemaking programs (Gritzmacher 1985). Redick, then Dohner (1985c) provided leadership on national research on career alternatives for home economics education graduates. Schultz (1985b), then Burge provided leadership on work and family relationships, while Way, then Kellett (1986) provided research leadership for Future Homemakers of America. While the leadership of these subcommittees has changed over the years, continuity of the research efforts has been provided through the research committee structure. Recently formed subcommittees include computer technology, chaired by Glinda Crawford (1985); basic skills, chaired by Sandra Miller (1985); responsiveness to legislative mandates, chaired by Robin White (1986); occupational programs, chaired by Betty Lee Stout (1985); middle/junior high school programs, chaired by Frances Smith (1985); higher-order thinking skills, chaired by Janet Laster (1985); and teacher education, chaired by Francine Hultgren (1986). The subcommittees all represent research needs as identified by the research committee. (Dates refer to subcommittee reports cited in the references.)

The research committee also identified the need for regional home economics education research meetings and international meetings focusing on critical issues in home economics education. This resulted in a regional home economics education meeting held at Michigan State University in 1985 (Bobbitt 1985) and an international conference on Thinking and Problem-Solving Skills in Home Economics Education held at the Ohio State University in 1986 (Laster 1985).

A significant contribution to advancing home economics education research was the launching of the Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education. Under the leadership of Aleene Cross, managing editor, Elizabeth Ray, immediate past editor, and Barbara Clawson, editor, the journal has provided an additional vehicle for publishing home economics education research.
Future Directions

While home economics educators can take pride in the great strides that have been made in developing a knowledge base for home economics education in higher education, secondary, post-secondary, and adult programs, additional research efforts will be needed to move the profession forward. The following recommendations are made based on this review and synthesis:

- Use approaches and techniques that include both quantitative and qualitative methods, and explore new designs and analyses.

- Strive to provide larger data bases and generalizable studies that may be attained more readily through pooling of resources and collaborative efforts.

- Disseminate research through conventional avenues as well as striving to reach new audiences.

- Conduct policy research and evaluation research as well as educational research.

- Continue to provide a formalized networking system for identifying, promoting, and conducting home economics education research such as that provided by the AVA Home Economics Research Committee.

- Attend to the critical questions in home economics education and encourage research that answers these questions. Such topics are reflected throughout this report and identified in the preceding section.
References


Bell, Camille G., and Durr, Gloria E. Consumer Education in Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. Lubbock: School of Home Economics, Texas Tech University; and Nacogdoches, TX: Stephen F. Austin State University, 1981. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 234 185).

———. Establishing a Communications Model for Changing Attitudes of Consumer and Homemaking Teachers toward Teaching Consumer Education. Lubbock: Texas Tech University, 1982.


Block, Mary Ann Christiansen. "An Exploratory Study of the Factors Affecting Socialization of Beginning Home Economics Teachers into the Teaching Profession." Ph.D. diss., University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 1983.


Bouie, Dorothy S. "A Comparative Analysis of Three Inservice Delivery Systems Designed to Increase the Utilization of Vocational Materials." Ph.D. diss., Florida State University, 1983.


Burge, Penny, and Cunningham, Daisy L. "Perceptions of Consumer and Homemaking Education." *Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education* 1, no. 3 (Summer 1983): 82-91.


Crook, Carla S. "Effectiveness of an Instructional Packet for Vocational Home Economics Teachers Obtaining Directed Work Experience." Ph.D. diss., The Ohio State University, 1979.


Cummings, Pamela R. "Home Economists and Political Participation." Ph.D. diss., Oklahoma State University, 1983.


Faircloth, Ann; Clawson, Barbara; and Godwin, Deborah D. *Effectiveness of Computer Assisted Instruction for Teaching Consumer Credit.* Greensboro: Home Economics in Education and Business Department, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1985.


*Fixing and Eating My Food: An Inventory of Food Behaviors Associated with Selection, Preparation, and Consumption of Food for Students in Grades 1-6.* Rosemont, IL: National Dairy Council, 1984b.


Gill, Sandra J. “Professional Involvement in the American Home Economics Association of Former Elected Officers in the Student Member Section.” Ph.D. diss., Washington State University, 1983.

Gilmore, Shirley C.; Fanslow, Alyce; and Brun, Judy K. “A Food Purchasing Inventory for Fifth and Sixth Grade Students.” *Journal of Nutrition Education* 17, no. 2 (June 1985): 55-58.


Griffin, W. P.; Heatherly, J. A.; and Cotton, K. J. *Follow-up of the Model to Create Awareness of Sex Bias and Sex Stereotyping in Vocational Education*. Lubbock: Texas Tech University, 1981.


———. *Comparison of Female Entrepreneurs and Female Managers, Their Spouses and a Child*. Final Project Report. Columbus: Ohio Agricultural Research and Development Center, The Ohio State University, 1986.

Gritzmacher, Joan E.; Stafford, Kathryn; and Smith, Joyce. “Costs of Working of Women in
Homebased Businesses and Women Employed Outside the Home in Four Occupational
Statuses.” Presentation to the Ohio Cooperative Extension Faculty, Columbus, Ohio, 1986.

Growel, Christie. “Locus of Control and Recognition Preferences of Home Economics Majors.”

Hall, Helen C.; Wallace, Sharon A.; and Lee, Sylvia L. “Characteristics of Faculty, Students, and
Programs in Home Economics Teacher Education.” Journal of Vocational Home Econom-
ics Education 1, no. 3 (Summer 1983): 3-23.

Hall, Lynne Degler. “Future Directions for Ohio Extension Home Economics Programs as Identifi-

Hallman, Patsy Spurrier, and Jones, Sue English. Nutrition Education in Vocational Home

Hallquist, Mary Wyatt. “Sex Role Attitudes and Deterrents for Women in Education Administra-

Harb, J. S. “The Effective Woman Home Economics Administrator.” Ed.D., Virginia Polytechnic
Institute and State University, 1980.


Harvey, Anne Allnutt. “A Comparison of Home Economics Teachers and Teacher Educators with
Respect to Competencies for Teaching in Secondary Schools.” Ph.D. diss., University of
Maryland, 1982.

Hawthorne, Betty E.; Woodburn, Margy; and Powell, Judith A. “Research Process and Achieve-
ment: Roles of Administrators and Researchers in the Success of Home Economics
EJ 300 919).

Haymore, Judy; Caputo, Colleen C.; and Peterson, Ken. “Sex Equity Attitudes of Secondary Home
Economics Teachers.” Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education 1, no. 1 (Winter

Hellums, Laverne S., and Gorman, Anna. “Consumer Education: Effects of the Type of Consumer
and Homemaking Programs in Mississippi.” Journal of Vocational Home Economics
Education 2, no. 4 (Fall 1984): 57-66.

Hertzler, Ann A., and Wall, Vera J. “University Home Economics Programs in the United States:
A Survey of International Involvement.” Home Economics Research Journal 12, no. 3

Hesler, Dixie Lee. “Characteristics of Family Environment and Levels of 4-H Member Participa-


Preparing Nebraska's Youth for Roles as Consumers and Family Members.
Lincoln: University of Nebraska, 1984.


Smith, Frances M. “Frequency of Selected Home Tasks Performed by Early Adolescents: Curricular Implications for Home Economics.” Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education 2, no. 3 (Summer 1984): 64-85.


57
Smith, Mary Anne M. “Leadership and Learning Styles of Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers as Related to Communication during Student Teaching.” Ph.D. diss., University of Minnesota, 1981.


Warta, Marjorie H. "Management Functions of Secondary Vocational Teachers in Kansas with Implications for Pre-Service and In-Service Education." Ph.D. diss., Kansas State University, 1982.


Wilson, Wanda M. "Teacher Perceptions of Competencies Needed by Occupational Home Economics Instructional Personnel as a Basis for Pre- and In-Service Education in Oklahoma." Ed.D. diss., Oklahoma State University, 1983.


IN 307 $6.00


Presents positive and negative implications of professional certification so that individuals and the profession can intelligently judge how to fulfill the mission of advancing the profession. Provides a proposed nine-stage model for the development of a professional certification program.

IN 308 $7.00


Examines deterrents to adults' participation in learning activities so that educators can identify the factors associated with adults' non-participation. In addition, the paper addresses possible strategies to overcome the deterrents.

IN 309 $5.25


Focuses on the role vocational education should play in the transition process to employment for special needs youth. Proposes program models for delivering instruction to promote a comprehensive approach to addressing interpersonal, basic academic and specific vocational skills.

IN 310 $7.00

Correctional Education: Perspectives on Programs for Adult Offenders. compiled by Bruce I. Wolford. 53 pp. 1986

Identifies basic concerns faced in correctional education—administration, law, special education, vocational education, and postsecondary education—in order to aid corrections educators and administrators in their efforts to promote and improve educational services for the incarcerated.

IN 311 $6.00


Proposes a new role—the development of balanced occupational programs enabling students to acquire transferable skills—for vocational education for persons involved at every level of the profession: educators, administrators, and policy makers. Addresses trends affecting vocational education, such as the increased international competition.

IN 312 $5.25


Discusses the future of vocational education. Utilizes the discussion of three scenarios to create preferred alternative futures for vocational education for the benefit of policy makers and strategic planners.

IN 313 $7.00


Covers eight aspects of home economics education: (1) administration, (2) professional roles, (3) needs and characteristics of learners, (4) curriculum, (5) instruction, (6) evaluation, (7) entrepreneurship, and (8) recommendations for further research, so that home economics leaders can guide the field through the rapid change of modern society.

To order additional copies, please use order number and title. Orders of $10.00 or less should be prepaid. Make remittance payable to the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. Mail order to:

The National Center for Research in Vocational Education
National Center Publications. Box F
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

Prices listed are in effect at the time of publication of this book. All prices include postage and handling. Prices are subject to change without notice.

Quantity Discounts
Orders of five (5) or more items, as listed by publication number and title, with a total dollar value for the order of:

- $50 to $100, the discount is 5%
- $101 to $200, the discount is 10%
- $201 to $300, the discount is 15%
- $301 to $400, the discount is 20%
- $401 and above, the discount is 25%

International Orders
All orders in any amount, from outside the United States and its possessions are to be paid in U.S. currency. Additional postage and handling charges may be added for foreign shipments if necessary.