FIELD EXPERIENCES IN UNDERGRADUATE HOME MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

by

KATHLEEN FAITH MIKITKA

B. A. Ed., Arizona State University, 1968

26
410 5-940

A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family Economics

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1974

Approved by:



Major Professor

LD
2668
T4
1974
M54
C.2
Document

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION 1

OBJECTIVES 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE 2

Field Experiences in Home Management (1929 - 1968) 2

Contemporary Field Experiences in Home Management (1969 - 1973) 5

PROCEDURE 9

Definition of Terms 9

Instrument Development 10

Data Collection 11

Data Analysis 12

RESULTS 12

Response to the Survey 12

Description of institutions 13

Description of respondents 13

Home Economics, Home Management and Field Experiences Offered by Institutions 16

Number of home management courses 17

Variety of home management course offerings 17

Home management theory and other home management courses 18

Number of home management courses 18

Characteristics of home management courses 18

Combinations of home management theory and other home management experience courses 21

Field experiences related to home management with residence and non-residence 21

Characteristics of Field Experiences Offered in Home Management 28

Stages of development 28

Number of years offered 29

Student participation in field experiences in home management 29

Levels of home management field experiences offered 30

Number of students participating in field experiences in home management 32

Relation of field experiences to other home management experiences 33

Problem identification 34

Institutions Not Offering Field Experiences in Home Management 35

Attitudes Toward Field Experiences in Home Management 37

For selected majors 39

Toward field experience approaches to teaching home management 41

Plans Concerning Field Experiences 41

Institutions offering field experiences 43

Institutions not offering field experiences 43

SUMMARY 44

RECOMMENDATIONS 47

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 49

SELECTED REFERENCES 50

APPENDICES 53

A Letter to Selected Educators Regarding Review of Questionnaire and Cover Letter 53

B Data Collection Instruments 54

C Cover Letter 58

D	Reminder Letter	59
E	Second Reminder Letter	60
F	Home Management Education of Respondents; Classified in Table 3 as "Other Management Education and Experiences"	61
G	Home Management Programs Offered, Spring 1973	63
H	Institutions from which Responses Were Not Received	78
I	Institutions from which Inapplicable Responses Were Received	81
J	Titles of Undergraduate Home Management and Related Courses	82
K	Problems with Offering Field Experiences in Home Management; Classified in Table 18 as "Other Problems, Explanations"	91
L	Reasons Why Field Experiences Not Offered in Home Management; Classified in Table 19 as "Other Reasons"	93
M	Attitudes of Respondents Toward Field Experiences in Home Management; Classified in Table 20 as "Other Attitudes"	97
N	Attitudes of Respondents Toward Home Management Field Experiences for Selected Majors; Classified in Table 21 as "Other Majors"	101
O	Attitudes of Respondents Toward Field Experience Approaches to Teaching Home Management; Classified in Table 22 as "Other Approaches"	102

INTRODUCTION

Home management educators in undergraduate home economics programs have investigated and experimented with various methods of teaching home management including field study experience. Alternative approaches were discussed at management conferences held in 1962 and 1966 (AHEA Proceedings, 1962; Proceedings, 1966).

Knoll (1971) contends that home management educators can exercise considerable choice in identifying course goals, in setting the level of course offerings, and in selecting the methods most likely to produce desired learnings, but that almost nothing is known about "typical" combinations of learning experiences currently offered. A full-scale organized study of the content, structure, and sequence of home management programs was suggested by Knoll.

Approaches used to teach home management are influenced by the objectives of programs and by the mechanics of the desired methods. Extensive reviews of literature regarding development of home management programs and home management residence courses are included in the writing of Furst (1965), Babcock and Ater (1966), and Vickers (1969). Cameron (1972) explored the feasibility of home management residence courses and gave consideration to residence alternatives.

Educators wishing to enable students to gain experience in applying home management theory to various situations are offering field experiences as parts or major components of home management courses (Cameron, 1972; Hollen et al., 1971; Hutchinson, 1973; Jensen, 1971; Mitch, 1972; Parker and Firebaugh, 1972; Simons, 1971; Vickers, 1971). Information regarding field experiences offered in home management is limited. Needed is a data

base to identify the status of field experiences and opportunities for integration of field experiences in home management education.

For purposes of this investigation, field study experience is defined as either a part or the major component of a home management course and refers to use of the community as a laboratory where students apply management concepts and principles through observation and/or participation in management situations and homes of various circumstances. The terms "field study experience," "field study," and "field experience" are used interchangeably in this thesis.

OBJECTIVES

The major objective of the study was to provide the data base needed to assess the status of undergraduate home management education programs and the utilization of field study experience therein. Specific objectives were

1) to determine the past, present, and possible future status of field study as an undergraduate home management experience, and
2) to identify "typical" patterns of field study which exist within undergraduate home management courses.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Field Experiences in Home Management

(1929 - 1968)

Field experiences have been used to some extent for many years as an approach to teaching home management. Judy (1929, p. 83) found that of sixty-eight institutions investigated, one-third had programs which

included student visits to problems. When asked what methods were included to provide managerial experience when a residence was not maintained by the department, representatives of some institutions replied that field work was conducted in homes in the community (Judy, 1929, p. 83).

Ella Cushman of Cornell University developed a home management course using existing families and homes in the community. Students studied family values and goals, resources, and decision making. A textbook written by Cushman (1945) described a philosophy and method of studying management in homes.

> The students will find that in real life homes often function smoothly that fly in the face of standards and theories; but it should surely be an advance to discover that, no matter what rules are broken or what theories upset or what well-established principles are side-stepped, the home that is managing most successfully is the one in which important family values are being attained, no matter what the method. It is for this reason that homes are the best textbooks of home management, a reservoir of source material invaluable and inexhaustible (Cushman, 1945, p. 256).

Home management achievements of families and individuals and various ways families with different incomes and circumstances managed were recorded by Cushman. Cushman wrote that the instructor of such a course has management problems in arranging the time and space for teaching classes and that limited time, money, and teaching staff might prohibit the teaching of such a course. Gross and Crandall (1954, p. 512; 1963, p. 513) described Cushman's approach and included the guidesheets developed by Cushman (pp. 557-8, pp. 567-8) for interpreting observations in homes.

Van Voorhis (1949, p. 43) investigated the teaching procedures and course content of home management classes taught in home economics departments having no residence house and found that nearly one-third of fifty-eight teachers used local facilities to give management learning experiences.

Teachers suggested the following ideas for the use of "natural homemaking problems": providing management responsibilities in the students' own homes; working with families on management problems; working out a questionnaire on management and going to homemakers for direct answers; having a week's management experience in instructors' homes; studying the problems of faculty families with children; and conducting buying projects in local stores. Of the fifty-eight teachers, seven used Cushman's book as a text, while thirty-three used the book as a reference (Van Voorhis, 1949, p. 46).

Snowman (1952) made a study of the home management procedures of thirteen selected families who cooperated in home management class field experiences at Cornell University from 1935 to 1952. A questionnaire was developed and interviews were conducted with the families related to work the students had done with them.

At the University of Cincinnati a modified home management laboratory course was developed in which students were assigned to cooperating families in the community. Graduate home economists participated by taking students into their homes. During a period of seven-and-one-half weeks, a planned sequence of managerial experiences was provided for each student (Whiteford, 1962).

Furst (1965) conducted a study to ascertain past, present, and future trends in home management residence programs in land-grant colleges and universities. Furst hypothesized that trends in home management programs were toward laboratory and field experiences and away from home management residence. Findings did not support the hypothesis. A recommendation was made that a similar study be conducted five years later to determine if opinions or curricula had changed.

Field experience methods were briefly mentioned by Babcock and Ater (1966, p. 18). The writers asserted that although giving home management field experiences are given in a more realistic environment, these experiences limit independent decision-making responsibilities of students; furthermore, that a variety of administrative problems are involved.

The challenges of the McGrath Report (1968) may have influenced administrators at some institutions to either change or incorporate new experiences into home management curricula.

> This study of the programs of home economics in the land-grant colleges and state universities leads to the firm conclusion that it is wiser social policy to help and to encourage home economics to adapt to new social needs than to abandon or dismember it as a field of study or to shift its services to other elements of the American system of higher education. Hence we advocate improving the practice of home economics and extending its beneficial influence to other phases of American life . . . (McGrath, 1968, pp. 83-4).

Contemporary Field Experiences in Home Management

(1969 - 1973)

For purposes of organizing current thinking about field experiences in home management, it can be concluded that field experience is not a new idea or a new experience. However, in the 1970's the emphasis on field experience has shifted to its study as a viable alternative or supplement to home management residence courses.

One of the outcomes related to Vickers' (1969) study of levels of concept attainment in residence and non-residence courses was an account of types of activities in non-residence home management courses across the nation, some of which included field experiences.

> At Arizona State University . . . students record field observations obtained by accompanying a professional caseworker

> to families with actual management problems. They identify one managerial situation which needs to be improved and prescribe a direction of change.
>
> Students at San Francisco State University participate in shared field experiences in a preprofessional relationship with an organized agency as preparation to working professionally with individuals, families, and community organizations. The field experience is accompanied by seminars to analyze the experiences (Vickers, 1971, p. 95).

Activities at other institutions involved students in observations and interviews to examine managerial concepts.

An evaluation of costs and benefits of the home management house experience at Pacific Union College raised questions and led to conclusions which motivated a change of approach.

> . . . As we communicated with persons at other schools we found some were already providing other types of experience. We visited with some of the teachers involved in programs where students were sent out to work with homemakers of various socio-economic levels. Our findings revealed that some schools sent all of their students into homes of newlyweds to act as "teachers" helping them to establish desirable patterns of management. Some schools sent all of their students into lower socioeconomic homes. We thought of the variety of backgrounds from which our students come and recognized that although most of them are middle class their mothers vary in management practices. Some are employed outside the home. A few of our students come from lower socio-economic level homes. Armed with these facts we developed our pilot course (Simon, 1971, p. 123).

The course at Pacific Union College included experiences in both middle-class and lower-income homes. An evaluation and appraisal of the method by the nine students brought overall favorable comments.

Home economics students at Ohio State University benefited from home management field experiences with families of various circumstances.

> . . . Students enrolled in a home management course (an alternative to the home management house experience) observe and participate in activities in homes. Concurrently, the students gain additional background and knowledge from personal research and discussions culminating in a paper analyzing the management aspects of the situation (Parker and Firebaugh, 1972, p. 233).

A systems framework presented by Maloch and Deacon (1966) served as a basis for analyzing family management and making suggestions to the family for improvement. The homemakers benefited from the help and friendship of the students; students learned to understand and apply management principles, became aware of various environments, and grew through the human relationships that developed.

The School of Human Development at the University of Maine discontinued the home management residence requirement during the 1965-66 academic year, and introduced a field experience centered around home visits.

> The purpose of the course is two-fold: first, to provide opportunities for students to become aware of the nature of management decisions by families of different social, economic, and educational levels and to appreciate the bases for these decisions and second, to provide experience for the students in helping families solve selected managerial problems (Hutchinson, 1973, p. 32).

Families representing various levels of socioeconomic status, patterns of family composition, and stages of the family life cycle were selected for the visitations. Cooperative efforts of local families, welfare agencies, public health nurses, and urban renewal representatives contributed to success of the program.

"While many universities throughout the nation question the validity of home management houses and complain of their expense, BYU stands firm as their strong advocate" (Jensen, 1971, p. 28). To help students apply theory, the Home Management and Family Economics Department at Brigham Young University developed a two-fold course. In addition to the traditional home management residence experiences, field experiences were developed to provide students work with low income families in the Provo

area. Supervisor Beth Bastian, assistant professor in the College of Family Living, commented:

> In the house, the girls have an upper-middle or middle-class experience with all the optimum home facilities. Through field experience we want to expose them to the lower-income levels, too, so they can see the real managerial problems of the homemaker and family (Jensen, 1971, p. 27).

Originally, the eight-week residence course was shortened to three weeks. The faculty, however, felt the shortened home management residence period was not sufficient so planned for the students to complete their residence and field experience during the traditional eight-week period the following year.

The Department of Home Economics at New Mexico State University is conducting an investigation with the purpose of developing innovative class and field experiences to help prepare family home consultants. The inter-disciplinary approach integrates nutrition, child development, home management and other studies of family living. Three phases of field experiences included consultations with young homemakers in their homes, participation in nursery school activities with the preschool children in the home, and participation in the daily work of community agencies concerned with family problems. Prior to home visits, a three-week orientation was held with the home management and child development instructors as team teachers. Students were able to make home visits with self-confidence, and later demonstrated maturity when planning for student teaching (Hollen et al., 1971).

A program planned jointly by Goshen College and Eastern Mennonite College home economics departments was to involve students in a transcultural field experience in the fall of 1973. The focus was to be on family living patterns in the Jamaican culture, with nine credits to be earned in

courses on area studies, comparisons in family resource use, and a trans-cultural home economics practicum. Students were to have an opportunity to develop sensitivity to the needs of individuals and families of another culture. Prerequisite courses in the family, nutrition, and home management theory were required.

PROCEDURE

A full-scale exploratory study of undergraduate home management courses in senior colleges and universities was conducted during the Spring semester, 1973. A mail survey was used to obtain the desired information. This was considered necessary because formal descriptions of combinations of learnings offered in home management by institutions were limited or not existent, therefore providing no rational basis for selecting institutions. Questionnaires and accompanying forms were mailed to the 383 home economics administrators on a special mailing list obtained from the American Home Economics Association which was dated, October, 1972.

Definition of Terms

Definitions of terms for the objectives of this study were developed. They are modified composites of the terminology and ideas expressed in the writing of Cameron (1972), Cook (1971), Craig (1969), Jensen (1971), Knolls (1971) and Vickers (1971), and in the conference proceedings, Approaches to Teaching Home Management (1966):

HOME MANAGEMENT COURSES refers to those home economics courses (theory and/or experience) that emphasize the management process, the elements of management (values, goals, standards, resources), decision making, household

operations, and work simplification and analysis as specialized and/or integrative subject matter.

RESIDENCE COURSE refers to the managerial activities carried out by students while living in the traditional home management house or other facilities maintained by the institution or (under various circumstances) the student's own home.

CONTROLLED LABORATORY COURSE refers to the management experiences of students in a laboratory which could be similar to a home management residence, a laboratory room or combinations of rooms, or a combination classroom-laboratory.

FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCE (as either a part of or the major component of a home management course) refers to use of the community as a laboratory where students apply management concepts and principles through observation and/or participation in management situations and homes of various circumstances.

THEORY COURSE refers to basic lecture or "lecture-type" courses where students learn about home management concepts and principles.

Instrument Development

A questionnaire consisting of check-list and open-end items was constructed in a manner designed to encourage replies. Questions asked were of an exploratory nature regarding the overall status of field experiences in home management programs. Items were included to ascertain attitudes toward concepts of field study in home management courses. Rough drafts of the questionnaire and cover letter were prepared for review and criticism by five selected home management instructors at other institutions. The letter

requesting the help of the five selected instructors is in Appendix A. As a result of this review, the questionnaire and cover letter were improved in various ways by altering the original style plus adding definitions of terms. Additional forms to obtain overall home management course structure information were developed. To facilitate ease in tabulating the data, the final questionnaires and forms were color coded and numbered to correspond to a master list of institutions. The data collection instruments are included in Appendix B.

Data Collection

The survey involved three major mailings plus limited individual follow-up inquiries to clarify course descriptions given by some institutions.

The initial mailing to 383 institutions included a cover letter, the questionnaire, course structure forms, and a self-addressed stamped envelope for the return mail. The packet was addressed to home economics administrators who were asked in the cover letter to forward the materials to home management personnel. A copy of the cover letter is in Appendix C.

A reminder letter was mailed to administrators whose responses to the initial mailing were not received within approximately three weeks. Administrators who had not received the questionnaire or needed a replacement were asked to request duplicates. A copy of the reminder letter is in Appendix D.

The final mailing consisted of additional reminder letters plus duplicates of the cover letter, questionnaire, and course structure forms. These materials were sent to administrators when responses had not been received within two weeks after the first reminder letter was sent to them.

If for some reason personnel of the institutions were unable to participate in the study, they were asked to indicate this by checking a box on the form letter and to return the letter in the envelope provided. A copy of the second reminder letter is found in Appendix E.

Data Analysis

Each institution on the mailing list was classified by number (1-383), geographic region (Census, 1970), source of financial support (Carter, 1954; Fine, 1972; McGrath, 1968) and undergraduate home economics enrollment 1971 (Harper and Woteki, 1972).

The returned materials were reviewed, edited, classified and coded. A combination of computer processing and hand sorting was used to tabulate the responses. Percentages and cross tabulations were made. Chi square tests were applied to a portion of the results to test significance of attitude differences between respondents. Responses to the optional open-end items were grouped and listed in the appendices.

RESULTS

Response to the Survey

Initially, cover letters, questionnaires and forms were mailed to the 383 institutions. Subsequently, 223 reminder letters and later 148 second reminder letters were mailed. Of the three mailings, completed instruments were returned from 318 institutions (83%). The mailings and returns are given in Table 1.

Table 1. Inquiries mailed and responses received

Inquiries mailed	Number	Responses received			
		Number	Percent	Cumulative number	Cumulative percent
Initial mailing	383	160	42	160	42
First reminder letter	223	75	34	235	61
Second reminder letter	148	83	56	318	83

Description of institutions

Institutions were classified by geographic region, source of financial support, and undergraduate home economics enrollment, and described by inquiries mailed and responses received (Table 2). Although the response was excellent for all types of institutions, the highest response rate was from those institutions having larger undergraduate home economics enrollments.

Description of respondents

Administrators were asked to forward the questionnaire to the person they thought best qualified to give the information requested. The 295 respondents were asked to indicate their educational status, years of home management teaching experience, and types of home management education (Table 3). Most (203) of the respondents had master's degrees and one-fourth (80) had doctoral degrees.

One-third of the respondents (101) had taught home management less than five years. Nearly one-third (79) had been teaching home management from five to ten years, and one-third (99) for more than ten years. Six

Table 2. Description of institutions by inquiries mailed and responses received

Geographic region of institutions[a]	Inquiries mailed		Responses received	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All	383	100	318	83
Northeast	45	12	36	80
North Central	125	33	110	88
South	154	40	117	76
West	57	15	53	93
Puerto Rico	2	--	2	100

Source of financial support of institutions[b]	Inquiries mailed		Responses received	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All	383	100	318	83
Land-grant	60	16	58	97
Other public (state, municipal)	163	43	139	85
Private, nonsectarian	21	5	14	67
Private, religious or sectarian	138	36	106	77
Not classified	1	--	1	100

Undergraduate home economics enrollment of institutions, 1971[c]	Inquiries mailed		Responses received	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All	383	100	318	83
Less than 50	77	20	61	79
50-100	88	23	69	78
101-500	148	39	125	84
501-1000	39	10	39	100
Greater than 1000	15	4	15	100
Not classified	16	4	9	56

[a]Census, 1970.

[b]Carter, 1964; Fine, 1972; McGrath, 1968.

[c]Harper and Woteki, 1972.

Table 3. Respondents' educational background and experience

Educational status	Respondents	
	Number	Percent
All respondents, degree	295	100
Bachelors	6	2
Masters	203	69
Doctoral	80	27
Not indicated	6	2

Years of home management teaching experience	Respondents	
	Number	Percent
All respondents	295	100
Less than five years	101	34
5-10 years	79	27
More than 10 years	99	34
None[a]	6	2
Not indicated	10	3

Home management education	Respondents	
	Number	Percent
All respondents	295	100
Home management theory course	261	88
Home management residence course	242	82
Graduate courses in home management	190	64
Professional workshops or conferences on home management	125	42
Graduate major in home management	82	28
Field study experience in home management	52	18
Other management education and experiences[b]	42	14
Not indicated	6	2

[a]Home economics department chairmen.

[b]Listed in Appendix F.

respondents were home economics department chairmen who had never taught home management.

Most of the respondents indicated their professional education included a home management theory course (261) and residence course (242). Sixty-four percent (190) had taken graduate courses in home management and 42 percent (125) had attended professional workshops or conferences on home management. Twenty-eight percent (82) had a graduate major in home management. Eighteen percent (52) had field study experience in home management. Other training listed by the respondents may be found in Appendix F.

Home Economics, Home Management and Field Experiences Offered by Institutions

Of the 383 inquiries mailed, 318 responses were received from the institutions (Table 4). Twenty-three of the instruments returned were inapplicable; these were from twelve institutions offering no home management courses, five offered no home economics programs, four were unable to participate, and two gave insufficient information. Of the 295 applicable instruments received from institutions offering home economics and home management courses, 134 (45%) offered some type of field experience in undergraduate home management courses, while 161 (55%) of the institutions offered no field experience in undergraduate home management courses.

A summary of the home management programs offered by the 295 institutions participating in this study is included in Appendix G, institutions from which responses were not received are listed in Appendix H, and institutions from which inapplicable responses were received are listed in Appendix I.

Table 4. Home economics, home management and field experiences offered by institutions

Inquiries mailed and responses received	Institutions	
	Number	Percent
Inquiries mailed	383	100
Response not received	65	17
Response received	318	83
Inapplicable	23	7
Home management courses not offered	12	
Home economics program not offered	5	
Unable to participate	4	
Insufficient information given	2	
Applicable	295 (100%)	76
Institutions offering home management courses with no field experience	161 (55%)	42
Institutions offering home management courses with some type of field experience	134 (45%)	34

Home Management as an Undergraduate Area in Home Economics

Number of home management courses

Respondents were asked to list all undergraduate home management courses offered. The number of courses listed by institutions varied from one to eleven, while most respondents listed one or two courses (Table 5). Only one-third of the respondents listed three or more courses.

Variety of home management course offerings

A diversity in understanding of what is construed to be "home management" was evident from the myriad of course titles and descriptions given by the respondents. The number of course titles and descriptions listed suggested a wide variety of courses among institutions. All of the course titles submitted are grouped by the major emphases of the courses and listed in Appendix J.

Table 5. Number of courses listed as home management courses by institutions[a]

Number of courses	Institutions	
	Number	Percent
All institutions	295	100
None	3	1
One	83	28
Two	105	36
Three	42	14
Four	34	12
Five	11	4
Six	4	1
Seven	6	2
Eight	5	2
Nine	1	-
Ten	-	-
Eleven	1	-

[a]Total number of courses listed = 736.

Home management theory and other home management courses

Patterns of course offerings given by institutions were so inextricably related to what institutions offered as home management theory and/or other home management that analysis was made relating these two emphases.

Number of home management courses

Half (146) of the 295 institutions offered two courses while 114 (39%) offered one course (Table 6). Only 29 institutions offered three or more courses.

Characteristics of home management courses

Approximately 500 home management theory and/or other home management courses (Appendix J) were reviewed and classified as to the emphases of the courses: basic home management, the only home management course offered by

Table 6. Number of home management theory and/or other home management courses offered by institutions

Number of courses	Institutions	
	Number	Percent
All institutions	295	100
One	114	39
Two	146	49
Three	27	9
Four	1	-
Five	1	-
Unclassifiable	6	2

an institution, emphasized various combinations of home management theory with non-residence home management experiences, some might include field experience; introductory theory, prerequisites to advanced theory and/or residence and/or controlled laboratory and/or field experience courses; advanced theory, residence, controlled laboratory, field experience, and a miscellaneous course combined theory with three home management experience options. The characteristics of enrollment, majors required to take the courses, level of course and credit hours of the courses are shown in Table 7. No specific pattern emerged other than what one might have expected, such as the restricted residence alternatives being offered for married students. Students most frequently required to take any of these courses were home economics education majors. There appears to be a trend to require all home economics majors to take "introductory theory" or "basic" home management courses.

Table 7. Characteristics of undergraduate home management theory and other home management courses

	Courses								
	Introductory theory	Advanced theory	Residence	Restricted residence alternative	Controlled laboratory	Field experience	Basic home mgt. (part field experience)	Basic home mgt. (no field experience)	Misc.
Number of institutions offering course	173	8	158	19	42	36	18	45	1
Enrollment, 1972-73									
range	7-660	0-85	3-220	4-30	3-190	0-100	0-80	0-395	50
median	50	27	26	14	27	27	28	24	
Home Ec. majors required to take course	all	education	education	married education	education	education	all and education	all	education
Level									
range	fr.-sr.	jr.-sr.	soph.-sr.	soph.-sr.	soph.-sr.	jr.-sr.	soph.-sr.	fr.-sr.	jr. & sr.
modal	jr. & sr.	jr. & sr.	sr.	jr. & sr.	sr.	sr.	jr. & sr.	jr. & sr.	---
Credit hours									
range	2-5 qtr. 1-5 sem.	1-3 qtr. 2-3 sem.	2-6 qtr. 2-5 sem.	2-5 qtr. 1-3 sem.	3-4 qtr. 1-4 sem.	3-4 qtr. 2-5 sem.	5 qtr. 2-4 sem.	3-5 qtr. 2-4 sem.	3 or 4 sem.
modal	3 sem.	3 sem.	3 sem.	3 sem.	3 sem.	3 sem.	3 sem.	3 sem.	---

Combinations of home management theory and other home management experience courses

Distributions of those institutions with and without field experiences, by residence and non-residence, and by type and number of home management theory and other home management courses (single courses or combinations of courses) are shown in Tables 8 and 9. The extent of field experiences among the 134 institutions offering field experiences is annotated in Table 9. Course descriptions of the wide range of approaches reported in this exploratory study were not sufficient to permit further classification of the offerings.

The most frequent combinations of home management theory and other home management experience courses among all 295 institutions were offered as two courses, introductory theory and residence. Sixty-one (46%) of the 134 institutions offering field experiences offered these experiences in some combination with residence or as a restricted substitute for residence. A few (9) offered residence and field experience among options. Seventy-two institutions (54% of 134) offered field experiences in non-residence programs. Field experiences ranged from parts to major components of a variety of theory and non-residence experience combinations offered. The most "typical" pattern was a combination of two courses, an introductory theory course and another course with field experience as the major component. Other "typical" approaches combined field experiences with controlled laboratory experiences.

Field experiences related to home management with residence and non-residence

The distribution of the 295 reporting institutions, identified whether the home management programs offered a residence component and/or field

Table 8. Home management theory and home management experience courses offered in programs without field experiences

Courses offered	Programs	
	Number	Percent
All programs without field experiences	161	100
Residence	97	61
Single Course	19	
Two Courses Introductory theory Residence	67	
Two of Three Courses Introductory theory Residence or Restricted Alternative	9	
Two or Three Courses of Four Courses Introductory theory Residence Residence Corequisite } or Restricted Alternative	1	
Three of Five Courses Introductory theory Residence Residence Corequisite } or Restricted Alternative Restricted Alternative Corequisite }	1	

Table 8. (continued)

Courses offered			Programs	
			Number	Percent
Non-Residence			63	39
Single Course		50		
Basic home management	42			
Controlled Laboratory	8			
Two Courses		11		
Introductory theory				
Controlled Laboratory				
Three Courses		1		
Introductory theory				
Advanced theory				
Controlled Laboratory				
Interdisciplinary Options		1		
Unclassifiable			1	--

Table 9. Home management theory and home management experience courses offered in programs with field experiences

Courses offered	Extent of field experiences	Programs	
		Number	Percent
All with some type of field study		134	100
Residence		61	46
Single Course		11	
	Part of course	4	
	Restricted residence substitute	4	
	No part	1	
	Not indicated	2	
One of Two Courses		2	
Residence or Restricted Alternative	Part of both courses	1	
	Restricted residence substitute	1	
Two Courses		29	
Introductory theory Residence	Part of theory course	3	
	Part of residence course	11	
	Part of both courses	4	
	Restricted residence substitute	7	
	No part	2	
	Not indicated	2	
Two of Three Courses		5	
Introductory theory Residence or Restricted Alternative	Part of theory course	1	
	Part of theory course and restricted alternative course	1	
	Part of residence course and restricted alternative course	2	
	Part of all three courses	1	

Table 9. (continued)

Courses offered	Extent of field experiences	Programs	
		Number	Percent
Two of Three Courses		1	
Residence or Restricted Field Study	Major component of restricted field study course		
Three Courses		3	
Introductory theory, Advanced theory, Residence	Part of residence course	1	
	Part of residence course and restricted residence substitute	1	
	Restricted residence substitute	1	
Three Courses		1	
Introductory theory, Residence, Field Experience	Major component of field experience course		
Options		9	
[Single Course		1	
Theory with choice of experiences: (1) residence, (2) field experience, (3) independent project.]			
[Two Courses		2	
Introductory theory, Residence (live in by choice)]	May perform residence experiences in own home	1	
	Part of theory course and may perform residence experiences in own home	1	

Table 9. (continued)

Courses offered	Extent of field experiences	Programs	
		Number	Percent
[Two Courses Introductory theory Laboratory]	Part of theory course and may select laboratory experience: residence or controlled laboratory plus field experience	1	
[Two of Three Courses Introductory theory Residence or Field Experience]	Major component of field experience course	2	
[Two of Three Courses Introductory theory Residence, or Transcultural Field Experience]	Part of transcultural field experiences	2	
[Two of Three Courses Introductory theory Residence or Institutional, Occupational Practicum]	Major component of practicum	1	
Non-Residence		72	54
Single Course		33	
	Part field experience	18	
	Controlled laboratory, part field experience	7	
	Field experience major component	6	
	No part	1	
	Not indicated	1	

Table 9. (continued)

Courses offered	Extent of field experiences	Programs	
		Number	Percent
Two Courses		12	
Controlled Laboratory	Part of theory course	1	
	Part of controlled laboratory course	7	
	Part of theory course and part of controlled laboratory course	1	
	No part	2	
	Not indicated	1	
Two Courses		22	
Introductory theory Field Experience	Major component of field experience course	20	
	Part of theory course and major component of field experience course	2	
Three Courses		2	
Introductory theory Advanced theory Controlled Laboratory	Part to major component of controlled laboratory course	1	
Introductory theory Controlled Laboratory Field Experience	Major component of field experience course	1	
Not Classifiable		3	
Not Classifiable		1	--

experiences, is presented in Table 10. Programs with residence more frequently did not have field experiences while those with a non-residence program more frequently had field experiences. These differences were significant at the five percent level.

Table 10. Home management programs offered by institutions

Programs	With field experience		Without field experience		All	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All	134	45	161	55	295	100
Residence	61	46	97	61	159	54
Non-residence	72	54	63	39	134	45
Unclassifiable[a]	1	--	1	--	2	1

[a]Insufficient information.

Corrected chi square = 5.77 $P < .05$.

Characteristics of Field Experiences Offered in Home Management

Of the 295 participating institutions, 134 (45%) offered some type of field experience. Respondents were asked to indicate the development stage of the field experiences, number of years offered, student participation in field experiences in home management, relation to other home management experiences, and problems in offering field experiences.

Stages of development

Field study was reported to be in various stages of development by the 134 respondents (Table 11). One-third reported having adopted field

experiences and the other two-thirds reported to be in some state of change--expanding, experimental or developmental.

Table 11. Stages of development of field experiences in home management

Stages of development	Number of institutions
Institutions offering field experiences	134
Developmental	23
and experimental	1
Experimental	33
and expanding	1
Adopted	44
and expanding	5
and developmental	1
and experimental	1
Expanding	15
Not indicated	10

Number of years offered

Respondents indicated that field experiences currently offered in home management were relatively new offerings at institutions (Table 12). Only one-fourth (34) of the institutions offering field experiences had offered them for five or more years, and another fourth (32) offered them for the first time during the 1972-73 academic year. Three-fourths of the institutions had less than five years experience with their type of offering.

Student participation in field experiences in home management

Eighty-two percent (109) of the institutions offering field experiences required some or all home economics majors to participate. At 25 institutions field experiences were strictly elective for some or all home economics majors. At six institutions, home management field experiences were a requirement or alternative for non home economics majors. The

Table 12. Number of years field experiences offered by institutions

Number of years offered	Institutions	
	Number	Percent
Institutions offering field experiences	134	100
One	32	24
Two	18	14
Three	31	23
Four	9	7
Five or more	34	25
Next year first year	3	2
Not indicated	7	5

non home economic majors listed were nursery school education, sociology, social service, vocational rehabilitation, general studies, and home economics minors.

The students most frequently required to participate in home management field experiences were home economics education majors; at least 61 (46%) of the institutions offering field experiences required home economics education majors to participate (Table 13). In thirteen of these, field experiences were required for vocational certification. Thirty-six (27%) of the institutions offering field experiences required all home economics majors to participate. At least 17 (13%) required family economics/home management majors to participate.

Levels of home management field experiences offered

Field experiences were offered predominantly at upper division levels as shown in Table 14. Forty percent of the institutions offered field experiences at the senior level exclusively and 35 percent indicated field experiences were offered at junior and senior levels. Only one institution

Table 13. Home economics majors required to participate in home management field experiences by institutions

Majors	Institutions	
	Number	Percent
Institutions offering field experiences	134	100
All Home Economics	36	27
Home Economics Education	61	46
Family Economics/Home Management	17	13
General Home Economics	10	7
Family Studies/Human Development	10	7
Family/Community Services	2	1
Housing/Equipment	2	1
Applied Art/Interior Design	2	1
Home Economics in Business	2	1
Foods	1	-
Other responses[a]	5	4

[a]Depends on previous experience, married students with young children, married students (2), those unable to live in residence.

Table 14. Levels of field experience offered in home management

Levels of offerings	Institutions	
	Number	Percent
Institutions offering field experiences	134	100
Senior	54	40
Junior and senior	47	35
Junior	8	6
Sophomore, junior, senior	7	5
Sophomore and senior	1	1
Sophomore and junior	1	1
Sophomore	1	1
Freshman, sophomore, junior, senior	1	1
Not indicated	14	10

offered field experiences at the freshman level, and few (11) offered them at the sophomore level.

Number of students participating in field experiences in home management

The number of students that participated in field experiences in home management during the 1972-73 academic year ranged from 0 to 215 as shown in Table 15. Participation in most of the institutions ranged from 1 to 80 students. The median number of students participating by institutions was 19.

Table 15. Number of students participating in field experiences in home management by institutions

Number of students	Institutions	
	Number	Percent[a]
Institutions offering field experiences	134	100
0	3	2
1-10	33	25
11-20	37	28
21-30	15	11
31-40	11	8
41-50	9	7
51-60	6	4
61-70	3	2
71-80	5	4
81-90	1	
91-100	1	
101-110	1	
121-130	1	5
131-140	1	
181-190	1	
211-215	1	
Not indicated	5	4

[a]Median = 19 students.

Most of the institutions had no non home economics majors participating in their home management field experiences. Of the 34 institutions that indicated non majors participated, the number of non majors ranged from 1 to 24 per institution as shown in Table 16.

Table 16. Number of non home economics majors participating in field experiences in home management by institutions

Number of non home economics majors participating	Institutions	
	Number	Percent
Institutions offering field experiences	134	100
0	83	62
1-10	29	22
11-20	4	3
21-24	1	-
Not indicated	17	13

Relation of field experiences to other home management experiences

Respondents were asked to indicate the relation of field experiences to other home management experiences (Table 17). Field experiences supplemented residence or controlled laboratory courses at 50 institutions while replaced residence courses at 38 institutions (28%). At 21 institutions (16%) field experiences substituted for residence or controlled laboratory courses. In 19 institutions (14%) field experiences were the only laboratory experiences offered to supplement theory courses. Fifteen institutions listed other relations between field experiences and home management. The listings were:

part of theory course (listed by 2 institutions)
part of "Management and Decision Making"
combination theory and field experience has replaced residence course
enrichment and application of theory course and controlled lab in personal living situation and homes in the community
six-hour laboratory as part of five-hour course
one of three options

residence time was reduced; field experience and residence applied theory of course
supplement residence as special projects
part of organized course; separate course
research and surveys with results being explained
as part of specialized interests of home management and social service majors
called a problems in home management course--field experience is limited
problems course credit
an elective for all majors.

Table 17. Relations of field experience to other home management experiences

Relation of field experience	Institutions	
	Number	Percent
Institutions offering field experience	134	100
Supplement residence or controlled lab course(s)	50	37
Replaced residence course	38	28
Substitute for residence or controlled lab course(s)	21	16
Only lab experiences offered to supplement theory course(s)	19	14
Other relations	15	11
Not indicated	1	--

The results indicate that concepts of home management field experiences were extremely broad and that there were wide variations in the types of field experiences offered.

Problem identification

Numerous problems were associated with field experiences as shown in Table 18. Only 12 of 134 institutions (9%) indicated there were no problems. Difficult to supervise was indicated by 50 (37%), transportation by 46 (34%), time/staff cost factors by 44 (33%), and limited opportunities for meaningful experiences by 32 (24%). Problems were less frequently

associated with staff training (10%) and student apathy or disinterest (9%). Respondents listed 28 other problems or explanations. Among the other problems listed were communication with the community, size of class (90 students), integrating theory with the variety of situations, concern that traditional facilities would be used for other purposes, and insurance (liability coverage). A complete list of problems may be found in Appendix K.

Table 18. Problems with offering field experiences in home management

Problems	Institutions	
	Number	Percent
Institutions offering field experiences	134	100
Difficult to supervise	50	37
Transportation	46	34
Time/staff cost factors	44	33
Limited opportunities for meaningful experiences	32	24
Staff not trained for it	13	10
Student apathy or disinterest	12	9
None	12	9
Other problems, explanations[a]	28	21
Not indicated	12	9

[a]Listed in Appendix K.

Institutions Not Offering Field Experiences in Home Management

Of 295 participating institutions, 161 (55%) offered no field experiences in home management. Respondents indicated various reasons why field experiences were not offered (Table 19).

Of 161 institutions, half (84) had never attempted field experiences. Sixteen respondents indicated field experiences had been tried and dropped. Time/staff cost factor was the most frequent response (77) why institutions

Table 19. Reasons field experiences not offered in home management by institutions

Reasons not offered	Institutions	
	Number	Percent
Institutions not offering field experiences	161	100
Never attempted	84	52
Tried and dropped	16	10
Time/staff cost factors	77	48
Limited opportunities for meaningful experiences	51	32
Transportation problems	47	29
Difficult to supervise	33	20
Staff not trained for it	28	17
Available in another subject matter structure	30	19
Not appropriate for teaching management competencies desired	26	16
Student apathy or disinterest	8	5
Other reasons[a]	40	25
Not indicated	5	3

[a]Listed in Appendix L.

did not offer field experiences, followed by limited opportunities for meaningful experiences (51), and transportation problems (47). "Difficult to supervise" was a reason given by 33, and "staff not trained for it" by 28. Twenty-six respondents indicated that field experiences were not appropriate for teaching management competencies desired.

At thirty institutions, field experiences were offered in other subject matter structures. Among the areas mentioned were teacher education, home economics field experiences, community services and social work, and independent study.

Respondents listed forty other reasons or explanations why field experiences were not offered. These could not be classified readily so are listed in Appendix L. The types of reasons ranged from mechanics to philosophy. Community resources and liaison involvement were mentioned in

several ways. Some expressed that other home management experiences were more desirable. Administrative opposition was another reason.

Attitudes Toward Field Experiences in Home Management

Attitudes expressed by respondents from institutions offering field experiences were contrasted with the attitudes of those from institutions not offering field experiences. Chi square tests were applied (Table 20). The most prevalent attitude among respondents was that field study enriches traditional experiences, 166 (55%) of all 295 respondents indicated this. Significantly more respondents (64%) from programs offering field experiences than respondents (48%) from programs not offering field experiences so indicated. Eighty-six (29%) of all the respondents indicated that field experiences were not sufficient for teaching all the practical competencies desired, with no significant difference in the number of respondents indicating this from programs offering and not offering field experiences. Of the respondents from programs offering field experience, 43 percent indicated that field experiences were essential for professional development, while significantly fewer (only 13%) respondents from programs not offering field experiences indicated field experiences were essential.

Almost one-fourth of all the respondents (22%) felt that field study was a contemporary replacement for outmoded traditional experiences, although there was no significant difference in the number of respondents indicating this from programs offering and not offering field experiences. While only 3 (2%) respondents from programs with field study expressed the attitude that field study was not appropriate for teaching management concepts and concepts desired, significantly more (14%) respondents from

Table 20. Attitudes of respondents toward field experience in home management

Attitudes	Programs of respondents						Significance of difference
	All		Offering field experience		Not offering experience		
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
All respondents	295	100	134	100	161	100	---
Enriches traditional experiences	163	55	86	64	77	48	$P < .01$[a]
Not sufficient for teaching all the practical competencies desired	86	29	34	25	52	32	Not significant
Essential for professional development	78	26	57	43	21	13	$P < .01$[a]
Contemporary replacement for outmoded traditional experiences	66	22	32	24	34	21	Not significant
Not appropriate for teaching management concepts and competencies desired	25	8	3	2	22	14	$P < .01$[a]
Anything is better than residence course	8	3	5	4	3	2	Not significant
Other attitudes[b]	50	17	24	18	26	16	---
Not indicated	11	4	3	2	8	5	---

[a]Chi square tests, $P < .01$.

[b]Listed in Appendix M.

programs not offering field experiences expressed the same attitude. The results appear to reflect self-fulfilled objectives relative to respondents' programs. Statistical controls for analysis of attitudes by respondents' educational status, years of home management teaching experience, and home management education were applied. There were no significant differences in attitudes between respondents.

A variety of other opinions were written by respondents. These comments are listed in Appendix M, classified by respondents' programs. Field experience as a viable alternative or companion for residence experience might be considered a controversial issue.

For selected majors

Respondents were asked to score on a ten-point scale, their attitudes toward field study as a home management experience for all home economics majors, for home economics education majors, and for family economics/home management majors (Table 21). This part of the instrument was variously interpreted by respondents. Most responded as had been expected to all three majors listed on the questionnaire, while others responded selectively to the majors. While respondents tended to advocate field experiences in home management, the strongest advocacy was for family economics/home management majors followed by advocacy for home economics education majors. Twenty-three other majors listed and scored by respondents are reported in Appendix N. Generally, there was advocacy of home management field experiences for majors in family studies and community service.

Table 21. Attitudes of respondents toward home management field experiences for selected majors

Majors	Attitudes of respondents (by score)						
	0, 1 Strongly oppose	2-4 Oppose	5 Neutral	6-8 Advocate	9, 10 Strongly advocate	No response	All
	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %
All home economics	33 (11)	26 (9)	67 (23)	67 (23)	49 (16)	53 (18)	295 (100)
Home economics education	7 (2)	15 (5)	40 (14)	86 (29)	95 (32)	52 (18)	295 (100)
Family economics/ home management	6 (2)	6 (2)	23 (8)	44 (15)	146 (49)	70 (24)	295 (100)
Other majors[a]	--	--	1	7 (2)	15 (5)	272 (93)	295 (100)

[a]Listed in Appendix N.

Attitudes toward field experience approaches to teaching home management

Respondents were asked to score on a ten-point scale their attitudes toward field experience approaches to teaching home management as a supplement, substitute, or replacement for residence or controlled laboratory courses (Table 22). Most responded to all the approaches listed on the questionnaire as was expected, but some of the respondents were selective in their responses. Field experience was most frequently advocated as a supplement to residence or controlled laboratory courses and least acceptable as a replacement for them. Only one-half of the respondents expressed advocacy or opposition for field experience as a substitute for residence or controlled laboratory, the response being about equal. The responses to field experiences as a replacement for residence or controlled laboratory experiences were also about equally divided. Thirteen other approaches were listed and scored by respondents. These miscellaneous approaches are grouped and listed in Appendix O.

It appears that home management educators share mixed opinions about the role of field study in home management. There are some who are strong advocates and some who are strongly opposed. No analysis was made regarding the attitude positions with statistical controls for the respondents' characteristics or those of the institutions represented.

Plans Concerning Field Experiences

Respondents were asked to indicate plans at their institutions concerning field study as a home management experience. Their plans are classified by type of program offered and are shown in Table 23.

Table 22. Attitudes of respondents toward field experience approaches to teaching home management

Approaches	Attitudes of respondents (by score)						
	0, 1 Strongly oppose	2-4 Oppose	5 Neutral	6-8 Advocate	9, 10 Strongly advocate	No response	All
	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %	No. %
Supplement to residence or controlled lab course	13 (4)	11 (4)	41 (14)	71 (24)	90 (31)	69 (23)	295 (100)
Substitute for residence or controlled lab course	33 (11)	26 (9)	44 (15)	42 (14)	48 (16)	102 (35)	295 (100)
Replacement for residence or controlled lab course	50 (17)	29 (10)	32 (11)	27 (9)	57 (19)	100 (34)	295 (100)
Other approaches[a]	--	--	--	5 (2)	8 (3)	284 (95)	295 (100)

[a]Listed in Appendix O.

Table 23. Plans of institutions concerning field study as a home management experience, by type of program

Plans	Institutions' programs			
	Offering field experience		Not offering experience	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
All institutions	134	100	161	100
Considering introduction	6	4	57	36
Retain as is	20	15	2	1
Retain and revise	48	36	9	6
Expand	40	30	7	4
Retain, revise and expand	12	9	1	1
Discontinue	0	-	0	-
Uncertain	1	1	2	1
No plans	3	2	81	50
Did not indicate plans	4	3	2	1

Institutions offering field experiences

Most institutions (120 of 134) planned to retain their field experiences. Of these, 20 expect to retain the experiences as is, 48 expect to revise them, 40 will expand them, and 12 expect to both revise and expand.

These results could reflect plans to remedy aforementioned problems associated with offering field experience in home management. No plans to discontinue field experiences could indicate that objectives of programs were being fulfilled.

Institutions not offering field experiences

Of the 161 institutions not offering field experiences one-half (81) had no plans concerning field study as a home management experience, 57 were considering introducing field study, and the remaining 23 were less explicit.

SUMMARY

The main purpose of the study was to provide a data base for assessing the status of undergraduate home management education programs and the utilization of field study experience therein. There was diversity in the types of field experiences offered by institutions. Home management educators shared mixed opinions about the role of field experiences with home management instruction.

A full-scale exploratory study was conducted by a mail survey of the 383 senior college institutions whose home economics administrators were identified on a list provided by the American Home Economics Association. Three mailings to institutions solicited a return of 83 percent. Of 295 participating institutions offering home management, 134 offered some type of home management field experiences and 161 did not offer field experiences in home management courses.

An objective of the study was to identify "typical" patterns, if any, of field experience within undergraduate home management programs. Respondents were asked to list all home management courses offered in the home economics programs. A myriad of responses was received which was interpreted as lack of standardization among institutions and diversity in understanding of what is construed to be "home management." The data obtained were difficult to analyze and classify because of the variations in the interpretations of the concepts of home management field experiences and wide variations in the types of programs offered. Field experience was inextricably related to what the institutions offered as home management theory and/or home management experience.

Of the 295 institutions offering home management, 54 percent had residence components and 46 percent did not. The programs without residence components more frequently offered field experiences. Sixty-one institutions offered field experiences in home management in some combination with residence programs, while seventy-two institutions offered field experiences in non-residence programs. The most "typical" pattern was a combination of two courses, an introductory home management theory course followed by a home management course with field study being the major component. Other frequently mentioned approaches combined field experiences with controlled laboratory experiences.

Field experiences were reported in various stages of development. One-third of the institutions offering field study reported having adopted some type of field experience approach. Only one-fourth of the 134 institutions reported offering field experiences for five years or more. Though home management field experiences were reported in literature of many years ago, the contemporary emphasis on field experiences seems to be a relatively new effort.

The students most frequently required to participate in home management field experiences were home economics education majors. Field study in home management was offered predominantly to junior and senior students. The median number of students participating was 19 and most frequently the number of students was in a range of 1 to 80 students. However one institution reported as many as 215 students participating in field experience.

Most frequently the home management field experiences offered supplemented residence or controlled laboratory courses, while in some institutions field experiences were substituted for residence or controlled laboratory

experiences. Field study approaches had replaced residence experiences at 38 institutions.

Only twelve of the 134 institutions indicated no problems associated with their field experiences. The most often cited problems were supervision, transportation, time/staff cost factors, and limited opportunities for meaningful experiences.

The most often cited reasons for institutions not offering field experiences were time/staff cost factors, limited opportunities for meaningful experiences, and transportation problems. Field experiences were considered inappropriate for teaching the concepts and competencies desired by some of the respondents. Sixteen of the 161 institutions not offering field experiences had tried and dropped some type of field experiences in home management.

There were significant differences of attitudes toward home management field experiences among and between educators from the programs offered. The most prevalent attitude among the respondents was that field study enriches traditional home management experiences. Respondents from programs offering field experiences more frequently considered field study essential for professional development and respondents from programs not offering field experiences more frequently considered field study inappropriate. The results may reflect self-fulfilled objectives relative to the respondents' programs.

Advocacy of home management field experiences was strongest for family economics/home management majors, followed by home economics education majors. Most highly advocated was the use of field experiences as a supplement to a residence or controlled laboratory course. Replacement of

residence or controlled laboratory courses by field experiences was about equally opposed or advocated.

An objective of the study was to determine the future status of field experience as a part of home management programs. Most of the 134 institutions offering field experiences planned to retain, revise or expand their approaches, while none planned to discontinue field experiences. Of the 161 institutions not offering field study, a third were considering introduction of field experiences, yet one-half had no plans concerning field study as a home management experience. The home management educators indicated interest in learning about methods of integrating field experience with home management instruction.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Follow-up studies are recommended to describe in depth the characteristics and feasibility of various approaches for integrating field study with home management. What is the rationale? How are theory and field experience learnings related? How are the field experiences organized? What procedures can be followed by institutions desiring to introduce home management field study? What are the responsibilities involved? What are the time/staff cost estimates? The results of the present study could help to provide a data base for selection of institutions which might be studied.

There is a lack of readily available resource materials related to instruction involving home management field experiences. An investigation could be conducted to identify what teaching materials are available and are being used. Guidelines and teachers references could be useful.

Home management field experiences were most frequently required of home economics education students. Studies could be undertaken to determine how field experiences have prepared home economics education graduates for academic teaching of home economics. How valuable do home economics graduates consider the contributions of home management field experiences to their professional careers? What practical competencies were gained from home management field experiences and what, if any, were their limitations?

For purposes of this study, analysis of the field experiences offered was primarily related to home management theory and home management experience courses. Study could be made of the field experiences offered in specialized management courses such as family finance, human resource development, or work experience, or the home management field experiences incorporated in interdisciplinary programs.

There was a wide variation among educators of what was construed to be home management. As a result, the classification of "theory" and "other experience" courses, as used in the present study, needs greater refinement. The results of this study have reemphasized the need for a content analysis of home management courses to determine the scope of the offerings.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Gratitude is expressed to Dr. Richard L. D. Morse, Professor and Head, Department of Family Economics for his guidance, encouragement and patience during the study conducted and writing of this manuscript.

Sincere appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Patty J. Annis, Assistant Professor in Family Economics, for her guidance and encouragement throughout my graduate work and for serving on my graduate committee. Special thanks are made to Dr. George Peters for serving on my graduate committee.

The special cooperation of Mrs. Pat Ogden, research assistant in Family Economics, and Mrs. Nedra Sylvis, my typist, is gratefully acknowledged.

Special appreciation is expressed to Mrs. Albie Rasmussen, Assistant Professor in Family Economics, for encouraging me to pursue graduate study in the Department of Family Economics at Kansas State University.

SELECTED REFERENCES

Books and Reports

Babcock, Gladys and Carolyn Ater. A Study of Home Management Education. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1966.

Carter, Allan M. American Universities and Colleges, Ninth Edition. Washington D.C.: American Council on Education, 1964.

Cushman, Ella M. Management in Homes. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1945.

Fine, Benjamin. Barron's Profiles of American Colleges. New York: Barron's Educational Series, Incorporated, 1972.

Gross, Irma H. and Elizabeth Walbert Crandall. Management for Modern Families. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Gross, Irma H. and Elizabeth Walbert Crandall. Management for Modern Families, Second Edition. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.

Harper, Laura Jane and Catherine E. Woteki. Home Economics in Institutions Granting Bachelor's or Higher Degrees 1970-71. Washington D.C.: American Home Economics Association, 1972.

Judy, Helen Elizabeth. Trends and Needs in Home Management (Published Ph.D. Problem). New York: Columbia Bureau of Publications, 1929.

McGrath, Earl and Jack Johnson. The Changing Mission of Home Economics. New York: Teachers College Press, 1968.

U.S. Bureau of the Census, U.S. Census of Population: 1970. Number of Inhabitants, United States Summary. Washington D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971.

Periodical Literature

Hollen, Evelyn, Bernita Hendrix, Maribel Rozendal, and Janice Roberstad. "Field Training to Prepare Students for Family-Health Teams--A Preliminary Report," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 63, No. 7, 1971, pp. 553-554.

Hutchinson, Dione W. and Margaret E. Thornbury. "Field Experience: An Alternative to Home Management Residency," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 65, No. 2, 1973, pp. 32-35.

Jensen, Shari. "New Approach to Home Management--A Two-Fold Experience," What's New in Home Economics, Vol. 35, No. 4, 1971, pp. 27-28.

Knoll, Marjorie M. "Home Management Theory and Practice, Integration or Interaction," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 63, No. 2, 1971, pp. 89-92.

Maloch, Francille and Ruth Deacon. "Proposed Framework for Home Management," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 58, No. 1, 1966, pp. 31-35.

Parker, Marianne and Francille M. Firebaugh. "An Experience in Home Management," Illinois Teacher for Contemporary Roles, Vol. 15, No. 5, 1972, pp. 233-238.

Simons, Barbara. "Evaluation of a Change of Approach to Home Management Experience," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 63, No. 2, 1971, pp. 123-125.

Vickers, Carole Allen. "Home Management Residence, Variations and Alternatives," Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 63, No. 2, 1971, pp. 93-96.

Unpublished Materials

Cameron, Susan Gail. "Feasibility of Home Management Residence Courses at the Undergraduate Level" (Master's Thesis). University of Arizona, 1972.

Cook, Carla A. "Management Perceptions of Students in the Cognitive and Affective Domains" (Master's Thesis). Southern Illinois University, 1971.

Craig, Karen E. Aeschliman. "Development of Parallel Forms of a Standardized Achievement Test in Home Management for Use with Students at the College Level" (Doctoral Thesis). Purdue University, 1969.

Furst, Delaine C. "Home Management Residence in Land-Grant Institutions to Ascertain Trends" (Master's Thesis). West Virginia University, 1965.

Mitch, Pat. Raw data from a survey of home management programs. University of Missouri, Fall 1972.

Van Voorhis, Frances. "Teaching Procedures and Course Content of Home Management Classes Taught in Home Economics Departments Having No Residence House" (Master's Thesis). Iowa State College, 1949.

Vickers, Carole Allen. "Level of Selected Home Management Concepts Attained in Residence and Non-Residence Courses" (Doctoral Dissertation). Ohio State University, 1969.

Conference Proceedings

1962. Conference on Teaching Home Management. The Family Economics-Home Management Section of the American Home Economics Association, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, July 1-3, 1962.

1962. Whiteford, Emma. "Laboratory Experience in Home Management: A Modified Plan." Conference on Teaching Home Management. The Family Economics-Home Management Section of the American Home Economics Association, Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana, July 1-3, 1962, pp. 23-29.

1966. Approaches to Teaching Home Management. Proceedings of a Home Management Conference, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, August 1-5, 1966.

Miscellaneous

"Home Economics Transcultural Field Experience in Jamaica" (Brochure). Goshen College and Eastern Mennonite College Home Economics Departments, 1973.

APPENDIX A

Letter to Selected Educators Regarding Review of Questionnaire and Cover Letter

Department of Family Economics
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
March 17, 1973

To: Dr. Marjorie Knoll (Pennsylvania State University)
Dr. Sarah Manning (Purdue University)
Dr. Sara Taubin (Drexel University)
Dr. Janet Vaughn (University of Arizona)
Dr. Carole Vickers (Marshall University)

From: Kathleen Faith Mikitka

Because of your experience, knowledge and interest in home management education I would like your reaction to the enclosed cover letter and questionnaire before the final drafts are sent to the approximately 400 institutions that offer undergraduate degrees in home economics.

I want to start the survey April 1, 1973 so I would appreciate your editing the enclosed form by making additions, deletions or marginal comments and returning it to me by Wednesday, March 28. Hopefully, the results will be useful at the post convention session on home management experiences.

The time taken from your busy schedule to help me will be greatly appreciated. Thank you so much.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Faith Mikitka

APPENDIX B

Data Collection Instruments

STATUS OF FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCE AS A HOME MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE
In Undergraduate College and University Home Economics Programs

HOME MANAGEMENT COURSES refer to those home economics courses (theory and/or experience) that emphasize the management process, the elements of management (values, goals, standards, resources), decision making, household operations, and work simplification and analysis as specialized and/or integrative subject matter.

FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCE (as either a part of or the major component of a home management course) refers to use of the community as a laboratory where students apply management concepts and principles through observation and/or participation in management situations and homes of various circumstances. The terms "field study experience", "field study", and "field experience" are used interchangeably.

RESIDENCE COURSE refers to the managerial activities carried out by students while living in the traditional home management house or other facilities maintained by the institution or (under various circumstances) the student's own home .

CONTROLLED LABORATORY COURSE refers to the management experiences of students in a laboratory which could be similar to a home management residence, a laboratory room or combinations of rooms, or a combination classroom-laboratory.

THEORY COURSE refers to basic lecture or "lecture-type" courses where students learn about home management concepts and principles.

(✓) all that apply

1. Are home management courses included in the undergraduate home economics program at your institution? . . . . . ( ) yes ( ) no

2. Are FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCES among the undergraduate home management experiences offered in your home management courses?. . . . . ( ) yes ( ) no

A) IF OFFERED:

Stage: ( ) developmental ( ) experimental ( ) adopted ( ) expanding
How long have field experiences been offered? ( ) first year ( ) 2 yrs ( ) 3 yrs ( ) 4 yrs ( ) 5 years or more
Student participation in field experiences:
( ) required for all home economics majors
( ) required for some home economics majors, list which_____
( ) elective for all home economics majors
( ) elective for some home economics majors
( ) requirement or alternative for some non home economics majors, list which_____
How many students participated this academic year? . . . . . _____(total number)
How many non home economics majors participated this academic year? . . . . . ( ) none, or ____(number)
Level:( ) freshman ( ) sophomore ( ) junior ( ) senior
How used in relation to other home management experiences:
( ) supplement residence or controlled lab course(s) ( ) substitutes for residence or controlled lab course(s)
( ) only lab experiences offered to supplement theory course(s) ( ) replaced residence course
( ) other_____
Problems. . .( ) time/staff cost factors ( ) staff not trained for it ( ) difficult to supervise ( ) transportation
( ) limited opportunities for meaningful experiences ( ) student apathy or disinterest ( ) none
( ) other_____

B) IF NOT OFFERED, why not?

( ) never attempted ( ) tried and dropped ( ) staff not trained for it ( ) difficult to supervise
( ) limited opportunities for meaningful experiences ( ) student apathy or disinterest
( ) time/staff cost factors ( ) transportation problems
( ) not appropriate for teaching management competencies desired
( ) available in another subject matter structure: where?_____
( ) other_____

[25% reduction in size]

3. What are the future plans at your institution concerning FIELD STUDY as a home management experience?

( ) considering introduction ( ) retain as is ( ) retain & revise ( ) expand ( ) discontinue ( ) no plans

4. What is your attitude toward FIELD STUDY as a home management experience?

( ) enriches traditional experiences ( ) not sufficient for teaching all the practical competencies desired
( ) not appropriate for teaching management concepts and competencies desired
( ) anything is better than residence course ( ) contemporary replacement for outmoded traditional experiences
( ) essential for professional development
( ) other_____

5. How strongly do you feel about FIELD STUDY as a home management experience?

(Score zero to ten: 0 = very strongly oppose, 5 = neutral, 10 = very strongly advocate)

For:	all home economics majors	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 10
	home economics education majors	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 10
	family economics/home management majors	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 10
	other_____	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 10
As:	supplement to residence or controlled lab course	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 10
	substitute for residence or controlled lab course	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 10
	replacement for residence or controlled lab course	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 10
	other_____	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9 10

BACKGROUND AND EXPERIENCE OF THE PERSON ANSWERING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE:

Experience teaching home management: ( ) less than 5 yrs. ( ) 5-10 yrs. ( ) more than 10 yrs.
Educational status: ( ) bachelor's ( ) master's ( ) doctoral ( ) other_____
What experiences were part of your professional training?
( ) home management residence course ( ) home management theory course
( ) field study experience in home management ( ) graduate courses in home management
( ) graduate major in home management ( ) professional workshops on home management
( ) other_____

Institutions OFFERING field experiences in home management courses, COMPLETE FORM A (pink).

Institutions NOT OFFERING field experience in home management courses, COMPLETE FORM B (blue).

Please mail QUESTIONNAIRE and FORM A or FORM B by April 27, 1973.

Thank you,

Department of Family Economics
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506

( ) Check if you wish a summary of the results.

[25% reduction in size]

FORM A
For institutions
OFFERING field study as a
home management experience

UNDERGRADUATE HOME MANAGEMENT COURSE(S) STRUCTURE

Please list all undergraduate home management courses offered in your program. (✓) all that apply

CREDIT SYSTEM: ( ) quarter ( ) trimester ( ) semester

Dept. & Course Number | Course Title | Level: ( )F ( )So ( )J ( )Sr | Number of CREDIT HOURS:

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Prerequisites:

Total enrollment this academic year_____
Majors required to take this course:
( ) all home ec ( ) home ec ed ( ) fam econ/home mgt
( ) other_____
( ) no majors, ELECTIVE COURSE
Of this course, field experience is:
( ) a part ( ) the major component ( ) no part.

Dept. & Course Number | Course Title | Level: ( )F ( )So ( )J ( )Sr | Number of CREDIT HOURS:

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Prerequisites:

Total enrollment this academic year_____
Majors required to take this course:
( ) all home ec ( ) home ec ed ( ) fam econ/home mgt
( ) other_____
( ) no majors, ELECTIVE COURSE
Of this course, field experience is:
( ) a part ( ) the major component ( ) no part.

Dept. & Course Number | Course Title | Level: ( )F ( )So ( )J ( )Sr | Number of CREDIT HOURS:

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Prerequisites:

Total enrollment this academic year_____
Majors required to take this course:
( ) all home ec ( ) home ec ed ( ) fam econ/home mgt
( ) other_____
( ) no majors, ELECTIVE COURSE
Of this course, field experience is:
( ) a part ( ) the major component ( ) no part.

Dept. & Course Number | Course Title | Level: ( )F ( )So ( )J ( )Sr | Number of CREDIT HOURS:

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Prerequisites:

Total enrollment this academic year_____
Majors required to take this course:
( ) all home ec ( ) home ec ed ( ) fam econ/home mgt
( ) other_____
( ) no majors, ELECTIVE COURSE
Of this course, field experience is:
( ) a part ( ) the major component ( ) no part.

KSU-FE kfm 4-73

[25% reduction in size]

FORM B
For institutions
NOT offering field study as a
home management experience

UNDERGRADUATE HOME MANAGEMENT COURSE(S) STRUCTURE

Please list all undergraduate home management courses offered in your program. (✓) all that apply

CREDIT SYSTEM: ( ) quarter ( ) trimester ( ) semester

Dept. & Course Number | Course Title | Level: ( )F ( )So ( )J ( )Sr | Number of CREDIT HOURS:

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Prerequisites:

Total enrollment this academic year_____
Majors required to take this course:
( ) all home ec ( ) home ec ed ( ) fam econ/home mgt
( ) other_____
( ) no majors, ELECTIVE COURSE

Dept. & Course Number | Course Title | Level: ( )F ( )So ( )J ( )Sr | Number of CREDIT HOURS:

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Prerequisites:

Total enrollment this academic year_____
Majors required to take this course:
( ) all home ec ( ) home ec ed ( ) fam econ/home mgt
( ) other_____
( ) no majors, ELECTIVE COURSE

Dept. & Course Number | Course Title | Level: ( )F ( )So ( )J ( )Sr | Number of CREDIT HOURS:

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Prerequisites:

Total enrollment this academic year_____
Majors required to take this course:
( ) all home ec ( ) home ec ed ( ) fam econ/home mgt
( ) other_____
( ) no majors, ELECTIVE COURSE

Dept. & Course Number | Course Title | Level: ( )F ( )So ( )J ( )Sr | Number of CREDIT HOURS:

COURSE DESCRIPTION:

Prerequisites:

Total enrollment this academic year_____
Majors required to take this course:
( ) all home ec ( ) home ec ed ( ) fam econ/home mgt
( ) other_____
( ) no majors, ELECTIVE COURSE

KSU-FE kfm 4-73

[25% reduction in size]

APPENDIX C

Cover Letter

Department of Family Economics
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
April 9, 1973

There have been various innovations and changes made in home management education. However, there is inadequate information about the types of experiences being offered.

We want to focus on FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCE as an approach to teaching home management in undergraduate home economics programs. Field experience is the use of the community as a laboratory where students apply management concepts and principles through observation and/or participation in management situations and homes of various circumstances. In the February, 1973 issue of the Journal of Home Economics such an experience is described.

To provide a data base for assessing the status of and opportunities for field experience in home management, we are asking all institutions about their programs; present, plans for future, and past experience. Your cooperation will be appreciated and the results will be distributed at the post-convention workshop on home management experiences.

Please forward this letter and the enclosed materials to the home management chairman or person you feel best qualified to give the information requested.

Thank you,

Patty J. Annis
Assistant Professor

Kathleen Faith Mikitka
Graduate Teaching Assistant

Richard L. D. Morse
Professor and Head

Enclosures:

Questionnaire
Form A (pink)
Form B (blue)
Self-addressed, stamped envelope for return mail

APPENDIX D

Reminder Letter

Department of Family Economics
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
May 1, 1973

REMINDER

Re: STATUS OF FIELD STUDY EXPERIENCE AS A HOME MANAGEMENT EXPERIENCE in Undergraduate Home Economics Programs

We have not received from your institution the completed questionnaire and form requested in our recent home management survey.

All institutions were included to provide a full-scale data base, so your input is important. If you have not already done so, we would appreciate your mailing the completed materials today.

If you did not receive our first request or need a replacement questionnaire, write your name and mailing address on this form letter, return to us, and we will get a copy to you by return mail.

Thank you for your cooperation. The results received to date have been most interesting.

Thank you,

Kathleen Faith Mikitka
Graduate Teaching Assistant

APPENDIX E

Second Reminder Letter

WE NEED YOUR INPUT!

Department of Family Economics
Kansas State University
Manhattan, Kansas 66506
May 16, 1973

Dear Colleague,

There is still time for you to respond to our home management survey so that your input will be included in our data processing. We know how busy you are at this time of the school term, but would greatly appreciate your time taken to help us in our endeavor.

For your convenience we have enclosed duplicate copies of our first mailing. Would you complete the questionnaire and corresponding form and mail back to us sometime this week?

If for some reason you are unable to participate in this study please acknowledge receipt of our materials by checking the box at the bottom of this form letter and return to us in the enclosed self-addressed, stamped envelope.

Thank you for your cooperation. We look forward to your return mail.

Sincerely,

Kathleen Faith Mikitka
Graduate Teaching Assistant

☐ We are unable to participate in this study.

APPENDIX F

Home Management Education of Respondents; Classified in Table 3 as "Other Management Education and Experiences"

Field study using my own family, work simplification course (engineering).

Field experiences in other courses which made me realize their value.

Undergraduate special problems in home management, housing, household equipment, and family finance courses.

Independent study on home management in higher education.

Graduate minor in home management.

Graduate study in consumer economics, marketing and living standards.

Various finance and family economics courses, workshops on consumer education.

Credit research paper with study tour of fifteen colleges and universities in Idaho, Oregon, Washington, and Utah, Fall 1972.

Worked in adult education.

Home management specialist in cooperative extension service.

Taught extension in home management.

Extension ten years.

Research and training paraprofessionals in home management.

Professional experience in housing management, parent education, family therapy, business.

Supervised house experience.

Both resident and nonresident advisor for resident course, HMFE 479, at Purdue University; and coordinator for course.

Eight years supervision of home management house which was dropped many years ago.

Supervised house residence eight years.

Five and one-half years residence supervision live in, plus five years supervising graduate students of residence.

Supervised home management residence after graduation.

Graduate assistant in home management house.

GTA KSU Ellen Richards 1970-71.

Taught adult education management classes, resident instructor for traditional home management residence course during graduate study.

Teaching theory course to graduates and undergraduates.

Undergraduate and graduate courses in business management and decision making.

Major in home economics education at graduate level with courses beyond M.S. in home management enough to equal a major in home management.

Supervision and coordination of student teachers, coordinating occupational experiences for vocational teachers.

Graduate major in home economics education.

Business minor, administration.

Graduate study in foods and nutrition only.

Special work with aging.

Homemaker.

I am also a homemaker.

Managed a home and career and reared my own children quite satisfactorily.

Managed a home and family twenty years.

Twenty-five years managing own home and family of four children and husband while working full time.

I have not taught home management--however I have evaluated each group--since we have had to make recent decisions concerning facilities and methods of teaching course.

Administrator of department with background in economics.

Department chairman.

APPENDIX G

Home Management Programs Offered, Spring 1973

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
All institutions	158	135	134	161	34	69	21	
Alabama								
Alabama A & M College	X			X				-----
Auburn University	X		X			X		Adopted
Florence State University	X[a]			X				-----
Jacksonville State University		X	X			X		Experimental
Judson College	X			X				-----
Samford University	X		X			X		Developmental
University of Alabama		X	X			X		Adopted
University of Montevallo	X			X				-----
Alaska								
University of Alaska		X		X				-----
Arizona								
Arizona State University		X	X		X			Adopted & expanding
Northern Arizona University	X		X				X	Experimental
University of Arizona	X			X				-----
Arkansas								
Harding College	X			X				-----
Henderson State Teachers College	X			X				-----
Ouachita Baptist University		X	X			Unknown		Unknown

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
Univ. of Arkansas, Fayetteville	X		X				X	Adopted
Univ. of Arkansas, Pine Bluff	X			X				-----
California								
Cal. State Polytech., S.L.O.		X	X		X			Experimental
Cal. State Univ., Chico		X	X		c			Adopted
Cal. State Univ., Fresno	X		X		X			Expanding
Cal. State Univ., Humboldt		X		X				-----
Cal. State Univ., Long Beach		X	X		X			Adopted
Cal. State Univ., Los Angeles		X	X		c			Adopted & expanding
Cal. State Univ., Northridge		X		X				-----
Cal. State Univ., Sacramento	X	X	X		c	X		Adopted
Cal. State Univ., San Diego	X		X		X		X	Expanding
Cal. State Univ., San Francisco		X		X[b]	Interdisciplinary			Adopted
Cal. State Univ., San Jose		X		X				-----
College of Notre Dame		X		X				-----
George Pepperdine University	X		X				X	Unknown
Loma Linda University		X	X			X		Expanding
Mount St. Marys College	X		X				X	Adopted
Pacific Union College		X	X		X			Unknown
Pasadena College		X		X				-----
Univ. of Cal., Davis		X	X		X			Adopted
Whittier College		X		X				-----
Colorado								
Colorado State University	X			X				-----
University of Northern Colorado	X		X			X		Developmental

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
Connecticut								
Saint Joseph College		X		X				-----
University of Connecticut		X	X		Part to major component			Developmental
Delaware								
University of Delaware		X		X				-----
District of Columbia								
Gallaudet College		X		X				-----
Florida								
Barry College		X	X		X	X		Developmental
Florida State University	X			X				-----
Georgia								
Fort Valley State College	X			X				-----
Georgia College	X			X				-----
Georgia Southern College	X			X				-----
North Georgia College	X			X				-----
University of Georgia	X		X			X		Developmental
Hawaii								
Church College of Hawaii	X		X				X	Unknown
University of Hawaii		X		X				-----
Idaho								
Idaho State University		X	X			X		Adopted
Northwest Nazarene College		X	X		X			Expanding
University of Idaho	X			X				-----

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences		
			Yes	No	Major component	Part Substitute	Stage
Illinois							
Eastern Illinois University		X	X			X	Experimental & expanding
Illinois State University		X		X			-----
Mundelein College		X	X			X	Adopted
Northern Illinois University		X		X			-----
Northwestern University	Unknown			X			-----
Olivet Nazarene College	X		X			Unknown	Unknown
Rosary College		X		X			-----
Southern Illinois University		X	X			Unknown	Expanding
University of Illinois		X	X		X		Adopted
Western Illinois University	X			X			-----
Indiana							
Ball State University	X			X			-----
Butler University		X	X		X		Developmental
Goshen College	X		X			Transcultural X	Expanding
Indiana State University	X		X			X	Expanding
Indiana University		X	X		X		Adopted
Marian College		X		X			-----
Purdue University	X		X			X	Experimental
St. Mary of the Woods College	X			X			-----
Valparaiso University		X		X			-----
Iowa							
Central College		X		X			-----
Iowa State University		X		X			-----
Iowa Wesleyan College		X		X			-----
Marycrest College		X	X			X	Experimental
University of Iowa		X		X			-----

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
University of Northern Iowa	X			X				-----
Westmar College	X			X				-----
William Penn College		X		X				-----
Kansas								
Ft. Hays Kansas State College		X		X				-----
Friends University		X	X			X		Adopted
Ks. State College of Pittsburgh		X		X				-----
Kansas State Teachers College		X		X				-----
Kansas State University		X		X				-----
Kansas Wesleyan University		X		X				-----
McPherson College		X	X			X		Developmental
Mt. St. Scholastica College		X	X		X			Adopted
Saint Mary College		X	X		c			Experimental
Southwestern College		X		X				-----
Sterling College		X		X				-----
Washburn University of Topeka		X	X		c			Experimental
Kentucky								
Berea College	X			X				-----
Eastern Kentucky University	X			X				-----
Georgetown College	X			X				-----
Kentucky State College	X		X				X	Experimental
Morehead State University	X			X				-----
Murray State University	X			X				-----
University of Kentucky	X		X		c			Adopted & experimental

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
Louisiana								
Louisiana State University	X		X			X		Expanding
Louisiana Tech University	X		X				X	Experimental
McNeese State University		X	X			X		Adopted
Nicholls State University	X		X			X		Experimental
Northeast Louisiana State Col.		X	X		X			Adopted
Northwestern State University	X			X				-----
St. Marys Dominican College	X			X				-----
Southeastern Louisiana Univ.		X		X				-----
Southern University	X		X				X	Experimental
Univ. of Southwestern Louisiana	X			X				-----
Maine								
University of Maine, Farmington	X		X			X		Expanding
University of Maine, Orono		X	X		X			Adopted
Maryland								
Columbia Union College		X	X		X			Adopted
Hood College	X			X				-----
Morgan State College	X		X		X		X	Adopted & developmental
University of Maryland	X		X		c	X	X	Adopted
Massachusetts								
Atlantic Union College		X	X		X			Expanding
Simmons College		X		X				-----
State College Framingham	X			X				-----
Michigan								
Andrews University	X			X				-----
Central Michigan University		X	X			X		Experimental

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
Eastern Michigan University		X	X		X			Adopted & expanding
Madonna College	X		X			X		Adopted
Marygrove College		X	X			X		Adopted
Mercy College of Detroit		X	X			X		Developmental
Michigan State University		X	X		X			Adopted
Northern Michigan University	X		X		X		X	Adopted
Siena Heights College		X	X		c	X		Developmental
Wayne State University		X		X				-----
Western Michigan University		X	X			X		Experimental
Minnesota								
College of St. Benedict		X	X		X			Experimental
College of Saint Catherine	X		X			X		Developmental
College of St. Scholastica	X		X			X		Adopted
College of St. Teresa	X		X			X		Adopted
Concordia College	X			X				-----
Mankato State College		X		X				-----
Univ. of Minnesota, Duluth		X	X			X		Adopted
Univ. of Minnesota, St. Paul	X		X			X		Developmental
Mississippi								
Alcorn A & M College	X			X				-----
Delta State College	X			X				-----
Mississippi College	X			X				-----
Mississippi St. Col. for Women	X			X				-----
Mississippi State University	X		X			X		Experimental
University of Mississippi	X			X				-----
Univ. of Southern Mississippi	X			X				-----

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
Missouri								
Central Missouri State College	X			X				-----
Fontbonne College		X		X				-----
Lincoln University	X		X			Unknown		Developmental
N. E. Missouri State University	X			X				-----
N. W. Missouri State University	X			X				-----
School of the Ozarks	X			X				-----
S. E. Missouri State College	X		X				X	Adopted
University of Missouri		X		X				-----
Montana								
Montana State University	X			X				-----
University of Montana	X			X				-----
Nebraska								
Chadron State College		X	X		X			Adopted
Peru State College		X		X				-----
Union College		X		X				-----
Univ. of Nebraska, Lincoln	X			X				-----
Univ. of Nebraska, Omaha		X	X			X		Developmental & experimental
Wayne State College		X		X				-----
Nevada								
University of Nevada		X		X				-----
New Hampshire								
Mount St. Mary College	X			X				-----
University of New Hampshire		X	X		c	X		Expanding

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
New Jersey								
College of St. Elizabeth	X		X				X	Adopted & expanding
Douglass College--Ruttgers	X			X				-----
Glassboro State College		X	X			X		Experimental
New Mexico								
Eastern New Mexico University		X	X			X		Expanding
New Mexico Highlands University		X	X			X		Adopted
New Mexico State University		X	X		X			Adopted
University of New Mexico	X		X			X		Experimental
Western New Mexico University		X	X			X		Unknown
New York								
Cornell University	X		X		One of three options			Adopted
Herbert H. Lehman College		X	X		X			Expanding
Hunter College		X		X				-----
New York University		X	X		X			Adopted
Queens College	X			X				-----
State Univ. College, Oneonta	X[a]			X				-----
State Univ. College, Plattsburg	X			X				-----
Syracuse University		X		X				-----
North Carolina								
Campbell College	X			X				-----
East Carolina University	X			X				-----
Mars Hill College	X			X				-----
Meredith College	X			X				-----
North Carolina A & T State Univ.	X		X				X	Developmental
Pembroke State University	X			X				-----
Salem College		X		X				-----

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
University of North Carolina	X			X				-----
Western Carolina University	X			X				-----
North Dakota								
North Dakota State University	X		X		X		X	Unknown
Ohio								
Ashland College	X		X			X		Developmental
Baldwin-Wallace College	X			X				-----
Bluffton College	X			X				-----
Bowling Green State University	X			X				-----
College of Mt. St. Joseph		X		X				-----
Edgecliff College		X		X				-----
Kent State University	X		X				X	Experimental
Miami University	X		X			X		Experimental
Notre Dame College		X		X				-----
Ohio State University	X		X			X		Experimental
Ohio University	X			X				-----
Ohio Wesleyan University		X	X		c			Experimental
Otterbein College		X		X				-----
University of Akron	X		X		c			Experimental
University of Cincinnati	X		X			X		Experimental
University of Dayton	X			X				-----
Ursuline College		X		X				-----
Western College	X			X				-----
Youngstown State University		X		X				-----

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences		
			Yes	No	Major component	Part Substitute	Stage
Oklahoma							
Central State University		X		X			-----
East Central State College		X	X			X	Adopted
Langston University	X		X			Unknown	Experimental
Northeastern State College		X		X			-----
Oklahoma Baptist University		X	X			Unknown	Adopted
Oklahoma College of Liberal Arts	X			X			-----
Oklahoma State University	X		X			c	Developmental
Oklahoma Panhandle State College		X	X			X	Adopted
Southeastern State College		X		X			-----
Southwestern State College		X		X			-----
University of Oklahoma		X	X			X	Adopted
Oregon							
Linfield College	X			X			-----
Marylhurst College		X		X			-----
Oregon State University	X		X		c	X	Developmental
Pennsylvania							
Albright College		X	X		X		Experimental
Cheyney State College	Unknown		X			Unknown	Expanding
Drexel University		X	X		X		Adopted & expanding
Immaculata College	X			X			-----
Indiana Univ. of Pennsylvania	X			X			-----
Marywood College	X			X			-----
Mercyhurst College		X	X			X	Experimental
Pennsylvania State University		X	X		c	X	Developmental
Seton-Hill College	X			X			-----

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences		
			Yes	No	Major component	Part Substitute	Stage
Villa Maria College		X	X		X		Experimental
Puerto Rico							
Inter-American University	X			X			-----
University of Puerto Rico	X		X			X	Experimental
Rhode Island							
University of Rhode Island	X			X			-----
South Carolina							
South Carolina State College	X		X		c		Developmental
Winthrop College	X		X			X	Adopted
South Dakota							
Mount Marty College	X			X			-----
South Dakota State University	X			X			-----
Tennessee							
Austin Peay State University		X		X			-----
Belmont College		X		X			-----
Carson-Newman College	X			X			-----
David Lipscomb College	X			X			-----
East Tennessee State University	X			X			-----
Memphis State University		X	X		X	X	Expanding
Southern Missionary College	X		X			X	Experimental
Tennessee State University	X		X		c	X	Unknown
Tennessee Technological Univ.	X			X			-----
Univ. of Tennessee, Knoxville	X			X			-----
Univ. of Tennessee, Martin	X			X			-----

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
Texas								
Baylor University	X			X				-----
Incarnate Word College	X			X				-----
Lamar State University	X[a]			X				-----
Mary Hardin Baylor College	X		X			X		Adopted
Prairie View A & M College	X			X				-----
Sam Houston State University	X			X				-----
S W Texas State University	X			X				-----
Stephen F. Austin State Univ.		X		X				-----
Trinity University	X			X				-----
Texas Christian University	X		X			X		Unknown
Texas Southern University	X		X			X	X	Unknown
Texas Tech University		X	X			X		Experimental
University of Houston		X		X				-----
University of Texas		X		X				-----
Utah								
Brigham Young University	X		X			X		Adopted
University of Utah	X			X				-----
Utah State University	X			X				-----
Virginia								
Bridgewater College	X		X		c	X		Developmental
Eastern Mennonite College	X		X		Transcultural		X	Experimental
Hampton Institute		X	X			X		Experimental
Longwood College	X			X				-----
Madison College		X		X				-----
Radford College		X	X		X			Developmental

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University		X	X			X		Developmental
Virginia State College	X	X		X				-----
Washington								
Central Washington State College	X			X				-----
Eastern Washington State College		X	X			X		Experimental
University of Puget Sound		X		X				-----
University of Washington	X[a]		X				X	Adopted
Washington State University		X	X		X			Adopted
Western Washington State College	X		X			X		Adopted
West Virginia								
Concord College	X			X				-----
Fairmont State College		X	X			X		Developmental
Glenville State College	X			X				-----
Marshall University		X	X			X		Adopted
Shepherd College	X			X				-----
West Liberty State College		X		X				-----
West Virginia University		X		X				-----
West Virginia Wesleyan College	X			X				-----
Wisconsin								
Silver Lake College of the Holy Family		X		X				-----
University of Wisconsin, Stout		X	X			X		Unknown
Viterbo College	X			X				-----
University of Wisconsin, Stevens Point	X			X				-----

State and institution	Residence	Non-residence	Field experience		Extent of field experiences			
			Yes	No	Major component	Part	Substitute	Stage
Wyoming								
University of Wyoming		X	X		X			Adopted

[a]Changing to non-residence.

[b]Interdisciplinary options which may include home management related field experiences.

[c]Interdisciplinary approach, work experience, special problem, special course or other concepts of field experience broader than the scope of this study.

APPENDIX H

Institutions from which Responses Were Not Received

Alabama

Tuskegee Institute (received after tabulation)

Arkansas

John Brown University
Philander Smith College

California

Chapman College

Delaware

Delaware State College

District of Columbia

Gallaudet College

Florida

Florida A & M University

Georgia

Berry College
Clarke College
Morris Brown College
Savannah State College
Spelman College

Illinois

Bradley University

Indiana

Manchester College

Iowa

Clarke College

Kansas

Baker University
College of Emporia
Ottawa University
Saint Mary of the Plains College

Kentucky

Spalding College
Union College
University of Louisville
Western Kentucky University

Louisiana

Grambling College

Michigan

Adrian College
Albion College
Nazareth College

Missouri

S.W. Missouri State College

Nebraska

Kearney State College (received after tabulation)

New Hampshire

Keene State College

New Jersey

Montclair State College

New York

Brooklyn College
Marymount College
Marymount Manhattan College
Pratt Institute
State University College, Buffalo

North Carolina

Appalachian State University
Bennet College
North Carolina Central University

North Dakota

University of North Dakota

Ohio

Ohio Dominican College

Oklahoma

Bethany Nazarene College
Northwestern State College

Pennsylvania

College of Misercordia
Mansfield State College (received after tabulation)

South Carolina

Erskine College
Lander College
Limestone College

Tennessee

George Peabody College
Middle Tennessee State University
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga

Texas

Abilene Christian College
East Texas State University
Huston-Tillotson College
North Texas State University
Our Lady of the Lake College
Southwestern University
Texas A & I University (received after tabulation)
Texas Wesleyan College
Texas Woman's University

Washington

Seattle Pacific College
Walla Walla College
Whitworth College

West Virginia

West Virginia State College

Wisconsin

Mount Mary College

APPENDIX I

Institutions from which Inapplicable Responses Were Received

No home management courses

Barat College of the Sacred Heart, Illinois
University of Massachusetts
Merrill-Palmer Institute, Michigan
St. Olaf College, Minnesota
Blue Mountain College, Mississippi
Drury College, Missouri (theory course on independent study only)
Stephens College, Missouri
William Woods College, Missouri
University of Tulsa, Oklahoma
Fort Wright College of the Holy Names, Washington
The Cardinal Stritch College, Wisconsin
University of Wisconsin, Madison

No home economics programs

University of California, Berkeley
St. Xavier College, Illinois
Case Western Reserve University, Ohio
Carnegie-Mellon University, Pennsylvania
One institution was listed twice (by different departments)

Unable to participate

State College of Arkansas
Rivier College, New Hampshire
University of Vermont

Insufficient information

Chicago State University, Illinois
Messiah College, Pennsylvania

College closing

St. Joseph College, Maryland

APPENDIX J

Titles of Undergraduate Home Management and Related Courses

Home Management Theory and Other Home Management Experiences

Introductory theory (courses that were prerequisites to advanced theory and/or residence and/or controlled laboratory and/or field experience courses)

Decision Making in Families
Decision Making in Family Living
Decision Making in the Family
Economic Problems of the Home
Economics of the Home
Factors Affecting Home Management
Family Decision Making
Family Economics
Family Economics and Management
Family Functions
Family Living
Family Management and Decision Making
Family Management Problems
Family Resource Management (2)
General Home Management
Home Management (52)
Home Management and Consumer Education (2)
Home Management I and Consumer Education
Home Management and Decision Making
Home Management and Equipment (2)
Home Management and Family Economics (2)
Home Management and Family Finance
Home Management and Social Family Relations
Home Management Principles
Home Management Principles and Theory (2)
Home Management: Theory
Home Management Theory (22)
Home Management Theory and Analysis
Home Management Theory and Practice
Home Management Theory--Non Financial Resources
Household Administration
Household Management and Economics
Introduction to Management
Introduction to Management Theory
Management (2)
Management I
Management and Decision Making
Management and Decision-Making in the Family (3)

Management and Equipment
Management and Family Economics
Management and Its Contribution to Family Living (2)
Management Dynamics
Management for Effective Living (2)
Management for Family Living
Management for Modern Families
Management for Today's Family
Management in Families
Management in Family and Personal Living
Management in Family Living (4)
Management in Individual and Family Living
Management in Personal and Family Development
Management in the Family (2)
Management in the Home (2)
Management of Family and Individual Resources
Management of Family Resources (4)
Management of Living
Management of the Home
Management of the Home Environment
Management of the Household
Management Principles
Management Theory (3)
Managerial Resources and Processes in Family Life
Man and Goal Attainment
Personal and Family Management
Personal and Home Management
Principles of Home Management (6)
Principles of Household Management
Principles of Management (4)
Problems in Home Management
Resource Management for Individual and Family
Systems Management in Home Economics
Theory of Decision Making/Management
Theory of Family Economics and Management

Advanced theory

Family Management and Decision Making
Family Values and Resource Management
Home Management Processes
Management in Modern Living
Management of Human Resources
Management of the Home
Problems in Household Administration (residence corequisite) (2)

Residence

Applied Home and Family Management
Dynamics of Family Resources
Family Living Center Practicum
Home Environment Practicum
Home Living Center
Home Management (10)
Home Management and Equipment
Home Management and Family Relationships
Home Management and House Residence (2)
Home Management and Residence
Home Management Experience (3)
Home Management Experiences
Home Management House (7)
Home Management House Laboratory
Home Management House Residence (6)
Home Management Laboratory (11)
Home Management Laboratory/Practicum
Home Management Practicum (5)
Home Management Principles and Practicum
Home Management Processes Lab
Home Management Residence (75)
Home Management Residence Lab
Home Management (Resident House)
Home Management: Theory and Application
Home Management Theory and Practice
Home Management: Theory and Residence
Home Residence
House Residence (2)
Laboratory in Home Management (2)
Lecture and Laboratory Home Management II
Management and Family Living
Management in Group Living
Management in Residence
Management of Family Resources
Management Principles Laboratory
Management Residence
Practice in Home Management
Practicum in Home Management
Residence
Residence Home Management (2)
Residence in Home Management House
Residence Management
Resident Experience in Home Management
Senior Seminar
Theory and Residence

Restricted residence alternative

Applied Home Management Practicum
Conserving Time and Energy in the Home
Evaluated Home Experience in Management
Home Management Done in Own Home
Home Management for Married Students
Home Management Experience
Home Management House (On Demand)
Home Management Laboratory
Home Management Practicum (2)
Home Management Problems
Home Management Residence
Home Management Residence for Married Students
Home Management Residence Seminar
Home Management Theory and Application
Management in the Home
Seminar in Home Management
Supervised Problems in Household Administration
Workshop in Home Management

Controlled laboratory

Analysis of Home Products and Procedures
Decision Making in Home Management
Family Economics and Management
Home Management (12)
Management II
Home Management Experience (2)
Home Management Experiment Laboratory
Home Management Laboratory (4)
Home Management Practicum (3)
Home Management: Principles and Application
Home Management Problems
Home Management: Theory and Laboratory
Home Management with Limited Resources
Management for Human Development
Management Experiences
Management in the Family (2)
Management of Resources
Management of the Home
Managerial Resources and Processes in Family Life
Practicum in Home Management
Problems in Home Management
Resource Management in Contemporary Living
The Management Process

Field experience

Advanced Home Management
Comparisons in Family Resource Use
Family Management
Family Management and Decision Making
Field Experience in Home Management (3)
Home Management (2)
Home Management Experience (2)
Home Management Experiences
Home Management Field Experiences
Home Management Laboratory (3)
Home Management Practicum (3)
Home Management Problems
Home Management Project
Home Management Seminar
Household Administration
Institutional and Occupational Management Practices
Laboratory
Management for Contemporary Living
Management Experiences
Management in Homes
Management Practicum
Practicum in Family Management
Practicum in Home Management
Problems in Home Management
Resource Management in Families
Supervised Field Work in Home Management
Theory and Application of Home Management
Transcultural Field Experience

Basic home management (emphasizing various combinations of home management theory with non-residence home management experiences, listed as the only home management course offered by an institution and no field experience)

Administration of Family Resources
Family Relations/Home Management
Home Management (27)
Home Management and Consumer Education
Home Management and Decision Making
Home Management Theory
Household Management
Housing and Management for the Family
Individual and Family Management
Management and Decision Making
Management and Work Simplification
Management Dynamics
Management in Family Living
Management in the Urban Home
Management of Family Resources (2)
Principles of Home Management
Theory of Home Management

[Part field experience]

Family Management Theory
Home Management (11)
Home Management Theory
Management and Decision Making (2)
Management and Family Decision Making
Management of Family Resources
Management Decisions

Miscellaneous (theory with three home management experience options)

Family Decision Making

Home management for non home economics majors

Contemporary Women--Home Management
Home Management (2)
Management for Effective Living
Management for Modern Living
Management of Resources
Personal and Family Management

Other management courses

Managing Family Resources
Management of Family Resources (2)
Management of Household Resources

Activity Analysis
Conserving Time and Energy in the Home
Human Resource Development
Management of Human Resources
Management of Time and Human Resources
Management of Work Capacity in the Home (3)
Management of Work in the Home
Time/Work Management in Daily Living
Work Simplification
Work Analysis and Simplification (2)

Home Management for the Physically Handicapped
Home Management: Limited Resources
Home Management Problems of Deprived Families
Management for Low Income Families
Management for the Low-Income Family
Seminar: Management Problems of Low Income Families
Seminar on Aging

Decision-Making
Family Life Styles in American Society
Home and Community Relations
Home Management (advanced interdisciplinary)
Recent Trends in Home Management
Teaching Management Concepts
The Professional in Home Management

Related Courses

Consumer education

Buyer in the Marketplace
Consumer and Economic Problems of the Family
Consumers and the Market (2)
The Consumer in the Market
Consumer Buying
Consumer Buymanship
Consumer Economics (6)
Consumer Economics Problems
Consumer Education (4)
Consumer Education and Family Finance
Consumer Problems (5)
Consumer Role of the Family
Economic Problems of the Consumer
Families as Consumers
The Family as Consumers
Man the Consumer
Management of Consumer Resources

Family economics

Economics for the Family
Economics of the Home
Family Economics (9)
Family Economics and Finance
Family Economics and Management
Family Management and Economics
Household Economics and Management

Family finance

Family Finance (12)
Family Finance and Consumer Education
Family Financial Management (7)
Family Financial Planning
Family Financial Problems (3)
The Family's Financial Problems
Home Finance
Home Management and Family Finance
Personal and Family Finance (3)
Personal and Family Financial Management (2)
Personal Finance

Household Equipment

Equipment (8)
Household Equipment (14)
Household Equipment and Space Utilization
Housing and Equipment (2)
Housing and Home Equipment
Management of Home Equipment
Management of Household Equipment
Selection and Use of Household Equipment

Housing

Family Housing
Family Housing Problems
Housing (3)
Housing and Home Furnishings (3)
Housing Finance
Home Furnishing
Home Planning and Furnishing
Interior of the Home
Organization and Use of House Space
Planning and Management of the Contemporary Home
Planning Kitchens and Work Areas
The Home and Its Interior
The Home--Its Design and Equipment
The House

Meal management

Family Meal Planning and Serving
Family Meal Management
Family Nutrition
Marketing and Meal Service
Meal Management (5)
Meal Planning and Management (2)
Meal Planning and Service
Nutrition Management in the Family

Seminars, projects, directed and independent study

Applying Management Principles
Directed Study: Home Management
Field Instruction in Management and Family Economics
Field Study
Home Management Seminar
Independent Honor Study
Management and Consumer Studies Practicum
Management Problems in Homes (2)
Problems
Problems in Home Management (3)
Research Seminar
Special Problems (2)
Special Problems in Family Economics/Home Management (3)
Special Problems in Home Management (2)
Special Projects or Reading in Home Management
Special Topics--Management and Consumer Studies
Special Unit Course
Studies in Household Equipment and/or Home Management
Undergraduate Directed Study

Home economics interdisciplinary field experience

Community Involvement in Home Economics
Families and Community Services
Home Economics Field Experience in Urban Communities
Practicum
Practicum in Home Economics and Corequisite
Practicum with Children and Families
Professional Home Economics Practicum
Projects: Field Experience
Seminar and Field Experience in Community Services

Home economics work experience

Directed Work Experience
Field Experience (2)
Field Experiences in Home Economics (3)
Field Work in Home Economics
Supervised Field Experience
Working with Families or with Community Agencies

Miscellaneous related courses

Demonstration Techniques
Environmental Textiles
Home and Family Living
Marriage Preparation
Research Seminar in Home Economics
Special Topics and Problems in Home Economics

APPENDIX K

Problems with Offering Field Experiences in Home Management; Classified in Table 18 as "Other Problems, Explanations"

Getting the experiences classified to fit the rigid structure set up for determining weighted teaching load.

Takes time to organize course.

Have to be developed for each semester.

Locating families to work with.

Community placement availability.

Finding placement for the students that is meaningful.

Still exploratory--placement is a concern.

Time needed to keep good working relations between community services and community.

Communication: the nurse from the Public Health met with the class and said that all families were expecting the students. This did not turn out to be accurate and some families did not want anyone to visit them.

Interested personnel at the cooperating agencies are not always available.

Must know resource people personally.

Not enough staff to supervise.

Community worker must evaluate for the most part because it would not create a good atmosphere to have college personnel come in to observe clients. Meeting and evaluation are set up to record students' progress.

Size of class (90 students).

Students sometimes have difficulty in participating depending on family situation which is used.

Some students and parents object to work in strange peoples' homes for experience.

Student reluctance to go into a neighborhood unlike their own--after fears are alleviated the field work is successful.

Students have difficulty finding time for field experiences.

Many students employed, feel too time consuming.

Helping students accept a class with a different format.

Sometimes students find it difficult to set objectives.

I've made it optional to overcome objections.

Integrating theory with the variety of field experiences. Field work can be a bit "far out" in terms of management.

If this is the only home management course it is too limited, supplemented it is tremendous.

There is concern that the "house" will be used for other purposes since the girls did not sleep there--used the house as a lab.

Insurance--liability coverage.

Don't know yet but think first 5 will apply.

We're experimenting--not sure of problems.

APPENDIX L

Reasons Why Field Experiences Not Offered in Home Management; Classified in Table 19 as "Other Reasons"

Offered in other subject matter structures

Methods courses.

Student teaching.

Not a course by itself but just an introduction for teacher education.

Home economics education.

Education, occupational education.

Home economics education and textile and clothing courses.

In various curricula for home economics majors since 1958. Have three different courses using field experiences in which home management is involved (not classified as home management courses, per se).

More feasible to incorporate in the course entitled Field Experience in Home Economics.

We use a quarter off campus for all students but it does not focus exclusively on management.

We have a limited field experience in the Senior Seminar required of all our students in home economics.

A part of the senior program is a field experience, but it is not necessarily directed into the management area, although it may be.

Each major area has a field practicum--child development--family relations, clothing and textiles, education, dietetics.

Seminar in family functioning, meal management, shelter and environment.

Clothing and Merchandising.

Home furnishings.

Only in food management at present.

Community nutrition course where students do home visits and observation of management problems of families--nutrition education is main thrust of this course however.

Community services practicum.

Community Service and Family Rehabilitation.

Home Economics and Sociology.

Social Work field experience.

Sociology and Volunteer Social Action Work.

Social Problems (Sociology Department).

Field Work Course.

A number of the home management students take advantage of field experience with the Cooperative Extension Service.

Internship program.

Elective as an employment/study activity, a minimum of such work required per week is 10 hours per student year around as per college requirements--the aim of which is to teach the dignity of labor and its worth in character building.

Get field experience in agencies etc. but not management oriented.

Independent study.

Used somewhat in independent study program (five weeks).

Institutions that tried and dropped field experiences

Problems getting approval of community agencies.

We had to discontinue a coop program we had because of funding problems in the cooperating agencies.

Community has been saturated with this type of work by all schools in the area.

Difficult to offer quality content without more staff time.

Need the basic course first--students lack practice in management themselves--and it is difficult to have a meaningful experience emphasizing management principles within confines of a particular family--too intimate.

Management Problems in the Home was taught several years ago--as an elective--only 4-6 students were interested or could work this course into schedule.

Other institutions

We are studying other approaches and this idea is included.

Currently under consideration--in planning stages.

Are considering developing a field study program--have had residence course.

Plans are being developed presently to offer field experience in future.

We plan to use field study experience in the fall 1973.

Making plans to start next year.

We have gotten field experience option through curriculum committee. So far, our president has not funded it.

Several years ago an attempt was made to change our residence course to a field project course. It was bitterly opposed by Home Economics education faculty and defeated. Currently the home economics education faculty desires to drop the residence course, no field service course will be substituted. However, we intend to change the content to field service for our community service majors.

We simply do not have the staff available--hopefully we can expand in this direction.

Difficult to get new courses accepted as we don't have faculty to cover nor are we about to get additional faculty!

At present staff is too small and work load too heavy.

There is only one person teaching one section of home management (1/3 of her total teaching time).

Teacher not interested--cannot see the value. (Note: As Department Head, I'm working to change this.)

Non approval by administration, limited time available by students.

Time consuming for students.

Enrollment too large.

Difficult to set up meaningful situation.

Liaison involvement in terms of both community personnel and facilities.

Contacts for this kind of program is very difficult and time consuming--community leadership can present some problems.

Cooperated with outreach program but difficult to travel in rural areas.

Parents often object to students traveling around the city--however, I don't see this as a deterrant.

Community uncooperative.

No facilities.

We have the traditional home management facilities.

Residence course at present.

We feel the residence experience is more valuable for students.

We have outstanding home management laboratories in which we can teach managerial concepts.

Must use home management house experience to be able to justify keeping it.

Only one home management course required of majors.

Students are not qualified until they have more experience in management themselves.

We offer only one home management course, students need some help before helping others.

It belongs to sociology. I don't know of any family, even one that a person marries into, that one can know all or even a part of what really goes on by observation for such a short time.

No program devised.

Detailed consideration of alternatives has not been made.

APPENDIX M

Attitudes of Respondents Toward Field Experiences in Home Management; Classified in Table 20 as "Other Attitudes"

Respondents' programs with field experiences

Depends upon purposes for home management courses. I think that we need to communicate theoretical concepts being developed and in addition offer experiences which deepen a student's understanding of theory. I think the student needs to be aware that he is learning about home management theory in action.

An awareness of managers problems with possible solutions derived from concepts learned in theory.

Helps students see principles applied or not applied in a realistic way.

Opportunity for students to develop independent studies for application of theory to real life situations that meet real life needs.

We feel the experience gained in the field work is more meaningful and opens new avenues of interest to the student.

Especially valuable because students see actual families in action--at various life cycle stages and of various socio-economic levels.

Offers an insight into some fields the students are unaware of.

Raises awareness level of students--environmental influences, value differences, etc.

Many of our students are placed in disadvantaged homes so it broadens their outlook considerably.

Middle class students need first hand experience with other economic levels.

Student should have more preparation for the field study.

Effective approach for many students depending on individuals experience and living situations.

Need 2 levels (exploratory and application level field study experience).

To be effective requires carefully planning experience with close supervision and constant interchange between students and faculty and the cooperating agency.

Qualify students for occupational aspects to utilize management concepts.

Provides a professional experience dimension not a part of a residence course.

We did away with the residence in 1961. My students have gone to nursing homes, hospitals, a day in court, day care center, extension club meetings, hospital auxillary, the welfare departments, city councils and school board meetings just to mention some of the types of field experiences we are able to do in a small town. . . .

I question the place of Home Management since to be effective I believe management must be taught in every course. There seems so much confusion in the area--no good text or references are available. I am horrified at the handouts given on some large campuses where one might expect expertise. We didn't offer the course this year--and for some time have not encouraged students to take it. I wish I knew the answer.

I found the traditional home management house a waste of time and believe the field experience approach more valid. I think we will not offer the course again until better texts and teaching materials are available.

Potentially excellent but may be less beneficial than a <u>good</u> residence experience if understaffed and inadequately implemented.

I am not at all sure it replaces a controlled live in situation but it is so difficult to administer to all students.

I feel that the traditional residence experience can be very timely if handled with contemporary changes in living patterns kept in mind.

Should not have to compete but should supplement residence experience.

The emphasis on field experience has come to full circle in my experience. In the early 40's we established home management field work to replace residence and successfully offered the course for two years. The state department would not accept this course for home management residence, so we had to drop it in favor of the structured live-in situation. Now, we are hearing much about the value of field experience and have set up some field experience to supplement the residence experience.

Desirable for professional development.

Highly desirable for professional development.

Not essential but recommended highly.

Respondents' programs without field experiences

Depends upon the quality of the experience.

Some experiences if properly planned and supervised could be very good.

May be appropriate in certain situations.

In institutions where there is adequate population or program--could be valuable.

We have so many cultural groups that field experience makes a very relevant educational experience.

Important but basic management theory should come first--only 6 hours management offered.

Feel students must have some practical personal experiences before they can recognize managerial experiences of others.

Requires interdisciplinary competencies in addition to home management, i.e. guidance and counseling, foundations of education, child development and family relations.

Descriptive rather than prescriptive attitude on part of students.

Ordinarily student does not have opportunity in field study to make decisions and take responsibility for the consequences.

Students don't live with the consequences, families do.

Students really cannot make decisions and live the results.

Unsuitable for our situation and for developmental stage of students.

At present not suitable since only one "true" management course offered.

Unnecessary for all but majors in this area.

This experience satisfies cultural rather than management experiences.

Would duplicate other courses.

Time factor, supervision, staff allocation.

Residence is a better experience for beginning students.

Feel it can increase tolerance.

We will try it with a married wife and mother next year--will be able to tell after that.

Could be an effective substitute for a residence experience.

Need both programs.

Can enrich laboratory; field study is older experience (Cushman) than residence and laboratory.

State department must ok.

Need to know more about mechanics.

I don't know enough about the general success of the program.

Have never given it consideration, need to think about it.

APPENDIX N

Attitudes of Respondents Toward Home Management Field Experiences for Selected Majors; Classified in Table 21 as "Other Majors"

Neutral (Score 5)

More advanced experiences as graduate students

Advocate (Scores 6-8)

General Home Economics
Family Studies majors
Family Life Education
Family Life majors
Community Service majors
Elective for those interested
Non-major elective

Strongly advocate (Scores 9, 10)

Community Service majors
Child Development/Social Service
Home Extension, isolated community workers
Home training consultants
Foods and Nutrition
Community nutritionists
Community Service
Social welfare
Students minoring in social work
Family Development majors
General Home Economics majors
Occupational certification
For graduate student majors
Elective for all majors

APPENDIX O

Attitudes of Respondents Toward Field Experience Approaches to Teaching Home Management; Classified in Table 22 as "Other Approaches"

Advocate (Scores 6-8)

Useful for a variety of situations related to family resource management.

For home management majors both experiences are necessary--a merging.

As a type of experience outside classroom.

Alternative to residence and controlled lab course.

An option.

Strongly advocate (Scores 9, 10)

Supplement to theory course.

Supplement controlled lab course.

Enrichment of controlled lab/theory course to provide application in real life situations.

Substitute for married students.

An introduction to social agencies for social services majors.

Course all of its own.

Need exploratory level and application level field study experience.

Some field experience any way it can be combined.

FIELD EXPERIENCES IN UNDERGRADUATE HOME MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS

by

KATHLEEN FAITH MIKITKA

B. A. Ed., Arizona State University, 1968

AN ABSTRACT OF A MASTER'S THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Family Economics

KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY
Manhattan, Kansas

1974

Educators wishing to enable students to gain experience in applying home management theory to various situations are offering field experiences as parts or major components of home management courses.

The major objective of the study was to provide the data base needed to assess the status of undergraduate home management education programs and the utilization of field study experience therein. Specific objectives were: (1) to determine the past, present, and possible future status of field study as an undergraduate home management experience, and (2) to identify "typical" patterns of field study which exist within undergraduate home management courses.

A full-scale exploratory study was conducted by a mail survey of the 383 institutions represented by senior college administrators identified on a list provided by the American Home Economics Association. Three mailings of questionnaires and accompanying forms to these institutions solicited a return of 83 percent. Of 295 participating institutions who offered home management, 134 offered some type of home management field experiences and 161 did not offer field experiences in home management courses. There was wide variation in the types of field experiences offered.

A myriad of responses received indicated a lack of standardization among institutions and diversity in understanding of what is construed to be "home management." Field experience was inextricably related to what the institutions offered as home management theory and/or home management experience. Institutions without residence programs more frequently offered home management field experiences and field experiences had replaced residence experiences at 38 institutions.

Contemporary field experiences were relatively new approaches at some institutions. One-third of the institutions offering field experiences had adopted their approaches. One-fourth of the institutions offering field experiences had offered them for five or more years.

The students most frequently required to participate in home management field experiences were home economics education majors. The median number of students participating in home management field experiences by institutions was 19 for the 1972-73 academic year.

The most often cited problems with offering field experiences in home management were supervision, transportation, time/staff cost factors and limited opportunities for meaningful experiences.

There were significant differences of attitudes toward home management field experiences among and between educators from the programs offered. The most prevalent attitude was that field study enriches traditional experiences.

In most of the institutions offering field experiences, plans were to retain and revise or expand the field study. In one-third of the institutions not offering field experiences, introduction of field study in home management was being considered. No plans concerning field study as a home management experience existed in one-half of the institutions not offering field experiences.