

FEASIBILITY OF HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE
COURSES AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL

by

Susan Gail Cameron

A Thesis Submitted to the Faculty of the
SCHOOL OF HOME ECONOMICS
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
For the Degree of
MASTER OF SCIENCE
In the Graduate College
THE UNIVERSITY OF ARIZONA

1 9 7 2

STATEMENT BY AUTHOR

This thesis has been submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for an advanced degree at The University of Arizona and is deposited in the University Library to be made available to borrowers under rules of the Library.

Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of source is made. Requests for permission for extended quotation from or reproduction of this manuscript in whole or in part may be granted by the head of the major department or the Dean of the Graduate College when in his judgment the proposed use of the material is in the interests of scholarship. In all other instances, however, permission must be obtained from the author.

SIGNED: Susan Gail Cameron

APPROVAL BY THESIS DIRECTOR

This thesis has been approved on the date shown below:

Janet Lee Vaughn
JANET LEE VAUGHN
Associate Professor of
Home Economics

7 MARCH 1972
Date

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer is indebted to Dr. Janet Lee Vaughn, Associate Professor of Home Economics. Her guidance, assistance, and sincere interest were essential for the completion of this study.

Additional acknowledgment is extended to Mrs. Alice B. Lowell, Professor of Home Economics, and Dr. Herbert Blair Wilson, Professor of Educational Administration, for their patience and assistance during the completion of this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
ABSTRACT	xi
INTRODUCTION	1
Purpose of the Study	2
Hypotheses	3
Limitation	5
Assumptions	5
Operational Definitions	5
Home Management Residence Course	5
Home Management Non-Residence Course Alternative-1	6
Home Management Non-Residence Course Alternative-2	6
Action Research	6
Quota Sampling	7
Responding Institutions	7
Participating Institutions	7
Non-Participating Institutions	7
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	8
Home Management Residence Course	8
Philosophies	8
Advisers	10
Facilities	11
Objectives	14
Evaluation	17
Financing	17
Trends	19
Home Management Non-Residence Course Alternative-1	22
Philosophies	22
Objectives	26
Evaluation	27
Home Management Non-Residence Course Alternative-2	28
Philosophies	28

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
METHODS AND PROCEDURES	31
Development of the Instrument	31
Selection of the Subjects	31
Collection of Data	33
Treatment of the Data	33
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS	36
Institutions with Neither a Home Management Residence Nor a Non-Residence Course	36
Institutions with Only a Home Management Residence Course	39
Characteristics of Instruction Staff	39
Faculty Staffing of Advisers	39
Qualifications for Adviser	40
Orientation Program for Advisers	40
Problems in Finding Advisers	41
Home Economics Majors	41
Enrollment	41
Prerequisites	42
Facilities	42
Length of Course	43
Objectives	43
Components of Course Grade	44
Institutions with Only a Home Management Non-Residence Course	44
Characteristics of Instruction Staff	44
Faculty Staffing of Advisers	45
Qualifications for Adviser	45
Orientation Program for Advisers	46
Problems in Finding Advisers	46
Home Economics Majors	46
Enrollment	47
Prerequisites	47
Facilities	48
Length of the Course	48
Objectives	48
Components of Course Grade	49
Institutions with Both a Home Management Residence and Non-Residence Course	49
Characteristics of Instruction Staff	49
Faculty Staffing of Advisers	50
Qualifications for Adviser	50
Orientation Program for Advisers	51
Problems in Finding Advisers	51
Home Economics Majors	52
Enrollment	52

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Prerequisites	52
Facilities	53
Length of the Course	53
Objectives	54
Components of Course Grade	54
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	56
Conclusions	56
Institutions with Neither a Home Management Residence Nor a Non-Residence Course	56
Institutions with Only a Home Management Residence Course	57
Institutions with Only a Home Management Non-Residence Course	58
Institutions with Both a Home Management Residence and Non-Residence Course	59
Recommendations	60
Further Research	60
Feasibility of a Home Management Residence Course	61
APPENDIX A: QUESTIONNAIRE	64
APPENDIX B: COVER LETTER TO SELECTED INSTITUTIONS	72
APPENDIX C: SECOND COVER LETTER TO NON- RESPONDENT INSTITUTIONS	74
APPENDIX D: TABULATIONS-INSTITUTIONS WITH NEITHER A HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE NOR A NON- RESIDENCE COURSE	76
APPENDIX E: TABULATIONS-INSTITUTIONS WITH ONLY A HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE COURSE	78
APPENDIX F: TABULATIONS-INSTITUTIONS WITH ONLY A HOME MANAGEMENT NON-RESIDENCE COURSE	90
APPENDIX G: TABULATIONS-INSTITUTIONS WITH BOTH HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE AND NON-RESIDENCE COURSE	102
SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	115

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Geographic regions of quota questionnaires and those obtained	32
2. Modified geographic regions of quota questionnaires and those obtained	35
3. Characteristics of the institutions, by residence, non-residence and combination . . .	37
4. Institutions with neither a home management residence nor non-residence by geographic regions and undergraduate enrollment	77
5. Institutions with home management residence by geographic regions and undergraduate enrollment	79
6. Characteristics of instruction staff in institutions with home management residence	80
7. Years Master's and Ph. D. degrees awarded to instructional staff in institutions with a home management residence	81
8. Institutions that awarded Ph. D. degrees to instructional staff in institutions with home management residence	81
9. Faculty staffing of advisers in institutions with a home management residence course . . .	82
10. Minimal qualifications for the position as adviser in institutions with a home management residence course	82
11. Adviser's orientation programs in institutions with a home management residence course	83
12. Problems involved with obtaining qualified advisers in institutions with a home management residence course	83

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
13. Institutions requiring home economics majors to take a home management residence course	84
14. Home management residence enrollment	85
15. Prerequisites for home management residence course in institutions	86
16. Type of different facilities in institutions with a home management residence course	87
17. Length of home management residence undergraduate course	87
18. Priority objectives of the home management residence course	88
19. Major components of course grade in institutions with a home management residence course	89
20. Institutions with home management non-residence by geographic regions and undergraduate enrollment	91
21. Characteristics of instruction staff in institutions with home management non-residence	93
22. Years Master's and Ph. D. degrees awarded to instructional staff in institutions with a home management non-residence	94
23. Institutions that awarded Ph. D. degrees to instructional staff in institutions with home management non-residence	94
24. Faculty staffing of advisers in institutions with a home management non-residence course	95
25. Minimal qualifications for the position as adviser in institutions with a home management non-residence course	95

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
26. Adviser's orientation programs in institutions with a home management non-residence course	96
27. Problems involved with obtaining qualified advisers in institutions with a home management non-residence course	96
28. Institutions requiring home economics majors to take a home management non-residence course	97
29. Home management non-residence enrollment	97
30. Prerequisites for home management non-residence course in institutions	98
31. Type of different facilities in institutions with a home management non-residence course	99
32. Length of home management non-residence undergraduate course	99
33. Priority objectives of the home management non-residence course	100
34. Major components of course grade in institutions with a home management non-residence course	101
35. Institutions with both home management residence and non-residence by geographic regions and undergraduate enrollment	103
36. Characteristics of instruction staff in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence	105
37. Years Master's and Ph. D. degrees awarded to instructional staff in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence	107
38. Institutions that awarded Ph. D. degrees to instructional staff in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence	107

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
39. Faculty staffing of advisers in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses	108
40. Minimal qualifications for the position as adviser in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses	108
41. Adviser's orientation programs in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses	109
42. Problems involved with obtaining qualified advisers in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses	109
43. Institutions requiring home economics majors to take home management residence or non-residence courses	110
44. Home management residence and non-residence combined enrollment	110
45. Prerequisites for home management residence and non-residence courses in institutions that have both	111
46. Type of different facilities in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses	112
47. Length of home management residence and non-residence undergraduate courses in institutions that have both	112
48. Priority objectives of the home management residence and non-residence courses in institutions that have both	113
49. Major components of course grade in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses	114

ABSTRACT

The purpose was to explore the feasibility of home management residence courses. A questionnaire was used to obtain the data from a quota sampling of institutions. Fifty institutions were contacted. Forty participated in the study. Institutions were divided regionally into: those with a home management residence course (eleven of forty); those with a home management non-residence course (thirteen of forty); and, those with both a home management residence and non-residence course (sixteen of forty).

The priority objective of the residence course was analyzing the managerial process and for the non-residence course was identifying values, goals, and standards in various socio-economic families. Objectives varied between and among the home management residence and non-residence courses.

The priority objectives reflect the philosophies of the types of home management courses in these participating institutions being indicative of managerial theory and changing educational objectives.

Both home management residence and non-residence combination courses were the most frequent type of course by participating institutions. Evidence indicated that

changing educational objectives, varying needs of students and faculty, and, financing the home management residence facility have been factors in considering the feasibility of the home management residence course.

INTRODUCTION

Are home management and the residence experience separable? Numerous home economics educators are beginning to think so. Nationwide, institutions are changing their home management (or reasonable facsimile) curriculums. Home management has had an intern program in the almost universal home management residence course. However, such factors as increased enrollment (number of married students), maintenance costs and staffing identifies the need to consider different methods to explore possible alternatives to meet changing educational objectives in home management.

In 1917, Bevier criticized the house as an educational method (Bevier, 1917, p. 2):

The criticism of this house is: first, that the standard of living is too costly, both as regards time and money expended; second, that so many students do the work that no one individual is responsible for any part of the result; third, that the conditions are so abnormal that the practice housekeeping has little value.

Over the years, changes in educational objectives reflect the needs of the students. In the earlier years emphasis was placed on providing opportunities for application of subject matter acquired in earlier courses (Johnson, 1922, p. 562), achievement of technological skills and development of interpersonal relationships (Gross and

Reynolds, 1931, p. 19). Later courses offered the utilization of resources (Hart, 1945, p. 639). Added to the list of home management objectives was the ability to make managerial decisions and to evaluate on these decisions. Recently, an analysis of actual managerial practices of socio-economic families became an objective of home management non-residence courses (Vickers, 1971, p. 95).

Simons states, "there appears to be a common agreement that experience beyond the theory class is needed in the area of management . . ." (Simons, 1971, p. 123). The point in dispute is if the structured situation of the home management residence is the more valuable approach. Instead of learning managerial practices from the traditional home management residence, current literature reveals that some educators are changing undergraduate curriculums to home management non-residence alternative courses. A look is needed at the total structure of the home management undergraduate courses.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose to be served in this study is the feasibility of the home management residence undergraduate course. Costs are increasing for the institution, therefore it is difficult to maintain the home management residence course. Increased enrollments compound the problem of scheduling students to live in the residence facility.

Qualified advisors who are experienced in home management are difficult to find in staffing the home management residence course. Should institutions remodel the home management residence facility, or develop both a residence and a non-residence, or develop just a non-residence course? Re-evaluation of the function of the home management courses is needed.

The problem of this study is to survey how institutions' home management undergraduate courses (specifically home management residence and home management non-residence) are meeting the present day needs of the home economics students in relation to the managerial theory taught. Consideration is given to the feasibility of home management residence.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses, which will provide order and direction to this study were:

1a. Less than five percent of the responding institutions have neither a home management residence course nor a home management non-residence course.

1b. The institutions who have neither a home management residence course nor a home management non-residence course do not feel that either course is essential to the objectives of home management.

2a. Less than fifty percent of the participating institutions studied have just a home management residence course.

2b. High finances, increased enrollments, and limited availability of advisers will cause participating institutions to evaluate the feasibility of home management residence house.

2c. Some participating institutions are considering deletion of the present home management residence course for a home management non-residence course.

3a. Less than twenty-five percent of the participating institutions have just a home management non-residence course.

3b. Participating institutions deleted the home management residence for a home management non-residence course.

3c. Increased awareness of families who are in various socio-economic groups will be a major factor in the objectives of a home management non-residence course.

3d. Some participating institutions are considering deletion of the present home management non-residence course for a home management residence course.

4a. Less than twenty percent of the participating institutions have a home management residence course and also, a home management non-residence course.

4b. Factors considered important in having both a home management residence course and a home management non-residence course in the undergraduate curriculum are availability of home management residence facilities, increasing number of married undergraduate students, and changing emphasis on course objectives.

Limitation

The results of this study will be generalized from a quota sampling of institutions.

Assumptions

This study was undertaken with these basic assumptions.

1. A questionnaire is a valid method of obtaining the desired information.

2. The home management residence staff member can, and will, give accurate and complete data on a questionnaire.

Operational Definitions

Home Management Residence Course

A home management course with a college-owned facility (for example: one-story house, apartment, mobile home) where students who are in a degree-granting home economics institution live and carry out managerial activities.

Home Management Non-Residence
Course Alternative-1

A home management course with either the use of a college-owned facility (for example: one-story house, apartment, mobile home) or a student's facility (for example: student's house or apartment) where married students who are in a degree-granting home economics institution learn to carry out managerial activities (Gross and Crandall, 1963, p. 510).

Home Management Non-Residence
Course Alternative-2

A home management course without the facility of a college-owned house but with a structured facility, such as a classroom. Students who are in a degree-granting home economics institution learn to carry out managerial activities working with community agencies or with families in socio-economic groups.

Action Research

"Action research is organized, investigative activity aimed toward the study and constructive change of a given endeavor by individuals or groups concerned with such change and improvement" (McGrath, Jelnick, and Wochner, 1963, p. 179).

Action research is engaged in by people who, themselves, want to know whether or not their methods or

courses of study or human relations procedures are achieving purposes they should achieve (Corey, 1953, p. 141).

Quota Sampling

A sample which is scattered over the population, and has some fraction of individuals having certain characteristics as does the population. However, the interviewer may specify more definitely the procedures he wants to follow in selecting the sample. The interviewer may allocate among strata such as: geographic regions, age and sex groups, etc. (Stephan and McCarthy, 1963, pp. 37-38).

Responding Institutions

Forty-four of fifty institutions replied to the questionnaire.

Participating Institutions

Forty of forty-four institutions who responded were tabulated into this study.

Non-Participating Institutions

Four of forty-four institutions who responded were not tabulated into this study because of non-compatibility with definitions of home management residence course, home management non-residence course alternative-1, and home management non-residence course alternative-2.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

A method of teaching home management at the college level has been through the home management residence course. Examination of the literature, in chronological order, as related to the home management courses, includes factors such as: home management residence course, home management non-residence course alternative-1¹, and home management non-residence course alternative-2¹. Furthermore, these factors were sub-divided into philosophies, advisers, facilities, objectives, evaluation and trends.

Home Management Residence Course

Philosophies

From 1935 to 1960. -- Many educators question what kind of learning takes place in the home management house. Nickell discusses three philosophies of the home management house (Nickell, 1940, p. 305):

The first views the work of the home as an endless round of household tasks and management in the home as concerned with the standardization of those tasks and with the tools or equipment used in performing the tasks. It measures efficiency by the units of resources or factors of consumption-time, energy, money-conserved through the process of utilization. The second philosophy views the home as made up of human

¹Operational Definitions, p. 6.

beings living together in an environment of love and affection and holds that these human beings are predominantly concerned with the quality of association which makes for satisfaction in living. Management in the home under such a concept is concerned with using the resources--of which the human resources are most important--in such a manner as to reach the desired goals in living. Efficiency in these terms is measured in individual development and in human progress and satisfactions. Management in this concept is a device or tool for accomplishment in living and becomes a way of life. The third view of management is that the home is a key unit in the national economy and that the aim of management in the home is their furtherance of the interests of the state and not the individual or family group. Efficiency under this concept is measured in terms of the strength of the state of the nation.

In combining the three philosophies, learning in a home management house resulted when a student was working under the following conditions (Nickell, 1940, p. 306):

- (1) where the life in the house is organized by the group to fit the needs of the individuals in the particular group;
- (2) where there is freedom of thought and action;
- (3) where there is respect for student ideas;
- (4) where there is self-direction on the part of the student in solving problems, with support and guidance from the adviser at points of weakness;
- (5) where the adviser and the administration are willing to accept standards which are being evolved by the group; and
- (6) where progress and accomplishment are measured in terms of individual student growth and not of competitiveness.

From 1960 to 1971. -- Two opposing philosophies existed at Cornell University. One group felt that the residence course should provide experiences representative of management as it occurs in the homes. The residence house should be like the student's parental homes or homes

they would like to establish. Another group felt that the residence should provide experiences unlike the home situation in which students used a greater variety of appliances, linens and furniture. Please see page 12 concerning the facilities that established these two philosophies (Knoll and Davey, 1960, p. 754).

Advisers

From 1935 to 1960. -- Should home management teaching faculty or graduate teaching assistants staff the residence houses? Both the more experienced, more mature staff member and the young, less-experienced graduate student may make different contributions to the learning experience of the group. The personality and character of the adviser, her cultural and educational background should help determine qualities of a good adviser. Frances S. Henderson and L. Jeanne Riebel, graduate assistants at Pennsylvania State University, described the type of person that the adviser should be: ". . . a person who understands and enjoys college students . . ." (Henderson and Riebel, 1956, pp. 246-247). However, the disadvantages of the adviser's role are the long hours, limited privacy, and heavy responsibility. Also, she was the first to arrive and last to leave the residence house during a school term. At Iowa State College, graduate students were the advisers for the residence house. The graduate students took courses on

supervision of the house and development of infants early in the graduate program. The graduate advisers and the supervisor of the house program had a regular weekly seminar to co-ordinate the teaching experiences. Advisers were encouraged to attain the departmental objectives with a variety of methods (Budolfson, 1956, p. 248).

Read points out that when considering two choices of an adviser for the home management residence either a full-time faculty member or a graduate assistant, both have disadvantages. The faculty member may not be as flexible and this would be a disadvantage to the students. She indicated that disadvantages of the graduate assistants were the possibility of immaturity and less continuity in policy and program (Read, 1959, p. 268).

Facilities

From 1935 to 1960. -- To assist in planing a home management house at Oregon State College a questionnaire was sent out. Thirty-four of the institutions studied had 49 residence facilities because some institutions felt it was necessary to establish more than one facility. On an average, the residence was for six weeks with a number of students at six (Cameron, 1940, p. 302).

A change in the home management residence at the University of Utah happened as they built a "home living center". During the spring of 1949, a survey reported that

of all those students who had graduated in home economics, when they married 97% lived in apartments.

Within about five years they moved into their own homes. In order to provide a practical, realistic experience preparatory to establishing a home, a home living center was developed that utilized apartments. Although the apartments were unfurnished, the students bought furnishings from the home living center. The students had \$500 in which they could purchase furnishings of low-cost to high-cost items. As each group of students moved out of their apartment, they moved all of their furniture into the home living center. Also, the home living center provided for extra-curricular facilities, such as a library and a workshop (Cutler, 1954, pp. 645-648).

From 1960 to 1971. -- As mentioned in *Philosophies*, there were two opposing philosophies on the home management residence course at Cornell University. A residence course was established to facilitate the philosophies of both groups. Students rotated and lived in both types of apartments which were the residence facilities. The two apartments were characterized as (Knoll and Davey, 1960, pp. 754-755):

Apartment A had been used for some time for home management groups and easily accommodated six and seven students, a resident advisor, and an infant. Supplies of small equipment, table linens, and dishes were large enough to allow a fair amount of choice. Food allowances were

aimed at what is commonly known as comfort level or above.

Apartment B was limited to two rooms plus a bath and was planned to house two students for approximately two weeks--long enough for each of them individually to have five or six days of planning and carrying out the homemaking activities attendant with the apartment. Furniture and furnishings already on hand were used with only slight adaptations. One room, originally a kitchen, provided centers for food preparation and cleanup, dining, planning, and account keeping. Since the kitchen had been planned for a larger group, restrictions were placed on the number of drawers and cabinets that could be used for the storage of food and supplies. The second room served as a living area by day and a sleeping area at night. Sometimes this room also served as a dining area by moving the table from the kitchen. The total space was thought to be comparable to that available in medium-priced apartments in Ithaca. Laundry facilities in another section of the apartment were shared with the large apartment. Minimum supplies of table linens, dishes, and small equipment were provided. Food allowances were more restricted, being comparable to food expenditures reported by student couples.

Reactions from 34 of 36 students who had taken the residence in both apartment types replied that they were in favor of the two-fold residence. When asked why the two-apartment arrangement was favored, 17 thought that apartment B was a very realistic home management experience. Since there were fewer resources they could improvise and become more aware of alternate and available resources. The 18 students who favored apartment A considered the experience valuable because they used a variety of equipment, supplies, food and work methods. When the students were asked to choose between Apartment A and B, 18 chose the small (B) and 17

chose the large (A). The reasons expressed were similar to those already expressed. The staff felt that it was easier to appraise managerial ability of the students in apartment B (Knoll and Davey, 1960).

In an article on "Presenting A Symposium on Facilities for Home Management Residence", the term "home management house" was not used. Due to diversification of structure and use of facilities the structures were called "home management laboratory", "home management center", and "residence facilities" ("Presenting", 1968, p. 359).

Texas Technological College utilizes two mobile homes and one large house for the home management residence course. Single women live in these facilities while married women use their own homes as the laboratory for the course (Wolf et al., 1968, p. 360).

Objectives

From 1935 to 1960. -- In order to analyze goals and reorganize objectives, Northern Illinois State Teachers College developed a study to determine attitudes of students who had taken the home management residence course. The study had summaries of 56 graduates who had lived in the house and had been away from the college for at least two years. The findings, listed below, are attitudes formed from the home management house that were still

characteristic of the majority of the students two years later (Hart, 1945, p. 639):

1. Attitudes of living with others are definitely developed, improved, and made more permanent by work in the home management house.
2. To make possible the greatest growth, there must be adequate opportunity for decision making under guidance in all phases of homemaking as well as increased effort for freedom of thought and action during the experience.
3. Attitudes and standards are clarified and improved by practice after college.
4. Probably no other area gives the student such a true picture of integrated homemaking as does this picture.
5. As time is an important factor in the maturity and stability of these attitudes, the period must be long enough to achieve this.
6. New interests, mental and physical, should be a part of this experience.
7. Development of adequate social attitudes toward relating, housing, and rights of other people is a definite need.

Read considers the home management house not as a "practice house" for the practice of skills although it incidently serves this purpose. Instead, over the years she feels that the home management residence offers students opportunities to: make decisions; use resources; evaluate accomplishments; have working relationships with a group; and, find sources of satisfaction in a homemaking type experience (Read, 1959, p. 267).

From 1960 to 1971. -- Objectives of the home management program established in the residence courses at Texas Technological College, University of Missouri, University

of Rhode Island and the University of Nebraska outlined in 1968 were ("Presenting", 1968, p. 359):

The residence course is professional in its focus but at the same time a homelike atmosphere is provided in the home management laboratory because all home economics work directly or indirectly with families and their managerial problems.

The home management laboratory creates a situation in which relatively small groups of students living together under limited supervision are able (1) to gain insight into the managerial problems faced by families, such as limited resources and limited space, (2) to apply in a practical situation principles which were learned earlier, (3) to make managerial decisions, and (4) to evaluate the consequences of such decisions. It provides one of the first opportunities for a student to supervise her peers and to be responsible for coordinating the activities of a group toward the achievement of group goals while at the same time striving for individual goals.

Living in a group which must also work together calls for considerable adjustment and is a real learning experience when group activities are analyzed and evaluated. The supportive atmosphere of the laboratory makes it possible for students to be creative and to experiment more than they might in other situations and provides the opportunity to see management as a 24-hour experience rather than as fragmented units in the day.

Students are constantly evaluated on their managerial qualities, and opportunities for growth are consciously provided. Emphasis is laid on the analysis of management and on professional as well as flexible standards; methods, materials, and performance are evaluated on a comparative basis. Living on different economic levels and in groups of different sizes provides valuable experience from a professional standpoint.

Objectives were the same for both the home management residence course and the home management non-residence

course at the University of Nebraska. Please note page 27 for the objectives of the two courses at the University of Nebraska (Larery, 1968, pp. 368-371).

Evaluation

From 1960 to 1971. -- Vickers evaluated the home management residence course and home management non-residence course. Please see page 27 for the evaluation (Vickers, 1971, pp. 94-95).

Financing

From 1960 to 1971. -- Johnston listed some of the administrative problems arising from the residence courses (Johnston, 1966, pp. 50-51).

1. The matter of whether management concepts are really being taught in such courses and whether residence is the only way to teach them.
2. The increased number of students who are married, have at least temporary homes, and children.
3. The difficulty of obtaining competent management trained advisors.
4. The financing of such courses in terms of original investment, upkeep, and operation.

Southern Illinois University studied the financing of home management residence programs in 22 colleges and universities. The universities were state supported and had home management houses. One of the three plans for financing was followed (Johnston, 1966).

1. Students living in home management houses paid a fee covering food and household supplies but did not pay rent. Other housing arrangements were generally left up to the students. If they lived in the university housing, they were reimbursed for board. This amount covered or nearly covered house fees in several cases. The institution provided and maintained the houses and furnished utilities.
2. Students paid a fee covering food and household supplies, also rent for their rooms in the home management houses. Usually arrangements were made with university housing so that students did not pay the institution for two rooms at one time. When the rent was paid or transferred to the home management house account it paid some operational and maintenance costs.
3. Students paid no fee directly for home management house residence. Under one arrangement, only education majors were required to live in the house. Their expenses while in the house were covered by a fee assessed all students, regardless of courses taken. The institution then budgeted funds for the home management houses. Under a second arrangement, students paid the room and board charged by the university for dormitories. This amount, transferred to the home management house operating budget, paid nearly all costs.

About two-thirds of the colleges reported using the first plan; only two used the third plan.

Factors included in payment of the housing arrangement were: the financial status of students; the number of majors required to live in home management houses; the length of the home management residence period; the proportion of students living in residence halls and in off campus housing; mobility of student body in student teaching; internship, home management residence and other

course which require part-time campus housing; the length of dormitory contracts and the willingness of campus housing officials to participate in cooperative arrangements. Fees for the students living in the home management residence ranging from 18 days to one quarter were from \$7 to \$28 per week, excluding rent. The median fee paid was \$10 per week (Johnston, 1966).

Trends

From 1935 to 1960. -- In order to learn trends in regard to certain problems of the home management house, a study was undertaken in 1938 at Michigan State College. Of 83 questionnaires sent out, 56 were returned. Tabulations of these replies are (Laurita, Ewing, and Gross, 1940, p. 303):

Number of houses. The number of home management houses per institutions ranged from one to five, with 35, or 62.5%, of the institutions having one house and only one having as many as five.

Guidance personnel. Forty-two of the 56 institutions relied on faculty members alone to furnish guidance in home management houses, and 14 combined faculty and graduate student guidance.

Preparation of instructor. The instructors employed for guidance had specialized in home management in 37, or two-thirds, of the institutions. The others had had one or more of the following types of preparation: training in child development, institution management, general home economics, nursing, or food and nutrition; practical experience; or a combination of these.

A study was undertaken in the winter of 1946 to investigate home management. Replies were from 88% of 106 colleges and universities that had home management houses in 1945. A summary of the major findings of the study includes (Elliott, 1948, pp. 127-128):

1. The majority of the co-operating teachers agree with the philosophy that home management is a way of life; goals of homemaking have bases in human values; management is a way of achieving the highest values; management is a way of achieving the highest values from human relations.
2. Predominant aims of home management emphasize the development of appreciations, understandings, attitudes, judgments, and standards that are important for the procurement of good human relations.
3. Home management courses today stress subject matter as follows, ranked according to percentages ascribed: the efficient home manager; time and energy management; fatigue; housekeeping management; philosophy; and the management of family food, finances, housing problems relating to furnishings and equipment, health, recreation, community problems, the family car and clothing.
4. Criteria for selecting the principles to be taught in these courses cluster around needs and those principles not taught in other courses.
5. Median, mean, and mode for credit given for the course are approximately 2.5 semester hours.
6. Subjects listed as prerequisites by 50 or more of the co-operating teachers are selection and preparation of food, meal planning and table service, nutrition, child development, home furnishings, and economics.
7. The median home management house has certain characteristics. It is the only home management house on campus. Six senior students live in the house for six weeks as a family group. The house is owned by the college, and students pay no rent. Students living

in the house pay a fee of \$53 and have no other expenses except personal ones. It is doubtful if students living in this house receive practical experiences in handling money. The house operates on a moderate and low-income level. It is supervised by the person who teaches the theory course; such supervision constitutes one-half of this teacher's load. Students living in this house receive approximately three semester hours of credit and spend approximately 29 clock hours for each credit. The course is required of all home economics majors, and students are not excused from living in this home management house. No system of blocking is used by the administration to lighten the load of these students. Definite house duties are set up for the students by the teacher or the administrator. There is no baby in this house. Students are required to carry on certain types of entertainment. Employed help is not used.

From 1960 to 1971. -- Furst did a study in 1965 at West Virginia University on the trends of home management residence in land grant colleges. Questionnaires were returned from 53% of the directors of land grant institutions. Provisions for residence programs for home economics majors were made for 94%; and for married students 57%. A non-residence program was available for married female students in 43% of the institutions and for males 28% of the institutions. Graduate students were full time advisers in 33% of the institutions reporting. Of the home management facilities, 62% had been constructed and 28% had been remodeled for home management residences. Nearly 75% of the facilities were houses, and 90% were single dwelling. "In the past five years over 21% of the

institutions remodeled facilities and over 34% have plans to add facilities in the near future" (Furst, 1966, pp. 126-128).

Home Management Non-Residence
Course Alternative-1

Philosophies

From 1960 to 1971. -- One of the first non-residence experiences was at the University of Nebraska. The experiment served two functions: (1) evaluation of a non-resident home management experience for married students, and (2) home management supervision of graduate students in advising a non-resident experience. Although home management residency is a degree requirement for all home economics education majors at the University of Nebraska, students who have been married for over five years may substitute a special problems course. The students who had been married under five years were the students for whom the non-residence experience was tried. The University of Nebraska's plan was (Davis, 1960, pp. 20-22):

The plan followed was a combination day residence and nonresidence. For the first four weeks, the married students participated in the activities at one of the home management houses but spent nights in their own apartments. The husbands had their evening meals at the home management house and participated in some of the social activities of the group. For the second four weeks, the married students carried on special managerial experiences in their own apartments under the guidance of a graduate

student in home management. The students' apartments served as home management laboratories, and a plan was individualized through a series of conferences in which the student, the graduate student advisor, and the staff advisor arrived at a group of meaningful managerial experiences for the student.

Each of the married students had one non-residence experience that was analyzed to evaluate her decisions in her family's goals. Co-operation among the husbands was high and many of the decisions were made jointly. One of the disadvantages to the non-residence program was that the adviser was not as readily available for guidance in the student's apartment. These are the alternative plans formulated from this experience (Davis, 1960, pp. 20-22):

1. Full-time residence for part of period; day residence for remainder of period. This alternative would fail to take advantage of the student's own laboratory as the setting for a potentially more meaningful experience than would be had in the home management house. However, this arrangement would not increase staff load, and students would not be separated from their husbands the entire period.
2. Day residence for part of period; nonresidence for remainder of period. The values of both the resident and nonresident situations could be realized. There could be immediate transferral of learnings from the home management house experience to the home situation. It is recognized that this alternative increases staff load and may not always be possible to implement.
3. Resident course for married students. A group of married couples would occupy a home management residence. The number of houses, the arrangement of houses, and the number of students needing the course would be factors in determining whether this alternative is feasible. Only one-half as many students

could be accommodated in a given time with this plan. Also, if housing had already been obtained by a couple prior to residence, living expenses would probably need to be paid in two places.

4. Nonresident course for married students.

The students would have the laboratory experience in their own homes. They would work toward the solving of managerial problems that were real and apparent to them. The individuality of this experience would offer the opportunity to select projects compatible with the student's home situation and her particular stage of development. Home visits would be made by the advisor, and there would be regular meetings of the entire group of students with the advisor. To be most effective, there would need to be several students having this experience at the same time in order for them to become aware of differences among families in values, goals, resources, and standards, and the varied ways in which families manage their resources to achieve goals important to them. Through interaction of the entire group--group discussion, intergroup entertainments, planned visitation in each other's homes--the students could realize many of the values of the resident experience and at the same time reap benefits from using their own homes as a home management laboratory.

The graduate students who advised the experience made home visits throughout the period. They were able to help the student plan, evaluate, and guide her in managerial situations. They constructed an evaluation device and reached, in collaboration with the instructor, a final grade for the student (David, 1960).

Conclusions from Pacific Union College study survey to determine the necessity of a home management residence were (Simons, 1971, p. 123):

- (1) The time involved on the part of the instructor is a major investment which includes extensive forfeiting of her private life.
- (2) The space devoted to the home management house could be put to many other uses to facilitate the home economics program.
- (3) Instructors could not be sure they were broadening the outreach of most students because students generally tend to relate to the socio-economic group from which they come.

Pacific Union College conducted a survey to investigate other types of institutions' residence experiences. Consequently, the residence program changed its curriculum (Simons, 1971, p. 123):

The curriculum is based on the quarter plan. One hour per week in class or three hours per week in the laboratory is required for each hour of credit received. Our course carried five hours credit with two hours earned in classwork, two hours in laboratory work, and one hour in a special project. The first two weeks of the quarter were devoted to intensive classwork which helped prepare students for their laboratory experience. Beginning with the third week of the quarter the class met twice each week. These class periods enabled students to share their home experiences and enrich their backgrounds through reports, guest speakers, movies, etc. Each girl was responsible for one class period. Laboratory work started during the third week. Each girl spent 30 hours in a welfare home and 30 hours in a middle-class home. It was hoped that the middle class home would provide additional learning experiences and that the lower-income home would provide opportunities to use previous and current learnings to assist these people in developing better management in their current circumstances.

The course will continue to remain in the curriculum, because both the students and the homemakers involved in the program gained valuable learning experiences.

In 1967, Marshall University changed from a residency course to a non-residency laboratory (Vickers, 1971, p. 94). The residence course contributed much to the feeling of personal competency of students but not necessarily to the competencies related to the home management concepts. Another type of course could be more beneficial in terms of faculty work load, space, credit hours, and cost of facilities. Staffing the residence was the biggest administrative problem. Because the residency course was a vocational certification requirement, the decision came after consultation with the home economics staff of the West Virginia Department of Vocational Education, the U. S. Office of Education, and home management specialists.

Objectives

From 1960 to 1971. -- At the 1962 Conference on Teaching Home Management, Whiteford listed goals or objectives of the non-residence experience at the University of Cincinnati (American Home Economics Association, 1962, p. 24):

- Recognizing the value of establishing family goals.

- Learning to respect individual personalities.

- Learning the value of co-operative planning in the family.

- Developing confidence and social skills through experience with social occasions.

- Improving one's ability in caring for a baby and/or a small child.

Learning to co-ordinate the care of children with other home responsibilities.

Learning to plan, procure, prepare, and serve attractive, appetizing food within the family budget.

Increasing skill in selecting, using and caring for pieces of equipment needed in completing tasks satisfactorily.

Understanding the value of using acceptable business procedures and keeping an accurate and sufficiently detailed record of accounts.

Improving one's ability in creating a harmonious and pleasing home atmosphere.

Learning what is involved in keeping the house presentable in an organized way, yet meet family needs.

Objectives of the laboratory course, which were for both the residence and non-residence at the University of Nebraska were (Larery, 1968, pp. 368-371):

1. To apply the concepts of management to household activities and group living.
2. To make conscious the decision-making process with a view toward developing judgement in the individual.
3. To foster and promote democratic processes in a group situation.
4. To develop appreciations, understanding, attitudes, judgements, and standards that are important to good human relationships.
5. To develop the perception of home management as a way of life.

Evaluation

From 1960 to 1971. -- Vickers conducted research to measure the effectiveness of residence and non-residence courses. Of 56 schools contacted, 17 offered a non-residence course. Ten non-residence courses were matched with the residence sample who were ". . . selected from schools which were similar in size of home economics

faculty, total and home economics enrollment, types of undergraduate programs offered, source of support, and size of community" (Vickers, 1971, p. 94). The conclusions were that the significant improvement scores, from a pretest and posttest questionnaire given to students in both residence and non-residence courses, indicated the importance of an advanced course in home management. Vickers also advocated the effectiveness of a non-residence course to achieve the more sophisticated concepts studied as contrasted with the residence course (p. 95).

Home Management Non-Residence
Course Alternative-2

Philosophies

From 1960 to 1971. -- An innovative year for Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah was 1970. An in-the-field-training program was established so students could work with low-income families. The traditional residence program was shortened from eight weeks to three weeks. It was proposed that the students in the field experience would be able to see real managerial problems of the low-income homemaker and family. The in-the-field-training program is in conjunction with Provo City's Community Action Program. The students observe the low-income families': management, decision-making, time orientation and finances. Also, the student notes the

families' care of the small child, and division of responsibilities. The best evaluation of this program is stated by the course supervisor Beth Bastian (Jensen, 1971, pp. 27-28):

The course is good because many high schools say their teachers come to them very unequipped in skills--we're combatting that. The cost of a home management house runs approximately the same as operating any other laboratory situation. The trend throughout the United States is to shorten the experience or do away with it entirely. We tried making it shorter and decided that we didn't like it. Our program is not unique except for the fact that we want to keep it.

The U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare is financing an innovative program at New Mexico State University (Hollen et al., 1971, p. 353).

The program is an educational unit that integrates the disciplines of nutrition, child development, home management, and other studies of family living through three phases of field experiences, including consultations with the young home makers 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.

This home management non-residence course Alternative-2 is an experimental phase of a five year study. To bridge a gap between knowledge and its application, the project helps home economics students visualize the social, technological and economic problems of families in various groups (Hollen et al., 1971).

Thus the validity of the home management residence course is continually being examined: the expense, the staffing of the course, the large enrollments and the type of structured facility. More research is needed in the evaluation of the type of experience that will more precisely validate the expressed objectives of home management.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Development of the Instrument

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent the home management residence course is meeting the needs of the home economics student in relation to the managerial theory taught. To obtain the data the writer constructed a questionnaire to be sent to the resident staff instructor of select universities. The questionnaire was pre-tested by two family economics/home management instructors at two universities. The questionnaire was rewritten and re-tested by three graduate students and two staff members of The University of Arizona. The questionnaire was reviewed by the graduate examining committee, and revised on the basis of criticism, suggestions, and recommendations made.

Selection of the Subjects

The criteria for selection of institutions are:

(1) geographic regions of the United States, as defined by the United States Census of Agriculture 1959 (U. S. Bureau of Census, 1961); (2) state universities and land grant institutions who have home economics students in one of three enrollment categories, as defined in Home Economics in Institutions Granting Bachelor's or Higher Degrees

Table 1. Geographic regions of quota questionnaires and those obtained.

Geographic Regions	Questionnaire Quota				Questionnaires Obtained			
	Enrollment 1968-69 ¹				Enrollment Fall 1971 ²			
	<500	500- 1000	1000>	Totals	<500	500- 1000	1000>	Totals
New England	2	1	0	3	1	2	0	3
Middle Atlantic	2	1	1	4	1	0	1	2
East North Central	3	2	3	8	2	2	3	7
West North Central	0	3	3	6	0	3	2	5
South Atlantic	4	3	0	7	2	4	1	7
East South Central	1	2	1	4	1	3	0	4
West South Central	1	1	2	4	0	1	2	3
Mountain	2	3	2	7	3	2	2	7
Pacific	4	3	0	7	3	2	1	6
Totals	19	19	12	50	13	19	12	44

¹Enrollment defined by Home Economics in Institutions Granting Bachelor's or Higher Degrees 1968-69 (Gorman and Harper, 1970).

²Enrollment given by questionnaires obtained.

1968-69 (Gorman and Harper, 1970); (3) degrees awarded in the subject matter area of family economics/home management, as classified by Home Economics in Institutions Granting Bachelor's or Higher Degrees 1968-69 (Gorman and Harper, 1970); and (4) information regarding trends in home management residence, home management non-residence alternative-1, and home management non-residence alternative-2 programs as described in Review of Literature.

Collection of Data

On November 13, 1971, 50 questionnaires, cover letters (explaining the purpose of the questionnaire) and self addressed stamped envelopes were sent to a select sample of 50 institutions. By December 1, 1971, 24 institutions had sent replies. Two institutions indicated that they were not able to complete the questionnaire in the allotted time which was December 13, 1971. A second letter was sent December 1, 1971 to the 26 institutions who had not answered the questionnaire. By December 20, 1971, 20 additional questionnaires were obtained for a total of 44 respondents.

Treatment of the Data

The data from the questionnaires were tabulated into quantitative form for analysis: summations, numbers, means, median, percents, range. The analysis was modified to tabulate summations, numbers, median, and percents. Of

the 44 institutions that replied 40 were tabulated as participating institutions. Four institutions (non-participating institutions) were not used because of noncompatibility with operational definitions. For example, one institution indicated that a lecture course was a non-residence course. Since this did not verify with the operational definitions, the questionnaire was not tabulated.

The data was tabulated into geographic regions by institutions with home management residence undergraduate courses; home management non-residence courses; and, both home management residence and non-residence courses. The geographic regions of the United States were modified, as defined by Survey of Consumer Expenditures, 1960-61 (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1960-61). This modification was considered desirable because of the frequency distribution of respondents in just four geographic regions.

From the results obtained in the data, the criterion to support the hypotheses is either a percent of the selected institutions which is less than that predicted; or a majority in each classification of selected institutions (Gebert, 1972).

Table 2. Modified geographic regions of quota questionnaires and those obtained.

Geographic Regions	Questionnaire Quota Enrollment 1968-69 ¹				Questionnaires Obtained Enrollment Fall 1971 ²			
	<500	500-1000	1000>	Totals	<500	500-1000	1000>	Totals
Northeast	4	2	1	7	2 ³	2	1	5
North Central	3	5	6	14	2	5	5 ³	12
South	6	6	3	15	3	8	3	14
West	6	6	2	14	6 ³	4	3	13
Totals	19	19	12	50	13 (10)	19	12 (11)	44 (40)

¹Enrollment defined by Home Economics in Institutions Granting Bachelor's or Higher Degrees 1968-69 (Gorman and Harper, 1970).

²Enrollment given by questionnaires obtained.

³One institution in the Northeast, one in the North Central and two institutions in the West region responded to the questionnaire but were not tabulated as participating institutions.

PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Responding institutions' home management residence and/or non-residence trends are presented and analyzed.

Institutions with Neither a Home Management Residence Nor a Non-Residence Course

Four institutions with neither a home management residence nor a home management non-residence were classified as non-participating institutions. Three had deleted the residence course within the past five years. An institution in the North Central Region deleted the residence course to offer a lecture course. The course dealt with management of family resources of human capital, property and community opportunities, as well as money, time, space and natural environment.

One of the two institutions in the Western Region deleted the residence course because it offered one specific cultural pattern rather than a multi-cultural approach. Field experiences are now offered which are carried out within the Cooperative Extension Service and other community experiences dealing with family living. The course is an option for home economics majors in secondary education. This course was not designated as a non-residence course and could not be tabulated with the institutions offering

Table 3. Characteristics¹ of the institutions, by residence, non-residence and combination.

Characteristics	Home Management Courses			
	Residence	Non-Residence	Combination	
			Residence	Non-Residence
INSTRUCTION STAFF CHARACTERISTICS				
Faculty Position	assistant professor or associate professor	instructor	assistant professor	
Length in Position	1-4 years or 5-9 years	1-4 years or 5-9 years	1-4 years	
Age	45-54 years	35-44 years	45-54 years	
Education	Ph.D.	Masters	Masters	
INSTRUCTION CHARACTERISTICS				
Type of Advisers	1 faculty member with 1 graduate student or 1 graduate student	1 faculty member	1 faculty member with 1 graduate student	1 faculty member
Qualifications for Advisers	experience in home management or graduate assistant	M.S.	experience in home management	experience in home management or M.S.
Adviser's Orientation Program	yes	no	yes	no

¹Characteristics are either the median characteristics or the most frequent in a category of characteristics.

Table 3. (Continued).

Characteristics	Home Management Courses			
	Residence	Non-Residence	Combination	
			Residence	Non-Residence
Problems in Finding Advisers	limited number of applicants	no problems	no problems	
Majors Required to Take Course	home economics education or family economics-home management	home economics education	home economics education	
Course Enrollment (term)	0-20 students ²	21-40 students	0-20 students ²	
Prerequisites	home management theory	home management theory	meal management	
Facilities	2-story house	laboratory	2-story house	student's home
Length of Course	1-6 weeks	13-18 weeks	1-6 weeks or 7-12 weeks	7-12 weeks
Priority Objectives	analyzing the management process; co-operation in group interaction; and, decision making	analyzing the management process; and, identifying goals of various socioeconomic families	analyzing the management process; co-operation in group interaction; and, decision-making	analyzing the management process; and, identifying goals of various socioeconomic families
Components of Course Grade	rating sheets	examinations	teacher evaluation	

²0 -indicates that the course was not offered for one term.

non-residence courses. The other institution in the Western Region deleted the residence course because it was no longer required for the states' teaching certificate. No other course was offered in its place.

The fourth institution, in the Northeast, has never had a home management residence nor a non-residence course. The staff felt that a home management residence was not essential for teaching of home management.

Institutions with Only a Home Management Residence Course

Characteristics of Instruction Staff

The median for faculty position was between an assistant professor and associate professor. The instruction staff member was in her faculty position between the categories of one to four years or five to nine years. Her median age was from 45-54 years. All of the instruction staff had a Master's Degree, the median date that the degree was received was during 1950-1959. Six of eleven instruction staff in institutions with only a home management residence course had Ph. D. Degrees awarded during a median date 1950-1959.

Faculty Staffing of Advisers

The median adviser for a home management residence course was two graduate students. Four institutions had

one graduate student. Others had one faculty member plus one graduate student. Furst's study revealed that 33 percent of 53 land grant administrators had graduate students as full time advisers while two thirds of advisers in this study were graduate students (Furst, 1966, pp. 126-128). The graduate student was single and thus available to live in the residence facility.

Qualifications for Adviser

The minimal qualification that the institutions with only a home management residence course stated was a median qualification of a person with a Bachelor of Science Degree. Five of the eleven institutions listed academic and/or experience in home management as a minimal qualification. One institution listed a Ph. D. degree as a minimal qualification; others listed a M.S. degree.

Orientation Program for Advisers

Seven of the eleven institutions with only a home management residence course had an orientation program for the adviser of the course. The adviser was usually instructed by the home management residence co-ordinator or the faculty of the institution. The remaining four institutions did not offer an orientation program for the adviser,

Problems in Finding Advisers

The median problem in obtaining advisers for institutions with only a home management residence course was marital status. Four of eleven institutions indicated that there was a limited number of applicants for the position as adviser. Others listed that adviser applicants had no academic experience in home management.

Home Economics Majors

Of nine groups of home economics undergraduate majors the most frequent major required to take the home management residence course was a home economics education major. The residence course was usually a certification requirement for a teaching certificate. Three institutions required general home economics majors to take the course. Others required foods, clothing, interior design housing, or dietitics majors to take the course. Eight of the institutions required the departmental home management/family economics majors to take the course. Geographically this reveals that colleges of home economics have undergraduate majors in home management/family economics in the southern region.

Enrollment

The median category of enrollment of students in Fall 1971-72 was from 0-20 students. Four of the eleven

institutions had 21-40 students enrolled in the course Fall 1971-72 while one institution had 61 and over students enrolled. In the Spring 1971 the median category of enrollment was from 21-40 students. Five of the eleven institutions had 0-20 students enrolled, one other had 61 and over students enrolled in Spring 1971. Consequently, some students probably combine the home management residence course and student teaching experience together in the Spring, which is indicated by increased enrollment.

Prerequisites

Of ten listings of prerequisites the most frequent was home management theory in eleven institutions with only a home management residence course. Seven of the eleven institutions listed nutrition, foods or meal management as prerequisites, others listed family relations, family finance, household equipment, social sciences, housing and clothing. Four of eleven listed senior standing as a prerequisite for home management residence.

Facilities

Of nine groups with different type facilities the most frequent was a two-story house in eleven institutions with only a home management residence course. Four institutions listed apartment(s). Others listed a one-story house, a community agency and community family as facilities.

The last two facilities were not described in the home management residence in the Review of Literature because they represent new concepts in the residence facility. Evidence indicates that administrators are remodeling the present facilities and are considering using different facilities (for example, the community family or community agency) for the home management residence course.

Length of Course

The median length of the home management residence course was between one to six weeks and seven to twelve weeks. Two institutions had the length of the home management residence course for a whole semester or quarter (13-18 weeks). Within the past year, one of the eleven institutions changed its residence course from a six week live-in experience to a three week live-in and a three week community experience course. Another institution had a combination residence course with a community experience program. Institutions are changing their facilities and length of the residence course in an attempt to strike a compromise between fulfilling the needs of the students and staying within their fiscal limitations.

Objectives

Of six groups of objectives three most frequent priority objectives in institutions with only a home

management residence course were: analyzing the management process (planning, controlling, evaluation); cooperating in group interaction; and, utilizing decision making. This indicates that the three priority objectives should have been fundamental objectives of the home management theory course that was required as a prerequisite for nine of eleven institutions.

Components of Course Grade

Of eight groups of components of course grade the most frequent component was the use of a rating sheet. Five institutions listed self evaluation, others listed group evaluation, teacher evaluation, and participation. Some institutions listed five components of the course grade, others listed only one component. The use of rating sheets will help the student discover if she gained the course objectives.

Institutions with Only a Home Management Non-Residence Course

Characteristics of Instruction Staff

The assistant professor was the median faculty position for institutions with only a home management non-residence course. Five of thirteen institutions had an instructor and four institutions had an associate professor as the instruction staff. The instruction staff was in

that position from a median of one to four years. The median age for the instruction staff was from 35-44 years. All of the instruction staff had received a Master's Degree and the median date that the degree was received was 1960-71. Twenty-three percent (three of thirteen who participated) of the instruction staff in institutions with only a home management non-residence course had a Ph. D. Degree, awarded during 1960-71.

Faculty Staffing of Advisers

One faculty member was the median adviser in institutions with only a home management non-residence course. Two of the thirteen institutions had one faculty member plus one graduate assistant as the adviser. Others listed one graduate assistant or two graduate assistants.

Qualifications for Adviser

A Master of Science degree was the median minimal qualification for institutions with only a home management non-residence course. Five of the thirteen institutions listed that the adviser should have academic and/or experience in home management. Five others listed a Bachelors of Science degree as a minimum requirement. A Master of Science degree is the minimum requirement for a faculty position in most institutions.

Orientation Program for Advisers

Eleven of the thirteen institutions with only a home management non-residence course did not have an orientation program for the adviser of the course. Orientation programs are not required of faculty members in most institutions teaching undergraduate courses, however, the faculty should have either academic and/or experience in her field of study.

Problems in Finding Advisers

Of four categories of problems in finding advisers the most frequent problem was that there was no problem. Only four of the institutions indicated difficulties in finding a qualified adviser for the course. Most institutions were desirous of having advisers or faculty members who had experience in home management.

Home Economics Majors

All thirteen institutions with only a home management non-residence course required home economics education majors to take the non-residence course. Five institutions required child development majors to take the course. Others listed home management/family economics, general home economics and clothing majors. The non-residence course was typically a certification requirement for a state's home economics teaching certificate.

Enrollment

The median category of enrollment of students in Fall 1971-72 and Spring 1971 was from 21-40 students. Three of the thirteen institutions had 0-20 students enrolled in Fall 1971-72. Three others had 41-60 students enrolled in the home management non-residence course. One of the institutions had deleted a former residence course for a non-residence course because the enrollment had increased steadily. Four of thirteen had 0-20 students enrolled in the Spring 1971. Two others listed 41-60 students enrolled and two others listed 61 and over students enrolled in the course.

Prerequisites

Of ten groups of prerequisites the most frequent was a home management theory course in institutions with only a home management non-residence course. Six institutions listed nutrition, foods, or meal management as a prerequisite for home management non-residence course. Others listed family finance, household equipment, and clothing as prerequisites. Evidence indicates that the purpose of the non-residence course is to maximize the managerial concepts learned from the home management theory course.

Facilities

It was difficult to tabulate the non-residence course facilities. Of nine groups of facilities, the most frequent facility was the utilization of a laboratory. The institutions had been using the former residence facility but referred to it as "laboratory". Four of thirteen institutions listed a community family as the facility. Others listed apartment(s), a one-story house, a two-story house and a community agency. Within the past ten years, a community family or community agency have been new concepts of facilities in the home management non-residence course (Simons, 1971, p. 123; Jensen, 1971, pp. 27-28; Hollen et al., 1971, p. 553).

Length of the Course

Within the three groups the most frequent length of the course was 13-18 weeks. Four institutions had a length of the course 7-12 weeks, three others were 1-6 weeks in length. The course was usually for a whole term, either a quarter or semester.

Objectives

Of six groups of objectives the most frequent in institutions with only a home management non-residence course were ranked in priority: analyzing the management process (planning, controlling, evaluation); and, identifying

values, goals, and standards in various socio-economic families. Five institutions listed cooperating in group interaction. Others listed utilizing decision making, recognizing the community resources, and gaining experiences in household equipment. Identifying values, goals, and standards in various socio-economic families was an objective in recent studies (Simons, 1971, p. 123; Jensen, 1971, pp. 27-28; Hollen et al., 1971, p. 553). Some residence courses have changed to non-residence courses because of changing educational objectives to attain competencies in managerial theory. One educational objective was of identifying values, goals, and standards in various socio-economic groups.

Components of Course Grade

Of eight groups of components of course grade the most frequent component was the use of examinations. Six of the thirteen institutions listed teacher evaluation, others listed papers, rating sheets, and case studies.

Institutions with Both a Home Management Residence and Non-Residence Course

Characteristics of Instruction Staff

The median faculty position in institutions with both a home management residence and non-residence course was an assistant professor. Five of sixteen institutions had an instructor as the instruction staff, others listed

associate professors or professors. The instruction staff was in her faculty position between the categories one to four and five to nine years. Five of sixteen instruction staff had been in her position ten or more years. All of the instruction staff had a Master's degree, the median date that the degree was awarded in either the category 1950-59 or 1960-71. Three of the sixteen institutions with both a home management residence and non-residence had instruction staff with a Ph. D. degree awarded 1950-59.

Faculty Staffing of Advisers

Of six groups of faculty staffing the most frequent in the residence course was one faculty member plus one graduate assistant and in the non-residence facility was one faculty member. In the home management residence, four institutions had one graduate assistant as the adviser. Others had one faculty member, two graduate assistants or one faculty member plus two graduate assistants. In the home management non-residence course, two of the sixteen institutions had one faculty member, plus one graduate assistant as the adviser of the course. Others listed two graduate assistants or one faculty member plus a graduate student.

Qualifications for Adviser

Twelve of the sixteen institutions with both a home management residence and non-residence course had a

minimal qualification for the position as adviser in the residence course as a Bachelor's degree. Ten institutions recommended a qualification as academic and/or experience in home management in the home management residence course. Eight of the sixteen institutions listed a Masters degree as a qualification. Eight others listed academic and/or experience in home management as a minimal qualification for the position as adviser in the non-residence course.

Orientation Program for Advisers

Ten of the sixteen institutions with a residence and a non-residence course had an orientation program for the residence course. Thirteen of the sixteen institutions did not have an orientation program for the adviser of the non-residence course. Generally, the orientation program was for the graduate student who had never taught home management.

Problems in Finding Advisers

Institutions with both a home management and non-residence course as a median felt that there were no problems in finding advisers for the courses. Four of the institutions listed limited number of applicants as a problem for the residence course. Four others listed marital status as a problem. Two of the sixteen institutions listed a limited number of applicants for the non-residence course as a problem.

Home Economics Majors

All of the institutions with both a home management residence and non-residence courses required home economics education majors to take the home management residence or non-residence course. The course must have been a certification requirement for a home economics teaching certificate. Seven institutions listed also, home management/family economics majors were required to take the residence or non-residence courses. Others listed general home economics, child development, housing, dietitics, and interior design majors.

Enrollment

The median category of enrollment was from 0-20 students in Fall 1971-72. Five institutions had 21-40 students enrollment, two others had 41-60 students enrolled in Fall 1971-72. The median for the Spring 1971 was in the category 21-40 students enrolled. Five institutions had 0-20 students enrolled. Others listed 41-60 and 61 and over students enrolled in Spring 1971.

Prerequisites

Of ten groups of prerequisites in priority the most frequent were: nutrition, foods, or meal management; home management theory; and, marital status. Four of the sixteen institutions listed household equipment. Others

listed family relations, family finance, social sciences, and senior standing as prerequisites.

Facilities

Of nine groups of facilities the most frequent facility in institutions with both a home management residence and non-residence courses was a two-story house for the residence course. Five institutions listed a one-story house and others listed apartment(s), mobile homes and a three-story house as the facilities for the residence course. Of nine groups of facilities, the facility most frequent was the student's home in the non-residence course. Eleven institutions separated single students into the residence course and married students into the non-residence course. Therefore, the married students frequently used their own home rather than the residence facility in learning managerial experiences.

Length of the Course

Eight of sixteen institutions with both a home management residence and non-residence course had the residence course 1-6 weeks in length and the other eight institutions from 7-12 weeks. Nine of the institutions had the length of the non-residence course from 7-12 weeks. Five institutions had the non-residence course from 13-18 weeks. Two others had the course from 1-6 weeks in length.

Generally courses were part of a semester or quarter in order to accommodate the increased enrollment.

Objectives

Of six groups of objectives, the most frequent objectives in a ranking of three for a residence course in institutions with both a residence and non-residence courses were: analyzing the management process (planning, controlling, evaluating); and, cooperating in group interaction, and utilizing decision making. In the non-residence courses of six groups of objectives in priority the most frequent were: analyzing the management process (planning, controlling, evaluating); and, identifying values, goals and standards in various socio-economic families. Institutions have been changing objectives because they felt that students should be able to apply managerial techniques to various socio-economic families.

Components of Course Grade

Teacher evaluation was the major component of the course grade in both the residence and non-residence course by institutions who have both. Other evaluative components for the residence course were self evaluation, group evaluation, examinations, rating sheets, papers, and case studies. Components for the non-residence course and residence course were the same except that non-residence

also used case studies. Some institutions listed seven components. Others listed only one component of the course grade.

Nine of the institutions with both a home management residence and a non-residence course have evaluated the two courses. In most cases, an answer of yes or no was given and it was difficult to determine what the institutions had evaluated. However, one institution that has designated two courses, the residence for singles, and non-residence for married students was developing a non-residence alternative-2 course for all students. The course would concentrate on field experiences in various socio-economic families.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The hypothesis was supported if the percent of the selected institutions was less than that predicted; or a majority of selected institutions was represented in each classification.

Institutions with Neither a Home Management Residence Nor a Non-Residence Course

It was hypothesized that less than five percent of the responding institutions had neither a home management residence nor a home management non-residence course. Data did not support this hypothesis because nine percent of the institutions (four of forty-four who responded), rather than five percent, did not have a residence nor a non-residence course.

It was hypothesized that these institutions did not have such courses because of being non essential to the attainment of the objectives of home management. Two of these four institutions stated that a home management residence or a non-residence experience would not advance the learning of home management. Thus, this hypothesis could not be supported.

Institutions with Only a Home Management Residence Course

It was hypothesized that less than 50 percent of the participating institutions had just a home management residence course. Twenty-eight percent (eleven of forty participating institutions) had a home management residence undergraduate course. Thus, this hypothesis could be supported.

It was hypothesized that high finances, increased enrollments, and limited availability of advisers will cause institutions to evaluate the feasibility of a home management residence facility. Three of the eleven institutions with only a home management residence course indicated evaluation of the practicality of a home management residence course. Since this was not a majority, the hypothesis could not be supported.

For example, one institution was considering deleting the home management residence course because of finances and space situations. This was indicated as an administrative problem by an earlier study (Johnston, 1966).

In institutions with only a home management residence course, it was hypothesized that they would delete the residence course for a non-residence course. Five of the eleven institutions with a home management residence indicated they might delete the residence course. However, they did not state that they were changing the course to a

home management non-residence course. The hypothesis was not supported because a majority of the institutions with only a home management residence course was not represented.

One institution was considering deleting the residence course for an alternative practicum experience. Another institution deleted the residence course as a family economics and home management major requirement, but retained the course for home economics education majors. While another institution seriously considered deleting the residence course, the course was retained because of certification requirements for secondary education teachers of home economics. Still another institution reviewed deleting the residence course but has retained it in the undergraduate curriculum.

Institutions with Only a Home Management Non-Residence Course

It was hypothesized that less than 25 percent of the institutions have just a home management non-residence course. The hypothesis is not supported because evidence indicates that 33 percent (13 of the 40 participating institutions) have a home management non-residence course.

It was hypothesized that institutions deleted the home management residence course for a non-residence course. Nine of thirteen institutions with only a home management

non-residence course deleted the residence course for a non-residence course. Thus, this hypothesis was supported.

Some of these institutions are still using residence facilities as laboratories for the non-residence courses. One institution indicated that the residence course was dropped because of the increased enrollment of home economics students.

Consistent with results of previous studies (Simons, 1971; Jensen, 1971), eleven of the thirteen institutions with only a home management non-residence course supported the hypothesis that a major objective of the course was an increased awareness of families in the various socio-economic groups.

It was hypothesized that some participating institutions are considering deleting the home management non-residence course for a residence course. Information was not obtained to support this hypothesis.

Institutions with Both a Home Management Residence and Non-Residence Course

It was hypothesized that less than 20 percent of the participating institutions have a home management residence and a non-residence course. The hypothesis was not supported because 40 percent (16 of the 40 participating institutions) had both a home management residence and non-residence course.

The availability of home management residence facilities, increasing number of married undergraduate students, and changing emphasis on course objectives were factors considered important in having both a home management residence and non-residence course. These factors were important in having both types of courses. However, the hypothesis could not be supported. Although eleven of sixteen institutions had both a residence and a non-residence course in the undergraduate curriculum because of married students, only three others indicated factors of availability of home management residence facilities and changing emphasis on course objectives.

Recommendations

Further Research

Home economics education is the predominant major required to take all types of home management residence courses in this study. Thus, studies could be undertaken to determine current and projected trends in the undergraduate home economics education curriculum. What particular educational objectives are home economics education students expected to achieve through the home management residence (laboratory) experience? Of particular relevance are the home economics vocational education certification requirement(s), and specifically what alternatives are

accepted to fulfill the directed laboratory experience in home management.

The most frequent prerequisite for all types of residence courses in this study was a home management theory course. Studies could be made to determine the educational objectives of the home management theory course and how such competencies are co-ordinated with the educational objectives of the home management residence course (Vickers, 1969).

A feasibility study could examine the non-residence community-oriented program. How is the program set up? What are the responsibilities and time commitment for the adviser staff? What are the responsibilities of the students, who interact with families in various socio-economic groups, in such a program? What are the responsibilities of the families and/or community agencies who work with the students. What is the accessibility or availability of community experiences--quantity, quality, and variety--to accommodate the typical non-residence community oriented course enrollment of 40 students?

Feasibility of a Home Management Residence Course

Institutions are concerned about the feasibility of a home management residence course as indicated by the current literature cited and the responses of the participating institutions.

Institutions question whether they should remodel the present residence facilities, develop a non-residence course, or develop both a residence and non-residence course.

Evidence indicates that more participating institutions in this study had both a residence and a non-residence course. Advantages for an institution to have both a home management residence and non-residence course are:

Students in the residence course still perceive the indicated priority objectives of overall managerial experiences, decision-making and group living; plus meal planning, marketing, meal preparation, house care, and personal relations.

The home management residence course could be shortened while the non-residence course could be lengthened to allow for increasing student enrollments.

A community family or agency could become the facility for the home management non-residence course wherein the students could perceive an indicated priority objective of identifying values, goals, and standards of families in various socio-economic groups.

Disadvantages of having both a home management residence and non-residence course are:

The non-residence course could become just an option for married students not to live in the residence facility.

Advisers are needed for both the residence and the non-residence courses.

The costs of the residence facilities will have to be maintained.

The financial budget may have to be increased if the residence facilities need to be remodeled.

An answer to the question concerning the feasibility of the home management residence course would be that the type of course should be flexible to meet changing educational objectives; administrative budgets; and, needs of both the students and the faculty staff.

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

<u> </u> Name of Institution	<u> </u> Master's	<u> </u> Date	<u> </u> Major Area of Concentration
<u> </u> Name of Institution	<u> </u> Ph. D.	<u> </u> Date	<u> </u> Major Area of Concentration
<u> </u> Name of Institution	<u> </u> Ed. D.	<u> </u> Date	<u> </u> Major Area of Concentration
<u> </u> Name of Institution	<u> </u> (Please Specify Other Degree)	<u> </u> Date	<u> </u> Major Area of Concentration

STUDENT ENROLLMENT

3. How many home economics majors are (were) enrolled during:

Fall Term of 1971-2	Spring Term of 1971
<u> </u> undergraduates	<u> </u> undergraduates
<u> </u> graduates	<u> </u> graduates

4. How many of these home economics students are Family Economics-Home Management (or reasonable facsimile) option majors:

Fall Term of 1971-2	Spring Term of 1971
<u> </u> undergraduates	<u> </u> undergraduates
<u> </u> graduates	<u> </u> graduates

HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE COURSE

6. If you do NOT have a home management residence course, have you considered establishing one? Please explain why?
7. If you DO have a home management residence course
- A. Please list three fundamental objectives of the residence course which you consider to be the most important
- 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
- B. What are the major components of your course grade?
- C. Which majors are required to take the course?
- Is the course open to non-majors?
- D. What is the length (calendar period) of the course?
- E. What are the course prerequisites?
- F. How many students are (were) enrolled in the course during:
- ___ Fall Term of 1971-2
- ___ Summer Term of 1971
- ___ Spring Term of 1971
- G. How are the students scheduled for residence in the facility(ies)?

HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE COURSE

- H. Is the residence facility: (indicate type & number of each)
- mobile home two-story house
 apartment other: please specify
 one-story house
- I. Could you give an estimate of the administrative home management residence budget for fiscal year 1971-2?
- J. What is the student fee assessment for the residence course?
- Are there any rebates or refunds from student housing units?
- K. Who serves as the adviser for the residence course?
- What are minimal qualifications for the position as the adviser?
- What, if any, problems are involved with obtaining qualified advisers?
- Is there an orientation program for the adviser of the residence course?
- L. Within the past five years, has there been a departmental or administrative decision to delete the residence course from your curriculum? What action was taken?

HOME MANAGEMENT NONRESIDENCE COURSE

8. If you do NOT have a home management nonresidence course, have you considered establishing one? Please explain why?
9. If you DO have a home management nonresidence course
- A. Please list three fundamental objectives of the nonresidence course which you consider to be the most important
- 1.
 - 2.
 - 3.
- B. What are the major components of your course grade?
- C. Which majors are required to take the course?
- Is the course open to non-majors?
- D. What is the length (calendar period) of the course?
- E. What are the course prerequisites?
- F. How many students are (were) enrolled in the course during:
- ___ Fall Term of 1971-2
- ___ Summer Term of 1971
- ___ Spring Term of 1971
- G. Is the nonresidence facility a/an: (indicate type and numbers of each)
- () laboratory
- () student's house
- () other: please specify

HOME MANAGEMENT NONRESIDENCE COURSE

- H. Could you give an estimate of the administrative home management nonresidence budget for fiscal year 1971-2?
- I. What is the student fee assessment for the non-residence course?
- J. Who serves as the adviser for the nonresidence course?

What are the minimal qualifications for the position as the adviser?

What, if any, problems are involved with obtaining qualified advisers?

Is there an orientation program for the adviser of the nonresidence course?

- K. Within the past five years, has there been a departmental or administrative decision to delete the nonresidence course from your curriculum? What action was taken?

IF YOUR INSTITUTION HAS BOTH A HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE COURSE AND A NONRESIDENCE COURSE:

- 10. Have you evaluated the attainment of the course objectives of the residence students with the nonresidence students?
Explain.

WOULD YOU PLEASE SEND ME THE INFORMATION THAT YOU SEND PROSPECTIVE STUDENTS WHO ARE INTERESTED IN YOUR FAMILY ECONOMICS-HOME MANAGEMENT DEGREE PROGRAMS?

APPENDIX B

COVER LETTER TO SELECTED INSTITUTIONS

School of Home Economics
Division of Family Economics-
Home Management
Tucson, Arizona 85721
November 13, 1971

There have been numerous changes in the home management residence program. Some institutions are changing their curriculums in home management. We are very concerned about the trends in the home management undergraduate curriculum. At The University of Arizona, we are conducting a study on the feasibility of home management residence courses at the undergraduate level.

In order to get an accurate interpretation of the trends in the home management residence curriculums, we are asking your cooperation to complete the enclosed questionnaire as part of our study. Would you please have your home management resident instruction staff member fill out this questionnaire? We would appreciate your returning the questionnaire in the enclosed self-addressed envelope before December 13, 1971. Results of the study will be made available to all participating institutions who are interested in reviewing them.

Thank you for agreeing to serve in the study.

Sincerely,

Dr. Janet Lee Vaughn, Chairman
Division of Family Economics-
Home Management

Susan Gail Cameron
Graduate Student

c.c./sgc
enclosure

APPENDIX C

SECOND COVER LETTER TO
NON-RESPONDENT INSTITUTIONS

December 1, 1971

RE: Arizona Express for the Questionnaire on the Home
Management Courses

We know that you're more than busy with activities scheduled for the holiday vacation. But won't you consider giving us an hour (or less) of your time to complete the questionnaire which was sent to you on 13 November?

A preliminary review of the questionnaires which have been returned indicate some most interesting developments in the residence and nonresidence courses . . . which may be of interest to you.

If the 13 December deadline has discouraged you from responding, please reconsider! We're flexible and would be willing to vary this target date . . . that is postmarked by 18 December!

Sincerely,

Susan Gail Cameron
Graduate Student

Dr. Janet Lee Vaughn, Chairman
Division of Family Economics-
Home Management

APPENDIX D

TABULATIONS-INSTITUTIONS WITH NEITHER A
HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE NOR A NON-RESIDENCE COURSE

Table 4. Institutions with neither a home management residence nor non-residence by geographic regions and undergraduate enrollment.

Geographic Regions	Fall 1971-72 Undergraduate Enrollment			Number (Percent) ²
	<500	500-1000	1000>	
<u>NORTHEAST</u>				1 (2)
Syracuse University	x			
<u>NORTH CENTRAL</u>				1 (2)
Iowa State University ¹			x	
<u>SOUTH</u>				0
<u>WEST</u>				2 (5)
University of Hawaii ¹	x			
San Jose State University	x			
Totals	3	0	1	4 (9)

¹Land Grant Universities and State Colleges.

²Percent is based on 100 = 44 (responding institutions).

APPENDIX E

TABULATIONS-INSTITUTIONS WITH ONLY A
HOME MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE COURSE

Table 5. Institutions with home management residence by geographic regions and undergraduate enrollment.

Geographic Regions	Fall 1971-72 Undergraduate Enrollment			Number (Percent) ²
	<500	500- 1000	1000>	
<u>NORTHEAST</u>				2 (5)
Cornell ¹			x	
Framingham State College	x			
<u>NORTH CENTRAL</u>				1 (3)
Miami University (Ohio)	x			
<u>SOUTH</u>				7 (18)
Auburn University ¹		x		
University of Georgia ¹		x		
Oklahoma State University ¹			x	
University of Tennessee ¹		x		
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University ¹		x		
University of Alabama		x		
Florida State University		x		
<u>WEST</u>				1 (3)
University of Arizona ¹		x		
TOTALS	2	7	2	11 (28)

¹Land Grant Universities and State Colleges.

²Percent is based on 100=40 (participating institutions) unless stated again, all percents will be on this basis.

Table 6. Characteristics of instruction staff in institutions with home management residence.

Characteristics	Number	Percent
<u>POSITION</u>		
Instructor	3	8
Assistant Professor	2	5
Associate Professor	2	5
Professor	4	10
<u>LENGTH IN THE POSITION</u>		
Less than 1 year	2	5
1-4 years	3	8
5-9 years	3	8
10 or more years	3	8
<u>AGE</u>		
20-24 years	0	0
25-29 years	2	5
30-34 years	1	3
35-44 years	1	3
45-54 years	5	13
55 or more years	2	5
<u>EDUCATION</u>		
M.S. or M. Ed.	11	28
Ph. D.	6	15

Table 7. Years Master's and Ph. D. degrees awarded to instructional staff in institutions with a home management residence.

Years	Master's	Ph. D.
Before 1939	1	0
1940-49	3	1
1950-59	3	2
1960-71	4	3
Totals	11	6

Table 8. Institutions that awarded Ph. D. degrees to instructional staff in institutions with home management residence.

Institutions	Number
Michigan	2
Purdue	3
Ohio	1
Iowa	0
Cornell	0
Totals	6

Table 9. Faculty staffing of advisers in institutions with a home management residence course.

Advisers	Number
One Faculty Member	0
Two Faculty Members	0
One Graduate Assistant	4
Two Graduate Assistants	3
One Faculty Member, Plus One Graduate Assistant	4
One Faculty Member, Plus Two Graduate Assistants	0
Total	11

Table 10. Minimal qualifications for the position as adviser in institutions with a home management residence course.

Qualifications	Number
Ph. D.	1
M.S. or M. Ed.	2
B.S.	8
Academic and/or experience in home management	5
Marital Status	1

Table 11. Adviser's orientation programs in institutions with a home management residence course.

Orientation Program	Number
Yes	7
No	4
Total	11

Table 12. Problems involved with obtaining qualified advisers in institutions with a home management residence course.

Problems	Number
Limited number of applicants	4
Marital status	2
Academic experience in home management	3
No problems	2
Total	11

Table 13. Institutions requiring home economics majors to take a home management residence course.

Majors	Number
Home Economics Education	9
Child Development	0
Home Management/Family Economics	8
Dietitics	1
General Home Economics	3
Housing	1
Interior Design	1
Clothing	1
Foods	1
Total	25

Table 14. Home management residence enrollment.

Enrollment of Students	Fall 1971-72	Spring 1971
0-20 students	6	5
21-40 students	4	5
41-60 students	0	0
61 and over	1	1
Totals	11	11

Table 15. Prerequisites for home management residence course in institutions.

Prerequisites	Number of Institutions	Percent
<u>COURSES</u>		
Home Management Theory	9	23
Nutrition, Foods, or Meal Management	7	18
Family Relations	2	5
Family Finance	1	3
Household Equipment	2	5
Social Sciences	2	5
Housing	2	5
Clothing	2	2
<u>OTHER</u>		
Marital Status	0	0
Senior Standing	4	10

Table 16. Type of different facilities in institutions with a home management residence course.

Facilities	Number
Mobile Home	0
Apartment(s)	4
One-story House	3
Two-story House	6
Three-story House	0
Student's Home	0
Laboratory	0
Community Agency	1
Community Family	2
Total	16

Table 17. Length of home management residence undergraduate course.

Length	Number
1-6 weeks	5
7-12 weeks	4
13-18 weeks	2
Total	11

Table 18. Priority objectives¹ of the home management residence course.

Objectives	Number
Identifying values, goals, and standards in various socio-economic families	3
Utilizing decision making	8
Recognizing the community resources	0
Analyzing the management process (planning, controlling, evaluating)	11
Cooperating in group interaction	9
Gaining experience in household equipment	2
Total	33

¹Institutions were asked to list three priority objectives for residence course.

Table 19. Major components¹ of course grade in institutions with a home management residence course.

Components	Number
Self Evaluation	5
Group Evaluation	4
Teacher Evaluation	4
Examinations	0
Rating Sheets	6
Papers	0
Case Studies	0
Participation	4

¹Each indicated component from the respondents were summed in the above tabulations.

APPENDIX F

TABULATIONS-INSTITUTIONS WITH ONLY A
HOME MANAGEMENT NON-RESIDENCE COURSE

Table 20. Institutions with home management non-residence by geographic regions and undergraduate enrollment.

Geographic Regions	Fall 1971-72 Undergraduate Enrollment			Number (Percent)
	<500	500- 1000	1000>	
<u>NORTHEAST</u>				1 (3)
University of Connecticut ¹		x		
<u>NORTH CENTRAL</u>				4 (10)
Kansas State University ¹		x		
South Dakota State University ¹		x		
Northern Illinois University		x		
Stout State University			x	
<u>SOUTH</u>				4 (10)
Winthrop College	x			
Marshall University	x			
Texas Technological University			x	
University of Texas		x		
<u>WEST</u>				4 (10)
New Mexico State University ¹	x			
Washington State University ¹			x	

¹Land Grant Universities and State Colleges.

Table 20. (Continued)

Geographic Regions	Fall 1971-72 Undergraduate Enrollment			Number (Percent)
	< 500	500- 1000	1000 >	
<u>WEST</u> (Continued)				
Arizona State University		x		
Pacific Union College	x			
Totals	4	6	3	13 (33)

Table 21. Characteristics of instruction staff in institutions with home management non-residence.

Characteristics	Number	Percent
<u>POSITION</u>		
Instructor	5	13
Assistant Professor	4	10
Associate Professor	4	10
Professor	0	0
<u>LENGTH IN THE POSITION</u>		
Less than 1 year	3	8
1-4 years	4	10
5-9 years	4	10
10 or more years	2	5
<u>AGE</u>		
20-24 years	2	5
25-29 years	1	3
30-34 years	3	8
35-44 years	5	13
45-54 years	2	5
55 or more years	0	0
<u>EDUCATION</u>		
M.S. or M. Ed.	13	33
Ph. D.	3	8

Table 22. Years Master's and Ph. D. degrees awarded to instructional staff in institutions with a home management non-residence.

Years	Master's	Ph. D.
Before 1939	0	0
1940-49	0	0
1950-59	3	0
1960-71	10	3
Totals	13	3

Table 23. Institutions that awarded Ph. D. degrees to instructional staff in institutions with home management non-residence.

Institutions	Number
Michigan	1
Purdue	0
Ohio	2
Iowa	0
Cornell	0

Table 24. Faculty staffing of advisers in institutions¹ with a home management non-residence course.

Advisers	Number
One Faculty Member	8
Two Faculty Members	1
One Graduate Assistant	0
Two Graduate Assistants	1
One Faculty Member, Plus One Graduate Assistant	2
One Faculty Member, Plus Two Graduate Assistants	0
Total	12

¹One institutions did not answer this question.

Table 25. Minimal qualifications for the position as adviser in institutions¹ with a home management non-residence course.

Qualifications	Number
Ph. D.	0
M.S. or M. Ed.	10
B.S.	3
Academic and/or experience in home management	5
Marital Status	0

¹One institution did not answer this question.

Table 26. Adviser's orientation programs¹ in institutions with a home management non-residence course.

Orientation Program	Number
Yes	1
No	11
Total	12

¹One institution did not answer this question.

Table 27. Problems involved with obtaining qualified advisers in institutions¹ with a home management non-residence course.

Problems	Number
Limited number of applicants	4
Marital status	0
Academic experience in home management	0
No problems	8
Total	12

¹One institution did not answer this question.

Table 28. Institutions requiring home economics majors to take a home management non-residence course.

Majors	Number
Home Economics Education	13
Child Development	5
Home Management/Family Economics	2
Dietitics	0
General Home Economics	2
Housing	0
Interior Design	0
Clothing	2
Foods	0
Total	24

Table 29. Home management non-residence enrollment.

Enrollment of Students	Fall 1971-72	Spring 1971
0-20 students	3	4
21-40 students	7	5
41-60 students	3	2
61 and over	0	2
Totals	13	13

Table 30. Prerequisites for home management non-residence course in institutions.

Prerequisites	Number of Institutions	Percent
<u>COURSES</u>		
Home Management Theory	10	25
Nutrition, Foods, or Meal Management	6	15
Family Relations	0	0
Family Finance	3	8
Household Equipment	3	8
Social Sciences	0	0
Housing	0	0
Clothing	1	3
<u>OTHER</u>		
Marital Status	0	0
Senior Standing	4	10

Table 31. Type of different facilities in institutions with a home management non-residence course.

Facilities	Number
Mobile Home	0
Apartment(s)	1
One-story House	2
Two-story House	1
Three-story House	0
Student's Home	0
Laboratory	7
Community Agency	1
Community Family	4
Total	16

Table 32. Length of home management non-residence undergraduate course.

Length	Number
1-6 weeks	3
7-12 weeks	4
13-18 weeks	6
Total	13

Table 33. Priority objectives¹ of the home management non-residence course.

Objectives	Number
Identifying values, goals, and standards in various socio-economic families	11
Utilizing decision making	4
Recognizing the community resources	4
Analyzing the management process (planning, controlling, evaluating)	13
Cooperating in group interaction	5
Gaining experience in household equipment	2
Total	39

¹Institutions were asked to list three priority objectives for non-residence course.

Table 34. Major components¹ of course grade in institutions with a home management non-residence course.

Components	Number
Self Evaluation	1
Group Evaluation	0
Teacher Evaluation	6
Examinations	7
Rating Sheets	2
Papers	5
Case Studies	2
Participation	1

¹Each indicated component from the respondents were summed in the above tabulations.

APPENDIX G

TABULATIONS-INSTITUTIONS WITH BOTH HOME
MANAGEMENT RESIDENCE AND NON-RESIDENCE COURSE

Table 35. Institutions with both home management residence and non-residence by geographic regions and undergraduate enrollment.

Geographic Regions	Fall 1971-72 Undergraduate Enrollment			Number (Percent)
	<500	500- 1000	1000>	
<u>NORTHEAST</u>				1 (3)
University of Rhode Island ¹		x		
<u>NORTH CENTRAL</u>				6 (15)
Michigan State University ¹			x	
University of Missouri ^{1,2}		x		
University of Nebraska ¹			x	
Ohio State University ¹		x		
Purdue ¹			x	
Ball State	x			
<u>SOUTH</u>				3 (8)
University of Maryland ¹			x	
University of Kentucky ²	x			
University of North Carolina		x		
<u>WEST</u>				6 (15)
Colorado State University ¹			x	
Oregon State University ¹		x		

¹Land Grant Universities and State Colleges.

²Residence and non-residence are two divisions of one course.

Table 35. (Continued)

Geographic Regions	Fall 1971-72 Undergraduate Enrollment			Number (Percent)
	<500	500- 1000	1000>	
<u>WEST</u> (Continued)				
Northern Arizona University ²	x			
Brigham Young University			x	
University of Utah	x			
University of Washington		x		
Totals	4	6	6	16 (40)

Table 36. Characteristics of instruction staff in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence.

Characteristics	Number	Percent
<u>POSITION¹</u>		
Instructor	5	13
Assistant Professor	7	18
Associate Professor	2	5
Professor	1	3
<u>LENGTH IN THE POSITION</u>		
Less than 1 year	2	5
1-4 years	6	15
5-9 years	3	8
10 or more years	5	13
<u>AGE</u>		
20-24 years	0	0
25-29 years	4	10
30-34 years	2	5
35-44 years	3	8
45-54 years	6	15
55 or more years	1	3

¹One institution did not list position of instruction staff.

Table 36. (Continued)

Characteristics	Number	Percent
<u>EDUCATION</u>		
M.S. or M. Ed.	16	40
Ph. D.	3	8

Table 37. Years Master's and Ph. D. degrees awarded to instructional staff in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence.

Years	Master's	Ph. D.
Before 1939	0	0
1940-49	3	0
1950-59	5	2
1960-71	8	1
Totals	16	3

Table 38. Institutions that awarded Ph. D. degrees to instructional staff in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence.

Institutions	Number
Michigan	1
Purdue	0
Ohio	0
Iowa	1
Cornell	1

Table 39. Faculty staffing of advisers in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses.

Advisers	Number		Totals
	Residence	Non-Residence	
One Faculty Member	3	12	15
Two Faculty Members	0	0	0
One Graduate Assistant	4	0	4
Two Graduate Assistants	3	1	4
One Faculty Member, Plus One Graduate Assistant	5	2	7
One Faculty Member, Plus Two Graduate Assistants	1	1	2
Totals	16	16	32

Table 40. Minimal qualifications for the position as adviser in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses.

Qualifications	Number	
	Residence	Non-Residence
Ph. D.	0	0
M.S. or M. Ed.	4	8
B.S.	12	3
Academic and/or experience in home management	10	8
Marital Status	0	0

Table 41. Adviser's orientation programs in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses.

Orientation Program	Number		Totals
	Residence	Non-Residence	
Yes	10	3	13
No	6	13	19
Totals	16	16	32

Table 42. Problems involved with obtaining qualified advisers in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses.

Problems	Number		Totals
	Residence	Non-Residence	
Limited number of applicants	4	2	6
Marital status	4	0	4
Academic experience in home management	0	0	0
No problems	8	14	22
Totals	16	16	32

Table 43. Institutions requiring home economics majors to take home management residence or non-residence courses.

Majors	Number
Home Economics Education	16
Child Development	2
Home Management/Family Economics	7
Dietitics	1
General Home Economics	6
Housing	2
Interior Design	1
Clothing	0
Foods	0
Total	35

Table 44. Home management residence and non-residence combined enrollment.

Enrollment of Students	Fall 1971-72	Spring 1971
0-20 students	9	5
21-40 students	5	7
41-60 students	2	3
61 and over	0	1
Totals	16	16

Table 45. Prerequisites for home management residence and non-residence courses in institutions that have both.

Prerequisites	Number of Institutions	Percent
<u>COURSES</u>		
Home Management Theory	12	30
Nutrition, Foods or Meal Management	16	40
Family Relations	2	5
Family Finance	2	5
Household Equipment	4	10
Social Sciences	2	5
Housing	0	0
Clothing	0	0
<u>OTHER</u>		
Marital Status	11	28
Senior Standing	2	5

Table 46. Type of different facilities in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses.

Facilities	Number		Totals
	Residence	Non-Residence	
Mobile Home	1	1	2
Apartment(s)	4	1	5
One-story House	5	2	7
Two-story House	10	1	11
Three-story House	1	0	1
Student's Home	0	11	11
Laboratory	0	6	6
Community Agency	0	0	0
Community Family	0	2	2
Totals	21	24	45

Table 47. Length of home management residence and non-residence undergraduate courses in institutions that have both.

Length	Number		Totals
	Residence	Non-Residence	
1-6 weeks	8	2	10
7-12 weeks	8	9	17
13-18 weeks	0	5	5
Totals	16	16	32

Table 48. Priority objectives¹ of the home management residence and non-residence courses in institutions that have both.

Objectives	Number		Totals
	Residence	Non-Residence	
Identifying values, goals, and standards in various socio-economic families	4	11	15
Utilizing decision making	11	8	19
Recognizing the community resources	4	3	7
Analyzing the management process (planning, controlling, evaluating)	15	16	31
Cooperating in group interaction	11	7	18
Gaining experience in household equipment	3	3	6
Totals	48	48	96

¹Institutions were asked to list three priority objectives for residence and non-residence courses.

Table 49. Major components¹ of course grade in institutions with both home management residence and non-residence courses.

Components	Number		Totals
	Residence	Non-Residence	
Self Evaluation	5	2	7
Group Evaluation	4	2	6
Teacher Evaluation	9	8	17
Examinations	3	4	7
Rating Sheets	5	1	6
Papers	4	5	9
Case Studies	0	3	3
Participation	4	3	7

¹Each indicated component from the respondents were summed in the above tabulations.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Allgood, Mary Brown. "Home Management Residence Gets a New Look", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 57, No. 8, 1965, pp. 658-659.
- American Home Economics Association. Proceedings Conference on Teaching Home Management, Lafayette, Indiana, 1962.
- Bell, Martha T. "The Use of a College Residence in Teaching Household Management", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1917, pp. 149-152.
- Bevier, Isabell. "The Development of Home Economics", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 9, No. 1, 1917, pp. 1-7.
- Bishop, Myra L. "Home Management House Advisers", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 48, No. 4, 1965, pp. 245-246.
- Budolfson, Marie. "We Select Graduate Students as Residence Advisers for the House", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 48, No. 4, 1956, p. 248.
- Cameron, Elizabeth. "Recommendations for Planning a Home Management House", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 48, No. 4, 1940, pp. 301-302.
- Corey, Stephen M. Action Research to Improvise School Practices. New York: Teachers College, 1953.
- Craig, Karen E. A. "Home Management in College-When?", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 63, No. 2, 1971, pp. 121-122.
- Crandall, Elizabeth W. "New Explorations in Home Management", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 52, No. 8, 1960, pp. 637-642.
- Cutler, Virginia F. "Home Living Experience at the University of Utah", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 46, No. 9, 1954, pp. 645-648.

- Davis, Jean, "Nonresidence Home Management for Married Students", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 52, No. 1, 1960, pp. 20-22.
- Dopson, Mary Elizabeth. "Social and Economic Trends as They Affect the Home Management Course". Unpublished Master's Thesis, Auburn University, 1962.
- Elliott, Eileen E. "An Analysis of Home Management Education", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 40, No. 3, 1948, pp. 127-128.
- Fox, David J. The Research Process in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Furst, Delaine Curtis. "Home Management Residence in Land Grant Institutions to Ascertain Trends 1965". Unpublished Master's Thesis, West Virginia University, 1966.
- Gebert, James. Private interview. Assistant Statistician in the Agricultural Experiment Station, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona, February, 1972.
- Gorman, Jeanette C. and Laura Jane Harper. Home Economics in Institutions Granting Bachelor's or Higher Degrees 1968-69. Washington D.C., American Home Economics Association, 1970.
- Gross, Irma H. "Historical Development and Trends of Research in Home Management", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 51, No. 4, 1959, pp. 260-263.
- Gross, Irma H. and Elizabeth Walbert Crandall. Management for Modern Families. 2nd Ed. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
- Gross, Irma H. and Lucile W. Reynolds. "The Functions of the Home Management House", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 23, No. 1, 1931, pp. 19-24.
- Halbert, Blanche. "Practice Houses and Home Economics Cottages", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 17, December, 1925, pp. 700-725.
- Hallaway, Joann. "Home Management Residence Uses Apartment", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 52, No. 4, 1960, pp. 275-277.

- Hart, Jean I. "Do Graduates Know?" Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 37, No. 10, 1945, pp. 639-640.
- Henderson, Frances S. and L. Jeanne Riebel. "We Enjoy Life as Home Management House Advisers", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 48, No. 4, 1956, pp. 246-247.
- Hollen, Evelyn, Berneita 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.
- Jensen, Shari. "New Approach to Home Management", What's New in Home Economics? Vol. 35, No. 4, 1971, pp. 27-28.
- Johnson, A. Grace. "Organization and Administration of Household Management Work", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 14, November, 1922, p. 562.
- Johnston, Betty Jane. "Financial Arrangement for Home Management Residences". Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 63, No. 2, 1966, pp. 50-51.
- Knoll, Marjorie M. "Home Management Theory and Practice: Integration or Interaction". Speech given at the 61st annual meeting of the American Home Economics Association, Cleveland, Ohio, June 24, 1970.
- Knoll, Marjorie M. and Alice J. Davey. "A Two-in-One Course for Home Management Residence", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 52, No. 9, 1960, pp. 754-755.
- Larery, Dorothy A. "Facilities at the University of Nebraska Feature Residence and Nonresidence Laboratories", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 60, No. 5, 1968, pp. 368-371.
- Laurita, Sister Mary, Helen L. Ewing and Erma H. Gross. "Home Management House Problems", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 32, No. 5, 1940, pp. 302-304.
- Lee, Bok Cha Yoon. "College Students' Attainment of Selected Home Management Concepts". Unpublished Ph. D. Dissertation, the Pennsylvania State University, 1967.

- McGrath, G. D., James J. Jelnick and Raymond E. Wochner. Educational Research Methods. New York: The Ronald Press Company, 1963.
- Nichols, Addreen, Catherine R. Mumaw, Maryann Paynter, Martha A. Plonk and Dorothy Z. Price. "Family Management", Journal of Marriage and the Family. Vol. 33, No. 1, 1971, pp. 112-117.
- Nickell, Paulena. "Learning in a Home Management House", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 32, No. 5, 1940, pp. 305-306.
- Ostle, Bernard. Statistics in Research. 2nd Ed. Ames, Iowa: The Iowa State University Press, 1963.
- Paolucci, Beatrice and Esther Everett. "Home Management Residence Looks Ahead to the Working Wife", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 50. No. 5, 1958, pp. 331-334.
- "Presenting a Symposium on Facilities for Home Management Residence", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 60, No. 5, 1968, pp. 359-371.
- Read, Katherine H. "The Role of the Residence Adviser", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 51, No. 4, 1959, pp. 267-270.
- Simons, Barbara. "Evaluation of a Change of Approach to Home Management Experience", Journal of Home Economics, Vol. 63, No. 2, 1971, pp. 123-125.
- Stephan, Frederick F. and Philip J. McCarthy. Sampling Opinions. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1963.
- United States Bureau of Census. U. S. Census of Agriculture. 1959. Vol. 1, Counties, Parts 1-54. Washington D.C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961.
- United States Department of Labor. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Survey of Consumer Expenditures, 1960-61.
- Vickers, Carole Allen. "Level of Selected Home Management Concepts Attained in Residence and Non-Residence Courses". Ph. D. Dissertation, Ohio State University, 1969.

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

Wolf, Ilse, and Estelle Wallace, Mildred Medlock, Lola
Drew and Billie Wolfe. "Home Management Residence
Facilities at Texas Technological College Utilize
Mobile Homes", Journal of Home Economics, Vol.
60, No. 5, 1968, pp. 360-363.

