This morning Dr. Moore pointed out that one of our first tasks is the broadening of competence and outlook of faculties.

Appropriate experiences, materials and references for academic advisers need to be provided; effective use should be made of visiting professors and scholars from overseas, and the background of faculty members who travel spasmodically or on a continuous assignment should be utilized.

Objectives and content of programs may refer to the ultimate, the specific, the norms. They require the inclusion of cross-cultural materials and global concepts; e.g., recognition of the many ways by which people can be well fed.

To encourage intercultural understanding, experiences must be provided to influence attitudinal learning as well as rational learning.

Curricula should include the economic principles which help us to understand the focus of change.

Research in other cultures and socio-economic groups within these cultures may well be encouraged. There is need for continuing professional contacts with people in other cultures.

A world community of professional colleagues may be an outcome of intercultural competence.

Perceiving Our Objectives

by Amy J. Knorr

If the international elements of home economics programs in the United States is to be of vital dimension rather than merely a patchwork of activities added to present programs, we need to have some clear understanding about the objectives of our field. Both we and our students need to develop a sense of the mission of our field.

Let me try to set forth my line of thinking. The ultimate objectives of home economics is to contribute to the full human development of individuals through sound home and family life. This is an objective that is as appropriate for Nigeria and for Latin America as for the United States. It was as appropriate at the beginning of our profession as it is now and as it will be in 2000.

At least four of our speakers in this conference have made reference to the responsibility of home economics for influencing the nature and quality of the environment to foster conditions in society and in the home and family which will permit the full development of human beings. At any rate, this is the meaning I attach to these phrases: "using human resources for human welfare," and "evaluating the degree of humanism of the field."
This ultimate objective does not change in time and in space what does differ from time to time and from place to place is our knowledge of what full human development is and our knowledge of what will foster it in a given set of societal conditions. You will recall Dr. Butts' statement concerning the need for research (building knowledge) about the economic growth of a country, its social conditions, its political trends and the relation of these to personality formation. It is from knowledge such as this that the specific objectives of home economics programs are to be derived.

I believe that we and our students need to understand the logical and scientific relationships between the ultimate purpose of the field and the specific purposes of our educational programs as they are developed in a particular time and place. Otherwise we run the risk of seeing our specific objectives as ends in themselves and we are not in a position, to quote Dr. Moore, "to teach, prepare materials, and design research problems that will in fact train American or foreign students to perform in such a way as to reach in the selected environment the goals of home economics education." 2

No doubt you can think of many examples of programs or plans for programs in which the specific objectives did not appear to have a valid relationship to the ultimate purpose of home economics. Let me give just one. As I worked with a young woman from Viet Nam studying at the undergraduate level in food and nutrition in a class in curriculum development, I thought all was going well -- that she was understanding principles of curriculum development -- until she turned in a first draft of curriculum material for a proposed college class in food and nutrition for Viet Nam. She had reproduced in essence the study program that she had experienced in food and nutrition at the university in which she was studying. This was home economics as she had experienced it and believed it to be. She was -- as our profession has been from time to time -- "hung up on the level of specific objectives," and she had missed the whole point of the larger mission of the field.

I believe that both foreign students and students from the United States need to develop understanding of why we -- in our culture -- choose to deal with certain specific objectives in home economics and what we see to be the relation of them to our ultimate objective.

---

2 See chapter by Forrest G. Moore, pages 167-178 of this report.