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INTRODUCTION

Historically home economists have viewed the field of home economics as a personal service profession (Gentzler, 1986). It is well known that the major goal of home economics is to improve the quality of life. In order to cope with the future, people will need skills that allow them to adapt to a changing world (Hargrove, 1988). Given this need, Bailey and Firebaugh (1986) stated that home economics is a future-oriented profession with a major focus on family well-being, growth and development of family members, and the reciprocal relationships between families and their environment. Home economics programs have been developed that respond to changing societal needs. Although there seems to be general support for vocational home economics programs, as found by Burnett, Harrison, and Miller (1986), the general trend continues to be one of declining enrollment in secondary programs.

The image of home economics is not always perceived accurately by the general public. Johnson, Holcombe, Kean, Woodward, Tweeten and Hafer (1987) found the image of home economics as "cooking and sewing" was very much present in their sample. In a study by Robinson (1987) professional school personnel also perceived home economics as teaching cooking skills. In Robinson's (1987) study, home economics also was perceived to be a woman's field. The image problem in home economics has been elusive for many years. Burnett et al. (1986) believed there was a need to improve communicative linkages between teachers and administrators so they would
have a more accurate view of home economics. The need to develop home economics marketing strategies has been documented by many (Yankelovich, 1974; Torrie, 1988; Robinson, 1987; and Johnson, 1987b). It has been established that the students are influenced not only by their peers but also by parents, teachers, guidance counselors, administrators, and professionals in various fields (Wendland, 1987; Torrie & Wendland, 1988; Santer, Seidl, & Karbon, 1980; Johnson, 1987a), so marketing home economics program strengths to all of these groups seems imperative.

The need for marketing home economics programs has been documented, but a new focus has caused even greater concerns for vocational education programs in general, that being the increased emphasis on academics. Reports such as *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), the Committee for Economic Development (1985) *Investing in Our Children* report and the Holmes Report (Holmes Group, Inc., 1986) have greatly influenced the demand for academic subjects, specifically increases in English, math, and the sciences. This has affected the ability of students to enroll in electives such as home economics. Frantz, Strickland, and Elson (1986) reported that 42 of the 50 states that were in his study documented decreased enrollments in vocational programs. This study (Frantz et al., 1986) found that 45 vocational directors from the 50 states and 6 territories reported increased graduation requirements but only 15 cited vocational education as being required for graduation.

Marketing home economics has been considered one effective method of giving the general public a more realistic view of current vocational home
economics programs. If home economics were to be viewed as the product in a marketing effort then according to Murphy and Enis (1986) the benefits of the product must be greater than the price paid by the consumer, e.g., taking home economics instead of another elective. In the area of marketing Bloch and Richins (1983) have developed a theoretical model for the study of product importance perceptions. This model examines the framework of product importance which is formed in three parts: sources (i.e., consumer, product, and situation), importance (i.e., whether enduring or instrumental), and response (i.e., ongoing or task-related). The model identifies the concept of product importance as a clarifying and unifying approach for examining related concepts in marketing literature (Bloch & Richins, 1983).

The purpose of the present research was to study the relationships among components in the theoretical model as they apply to the marketing of home economics programs to high school students. In examining the concepts presented in the model, the aspects of the present image of home economics, increased graduation requirements, influence of others in the decision-making process, and future plans enter into the consideration before enrollment occurs. Data were collected from three groups: students, parents of the students surveyed, and guidance counselors from the schools in which the students were enrolled.

The research was based on two major objectives. The first objective examined image and perceptions of home economics program content. The second objective tested the applicability of a theoretical model in
studying the importance of image perceptions on students' decisions to enroll in home economics.

Definitions

Consumer — The secondary student.

Consumer influences — People, print, and nonprint media with significant impact on the decision-making process in determining "buying" behavior. Examples in the present study would be parents, guidance counselors, and peers as well as the curriculum itself.

Enduring importance — A long-term, cross-situational perception of product importance based on the strength of the product's relationship to central needs and values (Bloch & Richins, 1983, p. 72).

Instrumental importance — A temporary perception of product importance based on the consumer's desire to obtain particular extrinsic goals that may derive from the purchase and/or usage of the product (Bloch & Richins, 1983, p. 72).

Marketing — The process of planning and executing the conception, pricing, promotion, and distribution of ideas, goods, and services to create exchanges that satisfy individual and organizational objectives (American Marketing Association, 1985; Murphy & Enis, 1986).
Marketing strategy — The set of organizational activities that determines the benefits which will satisfy the consumer in a given situation and offer the product which provides those benefits (Murphy & Enis, 1986).

Perceived product importance — The extent to which a consumer links a product to salient enduring or situation-specific goals (Bloch & Richins, 1983, p. 71).

Product — The home economics programs in the secondary school setting.

Ongoing responses — The result of enduring importance. This is characterized by high product interest for the products own sake but not needing a task-related response.

Risk — The amount at stake in a purchase and the consumer's subjective feelings of certainty about the favorableness of purchase consequences (Bloch & Richins, 1983, p. 70).

Situation — The point in the student's education in which courses are selected. Selection will be determined on the basis of perceived need and importance for later life activities.

Task-related — The purchase of an item or in this study enrolling in home economics courses. This is a result of goals related to the product (Bloch & Richins, 1983, p. 76).
Assumptions

1. The high school students surveyed are representative of the population of students in Iowa high schools.

2. The questions and word-pairs selected adequately represent the concepts in the theoretical model as it is applied to marketing home economics programs.

Limitation

The results are limited to high school students in Iowa and may not be generalized to all high school students in other geographical areas.

Explanation of the Alternate Format

This dissertation is presented in the alternate dissertation format approved by the Graduate College at Iowa State University. The alternate dissertation format allows for the inclusion of papers that have been or will be submitted to refereed scholarly journals for possible publication.

Two papers are included in this dissertation. The first manuscript will examine differences of enrolled students and nonenrolled students, and their parents' and guidance counselors' perceptions of home economics content areas. This manuscript will be submitted to the Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education. The second manuscript will deal with relationships between students' perceptions of home economics content, perceived risks of enrolling in a home economics program, and future plans. This manuscript will be submitted to the Home Economics Research
Journal. The authorship for these two manuscripts will be shared with Dr. Margaret Torrie and Dr. Jerelyn B. Schultz, co-major professors of the doctoral candidate.
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Several factors need to be considered when examining enrollment patterns in home economics. First, the current image of home economics needs to be studied to determine how closely it corresponds with the organization's goals and mission. Secondly, the influence of increased high school graduation requirements and college entrance requirements on home economics enrollment should be determined. Along with this second concern, an emphasis on academics has also been noted by several educational reports. Finally, the impact of parents, peers, and guidance counselors, as influencers on the student decision-making process and hence, enrollment in home economics is studied. These concerns are examined and then applied to marketing home economics with a focus on enrollment patterns.

Home economists have viewed the field of home economics as a personal service profession (Gentzler, 1986). It is well known since the major goal of home economics is to improve the quality of life. In order to cope with the future, people will need skills that allow them to adapt to a changing world (Hargrove, 1988). Bailey and Firebaugh (1986) stated that home economics is a future-oriented profession with a major focus on family well-being, growth and development of family members, and the reciprocal relationships between families and their environment (p. 3). Bailey and Firebaugh believe home economists are dedicated to the problems that directly or indirectly confront families and need to create
programs that are responsive to the impact of social policies and business and industry practices on the family.

Home economics programs have been developed that respond to changing societal needs. When responding to an attitudinal survey, 97.5% of the graduates of a Canadian college placed first "Home economics deals with important societal issues". These graduates also strongly agreed that home economics helps all family members (Smith & Turnbull, 1988). Dopkin (1985) supported this viewpoint and also stated,

"In the early part of our home economics history, family units provided for most of the members' needs. Today's families no longer provide services to the same extent so many of these functions have been taken over by society. Home economics programs address these needs. These classes provide students with consumer skills, preparation for adult roles, and coping skills for their current roles as family members" (p. 24).

Image of Home Economics

There has been great concern by professionals in the field of home economics that the perceptions of society toward home economics do not represent an accurate picture. In a study by Yankelovich (1974) 7 out of 10 respondents said:

"The home economist's major function and real role in society is relatively unknown (p. 14).

There is no more certain barrier to the creation and maintenance of a distinct and pervasive identity than lack of knowledge, especially at the 70 per cent level. The mission of home economics, however, is clear as defined by Brown and Paolucci (1978):
"The mission of home economics is to enable families, both as individual units and generally as a social institution, to build and maintain systems of action which lead (1) to maturing in individual self-formation and (2) to enlightened, cooperative participation in the critique and formation of goals and means for accompanying them" (p. 47).

Thirteen years after the Yankelovich study, however, questions still remained about the image of home economics. Johnson, Holcombe, Kean, Woodward, Tweeten, and Hafer (1987) provided evidence that the image of home economics as "cooking and/or sewing" was still alive and well in the 1980s. As a result the researchers supported a continued need for public relations because home economics was still being viewed in a very traditional way. They believed the general public was not aware of the many roles that home economists have.

In a study by Robinson (1987), professional school personnel also perceived home economics as the teaching of cooking skills. The students, parents, and professional school personnel in this study generally perceived home economics to be a woman's field that teaches individuals how to cook. Parents in Robinson's study (1987) did hold the view, however, that home economics also taught management skills. Again, as in previous studies, the need for a public relations program to interpret home economics at all levels was recommended. Robinson supported the use of marketing strategies to interpret home economics programs to potential students, parents, and decision makers such as principals, counselors, and policy makers with emphasis placed on improving and interpreting the image of home economics to others. Additional research was suggested to
determine the sources of attitudes toward and misconceptions about home economics. Robinson (1987) also stated that home economics teachers should become well versed in the goals and purposes of their discipline so that they can serve as education spokespersons for the home economics field.

A study by Burnett, Harrison, and Miller (1986) concurred with this, stating that there was a need to improve communicative linkages among teachers and administrators to transmit needs, priorities, curriculum strategies, and general information regarding local programs. It was considered critical that home economics keep information up-to-date and relevant to students' needs. Johnson (1987b) recommended the utilization of effective recruitment strategies for undergraduate home economics programs as essential for the survival of undergraduate programs in the field of home economics. Moore (1988) believed that to have a successful external public relations effort you first must look inside the organization. Until the benefits of the program are internalized the efforts to market the program externally will not be fulfilled.

High School Graduation Requirements

The historical overview of graduation requirements shows that requirements for graduation from high school have developed over time to serve the needs and purposes in schools and society (Copa & Johnson, 1988). Serow (1986) states that functional sociologists believe the needs of society determine the performance standards for education that then establish what is to be taught. In the 1800s most occupational skills were acquired through apprenticeships while liberal arts subject matter
was the primary curriculum utilized and was predominately for the elite. As more and more elite and middle class families began to send their young to be educated the credit or unit system came about as a way to standardize high school diploma standards so colleges could determine progress made by the pupil before admitting them for further study (Serow, 1986). Graduation requirements changed and by 1920 a third of all credits earned were outside the academic areas. During the period of the 1920s to 1950s vocational education had a dramatic increase in enrollments (Serow, 1986). Educational programs in the schools became less structured in the 1960s and 1970s and students had more options and could create individualized programs of study. In the 1980s much of this freedom was taken away as tighter structures allowed students less freedom in choosing electives because of increased graduation requirements.

Recently, Frantz et al. (1986) reported that 42 of the 50 states had documented decreased enrollments in vocational programs. More specifically, in home economics, decreased enrollments were found in 22 of the 50 states (Love, 1986). Concern that students will not be offered vocational programs due to cutbacks is great. This study found that of the vocational directors in the 50 states and 6 territories, 45 reported increased graduation requirements and 8 reported no change. Fifteen cited that vocational education was required for graduation and 38 had indicated that there was no vocational education requirement in their states. Seventeen of the states in this study who reported increased graduation requirements, also reported a drop in vocational education enrollment.
The one common aspect that appears to have affected the declining enrollments within vocational programs has been the increase in graduation requirements, which has resulted in fewer elective choices (including vocational education courses) for students. Copa and Johnson (1988) sought to explain the relationship of vocational education and high school education requirements. Their study examined ways vocational education courses have been implemented in several schools to meet graduation requirements. Copa and Johnson cited the most frequent reason for using vocational education to meet graduation requirements as a guarantee that the school is meeting students' real needs. A counselor in their study stated that vocational education allowed students to get what they need. By increasing the "basics", school administrators may be overlooking skills that are more basic to improving the quality of life such as those learned in home economics. Using vocational education courses to meet graduation requirements provides more flexible programs for all students but especially for students with special needs (Copa & Johnson, 1988). Several functions for a vocational education program which contribute to graduation requirements include:

1) meets needs of a diverse group of students,
2) enhances the learning of basic skills,
3) reduces drop-out rates,
4) provides alternatives for students with very special learning needs,
5) gives increased choices or options for all students,
6) preserves a role for vocational education in the curriculum, and
7) looks to the future needs of all students for a sound education.

(Copa & Johnson, 1988, p. 124)

As a result of the study on "High School Graduation Requirements and Enrollment Patterns in High School Vocational Education Programs in the United States," Frantz et al. (1986) recommended that state and local administrators of vocational education be responsive to enrollment declines and use initiatives and strategies to provide opportunities for students to enroll in vocational education courses. Johnson (1987b) pointed out that prospective students, through a variety of recruitment strategies, can be made aware of the contributions home economics can make and how they can be a part of this dynamic field. Yankelovich (1974) upon completing the AHEA study, recommended the development of a public relations program with a clear and consistent focus on what home economics is and the common skills of all home economists.

National Reports Supporting Academics

Reports such as A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), the Holmes Report (Holmes Group Inc., 1986) and the Carnegie Task Force (1983) report on Academic Preparation for College have greatly influenced the demand for academic courses with specific recommendations for increases in English, math, and the sciences. Both math and English requirements have been increased in most schools as
secondary education attempts to better prepare students to enter college. These increased requirements affect the ability of students to enroll in elective courses such as home economics because the opportunity to take electives decreases. The Carnegie Task Force (1983) expanded the previous reports' suggestions for high school preparation to include: four years of English, three years of mathematics, three years of science, three years of social studies, a half year of computer science and for those going to college two years of foreign language (p. 24). Academic courses should not be in competition with vocational education, however, as was pointed out in Investing in Our Children (Committee for Economic Development, 1985). Individual programs have been successful in integrating the basics with vocational education but this is the exception rather than the norm.

The 1980s reform movement in education focused on improving the overall performance of all students by increasing graduation requirements in academic areas and raising the minimum standards for graduation (Lotto & Murphy, 1987). Lotto and Murphy (1987) believed that nonacademic courses were being carefully examined and were in jeopardy of being defined out of the high school curriculum. Opponents of vocational education, however, appear to believe that high school students need to focus on the basics in order to develop a good solid foundation before beginning occupational preparation (National Academy of Sciences, 1984). The Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship (William T. Grant Foundation, 1988) also suggested strong instruction in core subjects but
did not support the concept of high schools teaching only academic skills. The commission stated that all vocational education students should take general education courses and use vocational education courses to enhance their learning of basic skills and to develop problem-solving skills.

These opposing views led to further examination of academic and vocational curricula. Students who were taking these courses often were in jeopardy of being "tracked" or locked into either a vocational program or an academic program without the option of taking coursework from both, due to scheduling or sequencing of courses. Goodlad (1984) believed that initial placement in an academic or vocational track often led to limited educational experiences because of the difficulty or impossibility of moving between the two areas. Goodlad (1984) also believed that students may go so far as to acquire friends with less interest or more interest in academics and thus limit their future educational experiences as a result of their peer group. Lotto and Murphy (1987) stated that tracking limits the likelihood that vocationally tracked students will have the opportunity to be exposed to and attracted to educational programs that promote higher aspirations and this may actually create strong pressure not to seek more rigorous programs. Lotto and Murphy (1987) believed that vocational education courses must be expanded to: 1) attract academic students, and 2) complement the academic program with "a content which focuses on the application of knowledge to real-world experiences and problems." Dr. Carole Vickers (1986) addressed this issue at an annual American Home Economics Association meeting and in a later article in the *Journal of Home Economics* by stressing that home economics knowledge
contributes to the well-being of individuals and families, and apart from home economics there is no other subject area that addresses the needs of these groups.

Dyrenfurth (1985) views vocational education as subject matter that shows concern for all students—not just those who are gifted, or have limited ability, or are average—but all students. What vocational education does best, Dyrenfurth (1985) believes, is to help students meet awareness, exploratory, preparatory, placement, remedial, and retraining needs related to the world of work and goes beyond just occupation specific skills (p. 46). Barlow (1986) takes this idea further by stating that the goal of high school education as a whole is to fulfill an obligation to: help young people to attain a balanced social and emotional adjustment; learn to express their ideas; become responsible citizens; learn to protect their health; participate in family affairs; direct their personal and social conduct; and choose a vocation (p. 15).

Darcy (1979) stated that there has been agreement that one of the goals of vocational education is to prepare students to enter into employment and remain employed, but disagreement still exists on what the curricular mix should be to accomplish this goal. Goodlad (1983) stated that education must include vocational education for all students and should center around a broad exposure to careers and work. He believed that students can obtain such exposure through vocational student organizations and cooperative education. This gives students opportunities to assume leadership positions, and the benefits of this type of education far outweigh the possible academic costs according to Goodlad. Stone (1988)
believed vocational education contributes to career aspirations and academic achievement in high school.

When the general public was polled in a National Gallup Poll cited in The Unfinished Agenda (National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education, 1984, p. 8), 83% responded that vocational education should be required for those not going to college and 37% thought some vocational education should be required for everyone. The Unfinished Agenda also stated that secondary vocational education courses should provide instruction and practice in the basic skills of reading, writing, arithmetic, speaking, listening, and problem solving and also provide opportunity for academic excellence (The National Commission on Secondary Vocational Education, 1984, p. 25). This approach would result in the use of vocational offerings to fulfill graduation requirements and would serve the needs of the students as well as provide opportunities to apply the basics in more realistic day-to-day situations.

A recent study, The Forgotten Half (William T. Grant Foundation Commission on Work, Family and Citizenship 1988), stated that educators have become so preoccupied with those who do go to college that they have ignored those who do not (p. 3), hence, the name "forgotten half." It is those students who are not college-bound who are often viewed as inadequately prepared for the requirements of society and employment. The idea that the primary purpose of a secondary school is to prepare students for entry into college is incorrect. Instead the Grant Foundation suggests that four strategies should be implemented to help all youth. Two of these strategies include: 1) extending and improving current
employment opportunities for more noncollege-bound youth, and 2) creating more equitable education and training for these young people. In Iowa the current state law and administrative rules require each school district to offer a minimum curriculum of 27 units to include: four units in English, two units in foreign language, five units in math, five units in vocational/occupational education, four units in science, and four units in social studies. Health, driver's education, the fine arts, and physical education also must be offered (Iowa Association of School Boards, 1987; SF 2278 School Code of Iowa).

Though it is stated in Strategies for Excellence (Iowa Association of School Boards, 1987) that students at the secondary level should have access to an educational program that is suited to pursuits following graduation, this is not uniformly implemented because of the diverse needs of the students. When studying the future plans of high school students in Iowa, a 1984 follow-up of high school graduates found that only 37% enrolled in a 4-year college program, 26% went on for other postsecondary training, and 40% found employment or engaged in another activity following graduation (Iowa Association of School Boards, 1987). In a similar study, the Iowa Department of Public Instruction (1983) found that after graduation 15% enrolled in vocational education, 30% completed a college degree, and 65% were in need of some vocational education/training at the high school level because they did not pursue postsecondary education. Thus it becomes clear that students entering the labor market should have access to an educational program which prepares them for the work experience (Iowa Association of School Boards, 1987).
Spitze (1983) cited several problems vocational home economics faces at the secondary level: declining enrollments, decreasing budgets, instructor cutbacks, and lack of respect and credibility. Even though superior home economics programs can apply academic subjects by incorporating opportunities in math, science, and communication skills to everyday examples explored in the classroom, (Gibbs and Wood, 1986), Iana (1984) stated that greater effort needs to be made to alert parents, school personnel, and policy makers that home economics programs support academics. Part of the lack of respect that is missing for home economics programs may be because home economics is not seen as an academic course which is relevant for today's students and is capable of incorporating the basics and teaching critical thinking skills to students (Iana, 1984).

Although there seems to be general support for vocational home economics programs, as found by Burnett, Harrison, and Miller (1986), the general trend continues to be one of declining enrollment. Thomas and Arcus (1988) found that when progressive principles have been the priority in education, home economics has expanded; when the goal of education was more intellectual, home economics programs have been reduced. The "push for excellence" has outlined increasing the requirements for math, science, and English. Add to this a foreign language requirement for those students considering college as an option and few electives, if any, are left for students. Interested students may not be enrolling in vocational education programs because of increased academic requirements necessary to graduate (Goldberg, 1987).
The Iowa Home Economics Association (IHEA) (Moore, 1989) created a task force as a result of the enrollment declines faced in that state. The enrollment declined by 3,000 students in the year 1987-1988 and a downsizing of the home economics programs was a general trend during this time period. The task force's goal was to determine what was needed to stop the trend and reinstate the home economics profession as a necessary part of every student's education. Teachers surveyed by the IHEA task force believed that home economics programs should stress "skills for life" (91%) and that home economics courses should meet college admission requirements in the areas of social studies, math, or science (77%). Many home economics teachers who responded to the IHEA survey believed enrollment was restricted by scheduling problems (83%), college requirements (78%), graduation requirements (52%), lack of parental and student understanding of program content (42%), and lack of administrative support (45%).

Influencers on the Student Decision-making Process

Veres and Carmichael (1981) noted that parents are the most important source of influence on their children's career decision-making process. A study by Nichols, Kennedy and Schumm (1983) found that the prior experience and feelings of competency in a subject area by the mother could be used to predict the amount of home economics the mother would want for her child in that same area. Role models also were found to be particularly important in influencing nontraditional students (Veres & Carmichael, 1981). Parents were viewed as very influential in the students' determination of career choice (Johnson, 1987a; Vaines & Arcus,
There was not agreement, however, on the rank of influence by others such as guidance counselors, peers, teachers, and role models on students' career choices. Johnson (1987a) stated that for students who choose careers in home economics education, the home economics teacher is the most influential. Wendland's (1987) findings showed that teachers were more influential than peers, guidance counselors, and principals. Others found peers to be more influential than teachers or counselors although teachers were scored above counselors by most young people (Vaines & Arcus, 1987; Wall et al., 1987; Michigan State Department of Education, 1978).

In a study by Stenberg (1989) superintendents, secondary principals, and guidance counselors viewed home economics as teaching students nutrition, the preparation and purchasing of nutritious foods, child development, responsible parenting and approaches for building healthy families. These groups did not believe that home economics was teaching topics such as global food supply, financial services, future housing needs, sexual responsibility, or the coordination of work and family roles. Because these groups of academic professionals can directly control the offerings or scheduling of courses in home economics, they are influential in what the student elects to take during high school. It becomes apparent that administrators and counselors need to be knowledgable about the goals and objectives in home economics programs in their schools. Although documented as not being as influential as others such as peers
and parents, in student career choice, counselors do have an impact on student scheduling and placement in high school classes (Stenberg, 1989).

Marketing Home Economics

The need to develop home economics marketing strategies in Iowa has been documented. A number one ranking was assigned to marketing home economics by the Curriculum Cadre for Quality Vocational Home Economics Programs (1988). The program of work goals established by the Iowa Vocational Home Economics Patterns for Progress organization cited the need for marketing (Goal VII, DE Newsletter, 1988) as did the Iowa Department of Education in the request for the proposal, "Marketing Home Economics Programs." Results from those who have implemented recruitment strategies have shown positive impacts on program growth and image (Torrie, 1988).

Assessing the current situation is the first step in developing the marketing plan. Lytton and Carsky (1987) believed the mission of an organization provides the framework for the marketing strategy. The second step is to determine the target market(s) on which the organization will focus. In the case of home economics, the primary target would be the students. Those who influence the students' career choice and impact the high school coursework would be another target group. Vocational educators have the opportunity to assist students, both male and female, to comprehend the need for skill development and job preparation for all people regardless of their sex (Hitchens & Thomas, 1979). This would help students overcome limitations created by traditional societal mores when considering possible vocational alternatives. Goggans (1980) stated that
when recruiting students for nontraditional vocational careers several considerations should be taken into account. These include helping all students recognize that they have access to a broad range of opportunities in the labor market and in vocational programs and making sure that recruitment of students for nontraditional fields is an integral part of vocational education.

Recruiting students for vocational programs, including vocational home economics, involves providing them with information about a variety of careers and involving them in activities that assist them in making sound decisions. Goggans (1980) believed student apprehension about taking a vocational education course in what would be considered a nontraditional area is the result of the reaction of those who are influential in the personal life of the students—namely parents, peers, and other family members. Parents and peers often help determine the values and expectations that dictate behavior, and influences decisions made by the student.

In viewing marketing more broadly, Murphy and Enis (1986) stated that the benefits expected from the product must be equal to or greater than the price paid by the consumer. Marketing involves the mutual satisfaction of the seller and the buyer through the exchange of a product (Kotler, 1972). A marketing strategy is a set of activities which determines the benefits that will satisfy the buyer in a specific situation and offers the product that will provide these benefits. Kotler (1972) stated that the benefits of the product must be equal to or greater than the price paid by the consumer. Several sources indicate that the
product is often perceived by the buyer to be a group of characteristics including qualities, processes, and/or capabilities (goods, services, and ideas) that are expected to provide satisfaction (Leavitt, 1980; Kotler, 1984; Enis & Roering, 1980).

If home economics is viewed as the product, then students would be viewed as the consumer. The risk or price paid in electing to take a home economics course would equal the amount of time or money spent in purchasing the product. By selecting a home economics course the student may be missing out on other requirements or electives that will assure him/her of acceptance at a post-secondary institution. Other factors may influence the "price paid" such as peer acceptance or stereotypes that are generated by students enrolled in home economics courses.

Jacoby and Kaplan (1972) distinguished five types of risk in making a decision to purchase a product. Those risks are: 1) financial, where the product will not be worth the price; 2) psychological, where a poor product choice will harm a buyer's ego; 3) physical, where there is risk to the buyer's safety; 4) functional, where the product will not perform as expected; and 5) social, where the product choice may result in embarrassment before one's family/friends/work group. The implications for the social risk in taking home economics courses seem the most relevant as students, especially males, often are questioned as to why they have enrolled in this subject. Traditional mores may indicate the subject matter is not appropriate, but current lifestyles and expectations of males would indicate the necessity for skills such as those taught in home economics to be developed.
Theoretical Model

Theory provides a shorthand for communication that organizes and generate new ideas (Cohen, 1980). Theory also assists in guiding the investigator by generating explanations and making predictions. Fisher (1978) stated, however, that theory can only be adequate if it contains all the theoretical concepts necessary to derive explanations. Fisher (1978) went on to explain that theory directs researchers beyond their own conscious control to observe the phenomenon within certain categories, terms, or concepts. The researcher's concepts are limited to those theoretical constructs with which he/she has chosen to work.

In the field of marketing, Bloch and Richins (1983) developed a theoretical model for the study of product importance perceptions (see Figure 1). This model examines the framework of product importance that is formed in three parts: sources (i.e., consumer, product, and situation), importance (i.e., whether enduring or instrumental), and response (ongoing or task-related). The model attempts to recognize the concept of product importance in order to clarify and unify a number of related concepts that have appeared in the marketing literature (Bloch & Richins, 1983).

________________________________________

Insert Figure 1 About Here

________________________________________
The theoretical model developed by Bloch and Richins (1983) used in studying product importance perceptions operationalizes several variables that assist the evaluation of the perceived image of home economics programs. The three major segments of components of the model are: sources, importance type, and responses. The first component containing the sources is composed of the consumer, the product meaning and attributes, and the situation specific to the task eliciting the response. The second component contains two types of importance. The first, instrumental importance, is influenced by the perceived risk and involves the consumer immediately in a choice situation. The second type of importance is enduring importance that is the long-term perception of the product that does not necessarily demand the consumer to be actively involved in making a response. The third component elicits a response either ongoing or task-related. The ongoing response differs from the task-related response because it is purchase independent. The task-related response relates to the purchase of the product.

In applying this model to home economics programs, students will be utilized as the consumers. The model also recognizes the influence of parents, guidance counselors and home economics teachers in the students' career choice and hence, coursework selection. The product, home economics programs, can be represented by concepts and characteristics of the home economics offerings. Course selection will be viewed as the situation to which the student must make a response. The instrumental importance consists of the perceived risks, the amount at stake, and the influence of others in deciding on the coursework selected. The risks can
be positive or negative and may result in gains or losses. Instrumental importance of a product can be viewed as potential gain (resulting in an approach goal) or potential loss (resulting in an avoidance goal). Each response assesses achieving each gain and avoiding each loss and evaluates the importance of the summed total. The enduring importance consists of the long term values of the student that can be met through participation in a home economics program.

Summary

Studies have been conducted that measure the perceptions of the public toward home economics programs but a number of questions still exist. The general disposition of those in the field is that home economics generally is not understood nor is the mission of the field recognized as benefitting those who take home economics courses. Due to increased high school graduation requirements and college entrance standards, competition for student enrollment between vocational courses, such as home economics, and academics has increased. Several national reports in education have also emphasized the need for increasing the academic preparation of high school students. Individuals who influence student career goals also impact vocational education enrollment.

Several factors need to be examined in order to determine what influences a student's participation in a home economics program. Risks, both social and financial, may be perceived by both students and parents as a hindrance to enrolling in the program. This research was designed to identify and apply several of the concepts in the theoretical model.
proposed by Bloch and Richins (1983) to the marketing of home economics programs. The first study focused on the perceptions of students, parents, and guidance counselors. The second study tested the application of the theoretical model to the marketing of home economics programs by using path analysis to examine the factors which influence and perhaps predict the likelihood of student enrollment in home economics. The results of these studies will help professionals in the field of home economics determine what approach(es) is (are) necessary in marketing their programs both to students and the general public so that a more accurate image of home economics is conveyed.
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to assess the perceptions of the current image of home economics held by high school students, their parents, and guidance counselors. In addition, analyses were conducted to determine if there were differences in perceptions of home economics by sex of student, size of school in which the student was enrolled, and whether or not the student was currently enrolled in home economics. No significant differences were found in the responses of students, parents, and guidance counselors to a semantic differential scale assessing the image of home economics content. However, significant differences were found for five of the six content areas between male and female student perceptions of image, and in all six content areas between those students who were currently enrolled and those who were not. Results suggest that the benefits of home economics content for all students need to be reinforced through marketing efforts.
INTRODUCTION

Historically home economists have viewed the field of home economics as a personal service profession (Gentzler, 1986). The major goal of home economics is to improve the quality of life. In order to cope with the future, people will need skills that allow them to adapt to a changing world (Hargrove, 1988). Bailey and Firebaugh (1986) stated that home economics is a future-oriented profession with a major focus on family well-being, growth and development of family members, and the reciprocal relationships between families and their environment. Bailey and Firebaugh believe home economists are dedicated to the problems that directly or indirectly confront families and need to create programs that are responsive to the impact of social policies and business and industry practices on the family. Home economics programs have been developed that respond to changing societal needs. When responding to an attitudinal survey, 97.5% of the graduates of a Canadian college placed "Home economics deals with important societal issues" first. The graduates also strongly agree that home economics helps all family members (Smith & Turnbull, 1988). Dopkin (1985) supports this viewpoint.

"In the early part of our home economics history, family units provided for most of the members' needs. Today's families no longer provide services to the same extent so many of these functions have been taken over by society. Home economics programs address these needs. These classes provide students with consumer skills, preparation for adult roles, and coping skills for their current roles as family members" (p. 24).
Several studies (Yankelovich, 1974; Johnson, Holcombe, Kean, Woodward, Tweeten, and Hafer, 1987; Robinson, 1987; Findlay, 1976) on the image of home economics point to a continued need for the assessment of perceptions and attitudes regarding the importance of home economics programs and content. The more recent impact of stressing academics has resulted in increasing college entrance requirements and has also caused many high schools to increase graduation requirements. This can affect the importance perceptions of others such as parents, peers and guidance counselors who influence students in career selection and hence, course enrollment. Examining these issues provided a basis for the development of this study.

Image of Home Economics

There has been great concern by professionals in the field of home economics that societal perceptions toward home economics do not represent an accurate understanding of home economics goals. In a study by Yankelovich (1974) seven out of ten respondents said:

"the home economist's major function and real role in society is relatively unknown (p. 14).

There is no more certain barrier to the creation and maintenance of a distinct and pervasive identity than lack of knowledge, especially at the 70 percent level.

Thirteen years after the Yankelovich study, however, questions still remained about the image of home economics. Johnson, Holcombe, Kean,
Woodward, Tweeten, and Hafer (1987) provided evidence that the image of home economics as "cooking and/or sewing" was still alive and well. As a result these researchers supported a continued need for a public relations program because home economics was still seen in a very traditional way. They also believed the general public was not aware of the many roles that home economists have.

In a study by Robinson (1987), professional school personnel also perceived home economics as the teaching of cooking skills. Students, parents, and professional school personnel in Robinson's study generally perceived home economics to be a woman's field that teaches individuals how to cook. Parents in this study held the view that home economics also taught management skills. Again, as in previous studies, the need for a public relations program to interpret home economics at all levels was recommended. Robinson supported the use of marketing strategies to interpret home economics programs to potential students, parents, and decision makers such as principals, counselors, and policy makers with emphasis placed on improving and interpreting the image of home economics to others. Additional research was suggested to determine the sources of attitudes toward and misconceptions about home economics. Robinson (1987) also stated that home economics teachers should become well versed in the goals and purposes of their discipline so that they can serve as education spokespersons for the home economics field.

A study by Burnett, Harrison, and Miller (1986) concurred with this stating that there was a need to improve communicative linkages among teachers and administrators to transmit needs, priorities, curriculum
strategies, and general information regarding local programs. It was considered critical that home economics keep information up-to-date and relevant to students' needs. Johnson (1987b) recommended the utilization of effective recruitment strategies for undergraduate home economics programs as essential for the survival of undergraduate programs in the field of home economics. Moore (1988) believed that to have a successful external public relations effort you first must look inside the organization. Until the benefits of the program are internalized the efforts to market the program externally will not be fulfilled.

Perceptions of former secondary home economics students were surveyed by Findlay (1976). It was reported that 92% of this group perceived money management and budgeting as the most important areas. These students ranked ordered the subject areas with the top selections being: Food Preparation (89%), Child Development (86%), Clothing Construction (83%), and Nutrition (83%). In a similar study of high school graduates from a home economics program in Nebraska, Bokenkamp (1978) found that respondents rated the top four most useful areas as Food and Nutrition (65%), Adult Living (53%), Clothing and Textiles (51%), and Housing and Home Furnishings (34%). Sixty percent of the former students in Findlay's study reported they would take more home economics classes if it were possible to repeat their high school years.

Bell and Glosson (1983) also surveyed former students and found that 83.9% of the respondents believed homemaking classes had been helpful in their personal life, while 54.7% stated homemaking knowledge and skills had been beneficial in their work. In this study only 10.9% replied that
homemaking courses had not helped them as employees. In the Bell and Glosson (1983) study a Pearson Product Moment Correlation showed a highly significant ($p \leq .01$) relationship between the perception of helpfulness to the students' personal lives and their work. This indicated the transferability of the skills and knowledge acquired by enrolling in a Consumer and Homemaking Education class.

Griggs and McFadden (1980) reported a positive relationship between the amount of time spent in a course, the number of courses taken, and the increase in knowledge about home economics programs. They also reported former students of Consumer and Homemaking programs had positive feelings about the usefulness and importance of the program content. Griggs and McFadden (1980) believed that there was a need to study the characteristics of Consumer and Homemaking Students and to compare them with their high school counterparts who do not enroll in Consumer and Homemaking courses.

High School Graduation Requirements

Reports that have greatly influenced the demand for academic courses with specific recommendations for increases in English, math, and the sciences include: A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983), the Holmes Report (Holmes Group, 1986) and the College Entrance Examination Board (1983) report on Academic Preparation for College. Both math and English requirements have been increased in most schools as secondary education attempts to better prepare students to enter college. These increased requirements negatively affect the ability of students to enroll in elective courses such as home economics because
of the decreased opportunity to take electives. The Carnegie Task Force (1983) expanded the previous reports' suggestions for high school preparation to include: four years of English, three years of mathematics, three years of science, three years of social studies, a half year of computer science and for those going to college two years of foreign language (p. 24). Although academic courses should not be in competition with vocational education, (Committee for Economic Development, 1985), individual programs have been successful in integrating the basics with vocational education. This latter case, however, is the exception rather than the norm.

The 1980s' reform movement in education focused on improving the overall performance of all students by increasing graduation requirements in academic areas and raising the minimum requirements in academic areas and raising the minimum standards for graduation (Lotto & Murphy, 1987). Lotto and Murphy (1987) believed that nonacademic courses were being carefully examined and were in jeopardy of being defined out of the high school curriculum. Opponents of vocational education, however, appear to believe that high school students need to focus on the basics in order to develop a good solid foundation before beginning occupational preparation (National Academy of Sciences, 1984). The Commission on Work, Family, and Citizenship (William T. Grant Foundation, 1988) also suggested strong instruction in core subjects but did not support the concept of high schools teaching only academic skills. The commission stated that all vocational education students should take general education courses and
use vocational education courses to enhance their learning of basic skills and to develop problem-solving skills.

These opposing views led to further examination of academic and vocational curricula. Students who were taking these courses often were in jeopardy of being "tracked" or locked into either a vocational program or an academic program without the option of taking coursework from both, due to scheduling or sequencing of courses.

As a result of the study on "High School Graduation Requirements and Enrollment Patterns in High School Vocational Education Programs in the United States," Frantz, Strickland, and Elson (1986) recommended that state and local administrators of vocational education be responsive to enrollment declines and use initiatives and strategies to provide opportunities for students to enroll in vocational education courses. Johnson (1987b) pointed out that prospective students, through a variety of recruitment strategies, can be made aware of the contributions home economics can make and that they can be a part of this dynamic field. Yankelovich (1974) upon completing the AHEA study recommended development of a public relations program with a clear and consistent focus on what home economics is and the common skills of all home economists.

Spitze (1983) cited the several problems home economics faces at the secondary level: declining enrollments, decreasing budgets, instructor cutbacks, and lack of respect and credibility. Superior home economics programs can apply academic subjects such as in math, science, and communication skills to practical daily problems (Gibbs and Wood, 1986). However, greater effort needs to be made to alert parents, school
personnel, and policy makers that home economics programs support academics (Iana, 1984). Part of the lack of respect that is missing for home economics programs may be because home economics is not seen as an academic course that is relevant for today's students and is capable of incorporating the basics and teaching critical thinking skills to students (Iana, 1984).

**Influencers on the Student Decision-making Process**

Veres and Carmichael (1981) noted that parents are the most important source of influence on their children's career decision-making process. Parents are viewed as very influential in the students' determination of career choice (Johnson, 1987a; Vaines & Arcus, 1987; Wall, Holt, Harrison, and Kotrlik, 1987; Michigan State Department of Education, 1978). There was not agreement, however, on the rank of influence by others such as guidance counselors, peers, teachers, and role models on students' career choices. Johnson (1987a) stated that for students who choose careers in home economics education, the home economics teacher was the most influential. Wendland's (1987) findings showed that teachers were more influential than peers, guidance counselors, and principals. Others found peers to be more influential than teachers or counselors, although teachers were scored above counselors by most young people (Vaines & Arcus, 1987; Wall et al., 1987; Michigan State Department of Education, 1978; Schultz, 1989). Role models were found to be particularly important in influencing nontraditional students (Veres & Carmichael, 1981). Although documented as not being very influential in student career
choice, counselors do have an impact on student scheduling and placement in high school classes (Stenberg, 1989).

In a study by Stenberg (1989) superintendents, secondary principals, and guidance counselors viewed home economics as teaching students nutrition, the preparation and purchasing of nutritious foods, child development, responsible parenting and approaches for building healthy families. These groups did not believe that home economics was teaching topics such as global food supply, financial services, future housing needs, sexual responsibility, or the coordination of work and family roles. Because these groups of academic professionals can directly control the offerings or scheduling of courses in home economics they are influential in what the student elects to take during high school. It becomes apparent that administrators and counselors need to be knowledgeable about the goals and objectives in home economics programs in their schools.
PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to assess perceptions of the current image of home economics held by high school students, their parents, and guidance counselors. Differences among students, parents, and guidance counselors were examined. The influence of sex of the student, school size, and whether or not the student is currently enrolled, on student perceptions also was investigated. Past experience in home economics as well as familiarity of home economics programs in their schools was also examined. Specific null hypotheses tested include:

1. There are no significant differences in perceptions of home economics content among students, parents, and guidance counselors.

2. There are no significant differences in perceptions of home economics content between students who are currently enrolled in home economics programs and those who are not.

3. There are no significant differences in perceptions of home economics content between male and female students.

4. There are no significant differences in perceptions of home economics content between students from smaller and larger schools.
5. There are no significant differences in reasons for not enrolling in home economics based on sex.
METHODOLOGY

The survey approach was selected in order to reach a large number of respondents in diverse geographical areas within the state of Iowa. The survey population was high school juniors and seniors, their parents, and their guidance counselors. Thirty schools were selected in a stratified random sample so that half the students were from smaller school districts (under the median of 1100 students enrolled in kindergarten through 12th grade) and half were from larger school districts (over 1100 enrolled). All groups responded to a questionnaire containing a basic demographic section and a semantic differential scale assessing their perceptions of home economics in relationship to the six content areas defined by Hughes, Rougvie, and Woods (1980). Students and parents also were asked to respond to items ascertaining career aspirations for the student. The guidance counselors responded to a section on the program offerings and its relevance for their school setting. Permission to conduct the study in each district was granted by the administrator in the school.

Upon receiving notification that permission had been granted, a packet of materials was sent to home economics teachers in the randomly selected districts. The home economics teachers were given directions to randomly select five students of junior or senior standing presently enrolled in their home economics programs and five students in the same grades who were not presently enrolled. Parents of these students were then sent a mailed survey instrument that was preaddressed and postage paid for return to the researcher following completion. The home economics teacher sent a
list of the parents and addresses back to the researcher to provide for follow-up.

Respondents included 179 students who were juniors and seniors in high school and were evenly distributed between smaller schools (under 1100 enrollment) (N=89) and larger schools (over 1100 enrollment) (N=90). Forty-six of the respondents were male and 133 were female. Eighty-two were in their junior year, 94 were in their senior year, and three did not indicate their present grade level. Ninety-one of the students were currently enrolled in a home economics program and 88 were not currently enrolled. Of those who reported being currently enrolled in a home economics program, 28% were enrolled in Child Development or Parenting, 19% were enrolled in Family Relations, 24% were enrolled in Food and Nutrition, 18% were enrolled in Clothing and Textiles, 2% were enrolled in a Consumer Education course, and 9% were enrolled in Housing or Home Furnishings or Equipment class. The response rate for those students selected was 89.5%.

There were 87 parents that responded to the mailed questionnaire. Over half the parents responding had a child in a larger school (N=50) and the remaining parents (N=37) had a child in a smaller school. Eighty-three of the parent respondents were female, two were male, and two did not indicate their sex. Forty-five parents reported that their child was currently taking a home economics class and 42 indicated their child was not currently enrolled in a home economics class. The response rate for the parents was 43.5%. Because the parents were predominantly
females, the responses to past involvement and familiarity with home economics programs in their school are most likely biased.

The 18 guidance counselors were divided evenly by school size with nine responding from both the larger and smaller schools selected. They were asked to respond to characteristics of the home economics program in addition to the semantic differential items. The response rate for the guidance counselors was 90%.

Instrument Development

Dillman (1978) recommends that questionnaires be printed in a photographically reduced form and incorporated into a booklet format. This was the format used in the present study. The questionnaire was tested with a group of eighth graders for readability and then submitted for expert review for content analysis. Necessary revisions were made and the booklets were printed and mailed to the home economics teachers of the selected districts. A preaddressed, postage paid return stamp was printed on the outside of the booklet sent to parents for ease in return. Students returned their surveys in sealed envelopes to the home economics teacher who in turn mailed them to the researcher.

Triandis (1971) indicated that attitudes are what people think or feel about an object and their behavior is not only determined by what they would like to do but by what is socially acceptable and what they think they should do. Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) suggest that attitude can be distinguished from other concepts because of its affective nature and should be measured by a procedure that locates the subject on a bipolar affective or evaluative dimension. Affect is defined as a person's
feelings toward and evaluation of some object, person, issue, or event
(Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Attitude toward an object is seen as related to
the person's intentions to select a behavior related to his/her beliefs
about the object.

Sherif and Sherif (1967) recommend the use of semantic differential
scales to assess an individual's judgement of attitude on all dimensions
of meaning. This method is more informative than the measurement of
"attitude" alone that is represented by ratings on an "evaluative
dimension." They believed that semantic differential scales give more
information about the meaning of the attitude object. Psycho-social
scales reflect the stand taken by groups, by strata, or by entire
populations at a given period and the individual differences in attitude
can be gauged relative to the current patterns of acceptability and
rejection and their changes (Sherif & Sherif, 1967). Therefore, the
decision was made to develop semantic differential adjective pairs to
ascertain students', parents', and counselors' perceptions of home
economics content. Seventeen word-pairs were chosen to represent positive
and negative characteristics of home economics content. A seven-level
(1-7) semantic scale was used. Concepts selected to be represented by the
17 word-pairs included: image of content, future use, stereotypes,
academic orientation of content, and classroom setting. A 5-part Likert
scale was used by students who were not enrolled in home economics to
indicate how strongly statements listed influenced their ability to enroll
in home economics. Descriptive statistics were used on items assessing
the level of past involvement in home economics programs by parents and students.
DATA ANALYSIS

Word pairs were selected to represent five major conceptual areas assessing positive and negative characteristics of home economics content. These five concepts were: image of content, future use, stereotypes, academic orientation, and classroom setting. A total of 17 word pairs were selected based on the literature and a 7-point semantic differential scale response was used to record responses. A response of "7" was associated with a positive characteristic and "1" with a negative characteristic. In all cases the first word of the pair was scored as "1" and the second word as "7".

Because of the differences in group size, Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used to determine if there were differences among the responses of students, parents, and guidance counselors. This nonparametric test rank ordered the means of the three groups to determine if there were significant differences in their responses.

The six subject areas were each factor analyzed. This procedure condensed the word pairs into one factor for each subject area for further analysis. The results of the factor analysis for each home economics subject matter/content area showed there was one factor in each that accounted for over 40% of the variance. No further factors were used beyond this point due to the lack of contribution to the explained variance. Individual variables (word pairs) with a loading of .50 or higher were retained to represent the factor. Seven word pairs were found
to be common in four or more of the factor analyses for the six subject matter/content areas. These seven word pair factors were highly correlated ($p \leq .0001$) (see Table 1). The seven word pairs represented: image of content (worthless/valuable, despised/respected, unpleasant/pleasant, unimportant/important); future use (inefficient/efficient); and classroom setting (apathetic/motivating, boring/interesting).

The coefficient alpha reliability for the subject matter/content areas factor was .97. Analyses of variance procedures were used for the six subject matter/content areas which revealed whether or not significant differences existed in factor scores based on enrollment characteristic of the student, sex of the student, and the size of the school the student attended.

Students who were not enrolled in home economics responded to statements listing influences as to why they had not enrolled. A 5-part Likert-type scale was used to indicate how strongly they believed the statement affected their ability to enroll in home economics. Analysis of variance tests were used to determine if there were significant differences between males and females in examining reasons why students had not enrolled.
Descriptive statistics were used on items assessing the level of past involvement in home economics of parents and enrolled and nonenrolled students. The number of semesters of home economics respondents had taken, and their own assessment of their familiarity with home economics also were summarized using descriptive statistics.
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Grand Means Across Respondents

A comparison of all three groups' beliefs on the image of home economics content found that Food and Nutrition was perceived as the most valuable (Mean = 6.40) (Table 2a). The subject area of Family Relations was the most respected (Mean = 5.93) and most important (Mean = 6.26). Child Development was viewed as the most pleasant (Mean = 5.97).

In terms of usefulness in the future, Food and Nutrition was believed to be the most efficient (Mean = 5.97) and Child Development the most realistic (Mean = 5.29). The highest mean for knowledge-oriented was the subject matter area of Family relations (Mean = 4.80) with Child Development being rated as the most family-centered subject (Mean = 5.19). None of the subject matter/content areas of home economics was viewed at either extreme. Notably the word pairs stable/changeable and traditional/futuristic were viewed about in the middle.

Stereotypes often associated with home economics subject matter areas were found for Clothing and Textiles, which was perceived as the most feminine (Mean = 2.82). All other subject areas had means between 3.40 and 3.75. These findings suggest all but one home economics subject matter area are becoming more acceptable as courses for both males or females.

Findings regarding the academic orientation of home economics subject matter areas indicate that Food and Nutrition was perceived as the most
scientific (Mean = 4.67) while Consumer Education was rated the most academic (Mean = 5.04). All subject areas were determined to be neither too easy nor too difficult (Mean range = 3.64 to 4.10). Respondents considered Child Development to be the most useful subject (Mean = 6.29).

Responses to word pairs ascertaining classroom atmosphere considerations revealed that Child Development was rated as the most motivating subject (Mean = 5.57). The subject that was believed to be the most interesting was Family Relations (Mean = 5.78). For the word pairs, apathetic/motivating and boring/interesting, all subject areas had grand means of 5.38 and 5.49 respectively. This indicates that the classroom atmosphere for home economics courses generally is perceived as positive.

Place Table 2a About Here

Image Perceptions by Group

Perceptions of the image of home economics held by students, parents, and guidance counselors are reflected in the mean scores to the semantic differential scale presented in Table 2b. When comparing the perceptions of the three groups Kendall's coefficient of concordance was used. This test showed there were no significant differences in the responses to the semantic scale terms. The first null hypothesis was therefore not rejected. The means of the group responses for the five broad concept areas identified during the development of the instrument were examined for further insights.
When responding to the word pair 'worthless-valuable' students believed the most valuable subject area was Child Development (Mean = 6.25) while parents rated Food and Nutrition as the most valuable (Mean = 6.60). Guidance counselors viewed Family Relations (Mean = 6.61) as the most valuable. Responses to the word pair 'despised or respected' indicated that students and guidance counselors believed Family Relations was the most respected (Means = 5.75 and 6.06 respectively), while parents perceived Food and Nutrition (Mean = 6.07) as most respected.

Students selected Family Relations as most pleasant (Mean = 5.81) as did guidance counselors (Mean = 6.22), while parents selected both Child Development and Food and Nutrition as generally pleasant (Mean = 6.01). The word pair 'important or unimportant' elicited the highest response from the students for the subject Child Development (Mean = 6.24). This did not agree with Findlay's study (1976) in which former students reported money management and budgeting as the most important. Findlay's (1976) sample, however, did report Child Development as third in importance. Parents viewed Food and Nutrition (Mean = 6.37) as the most important while guidance counselors selected Family Relations (Mean = 6.33).
Future Use

Students rated Consumer Education as most efficient (Mean = 5.86) while parents believed Food and Nutrition was the most efficient (Mean = 6.16). Guidance counselors placed Child Development first (Mean = 6.06) in terms of efficiency. Child Development was chosen by both students and parents as being the most realistic (Means = 5.32 and 5.33 respectively), however, guidance counselors selected Consumer Education (Mean = 5.41) as most realistic in content. Clothing and Textiles was viewed as more skills-oriented than the other subject areas by students, parents, and guidance counselors (Means = 3.11, 3.34, 3.18 respectively).

Interestingly, Bell and Glosson (1983) found that 54.7% of former students in their study reported homemaking knowledge and skills had been beneficial in their work or career. Both students and guidance counselors agreed that Family Relations was the most family-centered (means = 5.38 and 5.39 respectively) while parents viewed Child Development as most family-centered (Mean = 5.46). Consumer Education was found to be the least family-centered subject by all three groups (Means = 3.19, 4.30, 4.00 respectively). None of the subject areas within home economics was viewed as neither extremely stable/changeable nor traditional/futuristic. The mean scores for these two word pairs ranged from 3.06 to 4.32.

Stereotypes

Clothing and Textiles was rated as the most feminine of the six subject matter areas with Child Development being perceived next most feminine. The remaining four subject areas were perceived as either
feminine or masculine. This may indicate that enrollment in these home economics courses is more likely to be viewed as suitable for either sex.

Academic Orientation

Students rated Consumer Education as most scientific (Mean = 4.49) while parents and guidance counselors viewed Food and Nutrition as most scientific (Means = 5.04 and 4.56 respectively). Most subjects were not viewed as either easy or difficult by students (Mean range = 31.28 to 3.99). Parents and guidance counselors concurred with this and reported similar mean ranges indicating that the subject matter was neither too easy nor too difficult. Child Development was determined to be the most useful subject by the students (Mean = 6.28) and guidance counselors (Mean = 6.39), while parents believed both Food and Nutrition and Family Relations were equal in usefulness (Mean = 6.24). The students in Bokenkamp's study (1978) indicated that Food and Nutrition was the most useful. Consumer Education was determined to be the most academic-oriented subject by students (Mean = 5.15), parents (Mean = 5.15), and guidance counselors (Mean = 4.82).

Classroom Setting

The subject area believed by students (Mean = 5.45) and parents (Mean = 5.59) to be the most motivating was Food and Nutrition. Guidance counselors rated Consumer Education (Mean = 5.82) as the most motivating subject area. Students selected Child Development (Mean = 5.60) as the most interesting subject in home economics while parents (Mean = 5.80) and
guidance counselors (Mean = 6.00) believed Family Relations was the most interesting.

Differences Based on Status of Home Economics Enrollment, Gender of Student Respondent, and Size of School

Students who responded to the survey were randomly selected to represent the populations of those who were currently enrolled in home economics and those who were not. Analysis of variance tests of the factors derived from the six subject matter/content areas revealed significant differences between these two student groups in terms of how they responded to the semantic differential scales assessing home economics subject matter/content areas (see Table 3a). Further analyses of variance were conducted to examine differences based upon gender of the respondent and school size. Significant differences were found between students who were enrolled and those who were not for all six subject matter areas, hence, the second null hypothesis was rejected. Image of the content in all areas except Clothing and Textiles was significantly different based on gender of the respondent, as a result the third null hypothesis was rejected. No significant differences were found in image perceptions between students from larger and smaller schools. Therefore the fourth null hypothesis was not rejected. Significant interactions were found between the enrollment characteristic and size of school for the subject matter areas of Clothing and Textiles and Food and Nutrition.
Mean responses of these groups are reported in Tables 3b and 3c. Female students generally had higher mean scores than male students. School size did not result in any significant differences in factor scores assessing overall image perceptions of home economics content. Enrolled students were significantly more positive about the subject matter areas in home economics than were students who were not enrolled.

Reasons For Not Enrolling In Home Economics

A Likert scale was used with "1" representing 'extremely unlikely', "2" 'unlikely', "3" 'undecided', "4" 'likely', and "5" 'extremely likely'. The coefficient reliability for this section of the instrument was .99.

As shown in Table 4, male and female students reported that 'schedule conflicts' (Mean = 2.94 and 3.97 respectively) and 'college requirements' (Mean = 2.79 and 3.11 respectively) were the most likely "reasons for male
and female students not enrolling in home economics. Items with the lowest influence on the decision to enroll were: 'influence of parents not to enroll' (Mean = 1.67 and 1.63 respectively). Therefore, it might appear that parents and guidance counselors may be supportive of enrollment in home economics.

Insert Table 4 About Here

Friends were rated, especially by male students, slightly more influential than parents. This agrees with previous studies which also found that peers are more influential than parents (Vaines & Arcus, 1987; Wall et al., 1987; Michigan State Department of Education, 1978). Parents were, however, slightly more influential than guidance counselors for both male and female students. These scores do indicate that guidance counselors need to be aware of scheduling conflicts that can prevent male and female students from being able to enroll in home economics, as indicated by the highest scored response 'scheduling conflict' (Mean = 2.94 and 3.97 respectively). This finding concurs with results obtained by Stenberg (1989), who stated academic professionals directly control offerings and scheduling of courses that influence what high school students elect to take.

In comparing male and female student's responses, it was found that female students did not rate the statements the same as male students. Females were more likely to believe that schedule conflicts influenced
their ability to enroll in home economics. Male students reported "no interest" in taking home economics more often than females. The reason for this lack of interest was not assessed. Both males and females were significantly different (p < .01) but both reported stereotypes associated with home economics as "unlikely" influences to not enrolling. However, males did indicate a stronger belief that stereotypes are associated with home economics subject matter areas. Female and male students were also significantly different (p < .05) on their views of parental influence as a deterrent to enrolling. Based on the four significant differences between male and female students the fifth null hypothesis was rejected.

Past Involvement and Familiarity with Home Economics Programs

A comparison of the amount of past involvement in home economics programs on which perceptions of home economics might be based shows little variation between students and parents (see Table 5a). Both groups had taken more than two semesters of home economics. It should be noted that the parent sample was predominately female (N = 83 out of 87). Griggs and McFadden (1980) found a positive correlation between the number of courses taken and the increase in knowledge. Inference, therefore, may be made that increased coursework may result in more familiarity with home economics programs. Results indicate this is true in the present study.

Insert Table 5a About Here
The question, "How familiar do you believe yourself to be with the home economics program in your school?", also measured enrolled students', nonenrolled students', and parents' familiarity with home economics (see Table 5b.). Seventy-two percent of the parents believed they were 'somewhat' to 'very familiar' with the home economics program in their child's school. Fifty percent of the students, both enrolled and non-enrolled, viewed themselves as being somewhat familiar with the home economics program; 38.5% of those enrolled stated they were 'very familiar' compared to only 10.2% of those who were not enrolled. Of those who were not enrolled in 13.6% believed they were 'very unfamiliar' with the home economics program.

_____________________________________

Insert Table 5b About Here

_____________________________________
CONCLUSIONS

Mean responses to the semantic differential scales ascertaining image perceptions of home economics held by students and parents indicate that Child Development and Food and Nutrition were viewed as valuable content areas. Family Relations was considered 'respected' and 'pleasant' content area by students. Guidance counselors supported Family Relations and considered it to be the most 'valuable, respected, pleasant, and important' home economics subject matter/content area. Child Development was determined by students to be the most important while parents selected Food and Nutrition. These results may indicate a change in the public's perception of home economics as 'cooking and sewing' reported in Johnson et al. (1987) and Robinson's (1987) studies. Image perceptions of home economics vary by the subject matter/content area emphasizing the need for a variety of marketing messages to educate both students and the public about the current foci of home economics programs. Areas addressing current concerns of youth such as: sex roles; money management; health issues like AIDS; drug abuse; and decision-making (Schultz, 1989) should be stressed when developing marketing strategies aimed at all students explaining what home economics teaches.

An analysis of overall image perceptions based upon the factor scores for the six home economics subject matter/content areas revealed a disparity in perceptions based on gender. Whether the student was currently enrolled in home economics or not also significantly influenced
their perceptions of home economics. School size did not impact perceptions independently but interacted, i.e., influenced responses when paired, with the enrollment characteristic for the subject matter areas of Clothing and Textiles and Food and Nutrition.

Students responded that scheduling conflicts were the most likely reason for not enrolling in a home economics course. The relative influence of friends, parents, and guidance counselors on the decision to enroll was not as strong. Males were influenced by their friends more often than were females. Males reported 'no interest' in home economics as their top reason for not enrolling.

In examining the past involvement of parents and students in home economics programs few differences were found. Likely, this finding was influenced by the large number of female parent respondents. When students were separated into enrolled and nonenrolled groups, it was shown that once students enroll in home economics, the majority (68.1%) elect three or more semesters. The largest percentage of nonenrolled students had never taken a home economics course (28.4%). These findings indicate the need to study tracking practices in general and as applied to vocational programs. The largest percentage of the parents (43.6%) had taken three or more semesters. However, 83% of the parents responding were female so this may have biased the results. Over fifty percent of the parents, as well as enrolled and nonenrolled students believed they were 'somewhat familiar' with the home economics program. Only 38.5% of the enrolled students responded that they were 'very familiar' with the program. Marketing strategies that explain all consent areas to the
students and parents needs to be developed. Use of such materials is critical to both enrolled and nonenrolled students. Opportunities to use these strategies with nonenrolled students especially need to be identified.

Recommendations for further study include exploration of the effectiveness of ways to market home economics to all students, with sensitivity to the differing perceptions of males and females, as well as, the effects of differing amounts of previous home economics contact. Also it is recommended that longitudinal studies be conducted to determine if home economics programs prepared enrolled students for the demands of their future career and family lives. For nonenrolled students, lost benefits need to be assessed to determine if they find themselves lacking in needed skills. It is to all students' benefit that the home economics program offer skills and information for future use in such a way that they will recognize both the value and relevance of taking home economics programs. This can be accomplished when marketing principles are applied to the overall public relations plan.
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Table 1. Correlations of subject area factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>FN</th>
<th>HHF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td></td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>.50*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>.73*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td>.54*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.59*</td>
<td>.55*</td>
<td>.62*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHF</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.71*</td>
<td>.63*</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .0001

CD = Child Development
CE = Consumer Education
CT = Clothing and Textiles
FR = Family Relations
FN = Food and Nutrition
HHF = Housing and Home Furnishings
Table 2a. Semantic differential means\textsuperscript{a} for home economics subject matter areas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CD</th>
<th>CT</th>
<th>CE</th>
<th>FR</th>
<th>FN</th>
<th>HHP</th>
<th>GRAND X</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IMAGE OF CONTENT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>worthless/valuable</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>5.69</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>6.40</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>6.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>despised/respected</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>6.93</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpleasant/pleasant</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unimportant/important</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>5.51</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6.26</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUTURE USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inefficient/efficient</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idealistic/realistic</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skill-oriented/knowledge-oriented</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>4.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career-centered/family-centered</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stable/changeable</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional/futuristic</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STEREOTYPES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feminine/masculine</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACADEMIC ORIENTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unscientific/scientific</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy/difficult</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useless/useful</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>6.08</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nonacademic/academic</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CLASSROOM SETTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>apathetic/motivating</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>5.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boring/interesting</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}A semantic scale was used where the first term in the pair listed above was given a value of "1" and the second word in the pair was assigned a value of "7".
Table 2b. Means responses of students, parents, and guidance counselors to the semantic word pairs with corresponding values:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic word pairs</th>
<th>CD</th>
<th></th>
<th>CT</th>
<th></th>
<th>CE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S = students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P = parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G = guidance counselors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semantic word pairs</th>
<th>S</th>
<th></th>
<th>G</th>
<th></th>
<th>S</th>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) worthless to (7) valuable</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.21</td>
<td>6.56</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>6.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) despised to (7) respected</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) unpleasant to (7) pleasant</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) unimportant to (7) important</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.47</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) inefficient to (7) efficient</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) idealistic to (7) realistic</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) skill-oriented to (7) knowledge-oriented</td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) career-centered to (7) family-centered</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) stable to (7) changeable</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) feminine to (7) masculine</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) traditional to (7) futuristic</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) unscientific to (7) scientific</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) easy to (7) difficult</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) useless to (7) useful</td>
<td>6.28</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) nonacademic to (7) academic</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) apathetic to (7) motivated</td>
<td>5.35</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) boring to (7) interesting</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>5.74</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>4.81</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group abbreviations:

- S = students
- P = parents
- G = guidance counselors

Subject matter abbreviations:

- CD = child development
- CT = clothing and textiles
- CE = consumer education
- FR = family relations
- FN = food and nutrition
- HHF = housing and home furnishings
the semantic differential scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CE</th>
<th></th>
<th>FR</th>
<th></th>
<th>FN</th>
<th></th>
<th>HHF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>6.61</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>5.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>5.71</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.83</td>
<td>5.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>5.41</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.99</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.06</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>6.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>4.82</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3a. Differences in F ratios based on: Gender of student, and size of school, and home economics enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F Ratios</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>2-way Interactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>33.52****</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>13.34****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>4.20*</td>
<td>Enrollment With Size 4.03*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>7.00**</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>10.87***</td>
<td>Enrollment With Size 11.61***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>17.32****</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>9.38**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>13.03****</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>8.51**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHF</td>
<td>11.22****</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>14.82*****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = p < .05  
** = p < .01  
*** = p < .001  
**** = p < .0001

Enrollment = enrolled or not enrolled  
Gender = male or female student  
Size = larger school (over 1100) or smaller school (less than 1100)

CD = Child Development  
CE = Consumer Education  
CT = Clothing and Textiles  
FR = Family Relations  
FN = Food and Nutrition  
HHF = Housing and Home Furnishings
Table 3b. Factor mean scores based on gender of student respondent, size of school, and home economics enrollment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th></th>
<th>School Size</th>
<th></th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male (N=46)</td>
<td>Female (N=133)</td>
<td>Large (N=90)</td>
<td>Small (N=89)</td>
<td>Enrolled (N=91)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CD</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>6.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>5.81</td>
<td>6.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>5.76</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>6.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHP</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>5.54</td>
<td>6.06</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3c. Factor means for home economics subject areas with significant interaction cell means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Area</th>
<th>Large School</th>
<th>Small School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; Textiles</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food &amp; Nutrition</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Enrolled</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Reasons given for not enrolling in home economics programs by male and female students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Means</th>
<th>Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Ratio</td>
<td>Male (N = 46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule conflict</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College entrance requirements increased</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No interest</td>
<td>4.30**</td>
<td>3.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't meet college entrance requirements</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>2.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time due to extracurricular activities</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased requirements for high school graduation</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time due to employment outside of school</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>2.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes associated with home economics</td>
<td>6.06****</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of friends not to enroll in home economics</td>
<td>5.02***</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of parents not to enroll in home economics</td>
<td>2.75*</td>
<td>1.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance counselor suggests against enrolling in home economics</td>
<td>.81</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*=p < .05
**=p < .01
***=p < .001
****=p < .0001

Likert scale of 1 to 5 was used where 1 = unlikely and 5 = likely.
Table 5a. Past involvement in home economics programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of semesters</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Students</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enrolled (N = 91)</td>
<td>Non-enrolled (N = 88)</td>
<td>Male (N = 46)</td>
<td>Female (N = 133)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 semester</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 semester</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>20.5%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 semesters</td>
<td>29.9%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more semesters</td>
<td>41.4%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: percentages may not total 100% due to rounding.
**Table 5b. Familiarity with home economics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Parents (N = 87)</th>
<th>All Students (N = 179)</th>
<th>Enrolled Students (N = 91)</th>
<th>Nonenrolled Students (N = 88)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very familiar</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat familiar</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>50.5%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undecided</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not very familiar</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unfamiliar</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to test the applicability of Bloch and Richin's theoretical model on image perceptions as it relates to the marketing of home economics programs to high school students. Testing of the applicability of this model to the marketing of home economics involved analyzing the influencers of perceptions of product meaning (image perceptions of home economics content); enduring importance (student's future plans for career and family); and perceived risk (future educational plans for the student held by the student, their parents, friends, guidance counselors, and teachers) on the task-related response to purchase the product (enroll in home economics). One hundred seventy-nine students from 20 high schools representing a stratified random sample of Iowa schools participated in the study. A questionnaire was designed to ascertain students' perceptions of home economics content areas, their future career and family plans, and the influence of others such as parents and friends to their decision to enroll in home economics. Multiple regression analyses were run to operationalize a path analysis approach to the theoretical model. Results indicated that the variables with the largest total effect in the model were the number of semesters of home economics the respondent had taken and the respondents' perceptions of the image of home economics. Correlations indicated that future career and family plans of the student and their perceptions of their parents' views toward their future also influenced the decision to enroll.
INTRODUCTION

Marketing home economics has been advocated by state and national organizations. Yankelovich (1974) in his study for the American Home Economics Association recommended that a clear and consistent image of home economics be promoted. Johnson, Holcombe, Kean, Woodward, Tweeten, and Hafer (1987) provided evidence that the image of home economics as "cooking and/or sewing" was still alive and well in the 1980s. As a result the researchers supported a continued need for public relations because the general public was not aware of the many roles that home economists have. A study by Burnett, Harrison, and Miller (1986) also stated there was a need to improve communicative linkages among teachers and administrators to transmit needs, priorities, curriculum strategies, and general information regarding home economics programs. Johnson (1987b) recommended the utilization of effective recruitment strategies for home economics programs as essential for the survival of undergraduate programs. Results from those who have implemented recruitment strategies have shown positive impacts on program growth and image (Torrie, 1988).

Marketing home economics programs can be viewed as contributing to the overall goal of vocational education, which is to provide appropriate vocational education experiences for all students who can benefit (Evans & Herr, 1978).
In viewing marketing more broadly, Murphy and Enis (1986) stated that the benefits expected from the product must be equal to or greater than the price paid by the consumer. Marketing involves the mutual satisfaction of the seller and the buyer through the exchange of a product (Kotler, 1972). A marketing strategy is a set of activities that determines the benefits that will satisfy the buyer in a specific situation and offers a product that will provide those benefits. Kotler (1972) stated that the benefits of the product must be equal to or greater than the price paid by the consumer. Several sources have stated that the product is often perceived by the buyer to be a group of characteristics including: qualities, processes, and/or capabilities (goods, services, and ideas) that are expected to provide satisfaction (Leavitt, 1980; Kotler, 1984; Enis & Roering, 1980).

If home economics can be viewed as the product, then students can be viewed as the consumer. The risk or price paid in electing to take a home economics course would equate to the amount of time or money spent in purchasing the product. By selecting a home economics course the student may be missing out on other requirements or electives that will assure him/her of acceptance at a post-secondary institution. Other factors may influence the "price paid" such as peer acceptance or stereotypes that are generated of students enrolled in home economics courses. Jacoby and Kaplan (1972) distinguished five types of risk in making a decision to purchase a product: 1) financial risk where the product will not be worth the price; 2) psychological risk where a poor product choice will harm a buyer's ego; 3) physical risk where there is risk to the buyer's safety;
4) functional risk where the product will not perform as expected; and 5) social risk where the product choice may result in embarrassment before one's family/friends/work group. The implications of the social risk in taking a home economics course seems the most relevant as students, especially males, may be questioned as to why they may have enrolled in this subject. Traditional mores may indicate the subject matter is not appropriate, but current lifestyles and expectations of males would indicate the necessity of developing skills such as those taught in home economics.

Lytton and Carsky (1987) suggest that the mission of the organization should provide the framework for the development of a marketing strategy. This would indicate that the focus of the home economics message that "should be on enabling families, both as individual units and generally as a social institution, to build and maintain systems of action which lead 1) to maturing in individual self-formation and 2) to enlightened, cooperative participation in the critique and formation of goals and means for accompanying them" (Brown & Paolucci, 1979, p. 47). There has been concern by professionals in the field of home economics that the perceptions of society toward home economics do not represent an accurate picture. Home economics, however, has been viewed as highly marketable because it addresses the day-to-day living needs of people at all ages (Miller, 1981).

Kotler and Levy (1969) describe marketing as that function of the organization that keeps in constant touch with the organization's consumers, reads their needs, develops 'products' to meet those needs, and
creates a program to communicate the organizational purpose (p. 15). In developing a marketing plan, assessing the current image of the product is the first step. The image of an organization is composed of at least six components (American Vocational Association, 1988). These components are: beliefs or values such as what you want others to think of your program; traditions and visions that explain the history of your program and where you are headed in the future; the service focus or who are your audiences; a mission statement; slogans or phrases that could serve as reminders of the values and mission statement; and operational guidelines. The second step is to determine the target market on which the strategies will focus. In the case of home economics, the primary target would be the students.

Those who influence the students' career choice and essentially the high school coursework would be another target group. Goggans (1980) believes student apprehension about taking a vocational education course in what would be considered a nontraditional area is the result of the reaction of those who are influential in the personal life of the students—namely parents, peers, and other family members. Parents and peers often help determine the values and expectations that dictate behavior and influence the decisions made by students.

Other risks students need to consider are related to taking the necessary courses to meet college entrance or high school graduation requirements. Reports such as A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983), the Holmes Group (1986), and the College Entrance Examination Board (1983) report on Academic Preparation for College have greatly influenced the demand for academic courses with
specific recommendations for increased requirements in English, math, and the sciences. Both math and English requirements have been increased in most schools as secondary education has attempted to better prepare students to enter college. These increased requirements have affected the ability of students to enroll in elective courses such as home economics because the opportunity to take electives has decreased. The Carnegie Task Force (1983) expanded the previous reports' suggestions for high school preparation to include: four years of English, three years of mathematics, three years of science, three years of social studies, a half year of computer science and for those going to college two years of foreign language (p. 24). Academic courses, however, should not be in competition with vocational education as was pointed out in Investing in Our Children (Committee for Economic Development, 1985).

As a result of the study on "High School Graduation Requirements and Enrollment Patterns in High School Vocational Education Programs in the United States," Frantz, Strickland and Elson (1986) recommended that state and local administrators of vocational education be responsive to enrollment declines and use initiatives and strategies to provide opportunities for students to enroll in vocational education courses. Johnson (1987b) pointed out that prospective students, through a variety of recruitment strategies, can be made and how they can be a part of this dynamic field.

Theoretical Model

Theory provides a shorthand for communication that organizes and generates new ideas (Cohen, 1980). Theory also assists in guiding the
investigator by generating explanations and making predictions. Fisher (1978) states, however, that theory can only be adequate if it contains all the theoretical concepts necessary to derive explanations. Fisher (1978) goes on to explain that theory directs the researcher beyond their own conscious control to observe the phenomenon within certain categories, terms, or concepts. The researcher's concepts are limited to those theoretical concepts with which he/she has chosen to work.

In the field of marketing, Bloch and Richins (1983) developed a theoretical model for the study of product importance perceptions (see Figure 1). This model examines the framework of product importance which is developed along three components: sources (i.e., consumer, product, and situation), importance (i.e., enduring or instrumental importance), and response (i.e., ongoing or task-related). The model attempts to recognize the concept of product importance in order to clarify and unify a number of related concepts that have appeared in marketing literature (Bloch & Richins, 1983). The model proposes possible sources and outputs of product perceptions as well.

---

Insert Figure 1 About Here

---

The theoretical model developed by Bloch and Richins (1983) used in studying product importance perceptions operationalizes several variables that can assist in the evaluation of the perceived image of home economics programs and in the marketing of secondary home economics programs to
students. The first component of the model contains the sources of perceptions and is composed of the consumer, the product meaning and attributes, and the situation specific to eliciting a task-related response. In applying these components of the model to the marketing of secondary home economics programs the consumer is the student, product meaning is the image of home economics programs, and the situation is the previous contact with the home economics program.

The variables in the model were operationalized by specific questions or scales on the questionnaire. The variables representing the first component (i.e., sources of perceptions) were measured by the following questions. The student (i.e., consumer) aspect of model was operationalized by using gender of the respondent as the key variable of interest (see Figure 2). The image of home economics (i.e., product meaning) was measured by students' response to a 17-item semantic differential scale designed to ascertain beliefs about the image of six home economics subject matter areas. The scale assessed student perceptions related to their future use of home economics concepts, stereotypes about home economics, academic orientation of home economics content, and classroom atmosphere. The past involvement (i.e., situation specific to eliciting a task response) was measured by the number of semesters a student had been enrolled in home economics.

Insert Figure 2 About Here
The importance component of the model reflects two types of importance, enduring and instrumental (see Figure 2). The enduring importance as applied to the marketing of home economics programs consists of the long term goals of the student (i.e., the consumer). These were measured by students' responses to an instrument ascertaining their future family and career goals (Blinn & Pike, 1986). These goals were then analyzed for their contributions to the model in order to determine their perceived value of home economics. Instrumental importance is influenced by perceived risk and involves the student (i.e., the consumer) in a choice situation. Risk was viewed as the amount at stake in electing to take a home economics course and the influence of others in deciding on the coursework to be taken. In operationalizing this variables the influence of parents, friends, and guidance counselors on the students' career decision-making process and hence, their coursework selection, was recognized. The student's (i.e., the consumer's) subjective feelings of certainty about the favorableness of the purchase consequences determine whether the risks are positive or negative. In applying these concepts to marketing home economics programs, risk (i.e., instrumental importance) was measured by asking students what their parents, friends, teachers, and guidance counselors believed the student's future educational aspirations should be. The literature supported the role of these groups as influencers on the student career selection process (Johnson, 1987a; Vaines & Arcus, 1987; Wall, Holt, Harrison, Kotrlik, 1987; Wendland, 1987).
The last step in the application of the model to home economics programs was to examine situational involvement as measured by the students' current enrollment characteristic (i.e., whether or not the student was enrolled in a home economics program currently). This variable was used as the dependent variable in testing a portion of the theoretical model. The final portion of the model by Bloch and Richins (1983) was not tested because it dealt with future responses that could not be measured at the present time.
PURPOSE

The purpose of this study was to test the applicability of these components of Bloch and Richins theoretical model as they relate to the marketing of home economics programs to high school students. Specific objectives were to:

1) Determine the influence of students' perceptions of home economics content, future for family and career plans, and perceived risks on the decision to enroll in home economics.

2) Test the following relationships:
   a. Gender of the student (i.e., the consumer) and the semesters of past involvement in home economics (i.e., the situation) will influence perceptions of the image of home economics (i.e., the product).
   b. Gender of the student (i.e., the consumer), semesters of past involvement in home economics (i.e., the situation), and perceptions of the image of home economics (i.e., the product) will impact the future family plans of students (i.e., enduring importance).
   c. Gender of the student (i.e., the consumer), semesters of past involvement in home economics
(i.e., the situation), perceptions of the image of home economics (i.e., the product), and students' future family plans will contribute to their future career plans (i.e., enduring importance). Both future family and career plans were entered separately as variables associated with enduring importance.

d. Gender of the student (i.e., the consumer), semesters of past involvement in home economics (i.e., the situation), perceptions of the image of home economics (i.e., the product), and students' future family plans and career plans (i.e., enduring importance) will affect perceived risk associated with enrolling in home economics (i.e., instrumental importance).

e. Gender of the student (i.e., the consumer), semesters of past involvement in home economics (i.e., the situation), perceptions of the image of home economics (i.e., the product), and students' future family plans and career plans (i.e., enduring importance), and perceived risk (i.e., instrumental importance) will contribute to the students' current enrollment status in home economics (i.e., situational involvement).
As these objectives were operationalized, the last variable listed in each step was the dependent variable in the regression equation.
METHODOLOGY

The survey approach was selected because it could be used to reach a large number of respondents in diverse geographical areas within the state of Iowa. Questionnaires were printed in a photographically reduced booklet format as suggested by Dillman (1978). The population for this research consisted of high school juniors and seniors, parents, and guidance counselors. Thirty schools were selected in a stratified random sample so that half the students were from smaller school districts (under the median of 1100 students in grades K through 12) and half were from larger school districts (over 1100 students enrolled). Both groups were asked to respond to a basic demographic instrument and semantic differential scales assessing their perceptions of the six home economics content areas identified by Hughes, Rougut, and Woods (1980). Students also were asked to respond to items ascertaining future family and career aspirations. Permission to conduct the study in each district was granted by the administrator in the local school. Upon receiving notification that permission had been granted, a packet of materials was sent to the home economics teacher in 30 randomly selected districts. Twenty districts agreed to participate.

Respondents included 179 students who were juniors and seniors in high school and were evenly distributed between smaller schools (under 1100 enrollment) (N=89) and larger schools (over 1100 enrollment) (N=90). Forty-six of the respondents were male and 133 were female. The
instructions to the home economics teachers were to randomly select
students so although the sample was not gender balanced it was believed to
be an accurate representation of enrollment in home economics in those
districts. Eighty-two students were juniors, 94 were seniors, and three
did not indicate their present grade level. Ninety-one of the students
were currently enrolled in a home economics program and 88 were not
enrolled. Of those who reported being currently enrolled in a home
economics program, 28% were enrolled in Child Development or Parenting,
19% in Family Relations, 24% in Food and Nutrition, 18% in Clothing and
Textiles, 2% in Consumer Education, and 9% in Housing/Home Furnishings/
Equipment. The response rate for the students was 89.5%.

Instrument Development

Triandis (1971) defined attitudes as what people think or feel about
an object and indicated that behavior is determined not only by what they
would like to do but also by what is socially acceptable. Fishbein and
Ajzen (1975) suggested that attitude is distinguished from other concepts
because of its affective nature and should be measured by a procedure that
locates the subject on a bipolar affective or evaluative dimension.
Affect is defined as a person's feelings toward and evaluation of some
object, person, issue, or event (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Attitude toward
an object is seen as related to the person's intentions to select a
behavior related to his/her beliefs about the object.

Sherif and Sherif (1967) stated that the use of the semantic
differential scale to assess the individuals judgement of the attitude on
all dimensions of meaning is more informative than the measurement of
"attitude" alone that are represented by ratings on the "evaluative dimension." They believe that semantic differential scales give more information about the meaning of the attitude object than can be obtained from ratings on an evaluative dimension. Psycho-social scales reflect the stand taken by groups, by strata, or by entire populations at a given period and the individual differences in attitude can be gauged relative to the current patterns of acceptability and rejection and their changes (Sherif & Sherif, 1967). For those reasons a semantic differential scale was determined to be most useful in establishing a measurement of these attitudes toward this home economics research.
DATA ANALYSIS

Descriptive statistics were used to conduct a preliminary analysis on all of the variables studied. Questions relating to the image of home economics (i.e., product importance), future family and career plans (i.e., enduring importance), perceived risk associated with the decision to enroll in home economics (i.e., instrumental importance), and current home economics enrollment (i.e., situational involvement) were examined in order to analyze the applicability of the theoretical model to the marketing of home economics programs.

The component of the model representing the student (i.e., the consumer) was entered in the regression as the respondent's gender. This was one of the first independent variables entered along with past involvement (i.e., the situation which was measured by the number of semesters of home economics the student had taken. The dependent variable for the first regression equation was students' image perceptions of home economics (i.e., the product). The description of this dependent variable follows.

Word pairs were selected to represent five major concepts that indicated both positive and negative characteristics of home economics content. These word pairs were then used as an indicator of students' overall image of home economics (i.e., the product, Factor 1). The five concepts represented were: image of content, future use, stereotypes, academic orientation, and classroom atmosphere. A total of 17 word pairs
were used and students responded using a 7-point semantic differential scale format. A response of '7' was associated with a positive characteristic and '1' with a negative characteristic. If there was no clear indication in the word pair of positive or negative connotations, the researcher arbitrarily assigned a positive value to one of the words in the pair.

The six home economics content areas (i.e., Child Development, Clothing and Textiles, Consumer Education, Family Relations, Food and Nutrition, and Housing and Home Furnishings) were factor analyzed to condense the number of word pairs into a single factor that could be used for further analyses. The results for each content area showed there was a single factor that accounted for over 40% of the variance. Since 40% or more of the variance was explained by this first factor, no attempts were made to identify additional factors. Individual variables (word pairs) with a loading of .50 or higher were retained in the factor. Seven word pairs were found to be common to four or more of the six home economics content areas. These seven word pairs were highly correlated ($p < .0001$) across the subject areas and were combined to form a composite factor (Factor 1). The seven word pairs represented students' image perceptions of home economics. The word pairs were: worthless/valuable, despised/respected, unpleasant/pleasant, important/unimportant, inefficient/efficient, apathetic/motivating, and boring/interesting. The coefficient alpha reliability for this factor was .97.

A second factor analysis (Factor 2A) was computed to represent the dimension of future family plans of the students (i.e., enduring
importance) in order to test the theoretical model. A single factor representing 32.6% of the variance had an eigenvalue of 2.95 and contained the following items: 'Be a parent', 'Be a grandparent', and 'Work fulltime while you have infants or small children'. The factor loadings for the first two items were .91 and .82 respectively. The third item 'work fulltime while you have infants or small children' loaded at .20. Because of its relatedness to the first two items the third item was retained because it was the only other item grouped within this factor. This factor had a reliability of alpha .61 and was used to represent future family plans of the student (i.e., enduring importance, Factor 2A).

A factor analysis for the concept of future career plans of the student (i.e., enduring importance, Factor 2B) also yielded one factor. This factor explained 19% of the variance and had an eigenvalue of 2.14. This was the most variance explained by any one factor and contained three items loading .50 or above. It had a coefficient alpha reliability of .60 and was selected to represent future career plans of the student. The items represented included in the factor were: 'Have an education beyond a bachelor's degree', 'Work full time', and 'Work part time'.

The component of the model representing perceived risk associated with enrollment in home economics (i.e., instrumental importance, Factor 3) contained four items. The items asked the respondent to indicate what he/she believed others such as his/her father, mother, guidance counselor, teacher, friends, and the student himself/herself, thought the student should do following high school (i.e., get job, enter the military, go to
trade school, or attend college). A factor accounting for 47.7% of the variance and having an eigenvalue of 3.34 resulted. It included the following individuals as important influencers: the student (factor loading .81), student's mother (factor loading .77), student's father (factor loading .76), and student's friends (factor loading .49). The reliability for this perceived risk in enrolling in home economics (i.e., instrumental importance, Factor 3) was .83.

The theoretical model was tested using a path analysis approach that utilized a series of multiple regression analyses to test relationships among the dependent and independent variables. In the regression results the betas are the path coefficients used in the path analysis (Pedhazur, 1982). The percentage of variance explained (R) was computed for each equation. The four recursive linear equations for the model were:

\[
\text{Image of home economics} = a + \varepsilon_{i,j} b_i X_i \\
\text{Future family plans} = a + \varepsilon_{i,j} b_i X_i \\
\text{Future career plans} = a + \varepsilon_{i,j} b_i X_i \\
\text{Perceived risk} = a + \varepsilon_{i,j} b_i X_i \\
\text{Enrollment} = a + \varepsilon_{i,j} b_i X_i
\]

where

- \(b_1\) = gender of the student (i.e., the consumer)
- \(b_2\) = semesters of home economics taken (i.e., past involvement)
- \(b_3\) = home economics image (i.e., the product, Factor 1)
- \(b_4\) = future family plans (i.e., enduring importance, Factor 2A)
- \(b_5\) = future career plans (i.e., enduring importance, Factor 2B)
- \(b_6\) = perceived risk (i.e., instrumental importance, Factor 3)

Total effects, indirect effects, and direct effects also are possible to determine through a multiple regression analysis. The direct effect is
the part of a variable's total effect that is not transmitted via intervening variables and the indirect effect is that part of the variable's total effect that is transmitted by intervening variables (Frerichs, Crawford, & Kemis, 1989). The total effect is the amount of change in an effect (dependent) variable caused by a given shift in a causal (independent) variable (Frerichs, Crawford, & Kemis, 1989).
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Each of the components of the model that were factor analyzed (i.e., image, future family and career plans, and perceived risk) will first be presented in a descriptive summary. This information is useful in interpreting the trend of the students on all questions, not just those that were used in the factors selected for use in the model. Inferential statistics will then be used to indicate the relationship of each component of the model. The total effect, indirect effect, and direct effect of each component in the model will be analyzed for its contribution to the path analysis.

Image of Home Economics

The students responded to 17 word pairs on a semantic differential scale to ascertain their perceptions of the image of six home economics content areas. A 7-point scale was used to record student responses. Five concepts were represented by the word pairs: image of content, future use, stereotypes, academic orientation, and classroom atmosphere. The grand mean results across all six content areas indicate results of the perceptions of home economics with the values of each word pair as follows:

The concept of perceived image was represented by four of the 17 word pairs. Image of home economics content was viewed as more valuable (7) rather than worthless (1) ($\bar{x} = 5.92$), respected (7) rather than despised
(1) $(X = 5.49)$, pleasant (7) more than unpleasant (1) $(X = 5.49)$; and important (7) over unimportant (1) $(X = 5.96)$.

Future use of home economics was represented by six concepts in the instrument. Future use of home economics was believed to be more efficient (7) than inefficient (1) $(X = 4.83)$; neither extremely idealistic (1) nor realistic (7) $(X = 4.30)$; not just skill-oriented (1) or knowledge-oriented (7) $(X = 4.37)$; both career-centered (1) and family-centered (7) $(X = 4.09)$; relatively stable (1) rather than changeable (7) $(X = 3.48)$; and slightly more traditional (2) than futuristic (7) $(X = 3.62)$.

One concept was used to indicate stereotypes associated with home economics. The stereotype of home economics as more feminine (1) than masculine (7) $(X = 3.49)$ appears to exist only marginally.

Four word pairs were used to represent academic orientation. The academic orientation of home economics was described as more scientific (7) than unscientific (1) $(X = 4.10)$; viewed to be slightly more easy (1) than difficult (7) subject $(X = 3.57)$; useful (7) than useless (1) $(X = 6.02)$; somewhat more academic (7) than nonacademic (1) $(X = 4.47)$.

The classroom atmosphere of home economics programs was described as motivating (7) not apathetic (1) $(X = 5.14)$ and interesting (7) rather than boring (1) $(X = 5.18)$. These findings identify the strengths and weaknesses of the image of home economics and have implications for marketing strategies which can be developed.
Future Plans

Future family and career/education plans of students were measured using the following Likert scale: 1 = Extremely unlikely, 2 = Unlikely, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Likely, and 5 = Extremely likely. Results of the students' responses regarding their future plans are shown in Table 6. Students' foresaw themselves as 'Extremely Likely' to marry only once (55.9%), be a parent (57.5%), be a grandparent (45.3%), work fulltime (45.8%), earn more money than their parents (44.7%), and be in a dual income family (52.5%). These findings indicate that students believe they will assume traditional family roles while at the same time be part of a dual earner family.

Insert Table 6 About Here

Perceived Risks

To determine the risks perceived (i.e., instrumental importance, Factor 3) by students in choosing to enroll in home economics, their future career and educational goals were studied. Responses from the students indicated that 77% plan to go on to college. It has been documented that individuals such as parents, friends, and school personnel (i.e., guidance counselors and teachers), have an impact on the student's career choice. The students' beliefs regarding influencers effecting post-graduation plans also were examined. Seventy-two percent of the students believed their father thought they should attend college, and 76% reported
their mother thought the students should attend college. Eighty-two percent of the students stated that their guidance counselor believed they should attend college and 80% reported that their teachers also believed they should attend college. In response to what the student believed their friends thought they should pursue, 76% reported that their friends believed the student should go to college. These perceptions indicate that the influencers on students' career choices support an academic curriculum, which would assist the students in being able to enter a college or university. Hence, taking vocational courses such as home economics that do not count toward college entrance requirements would be considered a risk.

Testing the Theoretical Model

A correlation matrix was calculated for all of the variables retained in the model. Computation of such a matrix is recommended as a preliminary step in model testing by Warren, Klonglan, and Faisal (1977). The results of this matrix are reported in Table 7. Thirteen significant correlations were found to exist among the components of the model. The correlations that indicate a path analysis are: gender of the student (i.e., the consumer) and semesters of home economics taken (i.e., the situation) are significantly correlated with the image of home economics (i.e., the product, Factor 1) \( r = .36^{***} \) and \( r = .26^{***} \) respectively. The image of home economics (i.e., the product, Factor 1) is significantly correlated with perceived risks (i.e., instrumental importance, Factor 3) \( r = -.19^{**} \) but not with future family and career plans as would have
been predicted by the model. It was determined that the effect of student's future family and career plans needed to be tested in the model to determine its impact. The perceived risks (i.e., instrumental importance, Factor 3) and enrollment characteristic, whether or not the student was enrolled in home economics (i.e., situational involvement), did show a significantly negative relationship \( r = -.12^* \) as was to be expected. All components, with the exception of future family and career plans, were significantly related to the enrollment characteristic.

---

Insert Table 7 About Here

---

Results of the multiple regression analyses indicated that the semesters of home economics taken (i.e., the situation) significantly contributed to the total effect of the image of home economics (i.e., the product, Factor 1) (Table 8, beta = .31****). Gender of the student (i.e., the consumer) also was a significant contributor, although a negative one, to the future career plans of the student (i.e., enduring importance, Factor 2B). The high score for perceived risk (i.e., instrumental importance, Factor 3) had a significant negative contribution from both past semesters and the image of home economics (i.e., the product, Factor 1). For students who were planning to go to college, the risk of enrolling was higher, hence contributed negatively to the past enrollment and image perceptions of home economics. The future family and career plans of the student (i.e., enduring importance, Factors 2A and 2B)
significantly contributed to the perceived risk associated with enrolling in home economics (i.e., instrumental importance, Factor 3). The semesters of involvement (i.e., the situation) and image of home economics (i.e., the product, Factor 1) also significantly contributed to the perceived risk (i.e., instrumental importance, Factor 3), but with a negative impact.

In the final equation of the model using the path analysis approach, the number of semesters of home economics taken (i.e., situation) contributed significantly to the enrollment characteristic, whether the student was currently enrolled in a home economics course (i.e., situational involvement) (Table 8, beta = .50***). The image of home economics (i.e., the product, Factor 1) also made a significant contribution to the total effect of whether a student was currently enrolled in home economics (see Table 8, beta = .23***). Gender of the student (i.e., the consumer), future family and career/educational plans (i.e., enduring importance, Factors 2A and 2B) did not contribute to the total effect of the enrollment characteristic (i.e., situational involvement) nor did perceived risk (i.e., instrumental importance, Factor 3).

Because the final step of the multiple regression used the dichotomous variable Enrollment, discriminant analysis was also used. Discriminant
analysis showed the variables sex, semesters, and image of home economics (i.e., the product, Factor 1) as those most highly correlated with the discriminant function. These three variables also had the highest values for the standardized canonical discriminant function coefficient in comparison to the other variables. When the multiple regression data were reclassified for the discriminant function however, it could be correctly predicted 78% of the time. Therefore, the theoretical model as presented should not be used for predicting enrollment in home economics. The model did identify two very important factors which contributed to the model.

The present measurement model testing of this theoretical model for its relevance in predicting the decision to enroll in home economics utilized several concepts believed to affect this decision. Results indicate that the combined effect of the student's prior semesters of enrollment in home economics (i.e., the situation) and their perceptions of the image of home economics (i.e., the product, Factor 1) are associated with their current enrollment in home economics and contribute to 32 percent of the variance explained. Because more than 25% of the variance was explained, a common criterion in social science research, it can be concluded that these variables do provide a partial explanation of the decision to enroll in home economics.
CONCLUSIONS

The positive aspects of home economics as perceived by the students appear to be the usefulness of the content, its importance, and value. Home economics also was viewed as respected and pleasant. The classroom atmosphere was viewed positively as motivating and interesting.

Areas that possibly need more emphasis in a marketing approach would be that home economics can be futuristic and meet the changing needs of today's student/family. Emphasizing home economics as a realistic approach to everyday problems also would be a strategy to implement.

The future family and career plans of students are more difficult to assess because students may have unrealistic views about their adult life. It was noted, however, that most students perceived themselves to be part of traditional family but also realized they would be a member of a dual earner family. Many students viewed themselves as working full-time while having infants or small children.

Perceived risks associated with the decision to enroll in home economics represent a valid concern for vocational home economics. Over three quarters of the students (77%) believed that they would be attending college and stated that the influential people in their lives also believed they should attend college. The push for academics and increased college entrance requirements appears to have convinced the majority of this sample that college is where they should be.
This study is significant because it shows the relative influence of several key variables, derived from an application of a theoretical marketing framework, in the decision to enroll in a home economics program. The study also provides important information to persons marketing home economics. Different approaches will need to be adapted based upon the prospective student's prior contact with home economics and perceived image of home economics content. Marketing literature supports the need to develop strategies that focus on specialized interests and needs of various target audiences.

This study supported the need for the development of strategies which emphasize: 1) a positive image of home economics; 2) future use based on family, career, and educational plans, of home economics; and 3) a reduction of the risk associated with enrollment. Home economics needs to actively pursue promotion of its programs. Students who are in a college preparatory program need to be made aware of the value of home economics programs. Gaining college and university approval to count selected courses as social or natural science entrance requirements could result in students taking courses that will assist them in reaching their future family and career goals successfully.

Those working with students in home economics programs need to realize that a high percentage of high school students believe they are preparing for college upon graduation. Marketing efforts may need to be directed toward other groups such as parents and school personnel so they can influence the students' career and educational goals. A variety of
marketing strategies designed to target various audiences is the best assurance that an accurate image of home economics will be conveyed.
Table 6. Future plans of students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely (1)</th>
<th>Unlikely (2)</th>
<th>Undecided (3)</th>
<th>Likely (4)</th>
<th>Extremely Likely (5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marry only once</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marry more than once</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stay single</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a parent</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step parent</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandparent</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>38.5%</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be a single parent</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>53.1%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be an adoptive parent</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>43.5%</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAREER AND EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan own work hours</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>27.5%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work full-time</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work part-time</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>27.9%</td>
<td>25.1%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be self-employed</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have education beyond</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a BA degree</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in an office</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change jobs at least once</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
<td>43.4%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earn more than your</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parents</td>
<td>.6%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
<td>39.1%</td>
<td>44.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work in industry</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>37.1%</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel in your work</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a dual income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work full-time while</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>children are small</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*aLikert scale used where 1 was low and 5 was high.*
Table 7. Correlations between components of marketing model operationalized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Semesters</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2A</th>
<th>Factor 2B</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender/ Consumer</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Enrolled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semesters/ Situation</td>
<td>.39****</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>.36****</td>
<td>.26****</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2A</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2B</td>
<td>-.15*</td>
<td>-.14*</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.19**</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolled</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.52****</td>
<td>.34****</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.12*</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p ≤ .05.
** p ≤ .01.
*** p ≤ .001.
**** p ≤ .0001.

Factor 1 = image of home economics
Factor 2A = future family plans
Factor 2B = future career plans
Factor 3 = perceived risk
Table 8. Direct and total effects for components of marketing model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Total Effect</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2A</th>
<th>Factor 2B</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Direct Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Factor 1</td>
<td>sex</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>semesters</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.31***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 = .15</td>
<td>F = 15.41***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2A</td>
<td>sex</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>semesters</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 = .03</td>
<td>F = 1.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 2B</td>
<td>sex</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>semesters</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 = .10</td>
<td>F = 4.63**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factor 3</td>
<td>sex</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>.27***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>semesters</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 = .16</td>
<td>F = 6.49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>sex</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>semesters</td>
<td>.50****</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.46**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R2 = .32</td>
<td>F = 13.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Direct and indirect effects may not sum to the total effect due to rounding.

* = p ≤ .05.  ** = p ≤ .01.  *** = p ≤ .001.  **** = p ≤ .0001.

Factor 1 = image of home economics
Factor 2A = future family plans
Factor 2B = future career/educational plans
Factor 3 = perceived risk
Figure 1. Relationships among product importance and other constructs
Figure 2. Marketing model as applied to home economics and measurement testing

Upper case letters represent the original theory of Bloch and Richins. Lower case letters stand for the application to home economics. Measurement of the variables are indicated in parentheses.
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SUMMARY

Image studies of home economics have made it clear that marketing efforts are needed to assure an accurate perception of home economics program content. Further studies have documented enrollment declines in vocational education, including home economics. Few studies, however, have investigated the predictability and interrelationships of variables influencing enrollment.

The research was based on two major objectives. The first objective examined image and perceptions of home economics program content. The second objective tested the applicability of a theoretical model in studying the importance of image perceptions on students' decisions to enroll in home economics.

The survey approach was selected in order to reach a large number of respondents in diverse geographical areas within the state of Iowa. The survey population was high school juniors and seniors, their parents, and their guidance counselors. Thirty schools were selected in a stratified random sample so that half the students were from smaller school districts (under the median of 1,100 students enrolled in kindergarten through 12th grade) and half were from larger school districts (over 1,100 enrolled). All groups responded to a questionnaire containing a basic demographic section and a semantic differential scale assessing their perceptions of home economics in relationship to the six content areas defined by Hughes, Rougvie, and Woods (1980). Students and parents were also asked to
respond to items ascertaining career aspirations for the student. The guidance counselors responded to a section on the program offerings and its relevance for their school setting. Permission to conduct the study in each district was granted by the administrator in the school.

Respondents included 179 students who were juniors and seniors in high school and were evenly distributed between smaller schools (under 1100 enrollment) (N = 89) and larger schools (over 1100 enrollment) (N = 90). Forty-six of the respondents were male and 133 were female. Eighty-two were in their junior year, 94 were in their senior year, and three did not indicate their present grade level. Ninety-one of the students were currently enrolled in a home economics program and 88 were not currently enrolled at the present time. Of those who reported being currently enrolled in a home economics program, 28% were enrolled in Child Development or Parenting, 19% were enrolled in Family Relations, 24% were Textiles, 2% were enrolled in a Consumer Education course, and 9% were enrolled in Housing or Home Furnishings or Equipment class. The response rate for those students selected was 89.5%.

There were 87 parents that responded to the mailed questionnaire. Over half the parents responding had a child in a larger school (N = 50) and the remaining parents (N = 37) had a child in a smaller school. Eighty-three of the parent respondents were female, 2 were male, and 2 did not indicate their sex. Forty-five parents reported that their child was currently taking a home economics class and 42 indicated their child was not currently enrolled in a home economics class. The response rate for the parents was 43.5%. Because the parents were predominantly female, the
responses to past involvement and familiarity with home economics programs in their school are most likely biased.

The guidance counselors were divided evenly by school size with nine responding from both the larger and smaller schools selected. They were asked to respond to characteristics of the home economics program in addition to the semantic differential items. The response rate for the guidance counselors was 90%.

One purpose in the first segment of this study was to determine if there were significant differences in perceptions of home economics content among students', parents', and guidance counselors'. Using Kendall's coefficient of concordance, no significant differences between these groups was found. There were, however, significant differences found in perceptions of home economics content based on gender of the students, size of the school attended (i.e., large or small school), and current enrollment status. Significant differences were also found to exist between male and female students in their reasons for not enrolling in home economics.

The second part of the study tested relationships of the variables selected to operationalize the theoretical model by Bloch and Richins (1983). Results of the multiple regression analysis indicated that the semesters of home economics taken and the gender of the student significantly contributed to the total effect of the image of home economics. Gender of the student was a negative contributor to the future family/career plans of the students. Perceived risk had four variables that significantly contributed to the Total Effect. Those variables were:
the semesters of involvement; image of home economics; future family plans; and future career plans. In the final equation of the model the multiple regression indicated that semesters of home economics taken (i.e., situational involvement) and the image of home economics (the product, Factor 1) both made significant contributions whether or not a student was currently enrolled in a home economics course. Due to the dichotomous nature of the enrollment characteristic, discriminant analysis was also used for this final equation. The three variables that were most highly correlated with the discriminant function were: sex, semesters, and image of home economics (product, Factor 1). The discriminant analysis determined that this adapted model could be used to predict, with 78% accuracy, which students would enroll in home economics. At this level, the model is not considered to be an accurate predictor of enrollment.

Recommendations for Further Study

The results of this study indicate that the variables influencing student enrollment in home economics are highly correlated. Further work needs to be done to find a more reliable measurement of students' future aspirations. Each of these factors, however, do contribute to the explanation of possible deterrents to home economics enrollment. It is the combination of these factors that assist in the explanation of enrollment trends and toward which marketing efforts should be targeted. Further testing of this adapted model is recommended to support these findings.
The further testing of this theoretical model should attempt to find a more accurate measure for students' future career and family plans. This is difficult to measure because the students tend not to predict or plan realistically for the future. The model does present sex, semester, and image as important variables in this model, but more work needs to be done on the future and risk variables of the model.
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APPENDIX: CORRESPONDENCE AND INSTRUMENTS
INFORMATION ON THE USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH
IOWA STATE UNIVERSITY

(Please follow the accompanying instructions for completing this form.)

1. Title of project (please type): Importance of Perceptions: A Theoretical Approach to Marketing Home Economics Programs

2. I agree to provide the proper surveillance of this project to insure that the rights and welfare of the human subjects are properly protected. Additions to or changes in procedures affecting the subjects after the project has been approved will be submitted to the committee for review.

Janet Wendland 3-6-89
Typed Name of Principal Investigator Date Signature of Principal Investigator

3. Signatures of others (If any) Date Relationship to Principal Investigator

4. ATTACH an additional page(s) (A) describing your proposed research and (B) the subjects to be used, (C) indicating any risks or discomforts to the subjects, and (D) covering any topics checked below. CHECK all boxes applicable.

☐ Medical clearance necessary before subjects can participate
☐ Samples (blood, tissue, etc.) from subjects
☐ Administration of substances (foods, drugs, etc.) to subjects
☐ Physical exercise or conditioning for subjects
☐ Deception of subjects
☐ Subjects under 14 years of age and/or
☐ Subjects 14-17 years of age
☐ Subjects in institutions
☐ Research must be approved by another institution or agency

5. ATTACH an example of the material to be used to obtain Informed consent and CHECK which type will be used.

☐ Signed Informed consent will be obtained.
☐ Modified Informed consent will be obtained.

6. Anticipated date on which subjects will be first contacted: March 27 89
Anticipated date for last contact with subjects: May 27 89
If Applicable: Anticipated date on which audio or visual tapes will be erased and/or identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments:

7. Signature of Head or Chairperson Date Department or Administrative Unit

8. Decision of the University Committee on the Use of Human Subjects in Research:

☐ Project Approved ☐ Project not approved ☐ No action required

George G. Karas
Name of Committee Chairperson Date Signature of Committee Chairperson
This card is being sent as a reminder to return the "Perceptions of Home Economics Programs" survey you recently received. Your input is needed to make the results of this survey useful. If you have already returned the survey, your assistance is greatly appreciated. If you haven't returned the survey, please take a few minutes to fill it out and return it at your earliest convenience. Thank you for participating in this study.

Sincerely,

Janet Wendland
Graduate Research Assistant
Family & Consumer Sciences Education Department
Iowa State University (515) 294-6444
April 1989

Dear Home Economics Teacher,

Thank you for returning the permission form. We have included in this mailing surveys for 1 home economics teacher, 1 guidance counselor, 10 students, and 10 parents. Directions for selecting the participants follow.

We ask that 5 students be selected randomly from a junior or senior level home economics course. To randomize you may want to select every third student from the class list from the course you select. The remaining 5 students should be randomly selected from students in the junior or senior class who are not currently enrolled in home economics courses. It is important that these students not be in home economics courses because the differences in perceptions may assist us in determining stereotypes that may be hindering program enrollment. In randomly selecting the students that are not in a home economics course you may want to take the combined total of both grades and divide by 5 and select those students. If these students are in a home economics course select the next student lower on the list until you find one who is not in a home economics class.

We are asking the students to return these surveys to you so you can return them in the enclosed manila envelope.

The surveys for the parents are enclosed in envelopes that only need to be addressed to the parents of the 10 students participating. So we may follow up on those surveys that are not returned within a reasonable time we would like you to fill out the Parent Mail List form and return it to us.

Thank you for your assistance. Your support of this survey is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Janet Wendland
Graduate Assistant
Family & Consumer Sciences Education Dept.

Jerelyn B. Schultz, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Family & Consumer Sciences Education Dept.
HOME ECONOMICS TEACHER SURVEY

1. Check the grades the students you are currently teaching are enrolled in:
   ____ 7-12
   ____ 9-12
   ____ 10-12

2. What percent of your total contact time is spent in each of the following areas:
   %
   ____ Child development/parenting
   ____ Consumer education
   ____ Clothing and textiles
   ____ Food and nutrition
   ____ Family relations
   ____ Housing/home furnishings/equipment

3. What percent of the junior high program is devoted to each of these areas:
   %
   ____ Child development/parenting
   ____ Consumer education
   ____ Clothing and textiles
   ____ Food and nutrition
   ____ Family relations
   ____ Housing/home furnishings/equipment

4. What percent of the home economics programs offered in 1988-89 are
   offered on a
   ___ semester basis
   ___ year-long basis
   ___ other (explain: )

5. List your department's total number of home economics teachers for
   1988-89, full and part-time. Figure part-time teacher allocations in
   relation to the proportion of a full-time teacher (e.g., two teachers
   who teach 1/4 time = 1/2 time teacher).
   ___ full-time
   ___ half-time

6. Has the number of full or part-time teachers
   ___ increased over the past three years?
   ___ decreased over the past three years?
   ___ stayed the same over the past three years?
7. Since 1985, the following have occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>increased</th>
<th>decreased</th>
<th>remained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of home economics courses has:</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total high school enrollment has:</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home economics class sizes have:</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of home economics class sections have:</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
<td>___</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Has any transferring of subject matter to home economics or away from home economics occurred?

___ Yes, concepts formerly taught by other departments have been transferred to the home economics department.
___ Yes, concepts formerly taught in home economics have been transferred to other departments.
___ No change has occurred.

THANK YOU FOR ANSWERING THIS SURVEY.
Please make a list of the parents the survey has been sent to and return this list to the address below. This will enable us to follow up to increase our return rate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>ADDRESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please return to:

Janet Wendland
219 MacKay Hall
Family and Consumer Sciences Education Dept.
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-1120
April 1989

Dear Guidance Counselor,

Your school has been selected to respond to a survey on home economics programs. The purpose of this survey is to identify current perceptions and values associated with home economics programs. Because you influence students' choices in coursework, your responses will assist us in determining directions for future development in home economics programs. The survey will take approximately 10 minutes.

After completion, please return the survey to Iowa State University using the enclosed postage paid envelope. Your responses will be confidential and you or your school will not be identified in any way.

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have questions concerning the survey, feel free to contact us at the number above.

Sincerely,

Janet Wendland
Graduate Assistant
Family & Consumer Sciences
Education Department

Jerelyn B. Schultz, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Family and Consumer Sciences
Education Department
The purpose of this section of the survey is to provide a way for you to rate home economics content on each of 17 traits listed below. An example using the content food and nutrition is given below. An X on the line to the far left next to "helpful" would mean that food and nutrition is very helpful. An X on the line to the far right would mean that food and nutrition is "not helpful". Put one X on each line, to show how much each of these 17 traits the content area within home economics possesses.

Foods and nutrition is:
helpful  X  not helpful

Child Development/Parenting

Topics taught: overall growth and development of children; health and nutrition of children; child-rearing practices; family planning decisions; emotional considerations of parenting; and roles and responsibilities of parents.

worthless  valuable
despised  respected
unpleasant  pleasant
important  unimportant
efficient  inefficient
idealistic  realistic
skill-oriented  knowledge-oriented
career-centered  family-centered
stable  changeable
feminine  masculine
traditional  futuristic
scientific  unscientific
easy  difficult
useful  useless
academic  nonacademic
motivated  apathetic
boring  interesting
Food and Nutrition

Topics taught: food guides, nutrients and their sources; functions of nutrients in the body; safety and sanitation in the kitchen; food preparation; planning and organizing for buying goods; planning for individual and family nutrition; and labeling and food standards.

worthless  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  valuable

despised  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  respected

unpleasant  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  pleasant

important  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  unimportant

efficient  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  inefficient

idealistic  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  realistic

skill-oriented  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  knowledge-oriented

career-centered  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  family-centered

stable  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  changeable

feminine  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  masculine

traditional  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  futuristic

scientific  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  unscientific

easy  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  difficult

useful  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  useless

academic  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  nonacademic

motivated  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  apathetic

boring  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  interesting
### Family Relations

Topics taught: values and goals; mate selection; life styles; expectations and realities of relationships; readiness for serious commitments; and multiple roles of family members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>worthless</th>
<th>valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>despised</td>
<td>respected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpleasant</td>
<td>pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idealistic</td>
<td>realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skill-oriented</td>
<td>knowledge-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career-centered</td>
<td>family-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stable</td>
<td>changeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional</td>
<td>futuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scientific</td>
<td>unscientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy</td>
<td>difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td>useless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic</td>
<td>nonacademic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated</td>
<td>apathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boring</td>
<td>interesting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Clothing and Textiles

Topics taught: planning and selection of clothing; care of apparel; fiber characteristics and fabric construction; pattern alteration and fitting; and construction skills and pride in workmanship.

worthless      ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  valuable
despised       ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  respected
unpleasant     ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  pleasant
important      ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  unimportant
efficient      ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  inefficient
idealistic     ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  realistic
skill-oriented ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  knowledge-oriented
career-centered ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  family-centered
stable         ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  changeable
feminine       ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  masculine
traditional    ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  futuristic
scientific     ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  unscientific
easy           ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  difficult
useful         ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  useless
academic       ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  nonacademic
motivated      ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  apathetic
boring         ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  ______  interesting
Consumer Education

Topics taught: consumer rights and responsibilities; consumer buying; advertising; values, goals and product standards; decision making; resources; and management process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>worthless</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>valueable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>despised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>respected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unpleasant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>efficient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>idealistic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>skill-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>knowledge-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centered</td>
<td>oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>career-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>family-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>centered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>stable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>changeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>futuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>scientific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>unscientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>useless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>nonacademic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>apathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>boring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>interesting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Housing/Home Furnishing/Equipment

Topics taught: function of housing; choosing locating and evaluating housing; types of housing; aesthetic aspect of home furnishings; factors influencing furniture arrangement; and factors influencing equipment decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>worthless</th>
<th>respected</th>
<th>pleasurable</th>
<th>unimportant</th>
<th>inefficient</th>
<th>realistic</th>
<th>knowledge-oriented</th>
<th>changeable</th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>futuristic</th>
<th>unscientific</th>
<th>difficult</th>
<th>useless</th>
<th>nonacademic</th>
<th>apathetic</th>
<th>interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>skill-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career-centered</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scientific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Since 1985, the following have occurred

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>increased</th>
<th>decreased</th>
<th>remained</th>
<th>constant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of home economics courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total high school enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home economics class sizes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number of home economics class sections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Has any transferring of subject matter to home economics or away from home economics occurred?
   - Yes, concepts formerly taught by other departments have been transferred to the home economics department.
   - Yes, concepts formerly taught in home economics have been transferred to other departments.
   - No change has occurred.

4. What students do you recommend enroll in home economics coursework? (Mark as many as apply.)
   - Special needs students who are mainstreamed.
   - Talented and gifted students.
   - High risk students who are in danger of dropping out of school.
   - College-bound students.
   - Noncollege-bound students
   - Students wishing to prepare for a vocational career related to home economics.

5. Who or what influences your decision as to whether the student enrolls in a home economics program? (Mark the MOST influential person or source.)
   - parent
   - administrator
   - student
   - faculty other than home economics teacher
   - home economics teacher
   - grade average
   - achievement test scores

6. What in your opinion would increase the effectiveness for home economics programs for ALL students? Please be specific.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

THANK YOU FOR ANSWERING THIS SURVEY.
PERCEPTIONS OF
HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS
PART I.
Directions: This survey is designed to measure your attitudes towards the relevance of home economics education for students today. Please answer the following demographic characteristics about yourself by marking the appropriate blank.

1. Sex
   _____ Male
   _____ Female

2. Please mark how much home economics coursework you have had.
   _____ None
   _____ Less than 1 semester
   _____ 1 semester
   _____ 2 semesters
   _____ 3 or more semesters

3. How familiar do you believe yourself to be with the home economics program in your school?
   _____ Very familiar
   _____ Somewhat familiar
   _____ Undecided
   _____ Not very familiar
   _____ Very unfamiliar

4. Is your son/daughter currently enrolled in a home economics class?
   _____ Yes (if yes, please go to question 5.)
   _____ No (if no, please go to question 6.)

5. What subject matter area most closely fits the current home economics class your son/daughter is taking?
   _____ Child development/parenting
   _____ Family relations
   _____ Food and nutrition
   _____ Clothing and textiles
   _____ Consumer education
   _____ Housing/home furnishings/equipment
6. Determine from the scale below the response which best describes your son’s/daughter’s reason for not taking a home economics course. Circle the number to the left of each statement that best indicates how much these items contribute to his/her NOT enrolling in home economics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1  2  3  4  5 Schedule conflict
1  2  3  4  5 College entrance requirements increased
1  2  3  4  5 No interest
1  2  3  4  5 No time due to employment outside the school
1  2  3  4  5 Lack of time due to involvement in extra-curricular activities
1  2  3  4  5 Influence of friends not to enroll in home economics
1  2  3  4  5 Influence of parents not to enroll in home economics
1  2  3  4  5 Wouldn’t meet college entrance requirements
1  2  3  4  5 Stereotypes associated with home economics
1  2  3  4  5 Guidance counselor suggests against it
1  2  3  4  5 Increased requirements for high school graduation

7. Which of the following statements do you think represents your daughter’s/son’s friends views towards home economics?

____ Very important class
____ Important class
____ Undecided about the importance of the class
____ Unimportant
____ Very unimportant

8. Would you recommend that your daughter/son take a home economics class?

____ Yes
____ No

9. Which of the following statements do you think represents your daughter’s/son’s views towards home economics?

____ Very important class
____ Important class
____ Undecided about the importance of the class
____ Unimportant
____ Very unimportant
10. The purpose of this section of the survey is to provide a way for you to rate home economics content on each of 17 traits listed below. An example using the content food and nutrition is given below. An X on the line to the far left next to "helpful" would mean that food and nutrition is very helpful. An X on the line to the far right would mean that food and nutrition is "not helpful". Put one X on each line, to show how much each of these 17 traits the content areas within home economics possesses.

Food and nutrition is:
helpful  X  not helpful

Child Development/Parenting

Topics taught: overall growth and development of children; health and nutrition of children; child-rearing practices; family planning decisions; emotional considerations of parenting; and roles and responsibilities of parents.

worthless  valuable
despised  respected
unpleasant  pleasant
important  unimportant
efficient  inefficient
idealistic  realistic
skill-oriented  knowledge-oriented
career-centered  family-centered
stable  changeable
feminine  masculine
traditional  futuristic
scientific  unscientific
easy  difficult
useful  useless
academic  nonacademic
motivated  apathetic
boring  interesting
Clothing and Textiles

Topics taught: planning and selection of clothing; care of apparel; fiber characteristics and fabric construction; pattern alteration and fitting; and construction skills and pride in workmanship.

| worthless | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | valuable |
| despised  | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | respected |
| unpleasant| ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | pleasant |
| important | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | unimportant |
| efficient | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | inefficient |
| idealistic| ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | realistic |
| skill-oriented | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | knowledge-oriented |
| career-centered | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | family-centered |
| stable    | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | changeable |
| feminine  | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | masculine |
| traditional | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | futuristic |
| scientific| ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | unscientific |
| easy      | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | difficult |
| useful    | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | useless |
| academic  | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | nonacademic |
| motivated | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | apathetic |
| boring    | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | interesting |
## Consumer Education

Topics taught: consumer rights and responsibilities; consumer buying; advertising; values, goals and product standards; decision making; resources; and management process.

| worthless | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | valuabe |
| despised  | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | respected |
| unpleasant| ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | pleasant |
| important | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | unimportant |
| efficient | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | inefficient |
| idealistic| ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | realistic |
| skill-oriented | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | knowledge-oriented |
| career-centered | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | family-centered |
| stable     | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | changeable |
| feminine   | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | masculine |
| traditional| ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | futuristic |
| scientific | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | unscientific |
| easy       | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | difficult |
| useful     | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | useless |
| academic   | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | nonacademic |
| motivated  | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | apathetic |
| boring     | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | interesting |
### Family Relations

Topics taught: values and goals; mate selection; life styles; expectations and realities of relationships; readiness for serious commitments; and multiple roles of family members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>worthless</th>
<th>valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>despised</td>
<td>respected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpleasant</td>
<td>pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idealistic</td>
<td>realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skill-oriented</td>
<td>knowledge-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career-centered</td>
<td>family-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stable</td>
<td>changeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional</td>
<td>futuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scientific</td>
<td>unscientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy</td>
<td>difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td>useless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic</td>
<td>nonacademic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated</td>
<td>apathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boring</td>
<td>interesting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Food and Nutrition

Topics taught: food guides; nutrients and their sources; functions of nutrients in the body; safety and sanitation in the kitchen; food preparation; planning and organizing for buying goods; planning for individual and family nutrition; and labeling and food standards.

| worthless | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | valuable
| despised  | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | respected
| unpleasant| ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | pleasant
| important | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | unimportant
| efficient | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | inefficient
| idealistic| ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | realistic
| skill-oriented | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | knowledge-oriented
| career-centered | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | family-centered
| stable    | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | changeable
| feminine  | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | masculine
| traditional | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | futuristic
| scientific| ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | unscientific
| easy      | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | difficult
| useful    | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | useless
| academic  | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | nonacademic
| motivated | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | apathetic
| boring    | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | ____ | interesting
Topics taught: function of housing; choosing locating and evaluating housing; types of housing; aesthetic aspect of home furnishings; factors influencing furniture arrangement; and factors influencing equipment decisions.

worthless _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ valuable

despised _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ respected

unpleasant _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ pleasant

important _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ unimportant

efficient _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ inefficient

idealistic _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ realistic

skill-oriented _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ knowledge-oriented

career-centered _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ family-centered

stable _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ changeable

feminine _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ masculine

traditional _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ futuristic

scientific _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ unscientific

easy _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ difficult

useful _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ useless

academic _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ nonacademic

motivated _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ apathetic

boring _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ _______ interesting
PART II.
What do the following people think your son/daughter ought to do after high school? Circle the letter of the answer which best describes what each thinks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go to college</td>
<td>Enter a trade</td>
<td>Enter military school</td>
<td>Get a full time job</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

22. Self
23. Spouse
24. Guidance counselor
25. Teacher
26. Friends
27. Son/Daughter

28. Which of the categories below describes the job you currently hold?

A. Professional such as accountant, artist, registered nurse, engineer, librarian, writer, social worker, actor/actress, athlete, politician, but not including school teacher.
B. Professional such as clergyperson, dentist, physician, lawyer, scientist, college teacher, or school teacher.
C. Farmer, farm manager.
D. Manager, administrator, such as sales manager, office manager, school administrator, restaurant manager, business manager, government official.
E. Others: such as technical craftsperson, clerical, military service, protective, proprietor or business owner, homemaker or housewife only.

THANK YOU FOR ANSWERING THIS SURVEY!
PERCEPTIONS OF
HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS
STUDENT HOME ECONOMICS PERCEPTION SURVEY

PART I.
Directions: This survey is designed to measure your attitudes towards the relevance of home economics education for students today. Please answer the following demographic characteristics about yourself by marking the appropriate blank.

1. a. Sex  
   Male  
   Female

   b. Category  
   Eleventh grade student  
   Twelfth grade student

2. Please mark how much home economics coursework you have had.
   None
   Less than 1 semester
   1 semester
   2 semesters
   3 or more semesters

3. How familiar do you believe yourself to be with the home economics program in your school?
   Very familiar
   Somewhat familiar
   Undecided
   Not very familiar
   Very unfamiliar

4. Are you currently enrolled in a home economics class?
   Yes (if yes, please go to question 5.)
   No (if no, please go to question 6.)

5. What subject matter area most closely fits the current home economics class you are taking?
   Child development/parenting
   Family relations
   Food and nutrition
   Clothing and textiles
   Consumer education
   Housing/home furnishings/equipment
6. Determine from the scale below the response which best describes your reason for not taking a home economics course. Circle the number to the left of each statement that best indicates how much these items contribute to your NOT enrolling in home economics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule conflict</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College entrance requirements increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No interest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No time due to employment outside the school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of time due to involvement in extra-curricular activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of friends not to enroll in home economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence of parents not to enroll in home economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn't meet college entrance requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes associated with home economics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guidance counselor suggests against it</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased requirements for high school graduation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Which of the following statements do you think represents your friends views towards home economics?

- [ ] Very important class
- [ ] Important class
- [ ] Undecided about the importance of the class
- [ ] Unimportant
- [ ] Very unimportant

8. Would you recommend your friends take a home economics class?

- [ ] Yes
- [ ] No

9. Which of the following statements do you think represents your parents views towards home economics?

- [ ] Very important class
- [ ] Important class
- [ ] Undecided about the importance of the class
- [ ] Unimportant
- [ ] Very unimportant
The purpose of this section of the survey is to provide a way for you to rate home economics content on each of 17 traits listed below. An example using the content food and nutrition is given below. An X on the line to the far left next to "helpful" would mean that food and nutrition is very helpful. An X on the line to the far right would mean that food and nutrition is "not helpful". Put one X on each line, to show how much each of these 17 traits the content areas within home economics possesses.

Food and nutrition is:
helpful  X  not helpful

**Child Development/Parenting**

Topics taught: overall growth and development of children; health and nutrition of children; child-rearing practices; family planning decisions; emotional considerations of parenting; and roles and responsibilities of parents.

worthless  valuable
despised  respected
unpleasant  pleasant
important  unimportant
efficient  inefficient
idealistic  realistic
skill-oriented  knowledge-oriented
career-centered  family-centered
stable  changeable
feminine  masculine
traditional  futuristic
scientific  unscientific
easy  difficult
useful  useless
academic  nonacademic
motivated  apathetic
boring  interesting
Clothing and Textiles

Topics taught: planning and selection of clothing; care of apparel; fiber characteristics and fabric construction; pattern alteration and fitting; and construction skills and pride in workmanship.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>worthless</th>
<th>despised</th>
<th>unpleasant</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>efficient</th>
<th>idealistic</th>
<th>skill-oriented</th>
<th>career-centered</th>
<th>stable</th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>traditional</th>
<th>scientific</th>
<th>easy</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>academic</th>
<th>motivated</th>
<th>boring</th>
<th>interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Consumer Education

Topics taught: consumer rights and responsibilities; consumer buying; advertising; values, goals and product standards; decision making; resources; and management process.

worthless --- --- --- --- --- --- --- valuable

despised --- --- --- --- --- --- --- respected

unpleasant --- --- --- --- --- --- --- pleasant

important --- --- --- --- --- --- --- unimportant

efficient --- --- --- --- --- --- --- inefficient

idealistic --- --- --- --- --- --- --- realistic

skill-oriented --- --- --- --- --- --- --- knowledge-oriented

career-centered --- --- --- --- --- --- --- family-centered

stable --- --- --- --- --- --- --- changeable

feminine --- --- --- --- --- --- --- masculine

traditional --- --- --- --- --- --- --- futuristic

scientific --- --- --- --- --- --- --- unscientific

easy --- --- --- --- --- --- --- difficult

useful --- --- --- --- --- --- --- useless

academic --- --- --- --- --- --- --- nonacademic

motivated --- --- --- --- --- --- --- apathetic

boring --- --- --- --- --- --- --- interesting
Family Relations

Topics taught: values and goals; mate selection; life styles; expectations and realities of relationships; readiness for serious commitments; and multiple roles of family members.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>worthless</th>
<th>valuable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>despised</td>
<td>respected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unpleasant</td>
<td>pleasant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important</td>
<td>unimportant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient</td>
<td>inefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idealistic</td>
<td>realistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skill-oriented</td>
<td>knowledge-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>career-centered</td>
<td>family-centered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stable</td>
<td>changeable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feminine</td>
<td>masculine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>traditional</td>
<td>futuristic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scientific</td>
<td>unscientific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>easy</td>
<td>difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>useful</td>
<td>useless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>academic</td>
<td>nonacademic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>motivated</td>
<td>apathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boring</td>
<td>interesting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Food and Nutrition

Topics taught: food guides; nutrients and their sources; functions of nutrients in the body; safety and sanitation in the kitchen; food preparation; planning and organizing for buying goods; planning for individual and family nutrition; and labeling and food standards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>worthless</th>
<th>despised</th>
<th>unpleasant</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>efficient</th>
<th>realistic</th>
<th>skill-oriented</th>
<th>career-centered</th>
<th>stable</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>traditional</th>
<th>scientific</th>
<th>easy</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>academic</th>
<th>motivated</th>
<th>boring</th>
<th>interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
### Housing/Home Furnishing/Equipment

Topics taught: function of housing; choosing locating and evaluating housing; types of housing; aesthetic aspect of home furnishings; factors influencing furniture arrangement; and factors influencing equipment decisions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>worthless</th>
<th>valuable</th>
<th>despised</th>
<th>respected</th>
<th>unpleasant</th>
<th>pleasant</th>
<th>important</th>
<th>unimportant</th>
<th>efficient</th>
<th>inefficient</th>
<th>realistic</th>
<th>skill-oriented</th>
<th>knowledge-oriented</th>
<th>career-centered</th>
<th>family-centered</th>
<th>stable</th>
<th>changeable</th>
<th>feminine</th>
<th>masculine</th>
<th>traditional</th>
<th>futuristic</th>
<th>scientific</th>
<th>unscientific</th>
<th>easy</th>
<th>difficult</th>
<th>useful</th>
<th>useless</th>
<th>academic</th>
<th>nonacademic</th>
<th>motivated</th>
<th>apathetic</th>
<th>boring</th>
<th>interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
PART II.
This section of the survey includes a series of questions about your life in the future. Select the response for each question that best describes yourself in the future. Circle the number to the left of each statement that best indicates how you see yourself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Undecided</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Be married only once.
2. Be married more than once.
3. Remain unattached and unmarried.
4. Be a parent.
5. Be a stepparent.
6. Be a grandparent.
7. Be a single parent.
8. Be an adoptive or foster parent.
9. Plan your own work hours and schedule.
10. Work full time.
11. Work part time.
13. Have education beyond a bachelor's degree.
15. Have changed jobs at least once.
16. Earn more money than your parent(s) did at the same age.
17. Work in industry.
18. Travel in your work.
19. Are married to a working spouse.
20. Work full time while you have infants or small children.
21. Which of the categories below describes the job you will be preparing for upon graduation?

A. Professional such as accountant, artist, registered nurse, engineer, librarian, writer, social worker, actor/actress, athlete, politician, but not including school teacher.
B. Professional such as clergyman, dentist, physician, lawyer, scientist, college teacher, or school teacher.
C. Farmer, farm manager.
D. Manager, administrator, such as sales manager, office manager, school administrator, restaurant manager, business manager, government official.
E. Others: such as technical craftsperson, clerical, military service, protective, proprietor or business owner, homemaker or housewife only.

PART III.

What do the following people think you ought to do after high school? Circle the letter of the answer which best describes what each thinks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go to college</td>
<td>Enter a trade</td>
<td>Enter military service</td>
<td>Get a full time job</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Guidance counselor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. Myself</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. Which of the categories below describes the job your mother currently holds?

A. Professional such as accountant, artist, registered nurse, engineer, librarian, writer, social worker, actor/actress, athlete, politician, but not including school teacher.
B. Professional such as clergyman, dentist, physician, lawyer, scientist, college teacher, or school teacher.
C. Farmer, farm manager.
D. Manager, administrator, such as sales manager, office manager, school administrator, restaurant manager, business manager, government official.
E. Others: such as technical craftsperson, clerical, military service, protective, proprietor or business owner, homemaker or housewife only.
F. Don't know/does not apply.
29. Which of the categories below describes the job your father currently holds?

A. Professional such as accountant, artist, registered nurse, engineer, librarian, writer, social worker, actor/actress, athlete, politician, but not including school teacher.
B. Professional such as clergyman, dentist, physician, lawyer, scientist, college teacher, or school teacher.
C. Farmer, farm manager.
D. Manager, administrator, such as sales manager, office manager, school administrator, restaurant manager, business manager, government official.
E. Others: such as technical craftsperson, clerical, military service, protective, proprietor or business owner, homemaker or housewife only.
F. Don’t know/does not apply.

THANK YOU FOR ANSWERING THIS SURVEY.
May 1989

Dear Parent,

Lisa Stange, home economics teacher at Central Dallas High School, has randomly selected your name to help with a research study being conducted by Iowa State University to determine current perceptions of home economics programs. If you choose not to participate please return this survey to the home economics teacher. The purpose of this survey is to identify contributions of past home economics involvement, peers, parents, and future lifestyle in the formation of these perceptions. Your responses will assist us in increasing the effectiveness of home economics programs. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your response will be confidential and you will not be identified in any way.

Please return your survey by May 16 to Iowa State University by simply taping it closed and dropping it in a mailbox. Postage for the survey is prepaid.

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have questions concerning the survey, please feel free to contact us at the address above.

Sincerely,

Janet Wendland
Graduate Assistant
Family & Consumer Sciences Education

Jerelyn B. Schultz
Professor and Chair
Family & Consumer Sciences Education
May 1989

Dear Student:

You have been randomly selected by Lisa Stange, your home economics teacher at Central Dallas High School, to help with a research study being conducted by Iowa State University that is being done to determine current perceptions of home economics programs. If you choose not to participate please return this survey to the home economics teacher. The purpose of this survey is to identify contributions of past home economics involvement, peers, parents, and future lifestyle in the formation of these perceptions. Your responses will assist us in increasing the effectiveness of home economics programs. The survey will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. Your response will be confidential and you will not be identified in any way.

Please return your survey by May 16 to your home economics teacher. She will return it to Iowa State University in the envelope that has been provided.

Thank you for your cooperation. If you have questions concerning the survey, please feel free to contact us at the address above.

Sincerely,

Janet Wendland
Graduate Assistant
Family & Consumer Sciences Education

Jerelyn B. Schultz
Professor and Chair
Family & Consumer Sciences Education
Dear Home Economics Teacher:

You have been selected to take part in a survey called "Importance Perceptions of Home Economics Programs." The purpose of the survey is to identify current perceptions and values associated with home economics programs. The sample studied will include students and others that influence the students' course selection, specifically parents and guidance counselors. A separate short survey will ask you to identify characteristics of your program.

Enclosed you will find a draft of the survey that will be sent to parents and students. Those surveyed from each school will include 10 students, 10 parents (of the students selected), 1 guidance counselor, and 1 home economics teacher. Students selected will be asked to complete the survey as an outside class activity. Return envelopes will provide confidentiality.

The permission of the administrator of each school is required by law to conduct research within a school setting. Please take the enclosed form to your administrator and have him/her indicate whether permission is granted or not granted by marking and signing the form and returning it to us as soon as possible. We have found that if you will take it to her/him and show your support in conducting this survey the return time is greatly reduced. Upon receipt of the permission form, packets containing the surveys will be mailed to you.

We believe the results of this survey will guide program development in the future and will assist us in determining the values associated with content currently taught in home economics programs. Thank you for your assistance and cooperation. We look forward to working with you. If you have questions concerning the survey, feel free to contact us.

Sincerely,

Janet Wendland
Graduate Assistant
Department of Family and Consumer Sciences Education

Jerelyn B. Schultz, Ph.D.
Professor and Chair
Department of Family and Consumer Sciences Education
PERMISSION FOR PARTICIPATION IN THE IMPORTANCE PERCEPTIONS
OF HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS SURVEY

Administrator Name

School District

Date

(Be sure to mark if permission was granted or not granted.)

Thank you.

Return in enclosed envelope to:

Janet Wendland
Graduate Assistant
Dept. of Family & Consumer
   Sciences Education
219 MacKay Hall
Iowa State University
Ames, IA 50011-1120