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This study documented the implementation of the national teaching and learning standards developed and published in 1998 for family and consumer sciences curricula in secondary schools. Telephone interviews were used to collect data from 44 family and consumer sciences administrators in state departments of education. The Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) provided a framework for developing an interview schedule to identify the level and degree of use, concerns, and models of implementation related to the family and consumer sciences national standards.

Descriptive statistics were generated to summarize the data pertaining to the number of states using or not using the family and consumer sciences national standards, components of 16 areas of study most/least used, and the attitudes of family and consumer sciences state administrators toward the standards. Data from open-ended questions were analyzed using hand sorting methods to identify common themes related to concerns and models of implementation.

The interview results showed that 93% of these state department of education family and consumer sciences administrators were implementing the national standards in their states. The top reasons identified for implementing the
standards were to improve existing curriculum and as an aid in developing new curriculum. Nine of 16 areas of study were identified as most central to programs in states, and 5 of 16 areas were identified as not central.

Four areas of concern were identified by respondents. They included concern about the standards model, the assessment of standards, timelines for revision, and dissemination of information related to standards. A variety of implementation strategies were also identified, many centering around the use of curriculum teams as a model to guide state standards for education in family and consumer sciences.

Family and consumer sciences state department of education administrators were in agreement that the national standards document has had a positive impact on curriculum development. They also agreed that national standards were a positive tool for public relations and for promoting a positive image of family and consumer sciences as a discipline.
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

The term standards is frequently used. We hear about standards for behavior, athletic performance, and goods and services. The concept of national standards for education and learning has received renewed attention during the last decade. Recent legislation and policies have motivated the development of formal standards for subjects taught in the nation’s schools and community colleges, including family and consumer sciences.

Educators see publication of the report, A Nation at Risk (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983), as the initiating event of the modern standards movement (Mid-continent Regional Education Laboratory, 1997). Amid concerns resulting from the report, President Bush and the nation’s governors held an education summit in 1989, passing a resolution to set national education goals to be achieved by 2000. In early 1990, six goals were announced, the third and fourth of which focused on student knowledge and skills:

Goal 3: ...American students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use
their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.

Goal 4: ...U.S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement (Executive Office of the President, 1990, p. 3-4).

A National Education Goals Panel was next formed to foster development of specific standards—what students should know and be able to do—and encourage new methods of assessing success in their achievements (National Education Goals Panel, 1991). The primary goal was to improve content and instructional quality, and better motivate students to learn (Klein, 1996). In her book, National Standards in American Education: A Citizen's Guide (1995), Former Assistant Secretary of Education Diane Ravitch provides the following rationale for education standards:

Americans...expect strict standards to govern construction of buildings, bridges, highways, and tunnels; shoddy work would put lives at risk. They expect stringent standards to protect their drinking water, the food they eat, and the air they breathe.... Standards are
created because they improve the activity of life (p. 8-9).

According to the National Council on Education Standards and Testing (NCEST, 1992), clear education standards can lead to learner assessments that create higher expectations for students. The Council states:

"Clear standards help formulate a strategic plan to help make better decisions about resource allocations. They help promote educational equity, preserve democracy, enhance civic culture, and improve economic competitiveness and provide shared values and knowledge to a diverse and mobile population" (NCEST, 1992, p. 3).

**Family and Consumer Sciences National Standards**

In 1995, administrators of family and consumer sciences in state departments of education assumed leadership for preparing new voluntary standards for this area of education in middle, junior, and senior high school programs. Family and consumer sciences teachers, university teacher educators, employers in related occupations, parents, and students also participated. Standards in 16 areas of study were developed and then published for all professionals to study and apply (National Association of State Administrators for Family and Consumer Sciences, NASAFACS, 1998). They reflected beliefs of
those involved in their development about what learners should know and be able to do related to family and consumer sciences content.

The foundation for the family and consumer sciences standards is the vision and mission statements that were adopted by a major professional group within the profession in 1992. The vision states:

family and consumer sciences education empowers individuals and families across the life span to manage the challenges of living and working a diverse global society. Our unique focus is on families, work, and their interrelationships (NASAFACS, 1998, p. 2).

The mission:

...is to prepare students for family life, work life, and careers in family and consumer sciences by providing opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors needed for:

• Balancing personal, home, family and work lives.
• Promoting optimal nutrition and wellness across the life span.
• Successful life management, employment, and career development.
• Functioning effectively as providers and consumers of goods and services.
• Managing resources to meet the material needs of individuals and families.
• Strengthening the well-being of individuals and families across the life span.
• Becoming responsible citizens and leaders in family, community, and work settings.
• Appreciating human worth and accepting responsibility for one's actions and success in family and work life.
• Using critical and creative thinking skills to address problems in diverse family, community, and work environments. (NASAFACS, 1998, p. 2).

According to the NASAFACS, the standards are designed so that all 16 areas of study can interact with each other and with a variety of teaching processes, other academic proficiencies taught in the schools, and existing Family, Career, and Community Leaders of America¹ (FCCLA) programs. Further, because family and consumer sciences has both basic education and occupational content, the standards reflect areas of study

¹ This organization was formerly named Future Homemakers of America/Home Economics Related Occupations, but changed its name in 2000 to reflect the current focus of the organization.
in both. This means practitioners in the field can educate individuals for the daily tasks of family and individual life and also for related careers.

The draft document of the family and consumer sciences national standards was considered a potential tool that could be used to showcase the movement of family and consumer sciences curricula from an emphasis on technical homemaking skills to a focus on broader family and society issues (Wild, 2000). The potential of the standards to enhance the quality of family and consumer sciences education will not be realized unless the standards are implemented. According to the Institute for Educational Leadership (IEL), state education personnel need "to promote integration [of national standards] into the curriculum frameworks and programs of study at the secondary and post-secondary levels and to help instructors use the related materials" (1997, p.2). Leaders of family and consumer sciences programs in state departments of education and university teacher education programs are in critical positions to move the standards from awareness to widespread implementation.

Change theorists have long recognized that change is a process, not an event. The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM) is relevant for conceptualizing studies of educational
innovations (Hall & Hord, 1984). Three key dimensions of the change process as experienced by individuals are hypothesized by the model: stages of concern about an innovation, levels or degrees of its use, and configurations in which the innovation gets implemented. The model can be applied to help researchers define, organize, and study change in order to identify new knowledge about specific changes and predict effects of various change strategies. It seems applicable to studying implementation of educational innovations such as the new standards for family and consumer sciences education that can guide curriculum development for today's middle, junior, and senior high school programs.

**Purpose of the Study**

Although much effort and research have been devoted to the development of the new national education standards in family and consumer sciences, no studies have yet described how the standards are being implemented, or can best be implemented and effectively used. The purpose of the study to be reported here therefore, was to describe the status of the implementation of the national standards for family and consumer sciences secondary curricula as reported by key state department of education administrators of family and consumer
The CBAM guided the specific foci of the research to study:

- levels and degrees of use (implementation) of the standards by the administrators, and their perceptions of the levels and degrees of use by family and consumer sciences teachers in their states;
- concerns held by the administrators about the standards, and their perceptions of the concerns held by family and consumer sciences teachers in their states;
- configurations (strategies) for implementation of the standards by the administrators, and their perceptions or knowledge of family and consumer sciences teachers' views of these implementation configurations.

Within each of these categories, questions were formulated that guided this research study. In the category of levels and degrees of use, the related research questions were:

1. How many states have begun implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?
2. What is the level or degree of implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?
3. Why are some states not implementing the family and consumer sciences national standards, if this is the case?

4. Are any components of the 16 areas of study identified in the family and consumer sciences national standards being utilized to a higher degree than others? If so, which?

In the category of concerns, the related research question was:

5. What attitudes and beliefs are held by individual family and consumer sciences state administrators toward the family and consumer sciences national standards?

In the category of configurations, the correlating research question was:

6. What models exist related to the successful implementation of national family and consumer sciences standards?

The degree of implementation that occurred during the first 36 months following development of the standards was identified. Concerns held by state FCS administrators in regard to the standards document were identified. Most importantly, types of in-service education, configurations, strategies and models seen as most helpful as teachers change
curricula, redefine expectations for student learning, and adapt new teaching and assessment strategies were suggested.

Collectively, state administrators of family and consumer sciences in state departments of education and family and consumer sciences university teacher educators, the two key-leader groups for infusing the national standards into family and consumer sciences curricula, will find this information helpful in improving the implementation of the new standards and potentially the quality of family and consumer sciences educational programs. After the publication and distribution of the standards document, Dr. Sally Combs, then vice-president of NASAFACS, appointed a group of family and consumer sciences professionals to serve as the National Commission to Implement the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences Education. This group was charged with collecting reports on implementation activities and to document best practices. The National Standards Commission will find the information from this study useful in evaluating the implementation of these standards and in determining future revisions needed in the standards document. All family and consumer sciences education professionals will be able to use this information to determine how the implementation of
the standards is shaping curricula of family and consumer sciences programs nationwide.

**Funding Support**

The American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences provided partial funding support for this research through a grant from its Massachusetts Avenue Building Assets Fund.
CHAPTER 2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

An answer to the question, "what should students know and be able to do?" after completion of a particular course of study has been sought throughout the history of education, most recently by the development of national content standards. National content standards documents currently exist in 14 different subject areas, including family and consumer sciences. Even though these standards have been defined, implementation is an ongoing process.

The first section of this chapter will describe educational standards for high school programs, including the historical development of them. In the second section implementation of standards in school curricula will be examined. In the third section the development of national family and consumer sciences curricula documents and their impact on family and consumer sciences education in secondary school classrooms will be presented and discussed. The fourth section describes the relationship between the change process and the implementation of an innovation, such as educational standards. In the final section, research on the implementation of the national family and consumer sciences standards is reviewed.
Educational Standards for High School Programs

Regional differences in education date back to the colonial period. As schooling began to spread unevenly from New England throughout the United States in the first half of the 19th century, reformers attempted to create state educational systems to persuade reluctant communities and parents to educate their children (Vinovskis, 1998).

The tale of 20th century education has been a story of cycles of reform (Reeves, 1999). Gelberg (1997) related these cycles of reform to themes that originally occurred at the beginning of this century: fear of global competition, the breakdown of the family, an influx of new immigrants, rampant crime in cities, corruption in government, and a generation of youth who seemed ill-prepared to take its place as adults in society. These themes closely mirror the challenges prevalent in American society today, and then, as now, provide a rationale for debate on school reform. Urban and Wagoner (1996) traced the main factors motivating school reform in the U.S. in a chronological fashion beginning with the change from an agrarian society to an industrial workplace, moving through the impact of a wave of immigration, wars and economic issues, the Russian launch of Sputnik, the civil rights movement and call for equality, and the fear of economic decline.
The time period from 1913 until the 1930s gave rise to the "efficiency movement." A mechanical engineer, Frederick Taylor, devised a theory of "scientific management" which he said could create a neat, understandable, coordinated world in factories (Gelberg, 1997). Taylor conducted time-and-motion studies that resulted in making plants more efficient and subsequently more profitable. Taylor's principles were applied in schools, but, as Eisner (1995) reported, school administrators soon found the basic concept underlying the efficiency movement, namely that one could mechanize and routinize teaching and learning, did not work.

Another school reform movement was the focus on behavioral objectives that evolved in the 1960s. The basic premise behind this movement was for teachers to define educational goals in terms that were sufficiently specific to allow them to determine whether or not students had achieved them by measuring outcomes using quantitative evaluation devices (Marzano & Kendall, 1997). Teachers across the country in every subject area and at every grade level of the school system were writing large numbers of these detailed objectives. The resulting thousands of behavioral objectives led to school systems bogged down in minutia and eventually the movement lost steam (Eisner, 1995).
The role of the federal government was also at issue in school reform movements. Until the early 1960s, repeated attempts to increase the role of the federal government in education failed. A cabinet-level Department of Education, originally created in 1867, quickly lost its departmental status and was reorganized into a "bureau" of education, with duties limited to collecting and disseminating statistical information on the educational systems in various communities (Urban & Wagoner, 1996). Decisions on what was to be taught in school and how it was to be taught were considered to be local decisions.

But in the 1960s, President John F. Kennedy sought to expand the federal role in education primarily to equalize the quality of education for poor sections of the country with that of more affluent regions. Kennedy's proposed educational programs were initially enacted in 1963. Then, in 1965, Congress passed the *Elementary and Secondary Education Act* that targeted disadvantaged, poor children for most of the program's funds.

Despite a waning interest in educational reform during the 1970s, fresh momentum was gained with the publication of a 1983 federal report, *A Nation At Risk*, which detailed the failures of the nation's education system, challenged
Americans to return to the basics in education, and focused attention specifically on student academic achievement (Vinovskis, 1998; Helfand, 2000). In September 1989, then President Bush and 50 governors met in an historic education summit and agreed to set education goals for the nation. Their meeting resulted in the development of six national educational goals, the third and fourth of which focused on student knowledge and skills.

Goal 3:...by the year 2000, American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter, including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography. In addition, students at every school in America will learn to utilize their minds well, so that they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our current economy.

Goal 4:...by the year 2000, U.S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement. Moreover, Goal 4 indicates that teachers have continuing opportunities to attain the knowledge and skills required for teaching challenging subject matter while enlisting new methods, forms of assessment, and technologies (Executive Office of the President, 1990, p.3-4).
In July 1990, the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP) was formed. The NEGP is an independent, executive-branch agency of the federal government charged with monitoring national and state progress toward the goals (NEGP, 2001). The NEGP initially included both federal and state officials. It was expanded in 1992 also to include state and national legislators.

Based on input from six resource groups of national experts, the NEGP endorsed a proposal to develop national education standards that specify what students should know and be able to do. The NEGP believed these standards would objectively supply a measure of progress toward the goals, especially goals three and four (NEGP, 2001).

Subsequently, the Clinton administration embraced these goals in 1992 and Congress passed the Goals 2000 Educate America Act. This act identified educational goals and sanctioned the development of national educational standards as a means of encouraging and assessing student achievement.

To enable the development of these specific standards related to the broad national goals, federal agencies such as the U.S. Department of Education, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the National Science Foundation awarded grants to professional associations for the development of
standards in science, English, history, geography, civics, fine arts, and foreign languages. The NEGP and others also joined forces with numerous other professional organizations, state departments of education, and local school districts to advance standards-based reforms.

Elmore (1998) reported “beginning with A Nation At Risk and the handful of state reforms that immediately preceded it, the nation has undergone a seismic shift in its political posture toward elementary and secondary education” (p. 2). The shift could be seen in the actions of leaders in the nation’s educational system who have moved from emphasizing the autonomy of local school boards to a system that stresses the interdependence of states and localities with respect to a consensus regarding what students should know and be able to do. Moreover, the system has shifted from one in which state governments focused mainly on providing and monitoring inputs into schooling (e.g., financing, teacher certification, school facilities, etc.) to a system in which states are playing a much more assertive role in supervising local school performance and developing alternative structures for the delivery of schooling (e.g., charter schools, vouchers, and other market-based choice schemes).
Standards Defined

Congress, in 1991, also created the National Council on Education Standards and Testing (NCEST) to help in the implementation of the national goals for education. The charge to this group was to determine the feasibility and desirability of establishing world-class education standards, methods to assess their attainment, and a long-term mechanism for revising the standards (National Education Standards and Improvement Council, [NESIC], 1993). Subsequently, the NCEST issued the report, *Raising Standards for American Education* (1992), calling for high, voluntary national standards to serve as guides and resources for state and local school reform efforts.

Based on this report, the NEGP appointed and convened a technical planning group to provide insight as to how education standards, once developed, might be certified and reviewed. This group determined that two types of standards, content standards and performance standards, are integral to standards-based reform and defined them as follows:

Content standards: content standards specify what students should know and be able to do. In shorthand, they involve the knowledge and skills essential to a discipline that students are expected to learn. Those
"skills" include the ways of thinking, working, communicating, reasoning, and investigating that characterize each discipline. That "knowledge" includes the most important and enduring ideas, concepts, issues, dilemmas, and information of the discipline. Content standards are not merely lists of facts (NESIC, 1993 p.9).

Performance standards: performance standards specify "how good is good enough." In shorthand, they indicate how adept or competent a student demonstration must be to indicate attainment of the content standards. They involve judgments of what distinguishes an adequate from an outstanding level of performance. (NESIC, 1993, p.22)

The technical planning group indicated that although the standards-based reform was a national issue, the implementation of these standards would be developed at the local level.

**Standards Developed**

Before the press for standards was even initiated at the national level, the National Council of Teachers for Mathematics had already published *Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics* in 1989. Efforts to develop national standards in most other content areas, including
science, language arts, history, social studies and civics, followed, were supported by the efforts of the NEGP and NCEST. Many state and local school districts subsequently developed standards that were tailored to meet the needs and values of their individual schools and districts (Marzano & Kendall, 1997).

Miner (2000) and Helfand (2000) reported that 49 states currently have state standards in core academic subjects. Helfand (2000) further reported that educational performance trends can be attributed to city and state school boards. Moreover, virtually every state launched initiatives over the last decade to reform education through new academic standards, tests, and accountability measures (Helfand, 2000).

Marzano and Kendall (1998) contend that only those who have no knowledge of educational reform over the last decade could utter the words, "American education has no standards." According to a study they conducted at the Mid-continent Research for Education and Learning (McREL) Center, one of the growing problems facing American educators is that far too many standards have been identified. In fact, if American educators were to cover all of the knowledge identified in the current national standards for the core subject areas
adequately, it might take as many as 22 years of schooling for students to achieve them, assuming the current structure.

Historically, educational innovations tend to come and go quickly. The national education goals are an exception. Although there have been changes in presidential administrations, congressional leadership, and the gubernatorial leadership of nearly every state during the past 10 years, the national education goals have remained constant (NEGP, 1999). Marzano and Kendall (1998) contend that no longer will the question be asked, “Should we implement standards?” Rather, they state, that question has been replaced by “How will we implement standards?”

The commitment to these goals seems to be held by the American public as well as by political leaders. A 1990 Phi Delta Kappa/Gallup poll revealed widespread support for the goals, even though Americans were skeptical that they could be met by the end of the decade (Elam, 1990). A 1998 review of public opinion data on education concluded that the public believes the educational improvements called for in the national education goals are important, and that achieving the goals will benefit the nation and its communities (Johnson & Aulicino, 1998).
Former Assistant Secretary of Education, Diane Ravitch, commonly is recognized as one of the chief architects of the modern standards movement (Marzano & Kendall, 1997). In her book, *National Standards in American Education: A Citizen’s Guide*, Ravitch (1995) explains the rationale for standards in a straightforward manner:

Americans...expect strict standards to govern construction of buildings, bridges, highways, and tunnels; shoddy work would put lives at risk. They expect stringent standards to protect their drinking water, the food they eat, and the air they breathe...Standards are created because they improve the activity of life (p. 89).

Ravitch asserts that just as standards improve the daily lives of Americans, so too will they improve the effectiveness of American education: “Standards can improve achievement by clearly identifying what is to be taught and what kind of performance is expected” (p. 25).

**Standards Debated**

Positive outcomes related to standards are widely validated in the literature (NEGP, AFT, MCREL). Proponents’ support of the standards movement includes a belief that standards clarify what is going on in classrooms, that they
provide clearly defined expectations, and that they better support an effective assessment system to measure student achievement of these expectations.

Specifically, supporters contend, the intent of standards is to improve what students study at school and how they are taught and therefore learn. Improvement in these areas will result in improvement in student results on standardized achievement tests. Klein (1999) contends that standards also affect what teachers do in their classrooms, including what they teach, how they teach, and how they relate to students. In practice, American schools do not appear to have delineated clearly what should be addressed at each grade level. One intent behind the modern standards movement is that clear national standards may better compel teachers to focus on specific content at specific grade levels (Marzano & Kendall, 1998). Teachers will know what they are to teach, and students will know what is expected of them (Jennings, 1995). By clarifying expectations, the learning process can be more effective due to increased continuity across and between grade levels.

According to the American Federation of Teachers (1999), one-fifth of U.S. students change schools each year, and in low-income neighborhoods the rates are much higher. With no
common standards in place, mobile students usually arrive in their new classrooms way behind or ahead of other students, which places a considerable strain on the teachers, the students, and the classmates the students join. With national standards, the criteria for what students learn would be the same nationwide.

Supporters of national standards foster a belief that standards help address achievement problems caused by differences between advantaged and disadvantaged groups and student mobility. McCarty (1996) specifies that standards for the nation would allow our diverse population to share expectations and learning opportunities by coordinating efforts and pooling resources and ideas. However, Murname and Levy (1998) counter that well-designed academic standards and assessments are not a “solution” to the achievement problem. Rather, they are a first step that makes the achievement problem concrete and visible to parents, teachers, and students. Once the problem is visible, there remains the hard, day-to-day work of making a school better (Murnane and Levy, 1998).

Advocates for national standards also foster a belief that standards better prepare students for careers and continuing education. Outstanding schools share several key
traits, including high academic standards that encourage all students to take courses that put them on track to succeed. The best schools have standards that will help graduates perform in the real world and not simply score well on performance tests (Outstanding High Schools, 1999). By raising academic standards and focusing on teaching skills that directly prepare students for jobs, the opportunity to build the brain power that is the basis of a decent, self-sufficient life can be offered (Giles-Gee, 1996).

Finally, national standards supporters believe that standards offer us a basis of comparison of schools, state-to-state and district-to-district. A number of research studies have shown that parents lack the information needed to make good judgments about the effectiveness of their children's schools. Despite clear indications that student achievement is low and an assumption that there is widespread concern about this, most parents expressed satisfaction with their children's achievement and schools (OERI, 1992).

Many parents base their belief of school effectiveness on the grades their children receive. However, educators suggest that parents not rely solely on their children's grades to determine the quality of their education. In order to ensure that their children are receiving a world class education that
prepares them for the world today and in the future, parents need external standards against which they can assess the performance of their children and their children's schools (OERI, 1992). Virtually all states now have statewide testing systems capable of producing performance data on individual schools, and some form of standards to offer guidance to local schools and districts (Elmore, 1998).

A number of national education organizations, including the National Education Association (NEA), and the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), have voiced support for national standards. According to Chase (1999), NEA strongly supports high academic standards for all students and views the standards movement as the most positive development in education in the last quarter of this century. The AFT believes that the success of school reforms in the states depends in large part on the quality of the academic standards set for children and on how seriously those standards are taken by everyone connected with the schools (AFT, 1999).

An initiative such as High Schools That Work, which encompasses greater than 800 sites in 22 states, has provided the "academic rigor" movement with a major boost as it emphasizes college-prep academic standards, higher-level math and science, hands-on teaching linked to real life scenarios,
and high standards in career tech courses. Evidence reported by Ries (2000) suggests that the standardized test results, attendance, graduation, and post-secondary enrollment figures have risen at these sites, while dropout rates and discipline referrals have declined. Despite this success, Lewis (1998) indicates that high schools have been the more impervious to changes in the curriculum as recommended by the standards movement than have elementary schools.

Although positive outcomes of national standards are visible, concerns have been documented as well. From the very beginning of the standards movement, a great deal of concern was voiced about the possible development of a national curriculum. Eisner (1995) identified one of the main concerns about national standards as the diverse student population in the U.S. and the fact that "one" standard for everyone ignores this diversity. Eisner asserted that differences among individual children do not lend themselves to the lock step progression dictated by standards. Curriculum frameworks which assign discreet learning tasks to particular grade levels do not take into account the learning pace of individuals or the integrated learning which crosses the boundaries of subject matter.
Another common concern of those who oppose standards is that they will actually have little effect on student achievement, in and of themselves. Holbein (1998) questioned whether simply adding requirements to an overextended curriculum by creating standards will improve learning for students. Brady (2000) voiced a number of concerns about standards, contending that there is a mistaken belief "...that somehow just 'raising the bar' increases students' ability to clear it, that before the standards movement there were no standards, that the talent wasted by one-size-fits-all programs is not worth developing, that students who will be turned into 'failures' by the standards will not present a serious problem, that standardized tests tell us something really important, that market forces have a magical ability to cure the ills of education, that extrinsic rewards are dependable motivators, and so on" (p. 651).

Added to this is the concern that standards do not take into account differences in resource allocation among schools. Eisner (1995) asks, "If national policy dictates that there will be uniform national standards for student performance, will there also be uniform national standards for the resources available to schools" (p. 764)? During an interview with O'Neil (1995), Ted Sizer contended government standards
ignore the realities of resource-poor schools and teachers who lack support for changing their instruction.

Finally, critics voice much concern over who decides on the standards and how they know that they correctly represent what are the most important concepts to learn in each area. Nelson (1998) asserted that standards are based on a presumption that teaching certain information assures its retention. The assumption embedded here and in all standards is that the mandated knowledge of the standards is "the right stuff" (p. 69).

As various professionals in favor of and opposed to standards articulated their views, many questions and concerns about the significance of national standards for students themselves appropriately have been risen. In clarifying what goes on in classrooms by setting specific standards, do we ignore diversity? How do more clearly defined expectations translate into student performance? What does standards implementation look like in resource-poor schools?

**Standards Implemented**

There are different philosophies around the nation related to how educational standards are implemented (Marzano, 1998). Factors impacting implementation include assessment
practices, funding support, and state policies, especially those state policies related to curriculum decisions.

Researchers and consultants at McRel in Aurora, Colorado have identified a number of ways that a school, a district, or even an entire state might implement standards. Marzano (1998) identified three specific models of standards implementation, each directly related to assessment. These models typically would be adopted at the state or district level impacting what and how a teacher might teach and then evaluate student work. The three models identified by Marzano include the external test approach, performance tasks and portfolios, and reporting by individual standards.

When the external test model is used, test scores from defined tests are viewed as an indication of whether or not students have successfully met a given standard. With performance tasks and student portfolios, a compilation of student work is developed over time and is used to illustrate students' competence related to a specific standard. Reporting based on standards involves reporting each student's progress on each standard. Many districts opt to use a combination of all three models. Thus, the success of students on these assessment measures would provide input as to whether or not a standard had been successfully implemented and taught.
Massell, Kirst, and Hoppe (1997) asserted that the strategies each state may use to influence and support a curriculum designed to achieve the national standards vary significantly. First, the ways in which state and local policymakers negotiate the terrain of "local control" over education is one factor that affects interpretation and implementation of standards. What this means in Iowa is different from what it means in Kentucky. For example, Iowa does not mandate statewide assessment, a common practice for many other states in the union. In addition, less than half the states adopt lists of recommended or required texts, while some are even prohibited by state law from mandating any particular statewide curriculum, including one based on standards.

Differences in resources, knowledge, and numbers of staff available both within state departments of education and across organizations in the state were additional factors impacting standards implementation (Massell, Kirst, & Hoppe, 1997). As federal funding for promoting educational standards was compromised, schools were relying on external resources such as those from business and industry along with sources of institutional support for their curricula; this varied from state to state.
In addition to funding, approaches to curricular support varied. For example, some states provided incentives and key data for schools and districts to make decisions about curriculum revisions to meet standards. In one model of curriculum change, Connecticut and Kentucky established a novel student assessment program tied to higher standards to spur alignment and provide schools with the information desired to change their curricula. Massell et al. (1997) believed the professional support for teachers and policymakers must not neglect the often critical brokering role played by state and local staff in interpreting and deploying resources for schools to undertake curricular change. In summary, they also state that although some states have attempted to bridge the gap between standards and local practice via curricular redesign, they have only scratched the surface.

**Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences Education**

Home economics was formalized as a profession during the Lake Placid Conferences from 1899-1909 with the founding of the American Home Economics Association. During the Lake Placid conferences, a large group of home economics professionals met to discuss the following: the selection and name for this new field, the formal educational preparation of
women for leadership roles in the new field, the classification and organization of home economics literature, and specific curricula for educational institutions where the training of teachers and workers for family welfare would occur, and where graduate study and research would also be conducted. As home economics developed and grew in importance in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, colleges initiated efforts to apply science to the management of the home. Women pursued home economics and domestic economy in colleges (Richards, 2000).

Almost 90 years later, representatives from five home economics professional organizations met in Scottsdale, Arizona for a conference entitled *Positioning the Profession for the 21st Century* to discuss very similar concerns. Resulting from dialogue at this meeting, a new conceptual framework for the profession was formed that described the field's purpose, focus and mode of operation. The group also made a recommendation to change the name of the profession to family and consumer sciences². In 1994, members of most of the five participating professional organizations related to home economics supported the name change and changed their names

---

² Although this dissertation reviews research conducted prior to this name change, the new name family and consumer sciences will be used primarily to reflect current professional practice.
accordingly (Stage & Vincenti, 1997).

Curriculum work in all educational fields typically begins with the question, “What should we teach?” Throughout the history of family and consumer sciences, the answer to this question has been impacted by societal concerns, educational trends and federal legislation. In addition national curriculum documents have also been developed and implemented to help curriculum designers answer this question.

East (1980) identified a publication entitled Syllabus for Home Economics, published in 1913, as the first curriculum guide related to the field of family and consumer sciences. Little more than an outline, this publication identified the main topic areas of home economics as food, clothing, shelter, and household and institutional management. Although a variety of state and local curricula were developed for secondary schools, no other more specific national curriculum was formulated for home economics until 1967.

Beginning in 1961, home economics professionals representing secondary school teachers, state departments of education, and colleges and universities met together in a series of seven workshops to develop concepts and generalizations relevant to the field of home economics. The resulting publication was entitled Concepts and
Generalizations: Their Place in High School Home Economics Curriculum Development (AHEA, 1967). This document focused on the subject-matter areas of housing, textiles and clothing, foods and nutrition, family economics and home management, and human development and the family. The group that led the development of this conceptual framework also identified three major interrelated concepts that unified all the subject-matter areas. These were human development and interpersonal relationships; values; and management. This curriculum document, called informally The Bird Book, because of the cover graphic, guided home economics education content for the next 22 years.

In 1989, the document Home Economics Concepts: A Base for Curriculum Development was published by the American Home Economics Association. This latest document identified the philosophy, rationale, subject-matter concepts, and basic curriculum models related to the field. Five content areas were included in this guide: textiles and clothing; food and nutrition; individual, child and family development; housing and living environments; and consumer and resource management. This curriculum document included lists of concepts for each of these content areas. The intent was that state and local programs could use these concepts as a basis for developing
curriculum standards and measurable competencies related to each content area.

The most recent national curriculum document to be developed for family and consumer sciences was National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences (NASAFACS, 1998). In May, 1995, members of the National Association of State Administrators for Family and Consumer Sciences (NASAFACS) voted unanimously to undertake a national standards project for family and consumer sciences education (Wild, 1997). The project was initiated in 1996, with the collection of standards-related materials from states that wished to submit them, and from other disciplines that had relevant materials. Documents initially developed were critiqued and revised by family and consumer sciences leadership representatives, family and consumer sciences educators and teacher educators, other organizations, and business and industry representatives.

The foundation for the family and consumer sciences national standards included the vision and mission statements that were adopted by the profession in 1992. The vision stated: “Family and consumer sciences education empowers individuals and families across the life span to manage the challenges of living and working in a diverse global society.
Our unique focus is on families, work, and their interrelationships" (NASAFACS, 1998, p.2).

The mission of family and consumer sciences education emphasized family life, work, and careers in family and consumer sciences: "The mission of family and consumer sciences is to prepare students for family life, work life, and careers in family and consumer sciences by providing opportunities to develop the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and behaviors needed for

• Balancing personal, home, family and work lives.
• Promoting optimal nutrition and wellness across the life span.
• Successful life management, employment, and career development.
• Functioning effectively as providers and consumers of goods and services.
• Managing resources to meet the material needs of individuals and families.
• Strengthening the well-being of individuals and families across the life span.
• Becoming responsible citizens and leaders in family, community, and work settings.
• Appreciating human worth and accepting responsibility for one's actions and success in family and work life.
• Using critical and creative thinking skills to address problems in diverse family, community, and work environments.” (NASAFACS, 1998, p. 2).

Both the vision and mission statements emphasized preparation for both quality family life and effectiveness in career thus the standards document included areas of study related to both.

In June and July 1997, professionals attending meetings in Park City, Utah, developed a standards document that attempted to represent the diversity that existed among state philosophies, and allow for multiple approaches to implementation of standards-based education. The Park City meetings, much like the Lake Placid conferences on home economics of the early 1900s, were a forum for family and consumer sciences educators (e.g., teachers, teacher educators, administrators, technical workers, supervisors, managers, and government officials) to develop national standards that would blend multiple approaches to standards and educational delivery systems in order to arrive at a consensus that would represent the ability of family and consumer sciences educational programs on the whole. The

The national content standards listed in this document were directly related to the body of knowledge, skills, and practices belonging to the family and consumer sciences discipline. The following components were included: areas of study, comprehensive standards, content standards, competencies, academic proficiencies, process questions, and scenarios.

Sixteen categories called areas of study were included in the document (p.10). Each area of study was graphically depicted in a cube, as shown in Figure 1. The 16 cubes were arranged with four cubes in each row and four cubes in each column. Between the columns, the concepts of process, academics, and FHA/HERO were depicted on arrows to illustrate that each of these concepts could interact with each of the 16 areas of study. Each of the 16 areas of study was then identified by a broad description to assist individuals in understanding the content of the area. These descriptions were referred to as comprehensive standards (p.27-28).

Each of these comprehensive standards was associated next with a number of more specific content standards (p.29-36) that relate to what students need to be able to know and do if
Figure 1. Family and consumer sciences national education standards model
they are to be proficient in any one or more of the 16 areas of study. Three to eight content standards were listed for each of the 16 comprehensive standards. Verbs for content standards are written in an action and performance mode and represented high levels of desired learning in the cognitive and psychomotor domains, thereby promoting higher order thinking skills and high levels of performance, respectively. These verbs established the learning expectation levels for the standards and thereby also provided the bases for measurement criteria (NASAFCS, 1998).

Other academic proficiencies also were integrated into the family and consumer sciences national standards; they were language arts, mathematics, and science (p.11). Each of the academic statements included in this document was matched with a related family and consumer sciences content standard that correlated to it. The purpose of this process was to show how academic concepts are integrated within family and consumer sciences coursework.

Finally, process questions (p.12) related to each of the content standards were included. These questions related to the processes of thinking, communication, leadership, and management and were designed to engage students in thinking, reasoning, and reflecting on content from these perspectives
as they studied in the content areas.

Scenarios were defined in the family and consumer sciences national standards document as authentic life and work situations that place skills and knowledge in the context where the mastery of performance must be demonstrated (p. 12). Scenarios were not developed for the 16 content areas in the national standards document, but were recommended for future development as a possible assessment device.

The family and consumer sciences national standards identified two philosophical approaches (p. 9) that states could consider when addressing implementation of educational standards: the competency approach and the critical science perspective or process approach. These philosophies were included to illustrate how each can be applicable to standards implementation (NASAFACS, 1998). Chamberlain (1992) defined the competency approach as criterion-referenced education in which the desired outcomes are stated as behavioral objectives. Competencies, or measurable and observable behaviors, are specified for students who must then demonstrate that they have attained these competencies to pass the course. Process, defined as a vehicle for obtaining, analyzing, and using content, was addressed in two ways in the national standards document (NASAFACS, 1998). Process
questions included were related to each of 16 areas of study. These questions centered around the processes of thinking, communication, leadership and management. Questions in these categories were identified for each competency. For example, competency 1.1.1 stated, “Examine policies, issues, and trends in the workplace and community that impact individuals and families” (p.38). One related “thinking” process question asks “What factors should be considered when developing policies related to the workplace?” (p.39). A separate reasoning for action standard was also included in the introductory section of the standards document. The reasoning for action standard included a listing for comprehensive standard, content standards, and competencies. The reasoning for action standard was considered relevant and applicable to each of the 16 areas of study (NASAFACS, 1998).

Family, Career, and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA) is a national student organization that serves and supports family and consumer sciences education in high schools throughout the U.S. Students involved in FCCLA participate in projects related to family and consumer sciences content areas. These projects usually provide them opportunities to learn and demonstrate a variety of leadership skills while also demonstrating mastery of family and consumer sciences
content. A document authored by national FCCLA leaders and entitled *Implementing the National Family and Consumer Sciences Standards Through FCCLA* was published in 2000 and distributed to state administrators for family and consumer sciences. This document matched each FCCLA project with the national family and consumer sciences standard that could be attained through completion of the project. Thus, the implementation of the standards could be tied to activities carried out by the related student organization in addition to being implemented in family and consumer sciences high school classrooms.

**Change Process in the Implementation of Educational Standards**

The topic of standards has permeated American education. Although virtually every state has developed standards in most content areas, there is great diversity in how these standards are implemented (Marzano & Kendall, 1998). As individuals who make up school systems addressed the challenges of standards-based reform, they were confronted with the complexity and difficulty inherent in any change effort. The usefulness of standards as an educational reform guide can be viewed through change process frameworks that have been developed and refined over many years.
Theories of Change

Change is a complex process. The body of literature on the topic is broad. Therefore, the summary of research that follows focused specifically on the change process as it related to implementation of curriculum and innovation in education. The change process is defined as how a change or innovation takes place. Innovation is defined as any significant alteration in the status quo, usually an alteration intended to benefit people by making their situation or work better in some way (Havelock & Zlotolow, 1995).

Early discussions of change in education focused on first-order or more superficial, but also important, changes that had to do with factors such as curriculum, school organization, and assessment and reporting (Betances, 1999). Kinsler and Gamble (2001) stated that reform efforts in education have resulted in significant change as well as surprising stability. They reported “while various public school systems have implemented or adopted many of the recommended changes, the basic features of the schooling process have changed little” (p. 23). Other researchers also related the relationship between change and stability back to first order and second order change. Cuban (as cited in
Kinsler and Gamble, 2001) defines first-order change as trying to make what already exists more efficient and effective without disturbing the basic organizational features. Second-order change is involved in altering the fundamental ways an organization is put together.

Recent literature has begun to take a more holistic look at the process of change (Betances, 1999). Fullan (2001) indicated that as a result of extensive research over the past 30 years, we now know much more about the processes of educational change. This research base has shown “that there are no hard-and-fast rules, but rather a set of suggestions or implications given the contingencies specific to local situations” (p. 49). Therefore, it is important for practitioners and planners to utilize change research findings as a means to make sense of planning, implementation strategies, and monitoring rather than instruments of application.

Researchers have identified a number of phases in the change process. Havelock and Zlotolow (1995) identified seven steps or principles to promote positive system change. The seven principles included care, relate, examine, acquire, try, extend, and renew, characterized by the acronym CREATE. Care was defined as the ability to connect to the concern, relate
meant building relationships, examine involved defining problems in workable terms, acquire meant searching for relevant terms, try related to finding and testing solutions, extend referred to gaining acceptance for the change, and renew involved building capacity for continuing. Havelock and Zlotolow emphasized that all these aspects in the change process were inter-related, forming a cycle that needed to be repeated over and over again as change advances.

Following a qualitative study, *Innovation Up Close: How School Improvement Works*, Huberman and Miles (1984) identified a process that began with adoption, proceeded through transformation, and resulted in outcomes. In the adoption phase, administrators' and teachers' main reasons for utilizing an innovation were explored. Multiple reasons for adoption were discovered, most centering around the importance of the innovation, initial attitudes toward it, and a link to career plans.

The transformation stage was characterized by a progression of the implementation from the initial conception through coordinated practice to refinement and extension. Specifically, the researchers identified the type, extent, and significance of changes over time. Finally, the outcome stage investigated the extent to which the innovation had been
institutionalized. In this stage researchers identified three specific outcomes: stabilization of use or degree of “settledness” of the new practice, percentage of use or the number of individuals actually using the innovation, and institutionalization or the degree to which the innovation was incorporated into the ordinary structures and procedures of the school.

Fullan (2001) also discovered that most researchers organized the change process into three broad phases. He defined phase one as initiation, mobilization, or adoption which included the processes that led up to the decision to adopt or proceed with a change. Phase two was identified as the implementation or initial use phase, and included the first experiences of attempting to put a reform into practice. The final phase was called continuation, incorporation or routinization, and referred to whether or not the change got built into the ongoing system. The time frame from initiation to implementation was described as “lengthy,” with large scale efforts taking 5-10 years. Fullan also discussed the change process as experienced by teachers, students, principals, district administrators, consultants, parents, and the community.
The analysis of change conducted by Fullan led to the identification of 10 assumptions deemed basic to successful educational change. The first of these is the assumption that one main purpose of the implementation process is to exchange one’s reality of what should be through interaction with others. According to Fullan, individuals should enter the change process with the idea that transformation of original ideas will occur.

Secondly, there needed to be a realization that each implementer will work out his or her own meaning. Effective implementation will occur through a process of clarification that will take place through reflective practice. The third assumption was recognition that conflict and disagreement were inevitable and fundamental to successful change.

Assumption four stated that people would need to be pressured to change but only under conditions that would allow them to react and form their own positions. The fifth assumption was a realization that effective change takes time. Unrealistic timelines failed to recognize the developmental nature of implementation.

Lack of implementation was addressed in the sixth assumption. Many reasons can underlie a resistance to change, and resisters might have some valid points to make. Assumption
seven addressed the expectation that all groups or individuals will change; progress occurs when steps are taken to increase the number of people affected, not to reach everyone.

Assumption eight identified an implementation plan based on change processes as essential. Recognition of the combination of factors involved in the change process was the basis for assumption nine. A clear course of action will not be delineated no matter how much knowledge is accumulated. The final assumption focused on the change process impacting the culture of institutions, not implementation of single innovations. Fullan’s assumptions were summarized with the encouragement to “be a critical consumer of external ideas while working from a base of understanding and altering local context” (p.110).

Following 25 years of involvement as leaders of research efforts that studied the change process in a variety of educational institutions, Hall and Hord (2001) developed 12 change principles that summarized predictable aspects of change. The first of these principles was based on collaborative research completed in the 1970s and stated “Change is a process, not an event” (p.4). This principle is based in part on the fact that individuals involved in the
change process need time to learn about and understand new innovations.

The second principle differentiated between development and implementation of innovations. Development is related to the creation of an innovation, while implementation is related to establishment of the use of the innovation. Principle three related successful change to the individual first, not the organization. Rates of change will vary with each individual involved.

The effect of the size of an innovation and the subsequent impact on the amount of time for implementation was the basis of principle four. In principle five, interventions are defined as the actions and events that are undertaken to influence the change process. The realization that these interventions are key to the success of the change process became the underlying basis for this principle.

Horizontal change is best for implementation of change, as opposed to top-down, or bottom-up approaches. Principle six explained this premise by defining top-down change as change initiated at the top, by principals, superintendents, state legislators and members of Congress. Bottom-up change was defined as change initiated by teachers. For change to succeed, all players needed to be involved on equal levels.
The importance of administrative leadership was the focus for change principle seven. Principle eight focused on the fact that mandates, accompanied by continued training and communication, can be an effective intervention strategy. Principle nine identified the school as the primary unit for change. Even though the school is part of a district, state, and federal system of education, successful change efforts are made at the school level.

The team concept of change was the basis for principle 10. Collaboration was identified as a necessary ingredient in the change process. Change frequently has been defined as painful, but principle 11 indicated that appropriate interventions can reduce the challenge of change. Finally, principle 12 related the context of the school as having an impact on the process of change. School context included physical features and people factors. These principles provided a foundation for identification of predictable patterns about change in organizational settings.

The Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM)

Hall and Hord (1987) were also instrumental in the development of another model for understanding and managing change in people termed the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM). This model, used for over 25 years, hypothesized
three key dimensions in the change process; stages of concern, levels of use, and innovation components (Horsley & Loucks-Horsley, 1998).

The stages of concern part of the CBAM model was based on research conducted by Frances Fuller (1970) related to her work with teacher education students. Fuller originally proposed a model that identified concerns moving through four levels; unrelated, self, task, and impact (Hall & Hord, 2001). Building on Fuller's work, Hall, George, and Rutherford (1979) identified a set of seven specific categories of concerns about innovations they entitled Stages of Concern. The seven stages included awareness, informational, personal, management, consequence, collaboration, and refocusing. Change research has validated that the concerns phenomena originally identified by Fuller pertain to everyone involved in the change process (Hall & Hord, 2001).

The stages of concern part of this model addressed the affective side of change. The second dimension, levels of use, was developed to look at behavior and portray how people act with respect to specified changes. Levels of use initially identified change participants as users/nonusers of an innovation and subsequently defined levels within each of these categories (Loucks, Newlove, & Hall, 1975).
The third dimension, innovation configurations, focused on describing the operational forms an innovation can take (Hall & Hord, 1987). Users of innovation frequently adapt an innovation to fit their situation. The concept of innovation configurations addressed both the idealized form of an innovation that might be conceptualized by a developer and the various operational forms of the change that could be observed in a classroom (Hall & Hord, 2001). When analysis of an innovation is completed in terms of operational components and variations, an innovation configuration component checklist can be developed. This checklist is sometimes referred to as a practice profile (Horsley & Loucks-Horsley, 1998). This profile could include a description of resources and conditions necessary to implement an innovation along with identification of critical components.

The CBAM has provided an effective means for change facilitators to utilize a set of tools and procedures during the change process. It has proven to be an indispensable tool for developing and evaluating reform efforts (Hall & Hord, 1987).

The three levels of change identified in the CBAM instrument provided this researcher with a comprehensive framework for investigating how the family and consumer
sciences national standards were being used. The actual diagnostic tools of the CBAM are generic in nature; therefore an instrument using this framework was developed specific to the family and consumer sciences national standards in regard to the three components of the CBAM model: concerns, levels of use, and innovation configurations.

**Research Studies Related to Implementation of Family and Consumer Sciences National Standards**

Research findings on the implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards have just begun to appear in the literature. A study completed by Grogan-Faircloth, Smith, and Hall (2001) used the stages of concern questionnaire to measure the level of concern about the family and consumer sciences national standards of 173 family and consumer sciences teachers. These teachers were in attendance at a family and consumer sciences state inservice meeting in Georgia. The researchers discovered the majority of teachers were in stage three level of concern, (Hall, 1979), perceiving the innovation as a personal threat. The researchers felt these attitudes might relate to family and consumer sciences teachers being unsure of their personal abilities to implement these standards. They postulated this could be related to a lack of knowledge about, and understanding of, the standards, or to a lack of time and resources.
A second recent study (Smith, Hall, and Jones, 2001) sought to determine the perceptions of parents, professionals, and vocational administrators about the national family and consumer sciences standards. Seventy-one parents, 147 family and consumer sciences professionals, and 199 vocational administrators in the state of Georgia were surveyed in this study. Researchers identified seven priority content standards they believed needed to be included in comprehensive family and consumer sciences programs. These included family; nutrition and wellness; human development; interpersonal relationships; career, community and family connections; parenting; and family and community services. Through use of a mailed survey questionnaire, participants were asked to identify whether or not each of these seven standards represented content that should be taught in a family and consumer sciences program. Secondly, they were asked to identify whether or not the standard was being taught in the family and consumer sciences program with which they were familiar. The researchers in this study found great support of inclusion of the standards in all seven areas by each of three groups that participated. The vocational administrators indicated the highest level of support for each of the seven areas, followed by professionals and parents. However, in all
three groups the percentages of those who believed the content actually was included in current programs was lower than the response of those who felt it should be included. Researchers determined that vocational administrators responded “yes” to both groups of questions significantly more often than either professionals or parents. As a result of this study, the researchers recommended educating the public about the profession of family and consumer sciences through workshops and invitations to serve on advisory boards. Further, they recommended inservice opportunities be developed for teachers and administrators related to implementation of the national family and consumer sciences standards.

In a response to this study, Purcell (2001) encouraged educators in the field of family and consumer sciences to inform parents, professionals, and administrators about the relevance of the content areas in the standards. Purcell felt all family and consumer sciences programs across the country should be required to meet the national standards. She challenged educators to take a more active role in promoting their programs to administrators, parents, professionals, and other decision makers.
Summary

This literature review reveals that reform efforts have been constant throughout the history of education in the U.S. Many of these reform efforts have centered on defining what content is important for all students to know. One recent reform effort has been the development of national standards for many subjects taught in our nation's high schools. The first part of this review presented the history and rationale behind national standards, along with arguments both for and against national standards.

Family and consumer sciences was formalized as a profession over 100 years ago. Over the course of these 100 years, four documents have guided professionals nationally in making curriculum decisions for this field. The most recent was entitled National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences. This document was published in 1998, and implementation efforts related to it are currently under way.

Implementation experts clearly delineate two phases in innovation implementation: development of the innovation followed by implementation. Individuals involved in implementation frequently use models related to the change process as key to successfully launching an educational initiative.
Most change theorists identify clear phases or stages in the implementation process. Utilizing these models, researchers can investigate all aspects related to implementing reform in education.

The purpose of this study was to describe the status of the implementation of the national standards for family and consumer sciences secondary school curricula as reported by state department of education administrators of family and consumer sciences three years after publication of the standards. Information was collected and compiled specifically related to stages of concern, levels of use and innovation configurations related to the standards early implementation efforts.
CHAPTER 3. METHODOLOGY

This study examines the degree of implementation of family and consumer sciences national standards by state administrators for family and consumer sciences programs in state departments of education. It also considers factors that have either facilitated or deterred implementation of the family and consumer sciences standards.

The Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM) (Hall & Hord, 1987) hypothesized three key dimensions of the change process as experiences by individuals: stages of concern about an innovation, levels or degrees of its use, and configurations in which the innovation gets implemented. Questions related to each of these dimensions of change were formulated to determine how these dimensions of change were being experienced by administrators of state departments of education in this field in relation to the family and consumer sciences national standards. Specific questions related to each of these change levels were included in this study. In the category of levels and degree of use, the related research questions were:

1. How many states have begun implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?
2. What is the level or degree of implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?

3. Why are states not implementing the family and consumer sciences national standards, if this is the case?

4. Are any components of the 16 areas of study identified in the family and consumer sciences national standards being utilized to a higher degree than others? If so, which?

In the category of concerns, the related question was:

5. What attitudes and beliefs are held by individual family and consumer sciences state administrators toward the family and consumer sciences national standards?

In the category of configurations, the related question was:

6. What models exist related to the successful implementation of national family and consumer sciences standards?

In order to answer these questions, descriptive survey research methods were selected to gather data from family and consumer sciences administrators in state departments of education or instruction to allow the researcher to respond to the six questions.

**Research Methodology**

A descriptive study using survey techniques determines and describes the way things are (Gay & Airisian, 2000). Such
survey research allows "information to be collected from a group of people to describe some aspects or characteristics (such as abilities, opinions, attitudes, beliefs, and/or knowledge) of the population" (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996, p. 367). Descriptive survey research was appropriate for this study because the intention was to gather information to describe the current situation. Data from the study were to be analyzed to identify attitudes and to gather knowledge and opinions from family and consumer sciences state administrators in state departments of education related to the implementation of national family and consumer sciences standards in their states.

Well-conducted, one-on-one interviews using a prepared set of questions can produce in-depth data not possible with mailed questionnaires. Such interviews "may... result in more accurate and honest responses, since the interviewer can explain both the purposes of the research and the individual questions" (Gay and Airisian, 2000, p.291). Conducting such interviews by telephone tends to be less expensive than face-to-face interviews. Further, Gay and Airisian (2000) identify three advantages of telephone interviews as compared to other types of descriptive data collection methods: high response rate, quick data collection, and a wider range of locales and
respondents. Telephone interviews, conducted with respondents using a prepared list of response items were therefore used for this study.

**Population for the Study**

The population for gathering data for this study was administrators for public school family and consumer sciences education in each state's department of education. These state administrators make up the membership of the National Association of State Administrators for Family and Consumer Sciences (NASAFACS). They were selected for this study because they were the original group who provided leadership for the development of national family and consumer sciences standards. This group of professionals is directly responsible for leading the development of curricula for family and consumer sciences education in middle, junior, and high school programs within each state, and leading implementation and assessment plans for this developed curricula. Additionally the completed standards document included the recommendation that these state administrators provide leadership to a team who would carry out implementation activities related to the national family and consumer sciences national standards. (NASAFACS, 1998). Therefore, this group would be able to provide first-hand knowledge of standards implementation in
each state. Because the number of potential respondents was small, no decision to sample the population seemed appropriate.

Administrators of the Family and Consumer Sciences Education Division of the Association for Career and Technical Education (ACTE) maintain an up-to-date website with contact information for all state administrators for family and consumer sciences under the NASAFACS link. In an April 14, 2000 update, contact information for departments of public instruction or education was listed for all 50 states plus the District of Columbia. State administrators for family and consumer sciences were identified in 46 departments (Family and Consumer Sciences Education, http://www.facse.org/); Delaware, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Wyoming did not have a specific contact identified. In some states, there were more than one family and consumer sciences state administrator identified, so the administrator who was identified as the "head state administrator" was the contact.

**Instrument Development**

The CBAM (Hall & Hord, 1987) provided the framework for developing an interview schedule for this study. Three key dimensions of the change process as experienced by individuals are hypothesized by the model to be stages of concern about an
innovation, levels or degrees of its use, and configurations in which the innovation gets implemented.

A draft interview schedule was developed to include items related to each of these three dimensions hypothesized by the change model: open-ended questions to address both stages of concern experienced and configurations in which the standards were most commonly being implemented, checklist items to determine levels or degree of use of standards by teachers in the states as perceived by the administrators, and statements with a five-point Likert scale response format to identify further concerns and attitudes of the administrators toward the standards. Additionally, respondents were asked to supply background information including the number of years they had been employed as a family and consumer sciences administrator and information about their university degrees. Forty-five items were included in the initial draft of the interview schedule. The interview schedule format was based on that used in other surveys related to the adoption of innovations. The final format was a questionnaire-type document designed with questions to be asked and responses recorded by the interviewer.

To establish content-related evidence of validity, the content and structure of the interview schedule were examined
by three family and consumer sciences education college faculty and one research design specialist. All four faculty were full professors in their universities. Changes suggested were incorporated into the interview schedule. These included changes in wording some items to make the meaning more clear. For example in two items the word "relate" was changed to "support". Used in 11 items, the Likert scale was expanded from four choices to five to allow for a deeper sense of how firmly a respondent held a position. Finally, some open-ended questions were changed to precoded checklist items so that commonalities in answers would be easier to code and analyze, thus enhancing validity and keeping the telephone interview time to a reasonable length.

The revised interview schedule was next pilot tested by using it to conduct trial telephone interviews of five family and consumer sciences education professionals with backgrounds similar to those of the selected population. Three of these individuals had formerly served as state administrators for family and consumer sciences; the other two were family and consumer sciences education university faculty who had been involved extensively with development of the family and consumer sciences national standards. Additional revisions were next made to some instrument items based on the comments
of the pilot-testers. The term "supervisor" was changed to "administrator". The directions were clarified for a group of 16 items where the 16 content areas of family and consumer sciences education were listed and respondents were to identify the frequency each was taught in her state. Respondents were instead asked to identify five of 16 areas that were most central to their state programs and five that were least central. Four Likert scale items were deemed to be redundant with items in the open-ended questions and were deleted.

The final interview schedule contained 41 items. Items 1-38 related directly to the three key dimensions of the CBAM. Table 1 shows these dimensions and their corresponding item numbers in the interview. Items 39-41 were designed to provide an overview of the educational background and years of professional experience of the study population. A copy of the final interview schedule used to collect data for this study is found in Appendix A.

Data Collection

Approval to conduct this research study was granted by the Human Subjects Review Committee at Iowa State University (Appendix B). A letter (Appendix C) introducing the study and its purpose was prepared and sent to family and consumer
sciences state administrators at all 50 state departments of public instruction and the District of Columbia to alert them to the telephone call they could soon expect. In the four states where a family and consumer sciences administrator was not specifically identified by name in the NASAFACS database, a letter was sent with a generic label of "Family and Consumer Sciences State Administrator."

Table 1. Categories of items in the interview schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CBAM Dimensions</th>
<th>Corresponding Items/Type of Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stages of concern</td>
<td>Items 8-18 Statements with Likert-scaled responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levels or degrees of use</td>
<td>1-7, 1a, 1b, 1c, 1h, 19-22 Items with precoded responses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1g, 1i, 1j, 2e, 2f, 2g, 3c, 3d, 3e, 4b, 4c, 39-41 Open-ended items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation configurations</td>
<td>1d, 1e, 1f, 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d, 3a, 3b, 4a Open-ended items</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23-38 Items with precoded responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Oppenheim (1992) suggests a preliminary call may be necessary to fix a time when a longer call is to be made. This seemed practical for this study because the respondents, by nature of their statewide roles, have busy meeting and travel schedules. Telephone calls were made to each of the 46 named
administrators to set an appointment for a specific date and time to conduct the interview. The five education offices in Delaware, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Wyoming, where no family and consumer sciences state administrator was named, were called to determine if these positions had been filled or if an alternate respondent could be identified. A new family and consumer sciences state administrator had been employed in Delaware and successful contact was established to inform her of this study. A family and consumer sciences state administrator originally was identified in the state of New Mexico, but had resigned from her position. An appropriate alternate respondent could not be identified.

All 46 named family and consumer sciences state administrators therefore were contacted: one administrator from each state and the District of Columbia with the exception of the states of New Mexico, Hawaii, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Wyoming. Appointments for telephone interviews were made with 44 state administrators; two state administrators declined to participate. Of the total accessible population of 46 state administrators a 96% response rate was attained.

Both interviewer and interviewee need to be prepared in advance of the interview if its potential is to be realized.
(Oppenheim, 1992). To allow for thorough responses to the interview questions, the research design included sending a copy of the interview schedule to each administrator prior to the telephone interview. During the initial phone calls, administrators were asked if they preferred to receive the interview schedule by email or fax; their requests were subsequently honored.

According to Gay and Airasian (2000), if the interviewer writes responses down during an interview this may slow things down and make the interview awkward. Audio cassette recording can help the interview move more quickly and responses to be recorded exactly as given. Respondents were asked for permission to have their responses to the open-ended items tape-recorded. All respondents were assured of confidentiality of responses, and all respondents agreed to allow their responses to the open-ended questions to be tape-recorded.

The letter introducing the study was mailed to the administrators at the state departments of education on July 22, 2000. Initial phone calls to each state office for the purpose of answering questions about the study and setting appointments for data collection took place from August 2 through August 4, 2000. A number of administrators were unavailable during this time period, due primarily to state
teacher conferences and vacations. Office staff provided information on times when these state administrators would be available, and call backs were made at the identified times.

Data collection began on August 4, 2000 and continued through September 29, 2000. The interviews lasted from 13 minutes to 61 minutes; the mean amount of time for the interviews was 24 minutes. The interviews with administrators in the three states not currently using the standards took the shortest amounts of time.

Data Analysis

Responses to the open-ended items that had been tape-recorded were transcribed. The transcribed data were analyzed to determine patterns, emerging themes, commonalities and differences expressed by the family and consumer sciences administrators. The researcher used hand-sorting methods to sort the data from these items.

Items were sorted initially according the item response numbers from the interview schedule. Next, items that related to each of the three levels from the CBAM framework were grouped together. In reading the responses, certain patterns and topics began to emerge. Words and phrases related to each of these patterns were identified next to provide coding categories. For example, in response to item 1e, “As a result
of the implementation efforts in your state, describe any changes that have been made to family and consumer sciences programs," the words repeatedly identified included curriculum, dialogue, uniformity, and credibility. These words thus became the coding categories for sorting responses.

Responses to precoded checklist items, Likert rating scales, and identification of most and least important areas of study were reviewed, coded, and analyzed using the SPSS 10.0 software. Responses to these items had been recorded on a coding sheet by the interviewer. Responses were transferred from the coding sheet to a computer data file. Variables for each answer in the data file were coded for statistical analyses. Descriptive statistics, frequencies, item means and standard deviations to describe the population of family and consumer sciences state administrators' stages of concern and levels of usage were generated.

Summary

Descriptive survey research methods were used to carry out this study. The population that was surveyed consisted of 46 family and consumer sciences state administrators; 44 of them agreed to be interviewed.

A telephone interview was used to administer the data collection instrument developed by the researcher. During its
development, a review panel of family and consumer sciences education faculty and research design specialists was used to help enhance validity of the instrument and improve its reliability and usability. A pilot test was carried out by conducting telephone interviews using the draft instrument with professionals who had formerly served as family and consumer sciences state administrators and were involved in the development of the family and consumer sciences national standards. The final instrument contained 41 items in three formats, checklist-type items, open-ended questions, and items with Likert scale ratings.

The final instrument was used to interview family and consumer sciences department of education state administrators to determine the following: 1) how many states had begun implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards, 2) the level or degree of implementation, 3) why states were not implementing the national standards if they were not, 4) which of 16 areas of content in family and consumer sciences were being utilized to a higher degree than others, 5) attitudes of state department of education family and consumer sciences administrators toward the standards, and 6) models related to the successful implementation of the standards. Interviews were conducted over a two month period,
and took approximately 25 minutes each.

Responses to open-ended items were tape-recorded and later transcribed. Data were analyzed with hand sorting techniques to identify common themes. Additionally data were analyzed with SPSS software to determine descriptive statistics.
CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This chapter includes a description of the findings of this study and a discussion of their relevance and meaning. The purpose of this research was to describe the status of the implementation of national standards for family and consumer sciences secondary school curricula as reported by state department of education administrators of family and consumer sciences three years after publication of the standards. The Concerns Based Adoption Model (Hall & Hord, 1987) provided a framework for developing a telephone survey to study the following:

- levels and degrees of use (implementation) of the standards by the administrators, and their perceptions of the levels and degrees of use by family and consumer sciences teachers in their states;
- concerns held by the administrators about the standards, and their perceptions of the concerns held by family and consumer sciences teachers in their states;
- configurations (strategies) for implementation of the standards by the administrators, and their perception or knowledge of family and consumer sciences teachers' views of these implementation configurations.
Within each of these categories, questions were formulated that guided this research study. In the category of levels and degrees of use, the related research questions were

1. How many states have begun implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?
2. What is the level or degree of implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?
3. Why are some states not implementing the family and consumer sciences national standards, if this is the case?
4. Are any components of the 16 areas of study identified in the family and consumer sciences national standards being utilized to a higher degree than others? If so, which?

In the category of concerns, the related research question was

5. What attitudes and beliefs are held by individual family and consumer sciences state administrators toward the family and consumer sciences national standards?

In the category of configurations, the correlating research question was
6. What models exist related to the successful implementation of national family and consumer sciences standards?

Open-ended items in a researcher-developed interview schedule (Appendix A) were used to determine administrators’ concerns about the standards and configurations in which the standards were being implemented. Checklist-type items were used to identify the levels or degree of use of the standards by a particular state. A Likert rating scale was used in a third set of items in the instrument to further identify concerns and to measure administrators’ attitudes toward the standards. Questions about administrators’ personal characteristics were included to provide an overview of the educational background and years of professional experience of this population.

Data were collected during telephone interviews of 44 of the 46 family and consumer sciences state administrators in state departments of education in 43 states and the District of Columbia. Two state administrators declined to participate. The interview schedule was supplied to them in advance so they could refer to it during the telephone interview.
Professional Characteristics of Respondents

Using items 39 and 40 of the interview schedule, the family and consumer sciences state department of education administrators were asked by the researcher to provide information about their educational backgrounds and number of years they had been family and consumer sciences state administrators. All 44 responded to the two items. As the information in Table 2 shows, the vast majority of family and consumer sciences state administrators (86.4%) have completed an advanced degree.

Table 2. Highest degree obtained by family and consumer sciences state administrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>86.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were asked to share the field in which they attained their highest degree. Family and consumer sciences education was the most frequent response, although 11 other majors, all related to either teaching subject matter or pedagogy, also were given (Table 3).

Respondents were asked how many years they had been a family and consumer sciences state administrator. Data in
Table 4 show that most had been in their roles for five or fewer years, and only one had served more than 20 years.

Table 3. Field highest degree attained in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family and Consumer Sciences Education</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary Education</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational/Technical Administration</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Education</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Leadership/Supervision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development/Family Studies</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counseling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Total is more than 44 as 2 respondents indicated joint degree programs.

Table 4. Years experience as a family and consumer sciences state administrator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-5 years</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>47.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>84.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In item 6, the state administrators were asked if they had been involved directly in the development of the family and consumer sciences national standards as part of the team that developed them. Twenty-seven (61%) had been. In item 7 the administrators were asked if other people in their states had been involved directly in the development of the
standards. In this case, 33 (75%), indicated that other people from their states had been involved in the original development process.

**Use of Family and Consumer Sciences Standards in the States**

The category of levels and degrees of use included four research questions that will be addressed in this section:

- How many states have begun implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?
- What is the level or degree of implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?
- Why are some states not implementing the family and consumer sciences national standards, if this is the case?
- Are any components of the 16 areas of study identified in the family and consumer sciences national standards being utilized to a higher degree than others? If so, which?

Family and consumer sciences national standards have strong support at the state level. Forty-one of 44 respondents (93%) indicated that the national standards are being implemented to some degree in their states. The motivations for implementing them are: improve existing curricula (78%), to aid in developing new curricula (63%), aid in assessing
learning (46%), because it was mandated by a regulatory agency (12%), and because their use is tied to funding in their states (10%). Additional motivations shared by just one respondent each included enhanced credibility, guidance for program evaluation, more up-to-date and current programs, and to provide a united national content focus.

Three respondents indicated that national standards were not being implemented currently in their states. One of the three indicated her state would probably implement the national family and consumer sciences standards in the future. The other two state administrators said they have not begun implementation efforts because they are "local autonomy states" meaning that many of their curriculum decisions are made at the local level as opposed to the state level. Other reasons provided by the three respondents included not having enough information about them, implementation was too time consuming, and had already developed state standards prior to the time the family and consumer sciences national standards were distributed.

The implementation of the standards is a collaborative process in a majority of the states. Every state that is implementing the family and consumer sciences national standards indicated that middle, junior, and high school
teachers of family and consumer sciences are involved directly in the implementation efforts. This is not unexpected because the standards are designed for this educational level. Key groups taking part in implementation activities were family and consumer sciences teacher educators (76%), business people (37%), and other school administrators (32%). Identified less frequently were other academic teachers (15%), students (12%), and parents (10%). Individual responses included association leaders, curriculum developers, and workforce education coordinators as having input into implementation efforts. Of all those involved, most became so after being invited to participate by the state administrator.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether or not they felt teachers and teacher educators in their states were aware of the family and consumer sciences national standards. Eighty-four percent indicated that most or all family and consumer sciences teachers in their states were aware of the national standards, and 93% indicated that most or all teacher educators were aware of them.

Distribution of the standards document varied by state. A number of respondents indicated that sections of the document had been distributed at statewide meetings and inservice sessions. Fifty-two percent indicated that most or all of the
teachers in their states had a copy of the national standards document. Distribution of the standards document was perceived to be more widespread among teacher educators, 80% indicating teacher educators had copies.

Respondents were provided with a listing of 16 areas of study identified in the national standards document and asked to identify the five areas they believed to be most central to the mission of family and consumer sciences programming in their states, and the five areas they believed were least central. An average of 23.4 respondents operated in each of the 16 categories, with a range of 16 to 33 (SD of 4.9), indicating a high level of agreement among respondents as to categories most and least central. As a first step in analyzing these data, the total number of responses triggered, either positive or negative, was calculated for each of 16 areas of study. Next, areas of study were placed in rank order, according to categories that triggered the greatest number of responses. The percentage of respondents who identified each answer as most or least central was next calculated. As Table 5 shows, a significant pattern emerges from these data. There was clear agreement as to which of 16 areas of study administrators were finding most and least central to programming in their states. Even though they were
asked individually to identify five most and five least central of the areas, the aggregate data shows that overall, nine areas of study were frequently identified (70% or more of the time) as most central and six categories were identified frequently as least central. In fact, there was only one category (food science, dietetics, and nutrition) in which there was any substantial disagreement (a 5 percentage point difference) over whether it is most or least central.

Three distinct categories can be identified from these results. The nine the majority agreed were most central were: parenting; nutrition and wellness; early childhood, education and services; interpersonal relationships; human development; family; consumer and family resources; food production and services; and career, community and family connections. For one category there was controversy: food science, dietetics and nutrition. Six the majority agreed were least central were: facilities management and maintenance; consumer services; textiles and apparel; family and community services; housing, interiors, and furnishings; and hospitality, tourism and recreation.
Table 5. Sixteen areas of studies least to most central by total percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Study</th>
<th>Most</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Least</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Management and Maintenance</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Services</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textiles and Apparel</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family and Community Services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing, Interiors, and Furnishings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality, Tourism, and Recreation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Science, Dietetics, and Nutrition</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career, Community and Family Connections</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Production and Services</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer and Family Resources</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>79.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Development</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parenting</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition and Wellness</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Childhood, Education, and Services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpersonal Relationships</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In interpreting these findings, the categories that were identified as most central tended to be those categories many family and consumer sciences professionals label as core or essential for all students to attain. Those identified as least central tend to be those associated with the occupational areas of family and consumer sciences.

**Stages of Concern**

One research question pertained to the respondents’ stages of concern:

- What attitudes and beliefs are held by individual family and consumer sciences state administrators toward the family and consumer sciences national standards?

To begin to answer this question, respondents were first asked to identify which of two major philosophies for the field identified in *National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences* (p.9, 1998), the competency approach or the critical science or process approach, best fits current practices and approaches in their states. Nineteen respondents identified the competency approach as best describing their states, 10 the critical science approach, 10 a combination of both philosophies, 4 respondents indicated they were unsure of
which philosophy best described their states, and 1 respondent declined to answer this question.

To further identify respondents' concerns, they were asked to respond to a number of statements about the national standards that were worded as either positive or negative. Data in Table 6 show the level of agreement with the nine statements that were worded positively. Because responses were coded as 5, strongly agree, to 1, strongly disagree, the higher the mean score, the more positive respondents were about the statement. As data in Table 6 show, seven of nine positive statements received agreement (4.0 or higher) from the respondents. The other statements had only moderate levels of agreement (3.0-3.9).

Data in Table 7 show the level of agreement with two statements that were negatively worded. In this case, the lower the mean score, the more positive respondents were toward the family and consumer sciences national standards. In other words, they did not support the negative thought presented in the statement. Both of the negative statements received low levels (2.0 or less) of agreement.
Table 6. Agreement with positively worded statements about the national standards in rank order.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National family and consumer sciences (fcs) standards are a useful tool for curriculum development in my state.</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National fcs standards contribute to higher quality programs.</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National fcs standards contribute to a positive image of family and consumer sciences in my state.</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National fcs standards support the current programming focus in my state.</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National fcs standards provide enough flexibility to allow teachers to address student diversity issues.</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National fcs standards support future program needs in my state.</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National fcs standards are written in an easy-to-understand, usable format.</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National fcs standards reflect an appropriate balance of content areas both as occupational training and as general education for all students.</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National fcs standards are positively changing teacher behavior.</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7. Agreement with negatively worded statements about the national standards in rank order

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statements</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National fcs standards are just another example of bureaucratic &quot;red-tape.&quot;</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National fcs standards aren’t necessary in my state.</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Using a 5-point scale with anchors 5 (strongly agree), 3 (unsure), 1 (strongly disagree).
In analyzing these responses, there appeared to be strong support for the national standards document. State administrators are finding the document to be a useful tool to shape curricula in their states. The last national family and consumer sciences curriculum document was published in 1989. Administrators saw a need for this new document and seemed supportive of the idea of national standards.

Using an open-ended item, respondents also were asked to share any concerns they had about the family and consumer sciences national standards. The emerging themes included concerns about the standards model, assessment of the standards, timelines for revision of curricula, future directions for the standards, and dissemination of information related to them.

Respondents expressed some dissatisfaction with the alphabetic depiction of 16 areas of study as they were modeled in a cubic format. One administrator remarked, "The 16 cubes don't reflect our program." Another stated, "Many models were considered, but the final alphabetic list doesn't show relationships between content." Comments also showed concern about the lack of differentiation between what most administrators termed the "core" and "occupational" content. Comments in this regard included "I am concerned that the
current standards do not have a strong core identified; need to identify which are core to every single student." Another respondent said, "By combining both occupational and core standards, it makes it tough when we take standards to various stakeholder groups." Further, respondents indicated concern that the standards were not broken into grade levels. Many states have different standards for middle school or junior high school classes than for senior high school. One commented, "National standards do not include anything specifically for middle school." Finally, the inclusion of process or pedagogy as a central piece of the document was mentioned. One administrator commented "Process should have been in a separate document. The standards should focus on content, not instructional approaches." But another respondent was happy that process was included, stating, "The process piece was important. Congratulations!" Other comments indicated confusion about process and how it relates to the family and consumer sciences national standards. One respondent stated, "There is confusion about the process piece." And another said, "We need more information and resources on process."

A second theme identified by respondents was related to assessment. One respondent stated, "We need work on
assessment. Everyone wants assessment.” Another comment was “Develop assessments.” One administrator said “I was under the impression that development of the standards would be a several-pronged process, meaning that some assessment would evolve for each one of the areas, and that did not happen.”

A third theme related to concerns relative to a timeline for revision and future directions of the standards. Respondents indicated that they would like a process and timeline identified for revisions of the standards. They indicated that they would like to know the “next steps.” Supporting this was the comment, “We are not being kept informed of what’s happening at the national level, for example with assessment and scenario development.” Another comment in this regard was, “What are the next steps? I am concerned that we are not working cohesively on these standards.”

The final theme of concern identified by respondents was dissemination of information related to the standards. A number of respondents indicated that a website related to standards would be helpful. One shared a vision for a website for her state that would allow an individual to click on the text for a standard. The text would be linked to a page with
activity examples, and each activity example would link to a page of related assessment examples.

**Models of Implementation**

One research question pertained to the models of implementation:

- What models exist related to the successful implementation of national family and consumer sciences standards?

To begin to answer this question, respondents were asked the open-ended item, “Please describe the process and activities your state has undertaken to implement the national family and consumer sciences standards.” Two primary factors were identified as impacting how family and consumer sciences national standards are being implemented in individual states; the process regarding how curriculum guides are developed and disseminated in the several states, and the stage at which states are in their curriculum development cycle.

Regarding cycles, 14 respondents indicated that their states use a rotational process of curriculum development. The curricula for a specified number of courses are updated at regular intervals. The timeline for this revision varies from state to state. For example, one respondent said, “We revise our curriculum every five years. There’s a rotation. Last year
we did secondary school child care courses and this year we'll do something else." Another said, "We are working on updating materials. Last year we drafted five curriculum pieces and we have three slated for this year." Since the publication of the family and consumer sciences national standards document, a number of the respondents indicated utilizing a model of curriculum revision where the family and consumer sciences national standards are compared with existing state curricula for family and consumer sciences. Where gaps between the state curriculum and family and consumer sciences national standards are identified, a decision is then made as to whether or not to revise the current state guidelines. In relation to this, one respondent said, "Where we saw good things in the national model that we didn't have in the state model, that's where we improved our own state model."

Concerning the other primary factor, another common theme that emerged in the responses to this question was the use of curriculum teams in developing and disseminating curriculum at the state level. Curriculum teams in such states identified specific parts of the national standards document that they found pertinent to programming in their states. These parts of the national standards were then used as they worked on curriculum revisions.
Some variations related to this process included the responses, "We selected six areas of study [from the 16 areas] from the standards that reflect most accurately what is being taught in our state as well as what we felt should be taught." "We chose areas [of the national standards document] that were represented in our state. We came up with seven areas, and then aligned them into exploratory, core, and advanced courses."

Another variation was found in a state where a development team focused on using the national standards as a guide to develop one foundations course containing information they felt was essential for all students. Next they designed second-tier courses focusing on content essential for students preparing for careers in family and consumer sciences.

Two states adopted the national standards as their states' standards. In one of these two states, the administrator indicated that the existing curriculum was lined up with the national standards and any missing pieces were added. In the second state, the administrator indicated that the national standards were adopted as the state curriculum framework, implying that any existing state curricula were retired.
One administrator indicated that she purposefully waited until after the national standards document had been produced and distributed before starting a cycle of revision because "I wanted to align with national standards as much as possible. It saved us a lot of time."

Administrators in 36 states indicated their states had their own state standards. In some states, the terminology, competencies or requirements, was used instead of the word, standards. Eight administrators indicated their states did not have their own standards. Thirty-four administrators in the states with their own standards indicated that their standards had, however, now been aligned with the national standards. The alignment process involved comparing the state and national standards and, where there were discrepancies, discussing whether or not changes should be made to the state standards. Only two administrators in states with their own standards indicated that an alignment process had not taken place.

Academic proficiencies also are included in the family and consumer sciences national standards document for the subject matter areas of language arts, mathematics, and science. All but one administrator indicated that academic proficiencies also had been identified at the state level for
these content areas. In 29 of these states, administrators indicated that the proficiencies for language arts, mathematics, and science had been "crosswalked" with the family and consumer sciences national standards. This process involved matching the state academic proficiencies with corresponding competencies from the family and consumer sciences national standards. For example, a nutrition competency might involve a mathematical process, thus a student in a classroom might have this particular mathematical process reinforced during the nutrition lesson. Fourteen administrators indicated that such a process had not taken place between learning standards for the basic curricular areas and those for family and consumer sciences.

In items 1e and 1f, respondents were asked to describe any changes that have been made to programs or in teachers' behaviors as a result of the development of national standards. Four themes emerged in the analysis of the answers to these questions: improvements to curriculum, enhanced credibility, improved dialogue, and greater uniformity.

The most common theme appeared to be the view that the national standards were having a positive impact on curriculum development. Illustrative responses related to this theme include "Standards have had enormous impact on our curriculum
development process. Things that in the 1980s would have taken teachers two months to do, they had done and typed and printed out in two days because they had such rich stuff to start. It was pretty awesome," and "Teachers are using the national standards and state guidelines as their direction in developing curriculum at the local level. Our state has guidelines that were stated in terms of course content rather than student outcome. Adding the family and consumer sciences standards has helped put the student-directed component in.” Other respondents indicated that the standards have impacted the type of content teachers are covering, with an increased focus on consumer, nutrition, child development and career content, and also increased academic integration. Finally, respondents indicated that the standards have helped create a shift from low-level technical types of information being taught to higher-level competencies being the focus of education programs.

A second theme that emerged for changes in programs and teacher behavior resulting from the standards was credibility. Respondents believed that greater credibility for family and consumer sciences education was resulting due to the publicity, communications, and activities that implementation of the standards provided. Comments to validate this theme
included "National standards provided us with direction. We have an awareness of the fact that the document was developed by a large group of people so it’s probably pretty accurate, pretty current, pretty quality work." "Teachers are excited to have their own standards. There is pride and it has given them something to take back to school boards." "It’s a good thing to have people brainstorming and researching and being visionary about where we need to go." These findings reinforce earlier responses, indicating support for the national standards document. In fact, they go a step further, showing that not only is there a need for and support of this type of curriculum guide at the state level, but there is also perceived support at the local or teacher level.

The third theme to emerge in this area related to dialogue. Again, specific comments in this regard included "They give teachers a voice in the curriculum and provide a way of seeing relationships and making connections."

"A good discussion starter among teachers. Good public relations document at the state level. Our Department of Public Instruction is currently working on academic standards and we’ve been able to share our national standards and really impress them." Again, these verbalized responses validate the information reported earlier, the standards are positively
impacting how the field of family and consumer sciences is viewed. This increased positive view apparently could be seen with both teachers and state department of education professionals.

The fourth consistent theme to emerge concerned uniformity. Uniformity involved consistency as to what types of content were being taught in schools at local, state, or national levels. Comments related to this theme included “Teachers are looking forward to more uniformity between school districts within our state. They want to be better able to serve a student within a school district, from one high school to another.” “National standards help teachers see that on the larger picture it’s not just our state that is doing these things, you know, it’s across the nation.”

In addition to responses made that focused on these four themes, two respondents indicated changes they observed in family and consumer sciences programs in their states had been a result of state efforts that preceded the development of national standards, and not due to the national standards to any great degree. Additionally, five respondents indicated they had not yet witnessed any change in programs or teacher behavior in their states related to the national standards.
In item 1g, respondents were asked to share any plans their states had to assess student achievement in relation to the standards. The responses to this question fell into three categories: not yet determined, a move toward authentic assessment, and state-wide competency testing.

The most common response to this question was that this was a point at which a lot of the administrators currently were. Sixteen of the respondents stated that assessments related to student achievement had not yet been determined. Most respondents indicated that assessment was being discussed with teachers in their states and with business and industry people who would employ students as well. Two respondents indicated that students in their states were being "tested to death" because of the large number of state-mandated tests in areas such as mathematics, social studies, science, and language arts. These respondents indicated that they would like to focus more on development of authentic assessment devices for family and consumer sciences that were based on student performance. Respondents who indicated that development of assessment guidelines for family and consumer sciences was already underway or complete in their states were most likely to identify these authentic assessment devices for evaluating active performance of skills as the type being
developed, many of them including rubrics and scenarios in the written assessment guidelines and tying these directly to individual curriculum standards. Two respondents indicated that their states were setting up guidelines for the use of student portfolios as assessment techniques.

Dissemination of the assessment guidelines included their incorporation in a curriculum guide, a “teacher-toolbox” that would include examples of rubrics and scenarios to guide teachers’ further development of techniques, and a web-based resource that would include assessment resources for each of the 16 areas of study in the national standards. Most of these responses were qualified by statements that the final assessment guidelines keyed to the standards were two-to-four years away.

The final category of potential activity related to assessment of standards has been the possible development of statewide assessments that might be mandatory for students enrolled in particular family and consumer sciences classes. Only one respondent indicated that this process was underway in her state, but five other respondents indicated it was being considered. In one case, a respondent indicated that if a statewide assessment for family and consumer sciences was developed, it would be embedded into existing tests for
language arts, social studies, math, and science, as her state would not allow any additional state-wide assessment tests. Due to the increased number of state-mandated tests in academic areas, there was not strong support for developing this type of assessment for family and consumer sciences classes.

In item 4, respondents were asked "Has your state made any plans to integrate the national family and consumer sciences standards into the Family, Career, and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA) program?" FCCLA is the vocational student organization associated with family and consumer sciences secondary school classes. Over 65% of the respondents answered yes and 27% answered no. Three of the respondents were unsure of the answer to this question. The primary way the national standards were being integrated into FCCLA programs was through the distribution of a document entitled Implementing the National Family and Consumer Sciences Standards through FCCLA. This document was published by National FCCLA staff and matches each national content standard with a related FCCLA national program where it could be appropriately implemented. A number of respondents indicated that this document had been presented to teachers
attending state inservice meetings or mailed to all teachers in their states.

Additionally, two respondents indicated that the Students Taking Action with Recognition (STAR) events competitions held in their states in cooperation with FCCLA, during which students participate in competitive events to build leadership and job-related skills, had been revised so that they were "more in keeping with the priorities identified in the national standards document." Two other respondents indicated they have incorporated FCCLA into their states curriculum guides. One administrator had sponsored an "Integration Celebration" for junior and senior high school family and consumer sciences teachers who served as FCCLA advisors, to provide them an opportunity to align the family and consumer sciences national standards with FCCLA goals and programs. Another administrator had conducted a session at the state FCCLA officer training meeting to show relationships between national and state standards and STAR events.

**Summary**

A majority of state department of education administrators of family and consumer sciences were using the national standards for family and consumer sciences developed in 1998. Forty-one respondents (93%) indicated that the
national standards are being implemented to some degree in their states. The top two reasons identified for implementing the family and consumer sciences national standards were to improve existing curriculum (78%) and as an aid in developing new curriculum (63%). Only three respondents indicated the national standards are not being used in their states. The reasons identified for not implementing standards included time, lack of information, prior development of state standards, and being a local autonomy state.

State administrators were asked to identify which five areas of study were central to programming in their states and which five were not central. A statistical analysis of all responses indicated nine areas of study identified as most central, in order of most to least central were parenting; nutrition and wellness; early childhood, education and services; interpersonal relationships; human development; family; consumer and family resources; food production and services; and career, community and family connections. The six standards identified as least central, in order of least to most central were facilities management and maintenance; consumer services; textiles and apparel; family and community services; housing, interiors, and furnishings; and hospitality, tourism, and recreation.
The models of implementation identified were closely tied to the method used for curriculum development in the state. One common model related to curriculum updating that is done on a cyclical basis. A number of administrators who use this model indicated that the national standards are being used as a standard of comparison when they update state curriculum. Gaps between the national and state curricula are identified, and a decision is made as to whether or not to revise the state curriculum. Administrators also have used the national standards as an aid in identifying relationships with state academic proficiencies. Further, a national document on integrating national standards with the extracurricular student organization FCCLA, has been integrated to some degree in a majority of states. Assessment devices related to family and consumer sciences national standards are currently under development in some states. One recently completed national project entitled Assessment Strategies for Family and Consumer Sciences Food and Nutrition National Standards (U.S. Department of Agriculture, 2001) has resulted in a binder of assessment devices related to the family and consumer sciences food and nutrition standards. This was developed through a collaborative effort of family and consumer sciences education
university faculty in three states, Texas, Iowa, and Wisconsin.

Regardless of the implementation model used in a state, administrators were in agreement that the national standards document has had a positive impact on curriculum development. This positive impact related both to the amount of time saved in curriculum revisions and to improved focus of the family and consumer sciences content being taught in the middle, junior, and senior high school programs. Administrators were also in agreement that the national standards were a positive tool they were using in public relations activities to promote a positive image of family and consumer sciences as a discipline.
CHAPTER 5. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to document the implementation of the national teaching and learning standards developed and published in 1998 for family and consumer sciences curricula in secondary schools. Analysis of research data was to help identify three key levels of the change process as hypothesized by the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM), (Hall & Hord, 1987). These included concerns held about the standards, use of the standards across the country, and successful strategies of implementation. Within these three categories of change, answers to the following six research questions were sought:

Levels and degrees of use:

1. How many states have begun implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?
2. What is the level or degree of implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?
3. Why are states not implementing the family and consumer sciences national standards?
4. Are any components of the 16 areas of study identified in the family and consumer sciences national standards being utilized to a higher degree than others? If so, which?
Concerns:

5. What attitudes and beliefs are held by individual family and consumer sciences state administrators toward the family and consumer sciences national standards?

Models of implementation:

6. What models exist related to the successful implementation of national family and consumer sciences standards?

The population for this study was family and consumer sciences administrators in state departments of education. Telephone interviews were used to collect the data for this study. A review panel of family and consumer sciences teacher education university faculty was used to validate the instrument. Former family and consumer sciences state administrators and university level faculty involved in the development of the family and consumer sciences standards were used to pilot test the instrument.

Forty-six individuals were identified in state department of education positions with the title, family and consumer sciences state administrator. Forty-four (96%) of these individuals participated in the telephone interviews. The telephone interviews were carried out from August 4, 2000 through September 29, 2000.
Responses to open-ended questions in the telephone interview were tape recorded and later transcribed. Responses to closed-ended questions were transferred to coding sheets and used to construct data files. Hand sorting methods were employed with the transcribed information to identify common themes. Statistical analysis of the data files was completed using SPSS software. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data pertaining to the number of states utilizing or not utilizing the family and consumer sciences national standards, components of the 16 areas of study most/least utilized, and the attitudes of family and consumer sciences state administrators toward the standards.

All respondents in this study fulfilled the role of the family and consumer sciences state department of education administrator for their states. Over 86% of them have completed an advanced degree, most commonly in family and consumer sciences education. Over 70% of them have been in their current position for 10 years or less.

Research questions 1-4 related to levels of use.

1. How many states have begun implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?

2. What is the level or degree of implementation of the family and consumer sciences national standards?
3. Why are states not implementing the family and consumer sciences national standards?

4. Are any components of the 16 areas of study identified in the family and consumer sciences national standards being utilized to a higher degree than others? If so, which?

Ninety-three percent of state administrators said family and consumer sciences national standards were being implemented in their states. The top reasons for implementing standards were to improve existing curriculum and as an aid in developing new curriculum. Only 6% of respondents indicated the standards were not being implemented in their states. Reasons most commonly identified for not implementing family and consumer sciences national standards were lack of information and time.

The family and consumer sciences national standards document identifies 16 areas of study. Respondents identified nine of these as most central to programming in their state. In rank order (1-9), those most central included parenting; nutrition and wellness; early childhood, education, and services; interpersonal relationships; human development; family; consumer and family resources; food production and services; and career, community, and family connections.
Respondents also identified six areas of study as least central. In rank order (1-6), those identified as least central were facilities management and maintenance; consumer services; textiles and apparel; family and community services; housing, interiors, and furnishings; and hospitality, tourism, and recreation.

Research question 5 related to concerns:

5. What attitudes and beliefs are held by individual family and consumer sciences state administrators toward the family and consumer sciences national standards?

As a group, respondents tended to agree with statements that were positive toward the family and consumer sciences national standards and disagree with statements that were negative. The statements for which there were the greatest amount of agreement were "National family and consumer sciences standards are a useful tool for curriculum development in my state," and "National family and consumer sciences standards contribute to higher quality family and consumer sciences programs."

Four areas of concerns about family and consumer sciences national standards emerged from respondents' answers to open-ended questions. They included concerns about the current standards model, issues related to the assessment of the
standards, a timeline for revision and future directions of the standards, and concern about the dissemination of information related to the standards.

Research question 6 related to models of implementation:

6. What models exist related to the successful implementation of national family and consumer sciences standards?

A variety of implementation strategies are being employed. Methods frequently identified by the family and consumer sciences state administrators include the formation of curriculum teams typically including state level personnel, university teacher educators, and secondary family and consumer sciences teachers charged with developing state family and consumer sciences standards. These teams may compare current state curriculum guides with the national standards and determine if items of importance are lacking from the state model. The family and consumer sciences national standards serve as a highly regarded model in molding state standards.

Conclusions

Several conclusions may be summarized from the findings and interpretations of the data. They can be used to help provide guidance for future implementation activities related
to the relatively new learning standards for family and consumer sciences. The conclusions, as developed by the researcher, appear to be as follow:

1. The new national standards for family and consumer sciences are being implemented to a very high degree in the United States. Over 93% (42 of 44) of state department of education administrators of family and consumer sciences indicated that implementation was taking place in their states.

2. The two major motivations supporting strong implementation of the standards are to improve existing family and consumer sciences state curricula for middle, junior, and senior high schools and to aid in developing new curricula.

3. Administrators believe there is a high level of awareness of the national standards among both middle, junior, and senior high school teachers of family and consumer sciences and the university teacher educators in the field.

4. Some of the 16 areas of educational content identified in the national standards document are clearly being used more frequently than others. The two areas of subject matter most frequently identified as central to
school curricula were parenting; and nutrition and wellness. The two areas of study most frequently identified as least central to school curricula were hospitality, tourism and recreation; and housing, interiors, and furnishings.

5. Administrators for family and consumer sciences in state departments of education have a very positive attitude toward the national standards. This was clearly evidenced by their levels of agreement with positive statements about the national standards to which they were asked to react and their levels of disagreement with negative statements about the national standards. For example almost all respondents strongly agreed that family and consumer sciences national standards were a useful tool for curriculum development in their states, and almost all disagreed with the statement that the standards were unnecessary in their states.

6. Although the state administrators voiced strong support of the standards, there were four areas about which concerns were expressed. One concern related to the current standards model. Specifically, administrators indicated the model would be more helpful if it
differentiated between core content, necessary for all students to know, and occupational content, which would be useful for students pursuing related careers.

Another suggestion for making the document more usable was that standards be differentiated for differing school levels, such as middle school and high school. Concern also was voiced about the lack of specific learner assessments to evaluate the competencies related to standards. Administrators stated they were looking for more student performance type assessments. Additional concerns expressed were lack of a determined timeline for revision of standards, impacting the future directions of standards implementation, and concern about dissemination of information related to the standards.

7. A team approach is used most commonly when implementing the national standards at the state level. Teams most commonly include upper elementary and secondary school teachers of family and consumer sciences, state department of education personnel, and family and consumer sciences teacher educators at colleges and universities.
8. There is consensus among administrators that the national standards document is a useful tool for designing and revising state standards in family and consumer sciences. Administrators reported that the national standards have been useful to help speed up curriculum development processes, to help increase the credibility for the educational discipline of family and consumer sciences, to help foster increased dialogue among family and consumer sciences teachers, and to provide an opportunity for more uniform curricula within and among states.

9. More information on assessing student achievement of the national standards is needed. A few states are working on assessment guidelines and devices, but most are two to four years from completion. Authentic assessment that engages students in applying the knowledge they learn in the classroom in “real-world” settings was the preferred mode. Specific assessment devices that were mentioned included scoring rubrics, in which scaled grading criteria are provided, and scenarios, where students are presented with real-life problems they need to solve.
10. The national standards are being integrated into Family, Career, and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA) programs in 29 states. The primary way this is happening is by connecting national FCCLA programs with related national standard content standards. These connections were laid out in the document Implementing the National Family and Consumer Sciences Standards through FCCLA.

Recommendations

As a result of carrying out this research study, the investigator makes the following recommendations:

1. The family and consumer sciences administrators in state departments of education should continue to lead a team effort to refine and revise the family and consumer sciences national standards document for secondary school curricula. Specifically this team may want to address concerns related to differentiation of standards both in terms of core and occupational content and in terms of grade levels. This ongoing effort also could address the need for assessment devices related to the standards. A strategic plan including a timeline for this effort could be formulated and disseminated at national conferences.
frequently attended by family and consumer sciences education professionals such as the American Association for Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS) and the Association of Career and Technical Educators (ACTE) conferences. Revisions based on comments by the state department of education administrators as reported in this document can serve to guide future revisions.

2. Efforts to implement family and consumer sciences national standards vary greatly from state to state. Developing a central database that is accessible to family and consumer sciences state level personnel, family and consumer sciences university teacher educators, and family and consumer sciences secondary school teachers would be one way to share innovative strategies that teams in individual states have developed. This would require identifying an individual or individuals who would be responsible for collecting, updating, and posting this information.

3. A website related to family and consumer sciences national education standards be developed and maintained. A current family and consumer sciences education website (www.FACSE.org) has a listing of the
national standards, including the comprehensive and content standards under a link entitled *National Standards*. One respondent in this study shared a vision for a family and consumer sciences national standards website that would allow clicking on a content standard, being linked to a page with sample lessons related to that standard and next linked from the lessons to a page with related assessments. Again, the greatest challenge to this recommendation may well be the identification of an individual or group of individuals who would be responsible for the maintenance of this website.

4. Respondents indicated they desired more information about process. Some respondents indicated they identified process as a teaching method although it is identified in the standards document as a philosophy. Some respondents were concerned about the manner in which process was represented in the family and consumer sciences standards document. When asked to choose which philosophy represented their state, competency approach or process, a number of respondents indicated they did not know. Clearly there is confusion about process. Resources about process need to be
identified or developed and made available to family and consumer sciences education professionals. These resources could be made accessible at a website, such as the one suggested above. The topic of process also could be addressed through presentations at the AAFCS or ACTE national conferences.

5. This study should be replicated with family and consumer sciences university teacher educators and family and consumer sciences secondary school teachers. Although family and consumer sciences education state department administrators are frequently leaders in curriculum change, it is within family and consumer sciences at the local school level that most changes are initiated and where all are implemented. Family and consumer sciences secondary school teachers would be able to provide first-hand information on whether or not positive change related to standards is occurring within the classes they teach. Family and consumer sciences teacher educators would be able to describe if and how preservice family and consumer sciences education majors in colleges and universities are being introduced to the standards and are prepared to
implement standards-based reforms in secondary school classrooms.
APPENDIX A. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
Phone Survey on Implementation of the National Standards

Please take a few minutes to read over the survey questions. To aid in collecting your responses, it will be helpful if you have this copy of the survey available during the phone interview.

1. Has your state begun implementation of the National FACS Standards?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1a. I am going to read you a list of common reasons why program leaders decide to use National Standards. Which of these reasons describe why your state chose to implement the National FACS Standards? Check all that apply.

A. to improve existing curriculum
B. to develop new curriculum
C. to aid in assessing learning
D. mandated by regulatory agency - if yes, which regulatory agency
E. ties to funding
F. other - please identify

1b. Who is involved in the implementation process in your state? Check all that apply.

A. state administrator for FACS programs
B. FACS teacher educators
C. FACS teachers
D. other academic teachers
E. administrators
F. parents
G. students
H. business people
I. other - please identify

1c. How did these people become involved? Check all that apply.

A. by invitation
B. volunteered
C. already part of a group that was focusing on FACS issues
D. other - please identify

1h. I am going to read you a list of reasons program leaders frequently mention for not implementing standards. Please identify which of these reasons describe why your state decided not to implement the National FACS Standards? Check all that apply.

A. not enough information about them
B. too time consuming
C. already have state standards
D. already have local standards
E. lack of training on implementation process
F. other - please describe

1i. Do you have any intentions of implementing the National FACS Standards in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1j. When and under what circumstances? To question 2.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1d. Please describe the process and activities your state has undertaken to implement the National FACS Standards.

1e. As a result of the implementation efforts in your state, describe any changes that have been made to FACS programs.

1f. As a result of the implementation efforts in your state, describe any changes in teacher behavior.

1g. What plans does your state have to assess student achievement in relation to the standards? To question 2.

2. Does your state have State FACS Standards/competencies/requirements?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2a. Have the State FACS Standards/competencies/requirements been aligned with National FACS Standards?</td>
<td>2e. To question 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2b. How was this process accomplished?</td>
<td>2f. Is there any plan for aligning the state and national FACS standards in the future?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2c. In what ways did the national standards differ from the state standards?</td>
<td>2g. When and under what circumstances? To question 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2d. What value did the alignment process have? To question 3.</td>
<td>To question 3.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. Does your state have proficiencies for academic programs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3a. Has your state crosswalked these</td>
<td>3c. To question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>proficiencies with the National FACS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standards?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. How was this process accomplished?</td>
<td>3d. Are there any plans to incorporate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To question 4</td>
<td>the academic proficiencies listed in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FACS national standards with academic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>areas in schools in your state?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3e. When and under what circumstances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To question 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To question 4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Has your state made any efforts to integrate the National FACS Standards into the FCCLA (Family, Career, and Community Leaders of America) program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4a. Please describe</td>
<td>4b. Do you have any plans to integrate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the efforts that have</td>
<td>the National FACS Standards with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>been undertaken.</td>
<td>FCCLA program in the future?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To question 5.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4c. When and under what circumstances?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To question 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4d. To question 5.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. The FACS National Standards document identifies two major FACS philosophies: the competency approach and the critical science, or process approach. Please identify which of these philosophies best describes your state.
   A. Competency approach
   B. Critical science or process approach

6. Were you directly involved in the development of the FACS National Standards?

   Yes
   6a. Please describe how you were involved. To question 7.

   No
   6b. To question 7.

7. Were other people in your state directly involved in the development of the FACS National Standards?

   Yes
   7a. Please describe how they were involved. To question 8.

   No
   7b. To question 8.

**Items 8-18.** Select one of the following choices to indicate your answer:

A. Strongly agree   B. Agree   C. Disagree   D. Strongly disagree   E. Unsure

8. National FACS (Family and Consumer Sciences Education) Standards contribute to higher quality FACS programs.

9. National FACS Standards are a useful tool for curriculum development in my state.

10. National FACS Standards are written in an easy-to-understand, usable format.

11. National FACS Standards are just another example of bureaucratic “red-tape.”

12. National FACS Standards reflect an appropriate balance of FACS content areas both as occupational training and as general education for all students.

13. National FACS Standards support the current FACS programming focus in my state.

14. National FACS Standards support future FACS program needs in my state.

15. National FACS Standards contribute to a positive image of FACS in my state.

16. National FACS Standards are positively changing FACS teacher behavior.
17. National FACS Standards provide enough flexibility to allow teachers to address student diversity issues.

18. National FACS Standards aren’t necessary in my state.

**Items 19-22.** Select one of the following choices to indicate your answer.
A. All  B. Most  C. Few  D. None  E. Unsure

19. FACS teachers in my state are aware of the National FACS Standards.

20. FACS teachers in my state have a copy of the National FACS Standards.

21. FACS teacher educators in my state are aware of the National FACS Standards.

22. FACS teacher educators in my state have a copy of the National FACS Standards.

**Items 23-38.** Each of the National FACS areas of study is listed below. Please identify five of these areas that you feel are most central to the mission/purpose/direction of FACS programs in your state. Secondly, please identify the five that are least central to the mission/purpose/direction of FACS programs in your state.

23. Career, Community and Family Connections
24. Consumer and Family Resources
25. Consumer Services
26. Early Childhood, Education, and Services
27. Facilities Management and Maintenance
28. Family
29. Family and Community Services
30. Food Production and Services
31. Food Science, Dietetics, and Nutrition
32. Hospitality, Tourism, and Recreation
33. Housing, Interiors, and Furnishings
34. Human Development
35. Interpersonal Relationships
36. Nutrition and Wellness
37. Parenting
38. Textiles and Apparel
For the next 2 questions, please indicate the response that best describes you.

39. The total number of years that I have been a state administrator of FACS programs is_____.

40. My post-secondary education is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Major</th>
<th>Minor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

41. Are there any other areas of concern or comments you have in relation to the FACS National Standards?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Checklists for Attachments and Time Schedule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The following are attached (please check):</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. ☑ Letter or written statement to subjects indicating clearly:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) the purpose of the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) the use of any identifier codes (names, #’s), how they will be used, and when they will be removed (see item 17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) an estimate of time needed for participation in the research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) if applicable, the location of the research activity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) how you will ensure confidentiality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) in a longitudinal study, when and how you will contact subjects later</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) that participation is voluntary; nonparticipation will not affect evaluations of the subject</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. ☐ Signed consent form (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. ☐ Letter of approval for research from cooperating organizations or institutions (if applicable)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. ☑ Data-gathering instruments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Anticipated dates for contact with subjects: |  |
| First contact                              | Last contact |
| July 15, 2000                              | August 30, 2000 |
| Month/Day/Year                             | Month/Day/Year |  |

| If applicable: anticipated date that identifiers will be removed from completed survey instruments and/or audio or visual tapes will be erased: |  |
| July 1, 2001                               |  |
| Month/Day/Year                             |  |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature of Departmental Executive Officer</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Department or Administrative Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Decision of the University Human Subjects Review Committee: |  |
| ☑ Project approved                        | ☐ Project not approved | ☐ No action required |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Human Subjects in Research Committee Chair</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Signature of Committee Chair</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Patricia M. Keith</td>
<td>7-17-00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

http://www.grad-college.iastate.edu/forms/HumanSubjects.doc
APPENDIX C. CORRESPONDENCE TO FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES
STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ADMINISTRATORS
July 22, 2000

Dear <Title><Last Name>,

In 1998, National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences Education (FACS) were adopted. The Project Director for the standards stated at that time, "The directions for the package of FACS Education National Standards are not clearly defined, as states will need to determine how they will use them." As a FACS leader in your state, you are in a key position to help us gather information about how the standards are currently being utilized in your state, and plans for their future implementation. For that reason, you are being invited to participate in this study, jointly sponsored by the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences and the Department of Family and Consumer Sciences Education and Studies at Iowa State University.

Our goal is to collect information from each of the state administrators of Family and Consumer Sciences programs. Your response is very important to ensure that we have a complete picture of how the standards are being utilized throughout the U.S. The responses for this study will be collected through a phone interview, which should take less than one hour. We will ask for your permission to tape record these interviews to aid in later data analysis. Once the data is transcribed and analyzed, all tapes will be erased. To enable the ease of collecting data and obtain your thoughtful answers, we would like to send you an advance copy of the survey either via facsimile or email.

Your answers will be treated confidentially and all responses will remain confidential. Any information collected will be reported and published under conditions that will not identify individual respondents. Although your input is vital, your participation in this study is completely voluntary.

We are hopeful that the results of this study will identify successful models of implementation of the FACS Standards. This information will be valuable for all of us as efforts continue to strengthen FACS programs across the country. We know your time is valuable and appreciate your participation in the study.

We will be contacting you by phone the week of July 31st to discuss timing of the phone interview and if you prefer an advance copy of the survey via facsimile or email. In the meantime, if you have any questions regarding this study, please feel free to contact us by phone, facsimile, or email (suereichelt@hotmail.com). Thank you.

Sincerely,

Judy Brun, Ph.D., C.F.C.S.
Professor Emeritus
Iowa State University

Susan Reichelt, M.S.
Assistant Professor
Texas Tech University
REFERENCES


Miner, B. (2000, August) Standardized minds: The high price of America's testing culture and what we can do to change it. The Progressive, 64, 40-43.


