71-18,239

LORENZ, Martha Katherine, 1921-

Michigan State University, Ph.D., 1970
Home Economics

University Microfilms, A XEROX Company, Ann Arbor, Michigan

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE BACKGROUNDS, ATTITUDES, AND VALUES OF HOME ECONOMICS STUDENTS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Martha Katherine Lorenz

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Family Ecology

1970

ABSTRACT

A DESCRIPTIVE STUDY OF THE BACKGROUNDS, ATTITUDES, AND VALUES OF HOME ECONOMICS STUDENTS AT MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY

By

Martha Katherine Lorenz

The purpose of this study was to develop a method for describing students in home economics programs at Michigan State University.

A basis for description was provided by comparing students involved in home economics programs at Michigan State University with entering students (freshmen and transfers) in home economics, and with a comparative group of college and university women in general. Further comparisons were made between students in the various curricular areas of home economics and the total group of home economics students.

The instruments used were the College Student Questionnaires (CSQ) developed by the Educational Testing Service at Princeton, New Jersey, and Rokeach Value Survey developed in the Department of Psychology at Michigan

State University. Percentage responses were examined for the CSQ factual items, and differences between group means were used to analyze data from the CSQ scales. A probability level of .05 was accepted for determining the significance of differences between group means. Rankings on the Rokeach Value Survey were analyzed by the Chi-square test to discover differences among the home economics curricular subgroups, and rank-difference correlations were used for specific group comparisons.

The study was designed to discover differences which might exist between Michigan State University home economics students and other college and university women, between students involved in home economics programs and entering students in home economics, and among home economics curricular subgroups when compared with the home economics total group.

Findings in relation to these comparisons were:

1. Home economics students did differ significantly from other college and university women in a concern for social problems. Home economics students scored higher in the area of social conscience, but as a total group a lower percentage of home economics students expected job satisfaction from being useful to society when compared with college and university women in general. Marriage with children was important to both groups of women students, but home economics students became less

interested in a housewife role only and more interested in marriage with a career after they became involved with a home economics program. The reverse was true for college and university women in general.

Further comparisons showed home economics students to be significantly higher than the comparative group in family social status, family independence, peer independence, and satisfaction with the university administration, but lower in satisfaction with faculty and with major fields of study. The home economics students placed a much higher value on self-respect, but a lower value on social recognition than other women university students.

2. Home economics students scored significantly higher on liberalism and social conscience after becoming involved with home economics than when entering a home economics program. The involved students also had greater expectations for graduate work, more interest in a career, and were significantly higher in family and peer independence and in cultural sophistication than entering students in home economics.

3. Home economics curricular subgroups did not differ significantly from the total group of home economics students on liberalism and social conscience scores, and in their assessment of general values. There were significant differences among the subgroups, however, in

satisfaction with major. The subgroups also showed differences in their preferred career choices and expectations of graduate work, and in their expected job satisfactions.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Dr. Rosalind Mentzer gave untiring support, criticism, and direction throughout the progress of this study, and Dr. Norma Bobbitt gave valuable assistance in the critical reading of the manuscript. Their contribution to this study is gratefully acknowledged.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM

Throughout the history of home economics as a profession the cultural and social milieu have been recognized as a fundamental factor in the development of plans and programs focused on the well-being of families and individuals. Now, in the current American culture some of the traditional values concerning home and family life are being challenged, and social and environmental problems threaten the quality of life.

It is difficult for many of today's students to find meaning in things that were deemed important only a few years ago, and they denounce as materialistic many of the achievements which have been indicative of success in the past. Educators are taking a serious look at students and searching for ways to better understand them, their values, and their aspirations. Home economics educators are especially concerned since the value commitment of home economics to the well-being of families and individuals is implicit in the purpose and goals of the profession.

Statement of the Problem

The specific problem for which this study is designed is the identification of the characteristics, attitudes, and values of students in the College of Home Economics[1] at Michigan State University during the academic year 1968-1969.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to develop a method for describing students in the College of Home Economics at Michigan State University. A framework for the study is provided by questions asked about freshmen and transfer students as they enter the home economics program, and about students at all class levels after they have been involved in a home economics program for at least two terms.[2] The questions include: (1) What are the characteristics of students electing to major in the various curricula in home economics? (2) How do the students in each of these programs in home economics compare with the total group of home economics students? (3) How do students involved in home economics programs compare with college and university women in general?

---

[1] College of Human Ecology since July, 1970.

[2] Hereinafter referred to as entering and involved student groups.

(4) What changes are evident in students as they become acquainted with the basic purpose of home economics?

To help provide answers to these questions, this study describes entering home economics freshmen and transfer students and students who are involved in home economics programs. The data for both the entering students and the involved students are classified according to the following curricula in home economics: (1) teaching (preschool--early elementary and home economics secondary, (2) retailing, (3) interior design, (4) composite (general home economics, community service, communications, general textiles and clothing), and (5) foods and nutrition.

Importance of the Study

The describing of students is an integral part of institutional self-study and a necessary prelude to curriculum planning. The need for this is on-going since student groups are continually changing, and if satisfactory methods for describing students are evolved, valuable information can be accumulated for comparative study.

Recognizing this need, the Institutional Research Program for Higher Education in Princeton, New Jersey, began nearly a decade ago to develop an instrument that "would be potentially usable throughout the spectrum of American education (that is, all questions would be

meaningful to students at all types of institutions)."[3] More than four years of continuous research resulted in the College Student Questionnaires which are used in this study.

These questionnaires are designed to describe students by means of biographical and attitudinal information as they enter a college or university program and after they have become involved with the program; such data are also available for a control group of college and university students. Thus, comparisons are possible between entering and involved students and among subgroups of students, and all of these groups can be compared with the control group.

From these questionnaires information is available for a basic description of groups of students; however, additional data may be needed to describe adequately specific groups of students. For describing home economics students, it is necessary to find some indication of student values since the generally accepted purpose of home economics--the well-being of individuals and families--implies a value commitment. Although the College Student Questionnaires explore student attitudes they do not

---

[3]Richard E. Petersen, College Student Questionnaires, Technical Manual (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968), p. 4.

isolate values; therefore, a further method must be devised for studying values.

Studies in the Department of Psychology at Michigan State University provide some comparative data about values obtained from an instrument developed by Rokeach.[4] This instrument provides an index to the values held by students, and could add the necessary dimension for an adequate description of home economics students.

The need for identifying the characteristics, attitudes, and values of home economics students and their understanding of the values of home economics as a profession underlies the problem for this study.

Background and Rationale

If home economics is to be considered a profession, it must be organized around some central objective; it must be focused upon a task which belongs to no other profession exclusively, a task which it can accomplish better than laymen or any other organization.

According to Hughes, in a discussion of professions,

> Every profession considers itself the proper body to set the terms in which some aspect of society, life or nature is to be thought of, and to define the

---

[4]Milton Rokeach, Value Survey (Lansing, Michigan: Jenca Associates, Testing Division, 1967).

> general lines, or even the details, of public policy concerning it.[5]

Further, the people in a profession, the professionals,

> . . . profess to know better than others the nature of certain matters, and to know better than their clients what ails them or their affairs . . . The professional is expected to think objectively and inquiringly about matters which may be, for laymen, subject to orthodoxy and sentiment which limit intellectual exploration.[6]

The purpose of home economics as a profession is affirmed and reaffirmed as a concern for the well-being of families and individuals. A special committee on home economics in elementary and secondary schools clearly states this purpose in a report presented in 1901 at the third Lake Placid Conference, one of a series of conferences held at Lake Placid, New York, and climaxed by the organization of the American Home Economics Association in 1908. The following definition of home economics appears in this report.

> But home economics is more than the application of science and fine arts merely to the end that certain results may be correctly reached or certain articles artistically made, for we must consider the place of these arts in the social order, and this brings us immediately to the thought of the home and its conduct; the home, as the place where the

---

[5]Everett C. Hughes, "Professions," Daedalus, 92 (Fall, 1963), p. 657.

[6]Ibid., p. 656.

> individual is given such physical and ethical surroundings that he is made an effective human being; the conduct of the home, on the material side, as the seeking to produce the best results with the least expenditure of energy, material, time, and money.[7]

Three years later, in the reports of the sixth conference, the same concept appears as the popular "creed" attributed to Ellen H. Richards, the first president of the American Home Economics Association. This creed, which has been printed and distributed to visitors at the 1904 Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St. Louis, described home economics as:

> The ideal home life for to-day unhampered by the traditions of the past.
>
> The utilization of all the resources of modern science to improve the home life.
>
> The freedom of the home from the dominance of things and their due subordination to ideals.
>
> The simplicity in material surroundings which will most free the spirit for the more important and permanent interests of the home and of society.[8]

This basic concern for the well-being of families and individuals is reaffirmed by the American Home Economics Association committee surveying the past, present, and future of home economics in 1959. This committee states

---

[7] Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference (Lake Placid, New York: 1901), p. 2.

[8] Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference (Lake Placid, New York: 1904), p. 31.

its belief that if home economics is to meet present and future challenges it must "serve more individuals and families and serve them more effectively," and "expand research and focus it on needs of individuals and families. . ."[9]

A continuous affirmation of the purpose appears in the following statement of objective from the constitution of the American Home Economics Association.

> The object of the American Home Economics Association shall be to provide opportunities for professional home economists and members from other fields to cooperate in the attainment of the well-being of individuals and families, the improvement of homes, and the preservation of values significant in home life.[10]

McGrath further emphasizes this concern for home and family life in the 1968 report of a study to define the role and scope of home economics in state universities and land-grant colleges. From two years of extensive study, he concludes that no other profession "so directly aims to serve the overall well-being and maintenance of the family unit as does home economics."[11] He sees the

---

[9] Home Economics New Directions, prepared by the Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics, American Home Economics Association, Washington, D.C. (June, 1959), p. 10.

[10] Constitution of the American Home Economics Association (Washington, D.C., 1953 and 1958).

[11] Earl J. McGrath and Jack T. Johnson, The Changing Mission of Home Economics (New York: Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968), p. 106.

necessity for making this family service of home economics more available to more people,[12] and recommends that an institutional core for college home economics "ought to be the analysis of family structure and functioning; its value orientation that of assistance to families; and its goal, the creation and enhancement of viable family life."[13]

Although the specific objective of home economics relates to home, families, and individuals, this objective must of necessity also imply a concern for people in society as a whole. Throughout history some form of family organization has been the foundation upon which the structure of a society has been built. Hence, the broader term of a concern for people also implies a concern for families as the basic units of the society. Home economists must be aware of the needs and well-being of all people in a society, even though the specific commitment of the profession is directed toward the well-being of families and individuals. In this study, the term "people" is used instead of "families and individuals" when the broader application is intended.

There are indications that the value commitment to the well-being of people is not always comprehended or accepted by students in home economics. Since 1964 a

---

[12] Ibid., pp. 106-108.

[13] Ibid., p. 111.

seminar for seniors in the College of Home Economics at Michigan State University has acquainted students with home economics as a professional field, its history and purposes. Papers written by some students in this seminar reveal negative or indifferent attitudes concerning the well-being of families and individuals as a focal point for their present study and future work.

A study of freshman students entering Michigan State University in the Fall of 1967 shows home economics women to be slightly less interested in the issues facing society today than freshman women in general (37% of the home economics freshman women and 47% of the total group of freshman women consider themselves fairly or very well informed).[14] It is recognized that freshman women may have a limited and provincial outlook toward social issues which could change with breadth of study and experience; they may not necessarily lack interest in the well-being of people.

Questions have been raised about the effectiveness of home economics programs which might be partially answered if a method were developed for describing students as they enter a home economics program and after they become involved with home economics.

---

[14]Unpublished data from the Michigan State University Student Inventory given to all entering freshmen in the Fall term, 1967.

The appraisal of home economics programs at Michigan State University has been an active concern of faculty and students, both graduate and undergraduate, for more than three years. Purpose, programs, and College organization have been thoughtfully studied by committees of faculty and students. These studies have culminated in acceptance by the faculty of an ecological approach to courses and curricula in all areas of study. A change of name for the College and for the departments will reflect

> . . . new emphasis and direction of curricula and programs which will speak more directly to the pressing problems of society, particularly as they relate to families today, and which will prepare students more adequately for present and emerging roles in society. . .[15]

Hypotheses

The study of home economics students in relation to the basic purpose of home economics suggests the following broad hypotheses:

Home economics students will show a greater concern than college and university women in general for the well-being of people.

Home economics students will show a greater concern for the well-being of people after some

---

[15]Unpublished report of the Committee on Reorganization, College of Home Economics, Michigan State University, Internal Structure Reorganization and Name Change, E. Lansing, Michigan, April 28, 1970, p. 1.

involvement with a university program in home economics.

Home economics students within specific curricular areas will show varying degrees of concern for the well-being of people.

The above hypotheses are restated in testable form in Chapter III.

Definition of Terms

Attitudes and values are the primary terms to be defined in this study. Rokeach reviews a number of definitions in his studies of belief-systems, and then synthesizes definitions of his own which are adopted for this study.

Attitudes represent a group of beliefs about what is preferable for a specific situation. They are defined as:

> . . . an organization of several beliefs focused on a specific object or situation, pre-disposing one to respond in some preferential manner. . . An attitude is . . . a package of beliefs consisting of interconnected assertions to the effect that certain things about it are desirable or undesirable.[16]

Values go beyond immediate goals to more ultimate end-states of existence. They represent a single basic,

---

[16]Milton Rokeach, Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968), pp. 159-160.

enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end-state of existence is preferable, personally and socially. They are defined as ". . . a standard or yardstick to guide actions, attitudes, comparisons, evaluations, and justifications of self and others."[17]

Assumptions

For the purposes of this study, it is assumed that:

1. The attitudes and values of students are a product of their environment, and have been influenced to some degree by current trends in those environments; hence, such attitudes and values may be considered a reflection of current societal trends.

2. An awareness of student attitudes and values will make possible a more effective planning of programs to meet the needs and aspirations of these students and the society they represent.

3. If the primary concern of home economics is the well-being of families and individuals, the effectiveness of a college or university home economics program might be partially measured by the extent to which students of home economics express a sensitivity to people and their needs and a responsibility for those less fortunate.

---

[17] Ibid.

4. Data concerning the attitudes and values of students will yield useful information for further program planning.

Limitations

This study is limited to the description of two groups of women home economics students in one academic year at Michigan State University. One group is composed of entering students majoring in home economics (freshmen and transfers) from the fall of 1968, and the other is a group of students majoring in home economics (freshmen through seniors) from the spring of 1969. Men enrolled in home economics curricula are excluded since they represent only a small percentage of the total enrollment, and would make comparisons difficult.

It is recognized that the groups are not a true sample, so any results must be accepted as tentative. The groups are representative enough of the College of Home Economics as a whole, however, so that directions for further study might be indicated.

Overview

The problem, its importance and background have been presented; hypotheses and assumptions have been stated as a basis for studying the problem.

As a background for studying the characteristics, attitudes, and values of home economics students, literature pertinent to three aspects of the problem is reviewed in the next chapter. These aspects include:

1. Current values in the American culture.
2. Values for professional home economics held by the American Home Economics Association.
3. Values relative to curricula in higher education, especially higher education for women.

In Chapter III descriptive information is reported about the instruments used in the study, the home economics groups of students who served as subjects, and the procedures used to analyze the data. Broad hypotheses for determining the students' affirmation of the purposes of home economics are stated.

From the data obtained, home economics students at Michigan State University are described in Chapter IV. Evidences of students' attitudes relative to their fields of study, and of disparity between their personal commitments and the purpose of home economics are also examined.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Literature pertinent to the describing of university home economics students by means of their attitudes and values may be examined from three points of veiw. First, an understanding of the changing American culture and its concomitant values serves as a basis for viewing the characteristics of the home economics students in this study.

Second, the values of home economics as a profession, found in the history of the American Home Economics Association as well as in recent studies, are helpful in identifying the basic purpose of home economics.

Finally, references to values in higher education, especially as they pertain to the education of women, bring into focus the broad educational enterprise of which home economics programs are a part.

The Changing American Culture

Since the organization of home economics as a profession at the beginning of this century, cultural and social changes have been recognized in the development of

home economics plans and programs. Current literature, however, reflects a deeper concern, an awareness that long-held values are being challenged, which in turn could challenge the home and family focus of home economics.

Among the causes for this value turmoil, the effects of increasing urbanism and affluence were cited by Hurd in 1962.[1] She described our society then as urban, industrial, secular, and materialistic, drifting toward instability, confusion, despair, loneliness, and boredom. These latter characteristics were seen as results of the breakdown of traditional family life. Family functions were being fulfilled by a multiplicity of agencies, families themselves were in a constant state of reorganization, and there was more leisure among people who were crowded more closely together than ever before. Hurd warned that the old routines, the old assumptions, the old techniques could not be very successfully transferred to the new situations. Although the direction of change in American values was not clearly distinguishable, the indications of change were highly evident.

In a discussion of American values in 1966, Powell stated that values were determined by purpose, and "our over-all purpose ought to be to use material wealth and

---

[1]Helen G. Hurd, "The Changing Society and Its Challenged," Journal of Home Economics, 55 (February, 1963), pp. 85-89.

power for the continuation of history's greatest experiment, the society open to talent."[2] Such a purpose, according to Powell, implied the values of individuality and the opportunity to achieve happiness. A conflict had arisen, however, because the access to happiness had been confused with happiness itself. According to Powell,

> Our American value conflict exemplifies the difference between social philosophy and moral philosophy. Social philosophy is concerned with how men gain access to happiness, while moral philosophy deals with how men gain happiness itself once access is provided.[3]

In 1969 the question of values and change in American culture was again presented as a critical issue in a dialogue by Graves and Lyman.[4] They questioned whether society's traditional values were really being rejected in favor of others, or whether some long-proclaimed values had been professed only and not upheld in practice.

Some of the same conditions which had been cited by Hurd as causes of social change were now identified by Graves as reasons for social revolution. Old values were being questioned as people flocked together in cities,

---

[2]Thomas F. Powell, "American Values--What Are They?" Social Education, 30 (February, 1966), p. 87.

[3]Ibid., p. 87.

[4]Patsy Graves and Richard B. Lyman, "Values in Ferment," Journal of Home Economics, 61 (October, 1969), pp. 601-608.

with increasing numbers of different kinds of people sharing the same geographic area and economic, social, and political activities. The change from small primary-group affiliation to large contact groups had led to the assimilation of values from many sources, not all of which were harmonious.

Lyman pointed out that today's youth were impatient for change and wished to correct injustices and abuses immediately; their attack was upon selfishness and hypocrisy. He stated:

> It is far less that the values have been changed or lost in this generation than it is that the courage and tenacity and even the sincerity of those who have held power for so long and used it so narrowly to build a selfish society are under a most grievous assault.[5]

In 1969 Thomas discussed the cause-effect relationship of societal change on value change. He traced the present value dilemma to the increase in scientific knowledge which produced technology; technology caused societal change; societal change caused value change; and value change led to value uncertainty.[6]

Thomas thought the present knowledge explosion to be the basis for an increase in beliefs or facts.

---

[5] Ibid., p. 606.

[6] Walter L. Thomas, "Values and American Youth," Journal of Home Economics, 61 (December, 1969), pp. 748-754.

According to his explanation, "As our beliefs increase, our values tend to decrease . . . as our knowledge increases and our beliefs become more and more lofty and numerous, we find ourselves less and less able to make a commitment."[7]

This confidence in knowledge led to the emergence of values oriented to the present, according to Thomas, with a questioning of productivity and the old criteria of success. The values of loyalty, courage, honesty, justice, equality, and concern for others apparently remained stable, however.

Values in Professional Home Economics

A group of founding home economists recognized the importance of the family in the development of individuals and of society at a conference held at Lake Placid, New York, in 1902. The concerns at this conference centered about the controlling ideals in the family life of the future,[8] the economic function of women and the

---

[7] Ibid., p. 750.

[8] Thomas D. Wood, "Some Controlling Ideals of the Family Life of the Future," Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference (Lake Placid, New York: 1904), pp. 25-31.

use of new-found leisure,[9] and social and industrial conditions.[10]

The values identified at the beginning of the home economics movement were summed up in what became known as the home economics creed, which stated that home economics stood for:

> The ideal home life for to-day unhampered by the traditions of the past.
>
> The utilization of all the resources of modern science to improve the home life.
>
> The freedom of the home from the dominance of things and their due subordination to ideals.
>
> The simplicity in material surroundings which will most free the spirit for the more important and permanent interests of the home and of society.[11]

These apparently timeless values seem even more important today than when they were first stated. With increasing technology in American society, it is easy to succumb to the "dominance of things" and to lose the "simplicity in material surroundings" that is necessary

---

[9]Alice A. Chown, "Effect of Some Social Changes on the Family," Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference (Lake Placid, New York: 1904), pp. 31-35.

[10]Charles R. Henderson, "Social Conditions Affecting the Law of Domestic Life," Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference (Lake Placid, New York: 1904), pp. 61-70.

[11]Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference (Lake Placid, New York: 1904), p. 31.

to develop the more permanent interests of satisfying human relationships.

Fifty years after the organization of the American Home Economics Association, these early values were reaffirmed by the Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics.[12] After considering the social changes growing out of the educational, scientific, and technological advances, and the changes in the home and patterns of family life, professional home economists believed that the ideal for family life envisioned by the founders was still applicable.

In the changing social climate of the sixties, the presumably basic value commitment of the family as the "anchor of relevance" for home economics was questioned. In a study by Lee and Dressel to determine the balance of liberal and professional education in home economics curricula, it was found that the family orientation was not even evident in some home economics courses and curricula.[13] Lee and Dressel believed that the family focus could not

---

[12] Home Economics New Directions, prepared by the Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics, American Home Economics Association, Washington, D.C. (June, 1959), p. 3.

[13] Jeanette A. Lee and Paul L. Dressel, Liberal Education and Home Economics (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963), p. 106.

be based on more tradition or sentiment; this purpose claimed by home economics needed to

> . . . be buttressed by high-level research, by development of systematized bodies of knowledge and theoretical constructs, and by systematic application of these in the attainment of better solutions to problems involving food, clothing, and shelter, human needs and the relational aspects of family life.[14]

A more recent examination of values in home economics shows further confusion about the purpose of home economics. Brown saw the lack of a clear definition of values as the cause of uncertainty within the home economics profession, and of uncertainty about the role of home economics in higher education. She believed that while some of the values assumed by home economics are explicit, others are only implicit assumptions, unrecognized and unexamined, and therefore likely to be irrational, ideationally inadequate, and dogmatic and absolute.[15]

To help clarify this growing confusion concerning values and goals, the National Association of State Universities and Land-Grant Colleges requested a study to define the future role and scope of home economics. Earl McGrath, director of the Institute of Higher Education of Teachers College, Columbia University, conducted the study

---

[14] Ibid.

[15] Marjorie M. Brown, "Values in Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, 59 (December, 1967), pp. 769-775.

and reported in 1968. After careful examination of home economics programs in higher education and the career opportunities for its graduates, and after reviewing the character and problems of American society, he reached the decision that the well-being of families and individuals as the focus of home economics was "not only appropriate but preferable to any other presently conceivable alternative."[16] In fact, home economics could reach far beyond present matters of the family, and as an applied professional field be dedicated to professional service to families. Its concern should be not only with the analysis of families, but also with assistance to them.[17]

Creekmore projected the concerns of home economics beyond the present by asking what values, or preferred behavior patterns in individual and family living would be operative in the future. In an analysis of the concept basic to home economics over time and change, she stated that:

> . . . values passed on to the succeeding generation, through whatever agency available, are filtered through the milieu of the experience of the new generation and are never adopted in the same form as before.[18]

---

[16] Earl J. McGrath and Jack T. Johnson, The Changing Mission of Home Economics (New York: Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968), p. 105.

[17] Ibid., pp. 105-106.

[18] Anna M. Creekmore, "The Concept Basic to Home Economics," Journal of Home Economics, 60 (February, 1968), p. 94.

She reasoned further that while home economics continued to be concerned with man and his environment, there must also be a recognition of changes in that environment and the effects of these changes on the values held by man.[19]

Quilling explored some of the issues raised by Brown, especially as they related to the family in the value assumptions of home economics. She reviewed extensively the literature in each of four areas associated with the study of the family (anthropology, sociology, psychology, and home economics), believing that home economists must define more clearly their use of the concept "family" or they would be steering a rudderless ship.[20]

This assessment of the family from various aspects raised the following pertinent questions about the value focus of home economics:

> Is the [American Home Economics] Association's philosophy concerning families the one which all of home economics wants to subscribe to or are other views applicable for the present and the future? Where is the Association's focus leading? How relevant is home economics philosophy concerning families?[21]

---

[19] Ibid.

[20] Joan I. Quilling, "The Nature of the Family Projected by the Home Economics Profession as Evidenced Through Examination of the American Home Economics Association Literature," Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970, p. 6.

[21] Ibid., p. 263.

Values in Higher Education

Recent value studies in higher education have provided information about college students and clues for the development of curricula. In 1965 Dressel and Lehmann[22] reported on a longitudinal study of student attitudes, values, and critical thinking ability. In this four-year study they hoped to discover the impact of higher education on students at Michigan State University.

The findings of the study showed that students became more critical in their thinking and less authoritarian as they progressed from freshman to senior, and the females changed more than the males during their college career. Females majoring in vocationally oriented programs, however, were more stereotypic (rigid in attitudes and values, compulsive and authoritarian) and more dogmatic (fixed views, unreceptive to new ideas) than those in non-technical curricula.[23]

Dressel and Lehmann summed up the desired impact of higher education in the area of values as:

> . . . (a) increased consciousness of one's own values; (b) increased awareness of value differences and conflicts among individuals and groups; (c) re-examination and possibly modification of one's values;

---

[22]Paul L. Dressel and Irwin J. Lehmann, "The Impact of Higher Education on Student Attitudes, Values, and Critical Thinking Abilities," The Educational Record, 46 (Summer, 1965), pp. 248-258.

[23]Ibid., p. 253.

> and (d) increased ability to make decisions and take actions which witness and reinforce the values in which one believes.[24]

A year later in 1966 Lehmann, Sinha, and Hartnett reported that the changes in the personality of students listed in the previous study might be more a function of maturation and the social environment than of courses and formal academic experiences.[25]

In 1968 Dressel maintained that the primary value in higher education "is not how much a student has assimilated of his past work, but how far he has progressed toward attaining the desired competencies."[26] A further look at the delineation of desired competencies revealed that they encompassed a great many values, including an awareness of one's own values and value commitments, and an awareness that others may hold contrasting values.

Hopefully, the student who attained these competencies would have incorporated into his value system a regard for (1) ability to perform adequately some type of work, (2) knowledge--how to get it and how to use it, (3) the skills of communication, (4) value commitments of

---

[24] Ibid., p. 257.

[25] Irwin J. Lehmann, Birendra K. Sinha, and Rodney T. Hartnett, "Changes in Attitudes and Values Associated with College Attendance," Journal of Educational Psychology, 57 (April, 1966), p. 97.

[26] Dressel, College and University Curriculum (Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1968), p. 155.

self and others, (5) ability to cooperate with others in solving problems, (6) a sense of responsibility and concern for contemporary issues and problems, and (7) his further development as an individual to fulfill his obligation to society.[27]

Dressel believed that specific attitudes and values could not be insisted upon as educational outcomes if critical thinking and judgment were to be developed; hence the desired competencies were general in nature, but comprised a framework for the organization of individual values.

Values revealed as outcomes of higher education were found to be different for men and for women when Cross attempted a synthesis of the findings of several studies in which men and women students described themselves, their accomplishments, interests, attitudes, and goals.[28]

Cross studied data from four sources, each of which involved a national sampling of students. The four sources and samples were:

1. The Office of Research of the American Council on Education--surveys conducted in 1966 and 1967 involving 250,000 freshmen from more than 300 institutions.

---

[27] Ibid., pp. 210-212.

[28] K. Patricia Cross, "College Women: A Research Description," Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 32 (Fall, 1968), pp. 12-21.

2. SCOPE (School to College: Opportunities for Postsecondary Education)--a longitudinal study of 90,000 high school students as they moved into jobs, marriage, junior colleges, or four-year colleges and universities.

3. The College Student Questionnaires--research instruments developed by the Educational Testing Service for the use of colleges conducting research on the characteristics of their own students.

4. The High School Graduate Study directed by Leland Medsker and James Trent of the Center for Higher Education at Berkeley--characteristics of, and changes in, 10,000 high school graduates from 1959-1963.

The results of these studies showed that college women tended to come from homes of higher socioeconomic levels than did college men, the parents of the women were slightly better educated, and the family incomes were slightly higher, all of which indicated that in our culture it is more important for a son to go to college than for a daughter.

The women saw themselves as highly conscientious, and were more eager to conform to established expectations than were the men. On the whole, though, both men and women tended to reflect the attitudes and values of their parents. Since women students, particularly, showed a camaraderie with their elders, it seemed likely that any protests were "a reflection of liberal views rather than

adolescent rebellion."[29] It was also noted that ". . . civil rights, Vietnam, free speech, and so forth are values espoused by the faculty culture. In this sense, the protests are in support of the adult culture with which college men and women identify and not in opposition to it."[30]

The women shifted their interest from careers to home and family as they progressed through college. The upper classmen also showed increased interest in the well-rounded woman who valued social life, rewarding friendships, and living group functions. The women generally expected to have careers or work outside the home, but marriage and family took priority. The women were less self-confident than the men, but rated themselves as more artistic, more cheerful, more understanding of others, and more sensitive to criticism.

The conclusion reached by Cross was that education for women should lead toward the fulfillment of three goals: a home, a job, and the development of intellectual potential.

Summary

Literature was reviewed from three points of view: (1) values in the changing American culture, (2) values of

[29] Ibid., p. 16.

[30] Ibid.

home economics as a profession, and (3) values in higher education, especially as they pertained to the education of women.

The literature showed that the American culture had changed toward urbanism, secularism, and large group affiliation with resultant assimilation of diverse values. Values tended to be oriented to the present with knowledge and technology displacing value certainty.

Home economics as a profession held to its original value commitment--the importance of the family and the well-being of families and individuals--and careful study of present society and future potential indicated this still to be the most appropriate focus for home economics.

Values with high priority in higher education were the ability of students to think critically and to make judgments. Among women in higher education a greater value was placed on marriage, home, and family than on careers and intellectual achievement.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This study describes the backgrounds, attitudes, and values of home economics students at Michigan State University in 1968-1969. This chapter includes an explanation of the instruments used, a description of the groups studied, a statement of the hypotheses to be tested, and an outline of the procedures used in the analysis of the data.

Instruments

The instruments used in this study were the College Student Questionnaires, Part 1 and Part 2, published by the Educational Testing Service at Princeton, New Jersey, and the Rokeach Value Survey developed in the Department of Psychology at Michigan State University. These instruments were selected because they were similar to those which had been used in previous studies of attitudes and values at Michigan State University, and might yield appropriate data for the home economics students.

The College Student Questionnaires

These questionnaires, which are referred to as CSQ, are arranged in two parts. Part 1 is designed for entering students (freshmen and transfers) at the beginning of the academic year. It includes factual items about the background characteristics of the students, and scale items which further describe the students and reveal personal attitudes concerning individual freedom, independence, and social issues.

Part 2 is designed for students already involved in a college or university program. It includes some of the same factual items as CSQ-1 about the background characteristics of the students and the same personal description and attitude scales. In addition, questions are included which pertain to college activities, perceptions, and satisfactions as students at a particular college or university.

Since CSQ-1 and CSQ-2 partially overlap, it is possible to study differences between entering students and the students who are involved in a college or university program.[1] The questionnaires, an outline of the contents, and the scale items used appear in Appendix A.

---

[1]Richard E. Petersen, College Student Questionnaires, Technical Manual (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968), pp. 1, 2.

Reliability.--For factual items in the College Student Questionnaires, no test-retest studies of reliability were made since evidence suggests that consistent answers are usually given for such questions. For responses to scale items, reliability estimates were obtained by the Educational Testing Service for a random sample of 500 cases drawn from a larger pool of 6,680 undergraduates who completed the experimental version of CSQ-2 in the spring of 1963. At this time the number of items in each scale was reduced from twelve to ten. Further reliability data on the resulting ten-item scales were then obtained from an administration to another group of 450 undergraduates in March, 1965. The earlier scale reliabilities range from .62 to .84. The reliabilities based on the 1965 administration range from .57 to .75.[2] Comparative data, based on administration of the questionnaires at a range of institutions from 1965-1967 are available for both individual items and scales.[3]

Scoring.--The Educational Testing Service provides a computer print-out of the results of the questionnaires as follows:

---

[2] Ibid., pp. 27-28.

[3] Comparative Data for College Student Questionnaires Part 1 (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1966), p. 1; Comparative Data for College Student Questionnaires Part 2 (Educational Testing Service, 1968), p. 1.

1. Abstracted item stems and response alternatives: percentage responses and frequencies for the total group and for subgroups.
2. Scale scores: frequency distributions, means and standard deviations for the total group and for subgroups.
3. Comparison data: item response percentages, scale means, and standard deviations.

All scales except one, Family Social Status, are composed of ten items each with score alternatives ranging from one to four for each item. Thus the total score for the ten items has a possible range of ten (10x1) to forty (10x4).

The Family Social Status scale includes four rather than ten items, with score alternatives ranging from one to nine. Three items (father's education, mother's education, and family income) account for half of the total score with a possible range of three (3x1) to twenty-seven (3x9). The fourth item, father's occupation, is given a weight of three so that it contributes as much to this score as the first three items combined, a range of three (3x1) to twenty-seven (3x9). Thus the total scale score has a possible range of six (6x1) to fifty-four (6x9).

In scoring, scale scores rather than item scores are used for the following reasons:[4]

[4]Petersen, p. 18.

1. Compared to a single question, the finer gradations of measurement afforded by the scales make possible better discriminations and differential descriptions.

2. Compared to single items, the scales better lend themselves to various conventional statistical procedures--group means, correlation, analysis of variance.

3. The scales also enable a convenient summary of information gathered in several sections of the questionnaires.

These scale scores serve as ordinal measures only. It is possible to place groups of students in higher-than or lower-than relationships, but the scales are not designed for the precise measurement of differences. Equal differences in scores might not necessarily mean equal differences in terms of the trait measured by the scale.[5]

Rokeach Value Survey

This instrument is composed of two alphabetized sets of eighteen values each which are to be rank-ordered for importance. One set of values is instrumental in nature (referring to modes of conduct) and the other is terminal (referring to end-states of existence). These values are printed on adhesive-backed labels which can be conveniently moved about by the subjects, making them very

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 23-24.

easy to manipulate for rank-ordering. The value survey appears in Appendix B.

Reliability.--In studies conducted by the Department of Psychology at Michigan State University these values were carefully selected and improved upon in successive versions until they were reasonably stable over several weeks when rank-ordered. The final version, Form D, had test-retest reliabilities in the .70's after an interim of seven weeks.[6] The Form D version was given to a sample of 129 women students representing a cross-section of women enrolled at Michigan State University in 1967, and these data are available for comparative purposes.

Scoring.--Data from the value surveys may be obtained by tabulating the rank-orderings and computing the median ranking of the eighteen instrumental and the eighteen terminal values for each group of subjects.

Collection of Data

The two instruments, College Student Questionnaire and Rokeach Value Survey, were administered at a single sitting with no time limit. Each subject was given a booklet containing the CSQ items, and an answer sheet on which she recorded her choice of the options available for

---

[6]Milton Rokeach, Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968), p. 169.

each item. After completing the items in the CSQ booklet, each subject received the Rokeach Value Survey and rank-ordered the two sets of values (instrumental and terminal) by re-arranging the adhesive-backed labels on which the values were printed.

CSQ-1 was given to the entering home economics students (freshmen and transfers) in the fall of 1968, and CSQ-2 was given to the involved students participating in the study in the spring of 1969. The Rokeach Value Survey was used for both the fall and spring groups.

Subjects

The subjects were all women students enrolled in the College of Home Economics at Michigan State University during the academic year 1968-1969. Men enrolled in home economics curricula were excluded since they represented only a small percentage of the total enrollment, and would have made comparisons difficult.

The subjects represented two groups: entering home economics students (freshmen and transfers) who had not become acquainted with the home economics programs at Michigan State University, and home economics students from all class levels after some involvement with the home economics program. Each of these two groups was divided into five subgroups representing areas of study in home economics as follows: (1) teaching (pre-school-

early elementary and home economics secondary), (2) retailing, (3) interior design, (4) composite (general home economics, community service, communications, general textiles and clothing), and (5) foods and nutrition.

The entering group included 247 students, 188 freshmen and 59 transfer students, at the beginning of the fall term, 1968. They were divided among the curricular subgroups as follows:

Teaching	65
Retailing	60
Interior Design	61
Composite	40
Foods and Nutrition	21
Total	247

The involved group included 294 students from all class levels in the College of Home Economics. This second group participated in the study during the spring term in April, 1969, and was distributed among the various classes as follows:

Freshmen	60
Sophomores	34
Juniors	64
Seniors	134
Specials	2
Total	294

This involved group was distributed among the curricular subgroups in proportions similar to those within the actual enrollment as follows:

Major	N	% of sample	% of total College enrollment in major
Teaching	100	34	31
Retailing	65	22	23
Interior Design	56	19	23
General	35	12	14
Foods and Nutrition	38	13	9
Total	294	100	100

Most of the seniors in the study participated as part of their work in a senior seminar. The high percentage of upper classmen in this group, which resulted from using students enrolled in the seminar, made it possible to establish more clearly the differences between the entering students and those who had been involved with home economics for a time.

Hypotheses

In addition to obtaining factual information for describing students, some method was sought for determining the students' support of the purpose of home economics. Three scales which denoted concern for the well-being of people were selected from the College Student Questionnaries

and used for this aspect of the study which was designed to test the hypotheses suggested in Chapter I.

The liberalism scale was selected since it indicated an awareness of changes within a society. Although changes are not always constructive, the students who are truly concerned for the well-being of people would probably be alert to changes which might affect that well-being.

The social conscience scale was used because it included items directly related to the well-being of people such as concern about poverty, illegitimacy, juvenile crime, materialism, and unethical business and labor practices.

The satisfaction with major scale was used as an indirect reflection of concern for people. It was believed that students who supported the purpose of home economics as the well-being of people would be comparatively satisfied with a major oriented to that purpose. If, however, students showed little concern for others but high satisfaction with their major, or much concern for others and dissatisfaction with their major, then further study would be indicated to examine the relation of the major to home economics goals.

Hypotheses about the support of the purpose of home economics were broadly stated in Chapter I. To make

possible the testing of these hypotheses, they were restated more specifically.

Hypothesis 1: Home economics students will show a greater concern than college and university women in general for the well-being of people.

a. On the liberalism scale the mean scores will be higher for home economics students than for college and university women in general.

b. On the social conscience scale the mean scores will be higher for home economics students than for college and university women in general.

c. On the satisfaction with major scale the mean scores will be higher for home economics students than for college and university women in general.

Hypothesis 2: Home economics students will show a greater concern for the well-being of people after some involvement with a university program in home economics.

a. On the liberalism scale the mean scores will be higher for students involved in a home economics program than for entering students in home economics.

b. On the social conscience scale the mean scores will be higher for students involved in a home economics program than for entering students in home economics.

Hypothesis 3: Home economics students within specific curricular areas will show varying degrees of concern for the well-being of people.

a. On the liberalism scale the mean scores will vary for the curricular subgroups in home economics and the total home economics group.

b. On the social conscience scale the mean scores will vary for the curricular subgroups in home economics and the total home economics group.

c. On the satisfaction with major scale the mean scores will vary for the curricular subgroups in home economics and the total home economics group.

Analysis of Data

Information concerning the backgrounds of the students was obtained from percentage responses to factual questions in the College Student Questionnaires, from rankings on the Rokeach Value Survey, and from scores on four CSQ scales: family social status, family independence, peer independence, and cultural sophistication.

Attitudes toward curricula, faculty, and administration were revealed by scores from three CSQ scales: satisfaction with faculty, satisfaction with administration, and satisfaction with major.

The students' support of the purpose of home economics was determined by examining scores from three CSQ

scales: liberalism, social conscience, and satisfaction with major.

Rankings on the Rokeach Value Survey were analyzed by the Chi-square test to examine differences among the home economics curricular groups, and rank-difference correlations were used for specific group comparisons.

Percentage responses were examined for the CSQ factual items, and differences between means were used to analyze data from the CSQ scales so that group comparisons could be made and the hypotheses tested.

A probability level of .05 was accepted for determining the significance of differences between the group means.

Summary

This chapter includes a description of the instruments used in the study, a specification of the subjects and the groups they represent, a statement of hypotheses to be tested, and a summary of statistical procedures used in the analysis of the data.

The procedure is explained for the collection of data about the backgrounds, attitudes, and values of home economics students at Michigan State University by use of The College Student Questionnaires (Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service) and the Rokeach Value Survey (Michigan State University, Department of Psychology).

The subjects are described as two groups: 247 entering home economics students (freshmen and transfers) in the fall of 1968, and 294 home economics students from all class levels in the spring of 1969. Each of these groups is divided into five subgroups representing specific areas of study in home economics.

Hypotheses about scale scores which reflect concern for the well-being of families and individuals are restated with specific sub-hypotheses so that they can be tested by an analysis of differences between means. Methods are also outlined for examining data used to obtain descriptions of the groups of students.

The next chapter will include a discussion of the results obtained from an examination and analysis of the data. The last chapter will include a summary of the study, conclusions and implications.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

Two instruments, the College Student Questionnaires (CSQ) and the Rokeach Value Survey, were administered to two groups of students in the College of Home Economics at Michigan State University. The entering students (freshmen and transfers) completed the CSQ, Part 1, and the Value Survey. The students involved in a home economics program completed the CSQ, Part 2, and the Value Survey. The data were analyzed for three types of information:

1. Descriptions of the characteristics of the students obtained from answers to CSQ factual questions, from responses to CSQ scales, and from value rankings on the Rokeach Value Survey.

2. Students' appraisal of the academic environment and the home economics programs at Michigan State University, obtained from responses to CSQ scales.

3. Support of the purpose of home economics by home economics students, ascertained by testing hypothses with data from CSQ scales.

Sources for each type of information, and the methods used in analyzing the data are shown in the following outline.

Sources of information		Method of Analysis
Characteristics of the Students:		
CSQ factual items:	Size of hometown Influence in choice of major Expectation of graduate work Home-vs.-career choice Preferred career areas Source of job satisfaction	Percentage responses
CSQ scales:	Family social status Family independence Peer independence Cultural sophistication	t-test for difference between means
Rokeach Value Survey:	Instrumental values Terminal values	Chi-square and rank correlations
Students' Appraisal of the Academic Environment:		
CSQ scales:	Satisfaction with faculty Satisfaction with administration Satisfaction with major	t-test for difference between means
Testing of hypotheses:		
CSQ scales:	Liberalism Social conscience Satisfaction with Major	t-test for difference between means

Findings Related to the Characteristics of Students

The percentage responses for the factual items were examined for any indication of trends or patterns in

the characteristics of the home economics students. Data which indicated strong similarities or differences among the various groups were of special interest. In each section the highest percentage responses were noted first, and comparisons were drawn between the entering and involved home economics groups and/or among the home economics subgroups when compared with the home economics total group. Very low percentage responses were also noted. Finally, comparisons were made between the home economics groups and the national comparative group.

College Student Questionnaire
Factual Items

Size of hometown.--Hometowns of the students were identified as belonging to three categories: suburbs, cities, and small towns or farms. Although the size of hometown for both cities and suburbs might be similar, a suburban life-style is sufficiently different from a city life-style to justify separate categories.

Questions about the hometowns of students were included only in CSQ-1. An examination of the results for entering students indicated that a high proportion of the teaching subgroup was from small towns or farms (40%). Students in the retailing and interior design subgroups came for the most part from cities (44% and 33%) and from suburbs (38% and 34%). The hometowns of the composite subgroup were distributed about equally among suburbs

(35%), cities (33%), and small towns or farms (33%). Nearly half of the foods and nutrition subgroup came from suburbs (48%) and a third from cities (33%). In the total group, 36% came from suburbs, 33% from cities, and 29% from farms and small towns.

Residences claimed by students in the national comparative group were similar to those of home economics students at Michigan State University, but with a slightly higher percentage in the national group from cities (40%) and a correspondingly lower percentage from small towns and farms (22%). These data are shown in Table 1.

Influence in choice of major.--For entering students the strongest influence in choice of major was high school teachers for the teaching and composite subgroups (43% and 33%), and for the total home economics group (26%). Mother was the greatest influence for the interior design subgroup (30%) and for the foods and nutrition subgroup (29%). The influences on the retailing subgroup were diffuse, but adult acquaintances (reported by 23%) were slightly more influential than mother or high school teachers (reported by 20% and 17%).

For students involved in a home economics program, the strongest influence on choice of major was high school teachers for those in the teaching and composite subgroups (24% and 29%), with mother also a strong influence on students in the teaching subgroup (23%). Close friends

Table 1. Hometowns of entering home economics students.*

Type of hometown	Subgroups										Home Econ. Total		National Comp.**
	T		R		ID		C		FN				
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Suburb over 2 million	14	(9)	18	(11)	18	(11)	13	(5)	10	(2)	15	(38)	12
Suburb 1/2 to 2 million	6	(4)	13	(8)	5	(3)	13	(5)	19	(4)	10	(24)	12
Suburb 100,000 to 1/2 million	14	(9)	7	(4)	11	(7)	10	(4)	19	(4)	11	(28)	9
Suburb total	34	(22)	38	(23)	34	(21)	36	(14)	48	(10)	36	(90)	33
City more than 1/2 million	5	(3)	5	(3)	3	(2)	3	(1)	5	(1)	4	(10)	11
City 50,000 to 1/2 million	8	(5)	12	(7)	10	(6)	15	(6)	14	(3)	11	(27)	11
City 10,000 to 50,000	11	(7)	27	(16)	20	(12)	15	(6)	14	(3)	18	(44)	18
City total	24	(15)	44	(26)	33	(20)	33	(13)	33	(7)	33	(81)	40
Small town under 10,000	25	(16)	12	(7)	23	(14)	23	(9)	5	(1)	19	(47)	17
Farm	15	(10)	3	(2)	8	(5)	10	(4)	14	(3)	10	(24)	5
Rural total	40	(26)	15	(9)	31	(19)	33	(13)	19	(4)	29	(71)	22
Response total	98	(63)	97	(58)	98	(60)	102	(40)	100	(21)	98	(242)	95
Total N		(65)		(60)		(61)		(40)		(21)		(247)	(677)

*This CSQ item was designed for entering students only.
**Number of responses not available for national comparative group.

Key: T = Teaching; R = Retailing; ID = Interior Design; C = Composite; FN = Foods and Nutrition.

and adult acquaintances were the strongest influences on the retailing subgroup (28% and 26%) and on the interior design subgroup (21% and 18%), along with the influence of mother on interior design students (18%). Adult acquaintances were the greatest influence on the foods and nutrition subgroup (32%) and on the total group (21%).

Father was a relatively unimportant influence for both groups (entering students, 4%; involved students, 5%). His influence, however, was slightly stronger on students in the business related areas of retailing and interior design (retailing--entering students, 7% and involved students, 8%; interior design--entering students, 7% and involved students, 11%).

The influences in choice of major for home economics students as a total group and for the national comparative group were similar with three exceptions. Mother was a greater influence on entering students in home economics than in the national group (entering home economics group, 22%; entering national group, 10%), and adult acquaintances and close friends were a greater influence on involved students in home economics than in the national group (adult acquaintances--involved home economics group, 21% and involved national group, 12%; close friends--involved home economics group, 16% and involved national group, 7%). These data are shown in Tables 2.1 and 2.2.

Table 2.1. Influence in choice of major for entering home economics students.

Influence	Subgroups										Home Econ Total		National Comp.*
	T		R		ID		C		FN				
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Father	2	(1)	7	(4)	7	(4)	0	(0)	10	(2)	5	(11)	5
Mother	22	(14)	20	(12)	30	(18)	13	(5)	29	(6)	22	(55)	10
Adult acquaintances	12	(8)	23	(14)	18	(11)	10	(4)	19	(4)	17	(41)	15
High school teachers	43	(28)	17	(10)	15	(9)	33	(13)	19	(4)	26	(64)	28
Other teachers or counselors	9	(6)	8	(5)	12	(7)	18	(7)	14	(3)	11	(28)	8
Close friends	9	(6)	8	(5)	8	(5)	13	(5)	5	(1)	9	(22)	7
Response total	97	(63)	83	(50)	90	(54)	87	(34)	96	(20)	90	(221)	73
Total N		(65)		(60)		(61)		(40)		(21)		(247)	(677)

*Number of responses not available for national comparative group.

Key: See Table 1, p. 50.

Table 2.2. Influence in choice of major for involved home economics students.

Influence	Subgroups										Home Econ. Total		National Comp.*
	T		R		ID		C		FN				
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Father	2	(2)	8	(5)	11	(6)	0	(0)	3	(1)	5	(14)	8
Mother	23	(23)	14	(9)	18	(10)	14	(5)	16	(6)	18	(53)	14
Adult acquaintances	15	(15)	26	(17)	18	(10)	23	(8)	32	(12)	21	(62)	12
High school teachers	24	(24)	9	(6)	9	(5)	29	(10)	21	(8)	18	(53)	20
Other teachers or counselors	19	(19)	12	(8)	13	(7)	14	(5)	16	(6)	15	(45)	19
Close friends	9	(9)	28	(18)	21	(12)	14	(5)	11	(4)	16	(48)	7
Response total	92	(92)	97	(63)	90	(50)	94	(33)	99	(37)	93	(275)	80
Total N		(100)		(65)		(56)		(35)		(38)		(294)	(585)

*Number of responses not available for national comparative group.

Key: See Table 1, p. 50.

Expectation of graduate work.--Among entering students, the highest expectations for graduate work were found in the teaching subgroup (40%) and in the foods and nutrition subgroup (38%). All involved student subgroups had increased expectations for graduate work, but the teaching and the foods and nutrition subgroups were again the highest in this respect (53% and 58%). The interior design subgroup showed the greatest percentage increase (15% and 45%).

The retailing subgroup was the most consistent in its lack of commitment to graduate work. In this subgroup 78% of the entering students and 66% of the involved students definitely did not plan for graduate work or were undecided. Involved students in the interior design and composite subgroups showed more interest in graduate work than did the entering students, but a large percentage in both groups were uninterested or undecided (interior design--entering students, 81% and involved students, 50%; composite--entering students, 88% and involved students, 57%).

In both the entering and involved groups, the teaching subgroup showed the strongest expectation of earning a master's degree only, (29% and 35%), and the foods and nutrition subgroup of earning a doctorate (10% and 13%).

Entering students in home economics had less expectation for graduate work than the national comparative group (entering home economics group, 26%; entering national group, 53%). For involved students, however, the interest in graduate work increased from 26% to 46% for home economics students, but decreased from 53% to 48% for the national group. The percentage of home economics students expecting degrees changed from 16% (entering students) to 26% (involved students) for the master's degree only, and from 2% (entering students) to 5% (involved students) for the doctorate. The percentage of the national group expecting degrees changed from 43% (entering students) to 22% (involved students) for the master's degree only, and from 28% (entering students) to 9% (involved students) for the doctorate. These data are shown in Tables 3.1 and 3.2

Home-vs.-career choice.--When presented with choices involving careers, marriage, and children a high percentage of both entering and involved home economics students preferred marriage and children (entering students, 79% and involved students, 85%). The entering group was divided almost evenly between "housewife with children" and "married career woman with children" (housewife, 41% and married career, 40%). The involved home economics students showed a higher preference for the

Table 3.1. Expectation of graduate work for entering home economics students.

Response	Subgroups										Home Econ. Total		National Comp.*
	T		R		ID		C		FN				
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	40	(26)	18	(11)	15	(9)	23	(9)	38	(8)	26	(64)	53
No	39	(25)	60	(36)	51	(31)	43	(17)	57	(12)	49	(121)	23
Undecided	19	(12)	18	(11)	30	(18)	35	(14)	0	(0)	22	(55)	19
Response total	98	(63)	96	(58)	96	(58)	101	(40)	95	(20)	97	(240)	95
Total N		(65)		(60)		(61)		(40)		(21)		(247)	(677)
Degree expected:													
Master's only	29	(19)	8	(5)	8	(5)	15	(6)	19	(4)	16	(39)	43
Doctorate	0	(0)	0	(0)	2	(1)	3	(1)	10	(2)	2	(4)	28

*Number of responses not available for national comparative group.

Key: See Table 1, p. 50.

Table 3.2. Expectation of graduate work for involved home economics students.

Response	Subgroups										Home Econ. Total		National Comp.*
	T		R		ID		C		FN				
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Yes	53	(53)	32	(21)	45	(25)	43	(15)	58	(22)	46	(136)	48
No	39	(39)	55	(36)	43	(24)	40	(14)	34	(13)	43	(126)	38
Undecided	8	(8)	11	(7)	7	(4)	17	(6)	8	(3)	10	(28)	12
Response total	100	(100)	98	(64)	95	(53)	100	(35)	100	(38)	99	(290)	98
Total N		(100)		(65)		(56)		(35)		(38)		(294)	(585)
Degree expected:													
Master's only	35	(35)	23	(15)	14	(8)	26	(9)	26	(10)	26	(77)	22
Doctorate	6	(6)	3	(2)	2	(1)	3	(1)	13	(5)	5	(15)	9

*Number of responses not available for national comparative group.

Key: See Table 1, p. 50.

career than for the housewife role (housewife, 38% and married career, 47%).

Deviations from this pattern among the subgroups showed that entering students in interior design and foods and nutrition preferred the married career over the housewife role (interior design--married career, 48% and housewife, 28%; foods and nutrition--married career, 52% and housewife 33%). Entering students in the composite subgroup preferred the opposite (married career, 30% and housewife, 53%).

Among the involved student subgroups, the retailing students and the interior design students preferred the married career role more than the housewife role (retailing--married career, 54% and housewife, 37%; interior design--married career, 54% and housewife, 21%). The foods and nutrition and the composite subgroups showed less preference for the married career role than for the housewife role (foods and nutrition--married career, 37% and housewife, 47%; composite--married career, 26% and housewife 46%).

The teaching subgroup deviated only slightly from the total home economics groups with the entering students showing a small preference for the housewife role and the involved students showing a small preference for the married career role (entering teaching--married career, 40%

and housewife, 46%; involved teaching--married career, 49% and housewife, 42%).

The unmarried career woman was chosen by only a few of the entering students (entering home economics group, 2%; entering national group, 3%), and by even fewer of the involved students (involved home economics group, 1%; involved national group, 1%). The housewife with no children was apparently an empty role with only one student in the entire study, an involved home economics student in the composite subgroup, giving this choice.

The national comparative group preferred the same two roles as the home economics students, housewife with children and married career woman with children (entering national group--housewife, 35% and married career, 42%; involved national group--housewife, 48% and married career, 37%). The involved national group showed a greater preference for the housewife role and slightly less preference for the career role than did the entering national group which was the reverse of preferences stated by the home economics students.

These data are shown in Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

Preferred career areas.--The major career preference of entering home economics students in all subgroups except interior design was a life centering on home and family. The interior design subgroup preferred a life centering on the creative arts. There was a decreased

Table 4.1. Home-vs.-career choice of entering home economics students.

Choice	Subgroups										Home Econ. Total		National Comp.*
	T		R		ID		C		FN				
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Housewife with no children	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0
Housewife with children	46	(30)	40	(24)	28	(17)	53	(21)	33	(7)	41	(100)	35
Unmarried career woman	2	(1)	3	(2)	0	(0)	3	(1)	0	(0)	2	(4)	3
Married career woman-no children	2	(1)	5	(3)	5	(3)	5	(2)	0	(0)	4	(9)	4
Married career woman-children	40	(26)	33	(20)	48	(29)	30	(12)	52	(11)	40	(98)	42
Uncertain	5	(3)	17	(10)	15	(9)	10	(4)	10	(2)	11	(28)	16
Response total	95	(61)	98	(59)	96	(58)	101	(40)	95	(20)	98	(239)	100
Total N		(65)		(60)		(61)		(40)		(21)		(247)	(677)

*Number of responses not available for national comparative group.

Key: See Table 1, p. 50.

Table 4.2 Home-vs.-career choice of involved home economics students.

Choice	Subgroups										Home Econ. Total		National Comp.*
	T		R		ID		C		FN				
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Housewife with no children	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	3	(1)	0	(0)	0	(1)	0
Housewife with children	42	(42)	37	(24)	21	(12)	46	(16)	47	(18)	38	(112)	48
Unmarried career woman	1	(1)	2	(1)	2	(1)	0	(0)	0	(0)	1	(3)	1
Married career woman- no children	2	(2)	2	(1)	2	(1)	3	(1)	0	(0)	2	(5)	2
Married career woman-children	49	(49)	54	(35)	54	(30)	26	(9)	37	(14)	47	(137)	37
Uncertain	2	(2)	5	(3)	18	(10)	17	(6)	16	(6)	9	(27)	12
Response total	96	(96)	100	(64)	97	(54)	95	(33)	100	(38)	97	(285)	100
Total N		(100)		(65)		(56)		(35)		(38)		(294)	(585)

*Number of responses not available for national comparative group.

Key: See Table 1, p. 50.

preference for a life centering on home and family for the involved students in all subgroups.

In addition to the home and family career preference, the teaching subgroup also showed a preference for an academic life which was greater for the entering than for the involved students (entering teaching--home and family life, 49% and academic life, 46%; involved teaching--home and family life, 48% and academic life, 38%).

Both the entering and involved retailing subgroups showed preferences for a life centering on home and family and for a business life, with preference for a business career higher for the involved students (entering retailing--home and family life, 42% and a business life, 28%; involved retailing--home and family life, 35% and a business life, 52%). Other choices of entering retailing students were a life centered on the creative arts (12%) and undecided (13%).

The entering and involved interior design subgroups indicated three areas of major career interest--home and family life (entering interior design, 28%; involved interior design, 14%), a life centered on creative arts (entering interior design, 43%; involved interior design, 43%), and a professional life (entering interior design, 8%; involved interior design, 29%). While interest in a home and family career was lower for

the involved than for the entering group, interest in a professional life was higher.

Five percent in each interior design subgroup preferred a business life, while 10% of the entering students and 7% of the involved students were undecided. One entering student in interior design (2%) preferred a career as a trained technician or craftsman. This was the only home economics student to make this choice in the entire study.

The home and family career was the greatest preference for both the entering and involved students in the composite subgroups (entering composite, 58%; involved composite, 49%). The entering composite subgroup also expressed choices for a creative life (20%) and a business life (13%); the involved composite subgroup expressed a choice for a professional life (11%).

The entering foods and nutrition subgroup preferred a home and family life (43%), a professional life (19%), or a business life (10%), with 19% undecided. The involved foods and nutrition subgroup showed a marked preference for a professional life (37%). Thirteen percent preferred an academic life and 34% preferred a life centering on home and family.

Career preferences for both entering and involved home economics groups as a whole were distributed among five areas--an academic life, a business life, a professional

life, a life centering on the creative arts, and a life centering on home and family. Compared with the national group, both entering and involved home economics groups showed less preference for an academic life (home economics--entering students, 13% and involved students, 16%; national--entering students, 35% and involved students, 26%), but greater preference for a business life (home economics--entering students, 12% and involved students, 15%; national--entering students, 4% and involved students, 4%) and greater preference for a life centering on the creative arts (home economics--entering students, 17% and involved students, 11%; national--entering students, 7% and involved students, 8%). Interest in a professional life was greater for involved home economics students than for entering home economics students, while interest in a life centering on home and family was greater for the entering students. Results for the national groups were the reverse of the results for the home economics groups in these two areas--a professional life (home economics--entering students, 4% and involved students, 13%; national--entering students, 10% and involved students, 7%), and a life centering on home and family (home economics entering students, 43% and involved students 37%; national entering students, 26% and involved students 42%).

These data are shown in Tables 5.1 and 5.2.

Table 5.1. Preferred career areas of entering home economics students.

Preferred career	Subgroups										Home Econ. Total		National Comp.*
	T		R		ID		C		FN				
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Academic life	46	(30)	2	(1)	2	(1)	0	(0)	5	(1)	13	(33)	35
Business life	3	(2)	28	(17)	5	(3)	13	(5)	10	(2)	12	(29)	4
Professional life	0	(0)	0	(0)	8	(5)	0	(0)	19	(4)	4	(9)	10
Trained technician or craftsman	0	(0)	0	(0)	2	(1)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(1)	1
Life centering on creative arts	0	(0)	12	(7)	43	(26)	20	(8)	0	(0)	17	(41)	7
Life centering on home and family	49	(32)	42	(25)	28	(17)	58	(23)	43	(9)	43	(107)	26
Others	0	(0)	3	(2)	2	(1)	3	(1)	5	(1)	2	(5)	4
Undecided	2	(1)	13	(8)	10	(6)	8	(3)	19	(4)	9	(22)	9
Response total	100	(65)	100	(60)	100	(60)	102	(40)	101	(21)	100	(247)	96
Total N		(65)		(60)		(61)		(40)		(21)		(247)	(677)

*Number of responses not available for national comparative group.

Key: See Table 1, p. 50.

Table 5.2. Preferred career areas of involved home economics students.

Preferred career	Subgroups										Home Econ. Total		National Comp.*
	T		R		ID		C		FN				
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Academic life	38	(38)	3	(2)	2	(1)	6	(2)	13	(5)	16	(48)	26
Business life	2	(2)	52	(34)	5	(3)	9	(3)	5	(2)	15	(44)	4
Professional life	3	(3)	0	(0)	29	(16)	11	(4)	37	(14)	13	(37)	7
Trained technician or craftsman	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	1
Life centering on creative arts	3	(3)	5	(3)	43	(24)	9	(3)	0	(0)	11	(33)	8
Life centering on home and family	48	(48)	35	(23)	14	(8)	49	(17)	34	(13)	37	(109)	42
Others	2	(2)	3	(2)	0	(0)	9	(3)	5	(2)	3	(9)	6
Undecided	3	(3)	2	(1)	7	(4)	9	(3)	5	(2)	4	(13)	6
Response total	99	(99)	100	(65)	100	(56)	102	(35)	99	(38)	99	(293)	100
Total N		(100)		(65)		(56)		(35)		(38)		(294)	(585)

*Number of responses not available for national comparative group.

Key: See Table 1, p. 50.

Expected Source of Job Satisfaction.--Home economics students in both the entering and involved groups expected to receive job satisfaction from four major sources. The opportunity to be useful to society ranked first, followed by the opportunity to use abilities. Freedom to be creative and original and the opportunity to work with people rather than things were also high as expected sources of job satisfaction.

Items which seemed to offer little source of job satisfaction were the prospect of above average income, a stable, secure future, the avoidance of high pressure work, and relative freedom from supervision.

Among the subgroups, the entering and involved teaching and foods and nutrition subgroups had the highest expectation of being useful to society (teaching--entering students 42% and involved students, 43%; foods and nutrition--entering students, 43% and involved students, 47%).

Students in these subgroups also looked forward to working with people, although the percentage was lower for involved students, especially in foods and nutrition (teaching--entering students, 23% and involved students, 20%; foods and nutrition--entering students, 24% and involved students, 13%). For the involved foods and nutrition subgroup the reduced expectation of satisfaction from working with people corresponded to an increased

expectation of satisfaction from using one's abilities. The opportunity to use one's abilities was expected to be a source of job satisfaction by both the teaching and the foods and nutrition subgroups (teaching--entering students, 17% and involved students, 18%; foods and nutrition--entering students, 14% and involved students, 24%).

Students in the retailing subgroups looked for their greatest satisfaction from the opportunity to use their abilities, and this was especially true for the involved students (entering students, 28% and involved students, 42%). Usefulness to society and freedom to be creative and original were higher for the entering retailing students, while working with people and compatibility with colleagues appeared as a greater expected satisfaction for the involved retailing students (usefulness to society--entering students, 20% and involved students, 12%; creative and original--entering students, 17% and involved students, 9%; working with people--entering students, 8% and involved students, 15%; compatibility with colleagues--entering students, 5% and involved students, 12%).

Students in the interior design subgroups also expected their greatest satisfaction from the opportunity to use their abilities with an increased awareness of this for the involved students (entering students, 34% and involved students, 45%). The freedom to be creative

and original appeared as a source of satisfaction for 31% of the entering interior design students, but for only 20% of the involved interior design students. Usefulness to society was an expected source of satisfaction for both the entering and involved interior design subgroups (18% and 20%).

Projected job satisfactions for the composite subgroups were diffuse. They were usefulness to society (entering students, 30% and involved students, 23%), opportunity to use one's abilities (entering students, 18% and involved students, 23%), opportunity to work with people (entering students, 15% and involved students, 20%), freedom to be creative and original (entering students, 15% and involved students, 6%), and compatibility with colleagues (entering students, 8% and involved students, 11%).

Compared with the national group, both the entering and involved home economics groups looked for less satisfaction from being useful to society (home economics--entering students, 29% and involved students, 30%; national--entering students, 40% and involved students, 39%), slightly less satisfaction from working with people (home economics--entering students, 13% and involved students, 15%; national--entering students, 17% and involved students, 19%), and more satisfaction from using their abilities (home economics--entering students, 24% and

Table 6.1 Expected source of job satisfaction for entering home economics students.

Source of satisfaction	Subgroups										Home Econ. Total		National Comp.*
	T		R		ID		C		FN				
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Opportunity to use abilities	17	(11)	28	(17)	34	(21)	18	(7)	14	(3)	24	(58)	19
Prospect of above average income	0	(0)	5	(3)	2	(1)	5	(2)	5	(1)	3	(7)	2
Freedom to be creative and original	6	(4)	17	(10)	31	(19)	15	(6)	14	(3)	17	(42)	7
Work with people, not things	23	(15)	8	(5)	3	(2)	15	(6)	24	(5)	13	(33)	17
Usefulness to society	42	(27)	20	(12)	18	(11)	30	(12)	43	(9)	29	(72)	40
Stable, secure future	6	(4)	8	(5)	5	(3)	5	(2)	0	(0)	6	(14)	4
Compatibility with colleagues	5	(3)	5	(3)	2	(1)	8	(3)	0	(0)	4	(10)	4
Avoid high pressure work	0	(0)	2	(1)	2	(1)	5	(2)	0	(0)	2	(4)	0
Relative freedom from supervision	2	(1)	7	(4)	3	(2)	0	(0)	0	(0)	3	(7)	9
Response total	101	(65)	100	(60)	100	(61)	101	(40)	100	(21)	101	(247)	102
Total N		(65)		(60)		(61)		(40)		(21)		(247)	(677)

*Number of responses not available for national comparative group.
Key: See Table 1, p. 50.

Table 6.2. Expected source of job satisfaction for involved home economics students.

Source of satisfaction	Subgroups										Home Econ. Total		National Comp.*
	T		R		ID		C		FN				
	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Opportunity to use abilities	18	(18)	42	(27)	45	(25)	23	(8)	24	(9)	30	(87)	17
Prospect of above average income	0	(0)	3	(2)	0	(0)	3	(1)	0	(0)	1	(3)	3
Freedom to be creative and original	5	(5)	9	(6)	20	(11)	6	(2)	5	(2)	9	(26)	10
Work with people, not things	20	(20)	15	(10)	4	(2)	20	(7)	13	(5)	15	(44)	19
Usefulness to society	43	(43)	12	(8)	20	(11)	23	(8)	47	(18)	30	(88)	39
Stable, secure future	2	(2)	3	(2)	0	(0)	6	(2)	3	(1)	2	(7)	3
Compatibility with colleagues	4	(4)	12	(8)	9	(5)	11	(4)	3	(1)	8	(22)	5
Avoid high pressure work	2	(2)	2	(1)	2	(1)	0	(0)	0	(0)	1	(4)	1
Relative freedom from supervision	6	(6)	2	(1)	2	(1)	6	(2)	5	(2)	4	(12)	2
Response total	100	(100)	100	(65)	102	(56)	98	(34)	100	(38)	100	(293)	99
Total N		(100)		(65)		(56)		(35)		(38)		(294)	(585)

*Number of responses not available for national comparative group.
Key: See Table 1, p. 50.

involved students, 30%; national--entering students, 19% and involved students, 17%). Entering home economics students also looked for more satisfaction than the national group from the freedom to be creative and original (home economics entering students, 17% and national entering students, 7%).

College Student Questionnaire Scale Items

The College Student Questionnaire scales which contributed to a further description of the home economics students were family social status, family independence, peer independence, and cultural sophistication.

The family social status scale included four items with alternatives ranging from one to nine for each item. Three of the items (father's education, mother's education, and family income) accounted for half of this scale score. The fourth item, father's occupation, was given a weight of three and accounted for the other half of the score. The total scale score thus had a possible range of six (6x1) to fifty-four (6x9).

All other scales were composed of ten items each with alternatives ranging from one to four for each item. The possible score range for each scale was ten (10x1) to forty (10x4). The items included in the scales are listed in Appendix A.

The group means and standard deviations were computed for each group in the study, and the t-statistic obtained from an analysis of differences between means.

Family social status.--This scale was included only in CSQ-1, the questionnaire designed for entering students.

Scores from the family social status scale showed the entering retailing students to be significantly higher than both the entering home economics group as a whole and the national comparative group; the entering composite subgroup was significantly higher than the national group. The total entering home economics group was also significantly higher in family social status than the national comparative group.

Neither the entering nor the involved students in the teaching, interior design, and foods and nutrition subgroups were significantly different from the total home economics group or from the national comparative group in family social status.

The group means and standard deviations are shown in Table 7.1 and the t-statistic for differences between means appears in Table 7.2.

Family independence.--Such items as the students' ability to think, make decisions, and live independently from parents and family were included in this scale.

Table 7.1. Family social status: Mean scores and standard deviations.

Home economics groups	Entering Students		
	N	M	SD
Subgroups:			
Teaching	59	28.85	11.38
Retailing	50	35.98	10.92
Interior design	54	31.52	11.65
Composite	36	33.31	11.32
Foods and nutrition	20	31.10	11.36
Home economics total group	219	32.11	11.51
National comparative group	677	29.11	11.91

Table 7.2. Family social status: Comparisons of (1) home economics subgroups and total group, (2) home economics groups and national comparative group. T-statistic shown.

Home economics groups	Home economics subgroups and total group	Home economics groups and national group
	Entering students	Entering students
Subgroups:		
Teaching	-1.95	- .17
Retailing	2.24*	4.27*
Interior design	- .33	1.46
Composite	.59	2.16*
Foods and nutrition	- .38	.77
Home economics total group		3.33*

*Difference is significant.

As a total group, involved home economics students showed significantly more independence from their families than did the entering home economics students. Involved students were also significantly higher than entering students in the teaching, interior design, and composite subgroups.

The home economics students, both entering and involved, scored significantly higher than the national comparative group on family independence. Among the home economics subgroups, the entering interior design subgroup and the involved teaching, retailing, interior design, and composite subgroups were significantly higher in family independence than the national group.

The foods and nutrition subgroup did not differ significantly from any other group.

The group means and standard deviations are shown in Table 8.1 and the t-statistic for differences between means appears in Table 8.2.

Peer independence.--This scale revealed students' maturity in forming opinions and acting independently, regardless of the attitudes and behaviors of their peers.

Greater peer independence was apparent in the involved home economics total group than in the entering home economics total group. The involved foods and nutrition subgroup was also significantly higher than the entering foods and nutrition subgroup. The other subgroups

Table 8.1. Family independence: Mean scores and standard deviations.

Home economics groups	Entering students			Involved students		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Subgroups:						
Teaching	64	20.64	3.76	100	23.01	5.26
Retailing	59	21.56	4.65	65	23.17	5.40
Interior design	60	21.93	5.43	56	24.48	5.59
Composite	40	20.92	4.62	35	23.86	5.99
Foods and nutrition	20	21.60	5.56	38	22.79	4.91
Home economics total group	243	21.30	4.70	294	23.40	5.40
National comparative group	677	20.38	5.27	585	21.54	5.32

Table 8.2. Family independence: Comparisons of (1) home economics subgroups and total group, (2) home economics groups and national comparative group, and (3) entering and involved home economics groups. T-statistic shown.

Home economics groups	Home economics subgroups and total group		Home economics groups and national group		Entering and involved groups
	Entering students	Involved students	Entering students	Involved students	
Subgroups:					
Teaching	-1.18	- .64	.51	2.58*	3.36*
Retailing	.38	- .31	1.85	2.31*	1.78
Interior design	.83	1.33	2.12*	3.78*	2.49*
Composite	- .48	.43	.71	2.24*	2.35*
Foods and nutrition	.23	- .71	.97	1.51	.81
Home economics total group			2.54*	4.84*	4.82*

*Difference is significant.

did not show a significant difference between the entering and involved students, nor were there any significant differences between the home economics subgroups and the home economics total groups in peer independence.

Entering home economics students as a whole were significantly lower in peer independence than the national comparative group, but the involved home economics students were significantly higher than the national group. Among the home economics subgroups, the composite and foods and nutrition subgroups were both significantly higher than the national comparative group.

The group means and standard deviations are shown in Table 9.1 and the t-statistic for differences between means appears in Table 9.2.

Table 9.1. Peer independence: Mean scores and standard deviations.

Home economics groups	Entering students			Involved students		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Subgroups:						
Teaching	64	22.89	4.04	99	23.67	3.32
Retailing	60	22.87	4.14	65	23.77	3.55
Interior design	60	23.78	4.06	56	23.93	3.83
Composite	40	23.00	3.47	35	24.46	3.56
Foods and nutrition	20	22.40	3.93	38	24.89	3.13
Home economics total group	244	23.09	3.96	293	23.99	3.48
National comparative group	677	23.68	4.19	585	23.21	4.01

Table 9.2. Peer independence: Comparisons of (1) home economics subgroups and total group, (2) home economics groups and national comparative group, and (3) entering and involved home economics groups. T-statistic shown.

Home economics groups	Home economics subgroups & total group		Home economics groups and national group		Entering and involved groups
	Entering students	Involved students	Entering students	Involved students	
Subgroups:					
Teaching	- .35	- .82	-1.49	1.23	1.29
Retailing	- .37	- .45	-1.45	1.19	1.30
Interior design	1.19	- .11	.18	1.34	.20
Composite	- .15	.74	-1.19	2.00*	1.79
Foods and nutrition	- .75	1.65	-1.43	3.15*	2.45*
Home economics total group			-1.97*	2.97*	2.77*

*Difference is significant.

Cultural sophistication.--Interest in or pleasure from such things as wide reading, modern art, poetry, classical music, and discussions of philosophies of history were reflected by this scale.

The home economics group as a whole achieved significantly higher scores in cultural sophistication for the involved students than for the entering students, largely because of high scores in the interior design subgroup. Involved students were significantly higher than entering students in the interior design subgroup, but significantly lower in the teaching subgroup on cultural sophistication. There were no significant differences between entering and involved students in the retailing, composite, and foods and nutrition subgroups.

The major differences between the home economics students and the national comparative group in cultural sophistication appeared in certain subgroups. Both the entering and involved interior design subgroups were significantly higher than the national group; the cultural sophistication scores for the involved teaching and foods and nutrition subgroups were significantly lower than the national group.

The group means and standard deviations are shown in Table 10.1 and the t-statistic for differences between means appears in Table 10.2.

Table 10.1. Cultural sophistication: Mean scores and standard deviations.

Home economics groups	Entering students			Involved students		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Subgroups:						
Teaching	64	22.03	4.59	100	22.94	4.35
Retailing	60	23.48	4.67	65	24.51	4.97
Interior design	60	24.42	4.38	56	27.11	4.93
Composite	40	23.40	4.09	35	24.34	5.27
Foods and nutrition	21	21.86	3.79	38	23.32	4.23
Home economics total group	245	23.19	4.48	294	24.30	4.91
National comparative group	677	23.16	5.13	585	24.78	5.00

Rokeach Value Survey

Two sets of eighteen values each were rank-ordered for importance. The set of instrumental values referred to modes of conduct, and the set of terminal values referred to end-states of existence. The rank-orderings were tabulated and the median rankings of each of the thirty-six values computed.

The value rankings were examined by comparing the home economics subgroups with the total home economics groups, and the home economics groups with a Michigan State University campus comparative group for both entering and involved students, and by comparing the entering students with the involved students.

Table 10.2. Cultural sophistication: Comparisons of (1) home economics subgroups and total group, (2) home economics groups and national comparative group, and (3) entering and involved home economics groups. T-statistic shown.

Home economics groups	Home economics subgroups & total group		Home economics groups and national group		Entering and involved groups
	Entering students	Involved students	Entering students	Involved students	
Subgroups:					
Teaching	-1.81	-2.61*	-1.86	-3.82*	1.26
Retailing	.43	.31	.50	- .42	1.19
Interior design	1.94	3.91*	2.10*	3.37*	3.10*
Composite	.30	.04	.35	- .48	.85
Foods and nutrition	-1.52	-1.32	-1.53	-2.04*	1.36
Home economics total group			.09	-1.36	2.74*

*Difference is significant.

Comparisons of the home economics subgroups with the total home economics groups, of the home economics groups with the campus comparative group, and of entering and involved groups yielded high correlations in every case for the instrumental values.

Comparisons of the home economics subgroups with the total home economics groups, and of entering and involved groups yielded generally high correlations for the terminal values, but correlations of the home economics groups with the campus comparative group were relatively low for these values.

The rank-difference correlations for the comparisons are shown in Tables 11.1 and 11.2.

Significant differences in value rankings among the home economics subgroups were identified by the Chi-square test, and the results are shown in Table 12.

For values where significant differences appeared, the rankings were examined further to determine which subgroups differed most. For the entering students there were more significant differences among the subgroups in the ranking of terminal values, but for the involved students there were more significant differences in the ranking of instrumental values. The median rankings are listed in Tables 13.1 and 13.2.

Table 11.1. Correlation of value rankings: Instrumental values.

Home economics subgroups	Entering students		Involved students		Home economics entering and involved
	Home econ. total	MSU comp. group	Home econ. total	MSU comp. group	
	r	r	r	r	r
Teaching	.96	.74	.97	.84	.94
Retailing	.90	.84	.94	.87	.81
Interior design	.96	.90	.89	.77	.84
Composite	.94	.74	.95	.83	.92
Foods and nutrition	.92	.79	.96	.89	.86
Home economics total group		.85		.90	.96

Table 11.2. Correlation of value rankings: Terminal values.

Home economics subgroups	Entering students		Involved students		Home economics entering and involved
	Home econ. total	MSU comp. group	Home econ. total	MSU comp. group	
	r	r	r	r	r
Teaching	.96	.42	.97	.35	.87
Retailing	.88	.53	.97	.39	.93
Interior design	.89	.40	.88	.45	.89
Composite	.82	.29	.95	.44	.54
Foods and nutrition	.91	.48	.89	.45	.91
Home economics total group		.41		.39	.94

Table 12. Chi-square for value rankings of home economics groups.

Instrumental Values	Entering Group	Involved Group	Terminal Values	Entering Group	Involved Group
Ambitious	2.43	8.05	A comfortable life	12.50*	4.39
Broadminded	7.62	6.51	An exciting life	5.01	5.44
Capable	1.96	2.66	Accomplishment	1.72	6.01
Cheerful	2.13	6.49	A world at peace	.82	7.17
Clean	6.06	2.49	A world of beauty	4.56	7.19
Courageous	11.30*	10.39*	Equality	10.95*	6.27
Forgiving	5.74	2.29	Family security	13.82*	7.03
Helpful	2.15	9.65*	Freedom	9.41	6.02
Honest	4.28	4.92	Happiness	.21	8.36
Imaginative	7.82	13.74*	Inner harmony	7.76	5.58
Independent	4.89	7.40	Mature love	10.27*	10.40*
Intellectual	2.79	7.80	National security	3.97	2.69
Logical	4.73	2.58	Pleasure	3.63	6.41
Loving	1.68	8.55	Salvation	11.63*	1.48
Obedient	1.61	.67	Self-respect	4.10	2.59
Polite	1.96	2.16	Social recognition	3.66	2.83
Responsible	3.48	4.30	True friendship	2.24	4.61
Self-controlled	2.08	4.68	Wisdom	3.19	6.11

*Difference is significant.

Table 13.1. Median value rankings: Instrumental values.

Values	Nat. Comp.	T		R		ID		C		FN		Total	
		E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I
Honest	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	5	1	1	1
Loving	2	2	2	2	1	2	4	2	2	1	2	2	2
Responsible	3	4	3	4	4	5	3	5	6	2	4	4	3
Broadminded	4	9	5	6	3	3	2	4	3	4	5	6	4
Ambitious	5	8	10	8	5	8	10	8	8	7	8	8	7
Courageous	6	15	12	9	12	10	12	13	11	15	10	12	12
Forgiving	7	5	6	5	6	4	7	3	4	3	3	3	5
Helpful	8	6	7	7	13	7	9	7	7	12	6	7	8
Independent	9	11	11	13	8	9	8	14	14	9	12	10	10
Self-controlled	10	7	8	11	11	11	14	11	10	8	13	9	11
Cheerful	11	3	4	3	7	6	5	6	5	6	7	5	6
Intellectual	12	13	13	12	10	16	13	17	15	11	11	15	13
Capable	13	10	9	15	9	12	11	10	9	10	9	11	9
Logical	14	16	17	17	17	14	17	16	16	17	15	17	17
Imaginative	15	17	15	10	16	15	6	15	13	16	17	16	14
Polite	16	14	14	16	15	13	15	12	12	14	14	13	15
Clean	17	12	16	14	14	17	16	9	17	13	16	14	16
Obedient	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18	18

Key: E = Entering students
I = Involved students
T = Teaching subgroup
R = Retailing subgroup
ID = Interior design subgroup
C = Composite subgroup
FN = Foods and nutrition subgroup

Table 13.2. Median value rankings: Terminal values.

Values	Nat. Comp.	T		R		ID		C		FN		Total	
		E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I	E	I
Freedom	1	10	5	3	7	7	3	11	5	9	7	9	6
Wisdom	2	5	10	8	8	6	10	9	8	5	4	7	8
Happiness	3	1	2	1	2	1	2	3	2	3	6	1	1
Social recognition	4	18	18	17	18	18	18	18	18	18	17	18	18
True friendship	5	6	8	7	10	10	5	7	6	6	10	8	10
Mature love	6	2	4	2	1	9	8	1	4	1	1	2	3
Inner harmony	7	8	3	4	5	4	6	12	1	2	2	6	4
World at peace	8	7	7	6	4	3	1	5	9	7	9	4	5
Accomplishment	9	9	9	11	6	11	9	10	11	8	5	10	9
Equality	10	11	11	10	11	5	7	8	10	11	11	11	11
Family security	11	3	6	9	9	8	11	4	7	10	8	5	7
Salvation	12	13	15	18	17	12	17	2	17	12	15	12	17
World of beauty	13	15	12	14	13	13	12	13	13	14	13	14	12
Exciting life	14	14	13	12	12	14	13	14	12	16	12	13	13
National security	15	16	17	16	16	16	15	15	15	13	14	16	15
A comfortable life	16	12	14	13	14	15	14	16	14	15	18	15	14
Self-respect	17	4	1	5	3	2	4	6	3	4	3	3	2
Pleasure	18	17	16	15	15	17	16	17	16	17	16	17	16

Key: E = Entering students
I = Involved students
T = Teaching subgroup
R = Retailing subgroup
ID = Interior design subgroup
C = Composite subgroup
FN = Foods and nutrition subgroup

Instrumental values.--For entering home economics students there were significant differences among the subgroups in the rankings of one value, courageous. Compared with other subgroups, the teaching and foods and nutrition subgroups ranked this value low; the retailing and interior design subgroups ranked it high.

For involved home economics students there were significant differences among the subgroups in the rankings of the following values: courageous, helpful, and imaginative. Compared with other subgroups, the foods and nutrition subgroup ranked courageous high; the retailing subgroup ranked helpful low; the interior design subgroup ranked imaginative high, and the foods and nutrition subgroup ranked imaginative low.

Four instrumental values were ranked differently (four or more ranks difference) by the home economics students than by the Michigan State University campus comparative group. Both the entering and involved home economics students ranked courageous lower and cheerful higher than the comparative group of university women. The entering home economics students also ranked forgiving higher, and the involved home economics students ranked capable higher than the university women in general.

Terminal values.--For entering home economics students there were significant differences among subgroups in the rankings of the following values: a

comfortable life, equality, family security, mature love, and salvation. Compared with other subgroups, the teaching and retailing subgroups ranked a comfortable life high; the interior design and the composite subgroups ranked equality high; and the retailing, interior design, and foods and nutrition subgroups ranked family security low; the interior design subgroup ranked mature love low; the retailing subgroup ranked salvation low, and the composite subgroup ranked salvation high.

For involved home economics students there was a significant difference among the subgroups in the ranking of one value, mature love. Compared with other subgroups, the interior design subgroup ranked this value low.

A number of terminal values were ranked differently (four or more ranks difference) by the home economics students than by the Michigan State University campus comparative group. Terminal values which were ranked lower by both entering and involved home economics students than by the university women in general were freedom, wisdom, and social recognition. Social recognition was placed last (rank eighteen) by home economics students, but the comparative campus group ranked it in fourth place. The involved home economics students also ranked true friendship and salvation lower than did university women in general.

Terminal values which were ranked higher by both entering and involved home economics students than by the Michigan State University campus comparative group were family security and self-respect. Self-respect was ranked third by the entering home economics students and second by the involved home economics students; the campus comparative group ranked self-respect seventeenth, almost at the bottom of the list of eighteen values. Two other terminal values ranked higher by the entering home economics students than by the comparative group were mature love and a world at peace.

Findings Related to Students' Appraisal of the Academic Environment

The scales used for this part of the study were designed for involved students only since these were the students really qualified to express opinions about faculty, administration, and curricula.

These scales were composed of ten items each with alternatives ranging from one to four for each item. The score range for each scale was ten (10x1) to forty (10x4). The items included in these scales are listed in Appendix A.

From scale scores the group means and standard deviations were computed and the t-statistic obtained from an analysis of differences between means.

Satisfaction with faculty

Teachers' fairness, accessibility, interest in students, and ability to challenge students were items included in this scale.

A comparison of the subgroups with the home economics group as a whole showed the retailing subgroup significantly lower in satisfaction with faculty; the interior design subgroup, however, was significantly higher than the total home economics group in satisfaction with faculty. There were no significant differences for the teaching, composite and foods and nutrition subgroups when compared with the total home economics groups.

The home economics group as a whole and the retailing and foods and nutrition subgroups were significantly lower than the national comparative group in satisfaction with faculty.

The group means and standard deviations are shown in Table 14.1 and the t-statistic for differences between means appears in Table 14.2.

Satisfaction with administration

Student assessments of campus rules, of assistance available from administrators and their courtesy, efficiency, and fairness, and the administrative role assigned to students were revealed by this scale.

Table 14.1. Satisfaction with faculty: Mean scores and standard deviations.

Home economics groups	Involved students		
	N	M	SD
Subgroups:			
Teaching	98	24.88	4.18
Retailing	65	23.02	4.29
Interior design	56	26.04	4.79
Composite	35	24.86	4.97
Foods and nutrition	38	23.63	5.07
Home economics total group	292	24.52	4.63
National comparative group	585	25.37	4.65

Table 14.2. Satisfaction with faculty: Comparisons of (1) home economics subgroups and total group, (2) home economics groups and national comparative group. T-statistic shown.

Home economics groups	Home economics subgroups and total group	Home economics groups and national group
	Involved students	Involved students
Subgroups:		
Teaching	.72	-1.06
Retailing	-2.51*	-4.15*
Interior design	2.19*	1.00
Composite	.39	- .59
Foods and nutrition	-1.03	-2.06*
Home economics total group		-2.56*

*Difference is significant.

There were no significant differences between any of the home economics subgroups and the home economics total group in satisfaction with administration.

Home economics students as a whole were significantly higher than the national comparative group in satisfaction with administration. The teaching, composite, and foods and nutrition subgroups were also significantly higher than the national group.

The group means and standard deviations are shown in Table 15.1 and the t-statistic for differences between means appears in Table 15.2.

Satisfaction with major

Personal commitment to the major field of study, the level of achievement within that field, and the perceived quality of instruction and of the curriculum were included in this scale.

Among the home economics subgroups, the interior design subgroup was significantly higher than the total home economics group in satisfaction with major; the retailing and composite subgroups were significantly lower in satisfaction with major when compared with the total home economics group and with the national comparative group. There were no significant differences for the teaching or foods and nutrition subgroups when compared with the home economics total group and with the national group.

Table 15.1. Satisfaction with administration: Mean scores and standard deviations.

Home economics groups	Involved students		
	N	M	SD
Subgroups:			
Teaching	96	28.40	4.12
Retailing	65	26.49	3.93
Interior design	54	26.39	5.75
Composite	35	28.74	5.03
Foods and nutrition	38	27.76	3.96
Home economics total group	288	27.55	4.59
National comparative group	585	26.41	5.11

Table 15.2. Satisfaction with administration: Comparisons of (1) home economics subgroups and total group, (2) home economics groups and national comparative group. T-statistic shown.

Home economics groups	Home economics subgroups and total group	Home economics groups and national group
	Involved students	Involved students
Subgroups:		
Teaching	1.70	4.23*
Retailing	-1.90	.15
Interior design	-1.40	- .02
Composite	1.33	2.66*
Foods and nutrition	.30	2.00*
Home economics total group		3.32*

*Difference is significant.

Involved home economics students as a whole were significantly lower than the national comparative group in satisfaction with major.

The group means and standard deviations are shown in Table 16.1 and the t-statistic for differences between means appears in Table 16.2.

Table 16.1. Satisfaction with major: Mean scores and standard deviations.

Home economics groups	Involved students		
	N	M	SD
Subgroups:			
Teaching	95	26.80	3.83
Retailing	64	25.41	4.11
Interior design	52	28.15	3.78
Composite	33	24.88	4.64
Foods and nutrition	37	27.14	4.39
Home economics total group	281	26.54	4.18
National comparative group	585	27.50	4.47

Table 16.2. Satisfaction with major: Comparisons of (1) home economics subgroups and total group, (2) home economics groups and national comparative group. T-statistic shown.

Home economics groups	Home economics subgroups and total group	Home economics groups and national group
	Involved students	Involved students
Subgroups:		
Teaching	.56	-1.61
Retailing	-1.98*	-3.83*
Interior design	2.77*	1.17
Composite	-1.96*	-3.16*
Foods and nutrition	.79	- .48
Home economics total group		-3.10*

*Difference is significant.

Findings Related to the Support of the Purpose of Home Economics

The hypotheses, the data for testing them, and statements of the findings relative to the hypotheses are presented in this section. The data for testing the hypotheses were obtained from three College Student Questionnaire scales (liberalism, social conscience, and satisfaction with major) which could reveal a concern for the well-being of people.

The liberalism scale indicated an awareness of changes within a society and the possible need to question the customary ways of doing things. Students who were truly concerned for the well-being of people would most likely be alert to changes which might affect that well-being, and be willing to work with change rather than against it.

Results from the liberalism scale, however, should be interpreted with those from the social conscience scale since liberalism without a social conscience might not contribute to the well-being of people.

The social conscience scale included items directly related to the well-being of people such as concern about poverty, illegitimacy, juvenile crime, materialism, and unethical business and labor practices.

The satisfaction with major scale indirectly reflected a concern for people. Students whose scores on liberalism and social conscience affirmed the purpose of home economics as the well-being of people would very likely be satisfied with a major oriented to that purpose. If, however, students' scores on liberalism and social conscience revealed little concern for others but much satisfaction with the major, or much concern for others but dissatisfaction with the major, it could indicate a discrepancy between the goals of the major and the goals of home economics. The satisfaction with major scale was

designed for involved students only since entering students would not yet have participated in a major curricula sufficiently to evaluate it.

The scales included ten items each with alternatives ranging from one to four for each item. The score range for each scale was ten (10x1) to forty (10x4). The items included in the scales are listed in Appendix A.

Hypotheses

Specific sub-hypotheses were stated in relation to the scales used. For testing these hypotheses, group means and standard deviations were computed from the CSQ scale scores, and the t-test was used for determining the significance of differences between means.

Hypothesis 1.--Home economics students will show a greater concern than college and university women in general for the well-being of people. (Only data for students involved in a college or university program were used for comparison since the curricular influences of home economics would be minimal for entering students.)

Sub-hypothesis 1-a: On the liberalism scale the mean scores will be higher for home economics students than for college and university women in general.

There was no significant difference when home economics students (M=26.19) were compared with the national group of college and university women (M-25.99) on

the liberalism scale. The hypothesis of higher scores on liberalism for home economics students than for college and university women in general was rejected. The data are shown in Table 17.1.

Table 17.1. Liberalism: Comparison of home economics group and national comparative group.

Groups compared	N	M	SD	t-statistic
Home economics group	282	26.19	4.32	.64
National comparative group	585	25.99	4.34	

Liberalism suggests an awareness of change in a society, and may or may not be associated with the well-being of people. Therefore, the concern of home economics students for people is inconclusive on the basis of data from this scale alone.

Sub-hypothesis 1-b: On the social conscience scale the mean scores will be higher for home economics students than for college and university women in general.

On the social conscience scale the mean score of the home economics group was 30.93; the mean score of the national comparative group was 29.22. The difference between means was significant at the .001 level. The hypothesis of higher scores on the social conscience scale for home economics students than for college and

university women in general was supported. The data are shown in Table 17.2.

Table 17.2. Social conscience: Comparison of home economics group and national comparative group.

Groups compared	N	M	SD	t-statistic
Home economics group	292	30.93	3.98	5.79*
National comparative group	585	29.22	4.40	

*Difference is significant.

These results could be interpreted to mean that home economics students are generally more aware than other college and university women of the needs of people as reflected by this social conscience scale. These data do not measure the degree of concern for people, however.

Sub-hypothesis 1-c: On the satisfaction with major scale the mean scores will be higher for home economics students than for college and university women in general.

On the satisfaction with major scale the home economics group (M=26.54) was lower than the national comparative group (M=27.50). The difference was significant at the .01 level. The hypothesis of higher scores for home economics students than for college and university women

in general on the satisfaction with major scale was rejected. The data are shown in Table 17.3.

Table 17.3. Satisfaction with major: Comparison of home economics group and national comparative group.

Groups compared	N	M	SD	t-statistic
Home economics group	282	26.54	4.18	-3.10*
National comparative group	585	27.50	4.47	

*Difference is significant.

Since home economics students scored higher on the social conscience scale compared with college and university women in general, this relative dissatisfaction with the major suggests a possible discrepancy between the concerns of home economics students and the orientations of their curricula, especially as they relate to social conscience and the welfare of people.

Hypothesis 2.--Home economics students will show greater concern for the well-being of people after some involvement with a university program in home economics.

Sub-hypothesis 2-a: On the liberalism scale the mean scores will be higher for students involved in a home economics program than for entering students in home economics.

On the liberalism scale the students involved in a home economics program scored higher than the entering students in home economics (involved students, M=26.19; entering students, M=25.10). The difference was significant at the .01 level. The hypothesis of higher scores on liberalism for students involved in a home economics program than for entering students in home economics was supported. The data are shown in Table 18.1.

Table 18.1. Liberalism: Comparison of involved home economics students and entering home economic students.

Groups compared	N	M	SD	t-statistic
Involved home economics students	282	26.19	4.32	3.00*
Entering home economics students	238	25.10	3.96	

*Difference is significant.

Home economics students were apparently more liberal after some time spent at the university, but the total university program may have contributed as much to this as did home economics curricula, since the involved students did not differ from college and university women in general on liberalism (sub-hypothesis 1-a).

Sub-hypothesis 2-b: On the social conscience scale the mean scores will be higher for students involved

in a home economics program than for entering students in home economics.

Students involved in a home economics program had a mean score of 30.93 on the social conscience scale; entering students in home economics had a mean score of 29.43 on this scale. The difference was significant at the .01 level. The hypothesis of higher scores on the social conscience scale for students involved in a home economics program than for entering students in home economics was supported. The data are shown in Table 18.2.

Table 18.2. Social conscience: Comparison of involved home economics students and entering home economics students.

Groups compared	N	M	SD	t-statistic
Involved home economics students	292	30.93	3.98	4.23*
Entering home economics students	241	29.43	4.16	

*Difference is significant.

The greater concern with social conscience indicated by the involved home economics students when compared with the entering home economics students could be, to some extent, an outcome of home economics curricula since these students who were involved in a home economics

program also scored higher on this scale than did college and university women in general (hypothesis 1-b).

Hypothesis 3.--Home economics students within specific curricular areas will show varying degrees of concern for the well-being of people. (Only data for students involved in a home economics program were used in this comparison since they were the only ones really qualified to represent the home economics curricular areas.)

Sub-hypothesis 3-a: On the liberalism scale the mean scores will vary for the curricular subgroups in home economics and the total home economics group.

The range of mean scores for the home economics curricular subgroups on the liberalism scale was from 25.44 to 26.86; the mean score for the total home economics group on this scale was 26.19. When the subgroups were compared with the total group there were no significant differences for any of the subgroups. The hypothesis of varied scores for the home economics curricular subgroups when compared with the total home economics group was rejected. The data are shown in Table 19.1.

The data indicate that university women in home economics as a total group and university women in various home economics curricula, as well as college and university women in general (sub-hypothesis 1-a), tend toward homogeneity relative to liberalism. This suggests the

Table 19.1. Liberalism: Comparison of home economics curricular subgroups and home economics total group.

Groups compared	N	M	SD	t-statistic
Home economics subgroups:				
Teaching	95	26.05	4.48	- .27
Retailing	62	26.27	3.88	.14
Interior design	56	26.86	4.75	.98
Composite	33	26.09	4.41	- .12
Foods and nutrition	36	25.44	3.88	-1.08
Home economics total group	282	26.19	4.32	

possibility that college and university women may not really be doing their own thinking in this respect, but may be thinking as a group subject to similar campus and cultural influences.

Sub-hypothesis 3-b: On the social conscience scale the mean scores will vary for the curricular subgroups in home economics and the total home economics group.

The range of mean scores for the home economics curricular subgroups on the social conscience scale was 30.46 to 31.29; the mean score for the home economics total group was 30.93 on this scale. There were no significant differences for any of the curricular subgroups when compared with the total home economics group. The

hypothesis of varied scores for the home economics subgroups when compared with the home economics total group on the social conscience scale was rejected. The data are shown in Table 19.2.

Table 19.2. Social conscience: Comparison of home economics curricular subgroups and home economics total group.

Groups compared	N	M	SD	t-statistic
Home economics subgroups:				
Teaching	99	31.29	3.80	.80
Retailing	65	30.54	4.06	- .70
Interior design	56	30.46	3.84	- .83
Composite	34	31.00	4.21	.09
Foods and nutrition	38	31.26	4.33	.45
Home economics total group	292	30.93	3.98	

A concern for others as revealed by scores on the social conscience scale apparently is of almost equal importance to students in all home economics curricular areas when compared with the home economics group as a whole; students in all areas tend to reflect the central concern of home economics--a concern for people.

Sub-hypothesis 3-c: On the satisfaction with major scale the mean scores will vary for the curricular subgroups in home economics and the total home economics group.

The range of mean scores on the satisfaction with major scale was 24.88 to 28.15 for the home economics curricular subgroups; the mean score on this scale for the total home economics group was 26.54. Three of the subgroups (interior design, M-28.15; retailing, M-25.41; and composite, M=24.88) showed a significant difference when compared with the total group. The interior design subgroup was significantly higher ($p < .01$), and the retailing and composite subgroups were significantly lower ($p < .05$) than the total group on the satisfaction with major scale. The hypothesis of variance among the home economics subgroups when compared with the total home economics group was supported. The data are shown in Table 19.3.

Table 19.3. Satisfaction with major: Comparison of home economics curricular subgroups and home economics total group.

Groups compared	N	M	SD	t-statistic
Home economics subgroups:				
Teaching	95	26.80	3.83	.56
Retailing	64	25.41	4.11	-1.98*
Interior design	52	28.15	3.78	2.77*
Composite	33	24.88	4.64	-1.96*
Foods and nutrition	37	27.14	4.39	.79
Home economics total group	282	26.54	4.18	

*Difference is significant.

Since none of the curricular subgroups showed a significant difference when compared with the total home economics group on social conscience (the scale most directly related to a concern for the well-being of people), the significantly lower scores on satisfaction with major for the retailing and composite subgroups indicate a possible disparity between the content of the majors represented and the purpose of home economics. Conversely, on the basis of this test, the significantly higher score of the interior design subgroup appears to affirm the purpose of home economics.

Discussion of Findings

The findings indicated certain characteristics which were descriptive of the home economics curricular subgroups.

Students in the teaching subgroup tended to come from rural and small town areas, had plans for graduate study and an academic life, expected satisfaction from being useful to society, but scored low on cultural sophistication.

The retailing subgroup came for the most part from cities and large towns, and had above average social status. They had few plans for graduate work, preferred a business life, had greater expectation of job satisfaction from using their abilities than from being useful to

society, and showed dissatisfaction with their major and the university faculty.

Students in the interior design subgroup came from average social backgrounds and showed a preference for a career and/or a professional life with less emphasis on home and family. They expected job satisfaction from using their abilities and from the opportunity to be creative and original, showed little expected satisfaction from being useful to society, scored high in cultural sophistication, and were satisfied with their major and the university faculty.

Students in the composite subgroup were more interested in home and family and less in careers, were influenced by family and teachers and attached importance to family security, but were dissatisfied with their majors. Expected job satisfactions were diffuse.

Students in the foods and nutrition subgroup were independent of their peers, expected marriage along with a professional life and some graduate work with a few expecting to earn a doctorate. They had high expectations of job satisfaction from being useful to society and emphasized the practical aspects of their work to the exclusion of the creative arts.

A comparison of students involved in home economics programs with entering students in home economics revealed that the involved students were more independent

from their families and their peers. The teaching, interior design, and composite subgroups showed the greatest increased independence from families, and the foods and nutrition subgroup showed the greatest difference in peer independence.

The involved home economics students had more expectations for graduate work than the entering home economics students, and had greater interest in a career, although marriage and children were also important. Career interests for the involved home economics subgroups compared with the entering subgroups were an increased preference for a professional life by the interior design and foods and nutrition subgroups, an increased preference for a business life by the retailing subgroup, and an increased preference for an academic life by the teaching subgroup.

The involved home economics students as a whole scored higher on cultural sophistication, liberalism, and social conscience than entering home economics students. The involved interior design subgroup was especially high in cultural sophistication.

Compared with the national group of college and university women, home economics students expected greater satisfaction from using their abilities, particularly students in the retailing and interior design subgroups. As a total group, home economics students expected less

job satisfaction than the comparative group from being useful to society, although two of the subgroups (teaching and foods and nutrition) actually expected greater satisfaction from usefulness to society than the comparative group.

Home economics students became more interested in careers and graduate work while the national group became less interested. This difference is further emphasized by a research description of college women, reviewed in Chapter II, in which Cross notes that "as women progress through college, their interests shift from careers to the more traditional interests of home and family."[1]

The entering home economics students were higher than the national comparative group on family independence and family social status (data on family social status available for entering students only). The higher scores of home economics students on family social status may have been a result of a trend toward higher income, since family income was an item on this scale and there was a time lapse of more than two years between the collection of the home economics data and the comparative data. Students involved in home economics programs were higher

---

[1]K. Patricia Cross, "College Women: A Research Description," Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 32 (Fall, 1968), p. 18.

than the national group in family independence and peer independence.

Home economics students scored significantly lower on satisfaction with major and satisfaction with faculty than college and university women in general, but significantly higher on satisfaction with the university administration and higher on social conscience. The social conscience score may also have been influenced by a time lapse, since an expressed concern for social problems has become increasingly important on college and university campuses.

Compared with the Michigan State University campus comparative group, the home economics students were much less concerned with social recognition and placed a much higher value on self-respect. Home economics students also placed greater value than the campus comparative group on cheerfulness and family security, but considered freedom, wisdom, and courage of less value.

In examining the data for support of the purpose of home economics as the well-being of people, it was found that home economics students scored significantly higher on social conscience but lower on satisfaction with major than the national comparative group of college and university women. Compared with the national group, there was no significant difference on liberalism; however, involved home economics students were higher than

entering home economics students on both liberalism and social conscience.

Home economics students are apparently more concerned with the problems of people and of society than college and university women in general, and more concerned with these problems after they have become involved with a program in home economics. The greater dissatisfaction of home economics students with their majors, however, indicated a possible lack of commitment by the students to the purpose of home economics as the well-being of people, or a lack of commitment to that purpose in the organization of home economics curricula.

The various curricular subgroups in home economics showed no significant differences on liberalism or social conscience, but two of the subgroups, retailing and composite, were dissatisfied with their majors, while the interior design subgroup was quite satisfied. Since the composite subgroup represented several majors, the dissatisfaction is difficult to evaluate. Students in the retailing and interior design subgroups, however, were both more concerned with using their abilities and being creative than with being useful to society. The comparatively high social status of retailing students and a tendency toward self-concern could indicate that the dissatisfaction with the major is more a reflection on the students' commitment to curricular goals than on the

adequacy of the major. Although the interior design subgroup was satisfied with its major, the low expectation of satisfaction from usefulness to society and the low rankings assigned values related to home and family life by this subgroup apparently contradict the goal of home economics.

Since the total group of home economics students scored high on social conscience, but examination of the subgroups revealed discrepancies, then it must be concluded that the social conscience attitudes of home economics students may not always coincide with their personal goals.

A summary of the findings in relation to the hypotheses tested is shown at the end of this chapter.

Summary

This chapter included an analysis of the data obtained from the College Student Questionnaires and the Rokeach Value Survey for information about the background characteristics of home economics students, about the attitudes of students toward the university and their field of study, and about the affirmation of the purpose of home economics as a concern for the well-being of people.

Hypotheses about the support of the purpose of home economics by students were re-stated, followed by pertinent data and findings.

Chapter V will contain the summary and conclusions of the study, and implications for further work.

Table 20. Summary of hypotheses tested.

Hypotheses	t-statistic	Decision
Regarding concern for the well-being of people:		
1. Home economics students will show greater concern than college and university women in general.		
a. Home economics students--higher scores on liberalism.	.64	Hypothesis rejected
b. Home economics students--higher scores on social conscience.	5.79*	Hypothesis supported
c. Home economics students--higher scores on satisfaction with major.	-3.10*	Hypothesis rejected
2. Involved home economics students will show greater concern than entering home economics students.		
a. Involved home economics students, higher scores on liberalism.	3.00*	Hypothesis supported
b. Involved home economics students, higher scores on social conscience.	4.23*	Hypothesis supported

Table 20. (Continued)

Hypotheses	t-statistic	Decision
3. Home economics curricular subgroups will show varied concern compared with home economics total group.		
a. Home economics subgroups--varied scores on liberalism.		
Teaching	- .27	
Retailing	.14	
Interior design	.98	Hypothesis rejected
Composite	- .12	
Foods and nutrition	-1.08	
b. Home economics subgroups--varied scores on social conscience.		
Teaching	.80	
Retailing	- .70	
Interior design	- .83	Hypothesis rejected
Composite	.09	
Foods and nutrition	.45	
c. Home economics subgroups--varied scores on satisfaction with major		
Teaching	.56	
Retailing	-1.98*	
Interior design	2.77*	Hypothesis supported
Composite	-1.96*	
Foods and nutrition	.79	

*Difference is significant.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to develop a method for describing students in home economics programs at Michigan State University. A satisfactory method for describing students was deemed a necessary tool for institutional self-study and program planning.

A basis for the description of students was provided by comparing those involved in home economics programs at Michigan State University with entering students (freshmen and transfer students) in home economics, and with college and university women in general. Further comparisons were made between students in the various curricular areas of home economics and the total group of home economics students. The curricular areas included: teaching (preschool-early elementary and home economics secondary), retailing, interior design, composite (general home economics, community service, communications, general textiles and clothing), and foods and nutrition.

Specifically, answers were sought to four questions: (1) What are the characteristics of students

electing to major in the various curricula in home economics? (2) How do students in each of these programs in home economics compare with the total group of home economics students? (3) How do students involved in home economics programs compare with college and university women in general? (4) What changes are evident in students as they become acquainted with the basic purpose of home economics?

Information pertaining to these questions was obtained from two groups of students, 247 freshmen and transfer students at Michigan State University in the fall of 1968, and 294 students who had been involved in home economics programs at Michigan State University for at least two terms in the spring of 1969. The instruments used in collecting the data were The College Student Questionnaires (CSQ) developed by the Educational Testing Service at Princeton, New Jersey, and the Rokeach Value Survey developed in the Department of Psychology at Michigan State University.

The backgrounds and personal characteristics of the groups of students were studied from percentage responses to factual items in The College Student Questionnaires concerning the size of students' hometowns, influences in choice of majors, expectations of graduate work, home-vs.-career choice, preferred career areas, and expected sources of job satisfaction. Further descriptions

of the student groups were obtained from rankings of values on the Rokeach Value Survey and from scores on four CSQ scales: family social status, family independence, peer independence, and cultural sophistication.

Attitudes toward curricula, faculty, and administration were revealed by scores from three CSQ scales: satisfaction with faculty, satisfaction with administration, and satisfaction with major. The students' support of the purpose of home economics as the well-being of people was evaluated by examining scores from three CSQ scales: liberalism, social conscience, and satisfaction with major.

Rankings on the Rokeach Value Survey were analyzed by the Chi-square test to examine differences among the home economics curricular groups, and rank-difference correlations were used for specific group comparisons. Percentage responses were examined for the CSQ factual items, and differences between means were used to analyze data from the CSQ scales so that group comparisons could be made and hypotheses tested. A probability level of .05 was accepted for determinging the significance of differences between group means.

The scales used in testing the hypotheses (liberalism, social conscience, and satisfaction with major) were those which could reveal a concern for the well-being of people. The liberalism scale indicated an awareness

of changes within a society and the possible need to question the customary ways of doing things. The social conscience scale included items directly related to the well-being of people such as concern about poverty, illegitimacy, juvenile crime, materialism, and unethical business and labor practices. The satisfaction with major scale indirectly reflected a concern for people. Students who gave assent to the purpose of home economics as a concern for the well-being of families and individuals would very likely be satisfied with a major oriented to that purpose.

Summary of hypotheses tested

1. It was hypothesized that home economics students would show greater concern than college and university women in general for the well-being of people as evidenced by higher scores on the liberalism, social conscience, and satisfaction with major scales. When the mean scores on these scales were examined and the differences tested by means of a t-test, the hypothesis was supported by data from the social conscience scale with a significance level of .001. The hypothesis was not supported by data from the liberalism and satisfaction with major scales.

2. It was hypothesized that home economics students would show greater concern for the well-being of

people after some involvement with a university program in home economics; that is, mean scores of students involved in home economics programs would be higher than those of entering students in home economics on the liberalism and social conscience scales. (Satisfaction with major scale was not used since the entering students were not yet qualified to evaluate a major.) The hypothesis was supported with a difference significant at the .01 level for both the liberalism and the social conscience scales.

3. It was hypothesized that home economics students within specific curricular areas would show varying degrees of concern for the well-being of people. The mean scores for the home economics curricular subgroups on the liberalism, social conscience, and satisfaction with major scales would vary when compared with the home economics total group. For this comparison there were no significant differences among any of the home economics subgroups on the liberalism and social conscience scales; therefore, the hypothesis was not supported for liberalism or social conscience. On the satisfaction with major scale three subgroups were significantly different from the total home economics group: the retailing and composite subgroups were significantly lower at the .05 level, and the interior design subgroup was significantly higher at the .01 level on satisfaction with major. The

hypothesis of varied scores among the home economics subgroups when compared with the total home economics group was supported for satisfaction with major.

Conclusions

Both the questions asked at the beginning of this study and the hypotheses proposed were designed to discover differences which might exist between Michigan State University home economics students and other college and university women, between students involved in home economics programs and entering students in home economics, and among home economics curricular subgroups when compared with the home economics total group. Conclusions about these three comparisons are:

1. Michigan State University home economics students did differ significantly from other college and university women in a concern for social problems. Home economics students expressed greater concern in the area of social conscience, but fewer home economics students expected satisfaction from being useful to society when compared with college and university women in general. Marriage with children was important to both groups of women students, but home economics students became less interested in a housewife role and more interested in marriage with a career and had more expectations of graduate work after they became involved with their

university program. The reverse was true for college and university women in general.

Further comparisons showed home economics students to be significantly higher than the comparative group in family social status, family independence, peer independence, and satisfaction with the university administration, but lower in satisfaction with the faculty and with the major fields of study. The home economics students placed a much higher value on self-respect, but a much lower value on social recognition than a comparative group of Michigan State University women students.

2. Michigan State University home economics students were significantly more concerned with liberalism and social conscience after becoming involved with home economics than when entering a home economics program. The involved students also had more expectations for graduate work, more interest in a career, and were higher in family and peer independence and in cultural sophistication than entering students in home economics.

3. Michigan State University home economics curricular subgroups did not differ significantly from the total group of home economics students in their expressed concern for liberalism and social conscience, and in their assessment of general values. The subgroups did differ significantly, however, in satisfaction with major. There was an apparent discrepancy between the high scores

of all home economics subgroups on social conscience and the differences among the subgroups in satisfaction with major and in concern for the well-being of people as revealed by projected expectations of satisfaction from being useful to society. In this respect, the teaching and foods and nutrition subgroups gave evidence of an altruistic concern for people, but the retailing and interior design subgroups did not.

Implications for Future Research

The present study was limited to home economics students in one school during one academic year. The findings would undoubtedly be of greater value if comparisons were made over a period of several years, or with similar studies in other schools. As social and cultural conditions continue to change, further studies describing students might be made as part of the continued assessment of home economics curricula.

The most intrusive question raised by this study concerns the apparent difference in the students and curricula oriented toward business and aesthetics, and those oriented more directly toward the development, relationships, and nurturance of people. In the new organization of the College of Home Economics at Michigan State

University,[1] the Department of Human Environment and Design is still concerned with business and aesthetic orientations as it focuses on the utilization of material resources. These, however, will be integrated with the study of human needs, values, and goals, and emphasis will be given to the relationships which exist between man and his environment.[2] As the new organization becomes established, studies similar to the one reported here may indicate the success of this and other curricular areas in achieving support for the purpose of home economics.

An area of the present study which needs further attention is the analysis of the value rankings. Since the comparative data available gave median rankings only for each of the values, the data from the Value Survey for home economics students was also analyzed for median rankings. From these data, correlations of value rankings and the Chi-square test were made for comparisons among the groups. These procedures indicated differences or similarities among the groups, but did not show specifically where each group stood in relation to each of the values.

---

[1]College of Human Ecology since July 1, 1970.

[2]Unpublished report of the Committee on Reorganization, College of home Economics, Michigan State University, Internal Structure Reorganization and Name Change, (East Lansing, Michigan, April 28, 1970), p. 3.

It is suggested that in further analysis a mean ranking and standard deviation for each group of subjects on each value be obtained from the raw data. This would permit more precise comparisons than are possible with the median rankings.

It is hoped that this study will contribute to further studies of home economics students as progress is made in the implementation of the new ecological approach to home economics at Michigan State University.

APPENDIX A

Contents of College Student Questionnaires

Part 1

Section I: Educ. and Voc. Plans

1. Basic demographic data: sex, age
2. Status as student: class, residence
3. Educ. plans: major, grad. work
4. Vocational plans
5. Financial support
6. Anticipated activities, satisfactions, problems

Section II: Secondary School Information

1. Type, size of secondary school
2. Estimated level of acad. achieve't
3. Perceptions of various course work
4. Extracurricular activities
5. Perception of motivation for grades
6. Leisure time activities

Section III: Family Background

1. Location of home and birthplace
2. Parents status: together, divorced
3. Family size, birth order
4. Parents' occupations
5. Family income
6. Parents' education
7. Racial, ethnic, nationality factors
8. Religious preferences
9. Parents' concern re: respondent's education
10. Political and cultural characteristics

Section IV: Attitudes

1. Respondent's religious preference
2. Instructional preferences
3. Attitudes re: independ. from family
4. Attitudes re: independ. from peers
5. Political attitudes
6. Attitudes reflecting social conscience
7. Activities reflecting cultural sophistication

Part 2

Section I: Educ. and Voc. Plans

Identical to Section 1 in CSQ Part 1, except no questions abou anticipated activities satisfactions, problems (#6).

Section II: College Activities

1. Extracurricular activities
2. Attitudes re: faculty and studen faculty relations
3. Attitudes re: administration and administrative rules, regulations
4. Sources of satisfaction and problems
5. Fraternity-sororit considerations
6. Estimated grade average
7. Study techniques and attitudes
8. Leisure time activities
9. Outside reading preferences
10. Attitudes about th student body
11. Attitudes about wo in major field

Section III: Attitudes

Identical to Sectior in CSQ Part 1.

College Student Questionnaires
Scale Items Used

From CSQ, Part 1

(FS) Family Social Status:

High scores--high socioeconomic status based on father's occupation, father's and mother's education, and family income.

Low scores--low socioeconomic status.

Items:

Father's occupation

Estimated parents income

Father's education

Mother's education

From CSQ, Parts 1 and 2

(FI) Family Independence:

High scores--perception of self as coming from a family that is not closely united, not consulting with parents about important matters, not concerned about living up to parental expectations, etc.

Low scores--"psychological" dependence on parents and family suggested.

Items:

Plan to see -- have seen parents

Possible to forsake interest in family for own activities

Family needs more important than own needs

Family members should hold similar religious beliefs

Family cohesiveness

Importance of satisfying parents wishes

Growing closer or farther away from family

Consult parents about important decisions

Attitude toward consulting parents on decisions

Perceived dependnece on parents

(PI) Peer Independence:

High scores--tendency not to be concerned about how behavior appears to other students, not to consult with acquaintances about personal matters, and the like; may be thought of as unsociable, introverted, or inner-directed.

Low scores--suggestion of conformity to prevailing peer norms, sociability, extraversion, or other-directedness.

Items:

Hours a week spent in conversations with friends

Leisure time spent with friends

Friends artistic taste -- compared to own taste

Am in a group of close friends who do most things together

Hold own views despite others impatience with you

Ignore peers opinions on matters important to you

Do things without regard to peer relations

Consult close friends about important decisions

Possible to forsake interest in friends for own activities

Consider friends reactions before acting

(CS) Cultural Sophistication:

High scores--reported interest in or pleasure from such things as wide reading, modern art, poetry, classical music, discussions of philosophies of history.

Items:

Enjoy discussing philosophies of history

Discusses foreign films with friends

Interest in modern art

Number of authors read: Joyce, Tolstoy, Mann

Pleasure from classical music

Enjoy reading poetry

Knowledge about history of painting

Attendance at evening lectures on serious topics

Number of books owned by informant

Intense reaction to work of art in past year

(L) Liberalism:

High scores--(liberals) support welfare statism, organized labor, abolition of capital punishment, etc.

Low scores--(conservatism) opposition to welfare legislation, to tampering with the free enterprise system, to persons disagreeing with American political institutions.

Items:

Informants political viewpoint

Government should prevent peaceable meeting of dissenters

Police hampered by necessity for search warrant

Abolition of capital punishment

Government should step up efforts for universal medical care

Legislative committees should not investigate politics of faculty

Labor unions do more harm than good

Conscientious objectors should be excused from military service

Welfare state destroys individual initiative

Individual liberties are not possible under socialism

(SC) Social Conscience:

High scores--concern about poverty, illegitimacy, juvenile crime, materialism, unethical business and labor union practices, graft in government, etc.

Low scores--reported lack of concern, detachment, or apathy about these matters.

Items:

Concern about graft

Concern about rise in juvenile crime

Concern about extent of poverty in the U.S.

Concern about less opportunity for Non-Wasps in U.S.

Concern about growing materialism and moral behavior

Concern about welfare for the elderly

Concern about children and obscene literature

Decision to drop bomb on Hiroshima

Concern about business ethics

Reaction to a lynching

From CSQ, Part 2

(SM) Satisfaction with Major:

High scores--continued personal commitment to present major field, satisfaction with departmental procedures, the quality of instruction received, and the level of personal achievement within one's chosen field.

Low scores--an attitude of uncertainty and disaffection about current major field work.

Items:

Group identity of students in informants department

Informants department rewards conformity, punishes individuality

Intellectual ability of students in your department

Informants division has too many ritualistic requirements

Certainty about major field decision

Informants academic standing in major department

Informant finds course work in major

Satisfaction with competence of major professors

Adequacy of major field courses and facilities

Prestige of major department

(SF) Satisfaction with Faculty:

High scores--instructors regarded as competent, fair, accessible, and interested in the problems of individual students.

Low scores--dissatisfaction with faculty and the general nature of student-faculty interaction.

Items:

Informants teachers past year; proportion judged superior

Informants enjoyment of courses compared to expectations

Success of teachers in challenging informant to capacity

Faculty who gave informant encouragement in field

Last years teachers who know informant by name

Faculty who seemed genuinely interested in students

Grades based on irrelevant factors rather than quality of work

Impression of instructors tolerance of student dissent

Judged competency of instructors in their field

Satisfaction with opportunities to talk with professors

(SA) Satisfaction with Administration:

High scores--satisfaction with both the nature of administrative authority over student behavior and

with personal interactions with various facets of the administration.

Low scores--a critical, perhaps contemptous view of an administration that is variously held to be arbitrary, impersonal, and/or overly paternal.

Items:

Most campus rules are logical and necessary

This college has too much authority over student life

Quality of assistance given by college deans

Courtesy and efficiency of college deans

Colleges assistance with education and vocational plans

Role of students in formulating regulations

Perceived fairness in enforcing rules

College treats students more like children than adults

Perceived inappropriate pressures on college

Feeling about policies on attendance

PLEASE NOTE:

Pages 136-179 "College Student Questionnaires, Part 1 and 2", © 1965 by Educational Testing Service, and pages 180-183 "Value Survey", © 1967 by Milton Rokeach, not microfilmed at request of author. Available for consultation at Michigan State University Library.

UNIVERSITY MICROFILMS

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Brown, Marjorie M. "Values in Home Economics." Journal of home Economics, 59 (December, 1967), pp. 769-775.

Chown, Alice A. "Effect of Some Social Changes on the Family." Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference. Lake Placid, New York, 1904, pp. 31-35.

Comparative Data for College Student Questionnaires Part 1. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1966.

Comparative Data for College Student Questionnaires Part 2. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

Constitution of the American Home Economics Association. Washington, D. C., 1952 and 1958.

Creekmore, Anna M. "The Concept Basic to Home Economics." Journal of Home Economics, 60 (February, 1968), pp. 93-99.

Cross, K. Patricia. "College Women: A Research Description." Journal of National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, 32 (Fall, 1968), pp. 12-21.

Dressel, Paul L. College and University Curriculum. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corporation, 1968.

Dressel, Paul L. and Lehmann, Irwin J. "The Impact of Higher Education on Student Attitudes, Values, and Critical Thinking Abilities." The Educational Record, 46 (Summer, 1965), pp. 248-258.

Graves, Patsy and Lyman, Richard B. "Values in Ferment." Journal of Home Economics, 61 (October, 1969), pp. 601-608.

Henderson, Charles R. "Social Conditions Affecting the Law of Domestic Life." Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference, Lake Placid, New York, 1904, pp. 61-70.

Home Economics New Directions. Prepared by the Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics. Washington, D. C.: American Home Economics Association, June, 1959.

Hughes, Everett C. "Professions." Daedalus, 92 (Fall, 1963), pp. 655-668.

Hurd, Helen G. "The Changing Society and Its Challenges." Journal of Home Economics, 55 (February, 1963), pp. 85-89.

Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings of the Third Annual Conference. (Report of Special Committee on home economics in elementary and secondary schools.) Lake Placid, New York, 1901, insert between pp. 120 and 121.

Lee, Jeanette A. and Dressel, Paul L. Liberal Education and Home Economics. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1963.

Lehmann, Irwin J.; Sinha, Birendra K.; and Hartnett, Rodney T. "Changes in Attitudes and Values Associated with College Attendance," Journal of Educational Psychology, 57 (April, 1966), pp. 89-98.

McGrath, Earl J. and Johnson, Jack T. The Changing Mission of Home Economics. New York: Institute of Higher Education, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1968.

Michigan State University College of Home Economics. "Internal Structure Reorganization and Name Change." East Lansing, Michigan: Unpublished report of the Committee on Reorganization and Name Change, April 28, 1970.

Michigan State University College of Home Economics. "Progress Report, Committee on Undergraduate Program Development." East Lansing, Michigan: Unpublished report of the Committee on Undergraduate Program Development, April 9, 1969.

Petersen, Richard E. College Student Questionnaires, Technical Manual. Princeton, New Jersey: Educational Testing Service, 1968.

Powell, Thomas F. "American Values--What Are They?" Social Education, 30 (February, 1966), pp. 83-87.

Quilling, Joan I. "The Nature of the Family Projected by the Home Economics Profession as Evidenced Through Examination of the American Home Economics Association Literature." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Michigan State University, 1970.

Rokeach, Milton. Beliefs, Attitudes, and Values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Rokeach, Milton. Value Survey. Lansing, Michigan: Jenca Associates, Testing Division, 1967.

Thomas, Walter L. "Values and American Youth." Journal of Home Economics, 61 (December, 1969), pp. 748-754.

Wood, Thomas D. "Some Controlling Ideals of the Family Life of the Future." Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference. Lake Placid, New York, 1904, pp. 25-31.