

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

----

COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS  
IN ALABAMA

Submitted by  
Christine Beasley

In partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Education  
Colorado State College  
of  
Agriculture and Mechanic Arts  
Fort Collins, Colorado

S-1-08A-20-02-029

August, 1943



U18400 9073995

LIBRARY  
COLORADO STATE COLLEGE OF A. & M. A  
FORT COLLINS COLORADO

378,788

AO

1944

4a

## ABSTRACT OF THESIS

Since coeducational home economics is relatively new in Alabama, and, therefore, is, more or less, in the experimental stage, this investigation was made to discover possibilities for improving the present coeducational home economics program in the state.

### The problem

What are the possibilities for improving the coeducational home economics program in Alabama?

Problem analysis.---The problem may be divided into the following questions:

1. What are the possibilities for improving the organization of the Alabama coeducational home economics program?
2. What are the possibilities for improving the content of the courses offered to coeducational home economics classes in Alabama?
3. What are the possibilities for improving the techniques for teaching coeducational home economics classes in Alabama?
4. What are the possibilities for improving the objectives for coeducational home economics classes in Alabama?

Delimitation of the problem.---This study will include 98 per cent of the vocational home economics teachers in the white secondary schools of Alabama for the year 1941-42.

The terms "coeducational class" and "joint class" will refer to the combination of vocational home economics and vocational agriculture classes, the two groups being taught together as one class.

The study will be limited further to only that part of the joint program which relates to the classroom teaching of home economics.

#### Methods and materials

The data for this study were collected from 203, or 98 per cent, of the home economics teachers in Alabama schools where both vocational home economics and vocational agriculture were taught during 1941-42. A check sheet regarding the organization, content, objectives, techniques, and opinions of teachers concerning the program was sent to each of these teachers. Interviews were held with a sampling of the teachers, and their opinions of the program as expressed orally were checked against their opinions as stated on the check sheet to determine the validity of such opinions.

It was decided that, if 60 per cent of the respondents had found a practice successful, the practice was of sufficient importance for the recommenda-

tion that schools offering coeducational home economics work should consider its use. If 60 per cent of the respondents expressed a like opinion concerning the program, it was assumed that this was a justifiable opinion and should be considered in forming recommendations for improving the present program.

### Findings

It was found that, in 64 per cent of the schools investigated, some time was spent during 1941-42 in the teaching of coeducational home economics. It was, however, the opinion of 80 per cent of the teachers that not enough time was given to this type of work. The size of the classes ranged from fewer than nine to above 70, and, in most cases, lasted one or two weeks. In expressing their opinions of the organization of these classes, 70 per cent of the teachers suggested that the agriculture teacher, on most days, should be present and take an active part in the class, but, stated 67 per cent, the boys should be allowed to meet with the home economics teacher alone for one or more class periods if possible.

Problems in practically every phase of home economics included in the Alabama course of study were taught coeducationally. The topics found to have been taught by 60 per cent or more of the teachers offering work in a unit on any one level were as follows:

"Etiquette", "Clothing Selection", "Care of Clothing", "Gardening", "First Aid", "Landscaping", and "Toys for Children".

Eleven methods were used by the various teachers for determining the topics for study. In the larger percentage (39 per cent), but by no means the majority, of the cases the agriculture teacher and the home economics teacher decided in conference what should be taught. Sixty-one per cent of the teachers stated that they believed students should be given more voice in the selection of content for the classes.

A summary of the techniques considered successful for teaching coeducational home economics showed that "Discussion" was considered effective more often than any other method. "Discussion" was mentioned as being successful 194 times, "Demonstration" 112 times, and "Laboratory" 96 times. Twenty-one other methods were named as effective.

*Do they  
do some  
things about  
it after work?*

Forty-two per cent of the teachers stating general objectives hoped to improve the relations between the two departments, and 32 per cent hoped to encourage joint home and school projects. The specific objectives stated related to the individual units taught. More than 40 per cent of those stating objectives for the "Personal Relations" unit included "developing social graces" and "understanding boy-girl

problems"; 71 per cent of those stating "Clothing" objectives planned to develop skill in caring for clothes; and more than 40 per cent of those stating "Foods" objectives related their aims to home food supply and nutrition. The number of teachers listing any one objective for the other units was not significant.

Sixty-seven per cent of teachers who gave their opinions of the Alabama coeducational home economics program believed that there should be materials in the state course of study concerning joint classes in home economics.

#### Recommendations

In view of these findings the following recommendations were made concerning the possibilities for improving the coeducational home economics program in Alabama:

1. More emphasis should be given to home economics for boys.
2. The organization of a coeducational home economics class should be a cooperative enterprise between the two vocational teachers and the administration.
3. Both vocational teachers should usually be present and take an active part in the daily lesson.
4. Some time should be provided, perhaps a day or two, when the home economics teacher may meet the boys alone.

boys and  
the use of  
program.

5. Careful plans should be made before the class is organized to insure the effective teaching of a joint class possibly twice as large as the ordinary home economics class of girls.
6. Planning should be directed toward producing desired outcomes in a limited field rather than toward a hurried sampling of factors in several different areas.
- ✓ 7. The content of the coeducational home economics classes might well be planned by the home-making teacher in conference with the agriculture teacher, the principal, and student representatives.
8. It should be remembered that the technique most successful for the teaching of any one class is dependent on the topic to be studied, the objectives of the class, the equipment available, the skills and personality of the teacher, and the personality of the class members. No one technique can be accepted as successful for the teaching of any one class; a combination of several methods will always prove more successful.
9. If definite aims and outcomes for the class are set up before it is begun, it is much more likely that the teaching will have meaning and interest for the student than if such objectives are not formulated.
10. Both general and specific objectives should relate to the development of the student, rather than to any relationship between the two departments or to any other secondary issue.
11. Materials in the state course of study concerning coeducational home economics would be of value to teachers in the state.

LIBRARY -  
COLORADO STATE COLLEGE OF A. & M.  
FORT COLLINS, COLORADO

THESIS

---

COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS  
IN ALABAMA

Submitted by  
Christine Beasley

In partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of Master of Education  
Colorado State College  
of  
Agriculture and Mechanic Arts  
Fort Collins, Colorado

August, 1943

LIBRARY  
COLORADO STATE COLLEGE OF A. & M. A.  
FORT COLLINS COLORADO

378.788

AD

1944

f

COLORADO STATE COLLEGE

OF

AGRICULTURE AND MECHANIC ARTS

=

August 21 1943

I HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY  
SUPERVISION BY CHRISTINE BEASLEY  
ENTITLED COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS IN ALABAMA

BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE  
DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

MAJORING IN HOME ECONOMICS EDUCATION

CREDITS 3

Maud Williamson

In Charge of Thesis

APPROVED Maud Williamson

Head of Department

Examination Satisfactory

Committee on Final Examination

Kate Wherry

Elizabeth Riner

Raman E. Elliott

Maud Williamson

W. E. Dawson

Dean of the Graduate School

Permission to publish this thesis or any part of it  
must be obtained from the Dean of the Graduate School.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge with grateful appreciation the assistance of Dr. Maude Williamson, Associate Professor of Home Economics Education, Colorado State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, and that of Dr. David H. Morgan, Thesis Advisor, Colorado State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, in the writing of this study.

Appreciation is also expressed to Miss Mary Ling Hayley, State Supervisor of Home Economics in Alabama, and to the district supervisors of home economics in the state for their interest and constructive criticisms, and to both them and the home-making teachers in Alabama for their gracious cooperation in the collection of data for the study.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION - - - - -	10
The problem - - - - -	13
Problem analysis - - - - -	13
Delimitation of the problem - - - - -	13
CHAPTER II: REVIEW OF LITERATURE - - - - -	15
Need of boys for home economics - - - - -	15
Segregated or joint classes - - - - -	18
Organization - - - - -	22
Objectives - - - - -	24
Content - - - - -	27
Activities and techniques - - - - -	31
Evaluation - - - - -	33
Summary and implications - - - - -	36
CHAPTER III: METHODS AND MATERIALS - - - - -	38
CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS OF DATA - - - - -	41
Organization of classes for coeducational home economics - - - - -	41
Content of coeducational home economics courses - - - - -	46
Units - - - - -	46
Topics - - - - -	51
Methods for selecting topics - - - - -	61
Techniques considered successful for teaching coeducational home economics - - -	63
Objectives for coeducational home economics classes - - - - -	75

## TABLE OF CONTENTS--Continued

	Page
CHAPTER IV: ANALYSIS OF DATA--Continued	
Opinions of coeducational home economics teachers concerning program - - - - -	83
Comparison of opinions expressed in questionnaire and interview - - - - -	92
CHAPTER V: DISCUSSION - - - - -	98
Organization of classes - - - - -	99
Content of courses - - - - -	104
Techniques - - - - -	108
Objectives - - - - -	109
Implications - - - - -	110
CHAPTER VI: SOURCE MATERIALS FOR COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS IN ALABAMA - - - - -	112
Organization of coeducational classes - - - -	113
Content of courses for coeducational classes - - - - -	114
Suggestions for handling large coeducational classes - - - - -	125
CHAPTER VII: SUMMARY - - - - -	129
APPENDIX - - - - -	134
BIBLIOGRAPHY - - - - -	162

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. STATUS OF COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHING IN 208 SCHOOLS IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	43
2. SIZE OF COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	44
3. LENGTH OF TIME DEVOTED TO TEACHING COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	45
4. UNITS INCLUDED ENTIRELY OR PARTIALLY IN COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHING IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	47
5. LEVELS OF HOME ECONOMICS IN WHICH VARIOUS UNITS WERE TAUGHT ENTIRELY OR PARTIALLY TO COEDUCATIONAL CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	50
6. TOPICS TAUGHT IN "PERSONAL RELATIONS" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	52
7. TOPICS TAUGHT IN "CLOTHING" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	54
8. TOPICS TAUGHT IN "FOODS" TO CO- EDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	55
9. TOPICS TAUGHT IN "HEALTH" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	56
10. TOPICS TAUGHT IN "HOME MANAGEMENT" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	57
11. TOPICS TAUGHT IN "HOUSE" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	58

17

LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
12. TOPICS TAUGHT IN "FAMILY RELATIONS" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	59
13. TOPICS TAUGHT IN "CHILD DEVELOPMENT" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	60
14. OTHER TOPICS TAUGHT TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	61
15. METHODS BY WHICH TOPICS FOR STUDY IN COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA WERE SELECTED DURING 1941-42 -----	62
16. TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING "PERSONAL RELATIONS" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	64
17. TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING "CLOTHING" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	66
18. TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING "FOODS" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	67
19. TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING "HEALTH" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	68

## LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
20. TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING "HOME MANAGEMENT" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 ----	69
21. TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING "HOUSE" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	71
22. TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING "FAMILY RELATIONS" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	72
23. TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING "CHILD DEVELOPMENT" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	72
24. TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING OTHER UNITS TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	73
25. TECHNIQUES USED MOST FREQUENTLY IN TEACHING COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42 -----	74
26. GENERAL OBJECTIVES FOR COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS AS GIVEN BY 19 TEACHERS IN ALABAMA, 1941-42 -----	76
27. SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES FOR TEACHING THE VARIOUS UNITS IN COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS, AS GIVEN BY 56 TEACHERS IN ALABAMA, 1941-42 -----	79

## LIST OF TABLES--Continued

Table	Page
28. OPINIONS OF 121 VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS OF ALABAMA CONCERNING COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAM IN 1941-42 -----	90
29. OPINIONS OF 18 VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS OF ALABAMA OBTAINED THROUGH PERSONAL INTERVIEW COMPARED WITH OPINIONS OF SAME TEACHERS OBTAINED FROM CHECK SHEET -----	95

## Chapter I

### INTRODUCTION

It is readily recognized that a satisfying home life is necessary to the preservation of any civilization; and there is perhaps no greater service which one can contribute to his community than the building of a happy, successful family. Such a home is built, not by the works of one person alone, but by the combined efforts of every member of the family, and men as well as women function in the building and maintaining of successful family life. If the enterprise is to be cooperative, there must be adequate education of all family members toward this end. Many states, realizing this, are now accepting responsibility for the training of both boys and girls in home living.

Home economics in Alabama began with the training of girls in the fundamentals of cooking and sewing. Gradually the need for training in other phases of homemaking was recognized and the program was enlarged to include these phases. Educators in the state then realized the need for training boys in some phases of home economics and training girls

in some phases of the vocational program offered to boys. This realization gradually led to the practice of home economics teachers and agriculture teachers exchanging classes for a short time during the year, a procedure which became generally accepted as part of the Alabama vocational program.

It was then observed that since both groups needed training in some of the same problems, a combination of the classes for the study of common problems would be possible. During 1937-38 several schools were selected to teach, experimentally, a vocational program allowing for a combination of the home economics and agriculture classes during short periods of time for a study of mutual problems. At the beginning of the year, during a conference with the principal, the home economics teacher and the agriculture teacher in each of these schools studied each other's plan of work for the year and decided what units or topics, which they had planned to teach, would be of mutual interest to both groups and to what extent a joint teaching of these topics would strengthen both the agriculture and home economics programs. It was then so arranged that the two classes could meet together for the length of time required to study these problems. During the periods of joint study it was the policy for both the home economics and the agriculture teacher to meet

with the class and do as much joint teaching as possible. The units taught jointly in this fashion usually lasted anywhere from three days to three weeks, and in most of the schools there were several such units in each of the three vocational classes during the year.

After a favorable report of these experiments was made to groups of vocational teachers at the School of Instruction and at the annual meeting of the Alabama Education Association, additional departments adopted and used the program successfully in their schools.

Thus from observation and experimentation the philosophy was evolved that, in most cases, boys should receive their home economics training in classes with girls; and joint classes in home economics became a definite part of the vocational program in Alabama. It is, however, the generally accepted belief that, in special cases, boys should still be taught home economics in segregated groups, but, even then, with the view of teaching some problems to the boys and girls jointly when it seems advisable.

Coeducational home economics is still new in Alabama, and, therefore, is, more or less, in the experimental stage. A study of what the teachers in the state are now doing, what educational departments in other states include in their program, and what

authorities in the field believe about coeducational home economics should serve to give the teachers in Alabama some ideas for adapting their coeducational home economics teaching to the needs and interests of the students.

### The problem

What are the possibilities for improving the coeducational home economics program in Alabama?

Problem analysis.--The problem may be divided into the following questions:

1. What are the possibilities for improving the organization of the Alabama coeducational home economics program?
2. What are the possibilities for improving the content of the courses offered to coeducational home economics classes in Alabama?
3. What are the possibilities for improving the techniques for teaching coeducational home economics classes in Alabama?
4. What are the possibilities for improving the objectives for coeducational home economics classes in Alabama?

Delimitation of the problem.--This study will include 98 per cent of the vocational home economics teachers in the white secondary schools of Alabama for the year 1941-42.

The terms "coeducational class" and "joint class" will refer to the combination of vocational home economics and vocational agriculture classes, the two groups being taught together as one class.

The study will be limited further to only that part of the joint program which relates to the classroom teaching of home economics.

## Chapter II

### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Homemaking for boys has been recognized since 1916, according to a publication of the Kansas State Board of Vocational Education (13), when the first class of which there is record was organized in Albany, Indiana. Though the movement is 25 years old, it did not receive serious consideration until it was found in 1925 that there were classes in 42 states.

#### Need of boys for home economics

In spite of its rapid development and widespread practice at present, authorities are still called on to justify their position concerning the need of boys for training in home economics. In the past, according to Helen D. Redford (30) in 1937, too much of education for home and family living was left to chance, and now society is paying enormous prices for this neglect. She said also:

Since changing conditions have made it imperative that all members of the family, regardless of sex, should have an appreciation and understanding of the meaning of home and family, the boys have gradually been drawn into the field of home economics education (30:55).

That men are taking an active part in home life, and that they are realizing their inadequacies, was shown by Fern Kauffman-Springer (14) in 1939, when she asked 160 boys and 102 fathers for suggested materials to be included in a homemaking course for boys. Her study showed that two thirds of the fathers had participated in homemaking activities and that they had been forced to learn by the "trial and error" method.

In 1939, during an address to the National Education Association on the practices and implications of homemaking education for boys and men, Essie L. Elliott (5) said:

We find ample justification for home-making education in three important realms, namely, the social, the economic, and the biologic (5:487).

Fay Mack Scharmer (31), who considered the definition of education by Dr. John G. Higgen, "the ability to meet life's situations", an adequate one, stated in 1940 several reasons why boys should receive home economics training. Parents are often too busy to train their children in etiquette and the finer things of life; the parents themselves have not had the training; the parents are not abreast with the progress of the world and are not aware that the children are living in a different world with different obstacles to overcome; and in some homes children are less likely to

listen to their parents than to their teachers. Boys probably need this training and development even more than girls, she said, because, in addition to needing it for successful home life, they need it for earning a living.

In 1940, Florence Davis (4) made a comparative study of a group of girls and a parallel group of boys living in home management houses at Alabama Polytechnic Institute to determine differences in attitudes, abilities, and aptitudes between boys and girls doing the same work. She found that boys and girls ranked about the same in table service, that boys entertained more frequently and with greater evident pleasure, that the living room was more the center of family life in the masculine household, that washing dishes was the slowest and least popular task for the boys, that girls followed time schedules more readily, and that marketing, though not at first important to boys, soon became an interesting factor. Because of masculine interest and an inquiring attitude, the boys used the electric washer and ironer, though doing the house laundry was the only duty required of girls but not of boys.

It was found, also, that boys were very much interested in and felt the responsibility for the care of the nine months old baby who was a part of the household. They brushed his hair down flat instead of

into curls as the girls did; they taught him to say "daddy" instead of "mama". In making the baby's formula, planning his daily schedule, and giving him intelligent care, there seemed to be no appreciable difference between the two groups. The conclusion was drawn, after having had boys in the home management residence, that this course is one which boys need just as much as girls and one to which they readily adapt themselves.

Frances Schneider Goldsmith and Helen McClanathan (8), in a study of adolescent attitudes, made the following statement in 1942:

The majority of home economics teachers are coming to believe that it is desirable to teach home economics to classes of boys or boys and girls together, just as a generation ago they believed that such work should be offered to girls only. If education for personal and family life is fundamentally important, it should be available to boys and men as well as to girls and women (8:92).

All of the above writers seemed to agree that one of the greatest services which any individual can contribute to his community and to society is the building of a happy home, and that, if homemaking is to be a cooperative enterprise, appropriate education for the responsibilities of all its members is needed.

#### Segregated or joint classes

The point on which authorities have not agreed is the type of class in which the boys shall

be taught home economics. It is a point of contention as to whether it should be taught to boys in a segregated group or in a mixed class of boys and girls.

An experiment was made in the Central High School of Tulsa, Oklahoma, in 1936, to determine the possibilities for mixed classes in family relationships. Maude E. Firth (7) reported the following comments that were made by students at the end of the unit:

Working together, we girls know exactly what the boys think on a subject, whereas if we were in a class by ourselves we would just guess what they thought and probably think it up to suit our own fancy, and when we did find the truth it would be like breaking a dream house.

You can deal better with social problems in a mixed group.

If the sexes are ever going to get along together, they need to work together (7:53).

To determine to what extent coeducation is desirable in home economics, Helen D. Redford (30) in 1937, asked a group of Junior and Senior high school students what they considered to be the advantages and disadvantages in a mixed class in home economics.

It was the consensus of the Junior high school pupils that a mixed class would help them to make better adjustments. The Senior high school pupils felt that it would help solve boy and girl relationships and bring about, through a mutual exchange of ideas, a better understanding of the problems that confront them. The disadvantages suggested embodied the idea that some subjects would not be discussed so freely as they should because of the fact that there is likely to

be some embarrassment when topics of an intimate nature arise (30:551).

Nell Pelphry (26) conducted an experiment in the Lancaster High School of Kentucky, in 1937, to help determine whether homemaking should be taught to segregated groups or to mixed groups. She concluded that it is worthwhile to teach home economics to boys, that boys alone are not as self conscious as they are with girls, and that discipline with boys alone is no problem because they do not try to hide their slowness to learn, poor writing, and awkwardness as is the case where they are taught in mixed groups.

Ivol Spafford (34), in 1938, favored segregated groups during all classes except in the Junior and Senior years. Her conclusions were based on several facts: that boys and girls mature at different ages; that there is a difference in their interests; that the content and method used in mixed classes is influenced by practices developed for teaching girls alone; that girls are called on most often and they have a better use of the home economics vocabulary. She suggested, however, that boys do need the point of view of the other sex, but not necessarily that of their own grade group.

At the 1938 Nebraska state conference for vocational teachers (20) it was suggested that the

content of the course for the mixed class would determine its success. Because boys do not like to discuss personal problems freely before girls and because they cannot look impersonally at their problems, joint classes are not successful unless the subject matter is limited to such impersonal aspects as housing, finance, buying, safety, health, recreation, etc.

Henrietta Straub (35), after sending a questionnaire to home economics supervisors and making an extensive survey in New York and Colorado, found during 1938 that in most cases mixed classes for boys and girls were favored.

An investigation by Romaine Nicholson (21) of 24 courses of study indicated in 1940 that:

No consensus of opinion could be found on the question of opening classes in home economics or human relations to both boys and girls. Each school trying either segregated classes or mixed groups favored whatever plan they had tried (21:6).

Ruth Rick Miller (17), in a study of a coeducational home economics problem in Wisconsin, stated in 1940 that in most classes the coeducational units were successful for adults and that there appeared to be a growing interest in such classes. She also stated that the attitude of educators toward the future development of coeducational home economics classes seemed encouraging.

Williamson and Lyle (37), in the 1941 edition of their text for teachers, said:

Each teacher usually feels her own way, and in many cases plans cooperatively with her group. Perhaps we may accept the judgment of three boys who were discussing the question with a group of home economics teachers. An eighth-grade boy said he thought that boys and girls should study home life together because they lived together at home and worked together there. A ninth-grade boy said that he thought boys should study separately from girls because they had more fun that way. But a senior boy said that he thought some things should be studied together, but other things they should study separately because boys could talk some problems over more freely if they were alone (37:332-3).

### Organization

Much variety was found in the literature concerning the organization of classes, the length of the unit, the time allotted per week, the name of the course, and other points in which the course for boys might be different from the usual course given to girls.

V. G. Moser (19), an agriculture teacher during 1934, described a plan in which the home economics teacher and the agriculture teacher exchanged classes for a week. He found this very successful the year it was tried in his school. Scott Hoskinson (9), another agriculture teacher, reported in 1937 that he had tried the same plan with an exchange period of six weeks and had found it successful during the four years in which he had tried it.

In the annual descriptive report of the Kansas Board for Vocational Education for the year 1938 (11), it was stated that three out of the five schools which offered homemaking to boys gave it as a one-year course with 40-60 minutes each day, two offered it for 120 minutes daily for one semester, and one school called it a club and met once a week for 60 minutes.

In 1938, Ruth Cooley Cowles (3) reported that Cranston, Rhode Island, offered a class to boys for one year which met four times a week with an hour for each meeting and gave one half credit.

According to Ivol Spafford (34), non-laboratory courses for boys and girls together were being developed in Michigan, in 1938; Kalamazoo, Michigan, offered work in the tenth grade under the name of "Personal and Social Problems". It was also in 1938 that Louisiana (16) set up units of work for one or two semesters for which high school credit was given on the usual basis.

Winnetka, Illinois, according to Margaret Prichard (28), in 1938, introduced home economics to the sixth-grade and the seventh-grade boys and girls. The students spent five weeks in each of art, science, shop, art shop, printing, and homemaking to give them experiences in various fields and to make them better able to choose their work for later years. This type

of program they called "Survey".

The findings of a committee organized for the study of home economics for boys were reported by Henrietta Straub (35) in 1938. Questionnaires were sent to state home economics supervisors. The replies mentioned 200 home economics classes for boys with a total enrollment of around 6,000. The ideal number for a class was considered to be 20 and the duration to be for one semester. The majority of the respondents thought the course should be elective.

M. C. Noll (22) attempted in 1939 to determine the needs of the Junior high school boys in various phases of home economics through an interpretation of their expressed interests. He found that boys in the seventh grade were most interested in all phases of home economics; those in the eighth grade were interested to a fair degree; those in the ninth grade were interested only in cooking; and that a course in home economics would fit boys of all grades and all mental levels without difficulty.

### Objectives

The South Dakota Department of Public Instruction (33) stated that the aim of a semester course to be offered to Junior and Senior boys of Dell Rapids was to meet the needs of the high school boy so as to make him a happier, more capable, and more

useful member of family and community life, and to ascertain these needs by analyzing the activities which the young man performs in normal life.

Henrietta K. Straub (36), in 1936, gave the following general objectives for classes of boys, formulated by a committee composed of authorities on work with boys:

1. To give information in social behavior.
2. To give information in home economics subjects.
3. To give consumer education.
4. To give practice in the above with the hope that some contribution may be made in aiding personal adjustments to school, home, and society as they find it today (36:539).

In comparing the objectives of classes for boys and girls she said:

The specific objectives are not so different from those for girls, but a difference is made in the emphasis, except in the home and family problems, where there should be unification of point of view (36:540).

In a bulletin published by the Kansas State Board for Vocational Education (13), in 1938, it was suggested that it is not easy to develop behavior patterns that will fit the boy to make maximum contributions, to the success of his present and future home, and that it is not sufficient to teach just skills and knowledge. Teachers must go further, to

attitudes, tastes, habits, ideals and appreciations. They must help the boy develop and maintain a standard of living and be able to adjust to changing environment.

In summarizing his feelings concerning home economics for boys, A. M. Field (6) in 1938 made the following statement:

It would seem that the most important thing to consider in connection with exchange classes for boys in home economics is that the boys get something from the course that will prove helpful to them and that they will enjoy. ... The work should be made as practical, specific, and concrete as possible (6:206).

In a Home Economics Bulletin issued by the Indiana State Department of Education (10), during 1938, an outline for a course in home economics for boys was presented. Its objectives included the ability to practice good manners, to plan, purchase, prepare and serve simple meals, to select and purchase practical clothing, to care for clothing, and to use sound business in operating the home; an appreciation of correct table service and of the importance of nutrition; an understanding of food consumer problems; and a realization of the importance of good appearance and personality.

The objectives of a basic home economics course given to all seniors in some of the high schools of Los Angeles were stated by Ellen Milligan (18) in 1939:

1. To establish proper home relationships.
2. To establish wholesome attitudes between the sexes.
3. To acquaint the student with his responsibilities to the school, the home, and the community.
4. To build a well rounded personality.
5. To develop the social graces.
6. To teach proper etiquette and behavior in school, in public places, and in the home.
7. To understand a balanced diet.
8. To entertain inexpensively in the home (18:315).

Johnie Christian (2), who in 1940 made a study of the possibilities for reconstruction of home economics in secondary education, suggested that the major objective for a homemaking class should be the realization of a more democratic social order. An example of a specific objective of this type is shown in her suggestion that the horizon of the pupil should be extended to the point where improved diets and wholesome food would be seen as a goal toward which the nation should strive.

### Content

In a Kansas course of study (12) published in 1936 a suggested curriculum for the instruction of boys in home economics included units of work in house,

nutrition, etiquette, food preparation, carving and serving, camp cookery, and clothing selection.

Helen D. Redford (30) reported in 1937 the findings from a study to determine the content of units for boys and girls in home economics classes:

According to the junior high school pupils, the course should include things that a person comes in contact with every day; things that are necessary for social, physical and mental health; how to appreciate things that are around you and that people do for you; budgeting; food study; and how to get along with others. The senior high school students included in their list etiquette, money, general sex information, getting along with others, marriage, meaning of a family and a home, personal development, child care, boy and girl relations, selecting a partner in marriage, personal habits and appearance, how to make a living, making friends, food in relation to health and consumer problems (30:551).

It is agreed that what to teach boys depends on the needs of boys as individuals and as members of families. Their needs are in general in the same areas as the needs of the girls. Maurine Smith Pierce (27), in a study of the homemaking responsibilities of certain high school boys contrasted with the homemaking responsibilities of younger married men in the same area, found in 1938 that homemaking acts were performed by both boys and men occasionally rather than regularly. A large number bought clothing, food, and personal and family supplies, were responsible for the care of the house and its repair, and, where there were children in

the family, helped with their care. A relatively small number were responsible for the care and repair of their clothing and somewhat more with personal grooming activities. More men than boys assumed responsibility for personal and family financing, first aid, and home care of the sick, and helped regularly with the food preparation. More boys than men took care of the yards and garden.

In the 1938 annual state conference, the Nebraska Department of Vocational Education (20) suggested that a teacher may best learn the needs of the boy, and thus what to teach him, as she does those of the girl, by becoming acquainted with his parents and his home and by observing boys in the school.

The Oklahoma State Department of Education (23) suggested in a bulletin written in 1939 by A. L. Crable and Mary Russel, an outline for a homemaking course for boys. They included units on house, family and community relations, clothing, health, social courtesies, and foods.

Pauline Braly (1) made a study of content of courses for boys in home economics in 10 high schools of Texas for 1939-40. She found that a unit in clothing appeared most often in the courses; it was taught in nine of the 10 schools. A unit in family relationships was taught in eight schools, foods units appeared in

eight schools, and units in housing and in courtesy and manners appeared in courses from six of the 10 schools. Other units used in one or two schools were as follows: consumer education, physical and mental health, home management, and household mechanics.

Romaine Nicholson (21) made an investigation during 1940 of the content of 24 courses of study developed for school boys over the nation. She found that the core topics appearing most often were the following:

1. Human and home relations.
2. Personal development, including personality study and manners.
3. Clothing and appearance.
4. Nutrition, or foods for health.
5. Family and personal finance (21:6).

In 1937, Nell Pelphry (26) suggested that the units should be attacked from the standpoint of creating interests, desires, understanding, appreciations, and should include only a few manipulative processes.

In 1938, the Kansas State Board of Vocational Education (13) stated that since short units were definite, understandable, interesting, adaptable, and convenient to use, they were more desirable than long units.

### Activities and techniques

Margaret Prichard (28) developed during 1938 three rules to be used as guides in the selection of materials and procedures to be used in joint boy and girl classes:

1. School experiences in homemaking need to be developed so that all members of the group feel their responsibility as contributors and also appreciate the worth of the contributions of other members.
2. Experiences must be so guided as to build understanding, tolerance, and ability for boys and girls to work, play and think together in terms of mutually determined values.
3. Education in school for home and family living should be increasingly aware of opportunities through which the children may share in the selection of goods and services in terms of both quantities and values; it should make conscious effort to use the materials and equipment in new and more satisfying ways; it should constantly make opportunities to help children understand and appreciate the money value of knowledge and work (28:319).

Ivol Spafford (34) made the statement in 1938 that whatever is good teaching for girls is good teaching for boys, even though the types of activities in which they are most interested may vary.

In a vocational homemaking bulletin published by the Kansas State Board of Vocational Education (13), in 1938, some ideas for teaching boys were included. The methods to be used for teaching boys, they stated, were the same as those for girls. An effort should be made, however, through choice of subject matter and

method of approach and presentation to interpret homemaking education in terms of boys and men, and more work should be planned for boys, because they are able to cover more ground in a given amount of time than are girls, they suggested.

In a bulletin published by the Nebraska Department of Vocational Education (20), in 1938, it was stated that boys learn the same way as girls do, that the problem method is excellent for use with either sex or with mixed groups, that boys are not as patient as girls, and that class work must be worthwhile in the opinion of the boys and must engage their interest throughout the class period.

Freddie S. Link (15), who made a study in 1940 of attitudes of boys and girls toward certain social problems, made the following statement concerning methods and procedures for teaching mixed classes:

Teachers have been handicapped because there is only a small amount of reliable information available that will give satisfactory answers to the questions asked by the pupils, who are not interested in what social theories advocate, but in what the opposite sex of their own age think (15:10).

From professional books on education and recent periodicals, Romaine Nicholson (21) found during 1940 a list of methods and techniques adaptable for presenting home economics with human relations emphasis to boys alone or to a mixed group:

1. Case studies
2. Committee technique
3. Conference
4. Contracts
5. Debates
6. Demonstrations
7. Displays
8. Dramatics
9. Entertaining
10. Forum
11. Group organization
12. Interviews
13. Laboratory
14. Lectures
15. Library
16. Notebooks
17. Panel
18. Problem method
19. Projects
20. Reports
21. Reviews
22. Round table
23. Seminar
24. Supervised study
25. Symposium
26. Tours (21:7)

### Evaluation

Some effort has been made to evaluate the home economics work done with boys. Laura Frances Ray (29), in 1938, attempted to discover what changes in attitudes and practices related to care and selection of clothing and personal grooming were produced in boys who received instruction in home economics. Her findings showed that changes in attitudes were too small to be significant when measured by the Kellar Attitude Scale and that there was no significant difference between the instructed group and the control group in the selection of

clothing and in personal grooming. She found also that boys receiving home economics instruction were influenced to a highly significant extent to think they should care for their clothing and that they exhibited a tendency to do more of it. She stated that changes in practice which might be attributed to the home economics course were not great enough to be measured.

A study of the attitudes of boys toward certain family relations before and after instruction was made by Frances Schneider (32) in 1938. She found that the majority, before instruction, had attitudes regarded as desirable by adult experts. Their attitudes on the sharing of family resources and pleasure, the need for being honest with shortcomings, and the right of a boy to have certain privileges and to make his own decisions were the same before and after instruction. Money viewpoints were changed very little by instruction. The greatest changes in the desired direction were a willingness to discuss common problems with the family and to share in home tasks and in the social activities of the family.

An evaluation of a course by students is often as valuable as that by an instructor or an authority. Douglas Parkinson (25), a student who had been enrolled in a mixed home economics class in the

Blackfoot High School of Idaho in 1938, stated that after he had been enrolled in the class for some time he began to realize there was a great deal more to homemaking than preparing three meals a day. He made, also, the following statement:

The most important lesson I learned from this unit was the idea that good manners are not based upon stuffy rules and the use of the correct piece of silverware, but upon a courtesy and consideration for other people which can be developed only through everyday practice.

I can now concentrate my efforts on enjoying my food and talking at the table rather than wondering if I am doing the right thing.

I am glad that Blackfoot High School realized that boys are homemakers as well as girls and gave us an opportunity to discuss our problems together (25:328).

The principal of the Blackfoot High School, W. C. Park (24), gave at the same time his impressions of the course and its results:

The class as a whole is marked by the better taste of its members' dress and unobtrusive good manners.

We who are responsible for the high school curricula are too prone to overlook the tremendous value of that which is immediately applicable to the student's life. Perhaps if we did more towards helping them solve their now-and-here problems we'd be helping them more permanently than we realize. These boys and girls reflect in their attitude in their daily living in school and out, the things they learn in home economics. My belief is that this is the purpose of education (24:332).

### Summary and implications

Authorities in the field of general and home economics education have agreed that boys need home economics. It is yet a point of contention as to whether this training should be given them in segregated classes or in coeducational classes. A slight leaning toward the coeducational classes may be noted.

General objectives noted for coeducational home economics or home economics for boys related to the development of the student and his relationships in the areas of personal, social, economic and civic living. The specific objectives for such classes were not so different from those of girls, though some differences in emphasis may have been made.

Authorities have agreed that the content of a course for boys or for a mixed class will depend on the needs of the individuals. As one group of students stated, the course should include things that a person comes in contact with every day.

Activities and techniques found to be used for the teaching of boys or mixed groups were no different from those used for the teaching of girls alone. In most cases, however, more work had to be included for mixed classes than for classes of girls, and more varied activities were necessary for boys than for girls.

Both authorities and students attempting to evaluate home economics work for boys found that it resulted in improved attitudes and behavior on the part of the individuals enrolled.

These studies point to a steadily growing demand for home economics training for boys since early in the century. Home economics education for boys cannot be said to be a new child of education, but it is definitely no further advanced than adolescence; and like all individuals of that age it is suffering from an unequal growth of its parts and a strained attempt to attain the semblance of adulthood. It is up to us as educators to look at the problem sanely, profit by the successes and mistakes of those before us, and offer our stint of study with the hope that ere long our educational system will offer to boys and men the training they so definitely need for home and family living.

### Chapter III

#### METHODS AND MATERIALS

To determine possibilities for improvement of the coeducational home economics program in Alabama, it was necessary to obtain information concerning the practices and opinions of the teachers throughout the state. A questionnaire <sup>1/</sup> was devised to give information on the following problems:

1. The amount of home economics work that was offered to joint classes in Alabama during 1941-42.
2. The units in which coeducational classes were taught in Alabama during 1941-42.
3. The topics that were included in each of the units taught to joint classes in Alabama during 1941-42.
4. The method by which topics for study in coeducational home economics classes in Alabama were selected during 1941-42.
5. The activities and techniques which were successfully used in coeducational home economics classes in the state for the year 1941-42.
6. The objectives for coeducational home economics classes in Alabama for 1941-42.
7. The opinions of the 1941-42 home economics teachers concerning the Alabama program for coeducational home economics.

---

<sup>1/</sup> See appendix for copy of questionnaire

After the questionnaire was completed it was submitted with the plans for the study to the supervisor of vocational home economics in Alabama, to two district supervisors of home economics, and to two teachers of vocational homemaking in the high schools of the state for their criticism and suggestions. Plans for the study were also presented to the state supervisor of vocational agriculture for his suggestions and approval.

The questionnaire, with a letter explaining the study, was sent, toward the end of the year, to each of the 230 vocational homemaking teachers in the state. Data were obtained from 98 per cent of these teachers. It was found that in 22 of the schools no vocational agriculture program existed, and, therefore, there was no opportunity for combining a home economics and agriculture class for coeducational work. No information was obtained from five teachers in the state. The study, therefore, included the work of the remaining 203 vocational home economics teachers in Alabama.

To check the validity of the opinions of homemaking teachers regarding the state coeducational program, a personal interview was held with a sampling of those teachers who had expressed their opinions of the program on the questionnaire. The same proposed

opinions as were presented in the questionnaire were used in the interview and the respondents were asked to give their reaction, "yes", "no", or "undecided", orally while the interviewer checked the responses on the same form as was used for the questionnaire 2/. A comparison was then made of the opinions of each teacher as expressed in the interview with those recorded on the questionnaire.

The data collected pointed to successful practices in the selection of subject matter, activities and techniques, and objectives for coeducational home economics in Alabama. It was decided that, if 60 per cent of the respondents had found a practice successful, the practice was of sufficient importance for the recommendation that schools offering joint home economics work should consider its use. If 60 per cent of the respondents expressed a like opinion concerning the present program, it was assumed that this was a justifiable opinion and should be considered in forming recommendations for improving the present program.

---

2/ See appendix for questionnaire form and interview sheet.

## Chapter IV

### ANALYSIS OF DATA

The data collected for this study will be analyzed and presented according to the following outline:

1. Organization of classes for coeducational home economics.
2. Content of coeducational home economics courses.
3. Techniques considered successful for teaching coeducational home economics.
4. Objectives for coeducational home economics classes.
5. Opinions of coeducational home economics teachers concerning program.
6. Comparison of opinions expressed in questionnaire and interview.

#### Organization of classes for coeducational home economics

Of the 230 vocational homemaking teachers in Alabama, 22 were in schools where vocational agriculture was not offered, and were, therefore, ineligible for the study. A majority of the remaining 208 spent some

portion of their time in teaching home economics to coeducational classes during 1941-42 (Table 1). Sixty-four per cent of the teachers taught coeducational classes in the usual manner; namely, the agriculture class and the home economics class, which were scheduled at the same period, met jointly instead of separately to consider some problems that were vital to both groups. It may be noted that a larger number of these classes were held in first year home economics than in either of the other years. A little less than half of the teachers offered joint work in Home Economics II, and less than one third did any joint teaching in Home Economics III. A special type of coeducational teaching was done by two teachers in the state; about one third of the teachers in the study taught no coeducational home economics.

The unusual size of the class when the home economics and the agriculture vocational classes were combined was a problem dealt with differently by the individual teachers. The combined classes ranged in size from fewer than nine to above 70 (Table 2). In most of the classes ranging from five to 50 the students were allowed to meet and work together. One class in which there were more than 70 enrolled, another with 65 to 69, one with five to nine and several ranging from 30 to 35 were divided into two sections to facilitate

Table 1.--STATUS OF COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHING IN 208 SCHOOLS IN ALABAMA  
DURING 1941-42

TYPE OF COEDUCATIONAL CLASSES	STATUS BY CLASSES HOME ECONOMICS						GENERAL STATUS	
	I		II		III		Num- ber	Per Cent
	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent		
Usual coeducational class -----	102	49.0	94	45.2	64	30.8	133	63.9
Special type of coeducational class ---	2	1.0	2	1.0	2	1.0	2	1.0
No coeducational class ---	99	47.6	107	51.4	137	65.8	68	32.7
No information -----	5	2.4	5	2.4	5	2.4	5	2.4

Table 2.--SIZE OF COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

SIZE	ALL STUDENTS IN ONE CLASS HOME ECONOMICS						CLASS DIVIDED INTO TWO SECTIONS HOME ECONOMICS					
	I		II		III		I		II		III	
	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent
Above 70	0		0		0		1	12.5	0		0	
65 - 69	0		0		0		0		2	50.0	0	
60 - 64	0		0		0		0		0		0	
55 - 59	0		0		0		0		0		0	
50 - 54	3	4.0	1	1.6	0		2	25.0	0		0	
45 - 49	7	9.3	2	3.2	0		1	12.5	0		0	
40 - 44	6	8.0	2	3.2	1	2.3	1	12.5	0		0	
35 - 39	18	24.0	8	12.7	1	2.3	1	12.5	0		0	
30 - 34	16	21.3	7	11.1	1	2.3	1	12.5	1	25.0	0	
25 - 29	10	13.3	15	23.8	7	15.9	0		0		0	
20 - 24	7	9.3	12	19.0	11	25.0	0		0		0	
15 - 19	7	9.3	10	15.9	11	25.0	0		1	25.0	0	
10 - 14	0		4	6.3	10	22.7	1	12.5	0		0	
5 - 9	1	1.3	2	3.2	2	4.5	0		0		1	100.0
Total -----	75	99.8	63	100.0	44	100.0	8	100.0	4	100.0	1	100.0

the teaching of the large group.

It was found that the length of time devoted to the teaching of coeducational home economics to any one class in Alabama during 1941-42 ranged anywhere from less than a week to eight weeks (Table 3). The median for the length of time devoted to these classes was between one and two weeks for each of the three levels of home economics.

Table 3.--LENGTH OF TIME DEVOTED TO TEACHING COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

LENGTH OF TIME IN WEEKS	HOME ECONOMICS					
	I		II		III	
	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent
Less than one week -----	10	9.8	9	9.6	3	4.7
One week -----	36	35.3	33	35.1	24	37.4
Two weeks ----	37	36.3	34	36.2	18	28.1
Three weeks --	10	9.8	11	11.7	14	21.9
Four weeks ---	6	5.9	5	5.3	3	4.7
Five weeks ---	3	2.9	0		1	1.6
Six weeks ----	0		0		1	1.6
Eight weeks --	0		2	2.1	0	
Total -----	102	100.0	94	100.0	64	100.0

Ten per cent of the teachers offering coeducational work in Home Economics I and the same per cent of those offering it in Home Economics II spent less than one week in teaching joint classes, while about 20 per cent from each of the two groups spent three or more weeks at it.

It is evident that more time was spent for coeducational work in Home Economics III. Only five per cent of the teachers in this group spent less than a week in the teaching of joint classes, and as many as 30 per cent spent three or more weeks in such teaching.

#### Content of coeducational home economics courses

It appears that in practically every phase of home economics included in the Alabama course of study coeducational teaching was done in 1941-42 by at least five teachers (Table 4). It appears, also, that teaching in these units was done on all three levels of high school home economics by at least two teachers.

Units.--"Foods" was, by far, the most popular unit for coeducational teaching. Eighty-seven per cent of those teaching coeducational classes included work in this unit somewhere in their course. In fact "Foods" and "Personal Relations" were the only units in which coeducational teaching was done in more than 50 per cent of the schools. One fourth or more of the teachers

Table 4.--UNITS INCLUDED ENTIRELY OR PARTIALLY IN COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHING  
IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

UNITS	HOME ECONOMICS						TOTAL NUMBER	
	I		II		III		OF TEACHERS	
	Num-	Per	Num-	Per	Num-	Per	Num-	Per
	ber	Cent	ber	Cent	ber	Cent	ber	Cent
	Classes		Classes	Classes	Classes		(N = 121)	
	(N = 102)		(N = 94)		(N = 64)			
Foods -----	76	74.5	80	85.1	51	79.7	106	86.9
Personal Relations -----	73	71.6	33	35.1	20	31.3	80	68.1
House -----	30	29.4	23	24.5	28	43.8	49	40.2
Clothing -----	20	19.6	14	14.9	13	20.3	31	25.4
Health -----	17	16.7	18	19.1	12	18.8	30	24.6
Home Management -----	7	6.9	10	10.6	15	23.4	20	16.4
Family Relations -----	4	3.9	13	13.8	7	10.9	19	14.8
Child Development -----	2	2.0	3	3.2	5	7.8	7	5.7
Other Units -----	2	2.0	3	3.2	5	7.8	5	4.1

included work in the units, "House", "Clothing", and "Health". Problems in "Home Management" and "Family Relations" were taught by a very small percentage of the teachers, and work in "Child Development" was attempted in only seven of the 121 schools. Five of the teachers included work on units other than those listed.

The units in which teaching was most often done in Home Economics I were "Foods" and "Personal Relations", each receiving attention by more than 70 per cent of the teachers offering coeducational Home Economics I. Only 29 per cent of these teachers taught classes in "House", and a still smaller percentage taught class in "Clothing" and "Health". Almost no work appeared in Home Economics I on "Home Management", "Family Relations" and "Child Development".

In Home Economics II the only unit in which coeducational teaching was done to any considerable degree was "Foods". The only other unit receiving attention by as many as one third of the teachers offering coeducational Home Economics II was "Personal Relations".

There appears to have been more diversity of teaching in Home Economics III than in either of the previous levels. Teaching in "Foods", again, was done by the largest percentage of these schools (80 per cent). However, 44 per cent of the teachers offering coeduca-

tional work on the third-year level included work on the "House" unit and a few less than one third taught classes in "Personal Relations", "Home Management", and "Clothing".

Table 5 shows that coeducational classes in "Personal Relations" were taught more in Home Economics I than in any other level. Of the 83 teachers having coeducational classes during the "Personal Relations" unit, all but 10 of them offered it in Home Economics I, whereas, a little more than one third of them did some work in this unit for Home Economics II and about one fourth offered it in Home Economics III. "Clothing" also appears as a problem taught more often in Home Economics I than in either of the other two classes; however, only a few less than 50 per cent of the schools teaching any clothing coeducationally included it in Home Economics II and Home Economics III.

Problems in "Foods" were taught coeducationally to a considerable degree throughout the three years of home economics. Three fourths of the teachers including work in "Foods" as a part of their coeducational teaching offered it in Home Economics II, while between one half and three fourths of them included it in Home Economics I and about the same percentage in Home Economics III.

More than half of the teachers including work in "Health" as a part of their coeducational teaching

Table 5.--LEVELS OF HOME ECONOMICS IN WHICH VARIOUS UNITS WERE TAUGHT ENTIRELY OR PARTIALLY TO COEDUCATIONAL CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

UNITS	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	LEVELS OF HOME ECONOMICS					
		I		II		III	
		Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent
Foods -----	106	76	71.4	80	75.2	51	47.9
Personal Relations -----	83	73	87.6	33	39.6	20	24.0
House -----	49	30	61.2	23	46.9	28	57.1
Clothing -----	31	20	64.6	14	45.2	13	42.0
Health -----	30	17	56.6	18	59.9	12	40.0
Home Management -----	20	7	35.0	10	50.0	15	75.0
Family Relations -----	19	4	21.0	13	68.4	7	36.8
Child Development -----	7	2	28.6	3	42.8	5	71.4

introduced this into their Home Economics I teaching; about the same percentage did some teaching in "Health" in Home Economics II; only 40 per cent taught it in Home Economics III.

Very little teaching was done in "Home Management" in Home Economics I coeducational classes. Half of the teachers using problems in this unit introduced them in Home Economics II, and three fourths of the teachers arranged them for Home Economics III.

Problems in the "House" unit were taught coeducationally throughout the three years. Home Economics I rated first in the number of classes in "House", but Home Economics III was a close second with more than half of the teachers putting work in the "House" unit on this level, and only slightly less than 50 per cent of those teaching "House" problems coeducationally introduced them in Home Economics II.

The only coeducational classes in which more than half of the teachers included work in the "Family Relations" unit were those in Home Economics II; and third-year home economics was the only level on which "Child Development" teaching was done to any extent.

Topics.---The topics selected to be taught in each of the above units will indicate more exactly the content of the coeducational class work than a mere statement of units in which teaching was done. The

subject "Etiquette" was more often a teaching topic for coeducational classes in the "Personal Relations" unit than any other subject (Table 6). As many as 96 per cent of those teachers offering the unit in Home Economics I used this topic in their teaching, and more than 60 per cent of those teaching "Personal Relations" in Home Economics II and Home Economics III used the topic on these levels.

Table 6.--TOPICS TAUGHT IN "PERSONAL RELATIONS" TO CO-EDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TOPICS	HOME ECONOMICS					
	I		II		III	
	Num-	Per	Num-	Per	Num-	Per
	ber	Cent	ber	Cent	ber	Cent
	Classes		Classes		Classes	
	(N = 73)		(N = 33)		(N = 20)	
Etiquette -----	70	95.9	21	63.6	14	70.0
Personal Appearance-	37	50.7	7	21.1	4	20.0
Boy-Girl Relation-						
ships -----	37	50.7	14	42.4	7	35.0
Personality -----	28	38.4	7	21.2	2	10.0
Entertaining in						
the Home -----	12	16.4	9	27.3	4	20.0
Human Relations ----	7	9.6	10	30.3	2	10.0
Use of Leisure						
Time -----	5	6.9	3	9.1	2	10.0

"Boy-Girl Relationships" was the second most popular topic in the "Personal Relations" unit. About half of the teachers in the Home Economics I group, 42 per cent of those in the Home Economics II group, and 35 per cent of those in the Home Economics III group included it in their teaching.

The only topics, other than these two, taught to any degree were "Personal Appearance" included by about half of the teachers in the Home Economics I group, "Personality", by more than a third of the Home Economics I group; and "Human Relations", by 30 per cent of the Home Economics III group.

In the coeducational teaching of the "Clothing" unit in Home Economics I, the topic "Clothing Selection" was used by 65 per cent of the teachers offering the unit to this group; the topics "Care of Clothing" and "Mending" were taught by more than one third of the teachers in this group (Table 7). As many as 64 per cent of the teachers offering this unit coeducationally to Home Economics II taught the topics "Clothing Selection" and "Care of Clothing", while 29 per cent taught "Mending" and "Clothing Consumer Problems". In Home Economics III, 62 per cent of the teachers offering work in the clothing unit coeducationally taught "Clothing Selection"; more than a third of them taught "Mending" and "Clothing Consumer Problems"; and a few less than one third taught "Care of Clothing".

Table 7.--TOPICS TAUGHT IN "CLOTHING" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TOPICS	HOME ECONOMICS					
	I		II		III	
	Num-	Per	Num-	Per	Num-	Per
	ber Classes (N = 20)	Cent	ber Classes (N = 14)	Cent	ber Classes (N = 13)	Cent
Clothing Selection -	13	65.0	9	64.3	8	61.5
Care of Clothing ---	9	45.0	9	64.3	4	30.8
Mending -----	7	35.0	4	28.6	6	46.2
Clothing Consumer Problems -----	5	25.0	4	28.6	5	38.5
Clothing for Special Occasions-	0		1	7.1	0	

A survey of the topics taught in the "Foods" unit to coeducational home economics classes showed that "Gardening" received more attention than any other topic (Table 8). In schools where "Foods" was taught coeducationally it was found that on each level of home economics more than 75 per cent of the teachers using the unit on that level included lessons on "Gardening". More than one third of the teachers in Home Economics I and Home Economics II, and slightly less than one third in Home Economics III included the topic "Nutrition". The subject of "Poultry" was introduced by 35 per cent of the Home Economics II group, 31 per cent of the Home

Economics III group and 30 per cent of the Home Economics I group.

Table 8.--TOPICS TAUGHT IN "FOODS" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TOPICS	HOME ECONOMICS					
	I		II		III	
	Num-	Per	Num-	Per	Num-	Per
	ber Classes (N = 76)	Cent	ber Classes (N = 80)	Cent	ber Classes (N = 51)	Cent
Gardening -----	58	76.3	63	78.8	42	82.4
Nutrition -----	28	36.8	34	42.5	16	31.4
Poultry -----	23	30.3	28	35.0	16	31.4
Special Meals -----	12	15.8	16	20.0	20	39.2
Planning and Pre- paring Meals -----	11	14.5	17	21.3	10	19.6
Food Preservation --	9	11.8	14	17.5	6	11.8
Cooking Simple Dishes -----	7	9.2	7	8.8	5	9.8
Buying Foods -----	6	7.9	8	10.0	5	9.8
Home Food Supply ---	2	2.6	1	1.3	1	2.0
Camp Cookery -----	1	1.3	0		2	3.9
Dressing Chickens --	1	1.3	1	1.3	1	2.0

Thirty-nine per cent of the Home Economics III group did some work on "Special Meals" during their "Foods" unit; a much smaller percentage of the teachers in the Home Economics I and Home Economics II groups included work on this unit.

Other topics occurring in some of the "Foods" units were as follows: "Planning and Preparing Meals", "Food Preservation", "Cooking Simple Dishes", "Buying Foods", "Home Food Supply", "Camp Cookery", and "Dressing Chickens".

In the teaching of "Health" to coeducational home economics classes, "First Aid" was the only topic taught by more than 50 per cent of the teachers offering it on each of the levels (Table 9). On one level, Home Economics III, it was practically the only topic taught. However, one third of the schools where "Health" was taught coeducationally to Home Economics II included the topic "Health of Home and Community"; and 35 per cent of those in which it was taught coeducationally to Home Economics I included the topic "Personal Health". Very little work was done in any class on "Home Care of the Sick".

Table 9.--TOPICS TAUGHT IN "HEALTH" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TOPICS	HOME ECONOMICS					
	I		II		III	
	Num-	Per	Num-	Per	Num-	Per
	ber	Cent	ber	Cent	ber	Cent
	Classes		Classes		Classes	
	(N = 17)		(N = 18)		(N = 12)	
First Aid -----	10	58.8	12	66.7	11	91.7
Personal Health ---	6	35.3	4	22.2	1	8.3
Health of Home and Community -----	3	17.6	6	33.3	3	25.0
Home Care of Sick -	1	5.9	3	16.7	1	8.3

There was little consistency among the teachers concerning the topics taught in the coeducational "Home Management" classes (Table 10).

Table 10.--TOPICS TAUGHT IN "HOME MANAGEMENT" TO CO-EDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TOPICS	HOME ECONOMICS					
	I		II		III	
	Num- ber Classes (N = 7)	Per Cent	Num- ber Classes (N = 10)	Per Cent	Num- ber Classes (N = 15)	Per Cent
Division of Res- ponsibilities ---	3	42.9	3	30.0	2	13.3
Consumer Problems -	2	28.6	3	30.0	3	20.0
Family Finance ----	1	14.3	3	30.0	8	53.3
Equipment -- Arran- gement and Selection -----	1	14.3	1	10.0	3	20.0
Labor Saving Devices -----	1	14.3	0		2	13.3
Personal Money Problems -----	0		1	10.0	4	26.7
Use of Time and Energy -----	0		0		2	13.3

In Home Economics II there was no topic taught by as many as one third of the teachers in this group; in Home Economics I "Division of Responsibility" was the only topic used by more than one third (43 per cent) of the teachers; and in Home Economics III "Family Finance"

was the only topic listed as taught by more than one third (53 per cent) of the teachers.

Little consistency was shown also in the topics used for teaching "House" coeducationally (Table 11).

Table 11.--TOPICS TAUGHT IN "HOUSE" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TOPICS	HOME ECONOMICS					
	I		II		III	
	Num- ber Classes (N = 30)	Per Cent	Num- ber Classes (N = 23)	Per Cent	Num- ber Classes (N = 28)	Per Cent
Landscaping -----	26	86.7	15	65.2	23	82.1
Flowers -----	7	23.3	4	17.4	6	21.4
Comfort and Con- venience of Home -----	3	10.0	1	4.3	4	14.3
House Planning ----	2	6.7	1	4.3	4	14.3
Home Selection ----	1	3.3	1	4.3	2	7.1
Home Improvement --	1	3.3	3	13.0	0	
Moving -----	1	3.3	1	4.3	1	3.6
Care of House -----	0		1	4.3	1	3.6
Furniture and Furnishings -----	0		4	17.4	5	17.9

"Landscaping" was taught by 87 per cent of the teachers doing coeducational "House" teaching in Home Economics I, 82 per cent of those teaching "House" coeducationally in

Home Economics III, and 65 per cent of those teaching "House" coeducationally in Home Economics II. Of the other units -- "Flowers", "Furniture and Furnishings", "Comfort and Convenience of Home", and "Care of House" -- none was taught by as many as one fourth of the teachers offering "House" on any one level.

The topic "Marriage Problems" was taught more often than any other topic by teachers including work in the "Family Relations" unit as a part of their coeducational teaching (Table 12).

Table 12.--TOPICS TAUGHT IN "FAMILY RELATIONS" TO CO-EDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TOPICS	HOME ECONOMICS					
	I		II		III	
	Num- ber Classes (N = 4)	Per Cent	Num- ber Classes (N = 13)	Per Cent	Num- ber Classes (N = 7)	Per Cent
Marriage Problems --	2	50.0	7	53.8	3	42.9
Division of Res- ponsibilities ----	2	50.0	4	30.8	3	42.9
Family Recreation --	2	50.0	3	23.1	2	28.6
Family Finance -----	1	25.0	6	46.2	3	42.9
Building a Happy Home -----	0		4	30.8	1	14.3

In Home Economics I, of those teaching "Family Relations" coeducationally, 50 per cent included work on the

topics "Marriage Problems", "Division of Responsibilities", and "Family Recreation". In Home Economics II, 54 per cent of those teaching "Family Relations" co-educationally taught "Marriage Problems", and 46 per cent taught "Family Finance". In Home Economics III, 43 per cent of those offering "Family Relations" study used the topics "Marriage Problems", "Family Finance" and "Division of Responsibilities".

Of the few teachers including coeducational work in the "Child Development" unit, only one included any topic other than "Toys for Children" (Table 13). In Home Economics III "Child Care and Training" was taught coeducationally by one teacher.

Table 13.--TOPICS TAUGHT IN "CHILD DEVELOPMENT" TO CO-EDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TOPICS	HOME ECONOMICS					
	I		II		III	
	Num-	Per	Num-	Per	Num-	Per
	ber	Cent	ber	Cent	ber	Cent
	Classes		Classes		Classes	
	(N = 2)		(N = 3)		(N = 5)	
Toys for Children --	2	100.0	3	100.0	4	80.0
Child Care and Training -----	0		0		1	20.0

Topics taught coeducationally to the home economics classes in Alabama other than those discussed above were "Meat Cutting" and "Making Christmas Gifts",

both being taught once on each of the three levels; "Conservation" was taught once in Home Economics II and once in Home Economics III; and "Parliamentary Law" and "Home Decorations for Special Occasions" were both taught once in Home Economics III (Table 14).

Table 14.--OTHER TOPICS TAUGHT TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TOPICS	HOME ECONOMICS		
	I	II	III
	Number of Classes (N = 2)	Number of Classes (N = 3)	Number of Classes (N = 5)
Meat Cutting -----	1	1	1
Making Christmas Gifts -----	1	1	1
Conservation -----	0	1	1
Parliamentary Law --	0	0	1
Home Decoration for Special Occasions -----	0	0	1

Methods for selecting topics.--A survey of the methods by which topics for study in coeducational home economics classes in Alabama were selected in 1941-42 showed as many as 11 different methods (Table 15). In 39 per cent of the schools the agriculture teacher and the home economics teacher decided in conference those topics which should be taught to the joint class. This

Table 15.--METHODS BY WHICH TOPICS FOR STUDY IN  
COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA WERE  
SELECTED DURING 1941-42

METHOD	Number (N = 81)	Per Cent
Agriculture and home economics teacher decided topics to be taught -----	32	39.4
Students requested special topics -----	14	17.2
Agriculture and home economics teacher decided, keeping in consideration the student suggestions -----	12	14.8
Class resulted from special problems or projects arising unexpectedly -----	8	9.8
Students were given several topics to choose from -----	5	6.2
It was decided in a joint class discussion -----	5	6.2
Class was an outgrowth of a discussion on some other topic -----	5	6.2
The girls invited the boys to join their class during a discussion in which they felt the boys would be interested -----	2	2.5
Agriculture and home economics teacher, with the help of some other teacher or teachers, decided on the topics -----	1	1.2
Home Economics teacher decided on the topics-----	1	1.2
Parents requested special topics be taught -----	1	1.2

was the only method used by as many as one third of the teachers who stated their methods of selection. Seventeen per cent of the schools offered those topics

requested by students, and 15 per cent offered those decided on by the agriculture teacher and the home economics teacher after they had considered the requests of students. In eight schools the topics taught resulted from special problems or projects arising unexpectedly. Five teachers gave the students several possible topics for consideration and allowed them to select those in which they were most interested or needed most. In five other cases it was decided in a joint class discussion which topics would be pursued, and in another five the topics studied were an outgrowth of a class discussion on some other topic. In a few cases a combination of two or more methods was used to determine which topics should be taught.

Techniques considered successful  
for teaching coeducational  
home economics

A question of the techniques for successful teaching of coeducational home economics classes might present itself to one interested in such teaching. Tables 16-24 show techniques that were considered successful in the teaching of each phase of home economics to coeducational classes in Alabama during 1941-42.

Almost two thirds of the teachers offering work in the "Personal Relations" unit stated that they found discussion classes to be effective (Table 16).

Table 16.--TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING  
"PERSONAL RELATIONS" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS  
CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TECHNIQUE	NUMBER TEACHERS USING (N = 82)	PER CENT
Discussion -----	52	62.6
Demonstration -----	31	37.3
Entertaining -----	19	22.9
Problem Method -----	16	19.3
Round table -----	16	19.3
Supervised study -----	16	19.3
Stories -----	15	18.8
Committee work -----	13	15.7
Reports -----	12	14.5
Case Study -----	8	9.6
Dramatics -----	8	9.6
Lecture -----	8	9.6
Recitation -----	7	8.4
Conferences -----	6	7.2
Laboratory -----	6	7.2
Panel -----	5	6.0
Projects -----	5	6.0
Display -----	3	3.6
Movies -----	2	2.4
Notebook -----	2	2.4
Forum -----	2	2.4
Field trip -----	2	2.4
Debate -----	1	1.2

This is the only technique mentioned as being particularly successful by as many as half of the teachers in this group. Thirty-seven per cent stated that they used demonstrations effectively, and 23 per cent planned and promoted a party or other social function to make their teaching more effective.

Twenty other techniques were mentioned as successful ways of teaching this unit, but fewer than 20 per cent of the teachers checked any one of them.

The discussion class was also used most often (42 per cent) as a successful teaching method by those who included work in the "Clothing" unit in their coeducational teaching (Table 17). Fewer than 50 per cent of these teachers, however, checked this as being a successful technique. More than one third of the teachers in this group stated that demonstrations and laboratory work were successful ways of teaching the "Clothing" unit.

In the teaching of the "Foods" unit coeducationally, 54 per cent of the teachers checked the discussion technique as being successful (Table 18). Almost as many (49 per cent) named the laboratory method as being a successful technique. The demonstration technique was used by 46 per cent of the teachers in this group; supervised study by 32 per cent; and lecture, field trips, problem method, and committee work by from 20 to 30 per cent.

Table 17.--TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING  
"CLOTHING" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN  
ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TECHNIQUE	NUMBER TEACHERS USING (N = 31)	PER CENT
Discussion -----	13	41.9
Demonstration -----	12	38.7
Laboratory -----	11	35.5
Display -----	6	19.4
Field Trip -----	5	16.1
Problem Method -----	4	12.9
Recitation -----	4	12.9
Reports -----	4	12.9
Committee work -----	3	9.7
Round table -----	3	9.7
Supervised study -----	3	9.7
Conferences -----	2	6.5
Lecture -----	2	6.5
Projects -----	2	6.5
Dramatics -----	1	3.2
Entertaining -----	1	3.2
Forum -----	1	3.2
Notebook -----	1	3.2
Panel -----	1	3.2

Table 18.--TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING  
"FOODS" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN  
ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TECHNIQUE	NUMBER TEACHERS USING (N = 106)	PER CENT
Discussion -----	57	53.8
Laboratory -----	52	49.1
Demonstration -----	49	46.2
Supervised study -----	34	32.1
Lecture -----	31	29.2
Field trip -----	28	26.4
Problem Method -----	26	24.5
Committee work -----	25	23.6
Display -----	20	18.9
Projects -----	20	18.9
Notebook -----	19	17.9
Reports -----	17	16.0
Entertaining -----	12	11.3
Recitation -----	9	8.5
Movies -----	8	7.5
Panel -----	6	5.7
Round table -----	6	5.7
Conferences -----	5	4.7
Forum -----	4	3.8
Stories -----	2	1.9
Case study -----	2	1.9
Dramatics -----	1	.9
Group work -----	1	.9

Table 19.--TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING  
"HEALTH" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS IN ALABAMA  
DURING 1941-42

TECHNIQUE	NUMBER TEACHERS USING (N = 30)	PER CENT
Discussion -----	15	50.0
Demonstration -----	9	30.0
Lecture -----	9	30.0
Problem Method -----	9	30.0
Laboratory -----	6	20.0
Supervised study -----	6	20.0
Reports -----	5	16.7
Committee work -----	4	13.3
Notebook -----	4	13.3
Round table -----	4	13.3
Recitation -----	3	10.0
Conferences -----	2	6.7
Display -----	2	6.7
Panel -----	2	6.7
Projects -----	2	6.7
Case study -----	1	3.3
Movies -----	1	3.3
Stories -----	1	3.3

Again in the teaching of "Health", the discussion method seems to have been the only technique considered successful by as many as 50 per cent of the teachers including this unit (Table 19). Thirty per cent of these teachers, however, mentioned demonstration, lecture, and problem method as being effectively used in the coeducational teaching of "Health".

Less variety was used in the successful teaching of "Home Management" to coeducational classes. Only nine techniques were mentioned by the 20 schools including work in this unit (Table 20), and four of these were mentioned by only one teacher.

Table 20.--TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING "HOME MANAGEMENT" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TECHNIQUE	NUMBER TEACHERS USING (N = 20)	PER CENT
Discussion -----	4	20.0
Problem Method -----	4	20.0
Laboratory -----	3	15.0
Notebook -----	2	10.0
Committee work -----	2	10.0
Debate -----	1	5.0
Lecture -----	1	5.0
Projects -----	1	5.0
Reports -----	1	5.0

Less than one fourth of these teachers checked any effective technique, 20 per cent mentioning the discussion and problem methods as being used successfully.

The "House" unit is one of the two in which the discussion method did not rank first among the techniques considered successful for teaching coeducational classes (Table 21). Here field trips, though used by only 47 per cent of the schools teaching "House" coeducationally, were highest on the list. The only other technique considered successful by as many as one fourth of the teachers was the laboratory method.

Of those teachers including "Family Relations" as a part of their coeducational work, 53 per cent stated that they found the discussion type of class to be effective (Table 22). Committee work, used by 32 per cent of these teachers, seems to have been the next most successful technique for the teaching of "Family Relations".

The "Child Development" unit was the only one in which no teacher mentioned the discussion technique as being an effective one for coeducational classes (Table 23). The laboratory method of teaching, the only technique mentioned by more than one of the seven schools offering work in this unit, was used by 43 per cent of the group.

Table 21.--TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING  
"HOUSE" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN  
ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TECHNIQUE	NUMBER TEACHERS USING (N = 49)	PER CENT
Field trip -----	23	46.9
Laboratory -----	13	26.5
Discussion -----	9	18.4
Projects -----	8	16.3
Supervised study -----	8	16.3
Lecture -----	7	14.3
Demonstration -----	7	14.3
Committee work -----	7	14.3
Problem Method -----	5	10.2
Reports -----	4	8.2
Conference -----	2	4.1
Display -----	2	4.1
Notebook -----	2	4.1
Case study -----	1	2.0
Forum -----	1	2.0
Movies -----	1	2.0
Recitation -----	1	2.0
Round table -----	1	2.0
Stories -----	1	2.0

Table 22.--TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING  
"FAMILY RELATIONS" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS  
CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TECHNIQUE	NUMBER TEACHERS USING (N = 19)	PER CENT
Discussion -----	10	52.6
Committee work -----	6	31.6
Dramatics -----	4	21.1
Movies -----	4	21.1
Lecture -----	3	15.8
Entertaining -----	3	15.8
Case study -----	3	15.8
Recitation -----	2	10.5
Round table -----	2	10.5
Conferences -----	2	10.5
Forum -----	1	5.3
Field trip -----	1	5.3
Projects -----	1	5.3
Reports -----	1	5.3
Stories -----	1	5.3

Table 23.--TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING  
"CHILD DEVELOPMENT" TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS  
CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TECHNIQUE	NUMBER TEACHERS USING (N = 7)	PER CENT
Laboratory -----	3	42.9
Demonstration -----	1	14.3
Problem Method -----	1	14.3
Recitation -----	1	14.3
Round table -----	1	14.3

Of those five schools where units other than the above were taught coeducationally, 60 per cent of the teachers stated that they used the discussion method successfully in the teaching of these units, and 40 per cent that they used the demonstration and laboratory methods (Table 24).

Table 24.--TECHNIQUES CONSIDERED SUCCESSFUL FOR TEACHING OTHER UNITS TO COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES IN ALABAMA DURING 1941-42

TECHNIQUE	NUMBER TEACHERS USING (N = 5)	PER CENT
Discussion -----	3	60.0
Demonstration -----	2	40.0
Laboratory -----	2	40.0
Committee work -----	1	20.0
Display -----	1	20.0
Entertaining -----	1	20.0
Notebook -----	1	20.0
Projects -----	1	20.0

A summary of the techniques considered successful for teaching coeducational home economics in Alabama during 1941-42 showed 24 effective methods (Table 25). It may be noted that discussions were considered successful more often than any other method. Whereas the discussion method was mentioned 194 times,

Table 25.--TECHNIQUES USED MOST FREQUENTLY IN TEACHING  
COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS IN ALABAMA DURING  
1941-42

TECHNIQUE	NUMBER TIMES MENTIONED
Discussion -----	194
Demonstration -----	112
Laboratory -----	96
Supervised study -----	68
Problem Method -----	65
Lecture -----	62
Committee work -----	61
Field trip -----	60
Reports -----	45
Projects -----	40
Entertaining -----	36
Display -----	34
Round table -----	33
Notebook -----	31
Recitation -----	27
Conferences -----	20
Stories -----	20
Movies -----	16
Case study -----	15
Dramatics -----	14
Panel -----	14
Forum -----	9
Debate -----	2
Group work -----	1

the demonstration method was mentioned only 112 times and the laboratory method only 96 times. Supervised study, problem method, lecture, committee work, and field trips were used in from 60 to 70 classes. Others occurring as many as 25 times were reports, projects, entertaining, displays, round table, notebooks, and recitation.

Objectives for coeducational  
home economics classes

Because the objectives listed by many of the teachers were not pertinent, only the general objectives from 19 schools and the specific objectives from 56 schools have been included for analization.

Forty-two per cent of the teachers who stated any general objectives thought that a realization of the interdependence of the home economics and agriculture departments and an understanding of the work of each should be an important outgrowth of their coeducational teaching (Table 26).

Nearly one third of the teachers hoped to encourage projects at home on which an agriculture boy and a home economics girl might work cooperatively and projects at school on which the two groups might work cooperatively. Three of the 19 teachers were interested in a special type of cooperative project whereby the vocational departments might be improved. One home economics teacher was interested in having the agricul-

ture people feel free to use her department and ask for her help on their problems. Others hoped that through joint classes the boys might come to feel a greater need for home economics or that through the teaching of the joint class the teacher herself might come to know and understand the needs of boys as well as those of girls.

Table 26.--GENERAL OBJECTIVES FOR COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS AS GIVEN BY 19 TEACHERS IN ALABAMA, 1941-42

OBJECTIVES	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	PER CENT
Realize the interdependence of vocational agriculture and home economics departments and understand the work of each -----	8	42.1
Encourage activities in joint projects at home and at school -----	6	31.6
Cooperate in department improvement and other school projects -----	3	15.8
Help boys feel that home economics is important for them -----	2	10.5
Help the agriculture people feel free to use the home economics department and ask help with their problems -----	1	5.3
Understand the needs of boys as well as those of girls -----	1	5.3

The specific objectives listed by 56 teachers relate to six of the eight units taught coeducationally in the state (Table 27). The "Personal Relations"

77

objectives appearing most often were "to develop an appreciation for and a working knowledge of the social graces" and "an understanding of certain problems of boy-girl relationships". Each of these objectives was mentioned by more than 40 per cent of those including objectives for the "Personal Relations" unit. Several teachers aimed to develop desirable physical, mental, and social characteristics which go to make up a well-rounded individual and to improve the personal appearance of those in the class. Other objectives related to special types of social adjustment and physical fitness.

The objectives for the clothing unit were the following: "development of skill in caring for clothing", listed by 71 per cent of the teachers giving clothing objectives; "understanding of the importance of being well dressed" and "the ability to select a well planned wardrobe", each listed by more than one fourth of the teachers in this group.

Nearly half of the 31 teachers listing specific objectives for foods work were interested in the ability of the student to plan and help provide for the home food supply and in his understanding of the fundamentals of nutrition. Six of the teachers aimed to teach some fundamental principles of gardening, and three had as an objective the planting and cultivating of a school garden. Three teachers were interested in

giving the students a knowledge of poultry raising, and one planned to organize a cooperative chicken project at school. Only a few teachers hoped to do much about developing a knowledge of food preparation or meal planning. A few included objectives dealing with table etiquette, diet-deficiency diseases, food habits, wise buying, and special meals. These latter and a few others were each mentioned by only one of the 31 teachers whose objectives were included.

Only two teachers included an objective relating to "Health". Both aimed to encourage higher standards of health through the teaching of their coeducational classes.

Six objectives relating to work in the "House" unit were included. These objectives, each mentioned only one time, relate to home improvement and beautification, furniture and its renovation, landscaping, stove repair, and thrift.

One third of the 17 teachers including "Family Relations" objectives hoped to establish the feeling that boys and girls can work together with mutual benefit and enjoyment; nearly one fourth hoped to develop a standard of cooperation for home living; three of the 17 wanted to establish a feeling of individual responsibility for home maintenance; and two aimed for the students to develop the ability to take

part in community or social movements. Other objectives mentioned only once dealt with family morale, standards of home life, standard of living, and work on home problems.

Table 27.--SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES FOR TEACHING THE VARIOUS UNITS IN COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS, AS GIVEN BY 56 TEACHERS IN ALABAMA, 1941-42

OBJECTIVES	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	PER CENT
PERSONAL RELATIONS (N = 29)		
An appreciation for and a working knowledge of the social graces -----	14	48.3
An understanding of certain problems of boy-girl relationships -----	13	44.9
Development of desirable physical, mental and social characteristics which go to make up a well-rounded individual -----	7	24.2
Interest in improving one's personal appearance -----	4	13.8
Ability to make social adjustments with self-confidence -----	3	10.4
Development of poise and ease -----	2	6.9
Knowledge of successful entertaining in the home -----	2	6.9
Interest in learning things to do which will help students to take their places as good citizens of the home and community -----	2	6.9
Knowledge of how to meet people -----	1	3.5
Knowledge of the importance of being physically fit -----	1	3.5

Table 27.--SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES FOR TEACHING THE VARIOUS  
UNITS IN COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS, AS GIVEN BY  
56 TEACHERS IN ALABAMA, 1941-42--Continued

OBJECTIVES	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	PER CENT
CLOTHING (N = 7)		
Development of skill in caring for clothing -----	5	71.4
Understanding of the importance of being well dressed -----	3	42.8
Ability to select a well planned wardrobe -----	2	28.6
FOODS (N = 31)		
Ability to plan and help provide for the home food supply -----	15	48.5
Interest in better nutrition through an understanding of the basic food requirements of the body -----	13	42.0
Knowledge of the fundamentals of gardening -----	6	19.4
Sense of responsibility for increasing the food supply in the community, county, and nation through produc- tion and preservation -----	3	9.7
Knowledge of how to select, buy and care for good breeds of poultry -----	3	9.7
Planning and making a school garden ----	3	9.7
Some knowledge of the preparation of simple foods -----	3	9.7
Ability to plan and prepare balanced meals for the family -----	2	6.5
Understanding of the importance of foods in the war emergency -----	2	6.4
Interest in current food problems -----	1	3.2

Table 27.--SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES FOR TEACHING THE VARIOUS  
UNITS IN COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS, AS GIVEN BY  
56 TEACHERS IN ALABAMA, 1941-42--Continued

OBJECTIVES	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	PER CENT
Understanding of table etiquette -----	1	3.2
Ability to plan food for coming seasons -----	1	3.2
Understanding of diet deficiency diseases -----	1	3.2
Ability to substitute foods for those not available or too expensive -----	1	3.2
Understanding of need for buying wisely -----	1	3.2
Interest in forming better food habits -----	1	3.2
Providing a cooperative chicken project at school -----	1	3.2
Ability to plan and assist with foods for banquets and socials -----	1	3.2
HEALTH (N = 2)		
Higher standards of health -----	2	100.0
HOUSE (N = 4)		
Desire for beauty in the home and improvement of home surroundings -----	1	25.00
Knowledge of good furniture and good construction -----	1	25.00
Understanding of the fact that good pieces of furniture need not be discarded when a little work can make them usable -----	1	25.00
Ability to plan and landscape home grounds -----	1	25.00

Table 27.--SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES FOR TEACHING THE VARIOUS  
UNITS IN COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS, AS GIVEN BY  
56 TEACHERS IN ALABAMA, 1941-42--Continued

OBJECTIVES	NUMBER OF TEACHERS	PER CENT
Skill in repairing old stoves -----	1	25.0
Interest in thrift -----	1	25.0
FAMILY RELATIONS (N = 17)		
Feeling that boys and girls can work together with mutual benefit and enjoyment -----	6	35.3
Standard of cooperation in the home ---	4	23.5
Feeling of individual responsibility toward home maintenance -----	3	17.6
Ability to take part in community or social movement -----	2	11.8
Feeling that happy home life is a joint business between men and women -----	1	5.9
Development of a good family morale ---	1	5.9
Development of standards for making better present and future homes -----	1	5.9
Ability to cultivate ease of manner in home life and social activities -----	1	5.9
Development of higher standard of living -----	1	5.9
Ability to work together on problems of home in situations like those of husband and wife -----	1	5.9

Opinions of coeducational  
home economics teachers  
concerning program

Analysis of the opinions of those homemaking teachers who have been doing coeducational home economics work in Alabama concerning the program disclosed that no teacher believed that too much emphasis was being given to home economics for boys, and 80 per cent believed there should be more home economics training given to the boys (Table 28). Three teachers felt that sufficient work was being done, and the remaining 17 per cent were either undecided or did not express their opinion. Some of the comments made by teachers concerning emphasis given to home economics for boys are as follows:<sup>1/</sup>

1. The local school situation is a determining factor in whether or not more emphasis should be given to home economics for boys.

2. Boys need more home economics than they are getting. They share the home as well as the girls. Training in every field of home life helps men to feel a responsibility toward home and family living.

3. The field of home economics is so rich in materials which make for better home and community citizens that boys should be allowed to benefit from it.

4. Boys need home economics to develop appreciations for home problems and knowledge of how to solve them.

---

<sup>1/</sup> See Appendix

5. If boys had training in home economics there would be more happy homes.

6. Boys keep asking for information regarding their personal and home problems.

7. Boys participate eagerly and are very interested in home economics.

8. Boys have asked for home economics training in large numbers; they should be given the courses which interest them and are really necessary.

A few more than half of the teachers believed that there should be an elective coeducational home economics class in senior high school (Table 28). Most opinions regarding this were qualified with such statements as the following:<sup>2/</sup>

1. If a school program could provide such and if a trained teacher could be provided, such a class would be excellent.

2. This would be fine if there were time for it in the curriculum.

3. This would be fine, but there seems to be about as much as can be done well in the present vocational program.

4. In such a situation there should be two home economics teachers.

Another merely stated:

Questions asked teachers by boys indicate a need for such a class. Their behavior at certain times and places proves it.

And another suggested that an elective coeducational home economics class in senior high school

---

<sup>2/</sup> See Appendix

would be difficult because the boys and girls would not have had the same previous training.

Less than half of the teachers express themselves one way or the other regarding the problem of segregated groups or coeducational classes (Table 28). The larger percentage failed to make any expression as to this problem. Some teachers who favored coeducational classes said: 3/

1. Boys and girls are more interested when working together. It is the natural situation.
2. They need to exchange ideas and learn to work together.
3. There are many things that will be more real if taught to a mixed group.
4. Joint teaching means that each group profits by the experiences of and the association with the other group.

Those favoring segregated classes gave the following reasons for their opinion: 4/

1. For some work the presence of girls makes the boys shy.
2. Boys seem more free to talk when alone.
3. Discipline problems are fewer if boys are taught in segregated classes.
4. Boys and girls require a different approach; therefore should be taught separately.

---

3/ See Appendix

4/ Ibid

A great number suggested that whether the boys were taught in segregated classes or jointly with the girls would depend on the subject matter and the students, and that there might be provision for both types of teaching during the year. As many as 67 per cent believed that if the class was to be taught coeducationally, there should be some time, if only for a class or two, when the home economics teacher could meet the boys alone (Table 28). Some of the reasons for this belief, as stated by the teachers, are as follows: <sup>5/</sup>

1. Special problem week or special problem days could be set aside and a question box used to open a general discussion of personal problems boys have when the boys meet alone.

2. There are points and questions that boys are hesitant about bringing up in a mixed group. This will establish splendid relationships and allow the more personal problems to arise.

3. There are some subjects such as grooming and clothing selection which could be put across better if boys are alone.

4. Girls might not need or be interested in some problems of the boys; a more informative discussion might be held with the boys alone.

5. In many cases the boys will give their opinions and talk more freely if the girls are not present.

6. This would depend upon the subject and also upon the students to be taught.

---

<sup>5/</sup> See Appendix

About 70 per cent of the teachers believed, also, that if there was to be a coeducational class, the agriculture teacher should, on most days, be present and take an active part in the class activities (Table 28). Many excellent reasons for this are given by the teachers themselves: 6/

1. His presence will reassure the boys of the worthwhileness of the work.
2. His participation makes the boys more interested.
3. He may understand boys better than the home economics teacher, and thus be able to get more responses from them.
4. Often he can give view points that the home economics teacher fails to see.
5. He is in a position to give the view point of boys and men.
6. His understanding of the boys will enable all problems and needs to be brought to light.
7. His practical point of view often opens up the way for excellent opportunity for home project work.
8. His presence would make for a better teacher-teacher and pupil-teacher relationship.

There seemed to be doubt as to whether a combination of the home economics and agriculture classes made the joint class too large for effective work. Though 41 per cent of the teachers believed this

---

6/ See Appendix

to be definitely true and only 22 per cent did not believe it to be true, a very large percentage failed to express an opinion on this statement (Table 28). Many mentioned that this depended, of course, on the enrollment of the individual classes, and, therefore, no general statement concerning the effectiveness of the work could be made. Others who felt that their own joint class was sufficiently small believed that in many schools over the state the opposite condition would be true. Other statements concerning the size of the combined classes were as follows: 7/

1. It depends on the subject being taught.
2. In laboratory classes crowded conditions make for poor work.
3. Laboratory work is not effective with more than 25 members in the class.
4. Individual attention cannot be given for members of a large class.
5. There is not sufficient equipment for large classes.
6. It is hard to discipline a large group.
7. With two teachers a group of as many as 40 may be handled effectively.

Several excellent suggestions were given for the teaching of joint classes too large for the usual type of teaching 8/. One teacher suggested dividing

---

7/ See Appendix

8/ Ibid

the class into two sections, the same proportion of boys and girls in each, with one teacher supervising each group. Another favored the division of the class into several committees, each committee working on a different phase of a problem. Still another teacher mentioned the use of frequent field trips as an excellent method for teaching a class too large for effective work along the usual lines. The rotated group plan was also used by one teacher.

A majority of the teachers doing coeducational home economics work in Alabama agreed that the students should be given more opportunity to help select units and subject matter for joint classes (Table 28). It was suggested that students usually realize their own needs better than anyone else, that they will enjoy and participate more fully in work which they have helped plan, and that a realization of their need helps develop initiative <sup>9/</sup>. Some teachers, however, believed that if student planning is emphasized, the teacher should give careful guidance to such planning, since, they stated, students often select subjects for pleasure instead of real need, and the teacher is sometimes a better judge of their needs than they.

More than 65 per cent of the teachers in Alabama expressed a need for materials in the state

---

<sup>9/</sup> See Appendix

Table 28.--OPINIONS OF 121 VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS OF ALABAMA CONCERNING  
COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAM IN 1941-42

OPINION	YES		NO		UNDECIDED		NO COMMENT	
	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent
There should be more home economics training for boys -----	97	80.2	3	2.5	5	4.1	16	13.2
The agriculture teacher should be present and take an active part in the class activities -----	85	70.2	2	1.7	7	5.8	27	22.3
There should be materials in the state course of study concerning joint classes in home economics ---	81	66.9	8	6.6	8	6.6	24	19.8
There should be a short time when the home economics teacher could meet the boys alone -----	81	66.9	3	2.5	12	9.9	25	20.7
Students should be given more opportunity to help select subject matter for joint classes --	74	61.0	8	6.6	6	5.0	33	27.3
There should be an elective class in coeducational home economics for Senior high school -----	68	56.2	9	7.4	19	15.7	25	20.7

Table 28.--OPINIONS OF 121 VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS OF ALABAMA CONCERNING  
COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAM IN 1941-42--Continued

OPINION	YES		NO		UNDECIDED		NO COMMENT	
	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent
Combination of home economics and agriculture classes makes joint class too large for effective work -----	50	41.4	26	21.5	13	10.7	32	26.4
Boys should be taught home economics in segregated groups ----	26	21.5	35	28.9	21	17.4	39	32.2
Too much emphasis is being given to home economics for boys -----	0	0.0	89	73.6	1	.8	31	25.6

course of study concerning joint classes in home economics. It was mentioned that teachers are not as prepared for this work as they should be and that suggestions approved by the State Department of Education would be an excellent help to teachers. Some statements made by the teachers concerning the need for materials were as follows: 10/

1. It would be useful as a general guide.
2. Any guide would be helpful. We could always modify it to fit our situation.
3. Ideas or ways to teach should certainly be included.
4. A collection of ideas from experienced teachers would be most valuable.
5. It would be particularly helpful to beginning teachers.
6. Such materials in the course of study would make for more emphasis on joint teaching and therefore promote a more active coeducational program in the state.

Comparison of opinions  
expressed in questionnaire  
and interview

To test the validity of the opinions of homemaking teachers regarding the state coeducational program, a personal interview was held with a sampling of those teachers who had expressed their opinions of the program on the questionnaire. The same proposed

---

10/ See Appendix

opinions as were presented in the questionnaire were used in the interview and the respondents were asked to give their reaction, "yes", "no", or "undecided", orally while the interviewer checked the responses on the same form as was used for the questionnaire. A comparison was then made of the opinions of each teacher as expressed in the interview with those recorded on the questionnaire.

It was found that in only one instance did as many as one third of the teachers express a divergent opinion in the two questionings concerning any one issue (Table 29). When asked in a personal interview whether or not they considered that a combination of home economics and agriculture classes made the joint class too large for effective work, 44 per cent of the teachers gave the same answer as they had previously given by questionnaire and 34 per cent gave a different answer. Twenty two per cent failed to respond to the issue at one or both of the questionings. Three teachers had changed their opinion from "yes" or "undecided" in the questionnaire to "no" in the interview; while the same number had changed from "no" or "undecided" to "yes" in the interview.

Between the time of the questionnaire and the interview, four teachers had changed their mind concerning whether or not boys should be taught home

economics in segregated groups; two had changed their opinion to "no" and two to "yes". Equal numbers, also, changed their opinion to "no" as did to "yes" concerning whether or not there should be materials for coeducational home economics classes in the state course of study.

If the percentages for these three points may be accepted as representative, it may be observed that any number of questionings would result in the original percentage as obtained in the questionnaire, and, therefore, the original percentages may be considered as representative of the opinions of the vocational home economics teachers of Alabama during the period of this study.

In only one instance were there more respondents who changed their opinion to "no" than those who changed it to "yes" in the interview. Two teachers had decided, contrary to their opinion as expressed in the questionnaire, that there should not be an elective class in home economics for senior high school boys and girls; while one had changed her mind to believe that such classes should exist.

Since the differences in the opinions as expressed in the two questionings were so slight, and since, in every issue save one, the results of the interview showed a random change of opinion or a consistent change toward "yes", it may be inferred that

Table 29.--OPINIONS OF 18 VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS OF ALABAMA OBTAINED THROUGH PERSONAL INTERVIEW COMPARED WITH OPINIONS OF SAME TEACHERS OBTAINED FROM CHECK SHEET

OPINION	OPINIONS AGREE		OPINIONS DISAGREE				FAILED TO EXPRESS OPINION MORE THAN ONCE	
	Num- ber	Per Cent	Changed to "Yes"		Changed to "No"		Num- ber	Per Cent
			Num- ber	Per Cent	Num- ber	Per Cent		
There should be more home economics training for boys -----	16	88.8	1	5.6	0	0.0	1	5.6
Too much emphasis is being given to home economics for boys -----	16	88.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	11.1
There should be materials in the state course of study concerning joint classes in home economics ---	15	83.3	1	5.6	1	5.6	1	5.6
There should be some time if only for a class or two when the home economics teacher can meet the boys alone -----	14	77.7	2	11.1	0	0.0	2	11.1
There should be an elective class in home economics offered to boys and girls in Senior high school ---	13	72.2	1	5.6	2	11.1	2	11.1

Table 29.--OPINIONS OF 18 VOCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS OF ALABAMA OBTAINED THROUGH PERSONAL INTERVIEW COMPARED WITH OPINIONS OF SAME TEACHERS OBTAINED FROM CHECK SHEET--Continued

OPINION	OPINIONS AGREE		OPINIONS DISAGREE				FAILED TO EXPRESS OPINION MORE THAN ONCE	
	Num-ber	Per Cent	Changed to "Yes"		Changed to "No"		Num-ber	Per Cent
			Num-ber	Per Cent	Num-ber	Per Cent		
Boys should be taught home economics in segregated groups -----	12	66.6	2	11.1	2	11.1	2	11.1
Students should be given more opportunity to help select subject matter for joint classes -----	12	66.6	4	22.2	1	5.6	1	5.6
The agriculture teacher should be present and take an active part in class activities -----	11	61.1	2	11.1	1	5.6	4	22.2
A combination of home economics and agriculture classes makes the joint class too large for effective work -----	8	44.4	3	16.7	3	16.7	4	22.2
A class in joint vocational work for home economics and agriculture teachers should be held at School of Instruction -----							3	
A textbook for coeducational home economics is needed -----							1	

the opinions as expressed in the questionnaire are truly representative, and, in most cases, the opinions in favor of an issue represent the minimum percentages. One concludes that the opinions as expressed in the questionnaire may be accepted for discussion.

Three of the 18 teachers interviewed gave a suggestion for improving coeducational home economics not mentioned in the previous questionnaire. They stated that classes in joint work composed of home economics and agriculture teachers during the annual School of Instruction would possibly be of more value to the program than any other thing. One teacher mentioned also the need for a textbook for use in coeducational home economics classes.

## Chapter V

### DISCUSSION

The fact that a large majority of the teachers in Alabama spent some portion of their time during 1941-42 in teaching home economics to joint classes of boys and girls and the fact that such work is not definitely required by the State Department of Education point to their feeling of a need for this type of teaching. Many of the teachers who taught no coeducational home economics during the year stated that they approved of and were interested in such teaching, but, for one reason or another, did not offer this work during 1941-42.

A large majority of the teachers believed that the state program did not provide enough home economics training for boys. They offered excellent ideas to prove this opinion. One teacher said:

The field of home economics is so rich in materials which make for better home and community citizens that boys should be allowed to benefit from it.

Another stated that boys need much more home economics than they are getting and that, since they share the home as well as the girls, training in the fields of home living will help them to feel a responsibility toward family life. Several teachers pointed, as an

indication of a need for more coeducational home economics, to the fact that the boys themselves participate eagerly, show an active interest in the class, and request more home economics than is now being given them.

Alabama teachers share this philosophy of need for coeducational home economics with many authorities in the field of general education and home economics education.

The findings of this study, as they relate to the possibilities for improving the coeducational home economics program in Alabama, will be discussed in the following order: organization of classes, content of courses, techniques, and objectives.

#### Organization of classes

Some teachers in the state believed a coeducational home economics class should be made elective to senior high school students (Table 28). An elective class would, as some of them stated, avoid the problem of unnecessary discipline cases and make for more interest in the course. Other teachers pointed to difficulties in organizing such a class. Since there seems to be about as much in the present vocational program as can be done in the available time, such an elective class would necessarily have to be organized outside the vocational program or the program itself

would have to be changed through action by the State Department of Education. The lack of trained teachers and equipment would be a limiting factor in the organizing of a non-vocational class. It seems, therefore, that efforts should be directed toward making the present type of vocational coeducational class as potent as possible until favorable factors for an additional elective class are evident.

It was agreed (Table 28) that the agriculture teacher should, not only be present in the joint class, but should take an active part in it. His presence reassures the boys of the worthwhileness of the work; his participation makes them more interested; he often can give view points that the home economics teacher fails to see; his knowledge supplements that of the home economics teacher; and his understanding of the boys enables all problems and needs to be brought to light. He may advise committees and supervise group work. He may often do more teaching in this manner than the home economics teacher who is in charge of the class.

In spite of the fact that the home economics teacher needs the presence and participation of the agriculture teacher in the joint class, she feels that there should be some time, if only for a class or two, when she might meet the boys alone. This segre-

gated class would serve to take care of certain problems and questions that boys are hesitant about bringing to a mixed group, and those problems of his in which the girl has no interest. Some teachers suggested, too, that an occasional class of this type will make for splendid relationships between the teacher and the boys. An excellent way of managing this, as one teacher suggested, is to have a special problem week or special problem days in which the question box is used to introduce the personal problems of the boys. While the boys are meeting with the home economics teacher, the girls will have an opportunity to counsel with the agriculture teacher on their home problems with which he can help.

More than one third of the teachers participating in this study stated that in their opinion the combination of the agriculture class and the home economics class made the joint class too large for effective teaching (Table 28). Only 22 per cent felt positive in their opinion that the combined class was still sufficiently small for successful teaching, and many were undecided about the matter. It will, of course, depend on the enrollment of the individual classes, and a crowded condition will probably be found most often in Home Economics I groups.

Whether or not the class is too large will

also depend on the subject being taught, the procedure being used, and the ability of the teacher. It is evident that in foods laboratory crowded conditions make for poor work, since there is often not enough equipment for large classes and work requiring individual attention is difficult in large classes. Committee work and field trips are effective techniques for large coeducational classes, or, in some cases, it may prove worthwhile to divide the class into two sections and plan some way of providing supervision for both, or organize a rotating group procedure to facilitate the teaching of the large group.

The amount of time to be used for teaching coeducational home economics is a pertinent question for every vocational teacher in the state. It is difficult to plan time for joint classes since they usually require more class periods than the teaching of the topic to the girls alone would necessitate. Since both the home economics and agriculture programs are concerned with so many vital problems, any of which the wisdom of omitting to give time for coeducational teaching might be questioned, the problem is made doubly difficult. The procedure is so worthwhile, however, that every effort should be made to find a place for such teaching.

The majority of teachers spent between one

and two weeks teaching coeducational home economics to each class. Since this teaching in many instances included problems in several different units, one might question the thoroughness of the teaching and the value of the outcomes when crowding so much into so short a time. It requires an exceptional teacher to create interest, develop ideals and appreciations, change attitudes and behavior, develop skills, and encourage the assimilation of knowledge, or to accomplish any one of these to an appreciable degree in so short a time.

Most teachers tended to spend more time with coeducational work in Home Economics II than in Home Economics I, and more in Home Economics III than in either of the others. This is logical since there will probably be a growing interest and development of problems as the students advance to the higher levels, and because the background of home economics terms and procedures that is established for the boys in Home Economics I will probably make it less difficult and more worthwhile to teach them in Home Economics II and III.

The time to be allowed for joint teaching will, of course, depend upon the needs and interests of the students, the preparedness of the home economics teacher, the cooperation of the agriculture teacher, and the opinions of the administration.

The following generalizations may thus be made concerning the possibilities for improving the organization of coeducational home economics work in Alabama:

1. More emphasis should be given to home economics for boys and every effort should be made to find a place for coeducational home economics in each vocational department in the state.

2. The agriculture teacher should not only be present in the joint class, but he should be active in planning for and participating in the class.

3. Some provision should be made for the home economics teacher to meet the boys alone during one or more class periods.

4. Careful and definite plans should be made to insure the effective teaching of a joint class possibly twice as large as the ordinary home economics class of girls.

#### Content of courses

It is evident from the data gathered and from the review of literature that coeducational teaching may be done in any or every phase of home economics. The selection of these units will depend, again, on the feelings of the teachers and students concerning them. The present trends in education in general and home economics education in particular, whether for segregated

or coeducational groups, seem to be for teachings in the areas of relationships which deal with personal, social, economic and civic living. A following of this trend would put special emphasis on the units of "Personal Relations", "Family Relations", and "Home Management".

The matter of deciding at which level the teaching in each unit should be placed is, to some extent, an arbitrary one. Since the state course of study suggests an outline of units to be taught in each level, it is most likely that, whenever possible, the coeducational teaching will fit into this outline with minor adjustments. Since "Family Relations" appears on this outline only in Home Economics II, "Personal Relations" in Home Economics I, and "Child Development" and "Home Management" in Home Economics III, there is justification for the fact that these were the places at which most of the coeducational teaching in these units was done by the Alabama teachers. Other units outlined to be taught on all three levels showed a more equal distribution of the teaching on these levels. It may be understood, however, that a good teacher satisfies the educational needs of his students at the time they are evident, and, if a class in Home Economics I shows an interest in problems of "Child Development", the need will be satisfied at this level

rather than postponing such teaching until the third year. This philosophy allows for an elastic interpretation and following of the proposed outline in the course of study.

The topics of study used in the teaching of these units coeducationally varied so widely among the teachers that no general statement concerning their selection may be made. It depended entirely, in this instance, on pupil needs, teacher preparedness, and available time and equipment. One teacher voiced the opinion of a large number when she said that prospective vocational teachers need more training in gardening, poultry raising, landscaping, and simple home mechanics in order to advise members of coeducational classes in these lines.

It is generally agreed that the needs of boys as individuals and as members of families are in general in the same areas as the needs of girls, therefore little modification of the program as planned for girls is necessitated for the teaching of coeducational classes. The chief difficulty is in selecting from the possible topics those few most pertinent ones to be offered the coeducational class during the limited time that is available. It might be more worthwhile to concentrate on teaching well problems from a limited field rather than attempting to cover hurriedly

materials from several different areas. Teachers should perhaps be careful to avoid long-time instruction in food preparation which may not be as important as training in nutrition, food selection, care of clothing, and relationships, and which makes for less time to be spent on these topics which are probably more important to boys.

There appears to have been great variety as to the method for selecting the topics to be studied in coeducational classes. Some teachers stated that they allowed the students sufficient voice in selecting these subjects by teaching only those topics for which there was a request or by giving them an opportunity to choose from a list of acceptable topics. Others admitted frankly that the students had no opportunity to help plan the content of the course. Some teachers suggested that pupils are not able to cope with this problem since they tend to select subjects for pleasure instead of from a real need and that, unless they have had previous training in such, they are not able to recognize their needs and interests. They will, however, probably enjoy and participate more actively in the class if the teachers and pupils plan the course cooperatively. Most teachers agreed that the student should be given an increasing responsibility for helping to plan the content of his home economics course.

Teachers in Alabama might consider the following suggestions for improving the content of courses for coeducational home economics:

1. The planning should be directed toward producing desired outcomes in a limited field rather than toward a hurried sampling of factors in several different areas.
2. Careful consideration should be given to the choosing of the few topics for which there is time so that the greatest needs and interests of the students are satisfied.
3. Students should be given an increasing opportunity to help with the selection of subject matter. The planning might well be done in conference with the agriculture teacher, the principal, and student representatives.

### Techniques

Many home economics teachers, believing that the teaching of boys requires a special technique, are hesitant to accept the responsibilities of teaching a joint class. The data showed, however, that those teachers who had had the experience of teaching coeducational classes in Alabama used successfully the same techniques as are generally accepted as usable for classes of girls.

The technique most successful for the

teaching of any one class is dependent on the topic to be studied, the objectives of the class, the equipment available, the skills and personality of the teacher, and the personality of the class members. It is also evident that no one technique can be accepted as successful for the teaching of any one class; a combination of several methods will always prove more successful.

### Objectives

The success of coeducational home economics teaching is dependent to a large extent on the objectives of the course as set up before the course begins. If definite ideas as to the aims and outcomes of the class have been formulated, it is much more likely that the teaching will have meaning and interest for the student than if such objectives are not formulated before the class begins. Since the most frequently stated general objectives given by the teachers in Alabama dealt with a relationship between the two departments and to home and school activities, rather than to any development of the students, it may be inferred that insufficient thought was given to the formulation of these objectives.

The specific objectives as stated by the teachers in this study were more pertinent than the general objectives. Most teachers stated some very

definite desired outcomes for each individual unit. Since these objectives are dependent on the individual needs and class needs, it is logical that the objectives for no two teachers would be the same.

Alabama home economics teachers should give much careful consideration to the forming of both general and specific objectives for coeducational home economics teaching.

### Implications

While the teaching of coeducational home economics in Alabama is meeting many needs, the points where improvement can be made in the program, some of which are mentioned above, might well be offered for consideration to the teachers in the state. Teachers in Alabama are provided with source materials for all phases of their classroom teaching, except for that of coeducational classes, and, since there is little opportunity for training in the field of coeducational teaching, it is to be expected that most teachers will not possess the maximum self-confidence as they attempt the program. Two suggestions were given by the teachers themselves for improving this situation: (1) In personal interviews several teachers suggested the formation of a class made up of home economics and agriculture teachers to study methods in coeducational teaching of vocational subjects; and (2) a large

majority of the teachers believed that source materials for coeducational teaching should be included in the state course of study (Table 28). They mentioned the need for some sort of general guide and a collection of ideas from experienced teachers in the directing of coeducational home economics classes. They also suggested the fact that such materials in the course of study would make for more emphasis on joint teaching and therefore promote a more active coeducational program in the state.

Chapter VI

SOURCE MATERIALS FOR COEDUCATIONAL  
HOME ECONOMICS IN ALABAMA

In view of the fact that the majority of the teachers in the state expressed a feeling of need for materials or helps in their teaching of coeducational home economics, and since many of them asked to be advised of the outcome of this study, the following materials are set forth for the consideration of those who may be interested. These ideas and suggestions are compiled from data gathered among teachers in the state, and from expressions of authorities in the field and state departments of education as found in the review of literature. It would not be expected that any teacher could adopt all the ideas herein, but they may be accepted as source materials from which ideas may be selected and adapted to local situations.

These suggestions are presented to aid in the organization of coeducational home economics classes and in the planning of courses for these classes. Special techniques for handling large coeducational classes are also included.

## ORGANIZATION OF COEDUCATIONAL CLASSES

The following suggestions may be helpful in organizing joint classes in Alabama:

1. The organization of a coeducational home economics class should be a cooperative enterprise between the two vocational teachers and the administration.
2. Students should be given increasing responsibility for helping to plan the content of the courses.
3. Both vocational teachers should usually be present and take an active part in the daily lessons.
4. Some time should be provided, perhaps a day or two, when the home economics teacher may meet the boys alone.
5. Planning should be directed toward producing desired outcomes in a limited field rather than toward a hurried sampling of factors in several different areas.
6. Much consideration should be given the fact that the joint class will probably be twice as large as the ordinary home economics class. With equipment available for only small numbers, it may be necessary to use different teaching procedures to insure the effectiveness of the teaching in larger groups. Special techniques for handling the larger coeducational home economics class are presented further on in this outline.

CONTENT OF COURSES  
FOR COEDUCATIONAL CLASSES

Suggested objectives, and methods and materials are presented for each phase of home economics usually taught in the vocational departments of Alabama schools. No attempt is made to designate at which level of teaching any specific objective or activity should come, since it depends entirely on the local situation.

The child in the home

Objectives.--1. Interest in helping with the development of younger members of the family.

2. Understanding of the place of younger children in the family.

3. Skills in constructing toys and playthings for children.

Methods and materials.--1. Discuss what duties the students have in caring for younger members of the family.

2. Make a list of the care and training children require daily and point out the work and time this entails for some member of the family.

3. Discuss discipline problems with children and what older members can do about this.

4. Observe in play schools.

5. Read stories and recall movies on child life.
6. Find out what types of playthings are educative for children and construct some of these.
7. Promote a Christmas toy project for underprivileged children.

#### The well-dressed individual

Objectives.--1. Understanding of the importance of being well dressed.

2. Ability to select a well-planned wardrobe.
3. Appreciation for the problems involved in buying clothes.
4. Interest in improving appearance through care of clothing.

Methods and materials.--1. Find out what it takes for one to be well dressed.

2. Find pictures of well-dressed people and analyze them.
3. Discuss the proper dress for different occasions.
4. Find out the colors suitable for different members of the class.
5. Experiment with combining colors, designs, etc. to make up a costume.
6. Find out the part that line plays in a costume.

7. Consider the cost of clothing and how to plan and buy wisely.
8. Consult sampler books for colors, styles, and prices.
9. Make a field trip to a clothing store to note styles and fabrics.
10. Promote a fashion show.
11. List the daily care that should be given to clothes.
12. Find out how to darn socks.
13. Demonstrate methods of caring for clothing.
14. Learn to press woolens, trousers, coats, and dresses.
15. Learn how to lengthen trousers, turn collars, dry clean at home.
16. Visit a dry cleaning establishment.
17. Experiment with cleaning methods for new fabrics.
18. Use stories and movies depicting the influence of dress.

### Family living

Objectives.--1. Understanding of the problems of relationships that home living makes inevitable.

2. Feeling that happy home life may be obtained only through the cooperation of every member.

3. Development of standards for present and future homes.

4. Development of good family morale.

5. Appreciation of the home as a social center, where individual, family, or community recreation may be enjoyed.

6. Appreciation for the place of home and family in society.

Methods and materials.--1. Discuss problems and misunderstandings which arise often in the home. Find ways of lessening the strain caused from these.

2. Conduct a panel on problems of family life.

3. Discuss the qualities a good family member should have.

4. Invite successful family members to speak to the class.

5. Debate questions of family standards.

6. Use stories and movies as basis for discussion of family living.

7. Dramatize family life situations.

8. Use comic strips to illustrate types of family behavior.

9. Find out what boys look for in choosing a mate and what girls look for in choosing mates.

10. Find out where students in the class get most of their recreation.

11. Plan ways of including the family in recreational programs.
12. Plan "fun night" for a family.
13. Learn games that may be played in family groups.
14. Build a game library to be kept at school and checked out for home use.
15. Discuss the problem of grandmothers or other extra-family members.
16. Discuss the place of home and family life in society.
17. Compare our family life with that of other social orders.
18. Divide into committees called "family groups" to study problems of family life.

#### On being well-fed

Objectives.--1. Understanding of importance of nutrition to health.

2. Understanding of the importance of choosing foods to make up an adequate diet for the individual.

3. Interest in providing a year-round home food supply.

4. Knowledge of gardening and its relation to the home food supply.

5. Knowledge of the principles of table etiquette.

6. Appreciation for factors involved in food preparation.

Methods and materials.--1. Find out causes of underweight, overweight, and other simple health deficiencies.

2. Use charts and pictures to study food requirements.

3. Experiment with white rats to show results of inadequate diet.

4. Decide what the daily food requirements of the boys are and how they differ from those of the girls.

5. Check daily food habits to determine if requirements are reached.

6. Plan food needs for one day.

7. Investigate gardening principles.

8. Plan and help cultivate a school garden.

9. Make plans for a fall and winter garden as well as a spring garden at home.

10. Investigate rules of table etiquette.

11. Practice use of silverware and setting the table.

12. Prepare and serve simple party refreshments.

### Physical fitness

Objectives.--1. Interest in improving

personal health.

2. Understanding of the relation of diet to physical fitness.

3. Interest in improving the health conditions of the home, school, and community.

4. Skill in first aid treatments.

5. Knowledge of mechanical ways of making the sick comfortable.

6. Appreciation of the place of the patient in the family pattern.

Methods and materials.--1. Find out what the athletic training rules are and the reasons for them.

2. Decide on ways of making weight normal and improving general health conditions of the individual.

3. Refer to charts for information on diets.

4. Discuss health conditions of the community and ways of improving them.

5. Have the county health officials make physical examinations.

6. Survey community to find health hazards.

7. Demonstrate and practice first aid techniques.

8. Find out what daily care a patient needs and what can be done to make the patient more comfortable.

9. Make mechanical devices for use in the home care of the sick.

### Managing the home

Objectives.--1. Understanding of the need for division of responsibilities in the home.

2. Knowledge of family finance problems.

3. Appreciation for the part that wise buying may play in family finance.

4. Understanding of the part that the arrangement and selection of equipment may have on the use of time and energy.

5. Knowledge of and appreciation for labor-saving devices.

Methods and materials.--1. Discuss the duties of the different members of the family to find out if each individual is assuming his share of the responsibilities.

2. Investigate ways of saving time and energy.

3. Take a field trip to see labor-saving devices in the individual homes.

4. Use laboratory periods for making labor-saving devices.

5. Study furniture arrangement and its relation to energy management.

6. Make charts showing step-saving arrange-

ments.

7. Become familiar with budgets, discuss family finance problems, use references to seek solutions.

8. Investigate insurance policies, rates, etc.

9. Practice writing checks, deposit slips, receipts, etc.

### Improving the home

Objectives.--1. Appreciation for beauty in the home and its surroundings.

2. Knowledge of the problems involved in landscaping the home grounds.

3. Interest in making the home more livable.

4. Interest in improving the comforts and conveniences in the home.

5. Skills in refinishing and renovating furniture.

6. Interest in comparative advantages of owning and renting a home.

Methods and materials.---1. Take a field trip to note beauty in community homes and to study landscaping plans of homes in the community.

2. Find out what makes homes attractive.

3. Consider the cost and materials involved in the little things that make for beauty.

4. Study the landscaping plans of attractive homes in the neighborhood.

5. Find out what native shrubbery is available.

6. Learn how and when to transplant shrubbery.

7. Plan a simple school project for improving one area of the school grounds.

8. Find out about little things such as the height of working surfaces which make the home comfortable and convenient.

9. Investigate possibilities for renovating furniture.

10. Refinish furniture brought from home or found in the department.

11. Demonstrate the use of simple labor-saving devices and appliances.

12. Find out what provisions are made to insure privacy, comfort, and happiness of every member of the household.

13. Discuss the desirability of arranging a living room or other living center in the home to provide for entertaining friends and pursuing hobbies and other pleasures.

14. Investigate rents, home costs, mortgages, taxes, housing laws, etc.

15. Invite authoritative speaker to talk on home ownership.

Living with others

Objectives.--1. An appreciation for and a working knowledge of the social graces.

2. Wholesome attitude between the sexes.

3. Interest in improving personal appearance and physical fitness.

4. Development of well-rounded personality.

5. Knowledge of successful home entertaining.

Methods and materials.--1. Find out what boys consider an attractive girl, and what girls consider a nice looking boy.

2. Discuss ways of making oneself more attractive.

3. Demonstrate the effect of clothing and grooming on personal appearance. Use magazine articles, advertisements, and pamphlets to emphasize this point.

4. List things other than appearance that make for attractiveness.

5. Discuss embarrassing social situations and find out means of avoiding these.

6. Have a round table discussion of social problems.

7. Use a panel to discuss dating problems.

8. Provide a question-box for problems that might not otherwise arise.

9. Read stories of boy-girl relationships.

10. Divide into committees to secure material on problems mentioned.
11. Practice social graces such as introducing people and seating girls at the table.
12. Dramatize problems of conduct or relationships.
13. Use case studies to give practice in solving problems.
14. Have individual conferences with those needing special help.
15. Debate questions relating to social behavior.
16. Plan and execute a party or other social function.
17. Find out the hobbies of students in the class and discuss the place of hobbies in building personality.
18. Emphasize the responsibility the student has in the home, community and society.

#### SUGGESTIONS FOR HANDLING LARGE COEDUCATIONAL CLASSES

Large classes, mixed groups, little space, and limited equipment combine in many cases to make successful coeducational home economics teaching what may seem to be a practical impossibility. The following plans

have proved successful for some teachers who confronted these problems:

#### Two section plan

The combined agriculture and home economics class may be divided into two sections with an equal distribution of boys and girls in the two groups. One group may then be supervised by the home economics teacher and the other by the agriculture teacher. After this division is made, either of the following plans may be pursued:

Different problems.---One group may engage in problems of home economics while the other investigates their mutual problems with which the agriculture teacher may help. This requires careful planning so that both groups finish their study at approximately the same time and may, as they finish, exchange places and take up the problem the other group has been discussing.

Parallel problems.---Both groups may engage in the same study under different teachers, provided both teachers feel prepared to handle the problem. It may be possible, under this plan, for the teachers to exchange sections for an hour or so during the unit and provide the students with viewpoints on the subject from two individuals rather than one.

#### Committee plan

The class may be organized into committees and

sub-committees to pursue different phases of a problem. These committees can be scattered into different parts of the vocational department where they may work individually without disturbance from the other groups. The agriculture teacher and home economics teacher may move among the groups giving each the help it needs and supervising the activities of each. As a summary each committee may present to the entire group its findings or accomplishments.

#### Rotating group plan

The class may be divided into several smaller groups; perhaps three or four are as many as can be handled effectively. The work is then so organized that each group engages in a different problem or activity, all of which terminate at the same time. There should be a logical sequence to these problems so that as Group I completes its first study it attacks the problem which Group II has been pursuing and Group II takes over the work Group III has been doing. Group III must then assume the problems of the first group or others which logically grow out of its study. These progressions are continued until each group has completed the cycle. This plan must of necessity be devoid of the usual "discussion lesson". It is evident that the teacher must spend some time with each group and yet so arrange the work that the groups can work independently of her when

she is with another committee. The following outline for six days of study may give a picture of the plan.

LESSON	GROUP I	GROUP II	GROUP III
I	Table etiquette	Food needs of the body	Organizing work for preparation of simple meal
II	Table setting	Planning a simple meal	Preparing a meal, serving, clean- ing up
III	Food needs of the body	Organizing work for meal prepara- tion	Table etiquette
IV	Planning a simple meal	Preparing a meal, serv- ing, cleaning up	Table setting
V	Organizing work for meal preparation	Table etiquette	Food needs of the body
VI	Preparing a meal, serv- ing, cleaning up	Table setting	Planning a simple meal

## Chapter VII

### SUMMARY

Since coeducational home economics is relatively new in Alabama, and, therefore, is, more or less, in the experimental stage, this investigation was made to discover possibilities for improving the present coeducational home economics program in the state.

The data for this study were collected from 203, or 98 per cent, of the home economics teachers in Alabama schools where both vocational home economics and vocational agriculture were taught during 1941-42. A check sheet regarding the organization, content, objectives, techniques, and opinions of teachers concerning the program was sent to each of these teachers. Interviews were held with a sampling of the teachers, and their opinions of the program as expressed orally were checked against their opinions as stated on the check sheet to determine the validity of such opinions.

It was found that, in 64 per cent of the schools investigated, some time was spent during 1941-42 in the teaching of coeducational home economics. It was, however, the opinion of 80 per cent of the teachers that not enough time was given to this type of work.

The size of the classes ranged from fewer than nine to above 70, and, in most cases, lasted one or two weeks. In expressing their opinions of the organization of these classes, 70 per cent of the teachers suggested that the agriculture teacher, on most days, should be present and take an active part in the class, but, stated 67 per cent, the boys should be allowed to meet with the home economics teacher alone for one or more class periods if possible.

Problems in practically every phase of home economics included in the Alabama course of study were taught coeducationally. The topics found to have been taught by 60 per cent or more of the teachers offering work in a unit on any one level were as follows:

"Etiquette", "Clothing Selection", "Care of Clothing", "Gardening", "First Aid", "Landscaping", and "Toys for Children".

Eleven methods were used by the various teachers for determining the topics for study. In the larger percentage (39 per cent), but by no means the majority, of the cases the agriculture teacher and the home economics teacher decided in conference what should be taught. Sixty-one per cent of the teachers stated that they believed students should be given more voice in the selection of content for the classes.

A summary of the techniques considered

successful for teaching coeducational home economics showed that "Discussion" was considered effective more often than any other method. "Discussion" was mentioned as being successful 194 times, "Demonstration" 112 times, and "Laboratory" 96 times. Twenty-one other methods were named as effective.

Forty-two per cent of the teachers stating general objectives hoped to improve the relations between the two departments, and 32 per cent hoped to encourage joint home and school projects. The specific objectives stated related to the individual units taught. More than 40 per cent of those stating objectives for the "Personal Relations" unit included "developing social graces" and "understanding boy-girl problems"; 71 per cent of those stating "Clothing" objectives planned to develop skill in caring for clothes; and more than 40 per cent of those stating "Foods" objectives related their aims to home food supply and nutrition. The number of teachers listing any one objective for the other units was not significant.

Sixty-seven per cent of teachers who gave their opinions of the Alabama coeducational home economics program believed that there should be materials in the state course of study concerning joint classes in home economics.

In view of these findings the following

recommendations were made concerning the possibilities for improving the coeducational home economics program in Alabama:

1. More emphasis should be given to home economics for boys.
2. The organization of a coeducational home economics class should be a cooperative enterprise between the two vocational teachers and the administration.
3. Both vocational teachers should usually be present and take an active part in the daily lesson.
4. Some time should be provided, perhaps a day or two, when the home economics teacher may meet the boys alone.
5. Careful plans should be made before the class is organized to insure the effective teaching of a joint class possibly twice as large as the ordinary home economics class of girls.
6. Planning should be directed toward producing desired outcomes in a limited field rather than toward a hurried sampling of factors in several different areas.
7. The content of the coeducational home economics classes might well be planned by the homemaking teacher in conference with the agriculture teacher, the principal, and student representatives.
8. It should be remembered that the technique most successful for the teaching of any one class is dependent on the topic to be studied, the objectives of the class, the equipment available, the skills and personality of the class members. No one technique can be accepted as successful for the teaching of any one class; a combination of several methods will always prove more successful.

9. If definite aims and outcomes for the class are set up before it is begun, it is much more likely that the teaching will have meaning and interest for the student than if such objectives are not formulated.
10. Both general and specific objectives should relate to the development of the student, rather than to any relationship between the two departments or to any other secondary issue.
11. Materials in the state course of study concerning coeducational home economics would be of value to teachers in the state.

A P E N D I X

## APPENDIX CONTENTS

Appendix	Page
A.--CHECK SHEET - - - - -	136
B.--LETTER TO TEACHERS CONCERNING CHECK SHEET - - - - -	145
C.--REASONS GIVEN FOR OPINIONS EXPRESSED ON CHECK SHEET - - - - -	146
D.--ADDITIONAL OPINIONS EXPRESSED IN INTERVIEW - - - - -	159
E.--MASTER SHEET - - - - -	160

Appendix A.--CHECK SHEET

## Appendix A.--CHECK SHEET

## COEDUCATIONAL HOME ECONOMICS IN ALABAMA

1. DATE \_\_\_\_\_
2. NUMBER OF YEARS HOME ECONOMICS IS OFFERED \_\_\_\_\_
3. IS THERE A VOCATIONAL AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT IN YOUR SCHOOL? \_\_\_\_\_
4. DID YOU TEACH ANY JOINT AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS CLASSES THIS YEAR? \_\_\_\_\_

(The following applies only to those answering question four affirmatively. If you have not taught any joint classes, please return this questionnaire with only the above information).

**DIRECTIONS:** These questions concern only your work for the year 1941-42. Please place a check (x) in the proper columns to indicate your practice or opinion. Spaces have been left for you to include additional points if you desire.

- I. How much time was spent this year in teaching home economics to joint agriculture and home economics classes?

TIME	HOME ECONOMICS		
	I	II	III
One week			
Two weeks			
Three weeks			
Four weeks			
Five weeks			
Six weeks			

II. How many students were enrolled in each of your joint classes?

SITUATION	HOME ECONOMICS		
	I	II	III
All home economics and agriculture students met together in one class.			
The joint class of home economics and agriculture students was sufficiently large that it was divided into two sections which met separately	Sec. I		Sec. II

III. What topics did you teach to the joint classes in home economics this year?

TOPIC	HOME ECONOMICS		
	I	II	III
PERSONAL RELATIONS			
Personality			
Personal Appearance			
Etiquette			
Boy and Girl Relationships			
Other Human Relationships			
Entertaining in the Home			
Use of Leisure Time			

#### CLOTHING

Clothing Selection
Mending

## III.--Continued

TOPIC	HOME ECONOMICS		
	I	II	III
Care of Clothing			
Clothing Consumer Problems			
Clothing Construction			
FOODS			
Planning and Preparing Meals			
Cooking Simple Dishes			
Banquet or Special Meal			
Camp Cookery			
Nutrition			
Buying Foods			
Food Preservation			
Gardening			
Poultry			
HEALTH			
Home Care of the Sick			
First Aid			
Personal Health			
Health of Home and Community			

## III.--Continued

TOPIC	HOME ECONOMICS		
	I	II	III
HOME MANAGEMENT			
Division of Responsibilities			
Use of Time and Energy			
Family Finance			
Personal Money Problems			
Labor Saving Devices			
Equipment -- Arrangement and Selection			
Consumer Problems			
HOUSE			
House Planning			
Home Selection			
Care of the House			
Comfort and Convenience of Home			
Furniture and Furnishings			
Landscaping			
Flowers			
FAMILY RELATIONS			
Division of Responsibilities			
Family Finance			

## III.---Continued

TOPIC	HOME ECONOMICS		
	I	II	III

Family Recreation

Building a Happy Home

Marriage Problems

## CHILD DEVELOPMENT

Child Care and Training

Toys for Children

## OTHER UNITS

IV. What techniques did you find particularly effective for teaching joint classes this year and in which units did you use them successfully?

ACTIVITY	PER. REL.	CLOTHING	FOODS	HEALTH	HOME MGT.	HOUSE	FAM. REL.	CHILD DEV.	OTHERS
----------	--------------	----------	-------	--------	--------------	-------	--------------	---------------	--------

Case Study  
 Committee Work  
 Conferences  
 Debate  
 Demonstration  
 Discussion  
 Display  
 Dramatics  
 Entertaining  
 Forum  
 Field Trip  
 Laboratory  
 Lecture  
 Movies  
 Notebook  
 Panel  
 Problem Method  
 Projects  
 Recitation  
 Reports  
 Round Table  
 Stories  
 Supervised Study

V. What are your opinions of the present coeducational home economics program in Alabama and what are your reasons for these opinions?

OPINION	YES	NO	UNDECIDED	REASONS FOR OPINION
Too much emphasis is being given to home economics for boys.				
There should be more home economics training provided for boys.				
There should be an elective class in home economics offered to boys and girls in senior high school.				
Boys should be taught home economics in segregated groups.				
There should be some time, if only for a class or two, when the home economics teacher could meet the boys alone.				
A combination of home economics and agriculture classes makes the joint class too large for effective work				
The agriculture teacher should be present and take an active part in the class activities				
The student should be given more opportunity to help select units and subject matter for joint classes.				
There should be materials in the state course of study concerning joint classes in home economics.				

VI. Please state the method by which the topics for study in joint classes in home economics were selected this year.

VII. Please include a copy of your objectives for joint class work this year.

VIII. Comments:

## Appendix B.--LETTER TO TEACHERS CONCERNING CHECK SHEET

Montevallo, Ala.  
April 20, 1942.

Dear Vocational Home Economics Teacher:

Since home economics for boys, and especially that which boys study along with girls, is relatively new in Alabama, and since there are such varied practices and opinions regarding this work, I am interested in getting some idea of the different programs over the state. I am enclosing a questionnaire regarding such joint class work.

Plans for the gathering and use of this material have been discussed with Miss Hayley and she has approved of the study with the idea that it may bring to light some interesting procedures or problems that may be of value to Home Economics throughout the state. The information will also be used for a graduate study problem at Colorado State College.

I hope you will find it possible to consider this questionnaire and return it at your earliest convenience. Most of it requires only a check. In one instance it is asked that you state reasons for your opinions; though the mere check will be valuable here, it will be appreciated if you can state your reasons. If you have not done any joint Home Economics-Agriculture work this year, will you please consider only the preliminary, the first four, questions and return the questionnaire with only this information. I believe the entire questionnaire will require only a few minutes of your time and I shall appreciate it so much if you can return the information within the next two weeks.

If you are interested in the results of this study, the material will be tabulated and organized by the end of the summer and you may have the use of any of it you wish.

Yours very truly,

Christine Beasley

Appendix C.--REASONS GIVEN FOR OPINIONS EXPRESSED ON  
CHECK SHEET

Appendix C.--REASONS GIVEN FOR OPINIONS EXPRESSED ON  
CHECK SHEET

Opinion.--There should be more home economics training provided for boys.

Reasons and comments.--1. Home economics is becoming just as essential as English.

2. Many boys need to learn more about problems dealing with home economics to increase their understanding of home and family problems.

3. Boys need home economics to develop appreciation for home problems and knowledge of how to solve them.

4. Boys need to know more about nutrition, child development, home care of the sick, etc. because they have such a vital part to play in the family home life.

5. If boys had training in home economics there would be more happy homes.

6. Boys keep asking for information regarding their personal and home problems.

7. Boys need much more home economics than they are getting. They share the home as well as the girls. Training in every field of home life helps men to feel a responsibility toward home and family living.

8. The field of home economics is so rich in materials that make people better home and community

citizens that boys should be allowed to benefit from it.

9. Boys participate eagerly and are very interested in home economics.

10. Boys have asked for home economics training in large numbers; they should be given the courses which interest them and are really necessary. Boys are as responsible for happy home life as girls.

11. Boys need help especially in "foods" and "relationships".

12. Boys are interested in homemaking. Other courses do not provide enough of this training.

13. The local school situation is a determining factor in whether or not more emphasis should be given to home economics for boys.

Opinion.--There should be an elective class in home economics offered to boys and girls in Senior high school.

Reasons and comments.--1. If a school program could provide such and if a trained teacher and the equipment could be provided, such a class would be excellent.

2. The work would be more interesting if it were made elective.

3. This would be fine if there were time for it in the curriculum.

4. Questions asked teachers by boys indicate a need for such. Their behavior at certain times and

places proves it.

5. To avoid unnecessary discipline problems and to create interesting discussions of home problems, I think home economics should be elective.

6. Our high school is too small to offer a course like this.

7. This would be fine, but there seems to be about as much as can be done well in the present vocational program.

8. This would be excellent, when possible, to fill needs of those desiring special help in a phase of homemaking.

9. The students have asked about such a class for the past two years.

10. An elective course in family relationships and child development would help to clear up some of the family problems, especially during the present emergency.

11. Personalities and desires vary. If the course were elective and a child felt the need of the subject, he could work it into his own program to a better advantage.

12. An elective class is probably the most satisfactory of all methods, but I would like to have the boys and girls separate.

13. In such a situation there should be two home economics teachers in the school.

Opinion.--Boys should be taught home economics in segregated groups.

Reasons and comments.--1. It is easier and more effective in most cases.

2. For some classes it is best that the boys be in segregated groups.

3. This would depend on the subject matter and the students.

4. They should study jointly because they need to exchange ideas and learn to work together.

5. It would be good to have a few classes for the boys in a separate group.

6. Boys and girls enjoy home economics classes together.

7. Boys and girls are more interested when working together; it is the natural situation.

8. For some work the presence of girls makes the boys shy.

9. Boys seem more free to talk when alone.

10. Boys will get more out of it if they are alone.

11. There are many things that will be more real if taught to a mixed group.

12. Boys and girls don't live in segregated groups; why should they be taught in separate groups?

13. The work is more effective if the boys and girls are together.

14. Some things should be taught in segregated groups; others in mixed groups.

15. Joint teaching means that each group profits by the experiences of and the associations with the other group.

16. Discipline problems are fewer if the boys are taught in segregated classes.

17. Boys and girls require a different approach; therefore should be taught separately.

18. The teacher can suit her teaching to the problems of the boys better if they are taught separately.

19. Boys and girls need to work out their problems together.

20. Girls spur the boys on by asking questions and aiding in the discussion.

Opinion.--There should be some time, if only for a class or two, when the home economics teacher could meet the boys alone.

Reasons and comments.--1. Boys will not always ask questions or discuss topics they would like to know about if they are in the presence of girls.

2. With some subjects boys are self conscious if girls are present.

3. In many cases the boys will give their opinions and talk more freely if the girls are not present.

4. Special problem week or special problem days could be set aside and question box used to open a general discussion of personal problems boys have when the boys meet alone.

5. There are points and questions that boys are hesitant about bringing up in a mixed group. This would establish splendid relationships and allow the more personal problems to arise.

6. This should be provided so as to give them help with their problems and questions they had rather not discuss with girls.

7. Girls might not need or be interested in some of the problems of the boys; a more informative discussion might be held with the boys alone.

8. It is not necessary to provide time for them to meet in separate groups. All problems may be discussed together.

9. There are some subjects such as grooming and clothing selection which could be put across better if boys are alone.

10. This would depend upon the subject and also upon the students to be taught.

Opinion.--A combination of home economics and agriculture classes makes the joint class too large for effective work.

Reasons and comments.--1. In most cases this depends on the enrollment.

2. It depends on the subject being taught.

3. This is true in our Home Economics I classes.

4. This is not true in our school.

5. There is not sufficient equipment for large classes.

6. Individual attention cannot be given the members of a large class.

7. In the laboratory classes crowded conditions make for poor work.

8. Laboratory work is not effective with more than 25 members in the class.

9. It is hard to discipline a large group.

10. Field trips and group work are very effective in large classes.

11. Committee work is effective with large classes.

12. The class might be divided into two sections.

13. With two teachers a group of as many as 40 may be handled effectively.

14. The rotating group plan might be effectively used.

15. There are fewer activities suitable for use with large groups than with small groups.

Opinion.--The agriculture teacher should be present and take an active part in the class activities.

Reasons and comments.--1. This depends on the situation. There are times when it may be best that he not be in the class.

2. It makes for more effective work and more harmony.

3. The agriculture teacher might add important ideas to the class.

4. He can contribute valuable information to the class.

5. His presence will reassure the boys of the worthwhileness of the work.

6. He should be there to share the responsibility if for no other reason.

7. His practical point of view often opens up the way for excellent opportunity for home project work.

8. His participation makes the boys more interested.

9. He is in a position to give the viewpoint of boys and men.

10. Often he can give view points that the home economics teacher fails to see.

11. He may understand boys better than the home economics teacher, and thus be able to get more response from them.

12. His understanding of the boys will enable all problems and needs to be brought to light.

13. The agriculture teacher may wish, at a later date, to refer to the work done in home economics. If he is present at these classes then he has a better understanding of the student's background.

14. More effective work can be accomplished if both teachers are present.

15. It creates more interest if the agriculture teacher is present.

16. He should be present to help with discipline.

17. His presence would make for a better teacher-teacher and pupil-teacher relationship.

18. He should be present to contribute his share and to present a united front. His training and experience make him valuable.

19. He should be present in some classes. In every case he should know what subjects are presented and how they are handled. This could be done occasionally in conference with the home economics teacher.

Opinion.--The student should be given more opportunity to help select units and subject matter for joint classes.

Reasons and comments.--1. Students usually realize their own needs better than anyone else.

2. Unless they have had previous training they cannot recognize their needs and interests.

3. The boys have very definite ideas about what they want to study.

4. If they are to select their own subject matter, they need guidance. They often select subjects for pleasure instead of from real need.

5. It depends on the situation and teacher.

6. They will enjoy and participate more fully in the class if they have helped plan the study.

7. They are already given sufficient opportunity to help with the planning.

8. We should know better ourselves what they need.

9. They are often given joint work that they do not want.

10. Better work and more interest is manifested when the students feel that they wanted the study.

11. Realizing their needs develops initiative.

12. To some extent students should help plan their work. If there is a special need for a

particular problem it may be necessary for the teacher to guide their selection.

13. This should be done only in elective classes.

14. They are sufficiently conscious of their interests to base their choices on this, but they do not always realize the need for some things which we might give them.

Opinion.---There should be materials in the state course of study concerning joint classes in home economics.

Reasons and comments.---1. We are not as prepared for this work as we should be.

2. It would be useful as a general guide.

3. It would be particularly helpful to beginning teachers.

4. If this were true there would be too strong a tendency to follow the course of study instead of the local need.

5. It would help to give us materials and suggestions for joint work.

6. Ideas or ways to teach should certainly be included.

7. Any guide would be helpful. We could always modify it to fit our situation.

8. Such materials in the course of study would make for more emphasis on joint teaching and

therefore promote a more active coeducational program in the state.

9. Since it is an individual problem with different schools, such materials would be of little value.

10. Ideas collected from experienced teachers would be of great value.

11. A collection of ideas from experienced teachers over the state would be most valuable.

12. Such materials should be used as a guide only.

Opinion.--Prospective vocational teachers need training in gardening, poultry producing, landscaping, and simple home mechanics in order to do a more thorough job of advising students in these lines.

Appendix D.--ADDITIONAL OPINIONS EXPRESSED IN INTERVIEW

1. Classes in joint work composed of home economics and agriculture teachers during the annual School of Instruction would possibly be of more value to the program than any other thing.

2. There should be a special textbook to meet the needs of teaching a coeducational home economics class.

Appendix E.--MASTER SHEET

This image shows a blank, aged, cream-colored page, likely an endpaper or flyleaf of a book. The paper has a slightly textured appearance with some minor discoloration and faint horizontal lines near the top edge, possibly from a previous binding or scanning artifact. The left edge of the page shows the binding of the book, and the overall tone is a warm, off-white or light beige.

Master Sheet

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Braly, Pauline. Content of courses for boy's home economics in ten high schools of Texas for 1939-40. Master's thesis, 1940. Colorado state college of agriculture and mechanic arts. 99 p. ms.
2. Christian, Johnie. A suggested program for the reconstruction of home economics in secondary education. Doctor's thesis, 1940. Ohio state university. (Abstract in: Ohio state university. Graduate school. Abstracts of dissertations. . . doctor of philosophy, summer quarter, 1940. Abstracts of doctoral dissertations, no. 34:103-8)
3. Cowles, Ruth Cooley. Senior high economics for boys. Practical home economics, 16:464-5, December 1938.
4. Davis, Florence. Boys in the home management house. Journal of home economics, 33:640, November 1941.
5. Elliott, Essie L. Practices and implications of homemaking education for boys and men on various school levels. National education association. Addresses and proceedings, 77:486-7, 1939.
6. Field, A. M. Home economics instruction for boys. Agricultural education, 10:206-7, May 1938.
7. Firth, Maude E. Teaching family relationships to mixed classes. Journal of home economics, 29:151-3, March 1937.
8. Goldsmith, Frances Schneider and McClanathan, Helen. Adolescent attitudes. Journal of home economics, 34:92-6, February 1942.
9. Hoskinson, Scott. Exchange classes. Agricultural education, 10:67, October 1937.

10. Indiana. State department of education. Home economics education. A guide for the improvement of instruction with sample source materials; junior and senior high school home economics. Indianapolis, Burford printing co., 1938. 283 p. (Bulletin, no. 123)
11. Kansas. State board for vocational education. Annual descriptive report . . . to the Office of education, Division of vocational education, for the year ending June 30, 1938. nd. various paging. mim.
12. Kansas. State department of education. Course of study for high schools. Part IX-Home economics. Topeka, Kansas, Kansas state printing co., 1936. 208 p.
13. Kansas. State board for vocational education. Vocational homemaking bulletin, September-October, 1938. Topeka, Kansas. (Vol. X, no. 1)
14. Kauffman-Springer, Fern. An outline for a course in homemaking for boys in high school based on suggestions made by 160 boys and 102 fathers. Master's thesis, 1939. Purdue University. Abstract in: Association of land-grant colleges and universities. Home economics section. Notes on graduate studies and research in home economics and home economics education, 1939-40. p. 176.
15. Link, Freddie S. Attitude of boys and girls toward certain social problems. Master's thesis, 1940. Colorado state college of agriculture and mechanic arts. 91 p. ms.
16. Louisiana. State department of education. Suggestions for improving the home economics instruction in the public schools of Louisiana. Baton Rouge, Louisiana, 1938. 300 p. (Bulletin no. 379)
17. Miller, Ruth Rick. Coeducational adult homemaking in Wisconsin city vocational schools. Master's thesis, 1940. Colorado state college of agriculture and mechanic arts. 91 p. ms.

18. Milligan, Ellen J. Home economics in the basic course, II. Practical home economics, 17:315, November 1939.
19. Moser, V. G. Home economics and agriculture exchange classes. Agricultural education, 6:168-9, May 1934.
20. Nebraska. State department of vocational home-making. Twentieth annual state conference. Lincoln, Nebraska, The board, 1938. 58 p. ms.
21. Nicholson, Romaine. Home economics for boys has arrived. Practical home economics, 18:6-7. January 1940.
22. Noll, M. C. Boy's interests concerning home economics. Master's thesis, 1939. University of southern California. (Abstract in: U. S. office of education. Bibliography of research studies in education, 1938-39. Bulletin, 1940, no. 5, p. 180.)
23. Oklahoma. State department of education. Division of vocational education. Teacher's guide for instruction in homemaking, grades 7-12, Oklahoma City, Progress printing co., 1939. 86 p. (Home economics bulletin, no. 11.)
24. Park, W. C. What a pupil and principal think of a homemaking course for boys. Journal of home economics, 30:332, May 1938.
25. Parkinson, Douglas. The value of homemaking to a boy. Journal of home economics, 30:328-30, May 1938.
26. Pelphry, Nell. Social arts for boys. Practical home economics, 15:435, December 1937.
27. Pierce, Maurine Smith. Homemaking responsibilities of certain high school boys contrasted with the homemaking responsibilities of younger married men in the same area in west Tennessee. Master's thesis, 1938. University of Tennessee. 117 p. ms. (Abstract in: Association of land-grant colleges and universities. Home economics section. Notes on graduate studies and research in home economics and home economics education, 1938-39. U. S. Office of experiment stations, 1939. p. 193.)

28. Prichard, Margaret. Introductory homemaking for boys and girls. Journal of home economics, 30:318-20, May 1938.
29. Ray, Laura Frances. Effect of home economics course for boys in the Ames high school upon attitudes and practices related to clothing. Master's thesis, 1938. Iowa state college. 129 p. ms. (Abstract in: Associations of land-grant colleges and universities. Home economics section. Notes of graduate studies and research in home economics and home economics education, 1937-38. U. S. Office of education, 1938. Misc. 2086, p. 115.)
30. Redford, Helen D. Teaching home economics to mixed classes. Journal of home economics, 39:551, October 1937.
31. Scharmer, Fay Mack. Personality development for the high school boys. Journal of home economics, 32:371-3, June 1940.
32. Schneider, Frances. A study of attitudes of boys toward certain family relations. Master's thesis, 1938. University of Minnesota. 92 p. ms. (Abstract in: Association of land-grant colleges and universities. Home economics section. Notes on graduate studies and research in home economics and home economics education, 1937-38. U. S. Office of education, 1938. Misc. 2186, p. 207.)
33. South Dakota. Department of public instruction. Boys' homemaking. Pierre, South Dakota, The board. nd.
34. Spafford, Ivol. Home economics for the other sex. Practical home economics, 16:12, January 1938.
35. Straub, Henrietta K. Home economics for boys. Journal of home economics, 30:557, October 1938.
36. Straub, Henrietta K. Report of the committee on home economics for boys. Journal of home economics, 28:539-40, October 1936.
37. Williamson, Maude and Lyle, Mary Stewart. Home-making education in the high school. New York, D. Appleton-Century company, 1941. 484 p.