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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background for the Study

In-service education has long been considered important as a vehicle for improving teacher competence. Historically, some form of in-service education has existed since the beginning of schooling. Experienced teachers have always been expected to keep up-to-date with new developments in content and method. Beginning teachers have needed assistance in making the transition from student to teacher.

The major purposes of early efforts to provide in-service education for teachers are similar to the purposes of in-service education today. The recent focus on educational change and the emphasis on continuous education have reinforced the concept that teachers are not prepared for a lifetime of teaching after a pre-service teacher education program.

In a historical review of in-service education, Tyler (41) wrote that teacher institutes in the 1850's were designed to help teachers bridge the gap between what they were expected to know and do, and what were in fact their level of knowledge and their teaching competencies. The in-service education of that time was largely remedial. Although curriculum and teaching were then viewed as stable,
this did not mean that in-service education was offered only to beginning teachers. The ideal teacher was thought to be the one who continued to study and learn in order to become a great master of the art of teaching.

The specific reasons for in-service education changed as educational institutions responded to the realities of social change. According to Tyler, the Land Grant College Act of 1862, the First World War, the Great Depression, the Eight-Year Study, the Second World War, and the increased birth rate all affected educational programs and the in-service education of teachers. Although less time is spent today remedying the deficiencies in the pre-service preparation of teachers, many of the purposes of in-service education which have evolved over the past 125 years are still considered important.

In addition to helping teachers bridge the gap between preparation and competence, a major purpose of in-service education is to keep teachers current and abreast of new knowledge, techniques and research. In a review of reasons for in-service education, Thomas (48) cited the knowledge explosion, changing curricula, increased knowledge about the learning process and technological developments. She emphasized that the purpose of in-service education is to change instructional practices or conditions by changing people.

The primary objective of in-service education, in the past and the present, is to improve the quality of learning experiences provided for students in the classroom. Therefore, in-service programs, according to Thomas, should be planned to help teachers develop the
attitudes, knowledge and skills which will enable them to provide an effective, educational program.

Another historical purpose of in-service education relates to teacher promotion and salary increase. Finch (9) stated that society has assumed that competence in any field is directly related to the amount of training the practitioner has in that field. This questionable assumption found root in the professions and especially in the field of education. As long ago as 1928, school systems had salary schedules based on the preparation-competence concept. Recent reports and studies cited by Finch indicate that this trend has continued.

Regardless of the reasons why teachers participate in in-service programs, a review of the literature reveals continued support for in-service education. Most articles written before 1950 deal mainly with opinions, recommendations, problems and types of in-service education. Recent literature emphasizes the trend toward evaluating the effectiveness of in-service programs. Although in-service education is considered an important variable in the improvement of teacher competence, there is a dearth of research providing evidence of increased competence as a result of in-service programs.

Leaders in the field cite the need for research relating to in-service and teacher competence. Pollard (24) wrote that in-service education has not lived up to the expectations and demands made upon it. He expressed a need for more organization and structure based on research evidence.

Finch (9), who has conducted several studies related to in-service education and teacher competence, wrote that the very existence
of in-service education programs is based on the secondary assumption
that such programs do make a contribution to employee competency and
that there is a significant difference between the competency
of teachers who have experienced more in-service education,
and the competence of teachers who have participated in less
in-service education. (9:57)

The evidence which supports this assumption is meager. Finch
cited the need for research studies dealing with the variables related
to teacher competence and to in-service education programs.

One study, conducted by Finch in the Los Angeles City School
District in 1964, included elementary and secondary teachers who had
differing in-service education backgrounds. The teachers who had the
most in-service education were rated higher and more competent by
principals than those teachers who had less in-service education.
Finch concluded that teachers who participated extensively in in-
service education are more effective teachers, as viewed by principals,
than those who participated less in in-service education.

The Finch study did not identify which types of in-service
activity were most effective. All in-service activities were grouped
together and units were given for the total amount of in-service ed-
ucation. In-service activities included attendance at summer sessions,
workshops and institutes, university and college classes, study groups,
consultant services, approved travel, work-experience projects,
district-sponsored classes, teacher exchanges with other schools,
class and school visitations, participation in curriculum revision,
leadership training, internships, conferences, meetings with recognized
experts, and correspondence courses.
In the study by Finch, student performance and teacher self-evaluation, as indicators of teacher competence were not investigated. The evidence of teacher competence was based only on an evaluation by the principal.

Recent developments in education have focused attention on self-reports and self-evaluation as components of teacher assessment. Student achievement can be one measure of teacher performance. Management by objective involves evaluating the outcome of specified objectives which have been made known to the participants. The measurement of attitude and opinions, as well as measurement of knowledge and skill, would provide insights into evaluating the teacher and the student as whole persons. Variables, like these, investigated in relation to in-service education could add new dimensions to knowledge about in-service education, teacher behavior and the resulting classroom instruction.

The teacher institute, as one means of in-service education, has been revitalized to improve teacher competence and the quality of instruction. The Ohio Department of Education cited the following as the purpose of their Teacher Institute Program:

The strategy of the Teacher Institute Program is designed to focus on the need to raise the proficiency of teachers via a concentrated effort, cooperatively planned by school systems, universities and the State Department of Education. (13:1)

The improvement of instruction is of concern not only to educators but to society in general. The accountability movement has served as an impetus for more rigorous evaluation of educational programs. Demands that instructional programs be improved are being
made by the public. Questions are asked about teacher competence and about student performance. What are the objectives of the school and what are the objectives of each individual teacher? What will students learn? What evidence will be provided to indicate that learning has taken place?

The teacher institute can provide an opportunity for teachers to up-date themselves and to grow as professional persons. The teachers participating in the institute can be encouraged to evaluate themselves and to plan for improving their performance as teachers. Teachers can be encouraged to face the demands for accountability and they can also be assisted in designing, implementing and evaluating relevant instructional programs. Hopefully, the result would be changed teacher behavior and improved student learning.

Since the members of state and federal government agencies recognize the importance of in-service education for teachers, they are willing to invest large sums of monies to support in-service programs. The amount of funding for teacher in-service education, the time and energy of the people involved and the concern about the quality of education for boys and girls reinforces the need to evaluate the effectiveness of in-service education.

There is a need for follow up of in-service programs to strengthen the continuity of the program effort. Kirby (25) expressed concern that in-service programs are often a "one shot deal" conducted by outside consultants. This results in little opportunity for evaluating the results of the in-service activity in relation to teacher behavior or student learning. Accountability is needed on the part
of both the planners and the participants. The key question about an in-service activity, according to Kirby, is - what will I do differently in my classroom as a result of this program?

When evaluating an in-service program, some of the following questions might be asked: What are the results of an in-service education program in relation to teaching behavior? Does in-service education make any difference? Is the behavior of teachers who participate in an in-service education program different from the behavior of teachers who do not participate in an in-service program? Is there any evidence of change or growth in teachers who attend in-service programs? Do the students, of teachers who have had in-service education, benefit from the teacher's in-service experience?

In order to provide an in-service education program for home economics teachers that, hopefully, would make a difference in teacher behavior and classroom instruction, a proposal was written and submitted to the Ohio Department of Education. The proposed in-service education program included a 10-day teacher institute and three days for follow up activity. The program was funded for home economics teachers under the title Consumer Education Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged Students in Southeastern Ohio.

The institute and follow up were designed to improve consumer education instruction in the schools of rural Southeastern Ohio. Special emphasis was given to helping the twenty-eight home economics teachers understand and devise plans to meet the needs of disadvantaged students enrolled in home economics programs. Southeastern Ohio has been designated as a disadvantaged area geographically. The term
"disadvantaged" for the in-service program was used in this general context. Consumer education, in Southeastern Ohio, is usually taught by home economics teachers. A need for updating in consumer education was identified by home economics teachers, area supervisors and state staff members. The findings from the Ohio Program Review for Improvement, Development and Expansion in Vocational Education (PRIDE) also supported the need for in-service education in consumer education. The comprehensive PRIDE evaluation of the Tri-County Joint Vocational Planning District was completed in March, 1972. Involved in the process of evaluating all aspects of vocational education were state staff members, the area supervisor, administrators, teachers, parents and students. Recommendations for the home economics programs included increasing the emphasis on consumer education content and providing in-service opportunities for teachers.

Statement of the Problem

The major purpose in this study was to assess a consumer education in-service program in relation to the teaching behavior of home economics teachers in Southeastern Ohio. The variables used to evaluate teacher behavior, either directly or indirectly, included: knowledge related to the institute objectives, attitude toward students and teaching, weeks spent teaching consumer education, frequency of use of selected methods and materials in the classroom, opinions related to the institute and student scores on the Test of Consumer Economics and Education.
Hypotheses

The following hypotheses were formulated based on the purpose of the study and the objectives of the in-service education program:

(1) Home economics teachers who attend the in-service education program will report preparation and experience on the Teacher Information Inventory which is similar to the preparation and experience reported by the teachers in the no treatment comparison group who did not attend the in-service education program.

(2) The posttest knowledge scores of home economics teachers who attend an in-service education program will indicate a gain in knowledge about content, methods and materials related to the institute objectives, when compared to pretest scores on a short answer test.

(3) The delayed posttest knowledge scores of the teachers who attend an in-service education program will be higher than the knowledge test scores of teachers in the no treatment comparison group.

(4) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service education program will have a positive change in attitude toward teaching and students as indicated by scores on an opinionnaire pretest and posttest.
(5) The delayed posttest attitude scores of teachers who attend an in-service education program will be more positive than the attitude scores of teachers in the no treatment comparison group.

(6) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service education program will report spending more class time implementing consumer education content in the year following the institute than reported for the previous year.

(7) Teachers who attend an in-service education program will report spending more class time implementing consumer education content in the 1973-74 school year than will be reported by teachers in the no treatment comparison group.

(8) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service program will report using methods and materials such as those presented at the institute, more frequently the year following the institute than reported for the previous year.

(9) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service program will report using the methods and materials such as those presented during the institute more frequently than will be reported by teachers in the no treatment comparison group who did not attend the institute.
The students of the teachers who participated in the in-service program will gain more consumer education knowledge as shown by pretest and posttest scores on the Test of Consumer Economics and Education than the students of teachers in the no treatment comparison group who did not participate in the in-service program.

Home economics teachers who attend an in-service program will report, in a questionnaire, positive opinions about the institute and about implementing the content, methods and materials presented at the institute.

Subsequent sections of the report will deal with a review of literature related to the study, the methodology utilized in the study, the analysis and discussion of the findings, and implications for further study resulting from the present research.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In this chapter six aspects of the literature related to the present study of an assessment of a consumer education in-service program will be examined. These aspects include: the history of in-service education, definitions and purposes of in-service education, types of in-service activities, concerns related to in-service education, guidelines for in-service programs and evaluation and follow-up of in-service education.

History

The concept of in-service education can be found as far back in education as one cares to investigate. Tyler (41) presented a review of the historical development of in-service education starting in the 1850's. At that time thousands of teachers with little or no preparation were employed. Short courses in the evening and two or three day institutes provided in-service education which was largely remedial.

During the midperiod of the nineteenth century the need for continuous development in the field of education was not commonly accepted. Changes were not occurring rapidly and education for boys
and girls was considered desirable but not necessary. Education for the dropout was not considered important. The curriculum and teaching were viewed as relatively stable.

During this period of time, however, the ideal teacher was thought to be the one who continued to study and grow in understanding content and in developing new skills. Therefore, in-service opportunities were provided for both the beginning teacher and the veteran teacher. Tyler (41) reported that an evaluation of the teachers' institutes of that period indicated that veteran teachers showed greater interest in learning a new approach to a task like teaching decimal fractions than did beginners.

The Land Grant College Act of 1862 was the forerunner of the idea that American educational institutions should be expected to respond to the realities of social change. The Morrill Act provided land for the establishment of colleges which would offer agricultural and mechanical classes to meet the needs of students with different backgrounds. These acts gave strong support to the doctrine that education must and can change to meet the changing needs of a modern society.

From 1880 until the First World War, summer was the season for in-service education. Workshops were often called vacation courses.

Heavy immigration into the United States brought new problems for schools. Teachers had students who spoke no English. Habits, attitudes and values were different. The ideas of Darwin and Dewey influenced some educators to try new ideas in the classroom. Burke developed a plan for the demonstration school and for individualizing
instruction. These new ideas were presented in in-service programs during the turn of the century. This was a time of questioning, promoting new ideas, recognizing new educational problems and introducing new subjects into the curriculum. The chief means for helping teachers to deal with the changes that were proposed were in-service summer sessions and institutes. (41)

In the early twentieth century, the focus of in-service education changed during the interval after the First World War and through the Great Depression of the 1930's. At this time the establishment of quantitative standards for teaching certificates and the requirement of a bachelor's degree for all teachers resulted in in-service courses being offered mainly for certification purposes.

The depression and the Eight-Year Study brought about a concern for developing curricula that would better serve youth in light of the conditions at that time. Educators found that the teachers needed to be involved if changes were to occur in the schools. The Eight-Year Study provided workshops which involved teachers in problem solving activities related to developing curricula. In relation to the Eight-Year Study, Tyler wrote

We learned something of great importance to the in-service education of teachers - that the constructive involvement of teachers in attacking the real educational problems they face is a powerful instrument of continuing education. (41:13)

On the basis of his review of 125 years of in-service education, Tyler drew the following generalizations for the 1970's: (41:13-14)

- Less attention is given today than in earlier times to remedying gross deficiencies in the pre-service preparation of teachers.
- Teachers still view in-service as a means of increasing communication and reducing loneliness.

- In-service is still a major way of achieving social mobility in the educational profession.

- An individual teacher's personal interests and needs can be served through in-service.

- The new major purpose of in-service since 1930 is to aid in the implementation of new educational programs by involving the teachers.

**Definition and Purpose**

There are two main stages of education in relation to the teaching profession as described by Johnston. (20) Pre-service education takes place before the potential teacher is appointed to his initial post while in-service education may take place at any time during the professional life of the teacher.

In-service education, according to Johnston, can be either full-time or part-time study. In-service education may be carefully planned to lead to a higher degree or a certificate for some teachers. For other teachers, in-service education may be casual study, pursued in the evenings or during vacations, with no plan for measurable recognition or promotion.

Finch (9), being more specific than Johnston, defined in-service education as any activity in which teachers engage during their service which contributes to their improvement and effectiveness on their assignment. The overall purpose of in-service education programs according to Finch is to achieve and maintain an adequate supply of good teachers who are growing professionally.
Historically, the in-service education program grew out of the needs of the educational establishment for teachers with greater skills and knowledge in relation to both subject matter and methods. (9:11)

The literature contains many references to in-service training rather than education. Since the word training implies something that is done to a person, Brearley, Goddard, Browse and Kalley (1) emphasized the use of in-service education instead of in-service training. Their explanation of in-service education included anything that a teacher does or thinks about which makes him a better teacher.

Like other writers in the field of in-service, Lippitt and Fox (41) emphasized the teacher's involvement in his own learning. The teacher should participate in identifying the growth experiences most useful to him. A significant difference between pre-service and in-service education is based on the fact that only after the teacher has begun to teach can he become adept at identifying and analyzing his professional problems, evaluating potential correctives, and initiating stylistic changes in his techniques.

The major purposes of in-service education, according to Lippett and Fox, are based on professional growth and development. They suggest that the teacher who develops professional competence will be able to plan his own in-service program to meet his needs. In this way, the teacher will change his behavior and thus improve his classroom instruction.

Tyler (41) identified the major purposes of in-service education as bridging the gap from student to teacher and keeping the
teacher on the job up-to-date. Tyler, Thomas (48), and Finch (9) agree that in-service education is designed to help teachers meet educational and societal change, to aid in the implementation of new educational programs and to assist teachers to grow professionally.

Teacher promotion and salary increase were listed by Tyler and by Finch as incentives for in-service education while Thomas identified rewards such as sabbatical leaves, scholarships and income tax deductions, to encourage teachers to maintain and improve professional competence.

Stimulating morale and enthusiasm can also be a purpose of in-service education, according to Thomas. She stressed the primary purpose of in-service education as being the improvement of the quality of instruction for students. This can be done if in-service programs are organized to extend knowledge and learning in general as well as to keep personnel current and abreast of new knowledge, techniques and research. (48:18)

**Types of In-Service Activities**

In-service education activities can take a variety of forms as identified by Lippett and Fox: (41:161-165)

- Faculty meetings focused on professional problems.
- Principal-teacher consultation.
- Teacher consultation with university-based resource person.
- Building a temporary structure within the school system for support of a particular action-research project.
- Utilization of a curriculum materials center for retrieval of basic research, innovations and tools.
- Sessions for the sharing of practices.
- Clinic sessions with teachers from other systems.
- Internship with other projects on a released-time basis.
- Sensitivity training laboratory.
- College class.
- Membership on a team responsible for developing change strategies for the school system.
- Summer work sessions.
- Teacher Institutes.
- Preschool workshops.

Wagstaff and McCollough proposed in-service education activities which involved alternative approaches such as: (50:3)

- Mini courses using community instructors.
- Interchange between classroom teachers and college instructors.
- Simulation exercises.
- Cross-breeding with business persons.

Additional types of in-service activities were listed by Finch: (9:31-34)

- Approved travel.
- Professional reading.
- Curriculum development projects.
- Sabbatical leaves.
- Teacher exchanges.
- Leadership training.
- Study groups.
- Extension programs.
- Professional meetings.
- Work experience.
- Independent study.
- Consultant services.
- Class and school visitation.
- Correspondence courses.
An overview of in-service education in different countries by Johnston revealed additional in-service activities common to most countries: (20:40-62)

- Lecture programs.
- Weekend courses.
- Evening courses.
- Television courses.

The teacher center concept is a recent in-service development. The Teachers' Active Learning Center (TALC) in San Francisco is an example of a teacher center as described by Raskin. (40) The centers are easily accessible. Materials, resources and instructors are available to teachers during the day as well as in the evenings and on weekends.

The teachers go to the center to learn by doing and experimenting. There are over one hundred teacher centers in the United States including the Advisory and Learning Exchange in Washington, D.C., the Learning Center in St. Louis, the District Six Advisory Center in Philadelphia and the Advisory for Open Education in Cambridge. These teacher centers include informal but structured workshops, individual study and resources. The activities of the centers are in response to the needs that teachers have voiced.

More sophisticated centers for in-service have been developed in some parts of the country. In Texas, there are Regional Education Service Centers which offer cooperative multi-district in-service programs. Educational services include learning and teaching materials as well as information and technology. The centers have materials, consultants, diagnosticians and counselors to help solve problems.
The State of Texas backs its commitment to quality in-service by providing extra salary for ten teacher in-service days per year as well as providing the Regional Education Service Centers. (40)

Concerns Related To In-Service

The support for in-service education and the emphasis on continuous education is currently accompanied by concerns about the effectiveness of in-service programs.

Concern was expressed by Wagstaff and McCollough. (48) They pointed out that schools will not change unless educators change, not just once but continually. Therefore, the continuing education of educators themselves is at the heart of both school reform and consequently of the restoring of public confidence in our system of education. Until recently the in-service education of teachers has not been a matter of public concern. However, increasing attention is being focused on the effectiveness of education and this has resulted in questions being asked about the results of in-service programs. Little research exists which includes evaluation of the impact of in-service activities on classroom behavior.

In spite of the fact that they follow guidelines which focus on meeting individual needs of teachers in a variety of ways, many recent in-service education programs have not been considered effective. One of the problems as reported by Johnston (19) was "lecturing at" teachers about theory at a time of day when they are tired and fatigued. Another problem related to the fact that teachers must often sacrifice their hours of leisure or some part of their vacation to attend in-service education programs.
A generation gap exists among teachers, according to Pollard, (24) in their attitudes toward in-service education. He suggested that older teachers regard in-service as a necessary evil or one of the penalties of teaching. Younger teachers accept in-service as a symptom of change in the education system. However, teachers in both age groups indicated that the present pattern of in-service education does not meet their needs. Money, time and recognition are the rocks upon which in-service training, from the teachers' point of view, presently flounders.

Teachers complain about in-service programs which are not relevant to them. In other words, Christiansen (3) reported, the program designed to strengthen a teacher's competency and classroom skills has sometimes fallen short of its objective.

Kelley (23) reported concerns about in-service education programs which included: getting started without communication problems, facilitating the teachers' responsibility for their own learning, coping with limited time, reducing barriers between people sooner, solving evaluation problems and involving participants in planning.

Other concerns which plague in-service education include shortage of funds allocated by school boards, lack of competent personnel to assume responsibility for in-service programs and disregard for suitable time and facilities. (50)

Negative connotations are often found in relation to the word in-service. Instead of "doing something to educators" or improving shortcomings, Wagstaff and McCollough (50) recommend that a positive
concept of professional growth based on voluntary, self-created and self-directed programs is ideal.

Although in-service education of teachers has expanded rapidly, Brearley (1) suggests it is still inadequate for the health of the profession. In-service education relies a great deal on local and personal initiative. The teachers who most need in-service education may not have the opportunity to participate in in-service activities.

Since in-service education is now regarded as vital to the effectiveness of all teachers, Wiley and Maddison (53) cited the need for planning and coordination in order to meet various teacher needs. Presently, they note, in-service education appeals most to the active enthusiastic teacher who needs such training less than his more reluctant colleagues.

Concerns and problems related to in-service education, while reported in the literature by most authors are viewed as challenges which can serve to improve the effectiveness of in-service programs. Kelley (23) suggested that problems provide creative challenges and that without unsolved problems, without a feeling of unrest because we have not done better, sterility and routine would result.

**Guidelines For In-Service**

Christiansen (3) stated, like other writers, that a first criterion for a meaningful in-service program is that teachers become involved actively in specific learning problems and situations peculiar to a classroom setting. Teachers should be involved through various activities and methods related to their concerns. Christiansen
pointed out the need for demonstration teaching, for handout materials, for teacher sharing sessions and for incorporating media in in-service programs.

The use of programs which would integrate underlying principles with performance skills was encouraged by Lippett and Fox. (41) The activities also need to include a cognitive, an affective and a behavioral dimension. Better teaching requires more than familiarizing the teacher with something new---it requires fundamental changes in the teacher's behavior. Unless the teacher's motivation stems from an intrinsic desire to teach more effectively, the professional growth will be minimal.

O'Rourke and Burton (38) cited the workshop as one of the most important developments in in-service education as it was organized by Tyler in 1936 as a part of the Eight-Year Study. Current literature related to in-service education for teachers reveals a renewed emphasis on the process and the guidelines established by Tyler for workshops. These guidelines are being integrated into various other types of in-service activities.

The Tyler workshops, according to O'Rourke and Burton (38), utilized learning principles related to readiness and motivation, co-operative and participatory process, experimental procedure, and continuous evaluation. Workshops should be problem-centered and include persons working with expert assistance concurrently and co-operatively to meet common needs.
Workshops based on Tyler's guidelines provide an in-service program through which instructional innovations and advancements in teaching technologies are conceived, nurtured and developed. The value of in-service activities to teachers and ultimately to their students, was emphasized by Nissman and Lutz (37). The overall hoped for result was the improvement of instruction and a better education for boys and girls.

Guidelines for in-service education programs as reported by Tyler, Wagstaff and McCollough (48) and by Christiansen (3) are similar to the following points made by O'Rourke and Burton: (37:5-8)

- The over-all purpose must be clearly defined.

- The activity must be based upon the problems, needs, and interests of the participants.

- The specific problems of the participant should be allowed to emerge and be defined.

- Individuals with common problems should form tentative and flexible groups for work.

- Participants should do the bulk of the work on their own problems, with assistance from staff members on call.

- The planning and process is cooperative and participatory throughout.

- The personal and social growth of individual participants should be fostered as well as the solution to their professional problems.

- Evaluation is continuous and exercised on products and processes.

- The length of the session must be adequate.

- The collection of resource materials should be as extensive as finances permit.

- The instructional staff should represent a diversity of personnel.
Guidelines suggested by Heaton, Camp and Diederich (13) focused on meeting the needs and interests of the individual participants and were similar to those listed by O'Rourke and Burton. Concerns dealing with the whole person were emphasized. This included concepts of the whole child and the whole teacher.

Involving future developments, Tyler (41) predicted that in-service would deal with real problems either directly or by simulation. Feedback would be built into the training program as a basis for correction and revision. Pressures would come from outside the system to deal with concerns related to the disadvantaged student, changing problems of society, work experience adapted to school and structures involving older and younger students learning together.

In-service in the future will not be limited to college campuses or to school buildings but will be carried on in a variety of settings. According to Tyler, future in-service education will not be seen as "shaping" teachers but will be viewed as aiding, supporting and encouraging each teacher's development of the teaching capabilities that he values and seeks to enhance.

The learning experiences in these programs will furnish ample illustrations of role models to guide teachers as they are involved in studying problems and resources, setting goals for group and individual efforts, developing plans for attaining goals, appraising progress toward the goals, and reexamining the replanning when the appraisal indicates inadequacies. (41:15)

Evaluation and Follow Up

A review of the literature revealed that a major concern related to in-service programs involved the need for evaluation and
follow up study. Kelley (23) explored the topic of in-service evaluation and cited the need for evaluative techniques that will measure progress in growth rather than just subject matter knowledge. Materials need to be developed for use in subjective evaluation. The focus of evaluation should include self-evaluation and a variety of evaluative devices should be utilized during an in-service program to provide feedback about the total process.

Four types of evaluation were advocated by Kelley. These included self-evaluation, small group evaluation, the total group’s own evaluation and evaluation for the benefit of the staff. Within these four types of evaluation were included attitude questions, oral discussions, written reports, panel discussions, question sheets, random group reports, and questionnaires.

Evaluating the outcomes or the product of the process was also discussed by Kelley. He stated that outcomes are the differences to be observed in people as they go about their teaching and living. They are not only what one sees but also what one feels. The outcomes evaluated in the Wayne University Workshops included changes in attitudes, changes in teaching method, signs of personal growth, changes in human relations, change toward more democratic procedures and new skills in using resources.

O'Rourke and Burton (38) emphasized that the final evidence of effective in-service can be found in the transfer of things learned by participants to actual teaching situations. During the in-service program itself, evaluation should be continuous and participatory. Evaluations should be included whenever desired, by individuals, by
small groups or by the total group. Often participants are given a
questionnaire at the beginning and again at the end of the program
in order to evaluate changes in beliefs, attitudes and procedures.

The question raised by Nissman and Lutz (37) concerned the
impact of the in-service program on boys and girls and how they learn.
This in turn raises questions about implementation, follow up, feedback and evaluation. The method of evaluation must focus on the objectives. Evaluation makes the cycle complete and leads to the planning of the next in-service activity.

A follow up study reported by Heaton, Camp and Diederich (14)
revealed that participants reported marked classroom behavior changes. Although other forces were also involved in bringing about the changes, the participants testified that it would have taken them longer to bring about the changes without the workshop program. The behavior of the teachers was not compared with another group of teachers, not participating in the workshop, but was analyzed in relation to what they reported they did differently after the in-service.

Reported changes in behavior after the in-service program were most frequently related to:

- Basing education on pupils' needs and interests.
- Practicing democracy in school.
- Using new approaches to evaluation.
- Using new media for learning.
- Making professional adjustments.

The teachers also reported being more enthusiastic and excited about teaching, more experimental in approach and more creative in designing the teaching and learning environment.
Teacher education should practice what it preaches. Heaton, Camp and Diederich (14) reported that the in-service workshops which were most successful exemplified what they taught. The methods used with the teachers were then used by the teachers with their students. The in-service staff must be able to practice the kind of education it is trying to bring about. This means not talking about it, but practicing it, living it and experiencing its benefits. Then the participants will implement the activity in their schools.

Bush (41) stated that he did not honestly know how effectively in-service education could be evaluated. He wrote that teacher opinions should not be underestimated because teachers can express honest and thoughtful judgements. In fact, much of the current dissatisfaction related to in-service education stems from the expressions of teachers. If the dissatisfaction testimony is considered valid, then teacher opinions should be considered valid.

Although the ultimate objective of in-service education is to improve the students' learning, Bush (41) wrote that he believed there were intermediate objectives for in-service programs. These objectives might include teacher behavior change as an end in itself. Not all evaluations of in-service must be linked to changes in pupil behavior. However, any objectives of the in-service program should be as specific as possible not only to focus on the effort as related to the training program but to provide a better basis for measuring the outcome as well.

In a 1971 publication Fischler (41) stated that he knew of no study which indicated a relationship between in-service courses taken and productivity in the classroom. He said that there was no research study to support the assumption that a teacher with sixty hours beyond
the bachelor's degree has a greater effect on the learner's outcome than does a teacher who has thirty additional hours of credit.

A plea for evaluating in-service effectiveness and educational changes based on research data was made by Fischler. He wrote that any program aimed at changing teacher behavior must have built into it a clearly defined method of evaluating the effect of the program.

In-service education, in general, was studied by Finch (9) in 1964, and was titled "The Relationship of In-Service Education to Competence of Selected Teachers of the Los Angeles City School Districts." The Finch study included all types of in-service activities under a total point system which was correlated with administrator's evaluations of teaching competence. He did conclude that teachers who participated extensively in in-service education activities were rated as more effective in the classroom. Finch recommended that more effort should be given to determining the kinds of in-service education experience that are most productive of teacher growth in competence and performance.

An in-service institute for science teachers was the basis of research by Uffelman, Magoon, Idstein and Yolles. (49) The report of the study was entitled "In-Service Institutes: Do They Make a Difference?" In answering the question the authors presented the results of a student-achievement-based comparison of teachers who attended a special National Science Foundation Summer In-Service Institute in Modern Chemistry.

A nonequivalent control group design was used because the subjects deliberately sought out the institute. The hypothesis tested was
that there would be a greater gain in mean scores on the Cooperative Test in Chemistry, 1967 Form, for students whose teachers attended an in-service institute program than for students whose teachers did not attend. Student scores were divided into two groups, participant and nonparticipant student subjects. Pretest measures served as a control variable and the two groups formed two levels of a simple analysis of variance. The group means on the pretest and on the posttest were ranked. The results showed that the students of the participant teachers scored significantly lower than students of nonparticipants on both the pretest and the posttest measures.

The authors of the report stated that rejection of the hypothesis did not imply the institute was detrimental. Variables such as socio-economic and cultural differences may have been related to the scores. Another explanation of the negative results offered by the researchers was the possibility that teachers who volunteer for institutes may accurately perceive themselves as having less background in the subject matter.

Highwood and Mertens (16) reported on "Evaluations of NSF Summer Institutes" in The American Biology Teacher, April, 1972. Approximately five hundred biology teachers received instruction at Ball State University during a ten year time span with nearly $750,000 of support from the National Science Foundation. The authors of the report indicated that the institutes had received wide acceptance by universities and participants but the effectiveness of the programs has not been well substantiated. In order to continue to receive support concrete
evidence of the effectiveness of the current programs needed to be provided. Accountability was the motivating force reported for this study.

The study by Highwood and Mertens was designed to evaluate the usefulness of specific portions of the Ball State program. Using a questionnaire, data were collected in relation to residence and employment, advanced degrees, professional growth and course effectiveness. From the responses of participants, the authors generalized that the institute did succeed in upgrading the subject matter competence of the participants. The course work was judged to be effective in increasing the participants' understanding of and their ability to teach the concepts treated in the institute. Quantitative data were obtained which indicated classroom use of BSCS materials and a change in teaching philosophy.

Few studies had been conducted to document the effectiveness of NSF teacher-education programs according to Highwood and Mertens. The few studies done at other universities related to variables such as whether or not participants were still teaching, where they lived and if they had attended other institutes.

Girgis and MacDowell (11) reported their research, dealing with teaching of economics, in the article "A Quantitative Analysis of the Effectiveness of An In-Service Institute on Teaching Economics." The major purpose of the 1971 institute was to provide contemporary economic concepts and analyses that could be transferred to the high school classroom.
In planning the institute, Girgis and MacDowell cited the gap between the need for economic education and the documented inadequacy of many teachers to deal with the discipline. This gap presents an instructional problem which may be remedied through in-service institutes. The purpose of the study was to quantify and evaluate the effectiveness of the institute by analyzing the participants' performance.

The three scores which provided the basis for analysis were pretest scores on a multiple-choice test, posttest scores and the "difference" score. Both rank order and step-wise regression analyses were used to test the three basic hypotheses. Girgis and MacDowell reported that all statistical tests demonstrated a noticeable improvement in the participants' economic understanding. The results also indicated that those participants who gained the most from the institute were the ones who had recently graduated from college, had a high grade-point average, had taught a few years, had taken a moderate number of social science courses and had taken more than two courses in economics. The authors concluded that other economic institutes should be planned to meet the needs of other types of participants.

Monts and Lauscher (34) reported that workshops and similar activities provide a logical approach to in-service education for teachers. The need for evidence of improved classroom teaching and pupil development was stressed as well as the need to evaluate the lasting effect of the behavior changes.

A two week curriculum workshop for fourteen Wisconsin home economics teachers was held during the summer of 1967. The purpose
of the workshop was to translate portions of the conceptual structure of the new Wisconsin State Planning Guide for Home Economics at the Secondary Level into model teaching units.

Monts and Lauscher reported, in the assessment of the workshop and follow up, that all participants viewed the in-service as favorable, the interest of the participants increased during the workshop, and the interest level of the participants was high. Each teacher evaluated the model teaching unit she had developed and taught during the school year. The model units were evaluated using thirty-six variables. Other types of evaluation devices were used in relation to contributions to pupil learning and to solicit teacher needs for further in-service. The participants believed their teaching to be more effective and pupil learning to be both improved and of better quality. They reported that they had developed greater insight about the teaching-learning process and that they were more analytical of themselves and their needs as teachers.

Thomas (48) conducted a feasibility study in 1970-1971 to determine the effectiveness of "mini" in-service workshop sessions designed to help vocational home economics teachers adapt and implement consumer education concepts. The effectiveness of the workshop was measured indirectly by student knowledge of consumer education concepts and the teachers' confidence and satisfaction with their knowledge and utilization of the techniques introduced during the in-service program.

The highest mean gain scores for students on the Test of Consumer Education was obtained when their teachers attended the
'mini' workshop; however, these findings were not at a significant level. There was also a higher mean gain score for students of teachers who had a master's degree or above and for students of teachers who had taught six years or more.

Although the analysis of data did not reveal statistically significant differences for the experimental group, there was evidence of learning as provided by higher mean scores for students of teachers in the experimental group. Thomas concluded that the 'mini' workshop was a feasible way to update teachers in methods and techniques of teaching consumer education. She stated that there was a need for further development of similar programs which would provide in-depth instruction for more teachers and follow up programs to provide feedback related to both content and methodology.

A review of the literature related to in-service education reinforces the need for effective in-service programs. Leaders in the field of education have established guidelines for in-service programs and have defined the problems and issues related to in-service education. A major challenge related to in-service for teachers is the need for evaluation which will determine the effectiveness of programs. Follow up studies focusing on teacher behavior and student learning have been identified as one way to evaluate the results of in-service programs.

The purpose in this study was to assess the effectiveness of an in-service education program, which included a summer institute and follow-up activities during the school year, using variables related to teacher behavior and student learning.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

This study was designed to assess a consumer education inservice teacher education program in relation to the teaching behavior of home economics teachers in Southeastern Ohio.

Described in this chapter are the research design, the sample selected for the study, the variables investigated, the procedures followed in conducting the study and the data collection and analysis procedures.

Research Design

The quasi-experimental design for the first phase of this study was based on Campbell and Stanley's (2) Separate-Sample Pretest-Posttest Design Number 12. The teachers who attended the institute were in this group and received the treatment. The follow up study, involving a no treatment comparison group of teachers, incorporated Campbell and Stanley's Nonequivalent Control Group Design Number 10.

The Separate-Sample Pretest-Posttest Design was used to strengthen the internal validity of the study. The institute group was composed of individuals who purposely sought out the treatment and could not be randomly assigned to treatment levels. The twenty-eight teachers in the institute were randomly assigned to two groups for testing purposes. Group A took the knowledge pretest and the
attitude posttest. Group B took the attitude pretest and the knowledge posttest. The teachers did not learn about the posttest by taking the pretest and therefore the threat to the internal validity of testing was reduced.

Since the participating teachers did "self select" themselves into the institute, pre-experimental random assignment of teachers to the institute group and to the comparison group was not possible. The Nonequivalent Control Group Design Number 10 used for the comparison of the two groups at the end of the school year does require cautious interpretation of the findings because there could be differences between the two groups. The two designs are combined and presented in graphic form.

$$1 = \begin{cases} R (A) & 0_1 \ X_1 \ 0_2 \ X_2 \ 0_5 \\ R (B) & 0_3 \ X_1 \ 0_4 \ X_2 \ 0_5 \end{cases}$$

$$2 = 0_5$$

1 = refers to the treatment group divided into sub groups A and B for testing.

2 = refers to the no treatment comparison group for end of year comparison.

R = indicates random assignment to separate sub groups for testing.

$X_1$ = represents the institute.

$X_2$ = represents the three day follow up.

$0_1$ = refers to the knowledge pretest measurement.

$0_2$ = refers to the attitude posttest measurement.

$0_3$ = refers to the attitude pretest measurement.

$0_4$ = refers to the knowledge posttest measurement.
\[ \theta_s = \text{refers to the delayed posttest measurement of attitude, knowledge, self report information and student consumer education test scores.} \]

\[ Xs \text{ and Os vertical to one another occur simultaneously.} \]

\[ \text{--------- indicates nonequivalent groups.} \]

The independent variable, which was manipulated in this study, was the in-service education program which included a ten day institute and three days of follow up activity. The two levels of the independent variable were the treatment which was the in-service education program and no treatment.

Knowledge related to the institute objectives, attitude toward students, time spent teaching consumer education, methods and materials used in the classroom, opinions related to the institute and student scores on the Test of Consumer Economics and Education were the variables used to evaluate teacher behavior and the effectiveness of the institute.

**Population and Sample**

The target population for this study was the home economics teachers in Southeastern Ohio who were employed in some type of educational home economics program.

The experimentally accessible population included home economics teachers in Southeastern Ohio who were employed as: (1) consumer and homemaking teachers in middle schools, junior high schools and high schools; (2) job training teachers in vocational and technical schools; and (3) rural family life teachers.
The sampling unit for the in-service group was a "self selected" teacher from the accessible population. Letters were sent to all home economics teachers in Southeastern Ohio inviting participation in the institute. The frame for the population was developed from a State Department of Education directory. Approximately two hundred names of home economics teachers from Southeastern Ohio were on this list.

The first thirty respondents became members of the in-service group and received the treatment which included the ten day institute and the three days of follow up in-service education. Twenty-eight of the thirty teachers completed the in-service program.

A similar, but nonequivalent control group was selected from the next thirty applicants. This was the no treatment group. Twenty-four of the teachers in this group completed and returned all of the materials requested.

Due to certification requirements and similar educational preparation of Ohio home economics teachers the two groups of teachers were considered to be representative of the target population of home economics teachers in Southeastern Ohio.

The sampling unit of students was a class of approximately twenty-five students being taught some form of consumer education by each teacher in the treatment and the no treatment comparison groups. These thirteen hundred students were considered representative of students receiving consumer education instruction in home economics classes in Southeastern Ohio.
Procedure

During the Fall of 1973 several home economics teachers in Southeastern Ohio expressed the need for a consumer education in-service program. The emphasis on teaching consumer education had resulted in concerns by teachers related to both content and methodology in consumer education classes. Teacher preparation and student motivation were major interests of the teachers who were teaching courses or units in consumer education.

A needs assessment was made based on teacher questionnaire returns, teacher interviews, the Ohio Program Review For Improvement, Development and Expansion in Vocational Education (PRIDE), consultation with state department home economics staff members and the local home economics supervisor. A proposal was cooperatively written by faculty members in the School of Home Economics at Ohio University and the local home economics supervisor at Tri-County Joint Vocational School in Nelsonville, Ohio.

The in-service program was funded by the Ohio Department of Education for thirty home economics teachers. Funding provided college credit, stipends, materials, resources and speakers for the institute and for three in-service days during the school year.

Teacher Institute

The Consumer Education Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged Students in Southeastern Ohio was held July 23 - August 3 at Tri-County Joint Vocational School in Nelsonville, Ohio. Sixty hours of instruction were provided for the participants.
The major focus of the institute was to help home economics teachers relate current subject matter content to the teaching of consumer economics. Teachers reported that the students in their classes who most needed consumer education information did not seem interested in the topic. An emphasis was placed on understanding and motivating students, particularly those who might be disadvantaged. Disadvantaged was defined in the general sense that Southeastern Ohio has been designated as a disadvantaged area geographically.

The twenty-eight teachers who completed the institute represented home economics programs in middle schools, junior high schools, comprehensive high schools, occupational home economics in vocational schools and rural family life. This group was considered representative of the total population of home economics teachers in Southeastern Ohio.

The theme for the institute was "Fly Consumer - An Educational Excursion." The program (Appendix A) included the following activities:

- Value clarification activities.
- Group process activities.
- Speakers on consumer education.
- Speakers on disadvantaged students.
- Non-verbal and listening activities.
- Simulations and games.
- Curriculum developments.
- Task team assignments.
- Individual projects.
- Subject matter specialists.
- Media and materials development.
- Evaluation of resources.
- Updating on content and methodology.
- Recycling materials.
- Advisory groups.
- Participant panels.
- Demonstrations.
- Individualized instruction.
- Self-assessment.
- Professional development activities.
- Portfolio showings.

The investigator was the instructor for the institute. She had six years of teaching experience as a vocational home economics teacher in Southeastern Ohio, one year of teaching experience in a mental health center, nine years of experience as a home economics teacher educator, experience as a consultant for the Consumer Education Curriculum Guide for Ohio and various experiences in in-service education programs.

In order to develop their potential to teach consumer education effectively and to meet the individual needs of their students, the teachers accepted the following objectives of the institute:

1. To identify consumer education curriculum content relevant to students of all types with an emphasis on meeting the needs of disadvantaged students.

2. To prepare consumer education instructional materials with an emphasis on disadvantaged students.

3. To evaluate various types of teaching methods, media, materials, and resources which would motivate and involve students.

4. To write behavioral objectives and plan instruction to meet students' needs.

5. To analyze the teaching/learning process.

6. To recognize the characteristics of disadvantaged students.

7. To develop and use various types of individualized instruction.

8. To discuss how to organize and use advisory committees when planning programs of instruction which meet students' needs.

9. To develop and use a variety of evaluation materials and techniques for both student and self-evaluation.
10. To relate self-concept development and value clarification to consumer education and the disadvantaged student.

11. To apply up-to-date subject matter content related to housing, nutrition, child development, family life, etc., to consumer education and the disadvantaged student.

Each teacher worked through a learning package on writing behavioral objectives and then wrote her own personal objectives for the institute. Both sets of objectives were used by each teacher to evaluate the institute and to develop a self-assessment.

Determining consumer education content was based on several sources. The consumer education curriculum guide for Ohio (5) lists six consumer education concepts to be included in the curriculum. They are:

1. The economic system
2. Income procurement
3. Consumer behavior determinants
4. Consumer alternatives
5. Roles, rights, and responsibilities
6. Community resources

In addition to the consumer concepts, the curriculum guide identifies the five key concepts to be integrated into all areas of home economics. They are:

1. Human resource management
2. Self-development
3. Consumer economics
4. Life styles and cycles
5. Interpersonal relationships

The teachers who attended the institute used the consumer economic concepts and the key concepts to begin to formulate consumer education content. Other sources such as speakers on consumer education, subject matter specialists, reference materials, texts,
and curriculum guides added to knowledge about content. As the teachers gained confidence in their knowledge related to consumer education, they started to plan instruction relevant to their own students. Concerns, ideas, and materials were shared. Instructional units, modules, and learning packages were developed. The teachers prepared materials they could use in their own classrooms.

By the time the teachers started asking how to teach consumer education, they had already been involved in a variety of learning experiences. It was hoped that the teachers would incorporate into their own teaching the learning strategies they had experienced during the institute.

Follow Up Activities

An advisory committee, which included teachers from the institute, planned the follow up activities based on the final evaluation of the institute (Appendix B) and suggestions by the participants. Follow up days were held on the Saturdays of October 20, January 12 and March 30.

The first follow up day focused on an in-depth study of the consumer concepts and classroom implementation of the concepts. The Test for Consumer Economics and Education had been given by the teachers as a pretest for their students. The answer sheets were collected to be graded and the test itself was discussed.

The second follow up activity included viewing The School for Tomorrow multi-media program. Individualizing instruction was discussed in relation to consumer education.
The last follow up day emphasized a teacher sharing session, using video taping in the classroom, and taking the delayed posttests. Final evaluations of the in-service program and self report forms were also completed. (Appendix B)

Data Collection

Eight instruments were used for the collection of data in this quasi-experimental study. They included: Test of Consumer Economics and Education, Teacher Institute Knowledge Test, Teacher Opinionnaire (Likert scale), Teacher Information Inventory for 1972-73, Teacher Information Inventory for 1973-74, Evaluation of Teacher Institute, Self Assessment Form, and Final Evaluation of In-Service Program. (Appendix B)

The Test of Consumer Economics and Education by Lupher (28) was used to measure student consumer education knowledge. The Test of Consumer Economics and Education (TCEE) was developed in 1973 as a standardized consumer education achievement test to be used in Ohio. The content validity of the TCEE is based on the Ohio Guide. (5) Ohio consumer economic education experts assisted in the development of test items. Test items relate to the six economic concepts, identified in the Ohio Guide, which should be taught in consumer education courses.

An item analysis of each question revealed that all test items exceeded the minimum requirements established for discrimination and difficulty. The reported discrimination indices ranged from 0.228 to 0.596 with an average of 0.427. The difficulty indices ranged from
25.53 to 77.64 with an average of 51.95. The reliability of the instrument, using the Kuder-Richardson formula (20) to determine internal consistency, was 0.861. A stratified random sample of 3,329 students in Ohio comprised the group from which normative data were drawn. Using raw scores, the TCEE should provide evidence about student achievement in consumer education.

The selected sample of home economics students taught by teachers both in the treatment and no treatment groups were pretested in September of 1973 and posttested in May 1974 on consumer education knowledge using the Test for Consumer Economics and Education. Mean scores were computed for each class. Student consumer education test scores were used as one indication of teacher behavior. The major purpose of the institute was to motivate teachers to teach consumer education and to teach in such a way that students would know the consumer education concepts identified in the Ohio Curriculum Guide. This knowledge should be reflected in test scores on the Test of Consumer Economics and Education.

All student test responses were recorded on IBM sheets and were scored using the Ohio University Computer Services IBM 1230 Test Scoring program.

The teachers' knowledge of the content related to the in-service education program was determined by giving a pretest and a posttest titled Teacher Institute Knowledge Test, which was based on the objectives of the in-service program. (Appendix A) Test items related to consumer education definition and concepts, characteristics of students, motivation techniques, writing behavioral objectives,
analyzing instruction, individualizing instruction, using advisory committees, evaluating teaching/learning experiences and identifying new trends and developments. A grid was used to relate test items to the objectives. The short answer test was field tested with ten home economics teachers, revised and evaluated by three teacher educators. The test was found to be appropriate for the level of abilities of teachers in the treatment group. The content of the test was found to be based on the objectives of the in-service program.

The key for scoring the test was developed using a panel of judges, who were not involved in the in-service program. The panel included two members of a consumer education curriculum development workshop, two teachers of consumer education and two teacher educators. Each judge received a copy of the institute objectives and the assignment sheet which aided in establishing content validity in the test key.

Scoring of the Teacher Institute Knowledge Test was completed according to Ebel (9:149-154). Analytic scoring was accomplished by two independent gradings, answers were graded question by question and the name of the examinee was concealed. Each answer was given a weight of one point. The same test was given as a delayed posttest to both the treatment and the no treatment groups.

A review of the literature revealed no one instrument which met the needs of this study. Therefore, parts of various instruments were adapted for the construction of a Teacher Opinionnaire which would measure teacher attitude toward teaching and students. The items selected for the opinionnaire related to students from the
disadvantaged area of Southeastern Ohio. This instrument, using a Likert scale format, was adapted from selected parts of attitude scales such as The Teacher and the Community by Lehman, Personality and Attitudes Toward Juvenile Delinquency by Alberts, Teaching Home-makers with Special Needs by Kentucky Department of Education and Attitudes of High School and Other Teachers Toward Children and Current Educational Methodology by Lindgreen and Patton. (Appendix B)

The opinionnaire was field tested with ten home economics teachers, evaluated by three teacher educators, revised and then evaluated by a panel of three experts who work with persons from disadvantaged areas. The purposes and objectives of the in-service program were given to the panel so they could evaluate the validity of the instrument for the in-service program. The opinionnaire was revised and found by the panel to be suitable in content for the treatment group. A panel of five judges determined which responses were positive and which responses were negative toward teaching and students. The five point scale was weighted as: 5 - strongly agree, 4 - agree, 3 - undecided, 2 - disagree or 1 - strongly disagree for positive responses. The values assigned to the negative statements were the reverse of the positive statements. The opinionnaire was given as a pretest and a posttest to the teachers in the treatment group and as a delayed posttest to both the treatment and no treatment groups.

The responses to the Teacher Opinionnaire were marked on an IBM sheet and were graded and punched by the IBM 1230 computer
program. Summed scores were obtained for each teacher. A Likert program was run for an item analysis. The reliability of the instrument using the Kuder-Richardson formula (20) to determine internal consistency was 0.847.

A Teacher Information Inventory was developed to collect information, on the first day of the institute, from the treatment group of teachers relating to the consumer education content, methods and materials included in the home economics curriculum during the 1972-73 school year. At the end of the 1973-74 school year data were collected from both the treatment group and the no treatment group using the Teacher Information Inventory and other self report forms to determine the content, methods and materials related to the teacher institute which had been implemented in the home economics curriculum. Information concerning preparation and experience was collected to determine if there was any difference for these variables between the teachers in the treatment group and the teachers in the no treatment group. The inventory was field tested with ten home economics teachers, revised and evaluated by three teacher educators. The instrument was found to be appropriate for the collection of the desired information from the teachers.

The Evaluation of the Teacher Institute, Self Assessment Form and Final Evaluation of the In-Service Program were designed to collect data from the treatment group which included evaluation of the institute and the in-service program as well as self evaluation. These self report instruments were field tested with ten home economics teachers
and revised to relate as closely as possible to the objectives of 
the in-service program.

On the last day of the institute, the teachers in the treatment 
group evaluated their own progress and the effectiveness of the 
in-service education program. At the end of the school year, these 
teachers were asked to respond to questions concerning their opinions 
about the institute, follow up, and about their implementation of the 
content, methods and materials presented during the institute.

Data Analysis

All data were analyzed through the services of the Ohio University Computer Services. The data from the various instruments 
were coded and tabulated on a matrix sheet. The data to be used in 
computer programming were transferred to computer cards for analysis.

The Fortran Program U-NU was selected to compute t statistics 
on pretest posttest scores for hypothesis two to determine if there 
was significant gain in knowledge and for hypothesis four to determine 
any change in attitude of participants as related to involvement in 
the institute program. The use of the separate-sample pretest-post-
test design meant that the treatment group was divided into subgroups 
A and B. Therefore, these were treated as independent groups for 
statistical testing. The computer program provided means, standard 
errors and t values.

The T-NU program was also selected to compute t statistics for 
the variables in hypotheses one, three, five, seven and nine. These
hypotheses involved comparison between the treatment and no treatment groups in relation to teacher experience, knowledge scores, attitude scores, class time spent on consumer education and use of methods.

For hypotheses six and eight, the Fortran Program T-CE was selected to compute t values for differences in means of pairs of variables. This analysis was for correlated samples to determine if there was significant gain, using pretest posttest scores, in weeks spent teaching consumer education and frequency of use of methods as a result of the treatment. The output included means, standard errors and t values.

The Univariate and Multivariate Analysis of Variance, Covariance, and Regression Program Version 5.1 was selected to test hypothesis eleven. An analysis of covariance was applied to adjust means for the effects of the pretests when determining if there was significant difference between test scores of students taught by teachers in the treatment group and students taught by teachers in the no treatment group.

Opinions about the in-service program as reported by the treatment group were reported descriptively.

A summary of the data collected and the analysis of data for each hypothesis is presented in Table 1. Raw scores and summary data are reported in Tables 13 through 28 in Appendix C.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Preparation and experience of treatment group and no treatment group similar. | a. Years teaching experience.  
b. Highest degree received. | a. A t-test for independent groups.  
b. A frequency count. |
<p>| 2. Gain in knowledge from pretest to posttest by treatment group. | a. Knowledge pretest and posttest mean scores for subgroups A and B. | a. A t-test for independent groups. |
| 3. Higher knowledge posttest scores in treatment group than in no treatment group. | a. Delayed posttest mean scores on knowledge test for treatment group and no treatment group. | a. A t-test for independent groups. |
| 4. Positive change in attitude score from pretest to posttest by treatment group. | a. Attitude pretest and posttest mean scores for subgroups A and B. | a. A t-test for independent groups. |
| 5. Higher attitude posttest scores in treatment group than in no treatment group. | a. Delayed posttest mean scores on attitude test for treatment group and no treatment group. | a. A t-test for independent groups. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>Data Collected</th>
<th>Data Analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6. More class time spent teaching consumer education after the institute than previous year by treatment group.</td>
<td>a. Weeks spent teaching consumer education by treatment group for 1972-73 and 1973-74.</td>
<td>a. A correlated t-test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. More class time spent teaching consumer education after the institute by treatment group than by no treatment group.</td>
<td>a. Weeks spent teaching consumer education by treatment group and no treatment group for 1973-74.</td>
<td>a. A t-test for independent groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. More frequent use of methods and materials after the institute than for previous year by treatment group.</td>
<td>a. Number of times value clarification methods and materials were used in 1972-73 and in 1973-74 by treatment group.</td>
<td>a. A correlated t-test.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. More frequent use of methods and materials after the institute by treatment group than by no treatment group.</td>
<td>a. Number of times value clarification methods and materials were used in 1973-74 as reported by treatment and no treatment groups.</td>
<td>a. A t-test for independent groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotheses</td>
<td>Data Collected</td>
<td>Data Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Students of teachers in the treatment group gain more knowledge about consumer education concepts than the students of teachers in the no treatment group.</td>
<td>a. Consumer education pretest and posttest mean scores of one class per teacher in treatment and no treatment groups.</td>
<td>a. An analysis of covariance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Teachers in treatment group will report positive opinions about the in-service program.</td>
<td>a. Comments on self report forms.</td>
<td>a. A descriptive report.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The major purpose in this study was to assess a consumer education in-service program in relation to the teaching behavior of home economics teachers in Southeastern Ohio.

To assess the effectiveness of the in-service program eleven research questions were posed from which eleven research hypotheses were formulated. The findings of the study are presented in five sections. Section one includes a description of the teachers in the treatment group and no treatment group with reported years of teaching experience and level of education.

The emphasis in section two is on knowledge test scores and attitude test scores of teachers in the treatment group and teachers in the no treatment comparison group. Section three is focused on the weeks spent teaching consumer economics and the number of times methods and materials were used. Section four reveals student learning of consumer concepts as indicated by pretest and posttest scores on the Test of Consumer Economics and Education. The last section presents teacher opinions about the in-service program.

The hypotheses identified in this study were tested at the .01 level of significance in order to minimize a Type I error which may occur when several t-tests are used to analyze data.
Years of Teaching Experience and Level of Education

Is there a difference in the background preparation and experience reported by teachers in the treatment group and the background preparation and experience reported by teachers in the no treatment group?

A t-test for independent groups was used to test the following hypothesis:

(1) Home economics teachers who attend the in-service education program will report preparation and experience on the Teacher Information Inventory which is similar to the preparation and experience reported by the teachers in the no treatment comparison group who did not attend the in-service program.

The results of the analysis of data revealed that there was no difference significant at the .01 level in years of teaching experience between the two groups of teachers. (Table 2) The amount of teaching experience ranged from one to twenty-one years in the treatment group with 7.9 as the mean number of years. Teaching experience ranged from one to thirty years in the no treatment group with 10.2 as the mean number of years.

TABLE 2
YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7.89</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The level of education was similar in both groups of teachers. No one had below a bachelor's degree and three teachers in each group had master's degrees. Most of the teachers in the treatment group and in the no treatment group had a bachelor's degree plus additional hours of study. (Table 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>BS or BA</th>
<th>MS or MEd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The backgrounds of the teachers in both groups were found to be similar in respect to teaching situation and grade level taught. Both the treatment group and the no treatment group included teachers who taught junior high students, high school consumer homemaking students and high school job training students. One teacher in the treatment group taught in a technical school. In both groups approximately half of the teachers had boys in their classes. (Appendix C)

In both groups there were intervening variables. For example, some teachers changed positions or changed subject matter areas or went on strike. However, the teachers and the teaching situations in the no treatment group were similar enough to the treatment group to be used as a nonequivalent comparison group for the follow up study.
Knowledge and Attitude Test Scores

Knowledge Test

Will teachers who attend an in-service education program have a gain in knowledge which is related to the institute objectives?

To answer this question the following research hypothesis was tested:

(2) The posttest knowledge scores of home economics teachers who attend an in-service education program will indicate a gain in knowledge about content, methods and materials related to the institute objectives, when compared to pretest scores on a short answer test.

Using the separate-sample pretest-posttest design resulted in fourteen teachers being randomly selected to take the knowledge pretest. This was subgroup A. Subgroup B included the remaining fourteen teachers who took the knowledge posttest. A t-test for independent groups was used to determine the difference between the subgroup means for the pretest and the posttest groups. A t value of 4.95 was obtained between the pretest and the posttest scores of the subgroups which indicated a difference statistically significant at the .01 level.

The delayed knowledge posttest was taken by the total group of twenty-eight teachers. A drop of 1.1 points occurred at the end of the school year but this still indicates a gain of over sixteen points in relation to the pretest. (Table 4)
Will the delayed posttest knowledge scores of the teachers in
the treatment group be higher than the posttest knowledge scores of
teachers in the no treatment group?

To answer the above question the following research hypothesis
was tested:

(3) The delayed posttest knowledge scores of the teachers
who attend an in-service education program will be
higher than the knowledge test scores of teachers
in the no treatment comparison group.

A t-test for independent groups was used to determine if there
was a significant difference between the means of the treatment and
the no treatment groups on the delayed posttest of knowledge. A dif-
ference significant at the .01 level was indicated by a t value of
5.99 (Table 5) The teachers who participated in the in-service in-
istitute and the follow up scored significantly higher at the end of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest Subgroup A</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>4.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest Subgroup B</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46.00</td>
<td>2.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Posttest Subgroups A and B</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44.89</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the school year on the delayed posttest of knowledge than did teachers in the no treatment comparison group.

TABLE 5

DELAYED POSTTEST KNOWLEDGE SCORES FOR TREATMENT GROUP AND NO TREATMENT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>44.89</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>5.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>33.58</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Attitude Test

Will teachers who attend an in-service program give evidence of a change in attitude toward teaching and students?

This question was answered by testing the following research hypothesis:

(4) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service education program will have a positive change in attitude toward teaching and students as indicated by scores on an opinionnaire pretest and posttest.

Because of the separate sample pretest posttest design, a t-test for independent groups was used to determine the difference between the subgroup means for the pretest and the posttest. The fourteen teachers in subgroup B took the attitude pretest and the fourteen teachers in subgroup A took the attitude posttest. The points for each test item were summed for each teacher and the higher the total score the more favorable the attitude. A t value of 0.64
was obtained, indicating the difference was not significant of the .01 level between the attitude pretest and posttest. In fact, there was a slight drop in attitude scores from pretest to posttest and from immediate posttest to delayed posttest. (Table 6)

**TABLE 6**

**ATTITUDE PRETEST SCORES, POSTTEST SCORES AND DELAYED POSTTEST SCORES FOR TREATMENT GROUP**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>318.50</td>
<td>68.58</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>311.14</td>
<td>60.72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delayed Posttest</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>305.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will the delayed posttest attitude scores of the teachers in the treatment group be higher than the attitude scores of teachers in the no treatment comparison group?

The following research hypothesis was tested to answer the above question:

(5) The delayed posttest attitude scores of teachers who attend an in-service education program will be more positive than the attitude scores of teachers in the no treatment comparison group.

A t-test for independent groups was used to determine the differences between the means of the treatment group and the no treatment group on the delayed posttest of attitude. A t value of 1.27 revealed the difference was not significant at the .01 level between
the attitudes of the treatment group and the no treatment group as measured by the Teacher Opinionnaire. However, the mean score for the treatment group was slightly higher (6.44 points) than the no treatment group mean score. (Table 7)

TABLE 7
DELAYED POSTTEST ATTITUDE SCORES FOR TREATMENT GROUP AND NO TREATMENT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>305.36</td>
<td>18.50</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>298.92</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Weeks Spent Teaching Consumer Education and Number of Times Methods and Materials Were Used

Weeks Spent Teaching Consumer Education

Will teachers who attend an in-service program spend more class time teaching consumer education the year following the institute than the previous year?

To answer this question the following hypothesis was tested:

(6) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service education program will report spending more class time implementing consumer education content in the year following the institute than reported for the previous year.

A t-test for correlated groups was used to determine the difference between the mean number of weeks consumer education was taught in 1972-73 and in 1973-74 by teachers in the treatment group. One
teacher did not teach during the 1973-74 school year so the total number of teachers reporting weeks of consumer education taught was twenty-seven. A t value of 3.97 revealed a significant gain in the mean number of weeks consumer education was taught after the teachers had attended the in-service program. (Table 8) Although many of the teachers did not teach a semester course in consumer education, they taught units of consumer education within their courses of study. The mean of 3.46 weeks of consumer education taught in the 1972-73 school year was doubled to a mean of 7.00 weeks during the 1973-74 school year.

**TABLE 8**

WEEKS SPENT TEACHING CONSUMER EDUCATION IN 1972-73 AND IN 1973-74 AS REPORTED BY TEACHERS IN THE TREATMENT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will teachers in the treatment group spend more class time teaching consumer education after the in-service program than the teachers in the no treatment comparison group?

The following research hypothesis was tested to answer the above question:
Teachers who attend an in-service education program will report spending more class time implementing consumer education content in the 1973-74 school year than will be reported by teachers in the no treatment comparison group.

A t-test for independent groups revealed a t value of 0.18 which indicated the difference was not significant at the .01 level in the mean number of weeks consumer education was taught by the treatment and the no treatment group during 1973-74 school year. The mean score for both groups was approximately seven weeks although the no treatment group was slightly higher than the treatment group.

(Table 9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Times Methods and Materials Were Used

Will the teachers in the treatment group use methods and materials such as those presented at the institute more frequently the year following the institute than were used the previous year?
To answer the above question the following research hypothesis was tested:

(8) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service program will report using methods and materials such as those presented at the institute more frequently the year following the institute than reported for the previous year.

Frequency of use of value clarification activities was selected as a measure of methods and materials presented at the institute and implemented by teachers after the institute. Value clarification activities were integrated throughout the in-service program and the teachers received a variety of materials related to types of value clarification activities. The treatment group was actively involved each day of the institute in value clarification activities. Generalizations were made in relation to using value clarification activities when teaching consumer education. It was hoped that active participation in value clarification activities by the teachers would result in implementation of value clarification activities in the classroom.

A t-test for correlated groups was used to test the hypothesis that the treatment group of teachers would report using methods and materials such as those at the institute more frequently after the institute than in the previous year. The t value of 4.15 revealed a significant gain in the mean number of times value clarification activities were reported used by the teachers in the 1973-74 year as compared to the 1972-73 school year. The mean score for the twenty-seven teachers tripled from a reported 2.00 times in 1972-73 to 6.96 times that value clarification activities were used during the 1973-74 school year. (Table 10)
TABLE 10

NUMBER OF TIMES VALUE CLARIFICATION ACTIVITIES WERE USED IN 1972-73 AND IN 1973-74 AS REPORTED BY TEACHERS IN THE TREATMENT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Year</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1972-73</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>4.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973-74</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Will teachers in the treatment group report using value clarification activities more frequently than the teachers in the no treatment comparison group?

The following hypothesis was tested to answer the above question:

(9) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service program will report using the methods and materials such as those presented during the institute more frequently than will be reported by teachers in the no treatment comparison group who did not attend the institute.

The results of the analysis of data indicated that there was a difference significant at the .01 level in the number of times that value clarification activities were used by teachers in the treatment group when compared with teachers in the no treatment group. A t-test for independent groups revealed a t value of 3.90 which is statistically significant. The no treatment group had a mean score of 2.25 times that value clarification activities were used as compared to the mean of 6.96 times that value clarification activities were used by teachers in the treatment group. Teachers in the treatment group used value
clarification activities more than three times as often as the no treatment group of teachers during the 1973-74 school year. The no treatment group of teachers used value clarification activities approximately the same number of times in 1973-74 (2.25) as the treatment group used them in 1972-73 (2.00) before the institute. (Table 11)

**TABLE 11**

NUMBER OF TIMES VALUE CLARIFICATION ACTIVITIES WERE USED IN 1973-74 AS REPORTED BY TEACHERS IN THE TREATMENT GROUP AND NO TREATMENT GROUP

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.96</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers in the treatment group reported the use of various other methods and materials, such as those presented during the institute, for both the 1972-73 and 1973-74 school years. The no treatment group reported the use of similar methods and materials during the 1973-74 year. Reported were such items as writing behavioral objectives, giving objectives to the students, using learning packages in the classroom, using student self-evaluation and using advisory committees. (Appendix C)
Student Scores on the Test of Consumer Economics and Education

Will the students of the teachers in the treatment group gain more consumer education knowledge than the students of the teachers in the no treatment group?

The above question was answered by testing the following hypothesis:

(10) The students of the teachers who participated in the in-service program will gain more consumer education knowledge as shown by pretest and posttest scores on the Test of Consumer Economics and Education than the students of teachers in the no treatment comparison group who did not participate in the in-service program.

An analysis of covariance was utilized to determine the difference between the mean scores of students of teachers in the treatment group and the mean scores of students of teachers in the no treatment group. Pretest scores served as the covariate. The Test of Consumer Economics and Education was given to one class of students per teacher who would study consumer economics during the school year. The teachers in the treatment group and the teachers in the no treatment group gave the test in September as a pretest and in May as a posttest. A mean pretest score and posttest score for each teacher's class was used in analyzing the data.

A correlation of 0.72 indicated that there was a positive correlation between the pretest scores and the posttest scores. The teachers' students who scored higher on the pretest also scored higher on the posttest and the teachers' students who scored lower on the pretest scored lower on the posttest.
The analysis of covariance revealed no significant difference between the adjusted posttest mean scores, for students of teachers in the treatment group and students of teachers in the no treatment group, on the Test of Consumer Economics and Education. (Table 12) There was 1.73 points difference between the treatment group adjusted posttest scores and the no treatment group adjusted posttest scores. An examination of individual cases indicates that there was a significant gain in student scores for some teachers in each group. The lowest student scores in both groups were those of the job training teachers. Junior high student scores varied from high to low. In the treatment group, one eighth grade teacher's class had a mean score gain from 20.6 to 26.4. (Appendix C) Three junior high teachers did not give the tests to their students, citing the difficulty level of the test. This reduced the size of the treatment group to twenty-five teachers for this analysis.

One possible reason for these results could be the use of a standardized test designed for junior and senior students when the teachers in this study reported teaching consumer education to students in grades seven through twelve. Another factor could relate to the test being designed for a semester course while most of the home economics teachers reported teaching consumer education as a unit from two to six weeks long.
TABLE 12
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE OF STUDENT SCORES ON TEST OF CONSUMER ECONOMICS AND EDUCATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Pretest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean</th>
<th>Posttest Mean Adjusted</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19.90</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>21.66</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Treatment</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.21</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td>19.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Teacher Opinions About the In-Service Program

Will the teachers who attend an in-service program have positive opinions about the institute and about implementing the content, methods and materials presented at the institute?

To answer the above question the following hypothesis was formulated:

(11) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service program will report, in a questionnaire, positive opinions about the institute and about implementing the content, methods and materials presented at the institute.

No statistical analysis was used to interpret opinions about the in-service program as reported by the teachers. This information was categorized according to items on the questionnaire and self-report forms. (Appendix C)

On the last day of the institute the teachers filled out an evaluation questionnaire. All twenty-eight teachers made positive comments about the teacher institute. Twenty-two teachers rated the
institute as outstanding, four teachers marked very good and two teachers rated the program as good. Twenty-six of the teachers expressed interest in attending another similar institute while two participants checked maybe.

The following statements are illustrations of the comments made most frequently by the teachers concerning the best thing for them in the institute:

- The new and up-to-date information.
- Sharing ideas with other teachers.
- Value clarification activities.
- Portfolio showing by each teacher.
- Excellent speakers and resource persons.
- Confidence about teaching consumer education.

The comments related to what individual teachers liked least in the institute in the order of frequency were:

- The long days.
- Not enough time to do everything I wanted to do.
- Long drive to get to the institute.
- Sitting too long.
- Pressure to get so much done.

The positive comments by the teachers related most often to working together, sharing ideas, developing materials and getting new ideas. The negative comments involved mechanical details such as time, driving distances and too much sitting. Parts of the institute were repetitious for some of the participants who had heard speakers at other meetings. The recent graduates had been exposed to some of the materials which were new to the older teachers. The most positive responses about the institute came from teachers who had been teaching five years or more.
All teachers reported on a self assessment form that they accomplished the objectives they set for themselves as well as the objectives of the institute. Examples of additional comments about the institute written on the questionnaire by at least eight participants included:

- I'll go back to school a more enthusiastic person.
- Learning was fun.
- Enjoyable and educational experience.
- I realize now how to incorporate methods and materials in consumer education classes.
- I plan to go home and share with other teachers in my school.

The total in-service program was evaluated by the participants on the last follow up day. The comments made most often in relation to the strengths of the program included: being involved in activities, working cooperatively with other teachers, getting relevant up-to-date information and ideas and developing materials to use in their own consumer education classes. Twenty-six teachers made favorable references to actually doing things and being involved in the teaching/learning process while twenty-four teachers indicated that working with other teachers and sharing ideas was a major strength of the program.

The weaknesses of the total in-service education program which were mentioned most often included the long days, the need for more days of follow up and the need for more time to work on projects. Two teachers cited the need for more emphasis on the disadvantaged student and one participant said there was not enough information about the middle school student.
The teachers responded to the question - "How did the in-service program specifically help you this year?" The items listed by the teachers were categorized. Most frequently mentioned were:

- Materials which were developed at the institute.
- New ideas for methods of teaching.
- Values clarification activities.
- Materials prepared for class.
- Games to be used in the classroom.
- Renewed enthusiasm.
- Available resources.

The following statements are illustrative of those given most often by the participants in response to the question - "How did your students benefit from your participation in the program?"

- Variety of learning strategies.
- More teacher enthusiasm.
- Use of value clarification activities.
- Up-to-date materials.
- Variety of evaluation devices used.
- More emphasis on values and goals.
- More individualized instruction.
- Received behavioral objectives.
- Teacher better prepared.

In addition to those examples mentioned previously, the teachers reported using specific ideas and materials in the classroom during 1973-74. At least twenty of the teachers reported using visuals made at the institute, the listening tape, consumer kits and film strips, consumer materials from the resource center, the book Life on Paradise Island and a value continuum.

Ten or more of the teachers listed the use of the economic man, consumer puzzles, bulletin board ideas, hand out materials, learning packages, meat charts, pretests and posttests, behavioral objectives, flip charts, nutrition cards, evaluation materials, recycling ideas, and Consumer Eddie.
Based on the large number of positive responses about the in-service program, it seems that the teachers who attended the institute and the follow up had positive opinions about the in-service program. The teachers perceived the program as meaningful and helpful to them.

The teachers reported implementing in their own classroom teaching the content, methods and materials with which they were the most actively involved during the institute. They used the materials they actually developed during the institute. Using value clarification activities, investigating self assessment techniques, writing specific objectives, developing creative teaching/learning strategies, evaluating resources based on a criteria and preparing learning packages seemed to result in classroom implementation of similar items by the participants. The teachers in the treatment group reported changes in their behavior as a result of the in-service program. They also indicated that the teaching/learning process was improved and therefore, their students benefited either directly or indirectly. Some final comments by the teachers were:

- I was excited about what I did and learned - and I did learn.

- I feel more confident about teaching consumer education - and it shows.

- The students were much more interested in consumer education this year and I felt more secure.

- I shall continue to use the ideas and materials next year. I would never have tried these new methods and materials if I had not taken this institute.

- The materials I developed helped to improve by teaching - they were better than commercially made materials for my classes.
- I was very satisfied with the materials and ideas I tried out - all were relatively successful. Many of the other teachers on our faculty are using some of the materials and ideas I got from the institute.

- I really enjoy teaching this year - with all of my new ideas and materials.

- I was a bit hesitant to use some of the materials. Other teachers wondered what I was doing, but I was pleased with the comments and the performance of the students in my classes.

- Teaching was easier - I was more enthusiastic and students seemed more interested in units.

- I would not have used these ideas and materials without some preparation on how to use them.

The consumer education resource center, located at Ohio University, was used by every teacher in the treatment group, two or more times during the school year. Over half of the teachers expressed a desire to continue their in-service education by taking classes at the graduate level.

Three principals asked institute participants to conduct in-service programs for other faculty members and to share ideas from the consumer education institute. One participant wrote a proposal, which has been accepted, for an interdisciplinary consumer education program at the high school level.

Three other participants worked with individual teachers in their local school system to aid them in using materials and ideas from the institute. The follow up days were attended by university faculty members and guests of the participants.

Over half of the teachers developed learning packages or modules which they used during the school year. At least six of the teachers became involved in consumer education curriculum development.
Summary of Findings

The purpose in this study was to assess a consumer education in-service program in relation to the teaching behavior of home economics teachers. The variables used to evaluate teacher behavior directly included time spent teaching consumer education and frequency of use of methods and materials. Dependent variables which were considered related indirectly to teacher behavior included knowledge related to the institute objectives, attitude toward students and teaching and opinions about the in-service program. Consumer education test scores of students were also used as an indirect measure of teacher behavior.

The analysis of data provided some evidence that the in-service program did bring about some changes in teacher behavior. There was a statistically significant gain in knowledge related to the institute objectives from pretest to both immediate posttest and delayed posttest. This indicates that teachers retained what was learned during the summer institute for at least nine months.

There was also a difference significant at the .01 level between the knowledge test scores of the treatment group and the no treatment comparison group at the end of the school year. The fact that the teachers in the treatment group received the objectives of the institute and completed assignments based on the objectives may have contributed to the difference in knowledge scores.

The data showed that the attitude scores of teachers in the treatment group did not increase significantly from pretest to immediate or delayed posttest. There was no difference of statistical
significance between attitude scores of teachers in the treatment group and teachers in the no treatment group.

When the proposal was written for the in-service program there was a concern that some area teachers had negative attitudes toward students and teaching. It was hoped that the in-service program might stimulate some change in attitude. One reason there was no significant change in attitude might relate to the fact that teachers who volunteer for an in-service program may have a positive attitude toward students and teaching. The mean scores of teachers in both groups were high enough to be considered as indications of positive attitudes. The teachers in both the treatment and the no treatment comparison group had applied to be in the program.

The findings indicate that there was a significant gain in the number of weeks consumer education was taught by teachers in the treatment group after the institute as compared to the previous school year. However, there was no statistically significant difference between the number of weeks consumer education was taught in 1973-74 by teachers in the treatment group and teachers in the no treatment comparison group. The treatment group did include seven junior high teachers while there were only three junior high teachers in the no treatment group. This might make some difference in the amount of time teachers spent teaching consumer education.

Value clarification activities were selected as a measure of methods and materials used during the school year. An emphasis on value clarification methods and materials had been integrated throughout the in-service program and it was hoped that teachers would
implement these ideas in their classes. The data showed that the teachers did use value clarification activities more frequently during the school year after the institute than they reported the previous year. The number of times value clarification activities were used by teachers in the treatment group tripled from 2.0 in 1972-73 to 6.96 during the 1973-74 school year. This gain was statistically significant at the .01 level.

The use of value clarification activities during the 1973-74 school year was also significantly greater by teachers in the treatment group when compared to the use of value clarification activities by teachers in the no treatment comparison group.

The teachers in both groups could have been exposed to value clarification activities through sources such as books, magazines, commercial materials and other teachers. The fact that the treatment group did increase value clarification activities could relate to the active involvement of the teachers in using value clarification methods and materials during the institute.

Although not tested statistically, the number of teachers in the treatment group who wrote behavioral objectives, gave objectives to the students, utilized learning packages and used student self-assessment techniques also increased after the in-service program as compared with the previous year.

There was a slight gain in student consumer education test scores from pretest to posttest but there was no statistically significant difference between the adjusted mean scores for students of teachers in the treatment group and students of teachers in the no
treatment comparison group. An examination of individual cases indicates a significant gain in student scores for some teachers in each group. However, neither group of students did well on the test. A mean score of 26 was reported as average, by Lupher (28), on the Test of Consumer Economics and Education. The adjusted mean score on the posttest for students of teachers in the treatment group was 21.66 and was 19.93 for students of teachers in the no treatment group. The fact that the students taking the test were in grades seven through twelve and had units of consumer education, instead of semester courses at the junior and senior level, may account for some of the results.

A questionnaire was used to collect data about the strengths and weaknesses of the in-service program. The teachers also listed specific ways in which they and their students benefited from the in-service program. The teachers expressed a large number of positive comments about the in-service program and about implementing, in their classrooms, content, methods and materials presented in the institute.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

A brief review of the study, the major findings, and implications for further study are included in this chapter.

Summary

This study was designed to assess a consumer education in-service program in relation to the teaching behavior of home economics teachers in Southeastern Ohio. The in-service program included a ten day teacher institute and three follow up days during the school year. The research was pursued in cooperation with the Ohio Department of Education which provided funding for the in-service program.

The Consumer Education Institute for Teachers of Disadvantaged Students in Southeastern Ohio was held July 23 - August 3 at Tri-County Joint Vocational School in Nelsonville, Ohio. Sixty hours of instruction was provided for twenty-eight home economics teachers. Data were collected from the teachers during the institute and at the follow up days held on October 20, January 12 and March 30.

The research designs used in the study are based on Campbell and Stanley's (4) Separate-Sample Pretest-Posttest Design and Non-equivalent Control Group Design. The first design was used for
treatment of data to test the hypotheses relative to the teachers in the treatment group who participated in the in-service program. The second design was used to test the hypotheses relative to the no treatment comparison group of teachers.

Eight instruments were used for the collection of data for this study: 1) Test of Consumer Economics and Education to measure student knowledge of consumer education concepts; 2) Teacher Institute Knowledge Test to measure teacher knowledge related to the objectives of the institute; 3) Teacher Opinionnaire (Likert scale) to measure teacher attitude toward students and teaching; 4) Teacher Information Inventory for 1972-73 and 5) Teacher Information Inventory for 1973-74 to obtain background information in relation to years of teaching experience, level of education, teaching situation, consumer education content taught and the methods and materials included in the classroom; 6) Evaluation of Teacher Institute to identify strengths and weaknesses of the institute and to obtain teacher feelings about the program; 7) Self Assessment Form to collect self evaluation information related to the objectives of the institute and related to teacher set objectives; and 8) Final Evaluation of the In-Service Program to obtain teacher comments and perceptions about the total in-service program.

Hypotheses

The resulting data from these instruments were used to test the following research hypotheses:
(1) Home economics teachers who attend the in-service education program will report preparation and experience on the Teacher Information Inventory which is similar to the preparation and experience reported by the teachers in the no treatment comparison group who did not attend the in-service program.

(2) The posttest knowledge scores of home economics teachers who attend an in-service education program will indicate a gain in knowledge about content, methods and materials related to the institute objectives, when compared to pretest scores on a short answer test.

(3) The delayed posttest knowledge scores of the teachers who attend an in-service education program will be higher than the knowledge test scores of teachers in the no treatment comparison group.

(4) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service education program will have a positive change in attitude toward teaching and students as indicated by scores on an opinionnaire pretest and posttest.

(5) The delayed posttest attitude scores of teachers who attend an in-service education program will be more positive than the attitude scores of teachers in the no treatment comparison group.
(6) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service education program will report spending more class time implementing consumer education content in the year following the institute than reported for the previous year.

(7) Teachers who attend an in-service education program will report spending more class time implementing consumer education content in the 1973-74 school year than will be reported by teachers in the no treatment comparison group.

(8) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service program will report using methods and materials such as those presented at the institute more frequently the year following the institute than reported for the previous year.

(9) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service program will report using the methods and materials such as those presented at the institute more frequently than will be reported by teachers in the no treatment comparison group who did not attend the institute.

(10) The students of the teachers who participated in the in-service program will gain more consumer education knowledge as shown by pretest and post-test scores on the Test of Consumer Economics and Education than the students of teachers in the no
treatment comparison group who did not participate in the in-service program.

(11) Home economics teachers who attend an in-service program will report, in a questionnaire, positive opinions about the institute and about implementing the content, methods and materials presented at the institute.

The research hypotheses identified for this study were tested at the .01 level of confidence in order to minimize a Type I error. For hypotheses two and four, t-statistics were utilized to determine the gain from subgroup pretest to subgroup posttest for both knowledge and attitude. Hypotheses one, three, five, seven, and nine involved a comparison between the treatment and the no treatment groups of teachers on the variables of teaching experience, delayed knowledge test scores, delayed attitude test scores, time spent teaching consumer economics, and number of times methods were used. A t-test for independent groups was utilized to test these hypotheses. A t-test for correlated groups was used to test hypotheses five and seven which compared pre and post reports of weeks of consumer education taught and times methods were used. For the hypothesis to determine student gain in knowledge, analysis of covariance was utilized.
Findings

The major findings in the study were:

(1) The teachers who attended the in-service program reported preparation and experience which was similar to the preparation and experience reported by the teachers in the comparison group. There was no significant difference in years of teaching experience between the treatment group and the no treatment group. The level of education was also similar for both groups.

(2) There was a statistically significant difference between knowledge pretest and posttest scores of teachers in the treatment group, indicating a gain in knowledge about content, methods and materials related to the institute objectives.

(3) A statistically significant difference was found to exist between the treatment group delayed posttest knowledge scores and the no treatment group delayed posttest knowledge scores.

(4) An examination of the data revealed that there was no statistically significant difference between attitude pretest and posttest scores of teachers who attended the in-service program.

(5) No statistically significant difference existed between the treatment group and the no treatment comparison group on delayed attitude posttest scores.
(6) The number of weeks of consumer education taught by teachers in the treatment group after the in-service program as compared to the previous year was statistically significant.

(7) When the number of weeks that consumer education was taught during 1973-74 by the treatment group was compared to the weeks of consumer education taught by the no treatment group, there was no statistically significant difference.

(8) A comparison of the frequency of use of methods and materials, such as those presented at the institute, during the 1972-73 school year with the frequency of use during the 1973-74 year indicated a statistically significant difference for teachers in the treatment group.

(9) There was a statistically significant difference between the treatment group and the no treatment group in relation to the number of times methods and materials, such as those presented at the institute, were reported used during the 1973-74 school year.

(10) The students of teachers who participated in the in-service program did not score significantly higher on the Test of Consumer Economics and Education than the students of teachers in the no treatment group.
The twenty-eight teachers who attended the in-service program reported positive opinions about the in-service program and about implementing the content, methods and materials presented at the institute.

Implications

The rapidly changing educational scene, the focus on accountability and the concept of continuous education reinforce the need for effective in-service education programs for home economics teachers. In-service education should make a difference. A change in teacher behavior should result in improved classroom instruction and greater student learning. To improve the effectiveness of in-service education there is a need for in-service education research and development.

Having established some evidence that a teacher institute and follow up program can be effective in changing some of the teaching behavior of home economics teachers, the results of this study can be projected in two directions. These include expanding future in-service programs to meet the needs of more teachers and further research in determining the effectiveness of such in-service programs.

1. A state or area plan for continuous in-service opportunities would allow teachers to plan their professional growth program in relation to types of in-service programs which would be available. Alternative types of in-service opportunities could be investigated for feasibility. Options for in-service might include not only workshops, mini workshops, institutes and conferences, but, Saturday sessions,
weekend retreats and mobile units which take the program out to the teachers. The programs should include appropriate means of evaluation.

2. Follow up days could be more fully investigated in relation to the reinforcement they provide for the original in-service program. Longitudinal research studies to determine the carry over from in-service programs to the real classroom would be desirable.

3. An investigation of methods and techniques utilized in effective in-service programs would provide information about how to involve participants actively in meaningful experiences. Teachers must feel competent and confident about new content and methods before they will implement them in their own classroom.

4. Motivation for attending in-service programs could be studied to provide information for future planning. Are the teachers who attend the in-service programs the teachers who most need help? Should possible extrinsic motivational factors be explored in relation to providing in-service for those who most need help? What effect does giving credit, stipends and/or free materials have on attendance at in-service programs? Will the PIR credit through AHEA motivate teachers to participate in in-service programs? What attitudes about in-service programs are currently held by home economics teachers? Answers to these types of questions would help in planning future in-service opportunities for home economics teachers.

5. Investigating variables such as student knowledge, student skill and student attitudes would provide meaningful data about effectiveness of in-service education in relation to the improvement of student learning. Using appropriate measures and providing in-depth
programs, which focus on helping teachers to bring about student behavior change, would provide an opportunity to evaluate the student's benefit from in-service programs.

6. Experimentation with ways of individualizing in-service instruction would aid in meeting the individual needs of more teachers. Many in-service programs are already planned before the teachers enroll. Planning alternative activities within a program would provide for more individual differences.

7. A plan for professional dissemination of information and materials would extend the benefits of in-service programs. Sharing of ideas and materials could be carried out through consultants, newsletters, resource centers and/or packages for purchase.
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We hope your educational trip will be pleasant and rewarding. If we can be of any help or if you have any questions, do not hesitate to call us.

-Please Fasten Your Seat Belt-
AGENDA

Monday, July 23

A.M. PREFLIGHT PLANS

9:00 - Registration & Refreshments
10:00 - Pretests
11:00 - Procedure
12:00 - Lunch (Buffet at Hocking Valley Motor Lodge)

P.M. FILE FLIGHT PLAN

1:00 - What's New in Consumer Education Curriculum Development?
   Pat Snipes, Home Economics Teacher
   Athens High School

2:30 - Values Clarification
3:00 - Behavioral Objectives
   Shirley Slater

Tuesday, July 24

A.M. FIRST STOP: DISADVANTAGEDVILLE

9:00 - The Disadvantaged Student
   Dr. Monroe Johnson
   Associate Professor of Education
   Ohio University

12:00 - Lunch & Weather Check (on your own)

P.M. SECOND STOP: FAMILY LIFETOWN

1:00 - Family Ecology and Family Planning
   Tour of What's Happening
   Kay Atkins
   Family Life Educator
   Southeastern Ohio Family Planning Association
Wednesday, July 25

A.M. CONSUMER CITY TRIP

9:00 - Values Clarification
10:00 - Teaching Consumer Education
   Sandra Coffindaffer
   Home Economics Teacher
   Westerville High School
12:00 - Lunch (on your own)

P.M. CONSUMER EDUCATION TOUR

1:00 - Task Teams Work On Consumer Education
   Sandra Coffindaffer, Consultant
2:30 - Methods, Techniques and Materials
   Shirley Slater

Thursday, July 26

A.M. VISIT HUMAN ENVIRONMENT VILLAGE

9:00 - Low Cost and Creative
   Judy Matthews
   Assistant Professor
   School of Home Economics
   Ohio University
12:00 - Lunch (on your own)

P.M. CREATIVITY FAIR STOPOVER

1:00 - Work on Projects
   Judy Matthews, Consultant
3:00 - Report and Evaluate
Friday, July 27

A.M. HUMAN DEVELOPMENTVILLE

9:00 - Child Development Happening
June Varner
Child Development Specialist
Buckeye Hills Hocking Valley
Regional Development District
12:00 - Lunch (on your own)

P.M. HIJACK!!! To Athens to College of Education

1:00 - Media Trip to Media Center in McCracken
Dr. Palmer Dyer, Director
Educational Media
Ohio University

Monday, July 30

A.M. STOPOVER AT HUMAN NUTRITION AND
       FOOD SCIENCE CITY

9:00 - New Developments and Decisions
Mary Ann Lewis
Associate Professor
School of Home Economics
Ohio University
12:00 - Lunch (on your own)

P.M. SIDE TRIPS AND TOURS

1:00 - Group Think
2:30 - Task Teams and Individual Projects
Tuesday, July 31

A.M. TOUR OF THINK TOWN

9:00 - Advisory Committees
   Panel of Participants
10:00 - Motivation
   Shirley Slater
11:00 - Task Teams and Individual Projects
12:00 - Lunch (on your own)

P.M. MEATSVILLE, U.S.A.

1:00 - Consumer "Cuts"
   Dr. B. V. Van Stavern
   Professor of Animal Science
   The Ohio State University

Wednesday, August 1

A.M. COMMUNICATION CITY VISIT

9:00 - Task Team Evaluations
10:00 - Interpersonal Communication
   Dr. Robert R. Monaghan
   Communication Research
   The Ohio State University
12:00 - Lunch (on your own)

P.M. RADAR CONTACT

1:00 - Communication Concerns
   Group Reactions
2:30 - Task Team Evaluation
Thursday, August 2

A.M. RURAL LIFE EXPLORATION

9:00 - Rural Family Life
   Eleanor Fugate
   Rural Family Life Director
   Based at Hocking Valley Motor Lodge

11:00 - Consumer Education Implementation
        and Application
        Panel of Participants

12:00 - Lunch (on your own)

P.M. TOURS TO THINK INS AND THINK OUTS

1:00 - Task Teams and Individual Projects

3:00 - Evaluation Strategies
       Shirley Slater

Friday, August 3

A.M. CLEARED FOR FINAL APPROACH

9:00 - Presentations - Portfolio
        Individual Reports

12:00 - Lunch (together at Hocking Valley Motor Lodge)

P.M. LANDING

1:00 - Posttests
2:00 - Evaluations and Plan for Follow-Up
3:00 - Advisory Committee Meeting

-Thank you for flying Consumer Airlines-
GENERAL OBJECTIVES

The participants will:

1. Identify consumer education (curriculum) content relevant to students of all types with an emphasis on meeting the needs of disadvantaged students.

2. Prepare consumer education instructional materials with an emphasis on disadvantaged students.

3. Become familiar with and use various types of teaching methods, media, materials and resources which would motivate and involve students.

4. Improve instruction by learning to write behavioral objectives and planning instruction to meet students' needs.

5. Have experience in analyzing the teaching/learning process.

6. Identify and recognize the characteristics of disadvantaged students.

7. Develop and use various types of individualized instruction.

8. Become familiar with advisory committees and how to organize and use advisory committees when planning programs of instruction to meet students' needs.

9. Develop and use a variety of evaluation materials and techniques for both student and self-evaluation.

10. Relate self concept development and value clarification to consumer education and the disadvantaged student.

11. Apply up-to-date subject matter content related to housing, nutrition, child development, family life, etc., to consumer education and the disadvantaged student.

Key concepts to be integrated in all areas of Home Economics

HR  Human Resource Management
SD  Self Development
CE  Consumer Economics
LS  Life Styles, Cycles
IR  Interpersonal Relationships
Task Team Assignments

1. Write out a definition of "disadvantaged student" and a list of characteristics of disadvantaged students.

2. Define consumer education and identify major consumer concepts which should be included in curriculum planning.

3. Develop a criteria for evaluating consumer education media and materials.

4. Evaluate an assigned tape or visual aid.

5. Develop a list of ways to motivate disadvantaged students in consumer education classes.

6. Investigate a system to analyze teaching.

7. Recommend a 10 item bibliography for consumer education.

8. Develop a plan to integrate the key concepts within consumer education.

Individual Assignments

1. Do the learning package on behavioral objectives and write behavioral objectives for you at the institute. Turn in your list.

2. Write a brief description of the disadvantaged students in your classes.

3. Evaluate 6 references and resources including *The Teaching of Home Economics and Values Clarification*.

4. Develop 5 learning strategies (visuals, activities, games, materials, etc.) to use with the new curriculum guide consumer area.

5. Create either a learning package or a CBI module or a unit related to consumer education.

6. Plan 5 types of consumer education evaluation.

7. Pick a project for yourself.

8. Do a final evaluation of yourself and the institute and make a plan for the future.
ASSIGNMENT
Think! Think! Think! Think! Think! Think! Think! Think! Think! Think!
Think In
Think What
Think Out
Think Why
Think How
Think Who
Think Where
Think Positive
Think Things
Think People
Think Creative
Think Critical
Think Up
Think Ideas
Think Consumer Education
THINK!

In addition to the planned agenda you will be involved in ongoing activities with your task team and you will be working on individual projects.

Whenever you have time please read, examine materials, look at resources and view exhibits. Values clarification and evaluation will be a continuous process throughout the institute.

The major focus in the institute is to help home economics teachers relate current subject matter content to the teaching of consumer economics. An emphasis is being placed on understanding and motivating students, particularly those who may be disadvantaged or deprived.
APPENDIX B

Instruments

1. Test of Consumer Economics and Education
2. Teacher Institute Knowledge Test
3. Teacher Opinionnaire
4. Teacher Information Inventory for 1972-73
5. Teacher Information Inventory for 1973-74
6. Evaluation of Teacher Institute
7. Self Assessment Form
8. Final Evaluation of In-Service Program
TEST OF CONSUMER ECONOMICS AND EDUCATION

AN ACHIEVEMENT TEST DESIGNED TO ACCOMPANY

THE CONSUMER EDUCATION CURRICULUM GUIDE FOR OHIO,

GRADES K-12

2ND EDITION
March, 1973

Developed by
DENNIS A. LUPHER
SUPERVISOR OF CONSUMER ECONOMIC EDUCATION
ROOM G-15
STATE OFFICE BUILDING
65 SOUTH FRONT STREET
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43215
TEST OF CONSUMER ECONOMICS AND EDUCATION

Directions

This test is designed to measure your understanding of consumer economics and education. There are fifty questions or incomplete statements, choose the best answer for each. Attempt to answer all questions. If special answer sheets have been provided, please use a pencil to blacken the appropriate space.

You may begin.

1. Producers wish to sell their products at high prices; consumers wish to buy at low prices. How is this conflict usually resolved in a basically private enterprise system?
   1. By advertising
   2. By competitive markets
   3. Through government regulation
   4. Producers have complete control over prices

2. Select the option which best describes three essential features of the American economic system.
   1. Profit motive, private enterprise, and market system
   2. Private property, central planning, and competition
   3. Profit motive, public property, and competition
   4. State controlled production, competition, and private property

3. America could be called a land of specialized labor. Which of the following best describes a major result of specialization?
   1. Economic scarcity
   2. Decreased efficiency
   3. Economic independence
   4. Economic interdependence

4. What determines the value of the dollar?
   1. Gold backing
   2. The goods and services it can command
   3. The Federal Reserve System
   4. The value of foreign currencies

5. During a period of high unemployment and low inflation the federal government would probably
   1. Spend more money than it collects in taxes
   2. Attempt to balance the federal budget
   3. Spend less money than it collects in taxes
   4. Increase personal income taxes
6. Collective bargaining is best described as
   1. Usually ending with the government stepping in
   2. A necessary and healthy tool of labor-management relations
   3. A means of creating unnecessarily high prices
   4. A procedure seldom used in business today

7. Which of the following best describes the main reasons for the high standard of living in America?
   1. Advancements in technology
   2. Increases in socialism
   3. Increases in the Consumer Price Index
   4. Weak labor unions

8. Which of the following would be hurt the most by inflation?
   1. Small businessmen
   2. Salesmen
   3. Persons on fixed incomes
   4. Persons who borrow money

9. Suppose five years ago a major company sold 15,000 automatic dishwashers at $300 each, this year they sold 50,000 at $150 each. Why is the larger amount associated with the lower price?
   A. More people can afford the dishwashers at the lower price
   B. Greater production means less cost per unit and the price can be lowered
   C. Most families will probably buy more than one dishwasher at the lower price
   1. Only (A) is correct
   2. Only (A) and (B) are correct
   3. Only (B) and (C) are correct
   4. (A), (B) and (C) are correct

10. A plant manager would probably consider which of the following human resources as the most important requirement of an employee?
    1. Occupational dependability
    2. Academic ability
    3. Personal interest
    4. Physical strength

11. Which of the following would NOT be considered as a human resource?
    1. Time
    2. Money
    3. Personality
    4. Knowledge
12. Which of the following segments of the labor force has decreased considerably in the past twenty-five years?
   1. Management
   2. Industrial
   3. Transportation
   4. Agriculture

13. Educational training is time consuming and expensive. Which of the following best describes the usual reward or rewards of the college graduate compared to the nongraduate?
   1. Yearly wages are higher, but the time spent in college normally results in lower lifetime earnings
   2. Average lifetime and yearly earnings tend to increase as your educational level increases
   3. Personal job satisfaction is increased through educational training, but average lifetime earnings are not affected
   4. Yearly earnings are increased, but personal satisfaction usually decreases because of longer hours spent on the job

14. The major portion of the money collected by local governments from property taxes is used to pay for
   1. Public protection
   2. Public recreational facilities
   3. Public welfare
   4. Public education

15. Which of the following is NOT a function of the public educational system?
   1. Preparation for societal membership
   2. Enrichment of leisure time
   3. Preparation for an occupation
   4. Directing individuals into specific life styles

16. It is generally accepted that an individual's social position is
   1. Not related to his job
   2. Inversely related to his job
   3. Slightly related to his job
   4. Closely related to his job

17. What is the predominant reason for low individual incomes in the United States?
   1. Some people choose not to work
   2. Men are being displaced by machines
   3. Lack of a salable skill
   4. Foreign trade reduces incomes of American workers
18. Impulse buying is influenced most by which of the following?
   1. Goals
   2. Social status
   3. Needs
   4. Advertising

19. The major influencing factor which causes a young boy to wear long trousers is probably
   1. Imitation
   2. Personal values
   3. Emotion
   4. Habit

20. Which of the following should be the most significant factor in arriving at most consumer decisions?
   1. Overall goals
   2. Habits and customs
   3. Social standing
   4. Peer influences

21. Long-term group practices and habits which usually influence consumer behavior are known as
   1. Customs
   2. Peer influences
   3. Fashions
   4. Fads

22. Which of the following is the best indicator of an increased standard of living?
   1. An increase in the consumer goods and services considered necessary
   2. An increase in personal wages
   3. An increase in the Consumer Price Index
   4. Limited inflation during the past year

23. Select the option which is NOT true in describing values and goals.
   1. They affect spending patterns and habits
   2. They influence all aspects of living
   3. They remain the same year after year
   4. They usually differ for each individual and family

24. Trading stamps and similar buying incentives add to consumer satisfaction through the acquisition of various items from a gift catalog. In the long-run who usually pays the major portion of the cost of these items?
   1. The manufacturer, through a smaller profit margin
   2. The retailer, because of greater costs
   3. The consumer, through higher prices
   4. The worker, through lower wages
25. The central problem which necessitates consumer choice making is that
1. Most people have limited incomes and unlimited wants
2. Psychological factors are stronger than material needs
3. Values and goals change as life styles change
4. Peer groups and social status are influential forces

26. Which of the following best describes how most large companies determine their advertising campaigns?
1. Through past experience
2. Largely by guessing
3. Through scientific marketing research
4. By imitation of other successful businesses

27. If a consumer should choose to use credit to exchange his black-and-white television for a new color set, how would this affect his future spending potential?
1. Borrowing should not change his future spending potential.
2. It would be increased, he is able to buy more because he borrowed the money.
3. It would be decreased, future earnings must pay for the new set.
4. No effect, there is a credit cost, but it is usually absorbed by the producer.

28. Wise financial planning will NOT do which of the following?
1. Assist you in living better
2. Result in wiser consumer decisions
3. Help you obtain greater material satisfaction
4. Increase your immediate income

29. If the income for a family of four increases from $8,000 to $12,000 a year, they will probably spend a smaller portion of their total income for
1. Entertainment
2. Food
3. Clothing
4. Taxes

30. There are many points to consider in deciding whether to rent or buy a house. In arriving at a decision all but one of the following statements are valid arguments, which one would be INCORRECT?
1. All else being equal, renters usually receive better credit ratings than homeowners
2. Renters usually find it easier to budget for housing, their expenses fluctuate less than with homeowners.

3. Homeowners can claim personal income tax deductions for interest payments made on mortgages and from real estate taxes.

4. In the short-run, renting is often cheaper than buying.

31. A man decides to take his money out of a savings account and buy common stock. He is
   1. Almost certain to make more money
   2. Giving up safety in the hope of greater profits
   3. Probably going to lose money at first, but make more in the long-run
   4. Probably going to make more money with less risk involved

32. One of the best reasons for using bank checks is that
   1. Checks are the only way you can pay bills by mail
   2. Extra money left in checking accounts earns interest
   3. Bank checks are usually offered at no cost for handling
   4. Cancelled checks serve as receipts

33. Which of the following statements is usually true in reference to buying an item on an installment plan?
   1. Installment contracts can be easily broken
   2. This is the cheapest method of purchasing an item
   3. Credit can be obtained elsewhere at a lower cost
   4. Retailers extend credit in hopes of repossessing the item

34. Which of the following lenders usually offers the lowest range of interest rates?
   1. Credit unions
   2. Credit card agencies
   3. Department stores
   4. Small loan companies

35. What kind of automobile insurance should you have to pay for repairing another person's car involved in an accident which is your fault?
   1. Uninsured Motorists
   2. Collision
   3. Comprehensive
   4. Liability
36. A man desired to increase his life insurance by $10,000 for a two-year period of time. What type of policy would be the least expensive and meet his needs?
   1. An endowment policy
   2. A straight life policy
   3. A term insurance policy
   4. A 10-year endowment policy

37. Most decisions which help determine what to produce in a market economy are made through
   1. Producers
   2. The government
   3. Consumer buying
   4. Labor unions

38. Which of the following is an example of a producer of a service?
   1. A baker
   2. A farmer
   3. A manufacturer
   4. A barber

39. Select the option which most adequately describes taxes in the United States.
   1. Taxes take from many and benefit only a few
   2. Taxes will decrease as our country becomes more advanced
   3. Taxes take from the rich and give to the poor
   4. Taxes are the price we pay for civilization

40. What is the general theory underlying the progressive income tax?
   1. All individuals should contribute the same percentage of their income to financing the government.
   2. Government revenues should be paid according to the ability of each individual to pay
   3. Only individuals should pay taxes; industries and businesses should be exempt whenever possible
   4. All individuals should pay federal income taxes

41. If an individual is to maximize his resources, he will select that alternative
   1. Which is of the best quality
   2. Whose benefits are the most for the money
   3. Which is the least expensive
   4. Which he tends to like best

42. Minimizing consumer complaints is beneficial to which of the following?
   1. Consumers
   2. Businessmen
   3. Government
   4. All of the above
43. Most consumer rights are accompanied by certain responsibilities. Select the consumer responsibility which does NOT necessarily accompany the right to safety.
   1. Study safety ratings of products
   2. Report unsafe products
   3. Do comparative pricing
   4. Follow use and care instructions

44. Information from which of the following would be the best source to assist in obtaining the best buy for the price?
   1. The Consumers Union
   2. The Better Business Bureau
   3. The Federal Trade Commission
   4. Monthly household magazines

45. Which of the following is NOT a function of the Better Business Bureau?
   1. Furnish information on comparative pricing
   2. Promote fair advertising
   3. Promote fair selling practices
   4. Promote better consumer education

46. Who pays contributions for social security benefits?
   1. The employer pays the total cost
   2. The employee pays the total cost
   3. The employee and the employer share the cost
   4. Contributions are made through corporation taxes

47. All but one of the following forms of transfer payment are under the direction of state governments. Which is a function of the national government?
   1. Social security payments
   2. Unemployment compensation
   3. Public welfare payments
   4. Workmen's compensation

48. You suspect that a local meat packing factory does not comply with federal sanitary regulations. Which of the following agencies could substantiate or discredit your suspicion?
   1. Federal Trade Commission
   2. Better Business Bureau
   3. Food and Drug Administration
   4. Interstate Commerce Commission

49. Local governments usually provide which of the following services?
   1. Maintenance of hospital buildings
   2. Welfare payments
   3. Maintenance of courts and prisons
   4. Fire and police protection
50. Which of the following would be classified as a legal monopoly?

1. A line of dairy products which handles 90 percent of the dairy business in a particular town

2. A television cable company which has a franchise from the city council

3. A company which, with a few competitors, tends to dominate the market

4. Any company which controls at least 90 percent of the market in their particular industry
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Q.</th>
<th>A.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Define Consumer Education:

2. List the 6 major concepts of consumer education as identified in the curriculum guide.
   1.
   2.
   3.
   4.
   5.
   6.

3. A disadvantaged student is one who:

4. Identify 4 characteristics of a disadvantaged student.
   1.
   2.
   3.
   4.

5. Motivation means:
6. List 4 specific ways in which disadvantaged students could be motivated to study consumer education:
   1.
   2.
   3.
   4.

7. Write a behavioral objective for a student in consumer education:

8. List the 3 components of a behavioral objective:
   1.
   2.
   3.

9. The teaching/learning process can be systematically analyzed by using a system such as:
   1.
   or
   2.

10. The most important reason for using a learning package is to:

11. Name the 5 components of a learning package:
    1.
    2.
    3.
    4.
    5.

12. The main purposes of an advisory committee are:
    1.
    2.
13. An advisory committee in consumer homemaking would include 5 people such as:
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 
   4. 
   5. 

14. Explain the major reason for self-evaluation.

15. Identify 3 major purposes of evaluation.
   1. 
   2. 
   3. 

16. Values clarification is:

17. Give an example of a values clarification activity.

18. Self concept development is:

19. Define the metric system:

20. Have you recently read any books or articles by the following people? Write what you associate with each person.
   1. Bach - 
   2. Bloom - 
   3. Brothers - 
   4. Bruner - 
   5. Duvall -
21. List as many new trends, developments and issues as you can think of which are of concern to home economics teachers.

22. Identify a new trend in a subject matter area and give an example of how you could relate this trend to teaching consumer education to disadvantaged students.
Social Security Number

TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE

Part I The Teacher and Students

There are no right or wrong answers. Mark how you really feel about each statement.

SA = Strongly Agree
A = Agree
U = Undecided
D = Disagree
SD = Strongly Disagree

1. Home Economics is a helping profession.

2. Teachers have a responsibility to help in providing instruction for students with special needs.

3. All individuals have worth and dignity as persons.

4. Teachers should accept opportunities to help students even if it means additional duties and time.

5. Teachers should educate themselves for the task of understanding students through reading, listening, talking and through first-hand experiences.

6. Teachers should learn more about and work with all groups in the community.

7. Teachers should lose their own identity as they work with other groups.

Adapted from Hints for Teaching Homemakers with Special Needs, Kentucky Department of Education, Division of Vocational Home Economics, Frankfort, Kentucky, July, 1966, p. 5.
8. Teachers should work with volunteers in the community and try to help them understand ways to work with people with special needs.

9. Teachers should make use of available resources.

10. Teachers should actively seek the cooperation of other services in the community.

11. Teachers should refrain from imposing their values on others.

12. Teachers should try to help individuals develop those values that are consistent with our democratic society.

13. Teachers should avoid negative judgments based upon their own standards.

14. Teachers are usually superior to people having less education.

15. Teachers should help students to be proud of their families and their culture regardless of life styles.

16. Teachers should find ways to help students work with what they have for improved living.

17. Teachers should try to find fresh approaches to the problems of groups with special needs.

18. Teachers should use the mistakes they make to promote their own growth.

19. Teachers should realize that some students just won't learn.

20. Teachers should realize that everyone is disadvantaged in some way and everyone has some special needs.
Part II  The Teacher and the Community

The situations described in the Inventory are like those which some teachers have met. After each one is given a list of statements, describing how some have felt when they found themselves in such a position. You are asked to project yourself into these situations and JUST SUPPOSE how you would really feel. Different viewpoints are important; there can be no "right" or "wrong" answers!

I  JUST SUPPOSE: You have been asked to serve on a committee to judge essays submitted by teachers in a national contest on the subject, "Parents Today." Of course you are to judge the papers on quality of writing and skill in presenting and defending the position taken. Incidentally, however, you are finding the variety of points of view in these papers very interesting. Some statements from these papers are given below. What is your reaction to each of them?

1. Today's parents are too generous with their children.

2. Parents do the best they can in bringing up their children.

3. Parents nowadays tend to let their children be undisciplined.

4. Today's parents do not want to be simple parents; they want to really know and understand their children.

5. Parents tend to give their children too much independence.

6. On the whole, parents seem to neglect the social, aesthetic and spiritual growth of their children.

7. Parents put the responsibility for rearing their children upon the school.

2Adapted from The Teacher and the Community, by Ruth T. Lehman
The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1964.
II. JUST SUPPOSE: Many of the pupils whom you are teaching are from homes where the traditional family pattern of father earning the living and mother being the homemaker no longer exists. Several of the teachers are discussing these situations. The opinions expressed are varied. How do you feel about these family conditions?

1. Divorce is sometimes the best way out.

2. I hope I never have to teach in a community where most of the children come from interracial homes.

3. Delinquency of her children is the price a mother must expect to pay if she takes on a full-time job away from home.

4. One must accept alternate life styles and be willing to help youth from such homes adjust.

5. If the mother is employed, the chances are that her family's life can be as satisfying as it would be if she spent all her time at home.

6. Welfare children cannot be expected to do as well in school as children who have parents who support them.

7. A married woman who has small children should be home with her family and not on a job.

III. JUST SUPPOSE: You and two of your teacher friends have just spent the day observing in a high school which is unusual in certain respects. The I.Q. level of the students is generally "low average" to "low"; several students have "served time" in the reform school; the parents in general seem to have little interest in school or, apparently, in their children. One of your friends exclaims, "Deliver me from ever teaching in a school like this one!" The other says, "Oh, I don't know, it might be interesting." How do you feel about working in this type of school community?
1. I agree with the teacher who said, "Deliver me from ever teaching in a school like this one!"

2. The people in such a community are most interesting to me.

3. Pupils who are not high in native intelligence can be lovable individuals when one comes to know them.

4. The best way to get along in this difficult school is to ignore the parents and concentrate on the classes one is teaching.

5. Students who are eager and willing to learn are the only ones who really interest me.

6. Trying to teach children of low I.Q. would be an unpleasant way to make a living.

7. It would be more satisfying to succeed in such a community than to work in a situation where there were few if any problems.

Part III The Teacher and Students with Problems

The following are statements with which some people agree and others disagree. Similarly, you will probably find yourself agreeing strongly with some statements, disagreeing just as strongly with others and being perhaps more neutral about still others. There are no right or wrong answers. The best answer is your personal opinion.

1. Each member of a gang that becomes involved in a gang war, commits robbery, sets fires, etc., is equally guilty and should receive the same punishment.

---

2. Youngsters who get into trouble have to suffer the consequences in order to learn that wrong living does not pay and can only lead to punishment and suffering.

3. Living is too soft for kids today; less of them would get into trouble if they had a job to occupy their time and minds.

4. While looks can be deceiving, physical appearance, such as tidiness or sloppiness, tells a lot about a young person; it would seem that even the delinquent child who is tidy and neat would be easier to help than the delinquent whose appearance is rough and untidy.

5. If delinquents expect adults to like them, they have to show respect and obedience.

6. Character, honesty and obedience will tell in the long run; most boys and girls get what they deserve.

7. On the whole, juvenile delinquents are not as much the unfortunate and helpless victims of circumstances as some people think - they know right from wrong and can do better if they try.

8. With regard to juvenile delinquency, we are putting too much faith in the psychological approach, when what we really need are stiffer laws and more vigilant law enforcement.

9. Young people should not be allowed to hang out on street corners for it is often there that delinquent gangs are formed and malicious acts planned.

10. It would be easier to help a younger and smaller child who became involved in delinquency than an older and bigger child.
11. Most juvenile delinquents are vicious and destructive and present a growing threat to life and property.

12. Behavior is either right or wrong, good or bad and young people should be rewarded or punished accordingly as the case may be.

13. Psychologists who deal with delinquents in guidance centers and reformatories should be less concerned with the subconscious life of these youths and more concerned with their moral life.

14. In the final analysis, the only way to stop some kids from getting into further trouble is to instill fear in them whether it be the fear of God, or the fear of the police or the fear of punishment.

Part IV The Teacher and Education

Below are a number of statements about which teachers may have different opinions. Please indicate how you feel about each statement.

1. It is appropriate for teachers to require an additional assignment from a pupil who misbehaves in class.

2. How a student feels about what he learns is as important as what he learns.

3. The way to handle a pupil who tells lies is to threaten to punish him.

4. Education has failed unless it has helped boys and girls to understand and express their own feelings and experiences.

---

5. All children should be encouraged to aim at the highest academic goals.

6. What boys and girls become as adults is more closely related to the experiences they have with each other than it is to mastery of specific subject matter.

7. It is more important for students to learn to work together cooperatively than it is for them to learn how to compete.

8. Some pupils are just naturally stubborn.

9. Students should be permitted to disagree with the teacher.

10. It is better for a girl to be shy and timid than "boy crazy."

11. Boys and girls should learn that most of life's problems have several possible solutions and not just one "correct" one.

12. The first signs of delinquency in a pupil should be received by a lightening of discipline and more restrictions.

13. Most boys and girls who present extreme cases of "problem behavior" are doing the best they can to get along with other people.

14. An activity to be educationally valuable should train reasoning and memory in general.

15. It is more important for a child to have faith in himself than it is for him to be obedient.

16. Being grouped according to ability damages the self confidence of many boys and girls.

17. The pupil who isn't making good grades should be told to study harder.
<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18. A student who will not do his work should be helped in every way possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. The teacher should lower grades for misconduct in class.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. A teacher should permit a great deal of latitude in the way he permits boys and girls to address him.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. It is a good idea to tell a pupil that he can succeed in any type of work if he works hard.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. A teacher should accept the deficiencies and shortcomings of a student, as well as his good points.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Each time a pupil lies his punishment should be increased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Boys and girls can learn proper discipline only if they are given sufficient freedom.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. If a teacher keeps school conditions exactly the same and gives all pupils an equal opportunity to respond, he has done all he can do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. The teacher's first responsibility in all cases of misconduct is to locate and punish the offender.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. It is better for boys and girls to talk about the things that bother them than to try to forget them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. It is more important for boys and girls to be liked and accepted by their friends than it is for them to get along with their teachers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Teachers should answer children's questions about sex frankly and, if possible, without show of embarrassment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
30. When a pupil obeys all the rules of the school, one can be sure he is developing moral character.

31. Students should play a very active part in formulating rules for the classroom and the school.
TEACHER OPINIONNAIRE
(LIKERT SCALE)

Values For Each Item

+ = positive item with values of 5 4 3 2 1
- = negative item with values of 1 2 3 4 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TEACHER INFORMATION INVENTORY FOR 1972-73

Social Security Number__________________________ School Phone______________
School Address_________________________________________ Home Phone__________
Home Address_________________________________________ Home Phone____________
Degree_________________________ Years Teaching Experience________________
Position or Title__________________ Other Professional Experience__________
Courses and Background in Consumer Education__________________________

1. Did you teach consumer education last year? Yes ___ No ___

2. Did you teach consumer education as:
   A. A semester course ___ Grade level ___ No. boys ___ No. girls ___
   B. A year course ___ Grade level ___ No. boys ___ No. girls ___
   C. A unit ___ Number of weeks in unit ___
   D. Integrated in another area ___ What area ______ Time on consumer education ___ weeks

3. How do you feel about teaching consumer education?

4. How did your students react to studying consumer education?

5. What was your main consumer education content emphasis?

6. Did you use any values clarification activities last year?
   A. Yes ___ No ___
   B. About how many or how often? ______
   C. Length of time spent on values ______

7. Did you do any type of classroom analysis of teaching?
   A. Yes ___ No ___
   B. Name of analysis used ________________
   C. Your reaction:
8. Did you plan different activities for students in your classes who had special needs?
   A. Yes ____ No ____
   B. Examples of special needs: Examples of activities to meet need:

9. Did you write behavioral objectives for your students?
   A. Yes ____ No ____
   B. Did you give the objectives to the students? Yes ____ No ____
   C. How do you feel about behavioral objectives?

10. Did you use individualized instruction last year?
    A. Yes ____ No ____
    B. Examples of individualized instruction used:

11. Did you use learning packages last year?
    A. Yes ____ No ____
    B. Did you use commercially prepared packages? Yes ____ No ____
    C. Did you develop your own packages? Yes ____ No ____
    D. Titles of packages used: Star (*) those you developed:

12. Did you have an advisory committee last year?
    A. Yes ____ No ____
    B. Your reaction to having an advisory committee:

13. List the types of student evaluation you used last year:

14. Did you use any type of self evaluation?
    A. For you as a teacher? Yes ____ No ____
    B. With your students? Yes ____ No ____

15. How much time did you devote to students self-concept development last year? ________ days

16. How much time did you devote to human resource management? ________ days
17. How much time did you devote to life styles and cycles?
   ______ days

18. How much time was spent dealing with interpersonal relations?
   ______ days

19. In terms of your total curriculum for last year, rank (1, 2, 3, etc.) in order of total time spent on each area. Leave blank those areas you did not teach. Star (*) those you feel you emphasized.
   Star (*) those you feel you emphasized.
   __________ Child Development __________ Meal Management
   __________ Food Preparation __________ Ecology
   __________ Nutrition __________ Coping Behavior
   __________ Housing __________ Decision Making
   __________ Home Management __________ Human Sexuality
   __________ Consumer Education __________ Aging
   __________ Career Education __________ Drugs
   __________ Clothing Construction __________ Self Actualization
   __________ Home Furnishings __________ Health & Home Nursing
   __________ Crafts and Art __________ Job Readiness
   __________ Self-Development __________ Others - Please list
   __________ Masculine/Feminine Roles
   __________ Interpersonal Relations

20. In terms of last year rank (1, 2, 3, etc.) the media, methods and techniques used most frequently in your classes. Leave blank those items you did not use.
   __________ Lectures __________ TV
   __________ Demonstrations __________ Case Studies
   __________ Student Observation __________ Buzz Groups
   __________ Laboratory Work __________ Committees
   __________ Exhibits and Show Cases __________ Interviews
   __________ Role Play and Skits __________ Overhead Projector
   __________ Field Trips __________ Opaque Projector
   __________ Games __________ Chalkboard
   __________ Films __________ Flannel Board
   __________ Film Strips __________ Slides
   __________ Records __________ Posters and Charts
   __________ Audio Tapes __________ Learning Packages
   __________ Video Tapes __________ Others - Please list
   __________ Panels
   __________ Resource Speakers
   __________ Bulletin Boards

21. On the following scale of 1-10 rate yourself for last year's teaching performance.

   1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10
   Terrible __________ Terrific
   Teacher

   __________
22. Will you be teaching consumer education next year?
   Yes ___ No ___
   Semester Course ___
   Year Course ___
   Unit ___
   Integrated ___

THANK YOU!
TEACHER INFORMATION INVENTORY FOR 1973-74

Social Security Number ___________________
Latest Degree _______________ Years Teaching Experience _____________
Position or Title ________________________________

1. Did you teach consumer education this year? Yes ___ No ___

2. Did you teach consumer education as:
   A. A semester course ___ Grade level ____________
   B. A year course ___ Grade level ____________
   C. A unit ___
   D. Integrated in another area ___ List area__________

3. Estimate the total number of weeks you taught consumer education
during this school year _______

4. Estimate the total number of students in your consumer education
classes.
   ______ total   ______ boys   ______ girls

5. How did you feel about teaching consumer education this year?

6. How did your students react to studying consumer education this
   year?

7. What was your main consumer education content emphasis?

8. Did you use any values clarification activities this year?
   A. Yes ___ No ___
   B. About how many times ___
   C. Length of time spent on values ___________________

9. Did you plan different activities for students in your classes who
   had special needs?
   A. Yes ___ No ___
   B. Example of activities and special needs:
10. Did you write behavioral objectives for your students?
   A. Yes ___ No ___
   B. Did you give the objectives to students? Yes ___ No ___
   C. Did you base evaluation on objectives? Yes ___ No ___

11. Did you use individualized instruction this year?
   A. Yes ___ No ___
   B. Examples of individualized instruction:

12. Did you have learning packages or modules this year?
   A. Yes ___ No ___
   B. Did you use prepared materials? Yes ___ No ___
   C. Did you develop your own packages or modules? Yes ___ No ___

13. Did you have an advisory committee this year? Yes ___ No ___

14. List the types of student evaluation used this year?
   1.
   2.
   3.
   4.
   5.

15. Did you use any type of self evaluation this year?
   A. For you as a teacher? Yes ___ No ___
   B. With your students? Yes ___ No ___

16. In terms of your total curriculum for this year, rank (1, 2, 3, etc.) in order of total time spent on each area. Leave blank those areas you did not teach. Star (*) those you feel you emphasized.
   ____ Child Development   ____ Meal Management
   ____ Food Preparation    ____ Ecology
   ____ Nutrition           ____ Coping Behavior
   ____ Housing            ____ Decision Making
   ____ Home Management    ____ Human Sexuality
   ____ Consumer Education ____ Aging
   ____ Career Education    ____ Drugs
   ____ Clothing Construction ____ Self Actualization
   ____ Home Furnishings    ____ Health & Home Nursing
   ____ Crafts and Art      ____ Job Readiness
   ____ Self-Development    ____ Interpersonal relationships
   ____ Masculine/Feminine Roles  ____ Others - Please list
   ____ Interpersonal relations  ____
17. In terms of this year rank (1, 2, 3, etc.) the media, methods and techniques used most frequently in your classes. Leave blank those items you did not use.

- Lectures
- Demonstrations
- Student Observation
- Laboratory Work
- Exhibits and Show Cases
- Role Play and Skits
- Field Trips
- Games
- Films
- Film Strips
- Records
- Audio Tapes
- Video Tapes
- Panels
- Resource Speakers
- Bulletin Boards
- TV
- Case Studies
- Buzz Groups
- Committees
- Interviews
- Overhead Projector
- Opaque Projector
- Chalkboard
- Flannel Board
- Slides
- Posters and Charts
- Learning Packages
- Value Clarifications
- Non Verbal and Listening
- Activities
- Modules
- Others - Please list

18. On the following scale of 1-10 rate yourself for this year's teaching performance.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

Terrible Teacher

Terrific Teacher

19. Comments:
EVALUATION OF TEACHER INSTITUTE

Consumer Education for the Disadvantaged Student

July 23 - August 3

Draw in your face to show how you feel about the institute. How was your education excursion?

1. What was the best thing for you in the institute?

2. What did you like least in the institute?

3. How would you rate the overall institute?
   ____ Outstanding ____ Very Good ____ Good ____ Fair ____ Poor
   ____ Very Poor

4. Would you be interested in another similar institute?
   ____ Yes ____ No ____ Maybe

5. What topics or areas would you be interested in exploring in another workshop or institute setting?
   1.
   2.
   3.

6. What topics do you want to explore in the follow-up days?
   1.
   2.
   3.
7. Please give the speakers each a grade such as A, B, or C and add any comments.
   ___ Pat Snipes -
   ___ Monroe Johnson -
   ___ Kay Atkins -
   ___ Sandra Coffindaffer -
   ___ Judy Matthews -
   ___ June Varner -
   ___ Palmer Dyer -
   ___ Mary Ann Lewis -
   ___ Bobby Van Stavern -
   ___ Robert Monaghan -
   ___ Eleanor Fugate -

8. Please rank the activities in the order in which you found them effective (1, 2, 3, etc.). You can have more than one of the numbers, such as two 1's, etc.
   ___ Individual work
   ___ Task groups
   ___ Speakers
   ___ Work sessions
   ___ Hand outs
   ___ Viewing materials and books
   ___ Values clarification activities
   ___ Learning package (behavioral objectives)
   ___ Trip to media center
   ___ Panel on advisory committee
   ___ Textile session
   ___ Evaluation of learning aids
   ___ Individual sharing of own materials
   ___ Use of films, slides and other A-V materials

9. Did you get any new ideas?
   ___ Yes  ___ No
   Such as:

10. Did you have any ideas reinforced?
    ___ Yes  ___ No
    Such as:
11. Do you plan to try anything from the institute in your classroom? 
   ___ Yes ___ No 
   Such as:

12. What was your major objective in attending the institute?

13. Did you accomplish your objective?

14. Now - how about the mechanics and managerial aspects?
   a. Time schedule and hours were
   b. The facilities were
   c. Meals were
   d. The location was
   e. The pace was
   f. The assignments were
   g. Organization was
   h. Materials were
   Suggestions:

15. How do you feel about the institute now that it is over?
   a. I enjoyed
   b. I would have liked
   c. I disliked
   d. I hope
   e. I want
   f. I didn't
   g. I met
   h. People were
i. It was fun to
j. I couldn't
k. I will

16. Add any comments:

Thanks for being with us!
SELF ASSESSMENT

Did you accomplish your objectives for the institute? What were your objectives and how did you meet these? What evidence are you submitting for evaluation? In what ways did you benefit from the institute?
FINIAL EVALUATION OF IN-SERVICE PROGRAM

Please react to the following:

1. Rank (1, 2, 3, 4 and 5) five comments which indicate how you feel now about the summer institute and follow-up days.
   - worthwhile
   - outstanding
   - well organized
   - new ideas
   - too much activity
   - motivated me
   - shared ideas with others in home school
   - average
   - too much material
   - flexible
   - unorganized
   - nothing new

   ______ worthwhile
   ______ outstanding
   ______ well organized
   ______ new ideas
   ______ too much activity
   ______ motivated me
   ______ shared ideas with others in home school
   ______ average
   ______ too much material
   ______ flexible
   ______ unorganized
   ______ nothing new

   ______ strengthened consumer education
   ______ stimulating
   ______ helpful
   ______ boring
   ______ too much sitting
   ______ valuable materials
   ______ improved teaching
   ______ fun
   ______ other

2. Two strengths of the in-service program:
   1.
   2.

3. Two points which could have been improved:
   1.
   2.

4. Overall rating of program

5. How did the in-service specifically help you this year?
   1.
   2.
   3.
   4.
   5.
6. How did your students benefit from your participation in the program?
   1.
   2.
   3.

7. What specific ideas or materials from the institute did you use during this school year?
   1.
   2.
   3.
   4.
   5.

8. How did you feel about using these ideas and/or materials?
APPENDIX C

Summary Data
### TABLE 13
TREATMENT GROUP: KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Knowledge Test Scores</th>
<th>Attitude Test Scores</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pre</td>
<td>Post</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## TABLE 14

TREATMENT GROUP; WEEKS CONSUMER EDUCATION TAUGHT, TIMES METHODS USED AND STUDENT SCORES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Weeks Consumer Taught</th>
<th>Times Method Used</th>
<th>Consumer Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>05</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>08</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Knowledge Delayed</td>
<td>Attitude Delayed</td>
<td>Weeks Consumer Taught 1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>308</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 16
TREATMENT GROUP; BACKGROUND INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Years Teaching Experience 1973-74</th>
<th>Highest Degree 1973-74</th>
<th>Grade Level Consumer Taught 1972</th>
<th>Grade Level Taught 1973</th>
<th>Coed Classes 1972</th>
<th>Coed Classes 1973</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>8-9</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>04</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Med</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>7-8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = Yes

- = No
## TABLE 17

**NO TREATMENT GROUP; BACKGROUND INFORMATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Years Teaching Experience 1973-74</th>
<th>Highest Degree 1973-74</th>
<th>Grade Level Consumer Taught 1973-74</th>
<th>Coed Classes 1973-74</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>01</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>09</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>9-12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10-12</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>02</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>06</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>BS</td>
<td>10-11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>9-10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>MEd</td>
<td>11-12</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = Yes

- = No
### TABLE 18

**TREATMENT GROUP; 1972-73 AND 1973-74 VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Use of Learning Packages</th>
<th>Student Self Evaluation Used</th>
<th>Advisory Committee Used</th>
<th>Behavioral Objectives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>. . .</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>. . .</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

- + = Yes
- - = No
TABLE 19
NO TREATMENT GROUP; 1973-74 VARIABLES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = Yes

- = No
TABLE 20

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS ABOUT WHAT WAS LIKED BEST IN THE INSTITUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New and up-to-date information.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing ideas with other teachers.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value clarification activities.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio showing by each teacher.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent speakers and resource persons.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence about teaching consumer education.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas for teaching consumer education.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual aids and learning activities</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere of institute which encouraged learning at own rate.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning how to motivate disadvantaged students.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting to know other teachers.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellowship with people in the field.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All of the many new and exciting ideas and information.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning to understand and evaluate myself.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to express my own ideas.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting ideas from other teachers.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to write meaningful objectives.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning the new vocabulary.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 21

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS ABOUT WHAT WAS LIKED LEAST IN THE INSTITUTE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Long days.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough time to do everything I wanted to do.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long drive to get to institute.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting too long.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pressure to get so much done.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some information and material was repetitious.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluating books and resources.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some of the task team assignments were difficult.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting in a circle to hear speakers.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too much emphasis on techniques.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little emphasis on students.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The testing.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speakers who talked too long.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 22

PARTICIPANT COMMENTS ABOUT THE INSTITUTE EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'll go back to school a more enthusiastic person.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyable and educational experience.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning was fun.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan to go home and share with other teachers in my school.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I realize now how to incorporate methods and materials in consumer education classes.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This has given me much more confidence and motivation to each consumer education.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got a lot of ideas to try out next year.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are many ways to individualize instruction.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see now the importance of consumer education and I know what to teach.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I developed more empathy for my students.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm motivated now and I plan to motivate my students.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never a dull moment.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institute got me in the mood for starting school.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel revived.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hope I can use these ideas without being stifled by the administration.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm in the right profession.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can't believe we were all so creative.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I liked the group work but I also wanted to get to know each person better.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actually doing things and being involved.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working cooperatively with other teachers to produce many ideas.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent materials to use in own schools.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthwhile information.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to new ideas and materials was what I needed.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Felt motivated and interested.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer education content and methods were valuable.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New ideas, methods and materials.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very stimulating program.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people were great.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allowed for experimentation and growth.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic teachers and speakers.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ways to integrate consumer education into any classroom were presented.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instruction individualized.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible and well organized.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative activities.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great format and organization.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 23 - Continued**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to learn.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brought me back into the classroom as a student -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more ideas, more confidence and more material.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days were long.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would have liked more days of follow up.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed more free time to work.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So much was presented that it was hard to digest everything.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideas and content were not new to recent graduates.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued follow up needed after this year.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needed more background on economic system.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little focus on the disadvantaged student.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not enough emphasis on the middle school student.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 25
COMMENTS CONCERNING HOW THE IN-SERVICE PROGRAM SPECIFICALLY HELPED PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Materials which were developed at the institute.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used values clarification activities.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had new ideas for methods.</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed games to use in the classroom.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renewed my enthusiasm.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had materials prepared for class.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used the handout material.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knew about available resources.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed learning packages.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used the concept of economic man.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used new ideas in teaching consumer education.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased awareness of myself as a teacher.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased my basic knowledge concerning consumer education.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged creativity in the classroom.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was able to motivate students.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had a better insight into problems of students.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used more creative techniques in classroom.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Made me more confident.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used a variety of evaluation strategies.</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enjoyed teaching more.</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased my awareness and sensitivity.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened me as a teacher.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developed CBE modules.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthened my consumer education classes.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I changed some teaching habits.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Units were better planned.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It was a vacation for learning.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 26
COMMENTS CONCERNING SPECIFIC BENEFITS
TO STUDENTS OF PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of value clarification.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of learning strategies.</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More teacher enthusiasm.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Got up-to-date material.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More emphasis on values and goals.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More individualized instruction.</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher better prepared.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variety of evaluation devices used.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received behavioral objectives.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraged student self evaluation and self development.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More student creativity.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better student understanding of economics.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students were excited and enthusiastic.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More emphasis on student decision making.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More student involvement.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More resource people brought in the classroom.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More visuals prepared by teacher and students.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students activities were based on need and interest.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students seemed less bored.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students liked pretests and posttests.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer materials from resource center.</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value clarification activities.</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visuals made at institute.</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening tape.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer kits and filmstrips.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penney's Kits and materials.</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life on Paradise Island book and materials.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value continuum.</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posters and easels made at institute.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling ideas.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Textile design materials.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand out materials and resources.</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulletin board ideas.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives given to students.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition and consumer cards.</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic man materials.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Eddie and cardboard figures.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning packages.</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer puzzles.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block letters from erasers.</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 27 - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meat charts and information sheets.</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation materials.</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer concepts hand outs.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flip charts.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pretest and posttest format.</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forum magazines which were given out to each person.</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum guides from resource center.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flannel board materials.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competency based modules.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filmstrips, films and tapes previewed at institute.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metric materials and charts.</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 28
FINAL COMMENTS ABOUT IN-SERVICE PROGRAM
BY PARTICIPANTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel more confident about teaching consumer education - and it shows.</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The students were much more interested in consumer education this year and I felt more secure.</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was very satisfied with the materials and ideas I tried out - all were relatively successful. Many of the other teachers on our faculty are using some of the materials and ideas I got from the institute.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The materials I developed helped to improve my teaching - they were better than commercially made materials for my classes.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really enjoy teaching this year - with all of my new ideas and materials.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching was easier - I was more enthusiastic and students seemed more interested in units.</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would not have used these ideas and materials without some preparation on how to use them.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I shall continue to use the ideas and materials next year. I would never have tried these new methods and materials if I had not taken this institute.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was excited about what I did and learned - and I did learn.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was a bit hesitant to use some of the materials. Other teachers wondered what I was doing, but I was pleased with the comments and the performance of the students in my classes.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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