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The problem of this research study was to identify the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas as perceived by useful homemaking teachers. The study had a twofold purpose. The first was to develop and validate a survey instrument which would address specific concerns related to home visitations and which may be used as a model for future research studies in Vocational Education. The second was to survey a random sample of useful homemaking teachers in Texas to identify the perceived status of home visitations.

Seventeen research questions provided the framework for development of the survey instrument. The first question evaluated variables which might be related to the percentage of students visited during the regular school year. Other research questions were concerned with qualitative aspects of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. A panel of experts including useful homemaking teachers, homemaking supervisors, home economics teacher educators, school administrators, Texas Education
Agency area and state staff members, and representatives of the Advisory Council for Vocational-Technical Education and the Vocational Homemaking Teachers Association of Texas was involved in the development, validation, and pilot testing of the survey instrument.

During February, 1979, a random sample of 400 useful homemaking teachers was mailed questionnaires which addressed specific concerns related to home visitations. Data collection was terminated after four weeks with a return rate of 77.75 per cent. Analysis of the collected data generated frequencies, per cents, and appropriate Chi Square Tests of Independence for selected variables.

Findings indicated that useful homemaking teachers believe home visitations should continue to be a part of homemaking programs, although they are not satisfied with the current status of home visits. The teachers did not perceive home visits as they now exist to be important to the total homemaking program and believed the program would be effective without home visits. Nevertheless, a majority of the homemaking teachers indicated that they would make home visits even if no conference period were provided for the purpose of visits and that they currently make home visits at times other than the designated visitation period. Approximately 40 per cent of the teachers reported they expected to visit only 25 per cent or less of their students by the end of the school year. Scheduling home visits was
identified as the major difficulty by a very high percentage of the homemaking teachers.

Recommendations for improving home visitations and for additional studies related to home visitations are made. Included in the appendices are copies of the survey instrument and the letters of transmittal for the study.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

The problem of this study was to identify the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas as perceived by useful homemaking teachers.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of this study were the following:

1. To develop and validate a survey instrument which would address specific concerns related to home visitations and which may be used as a model for future research studies in Vocational Education.

2. To survey a random sample of useful homemaking teachers in Texas to identify the perceived status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education.

Rationale

School superintendents, principals, vocational directors, homemaking supervisors, useful homemaking teachers, and Texas Education Agency staff members have expressed concerns during the last few years regarding the role of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking programs in Texas. Useful homemaking teachers in grades nine through
twelve have been provided two conference periods each day. This is one more conference period than usually provided classroom teachers.

The purpose of the conference periods as defined in the Vocational Homemaking Education Program Standards is the following:

for the organization and supervision of the required home experiences of students; providing instructional programs for young and adult homemakers; sponsoring the Future Homemakers of America and Young Homemakers of Texas organizations in the school; securing and preparing instructional materials; compiling reports; and performing other duties necessary in the development and operation of the homemaking program (11, p. 8).

Home visitations are identified as an integral part of the Vocational Homemaking Education program as follows:

The high school homemaking teacher has responsibility for class instruction; visiting homes; supervising home experiences; conferring with students and their families; directing Future Homemakers of America activities; working with young and adult homemakers, individually or in organized classes, or with Young Homemakers of Texas; and preparing instructional materials and reports (11, p. 10).

The home is identified as an integral part of the Vocational Homemaking Education program as follows:

The classroom, home, and community shall serve as laboratories in which learning experiences take place. Additional learning experiences are provided through the Future Homemakers of America and Young Homemakers of Texas organizations (11, p. 11).

The home experience is identified as an integral part of the Vocational Homemaking Education program as follows:

Supervision of home experiences is an integral part of homemaking education, and it is the homemaking
teacher's responsibility to provide this guidance and direction. Supervision may be provided through visits in the home, through individual conferences, class progress reports, and class displays of individual work.

Home Experiences—Each student enrolled in homemaking education must conduct an approved supervised home experience program for a minimum of four weeks during each semester under the semester unit plan (80-minute periods) or during each quarter under the quarter unit plan (55-minute periods).

"Home Experience" is a term used to designate extended learning experiences conducted during the student's time away from school. With proper planning they may be carried out in a variety of locations within the community.

The intensity and depth of a home experience determines the time length—the experience should continue for a period that will allow for the development of skills and for growth and maturation. Home experiences should be evaluated according to the achievement of goals and plans established prior to the beginning of the experience, rather than in terms of time spent. Students who do not complete a home experience become ineligible to be counted toward allocation or reallocation of vocational homemaking teacher units. Local schools determine whether students pass or fail when they do not complete a home experience each semester or each quarter (11, p. 11).

Vocational homemaking teachers are reimbursed for vocational travel expenses for these purposes:

To confer with parents of students or prospective students:

(1) To explain objectives of the training program
(2) To determine attitudes of parents toward vocational training
(3) To review the progress of students in light of their vocational objectives
(4) To discuss special problems related to the instructional program

To organize and supervise instruction in approved vocational programs for in-school youth, out-of-school youth, and adults (5, pp. 6-7).
By the above statements, home visitations for the purpose of supervising home experiences are clearly established as an integral part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas.

Vocational Homemaking Education is one of the only program areas in secondary education in Texas which provides school time and reimbursement of travel expenses for teachers to visit students' homes. At this time, when accountability in all areas of education is a major issue, the continuation of providing school time for homemaking teachers to conduct home visitations is being questioned. Home visitations are an expensive part of the Vocational Homemaking program; therefore, the cost effectiveness of home visitations needs to be established to justify continuation of this practice. For this reason, a primary focus of this study was the percentage of students visited by useful homemaking teachers. Research question number one attempted to identify variables which might be related to the percentage of students visited.

Since a study focusing only on the quantitative aspects of home visitations may have limited usefulness, this study also addressed a number of qualitative factors. A review of research studies and projects involving home visitations revealed several common factors which seemed to be related to the success of programs. These factors included identified purposes of home visits, supervision and support for home visitations, pre-service and in-service training for home visitors, and materials and procedures used during the home
visit. Discussions with school superintendents, principals, vocational administrators, homemaking supervisors, useful homemaking teachers, and Texas Education Agency staff members confirmed these factors as concerns regarding home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. Research questions two through seventeen were formulated from the previously mentioned sources.

Research Questions

The following questions were addressed in this study.

1. Do relationships exist between the percentage of students currently being visited by useful homemaking teachers and variables such as
   a. courses taught
   b. teaching assignment
   c. area of state
   d. community size
   e. years of teaching experience
   f. degrees earned
   g. pre-service training
   h. scheduling of conference period
   i. distance traveled to home visit
   j. funds allocated for travel
   k. visits made in summer program?

2. When are most home visits typically scheduled?
3. What is the average amount of time spent on a home visit?

4. Who is typically present when the home is visited?

5. Is the same home visited more than once during the school year?

6. What are the purposes and contributions of home visits as perceived by useful homemaking teachers?

7. How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) are home visits to the total Vocational Homemaking program?

8. How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) do school administrators consider home visits to be to the total Vocational Homemaking program?

9. To what extent do the following individuals encourage useful homemaking teachers to conduct home visitations:
   a. teacher educators
   b. other homemaking teachers
   c. homemaking department chairperson
   d. homemaking city supervisor
   e. vocational administrator/director
   f. area homemaking consultant
   g. school principal
   h. superintendent/assistant superintendent?

10. What difficulties do useful homemaking teachers encounter in making home visitations?
11. To what extent do useful homemaking teachers use the information gained in the home visit?

12. What alternative methods of contacting the home are being used by useful homemaking teachers?

13. How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) are home experiences/extended learning experiences to the total Vocational Homemaking program?

14. Are additional resource materials and methods needed to assist useful homemaking teachers in making home visits?

15. Are useful homemaking teachers satisfied with the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education?

16. What are recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home visitations?

17. What are recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home experiences/extended learning experiences?

Background and Significance of the Study

Research studies and projects involving home visitations have been numerous and varied. However, the general objectives of most of the projects which included home visits were similar. In 1975, Lamont and Rice (7) reported these objectives for a Guidance Awareness Project involving home visitations in a large city school:
To try and narrow the gap between the home and the school preparing both students and parents for a productive high school experience, and to help the students gain decision making skills which will help them develop plans for the future.

To give parents input into school goals and objectives.

To identify handicapping features which might affect the student.

To cause students to feel more at ease in the new high school environment (7, p. 4).

In another project conducted by Weeks (12) in 1972 to attack education problems in rural areas of Pinal County, Arizona, the home visitor's role was defined in terms of these objectives of the project:

To interpret the teachers' problems to the parents.

To listen to the parents' side of the story.

To pull together sources of help to alleviate home troubles that might be adversely affecting a child's school work (12, p. 4).

Weeks concluded that the home visitor was "a vital link between home and school" (12, p. 5).

The National Home Start project (2), designed to serve low income families with young children, had as its objective to enhance the mother's ability to deal effectively with her children and to provide comprehensive social-emotional, health, and nutrition services. This program helped strengthen the parents' capacity for facilitating the general development of their children and involved parents directly in the educational development of their children.

The above cited studies seemed to indicate that through home
visitation and parent intervention, a variety of general objectives can be accomplished related to the educational process.

In many of the projects including home visitations, several school and project personnel were also involved in the total visitation process. Lamont and Rice (7) reported that twenty-four teachers, administrators, and counselors were involved in the total visitation process for the Guidance Awareness Project. They stated, "Our initial focus in promoting the GAP program was to stimulate voluntary enlistment of staff members as guidance advisors. An attempt was made to gain support from non-participating staff members as well as participating staff members" (7, p. 6). Another School-Home Contact Program (3) involved family assistants, acting with deans and guidance personnel, principals and assistant principals, and teachers who worked with pupils who were not achieving their potential.

Deloria (2) also related that in the National Home Start project, the home visitors were provided special preparatory assistance prior to the visit by the directors or specialists who also often accompanied them on the home visit. In this study, the degree of home visitor supervision depended largely on the presence of a staff member whose primary responsibility was to provide supervision. Deloria found that both the amount of time spent on and the frequency of home visitor supervision were highly correlated with the presence
of a staff member who was primarily responsible for the field supervision of home visitors.

Love (8), in evaluating the National Home Start project in 1976, reported that supervision provided to home visitors was inadequate. More in-home supervision was suggested rather than supervision related to reporting and record keeping.

In A Guide for Planning and Operating Home-Based Child Development Programs (10), the following statement was made regarding administrative planning and the need for effective supervision of home visitations:

Perhaps the single most important role in the development of a home based program is the role of supervision. No other factor is as critical, particularly at the beginning stages of operation, as the availability and quality of supervision for home visitors and staff (10, p. 27).

Another component of home visitation projects was materials and procedures used during the visit. As an example, the Home-Oriented Preschool Education program (6), developed specific materials for the visitor to take into the home to read and discuss with the parents. In addition to the home activity materials, the home visitor was responsible for planning and preparing many additional materials and home activities which involved children and parents during the home visit. The Guidance Awareness Program (7) also included a packet of orientation materials which were given to and discussed with students and their parents.
Deloria (2) reported that home visitors should be encouraged to follow a curriculum or format for each visit to insure that all major objectives were accomplished during the visit. However, no two visits were meant to be the same; they were specifically geared to the needs of the individuals being visited. A recommendation was made that less home visit time should be spent on general information and more time should be devoted to specific topics. The *Home-Oriented Preschool Education: Home Visitor's Handbook* (6) suggested the home visitor try to anticipate and prepare for questions which parents might ask and be alert to serious problems which could arise.

In addition to materials and procedures to use in conducting home visitations, some projects included staff development and in-service sessions to train the home visitor in the competencies necessary for effective visiting. In the final report of the School-Home Contact Program, Erickson (3) recommended additional in-service for home assistants for those projects which had limited or no in-service for the personnel visiting homes.

Deloria (1), in evaluating training received by home visitors, found that training concentrated on materials used during the visit, other preparations for the visit, and analysis of levels of interaction during the visit. Many of the projects had on-going in-service training for home visitors. As an example, an integral part of the preparation
of visitors for the Home-Oriented Preschool Education Project (6) included time for home visitors to meet together to share experiences and success stories.

Some other common aspects of projects involving home visitations included evaluation, publicity and public relations, follow-up activities, report forms, cost effectiveness, and personal qualities of visitors. The projects and studies reported in the literature seemed to support the proposition that programs were perceived as successful, and students and parents benefited when the home environment was involved in the change process.

This study to identify the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas has dual significance. First, the value of the home and community as laboratories in which learning experiences take place will be established. Second, the findings of the study will be useful to school administrators and Texas Education Agency staff members in making decisions related to home visitations and will identify means of improving home visits in homemaking education in Texas.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, the following definitions were used.

Combination. An organization of instruction which combines two vocational instructional techniques (i.e., useful
homemaking education and home economics cooperative education, useful homemaking education and home economics pre-employment laboratory education) (4).

Homemaking Education (Useful) Program. Courses of study in Texas public schools which provide instruction in the home economics subjects of child development, clothing and textiles, consumer education, family living, food and nutrition, home management, and housing for high school students preparing for the occupation of homemaking and for adults wanting to improve knowledge and skills in the homemaking areas. Instruction assists youth and adults in solving immediate home and family living problems as well as problems related to establishing and maintaining homes (11).

Home Experience/Extended Learning Experience. A learning experience which is conducted during the student's time away from school (11).

Home Visit/Visitation. A visit with parents, guardians, and/or students which is conducted in the student's home.

Vocational Administrator/Director. One whose responsibilities extend to all facets of a district's vocational program under the jurisdiction of the district superintendent. These responsibilities include school and community relations, liaison between the district and the Texas Education Agency, recruitment and training of staff, planning and evaluation activities, curriculum design, and such other
duties as the district superintendent may assign for the conduct of vocational education (4).

Vocational (Homemaking) Supervisor. One who works under the direction of the vocational administrator and functions in a leadership capacity within a prescribed area of responsibility. Typically, a supervisor's leadership function is focused on a specific element of a school district's total vocational effort (4).
CHAPTER BIBLIOGRAPHY


CHAPTER II
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Kinds of Projects Including Home Visitations

Studies and projects involving home visitations have been more numerous and varied than might be expected. In a search of the recent literature, 119 reports and studies identified home visitations as a major component of the program. The majority of these were reports of funded projects and model programs. In many cases, evaluations were made in terms of participants' perceptions rather than in objective measures of change. A lack of experimental research data related to the subject of home visitations seemed to exist. The majority of the reported studies were found to be descriptive rather than experimental in nature.

Of the cited reports, the largest number was in the area of early childhood education and most of these were designed for groups with special needs, such as low income and educationally disadvantaged populations (5, 9, 10, 18, 19, 28, 33, 39, 46, 55, 56, 63, 64), mentally retarded or handicapped children (9, 47, 49), and bilingual or bicultural populations (51, 59).

Beebe (4) described a program conducted in 1966 in which parents and teachers worked as partners in the education of
preschool children, both in a home and school environment. The aims of this program were to develop teaching skills in the parents and provide insights for the teacher into the child's needs. As a result of the cooperative efforts of teachers and parents, the child was provided with a wider range of learning opportunities. Similarly, Graves (21) described a six-week in-service training program for family day care mothers consisting of three components: (1) weekly small group meetings of the mothers to share ideas about child care and to learn about child development and various home activities for children, (2) home visitations--informal discussions between the mother and a program team member who demonstrated home activities, and (3) a classroom child care program provided for the family day care children while the mothers were in weekly meetings.

Another parent participation program described by Sayler (52) in 1971 in the pamphlet "Parents: Active Partners in Education" reflected the belief that parent-teacher cooperation is essential for the best education for children. Specific steps that teachers can take to involve parents in the classroom, as well as some of the fears and attitudes that may influence the behavior and effectiveness of parents, were presented. Suggestions were given to help teachers plan activities which were appropriate for parental help in class.

Financial limitations, staff availability, and poor parental attitudes were overcome in a program conducted by
Ade and Hoot (2) in 1976. As a result of this parent involvement program and home visitations, it was perceived that mutual respect between the home and school was developed and parents seemed encouraged to maintain an influence in their children's lives. A parent home curriculum, which could be implemented in day care and early childhood education programs, was a major by-product of this program.

The Richmond, Virginia Follow Through program (19), which was funded primarily by Educational Opportunity Act Title II funds, served a student population of whom the majority were black and from low income families. The program sought to improve the learning ability of the child as well as educate and involve the parent through a continuous program in which both home and school were integral parts of a single unit. The program provided educational, social and cultural experiences for the child and his family so that the child's entire environment might become more conducive to learning. This was accomplished through several methods: the institution of a new kind of paraprofessional—the parent educator—into the classroom; weekly home visits in which the parent educator collaborated with the parent on an educational talk program for the child; field trips for parents and children; and the fostering and encouragement of an active Parent Advisory Committee.

A similar home-based early childhood program conducted in the Memphis city school system in 1976 presented a rationale
for early education and for parental involvement (9). The program involved educationally deprived three and four year olds in eight preschool centers located in Title I schools. A parent or significant caretaker of each child enrolled in the program visited the center with the child at least twice a month and also conducted learning activities brought to the home by a home visitor. The needs of each child were determined through administration of a locally developed diagnostic instrument, with activities designed to fit these needs. Program results were measured by the use of three tests: the Cooperative Preschool Inventory was given to a sample of three and four year olds, the TOBF General Concepts Test was administered to four year olds, and the Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test was administered to all three and four year olds. The finding that the three year old children had more than an eleven month difference between chronological age and mental age and the four year olds an eighteen month gap justified the need for an early childhood program. Conley planned to use comprehensive data on parent involvement and participation to attempt to distinguish significant variables in the success of children in the program. A longitudinal study of these children was an ultimate goal. In conclusion she stated regarding the program, "Parents as well as children are the beneficiaries. Results will be long lasting because parents as well as teachers are vital to successful education of children" (9, p. 6).
Another innovative approach, introduced by Berlin and Berlin (5), increased parental involvement through learning games. Economically disadvantaged parents were taught to use games with their second grade children to increase their children's reading achievement. The results of this experiment were that the children in the experimental group, whose mothers helped to play educational games with them, learned more concepts, as measured by the Boehm Test of Basic Concepts, than the children in the control group whose parents were not involved with them. Findings also indicated that interaction between parent and child increased, encouragement and approval from the parent was greater, and parental interest in the child's abilities and progress increased. On the basis of these statistically significant findings, a model elementary school program was proposed in which an intermediary teacher teaches parents methods of helping children learn to read. These methods seemed to be a way of reversing the trend toward nonlearning and early failure among young disadvantaged children.

A study conducted in 1972 by Shelton (55, 56) was undertaken to determine if economically deprived students' behavior, attendance, and achievement would improve as a result of teacher-parent dialogue and contact. This study was based on the assumption that low-income parents could be trained to train middle-class teachers to communicate effectively with parents and children living in low-income neighborhoods.
The result of this investigation indicated that children's average daily attendance and achievement, as measured by grade point averages, could be significantly increased by Family Involvement-Communication System (FICS) training.

An experimental nursery school program in the Philadelphia School District (46) in 1965 helped disadvantaged children overcome some of the handicaps which hindered their educational, social, and emotional development. Featured in this instructional program were learning experiences to develop the child's language facility, to improve visual and auditory discrimination, and to increase attentiveness. Other educational experiences were designed to enhance the child's self-image and to increase his basic knowledge of science, mathematics, social studies, and health. Additional research was recommended to determine the impact of the program on pupils' social and intellectual functioning and on their attitudes toward learning and testing.

These reports document the contribution of parental involvement toward overcoming the limitations of a deprived environment. Innovative approaches have facilitated open lines of communication between school and home. Some apparently have enhanced the educational growth of disadvantaged youngsters.

Just as teachers of disadvantaged children found the home to be a vital link in the education process, teachers of physically handicapped and mentally retarded children have
reported similar findings. In an attempt to improve procedures for reporting the progress of mentally handicapped children in special classes, the Iowa State Department of Public Instruction (49) developed guidelines to explain the intent and design of report cards. In addition to report cards, parent-teacher conferences and home visitations were utilized to communicate academic progress, personal and social progress, and subjective information. In 1965, Charney and LaCrosse (8) devoted an entire chapter to the topic of home visitations in their handbook of basic information for prospective teachers of mentally retarded children. Case studies describing a teacher's visits to the homes of some of her students and the parental reactions to her visits were presented. From these reports it seems that parental involvement, and particularly home visitations, are an important part of educational programs for handicapped children. Rafael (47) stated that a home visit is an essential preadmission procedure in teaching exceptional children.

In addition to early childhood education programs, a variety of other projects was identified which included home visitations as a part of the program delivery system. A number of guidance and counseling programs at the junior high and high school levels reported the use of home visitations to disseminate information (1, 13, 14, 15, 35, 42, 48). A summer visitation program designed to facilitate orientation of sixth graders about to enter junior high
school was described by Rash (48). In this program the counselor visited each new seventh grader at his home, met with him and his parents and discussed realistic goals for the student based on his records and on the parents' aspirations. Another guidance program reported by Lamont (35) in 1975 was designed to prepare both students and parents for a productive high school experience. The overall goals of the Guidance Awareness Program were increasing decision-making ability and goal formulation at the sophomore level, expanding the guidance program to include the parent and home situation, increasing community support for school programs, and providing a model career guidance program. A visit was made during the summer to the home of each incoming sophomore student.

Peterson (42) outlined a similar career guidance program conducted in 1974 for grade ten students. As a result of this project, a recommendation was made to employ guidance tutors (graduate students from the university) for home visits.

The Home-School Contact Program (13, 14), which also included home visitations, provided a link between home and school for senior high school students who show serious problems in school attendance, adjustment and/or achievement. Home visitations were made to teach the parents what to expect from the school, and how to help their children achieve in school.
It is evident that a variety of educational programs at all levels, preschool through high school, provides services to parents and students through home visitations. A large number of projects which included home visitations were designed as public relations programs (6, 16, 24, 25, 27, 54, 58, 60, 66, 67). Brooks (6) reported in 1975 an open home night program which was implemented to increase the contact between parents and staff. This program which devised a series of meetings in the homes of parents replaced the Back-to-School Night program. Another program which significantly improved community-school relations employed paraprofessionals as community public relations agents (16). These persons assisted in attendance records, made frequent home visits, and acted as hostesses for parents visiting the school.

Other examples of the use of home visitations to improve relationships between parents and the school contributed to major changes in the school program such as integration and implementation of multi-age grouping. An evaluation of the outcomes of a year of desegregated education in the Redlands Unified School District, California (54) in 1970, indicated that home-school cooperation did exist. This report was a description of how bused parents, bused children, and teachers and principals in the receiving schools felt after the 1969-1970 school year. Though 66 per cent of the parents felt that they had been contacted by school personnel more
this year, 71 per cent desired more school-home contacts. Twenty-six per cent of the bused parents had become involved in school activities (PTA, Carnival, Room Mothers) this year. Since 24 per cent of the parents reported that their son or daughter's teacher had made a home visit, it was recommended that other teachers be encouraged to make such visits. As with the parents, teachers (69 per cent) desired more home-school contact. Of the teachers who visited in the homes, a high percentage felt that they were welcome in the homes and that the visit improved teacher understanding of each child's background. Home visitations were identified as a factor which improved the quality of education during the continued period of transition.

In 1973, when the Hackensack Public Schools in New Jersey (27) implemented a new program for multi-age groupings in open-spaced schools, a multi-faceted informational approach was developed. The school staff believed that good public relations called for parents to participate in helping to develop the program and the climate for improved learning. Home visitations, as well as a citizen advisory council, mini-teas, parent workshops, individual parent-teacher conferences, and open houses, were conducted as a part of this open-door policy.

The National Education Association has published Working With Parents, A Guide for Classroom Teachers and Other Educators (67) based on the concept that education is a
responsibility shared among school, teachers, and parents. Suggestions are made for teacher facilitation of good student-parent-school relations. Home visits are presented as one of the ways that parents can be encouraged to appreciate, respect, and care for the school program and to offer support and assistance to their children in that program.

Programs involving home visitations also serve adult populations. One of these projects, (POR FIN) (44), was undertaken in San Antonio, Texas in 1971, to develop a recruitment approach which would be more effective than the traditional mass media approach in recruiting hard-core undereducated individuals into adult education classes. A face-to-face interview technique and support materials were utilized during home visitations. The face-to-face recruitment technique was found to increase significantly the number of individuals enrolled into class, as opposed to nonpersonal methods of recruitment.

The variety of programs and projects which contact the home through a home visitation is extensive. Programs for the prevention of child abuse, for the home bound elderly, rehabilitation programs for troubled youth, programs providing nutrition and health services, infant development programs, library awareness programs, and nursing programs are examples of the wide range of populations served by home visitation programs.
In the area of vocational education, agricultural education programs at the secondary school level include a home visit or farm visit as part of that program. In 1976, Van Berkum (61) described seven kinds of student visitations: scheduled visits; requested visits; unannounced visits; a learning experience for the instructor visits; public relations visits; booster visits; and the welcome or hardship visit. In another 1976 article entitled "Home Visitation--A Chance for Counseling," Crosen (11) presented ideas for improving the effectiveness of home visitation of students by vocational agriculture instructors. The suggestions for improvement focus on planning for the visit, getting to know the student, assessing the home situation for influencing factors, using home responsibilities for plant and animal care as learning experiences, and considering life goals.

Five home economics programs including home visitations were identified (3, 15, 43, 45, 50), four of which were conducted by a paraprofessional rather than a home economist. In Alabama, nonprofessional program assistants were chosen to conduct educational programs for low income homemakers (45). An educational specialist and the county home economist assumed administrative and supervisory responsibilities for the program. Instruction was provided through a working visit, a one-to-one teaching method in the homemakers' home,
taught by telling, showing, and repeating a skill. Each visit was designed to meet the specific interests and needs of the homemaker at her economic, educational, and skill level. Daily logs were kept by program assistants on each homemaker in the program. What was taught and changes that families made were recorded. Program assistants recorded changes in 368 homes in which they had worked individually with young mothers. It was found that personalized informal learning experiences helped deprived young homemakers raise their level of living, encouraged mothers and families to grow out of the relief cycle, and raised self-esteem, hopes, and aspirations. Improvement in homemaker skills resulted in cleaner homes, improved eating habits, and better family relationships.

Another similar training model is available through the Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service (43, 50). These materials are designed to present ideas for training nonprofessional workers to help low income families improve homemaking skills. Guidelines are furnished for program planning and implementation.

Home economics agents in Oklahoma were involved in a federally funded program to train older women as visiting homemakers (3). Upon completion of the training course, these women were hired by families, by nursing homes, as home repairers, and as contact persons in Operation Medicare Alert. As a result of this program, the concept of job
qualifications in relation to age was abolished by the State Employment Service of California and new fields of employment and vocational training for older workers were created.

Only two reports were identified which related to home visitations as a part of homemaking education at the secondary level. Patterson (41) reported a student teaching program in home economics at Cornell University designed to produce homemaking teachers who could quickly become acquainted with a community, adapt teaching to it, and locate and use local resources. The unique feature of this program was that emphasis on learning to know a local community and to use this knowledge in teaching was incorporated in the total student teaching program. The graduates interviewed on the job during the pilot study of the program reported that home visits contributed to their "feeling at home in the community." They also reported that their experiences in visiting homes during student teaching had helped to make it easy for them to visit families when they went to their first teaching job. A follow-up of former students who had graduated between 1948 and 1960 revealed that a majority judged the student teaching program to be effective in preparing them to teach units in relation to community conditions and student background. The most valuable ratings of community experiences by the total sample of 206 graduates were to home visits, and living in the community.
Since homemaking students are encouraged to make practical applications at home of principles learned in class, extended learning experiences are an integral part of many homemaking education programs. A guide to help the homemaking teacher plan for learning experiences which extend beyond the classroom was developed by the Home and Family Life Division, Washington State Board for Vocational Education (23). Suggestions, illustrations, charts, and forms are provided for introducing, interpreting, setting standards, planning, supervising, and evaluating all phases of the program. These beliefs were stated regarding extended learnings:

1. Visiting homes is essential for guidance of extended learnings. Teachers should take time in class, as well as out of class, to help students plan for the extended learning.

2. The teacher needs to know the people who will be assisting the student with out-of-class learnings.

3. The teacher needs to know about the extended learning as it progresses.

4. Teaching is effective when students use principles at home which have been taught at school.

5. Extended learnings seem to result in experiences at home suited to individuals and families (23, p. 5).

The lack of identified studies related specifically to home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education is an indication of the need for and significance of this present study.
Paraprofessionals as Home Visitors

In the identified studies which included home visitations as a major component, a variety of personnel assumed the role of home visitor. Vacanti (60) reported in 1977 a training model which used parent educators who served as home visitors on a volunteer basis. The model could be used by teachers, paraprofessionals, or other adults who wanted to develop home learning activities that meet the individual needs of children. In 1974, Thomas (59) also recommended the use of parents as paraprofessionals to establish home/school continuity (the degree of similarity between the child's experiences at home and at school). The Richmond, Virginia Follow Through program (19) instituted a new kind of paraprofessional, the parent educator, into the classroom. Similarly, Graves (21) described a program which trained mothers to provide day care services for their own children. These programs were exemplary in nature and served as models for establishment of additional programs using parents as educators.

Many of the identified programs employed paraprofessionals or nonprofessionals to conduct home visitations (3, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, 25, 26, 28, 29, 43, 45, 50). In A Creative Approach to Special Staffing Problems: Staffing for Better Schools Under Title I (10), the focus was on staff quality and utilization. Ideas were presented for recruiting, training, and utilizing teaching aides—either paid or
volunteer—to extend the aims of the professional teaching staff and to develop new methods of productive ties with the community.

Two similar early childhood education programs (9, 29) used paraprofessionals under the supervision of a head teacher. Once a week the home visitor visited parents of the children they were responsible for in the preschool center. The head teacher was responsible for center administration, supervision of home visitors, and conducting the center's classroom activities.

At the secondary level, the School-Home Contact Program (13) used 100 family assistants to contact the homes of senior high school students who exhibited serious problems. The family assistants who were recruited from the target neighborhoods worked five hours a day, and when home visits were not possible in the daytime, evening or weekend visits were arranged and made.

Another secondary program reported by Hicks (25) trained indigenous nonprofessional aides to perform auxiliary non-instructional services and to act as liaison personnel between the school and community in disadvantaged East Saint Louis, Illinois. These aides made home visits, conducted surveys, and provided the parents with information about school programs and personnel, and services available from social agencies. An evaluation of this project showed that the aides established good rapport with teachers and the
community but were not successful in changing the negative parental attitudes about student-teacher relations and the educational quality of the schools.

Another program also using unemployed or underemployed women as visiting homemakers in disadvantaged homes (15) reported positive results. On the basis of the number of recorded calls for service, it was determined that an interest in visiting homemakers had been created. Although findings showed that the more disadvantaged women worked better as visiting homemakers, it was felt that with sound training, good supervision, and careful placement, other homemakers could also contribute to the rehabilitation of many families. It was found that the more disadvantaged homemakers had a greater understanding of some of the cases on which they were asked to work. A recommendation was made that an additional two weeks of classroom study in home economics, social work, and psychology be added to the visiting homemakers' pre-service training program. On-the-job training was also recommended to better acquaint visiting homemakers with the number of different cases and functions they might perform.

Materials and Training for Home Visitors

Although there was evidence that paraprofessionals could be effectively utilized as home visitors, supervision and training of home visitors seemed to be key factors whether the visitor was a professional or nonprofessional.
A large number of the identified programs utilized professional personnel (teachers, counselors, social workers, administrators) as home visitors (1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 17, 18, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 51, 52, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67). Of these programs, approximately one-half provided specific training for professional personnel related to conducting home visitations (7, 8, 22, 24, 25, 33, 35, 37, 38, 39, 41, 42, 44, 46, 49, 52, 54, 55, 56, 62, 63, 64, 65).

A number of the training programs were designed as part of the pre-service education of prospective teachers. In the In-Home Early Childhood Project (7), students in an early-childhood teacher training program were assigned to a family with one or more children of preprimary age. The student was asked to assess the family's behavior and needs and to devise techniques and materials to meet the needs. A trial kit of learning materials was prepared after the first two visits to the home, followed by a second permanent kit for circulation during the rest of the project. Students also planned a group session which brought together several children and parents. This four month teacher training program was in lieu of the regular kindergarten lab.

The Home-Oriented Preschool Education (HOPE) program (39) used television, a mobile classroom, and parental instruction to educate three, four, and five year olds. A ten
day pretraining period for the program members was conducted utilizing the Personnel Training Guide. A team instruction approach was followed to accomplish the goals of the in-service training.

In Preparing Teachers to Involve Parents in Children's Learning, Jones (33) documented and evaluated the process of staff-teacher and teacher-parent interaction in terms of the kinds of resources, supervision, and support which may be needed by teachers making home visits. An important objective of this project was the identification and documentation of dimensions of home visiting which could serve as a guide for home visitors in many settings. Jones stated, "When the teacher is a home visitor with the goal of involving parent's in the children's learning, dimensions need to be identified in the learner (here, the family), in the visitor, and in teaching strategies" (33, p. 52). The primary criterion used for evaluating the project was teachers' feelings and perceptions rather than objectively measured change in families. Most teachers felt some measure of success in involving parents, and all agreed in recommending the experience as a component of teacher education. Working with adults in their homes, they agreed, was much more demanding of the teacher than working with children or even adults in the classroom. "There are many more variables which are obviously outside the teachers' control" (33, p. 59).
In discussing evaluation of preschool compensatory education programs, Weikart (63) stated in 1969 that although the role of curriculum is primarily to help the teacher teach and the selection of curriculum is critical, staff development and involvement are more important than the particular curriculum used. He stated,

While competent administrative direction and a good curriculum are important to achieve success, staff involvement is crucial. The staff model employed must allow each individual to be creatively involved in the total operation. The human involvement of concerned teachers and staff is the key element in program success. A project must provide adequate time for the staff to plan what they are going to do within the restrictions demanded by the particular curriculum, and it must provide for adequate supervision by experienced personnel (63, p. 8).

Regarding the role of home visitations in compensatory education programs for preschool children he stated, "Parent involvement through home visits by teachers seems to be important, not so much for transfer of information or experience to the mother, but as an attempt to create an atmosphere of support for intellectual growth in the home" (63, p. 8).

Other programs emphasized the need for preparation of home visitors which included purposes, problems, and evaluation of home visitations. In an in-service training program for teachers of mentally retarded children (49), parent-teacher conferences were discussed in terms of preparing for and conducting the conference and teacher qualifications for conducting the conference. In Parents: Active Partners in
Education, Sayler (52) concluded the training manual with a summary of problems which may be encountered, and she enumerated teacher fears and rewards in a parent participation training program.

Materials to take into the home when conducting a visit were included in several of the programs (8, 22, 24, 26, 36, 42, 44). Such materials were the basis for activities conducted during the visit. In 1972, Greenwood (22) described the development of materials for family use which take into account not only the school's goals for the child but also the family's expectations, goals, life style, and value system. Materials for working with parents and children in the HOPE program (26) included get-acquainted activities, the planning of a "junk box" and "idea bank," and "do's and don'ts" to remember. Appendices to the Home Visitor's Handbook for project HOPE included a sample home visitor's newsletter, a sample parent's guide, a home visitor's feedback information form, a child data enrollment form, the home visitor mileage and time report form, and a list of materials for the home visitor's kits. Another training manual Learning: A Cooperative Adventure, A Resource Guide for Working with Young Children (36) contained a section on books, magazines, and records which offered ideas for learning activities.

Several guides were developed for the purpose of implementing programs involving home visitations. In designing
the home visitor's training program, Seefeldt (53) suggested these steps,

Break each job down into a list of its component parts, listing all the functions, responsibilities, and tasks that are involved. Then, by identifying all the knowledges and skills needed for the successful performance of each component part, a comprehensive check list can be derived that will show what subjects and topics to include in planning the training content (53, p. 40).

Below are listed two outlines for planning training for home visits:

Getting Ready

Ready Answers When Parents Ask
Learn the Territory
Sharing Information Obtained
Help Parents Understand the Program
Scheduling Home Visits
Making Notes--Keeping Records
Materials to Take
Do's and Don'ts
Be Alert to Serious Problems
Home Visit Feedback Information (26)

Planning/Preparation

Deciding on Goals/Objectives/Strategies
Ice Breakers--Greetings
Materials
Planning to Resolve Special Problems
Studying the Neighborhood
Making Appointments in Advance

Dressing Suitably

Importance of a Confident Frame of Mind (53).

Factors Contributing to Home Visitations

In addition to the factors contributing to successful home visitation which were introduced in Chapter I of this research report, others also exist. One important factor was related to publicity and public relations campaigns. In the identified programs, several efforts were implemented to communicate the philosophy and outcomes of the projects to the community and to gain public support for the programs. As an example, one study recommended that "an effective campaign should be organized and carried out for informing the community in general, and target population parents in particular about the program's purpose, goals, and objectives, and what can be expected of it" (53, p. 31).

Follow-up activities are another factor which can perhaps contribute to the effectiveness of programs involving home visitations. Many of the programs included follow-up activities which were planned after the initial visit. Often several visits were made to each home participating in the program. In the Guidance Awareness Program (35), special assembly programs were conducted for students during the school year. However, in this study, the home visits were perceived as more successful than the large group sessions.
Difficulties with follow-up sessions included problems related to monitoring the attendance of the students and loss of the one-to-one relationship with the advisor. A survey of parents indicated that they felt the home visit was very worthwhile and would like the program continued the next year. Parents felt a rapport with teachers, as evidenced by the number of parents who felt free to call their child's advisor when there was a question or problem. Of the students polled, 76.47 per cent reacted positively. The incoming students felt they had someone whom they knew and could go to for advice at the high school. The survey of advisors showed they felt the program was worth the time and effort spent, and should be continued next year. They felt the most valuable aspects of the program to the parents and students were the familiarization and clarification of the high school programs and that this showed the parents and students that the school staff cared.

Flexible scheduling of home visits was another factor which contributed to the success of programs. In the identified studies, home visitations were made during regular school or work hours, as well as at night and on weekends. Some projects recommended that additional time was needed to conduct visits (14). Many of the home visitors were only part time paraprofessionals or regular school personnel with limited time for home visits. A general recommendation for several projects was that the home visitors be full-time
personnel with reduced case loads. Availability to work some evenings and weekends was also listed as a consideration influencing the success of the home visitor (53).

Cost effectiveness of programs was also considered to be important for program success. Programs could not be recommended for continuation if cost effectiveness could not be proven. Cost per visit was determined and compared to other methods of contacting families and administering services. In most respects, The National Home Start program (12) was considered to be cost effective by the project's evaluators. However, with respect to internal improvements in cost effectiveness that could be made within the existing program, these concerns were identified—content of the home visit, use of staff time, and allocation of budget funds. Funding was a major problem in most of the identified programs, and recommendations were usually stated in terms of whether funding should be continued.

Report forms and other materials for record keeping were necessary for monitoring the success of the home visitation process. General report forms included information such as name of student or child, parents' names, home address, phone number, date and time visited, hours spent, reasons not visited, and other comments (35). One project director stated, "Every home visitor should make a report, in detail, on every home visit. The importance of this cannot be stressed too much" (53, p. 83). Another form included
information regarding materials taken on visits, persons present during the visits, factors affecting accomplishment of the plans, progress made, problems identified, and plans for the next visit. Survey instruments were also developed and administered to monitor the effectiveness of home visitation programs and to make suggestions for improvements. Visitors, parents, and students completed questionnaires, and in some cases, students or children and parents were tested before and after the home visitation program (12). Many examples of survey instruments were included in the appendices of the identified programs.

Another factor which seems to be related to the success of programs was the personal qualities of the home visitor. Concerns were often expressed by project directors regarding ways to instill motivation, understanding and confidence in the home visitor. In most cases, well-trained participants who were aware of their responsibilities as well as the expectations of the project made enthusiastic, competent home visitors. Other personal qualities of successful home visitors included relating effectively with many different people, maturity, sensitivity, flexibility, empathy, and cultural background. Language facility, availability to work some evenings and weekends, sex of visitor, age, health and energy, education, transportation, and discretion were also important considerations. In 1976, Love (37) compared home visitors on such variables as individual case load,
being a parent or not, length of time with the program, age of children and location of her home. There were many factors that influenced the success of the home visitor, and it was the responsibility of the director or supervisor of the project to select persons as home visitors who were well suited to the important responsibilities they assumed.

Summary of Characteristics of Programs Including Home Visitations

Home visitations are often included in programs providing services to individuals and families. Based on the review of the previously mentioned reports and studies, these characteristics seem to be common for programs including home visitations.

1. Paraprofessionals, as well as professionals, including teachers, administrators, counselors, and social workers have responsibility for conducting home visitations.

2. Young children and special needs groups (disadvantaged, handicapped, and the aged) are the populations most commonly receiving services which include home visitations.

3. Supervision and evaluation of the home visitors are considered essential for the successful operation of programs.

4. Specific goals and objectives of home visitations are typically stated and communicated to parents or individuals.
5. Training and staff development activities for the home visitor are considered necessary to develop skills and competencies for conducting home visits.

6. Materials related to the services of the program are prepared and taken to the home by the visitor.

7. Reporting and record keeping are considered important duties of the home visitor.

8. A public relations campaign is often conducted to inform the public and potential audience of the program including home visitations.

9. Cost effectiveness must be evaluated for continued funding to be recommended.

10. A variety of alternative methods are used to contact families and individuals in addition to home visitations, and several contacts are made with the home.

11. Homes are visited at times other than during regular school or work hours.

12. The format of the home visit is usually planned in advance to meet the specific needs of the individuals being served.

13. Training models and guides are available for planning and implementing programs which include home visitations.

In summary, the projects and studies reported in the literature seemed to indicate that a variety of programs provide service to families and individuals through home visits,
and home visitations were considered an integral and important part of these programs.
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CHAPTER III

PROCEDURES FOR COLLECTION AND TREATMENT OF DATA

This chapter consists of a detailed description of the procedures followed in the collection and treatment of the data in this study. This chapter is divided into the following four sections: (a) Developing and Validating the Instrument, (b) Pilot Testing the Instrument, (c) Collection of Data, and (d) Treatment of Data.

Developing and Validating the Instrument

This study proposed to identify the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas as perceived by useful homemaking teachers. In order to identify specific concerns related to home visitations, a panel of experts in the field of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas was organized. Recommendations from Elizabeth Smith, State Director of Homemaking Education, were considered in the selection of the panel. Nineteen persons were contacted during the first week of July, 1978, and agreed to participate in the study as a member of the panel of experts. The panel, which was composed of persons from various geographic areas of the state and various sizes of school districts, represented a wide range of positions,
experiences, and interests related to homemaking education.

These persons are listed below.

Caroline Bode
Homemaking Teacher
President of VHTAT
San Antonio, Texas

O'Neil Harris
Vocational Administrator
Arlington Public Schools
Arlington, Texas

Virginia Alders
Homemaking Teacher
Past President of VHTAT
Nacogdoches, Texas

Sylvia Hinojosa
Vocational Administrator
Edgewood Public Schools
San Antonio, Texas

Catherine Payne
Homemaking Teacher
Board of Directors of VHTAT
Friendswood, Texas

Bobbie Moore
Area Consultant
Texas Education Agency
Houston, Texas

Bobbie Clay
Homemaking Teacher
Board of Directors of VHTAT
Timpson, Texas

Judy Jackson
Area Consultant
Texas Education Agency
Houston, Texas

Ann Derrick
Vocational Homemaking Supervisor
Amarillo Public Schools
Amarillo, Texas

Angie Grace
Advisory Council for Vocational Technical Education
Austin, Texas

Loretta Clemons
Vocational Homemaking Supervisor
Dallas Public Schools
Dallas, Texas

Billie Chapman
Executive Director
VHTAT
Austin, Texas

Minerva Ritchie
Vocational Homemaking Supervisor
Brownsville Public Schools
Brownsville, Texas

Jean Barton
Consultant
Texas Education Agency
Austin, Texas
A letter explaining responsibilities to the study and announcing an orientation session was sent to each panel member following the initial contact. The orientation session was conducted by the investigator on July 24, 1978 at the Dallas Hilton Hotel during the State In-Service Conference for Homemaking Teachers. Fourteen of the panel members attended the orientation meeting. After an overview of the study, its purposes, activities, and time line were presented, the panel members formed small discussion groups. Contributions of home visitations, satisfaction with the current status of home visits, and concerns regarding home visits were discussed. Responses of the groups were recorded and reported. Additionally, the panel members were given a questionnaire containing twelve items to complete and return within two weeks. These responses were used to design the survey instrument to be sent to useful homemaking teachers in the state to identify the perceived status of home visits.
Panel members were also contacted individually regarding procedures for developing the survey instrument.

During August, a questionnaire containing thirty-eight content items and ten demographic items was developed. In September, each panel member received an instrument for the purpose of establishing content validity of the questionnaire. A subjective response regarding the appropriateness and form of each item of the questionnaire was requested. Eighteen of the validation instruments were returned. As a result of the validation process, an instrument containing thirty-five content items and seven demographic items was drafted for the pilot study. Notations required for key punching the responses were added before the questionnaire was printed. This process enabled the survey to go directly to keypunching with little hand coding.

Pilot Testing the Instrument

The questionnaire and procedures were pilot tested in November, 1978. Five school districts (Amarillo, Arlington, Brownsville, Edgewood-San Antonio, and Lewisville) which employ vocational administrators/directors and/or vocational homemaking supervisors were selected. Members of the panel of experts from these districts assisted in the distribution of cover letters, questionnaires, and return envelopes. Panel member Judy Jackson, Area III homemaking consultant, Texas Education Agency, Houston, Texas, provided names and school
addresses of teachers in small school districts in Area III where no vocational administrator or supervisor was employed. These districts were selected to achieve a balance of schools of various sizes and various geographic areas of the state. The above steps assured that the procedures followed closely the planned survey.

Seventy-three per cent of the useful homemaking teachers returned the questionnaires within a period of two weeks. Many of the teachers shared experiences, ideas, or materials related to home visits in the space provided at the end of the instrument. Teachers receiving the questionnaire were also asked to make suggestions which might improve the clarity and completeness of items. At the suggestion of several teachers from large school districts, a statement concerning busing and students who attend schools outside their own neighborhood was added to item 23 (difficulties related to home visitations). Teachers from San Antonio and Brownsville suggested adding to the list of possible difficulties a statement regarding a language barrier which exists when a language other than English is spoken in the home.

Other changes in the questionnaire were minor. The final form of the questionnaire used in this study was developed from insights given and suggestions received from pilot testing. The results of this pilot study emphasized the usefulness of and need for testing an instrument and procedures before conducting a large survey.
Collection of Data

In January, 1979, the 1978-79 directory of homemaking teachers in Texas was obtained from the Texas Education Agency. There were 2,501 teachers identified as teachers of full or combination units of useful homemaking for the 1978-79 school year. Utilizing a table of random numbers, a simple random sample of 400 teachers was selected from the identified population of useful homemaking teachers for participation in this study.

Names and school addresses of vocational administrators and homemaking supervisors were obtained from the 1978-79 directory of the Texas Association of Directors, Supervisors, and Counselors of Vocational-Technical Education. Packets were prepared containing questionnaires, cover letters explaining the purposes of the study, return envelopes, and letters of support from Elizabeth Smith, State Director of Homemaking Education and were mailed to vocational administrators or homemaking supervisors for distribution to selected teachers in their district. A letter of transmittal requested the administrator to encourage the teachers to complete and promptly return the questionnaire. Homemaking teachers in districts where no vocational administrator or supervisor was employed were mailed survey materials directly. All teachers in the sample were provided an individual stamped return envelope. The survey materials were mailed on February 1, 1979.
The dates questionnaires were returned are shown in Table I. Within eight days, 47.1 per cent of those returned had been received. On February 15, a follow-up postcard was mailed to those teachers whose questionnaires had not been received. By March 2, a total of 311 questionnaires had been returned. At this point the data collection was terminated.

**TABLE I**

**QUESTIONNAIRE RETURN ANALYSIS BY FREQUENCY AND PER CENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Return Frequency</th>
<th>Return Cumulative Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent of Total Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>February 5</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 6</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>47.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 16</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>71.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 23</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The collection activities at this point yielded a 77.75 per cent return rate.
Treatment of Data

When the questionnaires were returned, each one was visually inspected for missing data. All 311 of the questionnaires were considered to include an adequate number of responses to be included in the study. Specific responses to "other" on items 27, 31, and 32 were collected, as well as experiences, ideas, or materials related to home visitations which were shared in the space provided at the end of the questionnaire. These specific responses were coded according to community sizes found on the first page of the survey instrument.

After inspection, the data were keypunched and processed by the Computer Center at North Texas State University. In order to answer the seventeen research questions, frequency and per cent were calculated for each item on the questionnaire. Additionally, the Chi Square Test of Independence was calculated for selected variables to determine whether or not the variables had a relationship. Table II explains how each research question was matched with the appropriate questionnaire item and gives the related treatment of data for the questions. A series of thirty Chi Square Tests of Independence were calculated in this study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research Question</th>
<th>Questionnaire Item</th>
<th>Treatment of Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Demographic items 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 11, 8</td>
<td>Chi Square Test of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1, 3</td>
<td>Frequency and Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>Frequency and Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>Frequency and Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Frequency and Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Frequency and Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>15, 8</td>
<td>Chi Square Test of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>16, 8</td>
<td>Chi Square Test of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>Frequency and Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Frequency and Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>26, 27, 28</td>
<td>Frequency and Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>22, 25, 32</td>
<td>Frequency and Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>33, 34</td>
<td>Chi Square Test of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>18, 29, 30, 31</td>
<td>Frequency and Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Frequency and Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>19, 20, 24</td>
<td>Chi Square Test of Independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>34, 35</td>
<td>Chi Square Test of Independence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA AND FINDINGS

The results of this investigation, to identify the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas as perceived by useful homemaking teachers, are presented in this chapter as related to the seventeen research questions outlined in Chapter I.

During February, 1979, a total of 400 questionnaires was mailed to useful homemaking teachers in Texas who were randomly selected for this study. Those teachers who had not replied within the first two weeks of data collection activities were mailed a follow-up postcard to encourage their response. Data collection was terminated on March 2, 1979, with a return rate of 77.75 per cent.

Data were then submitted for keypunching and computer processing at the Computing Center at North Texas State University. From the computer generated statistical analyses, tables reported in this study were constructed. The following is a presentation of that data.

Research Questions Investigated

The seventeen research questions presented in Chapter I provided direction for conducting this study. The following
narrative will address these seventeen research questions in sequential order.

Research question 1 for this study was "Do relationships exist between the percentage of students currently being visited by useful homemaking teachers and variables such as (a) courses taught, (b) teaching assignment, (c) area of state, (d) community size, (e) years of teaching experience, (f) degrees earned, (g) pre-service training, (h) scheduling of conference period, (i) distance traveled to home visit, (j) funds allocated for travel, and (k) visits made in summer program?" The rationale for this research question related to establishing accountability for home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking programs in Texas. If variables could be identified which related to the quantity of students being visited, then cost effectiveness could be assessed. An analysis of the teachers' responses to item 8 on the questionnaire provided the quantitative variable for research question 1. Item 8 asked, "What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?", and provided a four group response pattern: (1) 0-25 per cent, (2) 26-50 per cent, (3) 51-75 per cent, (4) 76-100 per cent. Of the teachers responding to this item, 39.6 per cent reported they would visit 0-25 per cent of their students, 19.8 per cent planned to visit 26-50 per cent, 21.5 per cent reported they would visit 51-75 per cent of the students,
and 19.1 per cent said they expected to visit 76-100 per cent of their students by the end of the regular school year.

In order to answer research question 1, responses were obtained from the appropriate questionnaire item for each of the listed variables. Demographic items from page 1 of the questionnaire were matched with variables (a) through (g). Variable (h), "scheduling of conference period," was taken from questionnaire items 1 and 2; variable (i), "distance traveled to home visit," was obtained from item 4; variable (j), "funds allocated for travel," was taken from items 5 and 6; and item 11 provided data for variable (k), "visits made in summer program." A Chi Square Test of Independence was calculated for each of the appropriate items on the questionnaire for the variable "percentage of students visited during the regular school year"; therefore, a series of twenty-three Chi Square Tests of Independence were calculated for research question 1.

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) (1) was utilized to calculate the Chi Square Test for Independence. A cross tabulation table, with one variable serving as the horizontal axis and the second variable serving as the vertical axis of the table, was generated to include marginal totals and per cents and the grand total and per cent response. Below the cross-tabulation table the SPSS generated the Chi Square value, degrees of freedom, and probability level. The interpretation of these data was such
that a small value of Chi Square (those having a high probability level of occurrence) was interpreted as the absence of a relationship. Conversely, a large Chi Square (with a small probability level of occurrence) indicated a systematic relationship of some sort existed between the two variables under study.

Ten of the twenty-three Chi Square Tests calculated for research question 1 were for variable (a), "courses taught." The data for these ten tests are presented in Tables XXV through XXXIV in Appendix C. A summary of these Chi Square Tests of Independence for the variable "percentage of students visited during the regular school year" by the elements of courses taught is presented in Table XXXV. The elements for this variable were the ten Vocational (Useful) Homemaking courses presently being offered in public schools in Texas: comprehensive sequential courses in Homemaking I, Homemaking II, Homemaking III, Homemaking IV, and specialized semester or quarter courses in Home and Family Living, Home Furnishings, Home Management, Home Nursing, Child Development, and Consumer Education. None of the tests had a Chi Square value large enough to indicate a systematic relationship between the courses and the percentage of students visited.

The Chi Square Tests of Independence for variables (b) through (j) are presented in Tables XXVI through XLVIII in Appendix C. A summary of those variables listed in research question 1 which were found to exhibit a systematic
relationship with the variable "percentage of students visited during the regular school year" is presented in Table III. Four variables were found to exhibit dependent relationships with the quantitative variable at a .01 or less level of significance. These were (1) teaching assignment (months of contract), (2) community size, (3) distance traveled to home visit, and (4) funds allocated for travel (needs for additional funds). Regarding teaching assignments, the ten month contract tended to be associated with lower percentages of students visited during the regular school year. Larger community sizes (over 20,000), shorter distances traveled to home visits (less than ten miles), and the need for additional travel funds were also associated with a lower percentage of students visited by the homemaking teachers.

**TABLE III**

CHI SQUARE SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE VARIABLE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY SELECTED VARIABLES SIGNIFICANT AT .01 OR LESS LEVEL OF SIGNIFICANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Table Number</th>
<th>( x^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching assignment- (months of contract)</td>
<td>XXXVIII</td>
<td>24.161</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community size</td>
<td>XL</td>
<td>48.615</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance traveled to home visit</td>
<td>XLVI</td>
<td>42.420</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds allocated for travel- (needs for additional funds)</td>
<td>XLVIII</td>
<td>16.326</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research question 2, "When are most home visits typically scheduled?", was addressed by the teachers' responses to questionnaire items 1 and 3. Item 1 stated, "Do you have a period designated for the purpose of home visitations in addition to a conference period?" and "If yes, write which period of the school day is scheduled for home visitations." Table IV reports the response patterns to this question.

**TABLE IV**

**FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO THE PERIOD SCHEDULED FOR HOME VISITATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>85.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 2</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 3</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 4</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 5</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Period 7</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents  (N = 310)
Item 3 asked, "Do you make home visits at times other than the designated period for home visitations?" and "If yes, at what times?" This item had six possible responses: (1) before school, (2) conference period, (3) lunch period, (4) after school, (5) at night, (6) on weekends. The patterns of response for this question are reported in Table V.

**TABLE V**

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO THE SCHEDULING OF HOME VISITATIONS AT TIMES OTHER THAN DESIGNATED VISITATION PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>88.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before school</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference period</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lunch period</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>After school</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>93.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At night</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On weekends</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (N = 309)
From the responses to these items, it was concluded that most teachers (85.5 per cent) have a conference period designated for the purpose of home visitations. Period six (35.5 per cent) was the most frequently scheduled period for visitations with period five (18.3 per cent) designated as the second most frequently reported home visitation period. These findings indicated that teachers scheduled time for home visitations late in the school day. Also, most teachers (88.7 per cent) reported that they make home visits at times other than the designated period for home visits. After school (93.1 per cent), the regular conference period (48.5 per cent), and at night (39.8 per cent) were those times in addition to the period designated for home visitations when visits were typically made.

Research question 3 was "What is the average amount of time spent on a home visit?" This question was addressed by questionnaire item 13 which asked, "What is your estimate of the average time spent on a visit in the home?" Six possible time intervals, ranging from fifteen minutes to two hours or more, were given. Table VI provides the responses to this item. The majority of the teachers (58.3 per cent) reported that the average time spent on a home visit was thirty minutes. Only 6.0 per cent reported they spent one hour or one and a half hours, and none of the teachers reported spending two hours or more on a home visit. From the information provided by responses to this item, it was assumed
that most teachers could make at least one visit during a
designated conference period for home visitations.

**TABLE VI**

**FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO**
**THE TIME SPENT ON HOME VISITATION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is your estimate of the average time spent on a visit in the home?</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 minutes</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 minutes</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 minutes</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 hour</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 1/2 hours</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 hours or more</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (N = 300)

Research question 4, "Who is typically present when the home is visited?", was evaluated by the teachers' responses to item 14 on the questionnaire. This item gave the teachers an opportunity to check from a list of six individuals those who were typically present when the home was visited. These persons included (1) mother, (2) father, (3) guardian, (4) student, (5) other family member, (6) spouse of student. The response to this question as found in Table VII was that
the mother (93.2 per cent) was most often present for the visit, with the student present 61.7 per cent of the time. Fathers were usually not present for the visit, as indicated by the low response (11.3 per cent) to that variable. In addition to mothers and students, other family members (30.5 per cent), probably younger children, were frequently present when the home was visited.

TABLE VII

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO PERSONS WHO ARE PRESENT WHEN THE HOME IS VISITED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>93.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guardian</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family member</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse of student</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (N = 311)

"Is the same home visited more than once during the school year?" was the fifth research question investigated. Item 9, "Do you visit the same home more than once
during the regular school year?", addressed question 5 and offered a four-point continuum response pattern. The responses were (1) never, (2) seldom, (3) usually, (4) always. Table VIII contains the teachers' responses to this item. Of the homemaking teachers, 63.7 per cent reported that they seldom visit the same home more than once during the regular school year, while 23.1 per cent said they usually repeat visits. In reducing the response continuum to a dichotomy, it was concluded that the majority of the teachers (74.6 per cent) seldom or never visited the same home more than once during the regular school year.

**TABLE VIII**

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO WHETHER THE SAME HOME IS VISITED MORE THAN ONCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents  (N = 303)
Research question 6, "What are the purposes and contributions of home visits as perceived by useful homemaking teachers?" was addressed by the teachers' responses to questionnaire item 21. Item 21 stated "How do home visits contribute to your total Vocational Homemaking program? (Please check all that apply) and write the number of the item listed above that you would consider the main purpose of the visits." A list of twelve contributions was provided for the teachers' responses. Tables IX and X present the response patterns for this item. Six of the twelve responses were checked by over 50 per cent of the teachers as ways in which home visits contribute to their total Vocational Homemaking program. These were (1) "aids in individualizing instructional program to needs and interests of students," (55.9 per cent); (3) "gives parents an opportunity to contribute ideas and participate in setting goals for the homemaking program," (57.9 per cent); (5) "increases student self-concept and improves student and teacher relationships," (61.7 per cent); (6) "increases understanding and awareness of cultural factors," (67.8 per cent); (7) "increases understanding and knowledge of student's home environment," (87.8 per cent); and (10) "provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience," (65.0 per cent). There was no agreement among the majority of the teachers regarding the main purpose of home visitations. The two contributions which received
TABLE IX
FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO CONTRIBUTIONS OF HOME VISITATIONS

How do home visits contribute to your total Vocational Home-making program? (Please check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aids in individualizing instructional program to needs and interests of students</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aids in planning for relevant classroom activities and in developing and revising curriculum</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gives parents an opportunity to contribute ideas and participate in setting goals for the Homemaking program</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identifies needs for adult work</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increases student self concept and improves student and teacher relationships</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>61.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increases understanding and awareness of cultural factors</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Increases understanding and knowledge of student's home environment</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE IX—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Promotes understanding of FHA as an integral part of Vocational Homemaking programs</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provides better understanding of the community and its resources</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provides opportunity to promote regular and summer programs and encourage future enrollment and planning</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provides students and parents with information regarding vocational courses and careers</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (N = 311)
TABLE X

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION AND RANKINGS OF RESPONSES TO MAIN PURPOSE OF HOME VISITATIONS

Write the number of the item listed above that you would consider the main purpose of home visits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Aids in individualizing instructional program to needs and interests of students</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Aids in planning for relevant classroom activities and in developing and revising curriculum</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Gives parents an opportunity to contribute ideas and participate in setting goals for the homemaking program</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Identifies needs for adult work and YHT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Increases student self concept and improves student and teacher relationships</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Increases understanding and awareness of cultural factors</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
<td>Rank</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Increases understanding and knowledge of student's home environment</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Promotes understanding of FHA as an integral part of Vocational Homemaking programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Provides better understanding of the community and its resources</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Provides opportunity to promote regular and summer programs and encourage future enrollment and planning</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Provides students and parents with information regarding vocational courses and careers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (N = 261)
the greatest percentage of responses as the main purpose of home visits were (7) "increases understanding and knowledge of student's home environment," (34.9 per cent; and (1) "provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience," (19.2 per cent). The responses to this item indicated that although the teachers felt home visits contributed to the homemaking program in a variety of ways, there was not an identified main purpose of home visitations.

"How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) are home visits to the total Vocational Homemaking program?" was research question 7 for this study. Item 15 of the questionnaire provided data for evaluation of question 5. A four-point continuum response pattern was offered for the question "How important do you believe home visitations are to the total Vocational Homemaking program at your school?" Of the teachers responding to this item, 15.8 per cent said home visitations were "very important" and 24.2 per cent answered "definitely important." The largest percentage of the teachers, 40.0 per cent, indicated that home visitations were only "somewhat important" to the total Vocational Homemaking program at their school, and 20.0 per cent said home visits were "unimportant." When these responses were reduced to dichotomy, it was determined that a majority, 60.0 per cent, of the teachers believed that home visitations were only "somewhat important" or were "unimportant."
In order to determine if the teachers' beliefs about the importance of home visitations were related to the percentage of students visited, a Chi Square Test of Independence was calculated from items 15 and 8 on the questionnaire. The data, presented in Table XI, indicated that a relationship between these two variables did exist at the .001 level of significance.

Research question 8, "How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) do school administrators consider home visits to be to the total Vocational Homemaking program?", was closely related to research question 7. Item 16 of the questionnaire provided data for evaluation of question 8 and offered a four-point continuum response pattern. The responses were (1) unimportant, (2) somewhat important, (3) definitely important, (4) very important. Of the homemaking teachers, 50.3 per cent perceived that school administrators consider home visits as only "somewhat important" and 24.4 per cent perceived that school administrators consider home visits to be "unimportant" to the total Vocational Homemaking program at their school. The response "very important" was selected by 9.2 per cent of the homemaking teachers, and 16.7 per cent selected "definitely important." When these responses were reduced to a dichotomy, it was concluded that a majority of the homemaking teachers, 74.2 per cent, perceived that school administrators considered
TABLE XI
FOUR BY FIVE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF THE IMPORTANCE OF HOME VISITATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely important</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 35.883 \quad df = 12 \quad p = 0.0003 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
home visitations as "somewhat important" or "unimportant" to the total Vocational Homemaking program at their school.

In order to determine if the homemaking teachers' perceptions about administrators' beliefs regarding the importance of home visitations were related to the percentage of students visited, a Chi Square Test of Independence was calculated from items 16 and 8 on the questionnaire. The data, presented in Table XII, indicated that a relationship between these two variables also existed at the .001 level of significance.

Research question 9 was "To what extent do the following individuals encourage useful homemaking teachers to do home visitations: (a) teacher educators, (b) other homemaking teachers, (c) homemaking department chairperson, (d) homemaking city supervisor, (e) vocational administrator/director, (f) area homemaking consultant, (g) school principal, (h) superintendent/assistant superintendent?" Item 17 on the questionnaire asked the teachers to indicate the degree of encouragement they had received to do home visits from each of the previously listed individuals. Responses were given on a four-point continuum. If no such position existed, the teacher was instructed to mark "not applicable." Table XIII presents the teachers' responses to this item. From the responses given to this item, it was concluded that two individuals provided extensive encouragement to the teachers to do home visitations. These were homemaking city
TABLE XII
FOUR BY FIVE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF ADMINISTRATORS' OPINION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF HOME VISITATIONS

How important do you believe administrators (principals, vocational directors, superintendents, etc.) consider home visitations are to the total Vocational Home-making program at your school?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely important</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 37.560 \quad \text{df} = 12 \quad p = 0.0002 \]
(Number of missing observations = 8)
### TABLE XIII

**FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO ENCOURAGEMENT RECEIVED TO CONDUCT HOME VISITS FROM SELECTED INDIVIDUALS**

Indicate the degree of encouragement you have received to do home visits from each of these individuals. (Please circle appropriate number. If no such position exists in your school, mark Not Applicable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Not Applicable</th>
<th>No Encouragement</th>
<th>Very Little Encouragement</th>
<th>Some Encouragement</th>
<th>Extensive Encouragement</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Economics Teacher Educator</td>
<td>188 60.5 %</td>
<td>10 8.1 %</td>
<td>18 14.6 %</td>
<td>36 29.3 %</td>
<td>59 48.0 %</td>
<td>N = 123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Homemaking Teachers</td>
<td>69 22.2 %</td>
<td>60 24.8 %</td>
<td>58 24.0 %</td>
<td>87 36.0 %</td>
<td>37 15.3 %</td>
<td>N = 242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking Department Chairperson</td>
<td>166 53.4 %</td>
<td>24 16.6 %</td>
<td>23 15.9 %</td>
<td>50 34.5 %</td>
<td>48 33.1 %</td>
<td>N = 145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking City Supervisor</td>
<td>244 78.5 %</td>
<td>6 9.0 %</td>
<td>5 7.5 %</td>
<td>22 32.8 %</td>
<td>34 50.7 %</td>
<td>N = 67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Administrator/Director</td>
<td>150 48.2 %</td>
<td>43 26.7 %</td>
<td>25 15.5 %</td>
<td>46 28.6 %</td>
<td>47 29.2 %</td>
<td>N = 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area Homemaking Consultant</td>
<td>17 5.5 %</td>
<td>18 6.1 %</td>
<td>26 8.8 %</td>
<td>96 32.7 %</td>
<td>154 52.4 %</td>
<td>N = 294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Principal</td>
<td>26 8.4 %</td>
<td>125 43.9 %</td>
<td>56 19.6 %</td>
<td>76 26.7 %</td>
<td>28 9.8 %</td>
<td>N = 285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent</td>
<td>48 15.4 %</td>
<td>125 47.5 %</td>
<td>52 19.8 %</td>
<td>60 22.8 %</td>
<td>26 9.9 %</td>
<td>N = 263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
supervisors (50.7 per cent) and area homemaking consultants (52.4 per cent). When the responses were reduced to a dichotomy including "some" and "extensive" encouragement, six of the persons were identified by over 50 per cent of the teachers as providing encouragement. This procedure added teacher educators (77.3 per cent), homemaking department chairpersons (67.6 per cent), vocational administrators/directors (57.8 per cent), and other homemaking teachers (51.3 per cent) to area homemaking consultants (85.1 per cent) and homemaking city supervisors (83.5 per cent). At the opposite end of the continuum, superintendents/assistant superintendents were identified as providing "no encouragement" to do home visitations by 47.5 per cent of the homemaking teachers. Teachers (43.9 per cent) said school principals likewise provide no encouragement to do home visitations. From these responses, it can be concluded that homemaking teachers receive encouragement to visit students' homes from a variety of individuals. The contribution of the area homemaking consultant in motivating teachers to have effective homemaking programs was supported by the responses to this item. Since not all school districts have the benefit of a homemaking city supervisor, the importance of the role of the area consultant, although physically removed from the school setting, was established.

"What difficulties do useful homemaking teachers encounter in making home visitations?" was research question 10
for this study. Item 23 on the questionnaire asked, "What difficulties do you have related to home visitations? (Please check all that apply.)" A list of nine difficulties was provided for the homemaking teachers' consideration. The frequency and per cent distribution and rankings of their responses to this item are presented in Table XIV. The greatest response of the teachers related to difficulties in scheduling home visitations. "Parents and students are not available for visitations during school hours" was selected by 89.4 per cent of the teachers and "an invitation to visit the home is not extended" ranked second, being selected by 83.6 per cent of the teachers. The difficulty which ranked third was "Parents and students misinterpret the purpose of home visits" with 52.4 per cent of the responses. All other difficulties received less than 50 per cent of the responses. "Because of busing, some students attend a school outside their own neighborhood" was identified as a difficulty by 13.5 per cent of the homemaking teachers. From the teachers' responses to this item, it was concluded that a variety of difficulties are encountered in attempting to conduct home visitations; however, the greatest difficulties are related to scheduling home visitations.

"To what extent do useful homemaking teachers use the information gained in the home visit?" was research question 11. This research question is addressed by the questionnaire
TABLE XIV

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION AND RANKINGS
OF RESPONSES TO DIFFICULTIES RELATED
TO HOME VISITATIONS

What difficulties do you have related to home visitations?
(Please check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A barrier exists between parents and teachers when a language other than English is spoken in the home</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An invitation to visit the home is not extended</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because of busing, some students attend a school outside their own neighborhood</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to home visit is too far to travel and return during one period</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority of the period for home visits is used for other duties and activities related to the homemaking or school programs</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and students are not available for visitations during school hours</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents and students misinterpret the purpose of home visits</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some homes are located in areas that are considered to be unsafe to travel in alone</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting with male students or father only is questionable</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents ($N = 311$)
items 26, 27, and 28, and is presented in Table XV. Item 26, "Do you share information gained on the home visit with other school personnel?", offered a four-point continuum response pattern. The responses were (1) never, (2) seldom, (3) usually, (4) always. Of the homemaking teachers responding to this item, 41.9 per cent reported that they seldom shared information gained on the home visit with other school personnel, while 43.6 per cent said they usually shared information. Only 5.3 per cent said they never shared information gained on home visitations. In reducing the response continuum to a dichotomy, it was concluded that over half (52.8 per cent) of the teachers shared information with other school personnel.

Item 27 asked, "With which other school personnel might you share information obtained on the home visit? (Please check all that apply.)" This item gave the teachers an opportunity to select from a list of eight individuals those with whom they might share information. These personnel included (1) area homemaking consultant, (2) counselors, (3) homemaking supervisor or vocational administrator, (4) other homemaking teachers, (5) other teachers in building, (6) other vocational teachers, (7) principal or assistant principal, (8) school nurse, and (9) other. From the teachers' responses, it was found that other homemaking teachers (71.7 per cent), counselors (66.9 per cent), and principal or assistant principal (56.6 per cent) were the
TABLE XV

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO USE OF INFORMATION GAINED IN HOME VISITATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: Do you share information gained on the home visit with other school personnel?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>41.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents (N = 303)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: With which other school personnel might you share information obtained on the home visit? (Please check all that apply.)

| Area homemaking consultant                                              | 48        | 15.4     |
| Counselors                                                              | 208       | 66.9     |
| Homemaking supervisor or vocational administrator                       | 65        | 20.9     |
| Other homemaking teachers                                               | 223       | 71.7     |
| Other teachers in building                                              | 114       | 36.7     |
| Other vocational teachers                                               | 48        | 15.4     |
| Principal or assistant principal                                        | 176       | 56.6     |
| School nurse                                                            | 109       | 35.0     |
| Other                                                                    | 9         | 2.9      |
| Number of Respondents (N = 311)                                         |           |          |
TABLE XV --Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: Do you have a method of recording specific information gained on the home visit other than the existing Vocational Homemaking reports?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>73.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (N = 307)

individuals with whom homemaking teachers shared information. It was of interest that the individuals who were reported to provide the greatest degree of encouragement to conduct home visits were not the same individual with whom information gained on visitations was shared. Area homemaking consultants were selected by 15.4 per cent, and homemaking supervisors or vocational administrators were selected by 20.9 per cent of the teachers.

"Do you have a method of recording specific information gained on the home visit other than the existing vocational homemaking reports?" was item 28. The majority (73.3 per cent) of the teachers responding to this question answered negatively. This response was not unusual since 47.2 per cent of the teachers seldom or never shared information gained on the home visitations.
Research question 12, "What alternative methods of contacting the home are being used by useful homemaking teachers?" is addressed in Table XVI which contains the teachers' responses to items 22, 25, and 32 on the questionnaire. Item 25 asked, "Would you be willing to make home visits if requested by students and parents, if no period were provided for making home visits?" Of the teachers responding to this item, 57.2 per cent said "yes." This response indicated that teachers believe home visitations are an effective method of contacting homes.

Item 22, "In what ways other than home visits do you contact parents or the home? (Please check all that apply.)", gave the teachers an opportunity to select from a list of ten methods those that they used. These methods included (1) contacts in the community, (2) drive through neighborhood, (3) FHA activities, (4) homemaking department activities, (5) parents serve as resource person, (6) PTA meetings, (7) telephone conversations, (8) visit at parent's place of employment, (9) written correspondence, and (10) other school activities or events. Five of the ten methods were checked by over 50 per cent of the teachers as methods other than home visitations of contacting parents or the home. These were "contacts in the community," (81.4 per cent); "other school activities or events," (78.5 per cent); "telephone conversation," (76.8 per cent); "FHA activities," (77.2 per cent); and "homemaking department activities," (66.2 per cent). All
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: Would you be willing to make home visits if requested by students and parents, if no period were provided for making home visits?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents (N = 308)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question: In what ways other than home visits do you contact parents or the home? (Please check all that apply.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contacts in the community</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drive through neighborhood</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHA activities</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>77.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking department activities</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>66.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents serve as resource person</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA meetings</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone conversation</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit at parent's place of employment</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>39.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written correspondence</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other school activities or events</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>78.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents (N = 311)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE XVI --Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question: What methods do you use to supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class displays of individual work</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class progress reports</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home visit</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual student conference at school</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone conversation</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written evaluation from parents</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written evaluation from students</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents (N = 311)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ten of the methods listed in this item were employed by at least 20 per cent of the teachers. "Drive through neighborhood," (25.1 per cent) received the lowest frequency of responses. Responses to this item indicate that useful homemaking teachers employ a variety of methods to contact parents or the home other than home visitations.

Since supervision and evaluation of the home experience/extended learning experience is the identified purpose of home visitations, item 32 asked, "What methods do you use to
supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience?" Seven specific methods, including "home visit," were provided as choices for the teachers' responses. The largest percentage of teachers reported "written evaluation from students," (81.4 per cent) as the method used most frequently. Two other methods were also selected by over 50 per cent of the homemaking teachers. These were "written evaluation from parents," (61.4 per cent) and "class progress reports," (54.7 per cent). Slightly over half, 50.5 per cent, of the teachers reported that they use "home visits" to supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience. "Telephone conversation," which was reported in item 22 to be a major method of contacting parents or the home (76.8 per cent), was the least frequently reported method used to supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience (22.5 per cent).

Research question 13 for this study was "How important are home experiences/extended learning experiences to the total Vocational Homemaking program as perceived by useful homemaking teachers?" Responses to questionnaire items 33 and 34 were evaluated for this research question. Questionnaire item 34, "How important do you believe home experiences/extended learning experiences are to your homemaking program?", offered a four-point continuum response pattern as follows: (1) unimportant, (2) somewhat important, (3) definitely important, (4) very important. Of the teachers
responding to this item, the largest percentage (42.1 per cent) indicated that they believed that home experiences are only "somewhat important" to the homemaking program and 24.4 per cent said home experiences are "definitely important."

When these responses were reduced to a dichotomy, a majority, 55.9 per cent, of the homemaking teachers believed home experiences/extended learning experiences are only "somewhat important" or "unimportant" to their homemaking program.

The teachers' responses to item 33 on the questionnaire also indicated their beliefs about the importance of home experiences/extended learning experiences, since decisions regarding credit for courses and completion of home experiences are made by individual teachers and schools, rather than the Texas Education Agency. When asked, "In your class, can students receive credit for a useful homemaking course if they do not complete a home experience/extended learning experience?", 66.0 per cent of the teachers responded negatively. This response indicated that a high degree of importance was placed on home experiences by over half of the teachers responding. In order to test the relationship between these two variables, items 33 and 34, a Chi Square Test of Independence was calculated. The results of this test are found in Table XVIII. No relationship was found to exist between credit received for a useful homemaking course if no home experience/extended learning experience is
completed and the teachers' beliefs about the importance of the home experience to the homemaking program.

**TABLE XVII**

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF IMPORTANCE OF HOME EXPERIENCES/EXTENDED LEARNING EXPERIENCES BY CREDIT RECEIVED FOR A USEFUL HOMEMAKING COURSE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Definitely Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.920 \quad \text{df} = 3 \quad p = 0.2703 \]

(Number of missing observations = 5)

Research question 14, "Are additional resource materials and methods needed to assist useful homemaking teachers in making home visits," was evaluated by teachers' responses to four items on the questionnaire, 18, 29, 30, and 31. Tables XVIII and XIX provide the responses to these items. In addition
to assessing specific needs related to conducting home visits, item 18 asked the teachers to "rate the adequacy with which your teacher education program prepared you to make home visits." A four-point continuum response pattern, (1) inadequately prepared, (2) somewhat prepared, (3) well prepared, or (4) very well prepared, was provided. Of the teachers responding to this item, 40.3 per cent said they were somewhat prepared, and 29.0 per cent said they were inadequately prepared. Only 10.3 per cent rated the adequacy of their teacher education program as very well prepared. In reducing the response continuum to a dichotomy, it was concluded that the majority of the teachers (69.3 per cent) rated their pre-service education to home visits as less than well prepared.

**TABLE XVIII**

**FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO PREPARATION TO CONDUCT HOME VISITATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate the adequacy with which your teacher education program prepared you to make home visits.</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very well prepared</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well prepared</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat prepared</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequately prepared</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (N = 310)
## Table XIX

### Frequency and Per Cent Distribution of Responses to Needs Regarding Home Visitations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> Would an in-service workshop to develop skills and competencies for effective home visitations be helpful to you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Respondents (N = 306)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> Would a teacher handbook for planning and preparing for effective home visitations be helpful to you?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>38.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Respondents (N = 309)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question:</strong> If an in-service workshop or a handbook were planned related to home visitations, which topics would be most helpful to you? (Please check all that apply.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be alert to serious problems</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deciding on goals/objectives/strategies</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do's and don'ts</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>48.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Helping parents understand the program</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Per Cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice breakers—Greetings</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance of a confident frame of mind</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning the neighborhood</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Making notes--Keeping records</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials to take</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready answers when parents ask</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scheduling home visits</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>37.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing information obtained</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervising and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (N = 311)

Item 29 asked, "Would an in-service workshop to develop skills and competencies for effective home visitations be helpful to you?", and item 30 asked, "Would a teacher handbook for planning and preparing for effective home visitations be helpful to you?" A teacher handbook was favored by 61.8 per cent of the homemaking teachers, while only 48.0 per cent said that an in-service workshop for effective home visitations would be helpful. When the teachers were asked to select those topics which would be most helpful if an
in-service workshop or handbook were planned related to home visitations, none of the thirteen topics was selected by a majority of the teachers. Three topics were identified as needs by over 40 per cent of the homemaking teachers. These were "helping parents understand the programs," (49.5 per cent), "do's and don'ts," (48.2 per cent), and "supervising and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience," (42.4 per cent). These responses are consistent with the teachers' responses related to difficulties in making home visitations (research question 8) and purposes and contributions of home visitations (research question 4).

"Parents and students misinterpret the purpose of home visits" ranked third as a difficulty related to home visitations. However, difficulties related to scheduling home visits, "an invitation to visit the home is not extended" and "parents and students are not available for visitations during school hours" which ranked high on item 23, were not identified as a need in item 31. "Scheduling home visits" was identified as a topic which would be helpful to address in a handbook or in-service workshop on home visits by only 37.0 per cent of the homemaking teachers. "Provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience," which ranked second as the main purpose of home visitations in item 21, was also identified as a topic to be included in a handbook or in-service workshop for homemaking teachers.
"Are useful homemaking teachers satisfied with the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Home-making Education?" was research question 15. On item 24 teachers were asked, "Rate your degree of satisfaction with the current status of home visitations as a part of your homemaking program." Responses to the four-point continuum, (1) not satisfied, (2) somewhat satisfied, (3) definitely satisfied, and (4) very satisfied, are presented in Table XX.

**TABLE XX**

FREQUENCY AND PER CENT DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONSES TO SATISFACTION WITH STATUS OF HOME VISITATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Per Cent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely satisfied</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>34.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of Respondents (N = 307)

Of the teachers responding to this item, 41.7 per cent indicated they were "somewhat satisfied" and 34.9 per cent were "not satisfied." Together these responses represented 76.6 per cent of the teachers. Only 10.7 per cent of the
homemaking teachers rated their degree of satisfaction with the current status of home visitations as a part of their homemaking program as "very satisfied."

Finally, research questions 16 and 17 addressed recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home visitations and home experiences/extended learning experiences. Items 19, 20, and 24 on the questionnaire were utilized to evaluate question 14, "What are recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home visitations?" Item 19, "Home visits should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas," offered a four-point continuum response pattern as follows: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree, and (4) strongly agree. The percentage of teachers that agreed with the statement was 37.1 per cent, whereas 26.7 per cent disagreed. As a dichotomy, a majority, 57.3 per cent, agreed or strongly agreed that home visits should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. Item 20 asked, "How effective do you believe the Vocational Homemaking program would be without home visits?" and presented these five possible responses: "would make no difference," "ineffective," "somewhat effective," "definitely effective," and "very effective." Collectively, 49.8 per cent of the teachers said the homemaking program would be "definitely effective," (32.8 per cent) or "very effective," (17.0 per cent) without home visits. Only 6.8 per cent indicated that programs would be "ineffective"
without home visits and 15.8 per cent said it "would make no difference" without home visits in Vocational Homemaking programs.

Questionnaire item 24 from research question 15, (satisfaction with status of home visitations), was also utilized to evaluate research question 16. Three Chi Square Tests of Independence were calculated to determine relationships between these variables. Tables XXI, XXII, and XXIII present the results of these tests. It was determined that each respective variable was dependent on the two other variables at the .001 level of significance.

Research question 17 for this study was "What are recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home experiences/extended learning experiences?" Items 34 and 35 on the questionnaire were utilized to evaluate research question 17. Questionnaire item 35, "Home experiences should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas," provided four possible responses: (1) strongly disagree, (2) disagree, (3) agree, and (4) strongly agree. The largest percentage of the teachers (42.8 per cent) responding to this item agreed that home experiences should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. Collectively, 64.7 per cent of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed to continue home experiences. Only 12.7 per cent strongly disagreed with the statement.
TABLE XXI
FOUR BY FIVE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CONTINUING HOME VISITATIONS BY EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAM WITHOUT HOME VISITS

How effective do you believe the Vocational Homemaking program would be without home visits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely effective</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat effective</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would make no difference</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 172.266 \quad \text{df} = 12 \quad p = 0.0000 \]
(Number of missing observations = 4)
### TABLE XXII

**FOUR BY FOUR CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS OF CONTINUING HOME VISITATIONS BY SATISFACTION WITH STATUS OF HOME VISITS**

Rate your degree of satisfaction with the current status of home visitations as a part of your homemaking program.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely satisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>112</strong></td>
<td><strong>82</strong></td>
<td><strong>49</strong></td>
<td><strong>304</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 140.274 \quad df = 9 \quad p = 0.0000 \]

(Number of missing observations = 7)
TABLE XIII
FOUR BY FIVE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR TEACHERS' SATISFACTION WITH STATUS OF HOME VISITATIONS BY EFFECTIVENESS OF PROGRAM WITHOUT HOME VISITS

How effective do you believe the Vocational Homemaking program would be without home visits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Rate your degree of satisfaction with the current status of home visitations as a part of your homemaking program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very effective</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely effective</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat effective</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would make no difference</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 89.007 \quad \text{df} = 12 \quad p = 0.0000 \]
(Number of missing observations = 4)
Item 34, discussed in relation to research question 13, (importance of home experiences/extended learning experiences), served as the second variable with item 35 to calculate a Chi Square Test of Independence. The results of this test are presented in Table XXIV. It was determined that a relationship exists between the teachers' beliefs about the importance of home experiences/extended learning experiences and their opinion regarding continuation of home experiences as part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas at the .001 level of significance.
TABLE XXIV

FOUR BY FOUR CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR TEACHERS' PERCEPTIONS REGARDING CONTINUATION OF HOME EXPERIENCES BY IMPORTANCE OF HOME EXPERIENCES/EXTENDED LEARNING EXPERIENCES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Definitely important</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>67</strong></td>
<td><strong>131</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>306</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[X^2 = 370.720 \quad df = 9 \quad p = 0.0000\]

(Number of missing observations = 5)
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A survey of useful homemaking teachers in the state of Texas was conducted to identify the perceived status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education. During February, 1979, a random sample of 400 teachers was mailed questionnaires which addressed specific concerns related to home visitations. Seventeen research questions provided the framework for development of the survey instrument. The first question evaluated variables which might be related to the percentage of students visited during the regular school year. Other research questions were concerned with qualitative aspects of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. The collected data were keypunched and processed at North Texas State University's Computing Center. Data generated included frequencies, per cents, and appropriate Chi Square Tests of Independence.

Seventeen conclusions were reached in this study. They were the direct products of the research questions employed in conducting this study.

Answering research question number 1, "Do relationships exist between the percentage of students currently being
visited by useful homemaking teachers and selected variables?", it was concluded that four variables exhibited dependent relationships with the variable "percentage of students visited during the regular school year" at a .01 or less level of significance. These variables were teaching assignments (months of contract), community size, distance traveled to home visit, and funds allocated for travel (needs for additional funds).

In response to research question 2, "When are most home visits typically scheduled?", it was concluded that most teachers have a conference period designated for the purpose of home visitations and that period six was the most frequently scheduled period for visitations with period five designated as the second most frequently reported home visitation period. Also, most teachers reported that they make home visits at times other than the designated period for home visits. After school, the regular conference period, and at night were those times in addition to the period designated for home visitations when visits were typically made.

From research question 3, "What is the average amount of time spent on a home visit?", it was concluded that the majority of the teachers spend an average of thirty minutes on a home visit. Only a few of the teachers spent one hour or one and a half hours, and none of the teachers reported spending two hours or more on a home visit.
A fourth conclusion was reached as to who is typically present when the home is visited. Teachers reported that the mother was most often present for the visit, and fathers were usually not present. Students and other family members were frequently present when the home was visited. Additionally, it was concluded that the majority of the teachers seldom or never visited the same home more than once during the regular school year.

A sixth conclusion was reached regarding the purposes and contributions of home visits as perceived by useful homemaking teachers. Six responses were selected by a majority of the teachers as ways in which home visits contribute to their total Vocational Homemaking program. These were (1) "aids in individualizing instructional program to needs and interest of students," (2) "gives parents an opportunity to contribute ideas and participate in setting goals for the homemaking program," (3) "increases student self-concept and improves student and teacher relationships," (4) "increases understanding and awareness of cultural factors," (5) "increases understanding and knowledge of students' home environment," and (6) "provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience." There was no agreement by a majority of the teachers regarding the "main" purpose of home visitations.

Answering research question 7, "How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) are home visits to the
total Vocational Homemaking program?", it was concluded that a majority of the teachers believed that home visitations were only "somewhat important" or "unimportant." Additionally, it was concluded that the teachers' beliefs about the importance of home visitations were significantly related to the percentage of students visited during the regular school year.

In response to research question 8, "How important (as perceived by useful homemaking teachers) do school administrators consider home visits to be to the total Vocational Homemaking program?", it was concluded that a majority of the homemaking teachers perceived that school administrators considered home visitations as "somewhat important" or "unimportant" to the total Vocational Homemaking program at their school. Further, the teachers' perceptions about administrators beliefs regarding the importance of home visitations were significantly related to the percentage of students visited during the regular school year.

Another conclusion reached had to do with the degree of encouragement useful homemaking teachers received to conduct home visits from selected individuals (research question 9). Two individuals, homemaking city supervisors and area homemaking consultants, provided "extensive" encouragement to a majority of the teachers to conduct home visitations. Four individuals were identified by over half of the teachers as providing "some" or "extensive" encouragement. These
included teacher educators, homemaking department chairpersons, vocational administrators, and other homemaking teachers. At the opposite end of the continuum, it was concluded that superintendents/assistant superintendents and school principals provided "no encouragement" to the homemaking teachers to do home visitations.

Conclusion ten was that teachers encounter a variety of difficulties in attempting to conduct home visitations; however, the greatest difficulties are related to scheduling home visitations. The two major difficulties were "parents and students are not available for visitations during school hours" and "an invitation to visit the home is not extended."

The next conclusion related to research question 11, "To what extent do useful homemaking teachers use the information gained on the home visit?" It was concluded that over half of the teachers shared information with other school personnel. Other homemaking teachers, counselors, and principals or assistant principals were the individuals with whom homemaking teachers might share information. Additionally, it was determined that a majority of the teachers do not have a method of recording specific information gained on the home visit other than the existing Vocational Homemaking reports.

Another conclusion reached related to alternative methods of contacting the home that are being used by useful homemaking teachers (question 12). A majority of the teachers
indicated that they would be willing to make home visits if requested by students and parents, even if no period were provided for making home visits. Five methods other than home visits were identified by over half of the teachers as methods of contacting parents or the home. These were (1) "contacts in the community," (2) "other school activities or events," (3) "telephone conversations," (4) "FHA (Future Home-makers of America) activities," and (5) "homemaking department activities." From these responses, it was concluded that useful homemaking teachers employ a variety of methods to contact parents or the home other than home visitations. Additionally, a variety of methods in addition to home visitations are utilized to supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience. Written evaluations from students and parents, and class progress reports were the primary methods reported.

Answering research question 13, "How important are home experiences/extended learning experiences to the total Vocational Homemaking program as perceived by useful homemaking teachers?", it was concluded that a majority of the homemaking teachers believe home experiences/extended learning experiences are only "somewhat important" or "unimportant" to their homemaking program. Responses regarding credit received for course work if no home experience/extended learning experience is completed indicated that a high degree of importance was placed on home experiences by over half of
the teachers. Further, it was found that no relationship exists between credit received for a useful homemaking course if no home experience/extended learning experience is completed and the teachers' beliefs about the importance of the home experience to the homemaking program.

Conclusion fourteen was that the majority of teachers rated their pre-service education to do home visits as less than well prepared. Over half of the teachers indicated that a teacher handbook for planning and preparing for effective home visitations would be helpful. A handbook was favored by a larger percentage of teachers than an in-service workshop related to home visitations. No strong agreement regarding topics to be included in a handbook or workshop was found to exist. The topics that were most requested were somewhat consistent with the previously identified difficulties related to home visitations and the purposes and contributions of home visitations. Conclusion fifteen was that a majority of useful homemaking teachers are only "somewhat satisfied" or "not satisfied" with the current status of home visitations as a part of their homemaking program.

Conclusions sixteen and seventeen were related to recommendations of useful homemaking teachers regarding home visitations and home experiences/extended learning experiences. A majority of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed that home visits should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. Conversely, half of the
teachers said the homemaking program would be "definitely effective" or "very effective" without home visits. Significant relationships were found to exist between these two variables as well as with the teachers' satisfaction with the current status of home visitations. Regarding home experiences/extended learning experiences, it was concluded that a majority of the teachers agreed or strongly agreed to continue home experiences. It was also determined that a relationship exists between the teachers' beliefs about the importance of home experiences/extended learning experiences and their opinion regarding continuation of home experiences as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas.

A major implication from these conclusions regarding the status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas as perceived by useful homemaking teachers is that changes are needed. Useful homemaking teachers believe that home visitations should continue to be a part of homemaking programs, although they are not satisfied with the current status of home visits. The teachers did not perceive home visits as they now exist to be important to the total homemaking program and believed the program would be effective without home visits. Nevertheless, a majority of the homemaking teachers indicated that they would make home visits even if no conference period were provided for the purpose of visits and that they currently make home visits at times other than the designated visitation period.
Approximately 40 per cent of the teachers reported they expected to visit only 25 per cent or less of their students by the end of the school year. Scheduling home visits was identified as the major difficulty by a very high percentage of the homemaking teachers.

The following recommendations are implicit from the findings of this study.

1. If information gained on the home visit is to be useful and shared with other school personnel, then a method for recording information should be developed. This could be accomplished by the individual teacher or teachers within a department in order to meet the needs of individual schools.

2. A teacher handbook addressing the specific topics identified as needs for planning and conducting effective home visitations should be developed.

3. Preparation for conducting home visitations should be included as a major component of the homemaking teachers' pre-service education program.

4. The purpose of home visitations as stated in the Vocational Homemaking Education Program Standards should be expanded to include more than the supervision of home experiences/extended learning experiences. Further, these purposes and contributions of home visitations should be communicated to parents and students.

5. Homemaking teachers should be encouraged by persons in supervisory or administrative positions to make home
visits, and when home visits cannot be made, other methods for contacting the home should be employed.

6. Homemaking teachers should record all contacts with the home, whether through a home visit or other method.

The following are recommendations for additional studies related to home visitations as a part of Vocational Home-making Education in Texas.

1. A study to determine the cost effectiveness of home visitations should be conducted because of the low percentage of students visited as reported in this study.

2. A similar study to identify perceptions of useful homemaking students and their parents related to home visitations should be conducted.

3. A similar study to identify perceptions of school administrators and teacher educators related to home visitations should be conducted.
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SAMPLE OF COVER LETTER

TO THE VOCATIONAL ADMINISTRATOR OR SUPERVISOR ADDRESSED:

A project is currently being funded by the Texas Education Agency to identify the current status of home visitations as a part of vocational homemaking education in Texas. A panel of experts including useful homemaking teachers, homemaking supervisors, home economics teacher educators, school administrators, Texas Education Agency area and state staff members, and representatives of the Advisory Council for Vocational Technical Education and the Vocational Homemaking Teachers Association of Texas have been involved in the development and validation of the survey instrument. A pilot test was conducted in the fall with approximately 75 per cent of the sample responding. Your help is needed with the next step of this research project—the statewide survey of all useful homemaking teachers and combination useful/gainful teachers.

Enclosed you will find cover letters, support letters from Mrs. Elizabeth Smith, questionnaires, and return envelopes. Please distribute these materials within the next few days to each of the respective teachers in your district. It will not be necessary for you to collect and return the questionnaires since each teacher will mail the questionnaire directly to me.

I would appreciate any support you might lend to the project by encouraging the teachers to complete and promptly return the questionnaires. Please feel free to contact me by phone (214-231-6301) or mail if you have any questions. Thank you.

Yours truly,

Brenda S. Mitchell
Principal Investigator
Home Visitation Project

BSM:ns
Enclosures

cc: Mr. Hayden McDaniel
Mrs. Elizabeth Smith
TO THE VOCATIONAL HOMEMAKING TEACHER ADDRESSED:

As principal investigator for the Home Visitation project, I am sending copies of the enclosed survey to every useful homemaking teacher and combination useful/gainful homemaking teacher in Texas. The purpose of this project is to identify the current status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education. Perhaps Mrs. Elizabeth Smith's letter of support will indicate how important your response is. With your help, ideas for improving home visitations will be formulated.

Let me encourage you to respond to every item on the questionnaire. The time involved in completing the survey is brief. Participants in the pilot study reported that only 20-25 minutes were required to complete the questionnaire. Let me also assure you that the information collected will not be reported concerning an individual respondent. Your name appears on the questionnaire only for the purpose of follow-up.

I look forward to receiving your response within two weeks. A stamped envelope is included for your convenience. Please fold the instrument so that the return address appears in the envelope window.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me by phone (214-231-6301) or mail. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Brenda S. Mitchell
Principal Investigator
Home Visitation Project

Enclosures
TO THE VOCATIONAL HOMEMAKING TEACHER ADDRESSED:

Homemaking teachers, school administrators, and Texas Education Agency staff members have expressed concerns during the last few years regarding the role of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. At present, a project is being funded by Texas Education Agency to identify the current status of home visitations. Every useful homemaking teacher and combination useful/gainful teacher in the state has been included in the survey.

I support the Home Visitation Project in conducting this survey. We at the Texas Education Agency look forward to reviewing the findings of this project, which will be useful in identifying contributions of home visits to the effectiveness of Homemaking Education; planning preservice education for prospective vocational homemaking teachers; and making decisions regarding needs, alternatives, resource materials, and improvements related to home visitations. I would like to encourage you to participate in this project by completing the survey instrument.

Thank you for your cooperation by participating in this worthwhile project. If I can be of assistance to you in any way, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Mrs. Elizabeth F. Smith
Director, Homemaking Education
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VOCATIONAL HOMEMAKING EDUCATION
HOME VISITATION SURVEY

GENERAL INFORMATION
AND DIRECTIONS:
This survey will help identify the current status of home visitations as a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas. As a result of this questionnaire, ideas for improving the home visitation component of Homemaking will be formulated.

PLEASE NOTICE THE FOLLOWING POINTS BEFORE YOU GO ON:

- Home visit/visitation means a visit with parents, guardians, and/or students which is conducted only in the student's home.

- Home experience/extended learning experience means a learning experience conducted during the student's time away from school.

- Your responses should reflect your current perceptions of home visitations for the 1978-1979 school year.

You are encouraged to share any experiences, ideas or materials related to home visitations. Attach additional pages if necessary.

Please fold this survey instrument so that the return address at the end of the questionnaire appears in the envelope window. Your prompt reply will be appreciated.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

Please provide the following information:

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

1. Hmk. I
2. Hmk. II
3. Hmk. III
4. Hmk. IV
5. Home & Family Living
6. Home Furnishings
7. Home Management
8. Home Nursing
9. Child Development
10. Consumer Education

Teaching Assignment:
1. Full unit
2. Combination unit

Area in Texas:
1. 01
2. 02
3. 03
4. 04
5. 05
6. 06
7. 07
8. 08
9. 09
10. 10

Community Population:
1. Less than 2,500
2. 2,500 to 9,999
3. 10,000 to 19,999
4. 20,000 to 49,999
5. 50,000 to 499,999
6. 500,000 or more

Years of teaching experience in Vocational Homemaking in Texas including current year:
1. 1
2. 2
3. 3
4. 4
5. 5
6. 6
7. 7
8. 8
9. 9
10. 10

Highest Degree Earned:
1. Bachelor's degree
2. Master's degree
3. Doctor's degree

Did you receive certification as a Vocational Homemaking Teacher in a Texas college or university?
1. Yes
2. No
HOME VISITATION SURVEY

1. Do you have a period designated for the purpose of home visitations in addition to a conference period?
   - Yes
   - No

2. Is your period for home visitations adjacent to your conference period?
   - Yes
   - No

3. Do you make home visits at times other than the designated period for home visitations?
   - Yes
   - No

4. What is the farthest distance traveled from your school headquarters to a home visit (one way)?
   - 1-5 miles
   - 6-10 miles
   - 11-15 miles
   - 16-20 miles
   - Over 20 miles

5. Is your travel allowance adequate for making the home visits you have planned for this year?
   - Yes
   - No

6. If you were to visit 100 percent of your students' homes, would it be necessary to request additional travel funds?
   - Yes
   - No

7. How many home visits have you made for each of the first six months of this school year?
   - August
   - September
   - October
   - November
   - December
   - January

8. Approximately how many home visits do you think you will have made by the end of the regular school year?
   - 0-25%
   - 26-50%
   - 51-75%
   - 76-100%

9. Do you visit the same home more than once during the regular school year?
   - Always
   - Usually
   - Occasionally
   - Never

10. If you taught useful homemaking courses last year, how many home visits did you make during the 1977-1978 school year?
    - Number of home visits
    - Number of students enrolled during 1977-1978

11. If you conduct a summer homemaking program, do you visit a higher percentage of your students' homes in the summer than during the regular school year?
    - Yes
    - No
    - About the same
    - Not applicable

12. How many students are currently enrolled in your useful homemaking classes?
    - Males
    - Females

13. What is your estimate of the average time spent on a visit in the home?
    - 15 minutes
    - 30 minutes
    - 45 minutes
    - One hour
    - Two hours or more

14. Please check all persons who are typically present when the home is visited.
    - Mother
    - Father
    - Guardian
    - Student
    - Other family member
    - Spouse of student

15. How important do you believe home visitations are to the total Vocational Homemaking program at your school?
    - Very important
    - Definitely important
    - Somewhat important
    - Unimportant

16. How important do you believe administrators (principals, vocational directors, superintendents, etc.) consider home visitations to the total Vocational Homemaking program at your school?
    - Very important
    - Definitely important
    - Somewhat important
    - Unimportant

17. Indicate the degree of encouragement you have received to do home visits from each of these individuals. (Please circle appropriate number. If no such position exists in your school, mark Not applicable.)
    - Home Economics Teacher
    - Educator
    - Other Homemaking Teachers
    - Homemaking Department Chairperson
    - Homemaking City Supervisor
    - Vocational Administrator/Director
    - Area Homemaking Consultant
    - School Principal
    - Superintendent/Assistant Superintendent

Not applicable
No encouragement
Very little encouragement
Some encouragement
Extensive encouragement
18. Rate the adequacy with which your teacher education program prepared you to make home visits.

(01) 4 ______ Very well prepared
(02) 3 ______ Well prepared
(03) 2 ______ Somewhat prepared
(04) 1 ______ Inadequately prepared

19. Home visits should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas.

(05) 4 ______ Strongly agree
(06) 3 ______ Agree
(07) 2 ______ Disagree
(08) 1 ______ Strongly disagree

20. How effective do you believe the Vocational Homemaking program would be without home visits?

(09) 4 ______ Very effective
(10) 3 ______ Definitely effective
(11) 2 ______ Somewhat effective
(12) 1 ______ Ineffective
(13) 0 ______ Would make no difference

21. How do home visits contribute to your total Vocational Homemaking program? (Please check all that apply.)

(14) 01. Aids in individualizing instructional program to meet needs and interests of students
(15) 02. Aids in planning for relevant classroom activities and in developing and revising curriculum
(16) 03. Gives parents an opportunity to contribute ideas and participate in setting goals for the Homemaking program
(17) 04. Identifies needs for adult work and YMB
(18) 05. Increases student self-concept and improves student and teacher relationships
(19) 06. Increases understanding and awareness of cultural factors
(20) 07. Increases understanding and knowledge of student's home environment
(21) 08. Promotes understanding of FHA as an integral part of Vocational Homemaking programs
(22) 09. Provides better understanding of the community and its resources
(23) 10. Provides opportunity to assist in planning and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience
(24) 11. Provides opportunity to promote regular and summer programs and encourage future enrollment and planning
(25) 12. Provides students and parents with information regarding Vocational courses and careers

Write the number of the item listed above that you would consider the main purpose of home visits.

(26) 01. __________

22. In what ways other than home visits do you contact parents or the home? (Please check all that apply.)

(27) 01. Contacts in the community
(28) 02. Drive through neighborhood
(29) 03. FHA activities
(30) 04. Homemaking department activities
(31) 05. Parents serve as resource person
(32) 06. PTA meetings
(33) 07. Telephone conversations
(34) 08. Visit at parent's place of employment
(35) 09. Written correspondence
(36) 10. Other school activities or events

23. What difficulties do you have related to home visits? (Please check all that apply.)

(37) 01. A barrier exists between parents and teacher when a language other than English is spoken in the home
(38) 02. An invitation to visit the home is not extended
(39) 03. Because of busing, some students attend a school outside their own neighborhood
(40) 04. Distance to home visit is too far to travel and return during one period
(41) 05. Majority of the period for home visits is used for other duties and activities related to the homemaking program
(42) 06. Parents and students are not available for visitations during school hours
(43) 07. Some homes are located in areas that are considered to be unsafe to travel in alone
(44) 08. Visiting with male student or father only is questionable

24. Rate your degree of satisfaction with the current status of home visitations as a part of your homemaking program.

(45) 01. Very satisfied
(46) 02. Somewhat satisfied
(47) 03. Not satisfied

25. Would you be willing to make home visits if requested by students and parents, if no period were provided for making home visits?

(48) 01. Yes
(49) 02. No

26. Do you share information gained on the home visit with other school personnel?

(50) 01. Always
(51) 02. Usually
(52) 03. Seldom
(54) 04. Never

27. With which other school personnel might you share information obtained on the home visit? (Please check all that apply.)

(55) 01. Area homemaking consultant
(56) 02. Counselors
(57) 03. Homemaking supervisor or vocational administrator/director
(58) 04. Other homemaking teachers
(59) 05. Other teachers in building
(60) 06. Other vocational teachers
(61) 07. Principal or assistant principal
(62) 08. School nurse
(63) 09. Other (Please specify)

28. Do you have a method of recording specific information gained on the home visit other than the existing vocational homemaking reports?

(64) 01. Yes
(65) 02. No

29. Would an inservice workshop to develop skills and competencies for effective home visitations be helpful to you?

(66) 01. Yes
(67) 02. No

30. Would a teacher handbook for planning and preparing for effective home visitations be helpful to you?

(68) 01. Yes
(69) 02. No

PLEASE TURN PAGE
31. If an inservice workshop or a handbook were planned related to home visitations, which topics would be most helpful to you? (Please check all that apply.)

- Be alert to serious problems
- Deciding on Goals/Objectives/Strategies
- Do's and Don'ts
- Helping parents understand the program
- Ice breakers-Greetings
- Importance of a confident frame of mind
- Learning the neighborhood
- Making notes-Keeping records
- Materials to take
- Ready answers when parents ask
- Scheduling home visits
- Sharing information obtained
- Supervising and evaluating the home experience/extended learning experience
- Other (Please specify) __________

32. What methods do you use to supervise and evaluate the home experience/extended learning experience? (Please check the three most often used methods.)

- Class displays of individual work
- Class progress reports
- Home visit
- Individual student conference at school
- Telephone conversation
- Written evaluation from parents
- Written evaluation from students
- Other (Please specify) __________

33. In your class, can students receive credit for a useful homemaking course if they do not complete a home experience/extended learning experience?

1. ______ Yes
2. ______ No

34. How important do you believe home experiences/extended learning experiences are to your homemaking program?

4. ______ Very important
3. ______ Definitely important
2. ______ Somewhat important
1. ______ Unimportant

35. Home experiences should continue to be a part of Vocational Homemaking Education in Texas.

4. ______ Strongly agree
3. ______ Agree
2. ______ Disagree
1. ______ Strongly disagree

THANK YOU FOR YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO THE HOME VISITATION PROJECT.

Brenda S. Mitchell, Principal Investigator
EPD Consortium for Northeast Texas
P. O. Box 1300
Richardson, Texas 75080

PLEASE FOLD THE INSTRUMENT SO THAT THE RETURN ADDRESS APPEARS IN THE ENVELOPE WINDOW.
APPENDIX C

CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLES FOR THE VARIABLE
PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE
REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR WITH RESPECT
TO SELECTED VARIABLES
## APPENDIX C

### TABLE XXV

**FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOMEMAKING I)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response</td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking I</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 2.659 \quad \text{df} = 3 \quad p = 0.4472 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
TABLE XXVI
FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOMEMAKING II)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 3.479 \]
\[ df = 3 \]
\[ p = 0.3236 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
### TABLE XXVII

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOMEMAKING III)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking III</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 4.804 \quad df = 3 \quad p = 0.1867 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
### TABLE XXVIII

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOMEMAKING IV)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking IV</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 6.452 \quad df = 3 \quad p = 0.0916 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
**TABLE XXIX**

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOME AND FAMILY LIVING)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home and Family Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 1.733 \quad df = 3 \quad p = 0.6297$

(Number of missing observations = 8)
TABLE XXX
FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOME FURNISHINGS)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Furnishings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 5.454 \quad \text{df} = 3 \quad p = 0.1414 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
TABLE XXXI

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOME MANAGEMENT)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Management</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.060 \quad \text{df} = 3 \quad p = 0.7866 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
TABLE XXXII
FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (HOME NURSING)

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home Nursing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 3.813 \quad df = 3 \quad p = 0.2824 \]
(Number of missing observations = 8)
**TABLE XXXIII**

**FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT (CHILD DEVELOPMENT)**

Useful homemaking courses you are currently teaching:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 1.560 \quad df = 3 \quad p = 0.6684 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
TABLE XXXIV
FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE
OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR
SCHOOL YEAR BY COURSES TAUGHT
(CONSUMER EDUCATION)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumer Education</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x² = 4.276  df = 3  p = 0.2331
(Number of missing observations = 8)
TABLE XXXV

CHI SQUARE SUMMARY TABLE FOR THE VARIABLE PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY ELEMENTS OF COURSES TAUGHT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Elements</th>
<th>Table Number</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking I</td>
<td>XXVI</td>
<td>2.659</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.4472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking II</td>
<td>XXVII</td>
<td>3.479</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.3236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking III</td>
<td>XXVIII</td>
<td>4.804</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemaking IV</td>
<td>XXIX</td>
<td>6.452</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home and Family Living</td>
<td>XXX</td>
<td>1.733</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Furnishings</td>
<td>XXXI</td>
<td>5.454</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Management</td>
<td>XXXII</td>
<td>1.060</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Nursing</td>
<td>XXXIII</td>
<td>3.813</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Development</td>
<td>XXXIV</td>
<td>1.560</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer Education</td>
<td>XXXV</td>
<td>4.276</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.2331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching Assignment</td>
<td>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
<td>26-50%</td>
<td>51-75%</td>
<td>76-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full unit</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combination unit</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 11.353 \quad df = 6 \quad p = 0.0780 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
### TABLE XXXVII

FOUR BY FOUR CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY TEACHING ASSIGNMENT (MONTHS OF CONTRACT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Teaching Assignment</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10 month</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 month</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 month</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(x^2 = 24.161\)  \(\text{df} = 9\)  \(p = 0.0041\)

(Number of missing observations = 8)
TABLE XXXVIII

FOUR BY ELEVEN CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY AREA OF THE STATE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area in Texas</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

x² = 42.988  df = 30  p = .0587

(Number of missing observations = 8)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Population</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 2,500</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,500 to 9,999</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 to 19,999</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 to 49,999</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 to 499,999</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500,000 or more</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[
x^2 = 48.615 \quad \text{df} = 18 \quad p = 0.0001
\]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
**TABLE XL**

**FOUR BY SIX CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY YEARS OF TEACHING EXPERIENCE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Years of teaching experience in Vocational Homemaking in Texas including current year</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-7</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 7.755 \quad \text{df} = 15 \quad p = 0.9332 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
TABLE XLI
FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY DEGREES Earned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Degree Earned</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's degree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master's degree</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 7.331 \quad df = 3 \quad p = 0.0621 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
TABLE XLII

FOUR BY TWO CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY PRE-SERVICE TRAINING

Did you receive certification as a Vocational Homemaking teacher in a Texas college or university?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 1.612$  $df = 3$  $p = 0.6567$

(Number of missing observations = 8)
TABLE XLIII
FOUR BY THREE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY SCHEDULING OF CONFERENCE PERIOD

Do you have a period designated for the purpose of home visitations in addition to a conference period?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 9.100 \quad \text{df} = 6 \quad \text{p} = 0.1680 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
### TABLE XLIV

FOUR BY THREE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY SCHEDULING OF CONFERENCE PERIOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is your period for home visitations adjacent to your conference period?</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 2.259 \quad \text{df} = 6 \quad \text{p} = 0.8944$

(Number of missing observations = 8)
### TABLE XLV

**FOUR BY SIX CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY DISTANCE TRAVELED TO HOME VISIT**

What is the farthest distance traveled from your school headquarters to a home visit (one way)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5 miles</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 miles</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 miles</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20 miles</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 miles</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 42.420 \quad \text{df} = 15 \quad p = 0.0002 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
Is your travel allowance adequate for making the home visits you have planned for this year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>What percentage of your total student enrollment will these visits (number of visits made by the end of the regular school year) represent?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$x^2 = 7.213 \quad df = 6 \quad p = 0.3016$

(Number of missing observations = 8)
TABLE XLVII.

FOUR BY THREE CHI SQUARE CONTINGENCY TABLE FOR PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS VISITED DURING THE REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR BY NEEDS FOR ADDITIONAL TRAVEL FUNDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 16.326 \quad df = 6 \quad p = 0.0121 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
If you conduct a summer homemaking program, do you visit a higher percentage of your students' homes in the summer than during the regular school year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>0-25%</th>
<th>26-50%</th>
<th>51-75%</th>
<th>76-100%</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ X^2 = 19.641 \quad df = 12 \quad p = 0.0742 \]

(Number of missing observations = 8)
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