

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Cathy Arendall Lassiter entitled "The Development and Validation of an Instrument for Evaluating Consumer and Homemaking Programs." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education, with a major in Vocational Technical Education.

E. Ray Smith
E. Ray Smith, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation
and recommend its acceptance:

John J. Drellback

Jacquelyn A. M. Jones

Accepted for the Council:

L. Evans Geth
Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Thesis
806
.L388
cop. 2

THE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDATION OF AN INSTRUMENT FOR EVALUATING
CONSUMER AND HOME MAKING PROGRAMS

A Dissertation
Presented for the
Doctor of Education
Degree
The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Cathy Arendall Lassiter

March 1980

1413839

Copyright by Cathy Arendall Lassiter 1980
All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express her gratitude to the consumer and homemaking teachers, home economics supervisors, and home economics teacher educators who participated in this study making validation of the evaluation instrument possible. She sincerely appreciates their professional commitment to home economics and hopes that the evaluation instrument developed in this study proves to be a valuable tool for improving consumer and homemaking education.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Ray Smith, Dr. Jackie McInnis, Dr. John Stallard, and Dr. Ken McCullough for their assistance and support in all stages of the author's doctoral work. Their collective and individual guidance, friendship, inspiration, and encouragement have led to tremendous personal and professional growth by the author.

And finally, the author expresses her deepest gratitude to her husband, Tommy. He had enough strength and courage to envision two doctoral degrees, and enough wisdom and patience to ensure that both were completed. He loved the author for what she was, but yet more for what she is going to be.

ABSTRACT

The problem of this study was that no validated instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs could be found. Parallel studies by Harrison and Buero in 1979 identified and verified criteria that are essential for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. The purposes of the present study were 1) to develop an instrument based on the valid criteria established by the Harrison and Buero studies for evaluating programs in consumer and homemaking education; and 2) to validate the instrument for use in evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. In order to delineate the problem, the following questions were answered:

1. How well does the instrument accurately and comprehensively measure the valid criteria established by Buero and Harrison?
2. Does the evaluation instrument elicit similar responses among different population groups (the teacher of a consumer and homemaking program, a home economics teacher educator, a regional supervisor of home economics, and another consumer and homemaking teacher)?

An evaluation instrument consisting of 25 categories with 145 criterion statements was constructed based on the criteria verified as essential for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs by Buero and Harrison. Each criterion statement was to be rated on a scale of 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, and 1-Weak. An "Unable to Judge" rating was also included for situations in which not enough information was available or the criterion statement was not applicable to the program being evaluated. The instrument was checked for content

coverage and clarity by a panel of experts. Vocational-Technical Education graduate students in a seminar at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, read the instrument and made suggestions to improve its clarity and usefulness.

A pilot study was conducted to determine the usability and reliability of the evaluation instrument through the test-retest method. The evaluation instrument was administered twice to ten consumer and homemaking teachers in East Tennessee with a two- to three-week interval between each administration. Total scores for the tests and total scores for the retests were compared using Spearman Rho Rank Order Correlation.

For 29 programs in five southeastern states, the teacher of the consumer and homemaking program, another consumer and homemaking teacher, the home economics regional supervisor, and a home economics teacher educator were asked to rate the consumer and homemaking program using the evaluation instrument. The ratings for each criterion statement for each consumer and homemaking program from the four raters were compared using Friedman's Analysis of Variance. Programs in which the raters did not show a significant difference were classified as showing agreement among the raters. A binomial test was used to determine if the number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant.

Selected findings of the study were as follows:

1. The panel of experts concurred that the evaluation instrument accurately and comprehensively measured the Harrison and Buero valid criteria for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.

2. The Spearman Rho Rank Order Correlation for the test-retest reliability check for the ten programs included in the pilot study was 0.9030. This correlation was significant at the .05 level.

3. Of the 145 criterion statements used in the evaluation instrument, 110 criterion statements had z values for the number of programs showing agreement among the evaluators that were significant at the .05 level. Thirty criterion statements had more than 50 per cent of the programs showing agreement among the evaluators. Only five of the 145 criterion statements had less than 50 per cent of the programs showing agreement among the evaluators.

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusion was made:

The evaluation instrument developed in this study is basically a valid and reliable instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.

The primary recommendation derived from this study is that the evaluation instrument should be considered for use by states in evaluating their consumer and homemaking programs through self-evaluation by the teachers, and on-site evaluation by other consumer and homemaking teachers, home economics teacher educators, and home economics regional supervisors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Statement of Problem	1
Purposes of the Study	3
Importance of the Study	4
Assumptions	6
Scope and Limitations of the Study	6
Definition of Terms	7
Organization of the Study	8
II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	10
Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs	10
The Ray Study	13
The Wallace Study	15
The Buero and Harrison Studies	16
Instrument Construction	19
Validity and Reliability	28
The Watanabe Study	34
The Wilder Study	35
The Hirst Study	36
The Dale Study	37
Summary	38
III. METHODS AND PROCEDURES	40
Construction of the Instrument	40
Pilot Test of the Instrument	43
Use of Evaluation Instrument by Different Groups	45
IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA	52
Analyzing Data for Reliability	52
Analyzing Data for Construct Validity	58
Representativeness of Sample	58
Use of Evaluation Instrument by Different Groups	59
V. FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS . . .	105
Findings	105
Conclusion	107
Recommendations	108
Implications	109
BIBLIOGRAPHY	111

CHAPTER	PAGE
APPENDIXES	118
A. Criteria for Evaluating Consumer and Homemaking Programs Developed by Buero and Harrison	119
B. Consumer and Homemaking Program Evaluation Form	143
C. Letter Asking Teachers to Participate in Pilot Study	152
D. First Letter to Teachers Participating in Pilot Study	154
E. Second Letter to Teachers Participating in Pilot Study	156
F. Test-Retest Reliability Data on Ten East Tennessee Consumer and Homemaking Programs	158
G. Letter to State Supervisors of Home Economics	170
H. Form for Identifying Persons to Evaluate a Consumer and Homemaking Program for Instrument Validation Study	173
I. Letter to Florida Superintendents	175
J. Letter to Teachers Participating in Validation Study	177
K. Letter to Evaluators Participating in Validation Study	179
L. Follow-up Letter to Non-Respondents	182
M. Programs Showing a Significant Difference in Evaluators' Ratings Grouped According to Criterion Statements	184
VITA	210

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1. Test-Retest Reliability Rank Order Correlation	54
2. Criterion Statements Receiving "Unable to Judge" (UJ) Ratings in the Pilot Study	55
3. Criterion Statements Showing a Significant Difference Between Early and Later Respondents	60
4. Agreement Among Raters for DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM Criterion Statements	64
5. Agreement Among Raters for WRITTEN PHILOSOPHY Criterion Statements	66
6. Agreement Among Raters for SCOPE AND SEQUENCE Criterion Statements	67
7. Agreement Among Raters for CURRICULUM Criterion Statements .	69
8. Agreement Among Raters for OBJECTIVES AND GOALS Criterion Statements	70
9. Agreement Among Raters for CONTENT Criterion Statements . .	71
10. Agreement Among Raters for FREE OF SEX BIAS AND DISCRIMINATION Criterion Statements	74
11. Agreement Among Raters for FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA Criterion Statements	75
12. Agreement Among Raters for PROGRAM OUTCOMES Criterion Statements	77
13. Agreement Among Raters for INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS Criterion Statements	78
14. Agreement Among Raters for INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES Criterion Statements	80
15. Agreement Among Raters for ADMINISTRATION OF LOCAL PROGRAM Criterion Statements	81
16. Agreement Among Raters for TEACHER BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS Criterion Statements	84

TABLE	PAGE
17. Agreement Among Raters for TEACHER PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT Criterion Statements	86
18. Agreement Among Raters for TEACHER PERSONAL QUALITIES Criterion Statements	87
19. Agreement Among Raters for MEETING INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES Criterion Statements	88
20. Agreement Among Raters for ADVISORY COMMITTEE Criterion Statements	90
21. Agreement Among Raters for PUBLIC RELATIONS Criterion Statements	92
22. Agreement Among Raters for EVALUATION Criterion Statements .	94
23. Agreement Among Raters for FACILITIES Criterion Statements .	96
24. Agreement Among Raters for EQUIPMENT Criterion Statements .	97
25. Agreement Among Raters for SAFETY Criterion Statements . . .	99
26. Agreement Among Raters for STORAGE Criterion Statements . .	100
27. Agreement Among Raters for FINANCIAL RESOURCES Criterion Statements	102
28. Agreement Among Raters for DEPARTMENT HOUSEKEEPING Criterion Statements	104
A-1. Criteria for Evaluating Consumer and Homemaking Programs Developed by Buero and Harrison	119
A-2. Test-Retest Reliability Data on Ten East Tennessee Consumer and Homemaking Programs	158
A-3. Programs Showing a Significant Difference in Evaluators' Ratings Grouped According to Criterion Statements	184

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

In the midst of the continuing controversy concerning the role, adequacy and objectives of vocational education, the need for improved evaluation of vocational education programs has become increasingly clear. Much of the controversy and questioning concerning vocational education arises from changes in society and the need for vocational educators to define responses to these changes. An efficient and effective system for program evaluation is one important aspect of identifying these needed changes and planning for future changes and improvement. In a manual developed for locally directed evaluation of vocational education programs, Byram (1971, p. 1:1) makes the following statements about the reasons vocational education programs should be evaluated:

From many quarters have come questions as to the degree to which such programs are as available and effective as they should be in meeting the needs of those who support them, of those who benefit from them and of employers. This is a partial answer to the question of why evaluate. Another consideration is that vocational and technical education require considerable investment in facilities and staff. It is natural that the evaluation of vocational education programs at all levels has been given a high priority by the United States Office of Education and most state departments of education.

Beginning with the passage of the 1963 Vocational Education Act, evaluation of vocational education programs was advocated as essential to the development of quality programs. The 1976 Education Amendments went one step further to mandate that states evaluate the effectiveness

of each program receiving federal funds during the five-year period of the state plan. As a result, the need for development and validation of effective systems of evaluation for all vocational-technical programs has been realized as a priority for research.

The evaluation of occupational programs of vocational education has received the primary emphasis of recent research. In 1973, Ray conducted a study in which he developed a "Self-Evaluation for Vocational-Technical Programs" instrument to be used for evaluating vocational-technical education programs in Tennessee; however, the consumer and homemaking aspect of vocational education was not included in his study. In a review of evaluation research in vocational education, Lecht (1974, p. 2) also omitted homemaking programs because "these programs are not set up to impart vocational training."

Relatively little research has been done in evaluation for consumer and homemaking education programs. In her dissertation, Harrison (1979, p. 2) suggested the need for appropriate criteria and methodology for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs when she stated:

Much of the evaluation of vocational education programs has been job oriented and most of the evaluation forms contain criteria that relate to world of work situations. . . . Consequently, consumer and homemaking programs have not generally been evaluated comprehensively due to the lack of appropriate criteria and methodology for evaluating the programs.

The need for effective evaluation tools coupled with the lack of research in the consumer and homemaking area created the idea for parallel studies by Harrison (1979) and Buero (1979) to identify and verify criteria that are essential for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. These two studies represent the first step toward

providing an effective means of evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. The criteria validated as essential for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs by Harrison and Buero need to be utilized in an effective instrument that can be used to evaluate consumer and homemaking programs. The present study will attempt to execute the second step in the process of providing an effective means of evaluation by developing and validating an instrument for evaluating consumer and homaking programs based on the essential criteria Harrison and Buero identified and verified. No such valid instrument is currently available.

II. PURPOSES OF THE STUDY

The purposes of this study were 1) to develop an instrument based on the valid criteria established by the Harrison and Buero studies for evaluating programs in consumer and homemaking education; and 2) to validate the instrument for use in evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.

In order to delineate the problem, the following questions were answered:

1. How well does the instrument accurately and comprehensively measure the valid criteria established by Buero and Harrison?
2. Does the evaluation instrument elicit similar responses among different population groups (the teacher of a program, a home economics teacher educator, a regional supervisor of home economics, and another consumer and homemaking teacher)?

III. IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

Vocational education has three aspects: orientation and exploration, occupational preparation, and consumer and homemaking education (Elson, 1974). Since the beginning of federal funding for vocational education with the Smith-Hughes Act (1917), legislators have recognized the importance of homemaking education as a part of vocational education. The Education Amendments of 1976 include grants to states for instructional programs for the occupations of homemakers including consumer education, food and nutrition, family living and parenthood education, child development and guidance, housing and home management, and clothing and textiles which prepare for combining the roles of homemakers and wage earners.

Enrollment in home economics classes has grown from 48,938 in fiscal year 1920 to 3,505,042 in fiscal year 1976. This was nearly one-fourth of the enrollment in all federally aided vocational education classes (14,878,574) in 1976 (23.6 per cent). Enrollment in secondary home economics classes was 2,703,469; over one-fourth of the 8,740,148 vocational students enrolled in secondary classes (30.9 per cent). (Grant, 1978).

In Tennessee, the 1976 enrollment in consumer and homemaking classes was 52,653, or 20.3 per cent, of the 258,969 total vocational enrollment. The enrollment in secondary consumer and homemaking classes was 44,806, or 28.3 per cent, of the 158,798 total secondary enrollment (Tennessee Advisory Council for Vocational Education, 1977).

The 1976 Education Amendments (p. 125) placed priority on the evaluation of consumer and homemaking programs as one of the "means of

assuring quality in all homemaking education programs." The Amendments (p. 115) also mandated that:

(A) each State shall, during the five-year period of the State plan, evaluate the effectiveness of each program within the State being assisted with funds available under this Act; and the results of these evaluations shall be used to revise the State's programs, and shall be made readily available to the State advisory council. . . .

Evaluation of each program necessitates the development of effective and efficient evaluation procedures to assess consumer and homemaking programs. A conference report on consumer and homemaking education listed the identification of the relative effectiveness of consumer and homemaking education at various educational levels as one of the priorities for research areas (Gorman, 1970). A review of literature revealed relatively little research in the area of evaluation of consumer and homemaking programs. Buero and Harrison indicated that responses to letters sent to the fifty state supervisors of home economics in August 1977 requesting information about the evaluation of consumer and homemaking programs revealed that there was a concern for defining the criteria for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. In the justification of their studies, both stated that:

If such criteria can be validated by professionals in consumer and homemaking, the criteria will be useful in developing a process for evaluating the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking programs. (Buero, 1979, p. 10) and (Harrison, 1979, p. 9)

At present there is no validated instrument for evaluating the effectiveness of consumer and homemaking programs. This deficiency hampers the efforts of those who are charged with the responsibility of upgrading and improving the quality of consumer and homemaking programs. Construction and validation of an instrument that can be

used by teachers, members of the state department, or on-site evaluators should be a valuable tool for a planned, thorough, and continuous evaluation system for home economics.

IV. ASSUMPTIONS

For purposes of this study, the following assumptions were made:

1. The criteria identified and verified as essential for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs by Harrison and Buero are valid for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.
2. High school teachers of consumer and homemaking programs are qualified to provide an evaluation of their programs or other teachers' programs using the evaluation instrument.
3. Regional supervisors of home economics and teacher educators in home economics education are qualified to provide an evaluation of consumer and homemaking programs using the evaluation instrument.

V. SCOPE AND LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The evaluation instrument developed and validated in the study is useful for measuring the quality of consumer and homemaking programs only. The instrument was limited to those criteria verified as essential by the Buero and Harrison studies which received a 5.0 or higher mean rating by any four of the five groups of raters (state home economics supervisors, state directors of vocational education, home economics teacher educators, consumer and homemaking teachers in Tennessee, and local vocational directors in Tennessee).

The pilot testing of the instrument was limited to East Tennessee, and was completed during June and July 1979. The use of the evaluation instrument by different population groups was limited to five states in the southeastern region of the United States (Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Tennessee), and was conducted in September and October of 1979. The population groups using the evaluation instrument were limited to teachers of consumer and homemaking programs, regional home economics supervisors, and home economics teacher educators.

VI. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following terms were used in this study:

Consumer and Homemaking Education refers to that aspect of vocational home economics which gives greater consideration to (a) meeting social and cultural conditions and needs especially in economically depressed areas, (b) preparing youths and adults for the dual role of homemakers and wage earners, and (c) providing consumer education programs (Good, 1973).

Home Economics Related Occupations refers to that aspect of vocational home economics which emphasizes the acquisition of knowledge and development of understanding attitudes and skills in the field of home economics necessary for gainful employment. Learning activities and experiences are oriented toward the development of competencies essential for entry into a chosen occupation or for acquiring new or additional competencies for upgrading occupational proficiency (Good, 1973).

Validity is the extent to which the results of an evaluation procedure serve the particular uses for which they are intended (Gronlund, 1976), or fulfills the purpose for which it is used (Good, 1973).

Content Validity is the extent to which an evaluation instrument samples the subject matter content and behavioral changes about which conclusions are to be drawn (Gronlund, 1976).

Criterion-related Validity is the extent to which an evaluation instrument is related to one or more external variables considered to provide a direct measure of the characteristics in question (Good, 1973).

Construct Validity is the extent to which scores from an evaluation instrument permit inferences about underlying traits or constructs (Anderson, 1975).

Face Validity is a term which indicates what an evaluation instrument appears, on the basis of a subjective evaluation, to measure (Good, 1973).

Reliability is the degree to which an evaluation instrument measures consistently whatever it does in fact measure (Good, 1973).

VII. ORGANIZATION OF THE STUDY

Chapter I includes the introduction, purposes of the study, importance of the study, assumptions, scope and limitations, and definition of terms used in the study.

Chapter II includes a review of related literature.

Chapter III includes the procedures followed in construction of the evaluation instrument, pilot testing of the instrument, and use of the instrument by different population groups to evaluate consumer and homemaking programs.

Chapter IV includes the analysis of the data collected in the study.

Chapter V includes findings, conclusion, recommendations, and implications made as a result of the study.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of related literature for this study covered the following areas: Evaluation of Vocational Education Programs; Instrument Construction; and Validity and Reliability. Each is discussed in the following pages.

A computer assisted search of Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) and a manual search through Dissertation Abstracts from 1970 to 1978 revealed that very little research has been done in the area of evaluation of vocational programs, and even less in evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. However, a great amount of material was identified and reviewed in the areas of instrument construction, validity and reliability.

I. EVALUATION OF VOCATIONAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Calhoun and Finch (1976) define evaluation in vocational education as a systematic process of obtaining information for judging the effectiveness of programs in relation to acceptable criteria and objectives. Evaluation is an integral part of any decision-making process, and as such plays an important role in vocational education. There are many ways to approach the evaluation of vocational education programs, but no single evaluation procedure can be followed in all cases. This section reviews the current concepts of evaluation in vocational education, suggests the need for better evaluative instruments and reviews four studies aimed at improving evaluation in vocational programs.

In 1973, Ray (p. 14) completed an extensive and thorough review of literature relating to quality and evaluation of vocational-technical programs. He listed the following general points as recurring throughout the literature:

There is a need to improve vocational education evaluation.

Vocational-technical programs must be evaluated to improve programs and to ensure the highest possible quality for programs.

Evaluation must be planned, thorough and continuous.

Evaluation results provide much needed input for program planning, decision making, answering "accountability" questions, and keeping goals and objectives current.

Wentling and Lawson (1975) acknowledged several emerging concepts concerning vocational program evaluation. The four concepts were as follows:

1. Program evaluation is a process rather than a procedure; there are many ways to approach vocational education program evaluation, no single procedure can be followed in all cases.

2. Program evaluation is more than examining the achievement of objectives. A distinction must be made between a description of the results of a program and an evaluation of those results.

3. Program evaluation is more than instructional evaluation. Instructional evaluation is focused essentially on a specific course whereas program evaluation is concerned with the cumulative influence of a sequence of instructional components.

4. Program evaluation is more than evaluating the results of a program. Traditionally evaluation has been considered as a terminal endeavor, but with formative evaluation attracting more attention,

primary activities such as planning, organizing, and managing are now being evaluated.

According to Kilt (1970), the objectives of an evaluation system are basically threefold:

1. to promote and assist with development of quality occupational education programs at the local level;
2. to provide the state division of vocational-technical education with necessary data upon which state planning of vocational programs can be based; and
3. to assure accountability of federal and state funds allocated to local programs of occupational education.

Norton's Guide to Improving Vocational Education Evaluation (1970, p. 1) provided the following definition of program evaluation:

Program evaluation is the continuous process of collecting valid and reliable data for the purpose of comparing program outcomes with program objectives. The process is conducted to provide useful information for making sound educational decisions.

This definition points out the need for a valid instrument to collect and report evaluative data. Norton documents the need for the development and implementation of evaluation methods when he pointed out:

Before existing programs can be "improved," and before access to programs of "high quality" can be insured, adequate systems and techniques of evaluation must be developed and implemented. The use of quick and often highly subjective devices for appraising the quantity, quality, and cost-effectiveness of vocational programs will not suffice. Educators are gradually recognizing the importance and complexity of the evaluation process but have not yet taken the necessary steps to fully develop and operationalize effective evaluation programs.

Wentling and Lawson (1975) also substantiated this need for better evaluative instruments. They suggested that the lack of specified techniques for collecting and utilizing evaluative information in educational organizations has been a primary weakness of most theoretical evaluation models. Moss (1968) reviewed what had been done in programs evaluation for occupational education. He asserts that program evaluation is essential to systematic improvement in educational efficiency and effectiveness, and that an intensification of evaluation activity is highly desirable. But he concluded that much of what had been called program evaluation was of questionable usefulness because of the lack of appropriate criteria and methodology.

Several studies have been undertaken in order to improve vocational education program evaluation in the last several years. The studies of Ray (1972), Wallace (1973), Buero (1979), and Harrison (1979) are reviewed below.

The Ray Study

The basic purpose of the Ray study was to establish a model for the evaluation of the quality of vocational-technical education programs in Tennessee. A draft definition of "quality" secondary vocational-technical education program was defined and twenty components of a quality program identified from a review of literature and a survey of teacher educators and supervisors.

Regional supervisors of vocational education were asked to identify four programs considered to have "quality" characteristics. Principals, vocational guidance counselors and teachers of these quality programs were asked to react to the tentative consensus definition

and to indicate the importance they placed on each of the twenty components. In addition, regional vocational education supervisors and members of the State Advisory Council were also asked to react to the definition and rate the components. Responses from the 54 selected programs were compiled to establish criteria based on local programs.

A 60-item instrument with three items to measure each component was developed to evaluate vocational-technical programs. A five-point scale ranging from "excellent" to "no effort made," and a "0" for "not applicable" was used. The instrument was administered to teachers and students in field tests in East Tennessee to determine the instrument's content validity.

From the 54 quality programs, one program from each of the six vocational areas from each region was selected (18 programs) to participate in Phase II. Research team members visited each school, administering the 60-item questionnaire to the principal, guidance counselor(s), and senior-level students in the program.

The study resulted in agreement on a consensus definition of "quality" and the 20 most important components for quality vocational-technical programs. Ray concluded that among vocational-technical program areas there is general agreement as to what constitutes components of a quality program. He recommended that the model utilized in the study be used in evaluating vocational-technical programs in Tennessee. He further recommended that the "self-evaluation" instrument developed in the study be expanded to include sections of items specifically designed for each program area.

It should be reemphasized that in developing an instrument to evaluate vocational programs, Ray made the clarification that the

materials apply to all vocational-technical programs except consumer and homemaking programs. The present study is being undertaken to alleviate this deficiency and to provide an instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.

The Wallace Study

The primary purpose of the Wallace study was to determine whether a checklist system of evaluation obtains comparable results as a system using team visits for evaluating vocational programs. The two methods compared were the method used by the State Department of Vocational Technical Education in Tennessee, and a self-evaluation methods using Ray's "Self-Checklist of Quality Vocational-Technical Programs."

Summary evaluation forms of thirteen county and one city school systems which had been evaluated by state evaluation teams during 1972-73 were obtained from the State Division of Vocational-Technical Education. A panel of six experts converted the summary data from the on-site evaluation forms to the Ray Self-Checklist instrument. The data from the four panel members with the greatest degree of agreement as determined by Kendall's Coefficient of Concordance "W" were used in the comparison of data. The data converted by the panel were compared to ratings by local school professionals using Ray's Self-Checklist. Mean ratings were compared graphically to determine similarities and t-values were computed to determine the differences on each element.

The major finding was that the local school professionals using Ray's Self-Checklist and the panel members conversion of summary data from on-site evaluation forms indicated basic agreement on only three of the 60 elements included in the Self-Checklist. The mean scores of the professionals on each element were consistently higher, and in

most cases considerably higher, than mean scores converted by the panel members. Wallace concluded that information obtained from currently used instruments for on-site evaluations was not adequate to be able to determine relative quality of vocational-technical programs; and recommended that instruments for team visit evaluations "should be revised to include more quality indicators, such as those included in the Ray Self-Checklist and should be more objective in nature." In addition to specific recommendations to improve the Ray Self-Checklist, Wallace recommended that Ray's instrument should be further validated.

The Wallace study gives direction to the present study both through an excellent review of literature and the basic techniques used. In the present study, comparisons were made between teachers' ratings and the ratings of persons who represent typical on-site evaluators, i.e., regional supervisors, home economics teacher educators, and other consumer and homemaking teachers.

The Buero and Harrison Studies

In 1978-79, parallel studies were completed by Harrison and Buero to identify, validate and verify basic criteria for the evaluation of consumer and homemaking programs. Harrison determined the importance of the identified criteria for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs as perceived by state supervisors of home economics, state directors for secondary vocational programs, and home economics teacher educators, while Buero determined the importance of the criteria as perceived by local vocational directors and consumer and homemaking teachers in secondary vocational programs in Tennessee.

Buero and Harrison worked together to compile a list of proposed criteria for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs from related

literature. The list contained 181 criterion statements organized into thirteen categories: Program Organization and Planning, Curriculum, Administration and Supervision, Facilities and Equipment, Financial Resources, Instructional Staff, Instructional Process, Management and Housekeeping, Students, Future Homemakers of America, Advisory Committee, Public Relations, and Evaluation. A modified Delphi Technique was used to validate the criteria for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. A panel of experts in consumer and homemaking education were provided a list of the criterion statements, and asked to rate each statement as "Essential," "Desirable but not Essential," or "Unimportant" for a consumer and homemaking program to be effective. Panel members could revise any of the criterion statements and/or add other points to consider in evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. After three such probes of the panel, a survey instrument was developed including the 147 criterion statements rated "Essential" by 80 per cent of the panel. The thirteen categories remained the same.

The survey instrument was mailed to the separate populations identified above to determine their perceptions regarding the importance of the criteria for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. Each respondent was asked to indicate the importance of the evaluative criteria by rating each criterion statement on a six-point Likert scale: 6-strongly agree, 5-moderately agree, 4-mildly agree, 3-mildly disagree, 2-moderately disagree, and 1-strongly disagree. A mean rating of 5.0 was established as indicating agreement with the panel of experts. State supervisors of home economics verified 146 of the 147 criterion statements as being important for evaluating consumer and homemaking

programs. State directors of vocational programs and home economics teacher educators also verified 146 of the criterion statements as important. Tennessee local vocational directors verified 113 of the criterion statements, while Tennessee consumer and homemaking teachers verified 102 of the criterion statements.

From the studies, Harrison and Buero concluded that recognized leaders in home economics education agree as to what constitutes criteria for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs at the secondary level. State supervisors of home economics, state directors for secondary vocational programs, home economics teacher educators, local vocational directors in Tennessee, and secondary consumer and homemaking teachers in Tennessee generally agree with the panel of experts regarding the importance of the validated criteria for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.

Both Harrison and Buero recommended that the criterion statements should be used for the development of an evaluation process pertaining to secondary consumer and homemaking programs. The Harrison and Buero studies provide the validated criteria upon which the present study based the development of an instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.

Evaluation in vocational education is a systematic process of obtaining information and making decisions in order to improve vocational education programs. This section has suggested the need for adequate evaluation instruments and procedures and has reviewed studies undertaken to improve vocational education program evaluation. The following two sections review instrument construction and validation.

II. INSTRUMENT CONSTRUCTION

A review of relevant literature revealed considerable material concerning the construction of indexes, scales, surveys, and questionnaires. Ideas from these various types of instruments relevant to the evaluation instrument to be developed in this study are summarized in this section. First types of rating scales are discussed; then the types of errors that may arise and the problems of constructing rating scales are reviewed. Ten Brink's five steps for constructing a rating scale are presented, followed by a review of other suggestions to aid in instrument construction and final reviewing of the instrument.

The instrument used in this study was a numerical rating scale. Ten Brink (1974) described a rating scale as consisting of a set of characteristics or behaviors to be judged and some type of scale for indicating the degree to which each attribute is present. The observer uses the scale to indicate the quality, quantity, or level of performance observed. A rating scale helps the observer to focus on specific, observable aspects of the trait being judged. Gronlund (1976) emphasized that a rating scale served several important evaluative functions: 1) it directs observation toward specific and clearly defined aspects under consideration; 2) it provides a common frame of reference for comparing programs on the same set of characteristics; and 3) it provides a convenient method for recording judgments of the observers.

Gronlund describes three types of rating scales. In a numerical rating scale, which was used in the present study, the rater checks or circles a number to indicate the degree to which a characteristic is

present. Typically, each of a series of numbers is given a verbal description which remains constant from one characteristic to another. In a graphic rating scale, the second type of rating scales described by Gronlund, each characteristic is followed by a horizontal line, on which the rater places a check. Typically, a set of categories identifies specific positions along the line, but the rater is free to check between these points if he/she desires. Although the line makes it possible to rate at intermediate points, the use of single words to identify the categories has no great advantage over the use of numbers. The third type of rating scale, a descriptive graphic rating scale, uses descriptive phrases to identify the points on a graphic scale. In some cases, only the center and end positions are described; in others, a descriptive phrase is placed beneath each designated point.

According to Helmstadter (1964), all rating methods are classified under the psychometric scaling technique called successive intervals. Each of the stimuli under consideration is placed into one of a limited number of intervals or categories ordered along some continuum; thus creating an ordinal measurement. The practical advantages of such scales are that they take less time, can be used with a large number of subjects, and seem to work well with untrained raters.

Helmstadter defined several special types of errors which arise when using rating scales. The most widely observed error is that of leniency, a tendency of almost all raters to be overly generous in their descriptions. The halo effect error is a tendency on the part of raters to allow an overall impression of the subject to influence their descriptions. A tendency to describe behaviors which appear close

together on the rating sheet more nearly alike than behaviors which are separated by some distance is a proximity error. A logical error is a tendency to rate a person similarly on characteristics that the rater feels should go together. A tendency of raters to see others as opposite to themselves in a trait is a contrast error. The final error that Helmstadter defined was central tendency error in which raters seem to avoid using the extreme positions on a rating scale.

In spite of the many errors that can arise with rating scales, Helmstadter stated that ratings can be obtained which are reliable and highly useful. He suggested that careful preparation of the rating scale is the most dependable means for assuring adequate ratings. The major objective in instrument construction is to be able to develop the right kind of scale for the particular condition of rater sophistication, time, information available, and ultimate use.

Many authors agree that construction of instruments is not a simple task. As Good (1972, p. 266) suggested in Essentials of Educational Research, "a carefully devised questionnaire technique is not a simple, quick method of investigation, but requires time, patience, ingenuity and skill." In Principles of Psychological Measurement, Helmstadter (1964, p. 190) asserted that "a great many of the faults of rating scales can be attributed to the illusion that such devices are simple to construct." Ten Brink (1974) warned that unless care is taken in constructing checklists and rating scales, a great deal of instrument error can occur. The biases of the observer are less likely to affect the results of observation when well-constructed tools are used.

Fox (1969, p. 55) supported the need for more research to develop and validate new data-gathering instruments. He stated that "Instrument development is such a difficult and time-consuming process that researchers prefer to avoid it whenever possible." This has resulted in "little advance in instrumentation in the social disciplines in the last decades." Fox suggested that if universities were willing to support doctoral projects to develop instruments, there would be less research for a while, but significant research ultimately.

Ten Brink (1974) listed five steps to follow when constructing a rating scale in order to insure a well-constructed instrument:

1. Specify appropriate learning outcome.
2. List important characteristics of each outcome.
3. Define a scale for each characteristic.
4. Arrange the scales.
5. Write the instructions.

These five steps were followed in constructing the evaluation instrument used in this study to insure careful preparation of the rating scale.

The first of the five steps identified by Ten Brink was to select the criteria to be used in the evaluation instrument. In Survey Research Methods, Babbie (1973) stated that the criteria for selecting items to be included in a rating scale is face validity. The items logically appear to give some indication of the variable being measured. The evaluation instrument in this study was based on criteria validated as essential for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs by Buero and Harrison.

Ten Brink's second step in instrument development concerns the writing of basic characteristics to be included. Babbie (1973) provided

both general and specific guidelines for writing questions or statements in a research instrument:

1. Questionnaire items should be clear and unambiguous.
2. Items should be precise.
3. The respondent should be able to read an item quickly, and select or provide an answer without difficulty.
4. A negation in an item should be avoided.

These four guidelines were carefully followed in developing the items included in the evaluation instrument designed for this study. Efforts were made to make each item as clear, precise and short as possible, with each concept being stated in a positive rather than negative manner. After the items were written, each was re-checked by a panel of experts and a panel of vocational education graduate students for these four guidelines.

The third step in instrument construction concerns the development of the scale. Ten Brink divided this step into two subparts:

1) establish the extremes of the continuum by describing the worst and best the characteristics could possibly be, and 2) describe the points between the extremes. He suggested that it is best to divide the scale into an odd number of points so that there is a neutral or clear-cut midpoint between the two extremes. Helmstadter (1964) declared that one of the most important aspects of scale development is the selection of behavior labels which are short enough to fit on the scale yet sufficiently unambiguous to result in general uniformity of meaning for all potential raters. It is desirable to include a concise definition, and a few examples along with each label. The most popularly used scales have between five and eleven steps on the

continuum. According to Helmstadter, the use of general terms like "average," "excellent," and "very poor" should be avoided because they mean different things to different raters. More specific cues are better. Extreme words such as "always" and "never" should be avoided because they contribute to the central tendency error. The scale for the evaluation instrument in this study ranged from "superior" to "weak." These extremes were divided into five points: "Superior," "Very Good," "Good," "Fair," and "Weak."

Ten Brink's fourth step for instrument development concerns the arrangement of the scale. Babbie (1973) emphasized that the format of the instrument can be just as important as the nature and working of the questions asked. An improper format can confuse respondents and lead to their not completing and returning the instrument. The questionnaire should be spread out and uncluttered, with maximum white space. Each question should be on a separate line, with no abbreviations. Helmstadter (1964) asserted that the way in which scales are organized can also be helpful in reducing rating errors. Proximity errors can be reduced by placing behaviors which are judged to go together logically as far from one another as possible in the physical make-up of the scale. Halo errors can be reduced by alternating the direction of the high end of the scale. Although such a format may be so confusing that clerical errors offset any advantage. When using untrained raters, Helmstadter recommends that all scales be set up with the high end of the scale at the top or toward the left. The evaluation instrument in this study was designed so that it was uncluttered and presented maximum white space. The scale was arranged with the high end of the scale on the left. The researcher

decided against physically separating items which logically went together and alternating high ends of the scale. Such a format would have made the criterion statements, and thus the entire instrument, longer, and may have led to confusion since untrained raters were being used in the study.

Ten Brink's fifth and final step is the all important step of writing the instructions for the scale. Every instrument, whether to be self-administered by the respondent or administered by an interviewer, should contain clear instructions. Ten Brink suggested that instructions accompanying any rating scale should contain the following information: 1) a statement naming or describing the overall characteristic being rated, 2) directions on how to mark the scales, and 3) any special instructions, such as to add any comments at the end, or to omit any characteristics the rater does not feel qualified to judge. The instructions for the evaluation instrument in this study were written following the guidelines suggested by Ten Brink.

In addition to the suggestions to aid in instrument construction, Babbie (1973) made several comments concerning effective use of the instrument. The method of reproducing the questionnaire is important to the overall success of the study, as a neatly reproduced instrument will encourage a higher response rate. The basic method for mail distribution and return is the transmission of the instrument, letter of explanation and return envelope.

Babbie goes on to say that an invaluable tool is the return rate graph, on which the number of returned questionnaires is logged each day, either individually or cumulatively. The graph is a guide to how the data collection is going and when follow-up mailings should

be launched. As completed questionnaires are returned, each should be opened, perused, and assigned an identification number. Follow-up mailings are an effective method for increasing return rates in mail surveys. Properly timed follow-up mailings (i.e., two to three weeks) provide additional stimuli for responding. A new copy of the questionnaire should be sent with the follow-up letter. A response rate of at least 50 per cent is adequate for analysis and reporting, a 60 per cent rate is good, and a 70 per cent or more is very good. For this study, a neatly reproduced instrument was mailed to each participant along with a cover letter and return envelope. The return rate graph was used to log returned instruments. A follow-up letter and new copy of the evaluation instrument were mailed three weeks after the first mailing.

According to Gronlund, after the instrument has been constructed, it should be rechecked to insure a quality instrument. The improvement of ratings requires careful attention to selection of the characteristics to be rated, design of the rating form and conditions under which the ratings are obtained. Gronlund (1976, p. 445) advanced six principles of effective rating scales that summarize the most important considerations in the construction and use of numeric rating scales:

- 1) Characteristics should be educationally significant.
- 2) Characteristics should be directly observable.
- 3) Characteristics and points on the scale should be clearly defined.
- 4) Between three and seven rating positions should be provided and raters should be permitted to mark at intermediate points.
- 5) Raters should be instructed to omit ratings where they feel unqualified to judge.
- 6) Ratings from several observers should be combined, whenever possible.

In Essentials of Educational Research, Good (1972, p. 231)

provided a standard summary of criteria for construction of questionnaires including nine items:

- 1) It must be short enough so as not to take too much time and so that the respondent will not reject it completely.
- 2) It must be of sufficient interest and have enough face appeal so that the respondent will be inclined to respond to it and to complete it.
- 3) The questionnaire should obtain some depth to the response in order to avoid superficial replies.
- 4) The ideal questionnaire must not be too suggestive or too unstimulating, particularly with reference to choices.
- 5) The questionnaire should elicit responses that are definite, but not mechanically forced.
- 6) Questions must be asked in such a way that the responses will not be embarrassing to the individual.
- 7) Questions must be asked in such a manner as to allay suspicion on the part of the respondent concerning hidden purposes in the questionnaire.
- 8) The questionnaire must not be too narrow, restrictive, or limited in its scope or philosophy.
- 9) The response to the questionnaire must be valid, and the entire body of data taken as a whole must answer the basic question for which the questionnaire was designed.

The criteria suggested by Gronlund and Good were used as a final review of the evaluation instrument developed in this study to insure that the best possible instrument had been constructed.

Developing a well-designed evaluation instrument is not an easy task, but a well-designed instrument can be expected to have fewer rater errors and to have more useful and reliable ratings. The numerical rating scale developed for this study was designed following Ten Brink's five steps for constructing a rating scale. These five steps cover all areas of construction from selecting the criteria, to writing the individual items, to defining and arranging the scale, and finally to writing the instructions. Suggestions by other authors

also were incorporated into this review of literature and design of the evaluation instrument for this study.

III. VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY

In this final section of the review of related literature, the concepts of validity and reliability and four studies that have developed and validated instruments are reviewed. Gronlund (1976) maintained that validity is the most important quality to consider when selecting or constructing an evaluation instrument and that reliability is the second most important characteristic.

Validity refers to the extent to which the results of an evaluation procedure serve the particular uses for which the results are intended. Validity is always concerned with the specific use to be made of evaluation results and with the soundness of proposed interpretations. Validity pertains to the interpretation to be made from the results of a test or instrument, and not to the instrument itself. Validity is a matter of degree, and does not exist on an all-or-none basis. Validity is always specific to some particular use. Gronlund (1976) described three basic types of validity: content validity, criterion-related validity, and construct validity. Each is discussed below.

Content validity is the extent to which a test measures a representative sample of the subject matter content and behavioral changes under consideration. A test that appears to be a relevant measure, based on superficial examination, is said to have face validity, but this is not a substitute for content validity (Gronlund, 1976). Content validity is a built-in process where test items are developed

or carefully selected during test construction. Developing a test with built-in validity usually does not require significantly more time or effort (Spool, 1975). The basic procedure for determining validity of an instrument is to compare the test content to a list of content and behaviors to be measured and judge the degree to which the content and behaviors are included (Gronlund, 1976).

Criterion-related validity is the extent to which test performance is related to some other valued measure of performance. This includes both predictive and concurrent validity. In the new Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests of the American Psychological Association (1974), the designations of predictive and concurrent validity have been subsumed under the more general category-- criterion-related validity. The procedure to determine criterion-related validity is to compare test scores obtained using the instrument with another measure of performance obtained at a later date (predictive) or obtained concurrently (concurrent), and determine the correlation coefficient. However, for most instruments that are being validated, there is no known valid criterion. Gronlund (1976, p. 92-93) pointed out this difficulty when he stated:

The selection of a satisfactory criterion is one of the most difficult problems in validating a test. For most educational purposes, no adequate criterion of success exists. Those which are used tend to be lacking in comprehensiveness and in most cases provide results that are less stable than those of the test being validated.

According to Oppenheim (1966), in principle, criterion-related validity is not a difficult problem if a criterion can be obtained. A criterion is an independent measure of the same variable, to which

the results of the test or questionnaire can be compared. However, many criteria that might be suggested are themselves unreliable and of doubtful validity. In a great many instances criteria are not available. Attempts at direct validation against a criterion have included essay-type questions, experts' judgments, interviews and case studies, judgments by co-workers and self-ratings. Helmstadter (1964, p. 181) also approached the problem of determining criterion-related validity and suggested that:

Empirical evidence as to the general efficacy of rating scales is difficult, if not impossible, to obtain. In the first place, rating scales are often constructed and used in those situations where other measurement approaches are exceedingly difficult to apply. Thus criterion data against which to compare the results of rating scales are often not readily available. In the second place, whether or not a particular rating scale will be valid depends on the particular behavior observed, on the opportunity the raters have had to make the observations, and on the care with which the scale has been constructed.

Construct validity is the extent to which test performance can be interpreted in terms of certain psychological constructs. The psychological theory underlying the instrument is being validated. According to Erickson (1976), the process to determine construct validity involves synthesis of observation, reasoning and experimentation and rarely reaches 100 per cent completion. The procedure is to logically study the instrument to identify the psychological constructs underlying it, and to formulate hypotheses to test these constructs experimentally.

Anderson (1975, p. 459) defined construct validity as the "degree to which scores on a measure permit inferences about underlying traits." Construct validity is usually estimated from patterns

of correlation of the measure in question with other measures. Two subcategories of construct validity of special concern to those evaluating educational programs are population and ecological validity. Anderson (1975, p. 459) indicated that the researcher is concerned with the questions: "Does a measure have the same meaning - measure the same processes or traits - in different population groups?" and "Does a measure have the same meaning in different environmental settings - can we generalize the results to different situations?"

Selltiz (1976) declared that the most significant problem in the use of rating scales has to do with their validity. Examination of relevant literature reveals that whereas evaluation of the reliability of rating scales is common, measures of validity are rarely reported. The reason being the lack of available external criteria against which ratings can be compared. Selltiz (1976, p. 411) concluded that investigators have assumed that their scales were valid when the following conditions were met:

- 1) the attributes being measured were relatively "objective" so that their meaning would be uniformly understood by raters using the scales; and
- 2) the ratings were obtained under optimal conditions including carefully constructed scales, trained judges, and specified common frames of reference.

Fox (1969, p. 371) stated that all the procedures to produce a statistical estimate of validity require the researcher to have available some other criterion measure as indicated below:

This necessity to have an already existing criterion or alternative measure available before validity can be estimated statistically is the reason we see the statistical estimates of validity in the literature relatively seldom. The simple and unhappy truth is that in the social disciplines we do not have very many existing measures or criteria of sufficient relevance, reliability,

and validity in their own right for researchers to be willing to use them as the basis for estimating the validity of a new instrument.

Without a meaningful criterion measure, content or face validity are preferable to a statistical estimate of validity based on a concocted criteria.

No valid instrument could be found to evaluate consumer and homemaking programs. This fact created the need for the present study, but at the same time makes validation of the evaluation instrument developed in this study a difficult problem. The criteria upon which the instrument is based were validated by Buero and Harrison who obtained the data for verifying the criteria from the people actually involved with consumer and homemaking programs--the persons who should know best what criteria are necessary for evaluating consumer and homekaing programs. Therefore, the instrument was determined to have content validity by the process of the researcher's committee members checking to determine if each essential criteria were appropriately included. Since no valid criterion against which to compare the evaluation instrument could be found, it was deemed impossible to determine the criterion-related validity of the instrument developed in this study. Using Anderson's definition of construct validity, it was possible to determine the construct validity of the evaluation instrument. Four different populations used the instrument to evaluate consumer and homemaking programs and the four ratings for each criterion statement were correlated.

After validity has been considered, the second most important quality to consider when constructing an evaluation instrument is reliability. Reliability provides the consistency which makes validity possible and indicates how much confidence can be placed in the results.

Reliability refers to the consistency of evaluation results from one measurement to another. A reliable measure is not necessarily valid. Reliability is primarily a statistical concept, reported in terms of a reliability coefficient or the standard error measurement (Gronlund, 1976).

Reliability coefficients are determined by several different methods and each method provides a different estimate of consistency. The methods are similar in that all of them involve correlating two sets of data, obtained either from the same evaluation instrument or from equivalent forms of the same procedure. Coefficients of stability are correlations between scores obtained from test and retest of the same individuals with some significant time period between. Coefficients of equivalence are correlations between scores from two equivalent forms of the test administered to the same individuals. Coefficients of internal consistency are quantitative estimates of the accuracy of the test itself based on internal analysis of scores obtained on a single administration of the instrument. This analysis may be made by correlating the scores on two halves of the test or by applying the Kuder-Richardson formula (Erickson, 1976).

In the present study, reliability of the evaluation instrument was determined using a test-retest procedure. Consumer and homemaking teachers in East Tennessee used the evaluation instrument to rate their programs and two weeks later they again evaluated their programs. Correlation coefficients were determined for the test-retest ratings on each criterion statement.

Numerous studies that developed and validated an instrument were identified in the literature. Most of these instruments were to

test skills or knowledge that could easily provide a criterion measure, such as arithmetic ability, stenographic skills, and physical education skills. Studies by Watanabe (1976), Wilder (1977), Hirst (1974), and Dale (1977) have implications for the present study and are reviewed in this section.

The Watanabe Study

The basic purpose of the Watanabe study was to determine the extent of identified teaching/coordination qualities of teacher-coordinators of secondary cooperative vocational education programs in Tennessee and Virginia. A secondary purpose was to develop rating sheets for teacher-coordinators and student-learners to collect data.

Watanabe utilized the 385 pedagogical performance requirements for teacher-coordinators that were identified by Cotrell in 1972. The 385 performance requirements had been divided into ten categories and further divided by factor analysis into 127 module titles within the categories. These 385 requirements were only identified with no evaluative procedure to determine their existence in the classroom.

For Watanabe's study, a panel of eight consultants reviewed the module titles and narrowed the performance requirements to those which could be directly identifiable by student-learners as either relating to classroom instruction or correlating classroom instruction with the students' learning activities on the job. The remaining module titles were reworded for clarity, understanding and readability, and comprised the preliminary rating instrument consisting of 58 items divided into four categories. A five-point scale ranging from "excellent," "above average," "average," "below average," and "poor" was established.

The rating sheet developed by Watanabe was field tested at South High School, Knoxville, Tennessee, in three cooperative education classes. Teacher-coordinators and student-learners reacted to the rating sheet and rated the teacher-coordinator; one week later the instrument was readministered. The results of teacher rating sheets and student rating sheets were correlated using Pearson Product Moment Correlation to establish reliability of the instrument.

The Watanabe study is similar to the present study in that a previous study provides a large number of characteristics that must be reduced into a manageable number for an evaluation instrument. The procedures in the Watanabe study using a panel to validate the content of the instrument and to determine reliability through test-retest were used in the present study.

The Wilder Study

Wilder's study was concerned with the development and validation of a survey instrument which could be easily adapted by vocational education information systems across the country for the purpose of determining user information needs. Through a review of literature, content areas commonly used in information needs surveys were identified; and sample items were compiled into Draft I of the Information Needs Inventory for Vocational Educators. A jury of experts reacted to Draft I, judging whether or not the questions were essential for an information needs survey.

Draft II of the instrument was compiled from the essential questions, and the same jury judged the clarity of the questions, instructions page and overall appropriateness of the content of the

instrument. Draft III was sent to a validation panel with instructions for judging whether or not its contents were representative of its intended use. Draft IV was returned to the original jury of experts to verify approval of changes suggested by the validation panel.

A pretest of Draft IV (the final draft of the instrument) was conducted, and the sample selection, mail-out procedures, and analysis tried out. Wilder recommends a test-retest reliability study to determine whether the questionnaire consistently yields the same data, and additional testing of the instrument through simultaneous interviewing and comparing results.

The Wilder study has several implications for the present study. Whereas the Wilder study was directed toward developing and validating a survey instrument for vocational education information systems to determine user information needs, this study involved the development and validation of an instrument to evaluate consumer and homemaking programs. The techniques of the Wilder study gave direction for the present study. Two groups also reacted to the evaluation instrument developed in the present study. Members of the researcher's committee reviewed the instrument for content coverage and clarity. A panel of vocational education graduate students, who represented the actual persons who would be using the evaluation instrument, reacted to the final draft of the instrument for clarity and usefulness. As recommended by Wilder for her instrument, a test-retest reliability study was done in the present study.

The Hirst Study

One of the purposes of the Hirst study was to develop and validate a set of activities which could be utilized by occupational

education institutions during the self-study phase of the accreditation process. During Phase I of the study, a preliminary listing of 96 self-study activities was developed from the literature. A jury of 22 experts in occupational education was used to further develop, refine and validate the list. Two probes of the jury resulted in 130 activities divided into five sections receiving greater than 80 per cent concurrence of the jurors. These 130 activities were retained for the final instrument. A seven-point scale ranging from "not useful" to "extremely useful" was developed.

During Phase II, the survey instrument was administered to 240 randomly selected administrators, instructors, counselors, and supervisors in 72 occupational education institutions in seven southern states. A mean utility rating and percent of respondents performing figure was calculated for each activity. Chi-square was used to determine whether there were differences in perception of utility by administrators, instructors, counselors, and supervisors. Reliability of the instrument was determined by use of Alpha Coefficient.

The Hirst study was directed toward developing and validating a set of activities for the self-study phase of accreditation, rather than an evaluation instrument. The use of four groups of users, and comparison between the differences in perception in Hirst's study suggested the use of four groups of potential users and comparing their ratings used in the present study.

The Dale Study

The purposes of the Dale study were to design and validate an evaluation system for the Vocational Training Adult Education (VTAE)

Field/Community Services programs in Wisconsin. The system was to include self-evaluation and visitation evaluation procedures and instrumentation.

Project activities included: 1) reviewing evaluation literature pertaining to adult continuing education activities; 2) identifying state-wide goals and objectives and major functions of the VTAE Field/Community Services; 3) designing a comprehensive evaluation model which included instrumentation and procedures for program self-evaluation and on-site team evaluation; 4) pilot testing all phases of the evaluation procedure at one of the VTAE centers; 5) revising the final evaluation model from the pilot test; and 6) conducting a second pilot test at another VTAE center. Early in the project an advisory committee of VTAE instructors and supervisors was identified to react to and provide input for the evaluation model procedures and instrumentation. This committee served as a "validating sounding board" for the self-evaluation instrument and procedures.

The Dale study suggested the idea of using two groups to evaluate the same program and compare the evaluation ratings that was used in the present study. The advisory committee used in the Dale study was also carried over to the present study with the researcher's committee members being used to check the content validity of the instrument against the validated criteria.

IV. SUMMARY

Program evaluation in vocational education is a systematic and continuous process of obtaining valid and reliable data for judging the

effectiveness of programs in relation to acceptable criteria and objectives. In order for effective evaluation of consumer and homemaking programs to take place, better evaluation methodology and instruments are needed. Recent research in evaluation of vocational education programs was reviewed in this chapter, cumulating in the studies by Buero and Harrison that validated the criteria for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. The research review provided a basis for the evaluation instrument developed in the present study.

Instrument construction is not an easy task. But a well-constructed instrument can be expected to produce fewer rater errors and more useful and reliable ratings. The steps for constructing a numerical rating scale were discussed in the second section of this chapter, along with the guidelines and suggestions that were followed to construct the evaluation instrument used in the study.

Validity and reliability are the most important qualities to consider when constructing an evaluation instrument. Validity refers to the extent to which an evaluation instrument measures what it is supposed to measure; while reliability refers to the consistency of evaluation results from one measurement to another. Types of validity and reliability were reviewed in the third section of this chapter, along with the methodology for determining each type. This chapter also included selected studies having implications and giving direction to the present study.

Chapter III includes the methods and procedures utilized to conduct the present research study.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The purposes of this study were to develop and to validate an instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. This chapter describes the methodology involved in conducting the study. The study, which was classified as descriptive, was conducted in three phases: construction of the instrument, pilot testing of the instrument, and use of the instrument by different population groups to evaluate consumer and homemaking programs. Each phase is explained below.

I. CONSTRUCTION OF THE INSTRUMENT

A comprehensive review of related literature was conducted to identify the type of instrument to be used and the methodology for constructing an instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. A wide variety of evaluation forms were collected and reviewed to aid in determining the format for the instrument.

An evaluation instrument was constructed based on the criteria verified as essential for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs by Buero (1979) and Harrison (1979). In the Buero and Harrison studies, home economics supervisors, vocational directors and teacher educators in each of the fifty states and home economics teachers and local vocational directors in Tennessee were asked to indicate the importance of 207 criterion statements on a six-point Likert scale (6-strongly agree, 5-moderately agree, 4-mildly agree, 3-mildly

disagree, 2-moderately disagree, and 1-strongly disagree).

For the present study, the 175 criterion statements which received a 5.0 or higher mean rating by any four of the five groups of raters were included (see Table A-1, Appendix A, for the 207 criterion statements and mean ratings). These 175 criterion statements were grouped into 25 categories or concept areas by the researcher. The grouping of the criteria into concept areas was confirmed by the home economics teacher educator on the researcher's committee. Recommended changes were made and the concept categories revised. The categories were: Development of Program, Written Philosophy, Scope and Sequence, Curriculum, Objectives and Goals, Content, Free of Sex Bias and Discrimination, Future Homemakers of America, Program Outcomes, Instructional Methods, Instructional Materials and Supplies, Administration of Local Program, Teacher Background and Qualifications, Teacher Professional Growth and Development, Teacher Personal Qualities, Meeting Individual Differences, Advisory Committee, Public Relations, Evaluation, Facilities, Equipment, Safety, Storage, Financial Resources, and Department Housekeeping.

The instrument format for the present study (See Appendix B for copy of evaluation instrument) was based upon the "Career Competency Evaluation Form" developed by Purcell (1976), and the "Student Teacher Competencies" form developed by the University of Montevallo, Department of Home Economics (1975). A concept was given, and the criterion statements that supported the concept were listed. Each criterion statement was to be rated on a scale of 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, and 1-Weak. An "Unable to Judge" rating was also included for

situations in which not enough information was available or the criterion statement was not applicable to the program being evaluated. The program evaluator was instructed to judge each criteria and place a check mark in the appropriate box representing his/her rating of the concept.

The instrument designed in the current study was a numerical rating scale. A rating scale consists of a set of characteristics or behaviors to be judged and some type of scale for indicating the degree to which each attribute is present. According to Helmstadter (1964), all rating methods are classified under the psychometric scaling technique called successive intervals. Each of the stimuli under consideration is placed into one of a limited number of intervals or categories ordered along some continuum; thus creating an ordinal measurement. The practical advantages of such a scale are that it takes less time, can be used with a large number of subjects, and seems to work well with untrained raters. All of these characteristics are applicable for the users of the evaluation instrument that was developed. In order to relieve common rater errors, the instrument was constructed with the high end on the left and did not change direction.

The instrument was checked for content coverage and clarity by a panel of experts. Each was given a list of the criteria which were to have been included and a copy of the instrument; and each committee member was asked to determine if each criteria were appropriately included. The instrument was revised as suggested by the panel of experts and rechecked. This process of judging that the instrument adequately and appropriately included the criteria validated by Harrison and Buero determined the content validity of the instrument.

Vocational-technical education graduate students in a seminar at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, read the instrument and made suggestions to improve its clarity and usefulness during the spring quarter, 1979. These graduate students represented a cross-section of persons who would actually be using the instrument. Five were full-time graduate students in Home Economics Education who had taught or soon would be teaching consumer and homemaking programs; three were presently teaching consumer and homemaking courses; one was a Tennessee state specialist for business education; and one was a physical education teacher majoring in Educational Administration and Supervision. The instrument was revised as the graduate students suggested. The final revised instrument is presented in Appendix B.

II. PILOT TEST OF THE INSTRUMENT

The evaluation instrument was pilot tested to determine its usability and reliability. The test-retest method was used for establishing the reliability. Fifteen teachers in East Tennessee were selected to participate in the pilot study. The teachers were sent a letter explaining the purposes of the study and asking them to participate in the study (for letter see Appendix C). By returning an enclosed postcard, the teachers indicated their willingness to evaluate their program using the evaluation instrument; ten teachers indicated a willingness to participate.

The evaluation instrument along with cover letter, informed consent form, and return envelope were mailed to the ten participants (see Appendix D for cover letter). Participants were asked to

evaluate their consumer and homemaking program using the evaluation instrument and to return it along with the informed consent form. Each participant returned the first copy of the evaluation instrument and informed consent form.

Two weeks following the initial mail-out of the evaluation instrument, the ten teachers were asked to evaluate their programs again to determine the reliability of the instrument using the test-retest method. The teachers were sent a cover letter, evaluation instrument and return envelope (see Appendix E for cover letter). Eight teachers returned the second evaluation instrument within two weeks. The other two teachers were telephoned to encourage them to return the second evaluation instrument; these two instruments were returned by the end of the third week.

Each criterion statement was rated on a scale of 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, and 1-Weak. An "Unable to Judge" (UJ) rating was also included for situations in which not enough information was available or the criterion statement was not applicable to the program being evaluated. Since a meaningful number could not be assigned to the UJ ratings, they were omitted from the calculations.

Both sets of evaluation instruments had been coded prior to being mailed out. The responses to each criterion statement for the first and second mail-outs were recorded on a chart so that responses could be compared. Data obtained from the 10 programs is reported in Table A-2, Appendix F. For each program a total score for the test and a total score for the retest were determined by adding the ratings for that program. The total scores for the tests for the ten programs were ranked, as were the total scores for the retests.

Correlation coefficients were determined by using Spearman Rho Rank Order Correlation (r_s) for the difference (d) in test-retest ranks on the total scores. Spearman Rho Rank Order Correlation can be used to test for a significant relationship when there is ordinal data, only two groups, and less than 30 cases to be compared. Siegel (1956) provides a formula for calculating the Spearman Rho Rank Order Correlation:

$$r_s = 1 - \frac{6(\sum d^2)}{N^3 - N}, \text{ where } d = \text{the difference in ranks, and} \\ N = \text{the number of programs rated.}$$

This formula was used to calculate the r_s for the total scores of the ten programs. All calculations were made on a Texas Instruments Programmable 59 calculator. The level of significance was set at .05. Siegel states that for a N of 10, the critical value of r_s for the .05 level of significance (one-tailed test) is 0.564.

Data on reliability of the instrument is analyzed and reported in Chapter IV. The usability of the evaluation instrument is reported in Chapter V.

III. USE OF EVALUATION INSTRUMENT BY DIFFERENT GROUPS

Anderson (1975) indicated that construct validity has two subcategories: population and ecological validity. For population and ecological validity, the researcher is concerned with answering the question, "Does the measure have the same meaning or measure the same process or traits in different population groups, or in different environmental settings?". To ascertain the construct validity of the evaluation instrument in this study, different

populations used the instrument to evaluate consumer and homemaking programs.

A convenience sample of five states in the southeastern region of the United States was selected (Florida, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, and Tennessee). The state supervisor for home economics in each of these five states was asked to submit the names and addresses of six consumer and homemaking programs to be evaluated. They were also asked to supply the names and addresses of a regional home economics supervisor, a home economics teacher educator, and another consumer and homemaking teacher who were familiar with the program and would be able to evaluate it (See Appendix G for letter and Appendix H for form to suggest names).

Each of the state supervisors responded by returning the requested names and addresses. The Occupational Program Director for Home Economics Education for the State of Florida requested that the district superintendent of each teacher be contacted for permission to ask the teachers to participate. She also suggested informing the district home economics supervisor that the study was being conducted. The six district superintendents were sent letters requesting their permission for the consumer and homemaking teachers to participate in the study. They were to indicate their permission by returning an enclosed postcard (see Appendix I for cover letter). Copies of these letters were sent to the district home economics supervisor and the Occupational Program Director, five of the six district superintendents returned the postcard giving permission for their consumer and homemaking teachers to participate in the study. The

sixth district superintendent indicated that the request had been referred to the district's Educational Research committee. Permission for the consumer and homemaking teachers from this district to participate in the study was not received in time for the first mailout.

The teachers of the six consumer and homemaking programs to be evaluated from Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina and Tennessee, and the five from Florida were mailed evaluation instruments, informed consent forms, return envelopes and a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study (see Appendix J for cover letter). The regional supervisors, teacher educators, and the other consumer and homemaking teachers were mailed evaluation instruments, informed consent forms, return envelopes and a cover letter explaining the purpose of the study (see Appendix K for cover letter). Each participant was notified that she had been identified by her state supervisor to participate in the study. The teachers, regional supervisors, and teacher educators were asked to rate the consumer and homemaking program and return the evaluation instruments to the researcher along with the informed consent form.

At the end of three weeks, 81 of the 116 evaluation instruments had been returned. Non-respondents were followed up by a second letter three and a half weeks after the first mailing. Non-respondents were important to this study because they could have represented a different quality program which would have affected the representativeness of the sample. After the follow-up letter, an additional 25 persons responded. These later respondents were tabulated separately to determine if a difference existed between early respondents and later respondents who could be expected to be similar to non-respondents.

Mann-Whitney U was used to determine if there was a significant difference between respondents and non-respondents. Mann-Whitney U is a non-parametric procedure for testing whether two independent groups have been drawn from the same population.

Siegel (1956) provides a formula for determining Mann-Whitney U:

$$U = n_1 n_2 + \frac{n_1(n_1 + 1)}{2} - R_1, \text{ where } n_1 = \text{the number of cases in the smaller group,}$$

$n_2 = \text{the number of cases in the larger group, and}$

$R_1 = \text{sum of ranks assigned to the group whose sample size is } n_1.$

With an n_2 larger than 20 (as was the case in this study), the significance of an observed value of U is determined by using the formula:

$$z = \frac{U - \mu_U}{\sigma_U}, \text{ where } \mu_U = \frac{n_1 n_2}{2}, \text{ and } \sigma_U = \frac{n_1 n_2 (n_1 + n_2 + 1)}{12}.$$

Siegel (1956) indicates that when a considerable number of ties are present in the data (as was the case in this study), a correction factor must be incorporated into the computation of z. The correction factor is T:

$$T = \frac{t^3 - t}{12}, \text{ where } t = \text{the number of observations tied at a given rank.}$$

With the correction for ties, z (Siegel) is:

$$z \text{ (Siegel)} = \frac{U - \frac{n_1 n_2}{2}}{\sqrt{\frac{n_1 n_2}{N(n-1)} \left(\frac{N^3 - N}{12} - \sum T \right)}}, \text{ where } N = n_1 + n_2.$$

These formulae were used to calculate the U and z (Siegel) for each criterion statement. The level of significance was set at .05.

Siegel presents tables for determining the probability of z (Siegel) for a one-tailed test. Data on the U's and their significance is analyzed and reported in Chapter IV.

A total of 106, or 91.37 per cent, of the evaluation instruments were returned. The group classification of the evaluation instruments returned by the four groups of raters were as follows: 27 teachers of consumer and homemaking programs, 24 other consumer and homemaking teachers; 29 home economics regional supervisors; and 26 home economics teacher educators. Sixteen persons who returned the evaluation instrument stated they were unable to rate the program as requested, resulting in 90, or 84.91 per cent, of the returned instruments being usable for the study. These usable instruments provided by the four groups of raters were as follows: 26 teachers of consumer and home-making programs, 22 other consumer and homemaking teachers; 24 home economics regional supervisors; and 18 home economics teacher educators.

The evaluation instruments had been coded prior to being mailed out. The responses to each criterion statement were recorded on charts so that responses could be compared and ranked. No evaluation instruments were returned for one program, one evaluation instrument was returned for two programs, two evaluation instruments were returned for one program, three evaluation instruments were returned for fourteen programs, and all four evaluation instruments were returned for eleven programs. The one program with no evaluation forms returned, and the two programs with one evaluation form returned were omitted from the

data, resulting in 26 of the 29 programs being included in the study. Each criterion statement was rated on a scale of 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, and 1-Weak. An "unable to judge" (UJ) rating was also included for situations in which not enough information was available or the criterion statement was not applicable to the program being evaluated. Since a meaningful number could not be assigned to the UJ ratings, they were omitted from the calculations. This resulted in some criterion statements having fewer than 26 programs to be compared.

The ratings for each criterion statement for each consumer and homemaking program from the teacher, regional supervisor, home economics teacher educator and another consumer and homemaking teacher were compared using Friedman's Analysis of Variance (Xr^2). Friedman's Analysis of Variance is used to test for significant difference among k matched groups, when there is at least ordinal data. Siegel (1956) provides a formula for Friedman's Analysis of Variance:

$$Xr^2 = \frac{12}{Nk(k+1)} \sum (R_j)^2 - 3N(k+1), \text{ where } k = \text{number of raters,}$$

N = number of statements, and

R_j = sum of ranks.

Xr^2 is distributed approximately as chi square with $df = k - 1$, when N and/or k are not too small. Siegel provides exact probability tables for k 's and n 's smaller than $k = 4$, $N = 4$, and chi square tables for k 's and N 's larger than four.

The above formula was used to calculate the Xr^2 for each criterion statement for each program to determine if there was a significant difference between ratings by the different evaluators. The level of significance was set at .05. Programs in which the raters

did not show a significant difference were classified as showing agreement among the raters, while programs in which raters showed a significant difference were classified as showing disagreement among the raters. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters, the number of programs included in the calculations, and the number of persons who were unable to judge the program were tabulated for each criterion statement. Criterion statements showing a significant difference among raters for any of the 26 programs are reported in Table A-3, Appendix M.

In order to determine if the number of programs showing agreement among the raters is significant, a binomial test should be applied. Hays (1972) provides the formula for a binomial test:

$$z = \frac{X - \mu_X}{\sigma_X}, \text{ where } \mu_X = N(.5), \sigma_X = N(.25),$$

X = number of programs showing agreement, and

N = total number of programs.

When N is larger than 20, standard z tables may be used to interpret the z scores. Hays provides tables of exact binomial probabilities for N 's less than 20, and standard z tables.

The above formula was used to calculate the z scores for each criterion statement. The level of significance was set at .05. Data on the number of raters showing agreement and z scores are analyzed and reported in Chapter IV. Chapter V summarizes the usability of the evaluation instrument.

CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purposes of this study were to develop and to validate an evaluation instrument for consumer and homemaking programs. The instrument was constructed following the methodology discussed in Chapter III. Validating the instrument involved two phases as were outlined in Chapter II and Chapter III: 1) determining the instrument's reliability and 2) determining its construct validity. These two phases are discussed in this chapter.

I. ANALYZING DATA FOR RELIABILITY

A pilot study was conducted as described in Chapter III to determine the reliability of the evaluation instrument through a test-retest procedure. The evaluation instrument consisting of 25 categories with 145 criterion statements was administered twice to ten consumer and homemaking teachers in East Tennessee with a two- to three-week interval between each administration. Spearman Rho Rank Order Correlation (r_s) was chosen as the appropriate statistical tool for use with the ordinal data collected from two groups of less than 30 cases. Since a meaningful number could not be assigned to the "UJ" (Unable to Judge) ratings, they were omitted from the calculations.

For each program a total score for the test and a total score for the retest were calculated. Total scores for the test, and then total scores for the retest were ranked, and the r_s value for total scores calculated. The formula that was used to make the r_s calculations

was discussed in Chapter III (p. 45). Calculations were made by entering the data into a Texas Instruments Programmable 59 calculator into which the Spearman Rho Rank Order Correlation formula had been programmed. The level of significance was set at .05. Siegel (1956) provides tables indicating that for an N of 10, the critical value of r_s for the .05 level of significance (one-tailed test) is 0.564.

The Spearman Rho Rank Order Correlation for the test-retest total scores for the ten programs included in this pilot study was 0.9030. This r_s value is significant at the .05 level, indicating that the evaluation instrument has a significant level of reliability as determined by the test-retest method. Table 1 presents the total scores for the test and total scores for the retest for each of the ten programs and their respective ranks. (The reliability data obtained by the test-retest method from the ten programs is reported in Table A-2, Appendix F.)

Twenty-five of the 145 criterion statements included in the evaluation instrument received "unable to judge" (UJ) ratings from one or more of the ten teachers in the pilot study. For ten of the 25 criterion statements receiving an "UJ" rating, the corresponding test or retest rating was the lowest rating, "1-Weak." This finding suggests that the rater may have confused the "UJ" column with the lowest rating column which was adjacent to the "UJ" column, indicating that the "UJ" column should be physically separated from the rating columns. Table 2 lists the 25 criterion statements that received "UJ" ratings, and their test-retest ratings. None of the criterion statements received more than three "UJ" ratings from the 10 programs; only seven criterion statements received two or more "UJ" ratings.

TABLE 1. Test-Retest Reliability Rank Order Correlation¹

Program ²	Test Total Score	Test Rank	Retest Total Score	Retest Rank
A	563	4	563	6
B	477	10	445	10
C	661	1	661	1
D	552	6	545	7
E	655	2	638	2
F	547	7	590	4
G	588	3	624	3
H	530	9	529	8
I	558	5	565	5
J	541	8	495	9

¹ $r_s = 0.9030$ (Significant at the .05 level).

²Consumer and homemaking program

TABLE 2. Criterion Statements Receiving "Unable to Judge" (UJ) Ratings¹ in the Pilot Study

Criterion Statements	T-R ²
2. Written Philosophy	
a. Conforms with school's philosophy and objectives and is an integral part of the total school curriculum	UJ-UJ ³
3. Scope and Sequence	
a. Developed for grades 7 through 12	UJ-UJ UJ-UJ UJ-4
9. Program Outcomes	
b. Contribute to employability of youth and adults in the dual role of homemaker and wage earner	UJ-3
12. Administration of Local Program	
e. Provides for coordination of total district program by home economics educator	UJ-4
f. Involves advisory committee in program evaluation and improvement	UJ-4
g. Utilizes advisory committee recommendations and suggestions	UJ-4
i. Provides reimbursement for teachers to attend professional meetings	UJ-UJ UJ-5
14. Teacher Professional Growth and Development	
d. Utilizes regularly scheduled meetings of district home economics staff for program improvement	UJ-5
15. Teacher Personal Qualities	
i. Demonstrates responsiveness to supervision by implementing recommended modifications to improve program	UJ-UJ

TABLE 2. (continued)

Criterion Statements	T-R ²
16. Meeting Individual Differences	
c. Handicapped students are mainstreamed when mutually beneficial	UJ-UJ 3-UJ
d. Individualized educational plans are on file for each handicapped student	UJ-UJ UJ-UJ 1-UJ
17. Advisory Committee	
a. Includes:	
1. Parents	UJ-1
2. Administrators	UJ-UJ UJ-1
3. Community members with consumer and homemaking interests	UJ-1
b. Assists in improving and expanding home economics program	UJ-1
c. Meets at least twice a year	UJ-1
d. Maintains records of planned agenda for each meeting	UJ-1
e. Assists in interpreting homemaking program to community	UJ-1
f. Staggers membership appointments for continuity	UJ-1
g. Maintains liasion with homemaking teacher	UJ-1
19. Evaluation	
d. Satisfactory provision for: 3. Heating	UJ-5

TABLE 2. (continued)

Criterion Statements	T-R ²
22. Safety	
a. Fire extinguishers are:	
1. Located in department	UJ-UJ
2. Inspected regularly	UJ-5 3-UJ
3. Usable by students and teachers	UJ-UJ 3-UJ
24. Financial Resources	
c. Adequate funds provided for:	
2. Experimental activities	UJ-5

¹For each criterion statement, one set of ratings indicates that only one of the ten programs had an "Unable to Judge" rating; two sets of ratings indicate that two of the ten programs had an "Unable to Judge" rating; three sets of ratings indicate that three of the ten programs had an "Unable to Judge" rating.

²First rating labeled "Test" (T): second rating labeled "Retest" (R).

³Rating scale used was 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, 1-Weak, and UJ-Unable to Judge.

This finding suggests that there is a need for an "Unable to Judge" rating, because some criterion statements are viewed as not applicable to the program being rated, or not enough information is available to judge the criterion statement. However, the "UJ" rating was not used to excess by the raters in the pilot study; therefore reliability of the instrument was not greatly affected.

The findings, conclusions, and recommendations based on the data collected in the pilot study are presented in Chapter V.

II. ANALYZING DATA FOR CONSTRUCT VALIDITY

The study was conducted as described in Chapter III to determine the usability and validity of the evaluation instrument. The evaluation instrument consisting of 25 categories with 145 criterion statements was mailed to the 116 persons who were to evaluate the 29 consumer and homemaking programs included in the study. The 116 evaluators included 58 consumer and homemaking teachers, 29 home economics regional supervisors, and 29 home economics teacher educators in five southeastern states. In the following sections, representativeness of the sample and use of the evaluation instrument by different groups are discussed.

Representativeness of Sample

Responses from early respondents and later respondents who could be expected to be similar to non-respondents were compared to determine the representativeness of the sample. Non-respondents were important to this study because they could have represented a different quality program. Of the 116 evaluation instruments mailed, a total of 106, or 91.37 per cent, were returned. Eighty-one evaluation instruments were returned in response to the first mail-out; an additional 25 instruments

were returned after the second mail-out. Responses for each criterion statement from the 81 participants who returned the instrument after the first mail-out and the 25 participants who returned it after the second mail-out were compared.

Mann Whitney U was used to determine if there was a significant difference between early respondents and later respondents because it is a non-parametric procedure for testing whether two independent groups have been drawn from the same population. The formulae used to make the Mann Whitney U calculations were discussed in Chapter III, page 48. Calculations were made by entering the data into a Texas Instruments Programmable 59 calculator into which the formulae had been programmed. The level of significance was set at .05 and Siegel's z tables used for determining the critical values of z (Siegel).

The results show similarities in early and later respondents. Of the 145 criterion statements, 140 did not show a significant difference between early respondents and later respondents. Table 3 presents the five criterion statements which showed a significant difference between early respondents and later respondents. The non-respondents in this study can be considered to be similar to the respondents included in the study. Therefore, the representativeness of the sample was not adversely affected by non-respondents.

Use of Evaluation Instrument by Different Groups

Responses for each criterion statement for each consumer and homemaking program from the teacher of the program, home economics regional supervisor, home economics teacher educator, and another consumer and homemaking teacher were compared to determine if there was a significant difference in ratings among the different evaluators for

TABLE 3. Criterion Statements Showing a Significant Difference Between Early and Later Respondents

Criterion Statements	U value	z value
16. Meeting Individual Differences		
d. Individualized educational plans are on file for each handicapped student	84.5	-2.283 *
17. Advisory Committee		
a. Includes:		
2. Administrators	212.5	-2.032 *
f. Staggers membership appointments for continuity	168.5	-1.665 *
20. Facilities		
d. Satisfactory provision for:		
5. Acoustical factors	354.5	-1.825 *
22. Safety		
a. Fire Extinguishers are:		
1. Located in department	175.5	-2.219 *

*Significant at the .05 level

each program. No evaluation instruments were returned for one program, one evaluation instrument was returned for two programs, two evaluation instruments were returned for one program, three evaluation instruments were returned for fourteen programs, and all four evaluation instruments were returned for eleven programs. The one program with no evaluation instruments returned and the two programs with one evaluation instrument returned were omitted from the data, resulting in 26 of the 29 programs being included in the following analysis of the results. Since the data from the 26 programs was very lengthy, only the criterion statements with a significant difference among raters as demonstrated by Xr^2 are listed in Table A-3, Appendix M.

Each criterion statement was rated on a scale of 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, and 1-Weak. An "Unable to Judge" (UJ) rating was also included for situations in which not enough information was available or the criterion statement was not applicable to the program being evaluated. Since a meaningful number could not be assigned to the "UJ" ratings, they were omitted from the calculations. This resulted in some criterion statements having fewer than 26 programs to be compared.

The responses were ranked and Friedman's Analysis of Variance (Xr^2) values calculated for each statement for each program. Friedman's Analysis of Variance was chosen to test for a significant difference in ratings among the different evaluators for each program because it can be used to test for significant difference among k matched groups when there is at least ordinal data. The formula used to make the Xr^2 calculations was discussed in Chapter III, page 50. Calculations were made by entering the data into a Texas Instruments Programmable 59 calculator into which

the formula had been programmed. The level of significance was set at .05. Siegel (1956) indicates that Xr^2 is distributed approximately as chi square with $df = k-1$, when N and/or k are not too small. Siegel's chi square tables, and exact probability tables for Xr^2 were used for determining the critical values of Xr^2 . Programs in which the raters did not show a significant difference were classified as showing agreement among the raters, while programs in which the raters showed a significant difference were classified as showing disagreement among the raters. The programs showing a significant difference among ratings for individual criterion statements are presented in Table A-2, Appendix M.

In order to determine if the number of programs classified as showing agreement among the raters for each criterion statement was significant, a binomial test was applied. The formula used to make a binomial test described by Hays (1972) was presented in Chapter III, page 51. The z values were calculated using the formula. The level of significance was set at .05, and z tables and exact binomial probabilities tables provided by Hays were used for determining the critical values of z . Tables 4 through 29 present the data derived from the use of the evaluation instrument by the four groups of raters, grouped according to the 25 categories of the evaluation instrument. In each table, the category, all the criterion statements in the category, the number of programs showing agreement among the raters as assessed by Xr^2 , the number of programs included in the calculations, the z value indicating the degree of agreement based on the number of programs showing agreement among the raters, and the number of raters who were

unable to judge the program from the 90 raters included in the study are given. An asterisk (*) following the z value indicates significance at the .05 level.

The evaluation instrument demonstrates a high level of construct validity as reflected by the large number of consumer and homemaking programs showing agreement among the evaluators using the evaluation instrument. The z values for 110 of the 145 criterion statements were significant at the .05 level of significance, indicating that the number of programs showing agreement among the evaluators was significant. For an additional 30 criterion statements, even though the number of programs showing agreement among the evaluators was not significant, the number of programs showing agreement among the raters was more than 50 per cent. For 50 of the 145 criterion statements, 10 or more of the 90 raters responded that they were unable to judge the program for that statement. The reasons for these "UJ" ratings as suggested by the raters' written comments are summarized in the discussion of the tables. The description of the data collected for the criterion statements in each of the 25 categories is given below.

Development of Program category. Table 4 includes the four criterion statements grouped under the Development of Program category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for all four of the criterion statements. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Development of Program category demonstrate a significant degree of agreement among raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity.

TABLE 4. Agreement Among Raters for DEVELOPMENT OF PROGRAM Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
1. Development of Program			
a. Based on assessment of social and cultural conditions and needs of community	19/26	2.353 *	6
b. Designed to strengthen family living and human relations	24/26	4.314 *	1
c. Designed to develop improved consumer competence	20/26	2.745 *	1
d. Designed to develop homemaking skills and managerial ability for the dual role of homemaker/wage earner	18/26	1.961 *	2

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

Written Philosophy category. Table 5 includes the two criterion statements grouped under the Written Philosophy category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for both of the criterion statements. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Written Philosophy category demonstrate a significant degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. All eleven of the raters using the "Unable to Judge" rating for criterion statement 2.a. were from outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for this criterion statement.

Scope and Sequence category. Table 6 includes the four criterion statements grouped under the Scope and Sequence category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for three of the four criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion statement 3.a. was not significant at the .05 level, 15 of 24 programs shows a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Scope and Sequence category demonstrate a high degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. The 17 raters using the "Unable to Judge" rating for criterion statement 3.a. may have affected the results for this criterion statement. The 17 raters were equally distributed over the four groups of raters. Written comments from raters using the "UJ" rating suggested that they did not believe the criterion statement was applicable to the program if the school did not include grades 7 through 12.

TABLE 5. Agreement Among Raters for WRITTEN PHILOSOPHY Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
2. Written Philosophy			
a. Conforms with school's philosophy and objectives and is an integral part of the total school curriculum	22/26	3.529 *	11
b. Serves as reference for program planning	18/26	1.961 *	9

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 6. Agreement Among Raters for SCOPE AND SEQUENCE Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
3. Scope and Sequence			
a. Developed for grades 7 through 12	15/24	1.225	17
b. State guidelines followed	21/26	3.137 *	2
c. Introductory and advanced courses articulated	19/26	2.353 *	4
d. Outline for each course available	21/26	3.137 *	3

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

Curriculum category. Table 7 includes the four criterion statements grouped under the Curriculum category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for three of the four criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion statement 4.d. was not significant at the .05 level, 15 of 26 programs shows a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Curriculum category demonstrate a high degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. No reasons were discernible for criterion statement 4.d. not being significant.

Objectives and Goals category. Table 8 includes the four criterion statements grouped under the Objectives and Goals category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for all four of the criterion statements. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Objectives and Goals category demonstrate a significant degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity.

Content category. Table 9 includes the ten criterion statements grouped under the Content category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for nine of the ten criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion statement 6.b.2. was not significant at the .05 level, 17 of 26 programs shows a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Content category

TABLE 7. Agreement Among Raters for CURRICULUM Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
4. Curriculum			
a. Based on student needs, interests, and aptitudes	20/26	2.745 *	1
b. Based on community needs and interests	22/26	3.529 *	3
c. Allows for flexibility and innovation	22/26	3.529 *	3
d. Variety of cultural groups portrayed in positive and non-stereotyped ways	15/26	0.784	6

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 8. Agreement Among Raters for OBJECTIVES AND GOALS Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
5. Objectives and Goals			
a. Written objectives available	21/26	3.137 *	9
b. Reviewed annually for needed changes	20/26	2.745 *	9
c. Realistic and obtainable objectives included	19/26	2.353 *	8
d. Used to give direction to program and student evaluation	18/26	1.961 *	9

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 9. Agreement Among Raters for CONTENT Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
6. Content			
a. Includes comprehensive instruction including but not limited to: housing and home management, consumer education and resource management, child development and guidance, family living and parenthood education, foods and nutrition, textiles and clothing, human relationships and citizenship, and energy conservation.	18/26	1.961 *	3
b. Emphasizes in each area:			
1. Daily life problems	19/26	2.353 *	2
2. Management of time and resources	17/26	1.569	2
3. Consumer education	19/26	2.353 *	2
4. Occupational opportunities in home economics	18/26	1.961 *	6
c. Provides for:			
1. Creativity	18/26	1.961 *	2
2. Flexibility	21/26	3.137 *	2
3. Respect for human values	21/26	3.137 *	2

TABLE 9 (continued)

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
d. Based on state and local curriculum guides	22/26	5.098 *	2
e. Reflects changes in society by being revised within past three years	18/25	2.200 *	7

¹N = 90 raters

* Significant at the .05 level

demonstrate a high degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. No reasons were discernible for criterion statement 6.b.2. not being significant.

Free of Sex Bias and Discrimination category. Table 10 includes the six criterion statements grouped under the Free of Sex Bias and Discrimination category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for five of the six criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion statement 7.e. was not significant at the .05 level, 16 of 26 programs shows a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Free of Sex Bias and Discrimination category demonstrate a high degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. No reasons were discernible for criterion statement 7.e. not being significant. Written comments from raters for criterion statement 7.f. indicated that three consumer and homemaking programs did not sponsor an FHA chapter. These three programs account for eight of the 29 "UJ" ratings, the other 12 "UJ" ratings were all from raters outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for this criterion statement.

Future Homemakers of America category. Table 11 includes the eight criterion statements grouped under the Future Homemakers of America category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for six of the eight criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion

TABLE 10. Agreement Among Raters for FREE OF SEX BIAS AND DISCRIMINATION Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
7. Free of Sex Bias and Discrimination			
a. Eliminates sex bias and discrimination implications in course titles and descriptions	20/26	2.745 *	0
b. Opens all classes to both sexes	25/26	4.706 *	1
c. Objectives focus on shared needs and interests of male and female homemakers	22/26	3.529 *	4
d. Facilities and equipment accommodate male and female students	19/26	2.353 *	1
e. Evidence exists of effort to recruit males	16/26	1.176	6
f. FHA includes male and female members	18/23	2.710 *	20

¹N = 90 raters

* Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 11. Agreement Among Raters for FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
8. Future Homemakers of America			
a. Teacher sponsors an FHA chapter	20/23	3.545 *	9
b. Affiliates with state and national organization	21/23	3.963 *	9
c. Members actively participate in local and district activities	19/23	3.128 *	9
d. Includes FHA experiences in home economics program at all levels	17/23	2.294 *	14
e. Program of work contributes to instructional program	18/23	2.710 *	15
f. Keeps FHA financial reports on file	15/23	1.460	22
g. Student committees contribute to improvement of FHA, school, and community	17/23	2.294 *	12
h. Uses ENCOUNTER and IMPACT processes	5/21	-2.401	24

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

statement 8.f. was not significant at the .05 level, 15 of 23 programs shows a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Future Homemakers of America category, except for criterion statement 8.h., demonstrate a high degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. Written comments from raters indicated that three consumer and homemaking programs did not sponsor an FHA chapter. These three programs account for six of the "UJ" ratings for criterion statements 8.a., 8.b., 8.c., 8.d., 8.e., and 8.g., and for seven of the "UJ" ratings for criterion statements 8.f. and 8.h. The remaining 15 "UJ" ratings for criterion statement 8.f. and the remaining 17 "UJ" ratings for criterion statement 8.h. were from raters outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for these criterion statements. The 22 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 8.f. and the 24 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 8.h. may have affected the results for these criterion statements.

Program Outcomes category. Table 12 includes the three criterion statements grouped under the Program Outcomes category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for all three of the criterion statements. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Program Outcomes category demonstrate a significant degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity.

Instructional Methods category. Table 13 includes the seven criterion statements grouped under the Instructional Methods category.

TABLE 12. Agreement Among Raters for PROGRAM OUTCOMES Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
9. Program Outcomes			
a. Reflect students' ability to be self-directing	21/26	3.137 *	8
b. Contribute to employability of youth and adults in the dual role of homemaker and wage earner	19/26	2.353 *	7
c. Help students develop skills, attitudes and values for working cooperatively with family members and employers	18/26	1.961 *	7

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 13. Agreement Among Raters for INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements		Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
10. Instructional Methods				
a.	Replicate occupation of the homemaker	19/26	2.353 *	3
b.	Use variety of methods daily	24/26	4.314 *	6
c.	Demonstrate ingenuity and initiative	20/26	2.745 *	2
d.	Conform to maturity level of students	21/26	3.137 *	2
e.	Provide individualized instruction for varying abilities of students	18/26	1.961 *	5
f.	Selected in relation to behavioral outcomes desired	18/25	2.200 *	5
g.	Provide opportunities for individual and group participation	19/26	2.353 *	2

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for all seven of the criterion statements. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Instructional Methods category demonstrate a significant degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity.

Instructional Materials and Supplies category. Table 14 includes the four criterion statements grouped under the Instructional Materials and Supplies category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for three of the four criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion statement 11.a.1. was not significant at the .05 level, 17 of 26 programs shows a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Instructional Materials and Supplies category demonstrate a high degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. No reasons were discernible for criterion statement 11.a.1. not being significant.

Administration of Local Program category. Table 15 includes the ten criterion statements grouped under the Administration of Local Program category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for six of the ten criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion statements 12.a., 12.f., and 12.g. were not significant at the .05 level, 15 of 26 programs for criterion statement 12.a., 17 of 26 programs for criterion statement 12.f., and 17 of 26 programs for criterion statement 12.g. show a high level of agreement. The results

TABLE 14. Agreement Among Raters for INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
11. Instructional Materials and Supplies			
a. Sufficient quantity of:			
1. Materials and supplies	17/26	1.569	0
2. Up-to-date textbooks and reference materials	20/26	2.745 *	0
b. Readily accessible to students and teacher	21/26	3.137 *	0
c. Multi-media materials available for all areas	18/26	1.961 *	0

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 15. Agreement Among Raters for ADMINISTRATION OF LOCAL PROGRAM Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
12. Administration of Local Program			
a. Cooperates with teacher in development of total program	15/26	0.784	8
b. Encourages and supports in-service training for teachers	21/26	3.137 *	8
c. Discusses general operational procedures of department with teachers	18/25	2.353 *	18
d. Defines and utilizes lines of authority, communication and responsibility	19/26	2.353 *	15
e. Provides for coordination of total district program by home economics educator	19/26	2.353 *	17
f. Involves advisory committee in program evaluation and improvement	17/26	1.569	23
g. Utilizes advisory committee recommendations and suggestions	17/26	1.569	24
h. Allows teachers to attend professional meetings	19/26	2.353 *	6

TABLE 15 (continued)

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
i. Provides reimbursement for teachers to attend professional meetings	11/24	-0.408	26
j. Schedules at least one planning period per day for each teacher	25/26	4.706 *	5

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

indicate that the criterion statements in the Administration of Local Program category, except for criterion statement 12.i., demonstrate a high degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. Sixteen of the 18 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 12.c., all 15 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 12.d., all 17 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 12.e., 21 of the 23 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 12.f., 22 of the 24 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 12.g., and 23 of the 26 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 12.i. were from outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for these criterion statements. No reasons were discernible for criterion statement 12.a. not being significant. The 23 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 12.f., the 24 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 12.g., and the 26 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 12.i. may have affected the results for these criterion statements.

Teacher Background and Qualifications category. Table 16 includes the four criterion statements grouped under the Teacher Background and Qualifications category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for all four of the criterion statements. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Teacher Background and Qualifications category demonstrate a significant degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity.

TABLE 16. Agreement Among Raters for TEACHER BACKGROUND AND QUALIFICATIONS Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
13. Teacher Background and Qualifications			
a. Holds B.S. degree in Home Economics Education	26/26	5.098 *	0
b. Holds valid vocational homemaking education certificate	26/26	5.098 *	0
c. Recognizes scope of total district and state home economics education program	24/26	4.314 *	2
d. Teacher's qualifications, experiences and interests determine teaching assignments	25/26	4.706 *	8

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

Teacher Professional Growth and Development category. Table 17 includes the five criterion statements grouped under the Teacher Professional Growth and Development category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for all five of the criterion statements. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Teacher Professional Growth and Development category demonstrate a significant degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. All 13 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 14.a., and all 18 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 14.e. were from outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for these criterion statements.

Teacher Personal Qualities category. Table 18 includes the nine criterion statements grouped under the Teacher Personal Qualities category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for all nine of the criterion statements. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Teacher Personal Qualities category demonstrate a significant degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity.

Meeting Individual Differences category. Table 19 includes the four criterion statements grouped under the Meeting Individual Differences category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for one of the four criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion

TABLE 17. Agreement Among Raters for TEACHER PROFESSIONAL GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
14. Teacher Professional Growth and Development			
a. Regularly attends faculty meetings	26/26	5.098 *	13
b. Participates in available in-service programs	24/26	4.314 *	4
c. Demonstrates professionalism by being active member of professional organizations, such as AHEA, AVA, State home economics and vocational association, and local professional and educational groups	20/26	2.745 *	3
d. Utilizes regularly scheduled meetings of district home economics staff for program improvement	21/26	3.137 *	5
e. Continuously reviews professional materials	17/23	2.294 *	18

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 18. Agreement Among Raters for TEACHER PERSONAL QUALITIES Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
15. Teacher Personal Qualities			
a. Demonstrates sensitivity to individual student needs	22/26	3.529 *	0
b. Demonstrates leadership qualities	24/26	4.314 *	0
c. Possesses skills in the organization of subject matter and the teaching-learning process	22/26	3.529 *	0
d. Utilizes daily lesson plans developed from objectives	20/26	2.745 *	7
e. Understands differences among varying social, economic and cultural backgrounds and applies to program	21/26	3.137 *	2
f. Demonstrates organizational ability by effective classroom management	21/26	3.137 *	2
g. Respects and works well with students	24/26	4.314 *	0
h. Works productively, cooperatively and professionally with other academic staff and guidance staff	20/26	2.745 *	4
i. Demonstrates responsiveness to supervision by implementing recommended modifications to improve program	24/26	4.314 *	6

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 19. Agreement Among Raters for MEETING INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
16. Meeting Individual Differences			
a. Individual differences among students are provided for through objectives, goals, curriculum, and instructional methods	17/26	1.569	6
b. Disadvantaged and handicapped students are identified	14/24	0.817	14
c. Handicapped students are mainstreamed when mutually beneficial	19/25	2.600 *	16
d. Individualized educational plans are on file for each handicapped student	7/19	-1.147	46

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

statements 16.a. and 16.b. were not significant at the .05 level, 17 of 26 programs for criterion statement 16.a., and 14 of 24 programs for criterion statement 16.b. show a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Meeting Individual Differences category, except for criterion statement 16.d., demonstrate a satisfactory degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a satisfactory level of construct validity. No reasons were discernible for criterion statement 16.a. not being significant. The 14 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 16.b., and the 46 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 16.d. may have affected the results for this criterion statement. The raters using the "UJ" rating were equally distributed over the four groups of raters. Written comments from raters using the "UJ" rating suggested that criterion statement 16.d. was not applicable to the program because there were no handicapped students enrolled in the program this year.

Advisory Committee category. Table 20 includes the nine criterion statements grouped under the Advisory Committee category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for one of the nine criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion statements 17.a.2., 17.a.3., 17.b., 17.c., 17.d., 17.e., and 17.f. were not significant at the .05 level, 15 of 26 programs for criterion statement 17.a.2., 16 of 25 programs for criterion statement 17.a.3., 15 of 26 programs for criterion statement 17.b., 12 of 21 programs for criterion statement 17.c., 13 of 22 programs for criterion statement 17.d., 14 of 24 programs for criterion statement 17.e., and 13 of 22

TABLE 20. Agreement Among Raters for ADVISORY COMMITTEE Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating
17. Advisory Committee			
a. Includes:			
1. Parents	17/25	1.800 *	19
2. Administrators	15/26	0.784	15
3. Community members with consumer and homemaking interests	16/25	1.400	17
b. Assists in improving and expanding home economics program	15/25	1.000	18
c. Meets at least twice a year	12/21	0.655	25
d. Maintains records of planned agenda for each meeting	13/22	0.853	27
e. Assists in interpreting homemaking program to community	14/24	0.817	24
f. Staggers membership appointments for continuity	13/22	0.853	29
g. Maintains liaison with homemaking teacher	10/23	-0.626	23

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

programs for criterion statement 17.f. show a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statement in the Advisory Committee category, except for criterion statement 17.g., demonstrate a satisfactory degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a satisfactory level of construct validity. The large number of raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statements 17.a.2., 17.a.3., 17.b., 17.c., 17.d., 17.e., 17.f., and 17.g. may have affected the results for these criterion statements. Thirteen of the 15 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 17.a.2., 16 of the 17 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 17.a.3., 17 of the 18 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 17.b., 23 of the 25 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 17.c., 25 of the 27 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 17.d., 22 of the 24 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 17.e., 26 of the 29 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 17.f., and 22 of the 23 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 17.g. were from outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for these criterion statements. Written comments from several raters using the "UJ" rating for this category indicated that there was no separate advisory committee for the program. Therefore, the criterion statements were felt to be "not applicable" to the program.

Public Relations category. Table 21 includes the six criterion statements grouped under the Public Relations category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for one of the six criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing

TABLE 21. Agreement Among Raters for PUBLIC RELATIONS Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
18. Public Relations			
a. Maintains cooperation and coordination with community	17/26	1.569	5
b. Creates favorable image of home economics through regular information dissemination through media	19/26	2.353 *	9
c. Plans activities promoting awareness of program to administrators, students, teachers, parents, and community	14/26	0.393	6
d. Enriches curriculum with guest speakers and related resources	17/26	1.569	5
e. Becomes familiar with community through personal contacts and community involvement	17/26	1.569	7
f. Involves parents in program	14/25	0.600	14

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

agreement among the raters for criterion statements 18.a., 18.c., 18.d., 18.e., and 18.f. were not significant at the .05 level, 17 of 26 programs for criterion statement 18.a., 14 of 26 programs for criterion statement 18.c., 17 of 26 programs for criterion statement 18.d., 17 of 26 programs for criterion statement 18.e., and 14 of 25 programs for criterion statement 18.f. show a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Public Relations category demonstrate a satisfactory degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a satisfactory level of construct validity. No reasons were discernible for criterion statements 18.a., 18.c., 18.d., and 18.e. not being significant. All 14 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 18.f. were from outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for this criterion statement. The 14 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 18.f. may have affected the results for this criterion statement.

Evaluation category. Table 22 includes the nine criterion statements grouped under the Evaluation category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for all nine of the criterion statements. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Evaluation category demonstrate a significant degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. All ten of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 19.c., 11 of the 12 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 19.d.1., all 14 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 19.d.2., all 13 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion

TABLE 22. Agreement Among Raters for EVALUATION Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
19. Evaluation			
a. Conducted on continuing basis	21/26	3.137 *	8
b. Used to make current and long-range plans for program development	23/26	3.922 *	9
c. Utilized to modify and improve home economics program	23/26	3.922 *	10
d. Involves qualified personnel and committees including:			
1. State Staff	21/26	3.137 *	12
2. Local administrators	21/25	3.400 *	14
3. Home economics teachers	22/26	3.529 *	13
4. Students	20/25	3.000 *	16
e. Includes teacher self-evaluation in program	24/26	4.314 *	12
f. Includes student evaluation based on course objectives	19/25	2.600 *	15

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

statement 19.d.3., 15 of the 17 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 19.d.4., all 12 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 19.e., and all 15 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 19.f. were from outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for these criterion statements.

Facilities category. Table 23 includes the eleven criterion statements grouped under the Facilities category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for eight of the eleven criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion statements 20.a., 20.b., and 20.d.1. were not significant at the .05 level, 16 of 26 programs for criterion statement 20.a., 17 of 26 programs for criterion statement 20.b., and 17 of 26 programs for criterion statement 20.d.1. show a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Facilities category demonstrate a high degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity.

Equipment category. Table 24 includes the five criterion statements grouped under the Equipment category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for three of the five criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion statement 21.c. was not significant at the .05 level, 15 of 26 programs shows a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the

TABLE 23. Agreement Among Raters for FACILITIES Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating
20. Facilities			
a. Adequate space provided for conference area, large group instruction	16/26	1.176	1
b. Arranged for convenience, safety, and efficiency	17/26	1.569	1
c. Attractive, clean, and organized	22/26	3.529 *	1
d. Satisfactory provision for:			
1. Electrical outlets	17/26	1.176	5
2. Lighting	18/26	1.961 *	2
3. Heating	19/26	2.353 *	2
4. Ventilation	18/26	1.961 *	2
5. Acoustical factors	19/26	2.353 *	1
e. Flexible and efficient working conditions provided	19/26	2.353 *	1
f. Image of home economics enhanced by appearance and arrangement	18/26	1.961 *	2
g. Easily accessible chalkboard and bulletin boards provided	21/26	3.137 *	1

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 24. Agreement Among Raters for EQUIPMENT Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
21. Equipment			
a. Sufficient equipment provided to promote maximum learning in all areas of instruction	19/26	2.353 *	2
b. Inventory of equipment, materials, instructional materials available	20/26	2.745 *	12
c. Purchased within last five years or in good working order	16/26	1.176	14
d. Reflects current developments and equipment used in average home	19/26	2.353 *	3
e. Selected to illustrated a variety of costs and family situations	10/26	-1.176	7

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

Equipment category, except for criterion statement 21.e., demonstrate a high degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. All 12 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 21.b., and all 14 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 21.c. were from outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for these criterion statements. The 14 raters using the unable to judge rating for criterion statement 21.c. may have affected the results for this criterion statement. No reasons were discernible for criterion statement 21.e. not being significant.

Safety category. Table 25 includes the four criterion statements grouped under the Safety category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for all four of the criterion statements. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Safety category demonstrate a significant degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. All 24 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 22.a.1., 33 of the 34 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 22.a.2., 33 of the 34 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 22.a.3., and all 21 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 22.b. were from outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for these criterion statements.

Storage category. Table 26 includes the three criterion statements grouped under the Storage category. The number of programs

TABLE 25. Agreement Among Raters for SAFETY Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
22. Safety			
a. Fire extinguishers are:			
1. Located in department	19/23	3.128 *	24
2. Inspected regularly	19/23	3.128 *	34
3. Usable by students and teachers	16/21	2.401 *	34
b. Safety practices in use of facilities and equipment are included in instruction	19/24	2.858 *	21

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

TABLE 26. Agreement Among Raters for STORAGE Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating
23. Storage			
a. Allows for systematic, easily accessible storage	19/26	2.353 *	18
b. Provides closet space and storage drawers for students	17/26	1.569	2
c. Provides sufficient storage for equipment, teaching supplies, instructional materials and aids	16/26	1.176	2

¹N = 90 raters

* Significant at the .05 level

showing agreement among the raters was significant for one of the three criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion statements 23.b. and 23.c. were not significant at the .05 level, 17 of 26 programs for criterion statement 23.b., and 16 of 26 programs for criterion statement 23.c. show a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Storage category demonstrate a satisfactory degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a satisfactory level of construct validity. All 18 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 23.a. were from outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for this criterion statement. No reasons were discernible for criterion statements 23.b. and 23.c. not being significant.

Financial Resources category. Table 27 includes the six criterion statements grouped under the Financial Resources category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for four of the six criterion statements. Even though the number of programs showing agreement among the raters for criterion statements 24.a. and 24.c.1. were not significant at the .05 level, 16 of 26 programs for criterion statement 24.a. and 16 of 26 programs for criterion statement 24.c.1. show a high level of agreement. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Financial Resources category demonstrate a high degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. All 18 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 24.a., all 13 of

TABLE 27. Agreement Among Raters for FINANCIAL RESOURCES Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
24. Financial Resources			
a. Formal itemized budget established prior to the school year and on file	16/26	1.176	18
b. Funds used with maximum efficiency	19/25	2.600 *	13
c. Adequate funds provided for:			
1. Consumable supplies	16/26	1.176	5
2. Experimental activities	18/26	1.961 *	8
3. Immediate repairs of equipment	18/26	1.961 *	8
d. Records kept for expenditures	21/26	3.137 *	17

¹N = 90 raters

*Significant at the .05 level

the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 24.b., and all 17 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 24.d. were from outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for these criterion statements. The 18 raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 24.a. may have affected the results for this criterion statement. No reasons were discernible for criterion statement 24.c.1. not being significant.

Department Housekeeping category. Table 28 includes the four criterion statements grouped under the Department Housekeeping category. The number of programs showing agreement among the raters was significant for all four of the criterion statements. The results indicate that the criterion statements in the Department Housekeeping category demonstrate a significant degree of agreement among the raters, and therefore exhibit a high level of construct validity. All 15 of the raters using the "UJ" rating for criterion statement 25.d. were from outside of the program, indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for this criterion statement.

Chapter V presents the findings, conclusion, recommendations, and implications based on the data collected in this study.

TABLE 28. Agreement Among Raters for DEPARTMENT HOUSEKEEPING Criterion Statements

Criterion Statements	Number of Programs With Agreement / Number of Programs	z Values	Number of Raters Using UJ Rating ¹
25. Department Housekeeping			
a. Provides an example of good housekeeping	23/26	3.922 *	2
b. Students assume responsibility for housekeeping chores	20/25	3.000 *	7
c. Reflects attractive, home-like atmosphere, desirable living standards	22/26	3.529 *	3
d. Includes adequate care and maintenance by custodial staff	19/26	2.353 *	15

¹N = 90 raters

* Significant at the .05 level

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The problem of the study was that no validated instrument was currently available for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. The purposes of the study were 1) to develop an instrument based on the valid criteria established by the Harrison and Buero studies for evaluating programs in consumer and homemaking education; and 2) to validate the instrument for use in evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. In order to delineate the problem, the following questions were answered:

1. How well does the instrument accurately and comprehensively measure the valid criteria established by Buero and Harrison?

2. Does the evaluation instrument elicit similar responses among different population groups (the teacher of a consumer and homemaking program, a home economics teacher educator, a regional supervisor of home economics, and another consumer and homemaking teacher)?

The findings, conclusion, recommendations, and implications that resulted from the study are presented in the following sections.

I. FINDINGS

The major findings of the study were as follows:

1. The evaluation instrument developed in this study included 145 criterion statements grouped into 25 categories.

2. The panel of experts concurred that the evaluation instrument accurately and comprehensively measured the Harrison and Buero valid criteria for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.

3. The Spearman Rho Rank Order Correlation (r_s) for the test-retest reliability check for the ten programs included in the pilot study was 0.9030. This correlation was significant at the .05 level.

4. Of the 145 criterion statements used in the evaluation instrument, 25 criterion statements received "UJ" (Unable to Judge) ratings by the ten teachers participating in the pilot study.

5. For 10 of the 25 criterion statements which received "UJ" ratings in the pilot study, the corresponding test or retest rating was "1-Weak." The "1-Weak" rating was adjacent to the "UJ" rating on the evaluation instrument.

6. Of the 145 criterion statements used in the evaluation instrument, 140 criterion statements did not show a significant difference between early respondents and later respondents in the study. The five statements showing a significant difference were 16.d., 17.a.2., 17.f., 20.d.5., and 22.a.1.

7. Of the 145 criterion statements used in the evaluation instrument, 110 had z values for the number of programs showing agreement among the evaluators that were significant at the .05 level; 35 criterion statements had z values for the number of programs showing agreement among the evaluators that were not significant at the .05 level.

8. Of the 35 criterion statements that had z values for the number of programs showing agreement among the evaluators that were not significant at the .05 level, 30 criterion statements had more than 50 per cent of the programs showing agreement among the evaluators. Only five of the 145 criterion statements (8.h., 12.i., 16.d., 17.g.,

and 21.e.) had less than 50 per cent of the programs showing agreement among the evaluators.

9. For 11 of the 25 categories included in the instrument (Development of Program, Written Philosophy, Objectives and Goals, Program Outcomes, Instructional Methods, Teacher Background and Qualifications, Teacher Professional Growth and Development, Teacher Personal Qualities, Evaluation, Safety, and Department Housekeeping), all of the criterion statements had z values for the number of programs showing agreement among the evaluators that were significant at the .05 level.

10. For 50 of the 145 criterion statements, 10 or more of the raters responded "Unable to Judge."

11. For three of the 25 categories included in the instrument (Future Homemakers of America, Advisory Committee, and Safety), all of the criterion statements had 10 or more raters responding "Unable to Judge," and for two of the categories (Administration of Local Program, and Meeting Individual Differences), half of the criterion statements had 10 or more raters responding "Unable to Judge." Most of the raters using the "UJ" rating were from outside of the program indicating that it is hard for persons not closely connected with the program to evaluate the program for some categories and criterion statements.

II. CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this study, the following conclusion is made:

The evaluation instrument developed in this study is basically

a valid and reliable instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.

This conclusion is based upon the following summary statements:

1. The evaluation instrument developed in this study established content validity by adequately and comprehensively including the criteria validated as essential for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs by Harrison and Buero (Findings 1 and 2).

2. The evaluation displayed a significant level of reliability as determined by the test-retest method (Finding 3).

3. The evaluation instrument developed in this study had a high degree of construct validity since different population groups (the teacher of a consumer and homemaking program, a home economics teacher educator, a regional supervisor of home economics, and another consumer and homemaking teacher) gave similar responses when evaluating consumer and homemaking programs (Findings 7, 8, and 9).

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations derived from this study were as follows:

1. Slight modifications need to be made to improve the evaluation instrument:

- a. Criterion statements 8.h., 12.i., 16.d., 17.g., and 12.e. need to be reviewed, rewritten, and/or retested to improve construct validity.

- b. The "Unable to Judge" rating should be physically separated from the end of the rating scale so that it is not confused with the lowest rating.

2. The modified evaluation instrument should be further tested by having on-site evaluators use the instrument and comparing the results with those of teachers or other on-site evaluators.

3. To adequately evaluate a program with the instrument, outside evaluators need to visit the program.

4. The evaluation instrument should be considered for use by states in evaluating their consumer and homemaking programs through self-evaluation by the teacher and on-site evaluation by other consumer and homemaking teachers, home economics teacher educators, and home economics regional supervisors.

5. Additional studies should be undertaken to develop and validate evaluation instruments for other areas of vocational education.

IV. IMPLICATIONS

The evaluation instrument developed and validated in this study completes the second step in the process of providing an effective means of evaluating consumer and homemaking programs--the first step was the identification of valid criteria established by Buero and Harrison. The third step is to develop and implement a planned, thorough, and continuous evaluation system for consumer and homemaking education incorporating the evaluation instrument. Prospective users of the evaluation instrument are reminded that validity and reliability were determined based on the instrument as a whole. Individual criterion statements and/or categories should not be separated and used by themselves.

The evaluation instrument should provide a valuable tool for collecting valid and reliable data to be used in making sound educational

decisions about consumer and homemaking programs by educators. By using the evaluation instrument in a planned, periodic evaluation system, educators could identify problem areas for improving consumer and homemaking programs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Kay A. and N.L. McCaslin. The Development and Pilot Testing of Self-Review Instruments for Vocational Education Programs in Kentucky. Columbus: Center for Vocational Education, Ohio State University, 1976.
- American Psychological Association. Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association, 1974.
- Anderson, Scavia B., Samuel Ball, Richard T. Murphy and Associates. Encyclopedia of Educational Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.
- Anderson, Scavia B., and Samuel Ball. The Profession and Practice of Program Evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1978.
- Asher, J. William. Educational Research and Evaluation Methods. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, Inc., 1973.
- Babbie, Earl R. Survey Research Methods. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc., 1973.
- Barkat, Samuel. "Development of Criteria and Their Employment for Evaluation of Student Teaching Programs Offered by the Colleges and Universities in Tennessee." Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1963.
- Blevins, William R. "The Development of Qualitative Criteria for Follow-up Programs in Teacher Education." Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1967.
- Buero, C. Sherrel Lawson. "Criteria for Evaluating Secondary Consumer and Homemaking Programs in Tennessee." Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1979.
- Byram, Harold M. and Marvin Robertson. Locally Directed Evaluation of Local Vocational Education Programs: A Manual for Administrators, Teachers and Citizens. Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers and Publishers, Inc., 1971.
- Calhoun Calfrey C., and Alton V. Finch. Vocational and Career Education: Concepts and Operations. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing Co., 1976.
- Chaney, Lillian Alice Hunt. "The Development of an Instrument for Evaluating Student Teachers of Skills Subjects in Business." Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1972.

- A Comparative Assessment of Secondary Consumer and Homemaking Education Programs 1974-75. Final Report. Durham, NC: IBEX, Inc., 1975. (ED 126285).
- Craig, Albert Thomas. "The Development and Validation of a Test for Empathy as a Partial Basis for Selecting Public School Principals in Pinellas County, Florida." Dissertation, Florida State University, 1959.
- Dale, Dorothy. VTAE Field/Community Service Evaluation Models and Procedures, Phase II. Final Report. Stout: Center for Vocational, Technical, and Adult Education, University of Wisconsin-Stout Memomie, June 1977. (ED 142839).
- Denton, William T. Program Evaluation in Vocational and Technical Education. Columbus: Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, 1973. (ED 087899).
- Dickey, Eddie L. "Validation of the GATB Test for Predicting Arithmetic Ability of Post-Secondary Vocational Students." Thesis, University of Tennessee, 1975.
- Downie, N. M. Fundamentals of Measurement. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, 1967.
- Elson, Donald E. "The Role of Program Evaluation in Program Planning." The Agricultural Education Magazine, February 1974, p. 10.
- Erickson, Richard C., and Tim L. Wentling. Measuring Student Growth: Techniques and Procedures for Occupational Education. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1976.
- Ford, Janice Beeler. "An Evaluation of the Elementary Art Programs of the Pikeville County School System (Kentucky), Including the Development of an Evaluative Instrument." Thesis, University of Tennessee, 1970.
- Fox, David J. The Research Process in Education. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.
- Fults, Anna Carol. Evaluation of Special Consumer-Homemaking Programs in Illinois High Schools. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University, 1972. (ED 118866).
- Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1973.
- _____. Essentials of Educational Research: Methodology and Design. New York: Appleton-Century-Crafts, 1972.

- Gorman, Anna. Proceedings of the National Research Conference on Consumer and Homemaking Education. Leadership Training Series No. 31. Columbus: Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, 1970.
- Grant, W. Vance and C. George Lind. Digest of Education Statistics, 1977-78 Edition. Washington: United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1978.
- Gronlund, Norman E. Measurement and Evaluation in Teaching. New York: Macmillan Publishing Company, Inc., 1976.
- Harrison, Joyce S. "Criteria for Evaluating Consumer and Homemaking Programs as Perceived by Directors of Secondary Vocational Programs, State Supervisors of Home Economics, and Selected Teacher Educators." Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1979.
- Hays, William L. Statistics for the Social Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1973.
- Heater, William K. "Validation of the General, Numerical, and Spatial Scores of the GATB Test for Predicting Success in Drafting Training and Drafting Vocation." Thesis, University of Tennessee, 1974.
- Helmstadter, G.C. Principles of Psychological Measurement. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1964.
- Hirst, Bettye Gurley. "An Assessment of the Perceived Utility of the Self-Study Activities Performed during the Process of Accreditation of Selected Post-Secondary, Non-Collegiate Occupational Education Institutions." Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1974.
- Hoepfner, Ralph. A Test of Tests. CSE Report No. 69. Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation, UCLA Graduate School of Education, 1971.
- Kievet, Mary Bach. Systematizing Local Education Agency Evaluation as a Basis for Statewide Evaluation of Occupation Courses. Paper presented at American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, April 1974. (ED 095197).
- Kilt, John A. "Evaluation - The Key to Developing Quality Vocational Programs," Illinois Vocational Progress. Springfield: Board of Vocational Education and Rehabilitation, Vocational and Technical Education Division, 1970.
- Lecht, Leonard A. Evaluating Vocational Education: Policies and Plans for the 1970's. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.

- Manning, Patricia Cripe. "A Validation Study of the Faculty Evaluative Criteria at Florida Technological University." Dissertation, Nova University, 1975.
- Mendenhall, Elton B. The Nebraska Vocational Information System. Final Report. Lincoln: Nebraska Occupational Needs Research Coordinating Unit, June 1977. (ED 142826).
- Millonzi, Frank C. "The Development and Validation of a Handball Skill Test." Thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1972.
- Moss, Jerome, Jr. The Evaluation of Occupational Education Programs, Technical Report. Minneapolis: Research Coordinating Unit in Occupational Education, University of Minnesota, 1968.
- Motley, Robert Joseph. "The Development and Validation of Case Studies in Office Management." Dissertation, University of Colorado, 1966.
- Norton, Robert E. Guide to Improving Vocational Education Evaluation. Fayetteville: College of Education, University of Arkansas, 1970.
- Nunnally, Jum C. Psychometric Theory. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1967.
- Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.
- Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci, and Percy H. Tannenbaum. The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.
- Popham, W. James. Evaluation in Education: Current Applications. Berkley: McCutchen Publishing Company, 1974.
- Public Law 347. Smith Hughes Act. 64th Congress. 1917.
- Public Law 94-482. Education Amendments of 1976. 94th Congress. 1976.
- Purcell, Johanna Miller, "Career Competency Evaluation Form," Reno: University of Nevada, School of Home Economics, 1976.
- Ray, John R. Development of the Evaluation Model for Tennessee Secondary Vocational-Technical Education Programs. Knoxville: Tennessee Research Coordinating Unit, 1973.
- Richardson, Lovella Stoll. "Construction of Valid Consumer Education Tests for Adults on Purchasing and Conserving Goods and Services." Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1976.

- Richardson, Ruth Delene. "An Evaluation of Part G Cooperative Vocational Education Programs in Selected High Schools in the State of Tennessee, 1973-74." Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1974.
- Ripka, G. Elizabeth. "Development of a Standardized Test of Stenographic Information Skills for Use on the High School Level." Dissertation, Temple University, 1963.
- Robertson, J. Martin. Personnel Evaluation in Vocational Technical Education. Columbus: Center for Vocational and Technical Education, Ohio State University, 1973. (ED 089078).
- Selltiz, Claire, Lawrence S. Wrightsman, and Stuart Cook. Research Methods in Social Relations. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1976.
- Siegel, Sidney. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.
- Skaiff, Lorraine Barbara. "The Development and Validation of a Predictive Instrument to Measure Student Success in the First Semester of Gregg Shorthand." Dissertation, Oregon State University, 1972.
- Spool, Mark D. Performing a Content Validation Study. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southeastern Psychological Association. Atlanta, 1975.
- Stake, Robert E. Evaluating Educational Programmes: The Need and Response. Paris: Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, 1976.
- Ten Brink, Terry D. Evaluation: A Practical Guide for Teachers. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, 1974.
- Tennessee Advisory Council for Vocational Education. 1977 Annual Evaluation Report. Nashville: State of Tennessee Central Printing, 1978.
- Thorndike, Robert L. and Elizabeth Hagen. Measurement and Evaluation in Psychology and Education. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1961.
- Wallace, Juanita DePew. "Comparison of a Comprehensive Team Visit Evaluation Procedure and a Self-Administered Checklist Evaluation Procedure for Evaluating Vocational Education Programs." Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1973.
- Ward, Annie W. The Development and Validation of an Inventory of Non-Cognitive Predictors of Academic Success. Knoxville: Creativity Research Institute Press, University of Tennessee, 1958.

- Watanabe, Karla Ann. "A Validation of the Existence of Identified Qualities of Teacher-Coordiators of Secondary Vocational Education Cooperative Programs in Tennessee and Virginia." Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1976.
- Wentling, Tim L. and Tom E. Lawson. Evaluating Occupational Education and Training Programs. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1975.
- Whiddon, Ann McRorie. "Developing Criteria and Processes for the Evaluation of Student Teaching Performance by Cooperating Teachers." Thesis, University of Tennessee, 1972.
- Wilder, Dolores J. "The Development and Validation of an Information Needs Inventory for Selected User Groups in Vocational Education." Dissertation, University of Tennessee, 1977.
- Wircenski, J.L. The Development and Field Test of an Objective Career Counseling Instrument, Final Report. Lubbock, TX: Education Service Center, Region 17, 1976.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING PROGRAMS

DEVELOPED BY BUERO AND HARRISON

TABLE A-1. Criteria for Evaluating Consumer and Homemaking Programs Developed by Buero and Harrison

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
I. PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING						
1.	A written philosophy serves as a frame of reference for planning.	5.68 ²	5.82	5.76	5.56	5.15
2.	The home economics philosophy conforms with the general philosophy and objectives of the school and is an integral part of the total school curriculum.	5.79	5.71	5.82	5.62	5.55
3.	The program is designed to strengthen family living and human relations based upon an assessment of social and cultural conditions and needs of the community.	5.68	5.86	5.89	5.54	5.72
4.	The program is designed to help youth and adults in developing a better understanding of the individual's role as a consumer by improving consumer competence.	5.82	5.64	5.66	5.61	5.74
5.	The program is designed to develop managerial ability and homemaking skills necessary for the dual role of homemaker and wage earner.	5.79	5.71	5.75	5.51	5.69
6.	In the school system, there is close coordination and cooperation between the homemaking program and the academic staff, guidance staff, and community.	5.57	5.68	5.55	4.94	5.02
7.	All aspects of the program are free of sex bias and stereotyping.	5.50	5.57	5.55	4.80	4.93

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
I. PROGRAM ORGANIZATION AND PLANNING (Continued)						
8.	There is evidence of effort to recruit males into the homemaking program.	5.64	5.43	5.59	4.94	5.09
9.	There is a planned program which is followed for the periodic revision of the course to allow for community, socio-economic, mechanical, and technical changes.	5.46	5.50	5.66	4.90	4.97
II. CURRICULUM						
A. <u>Scope and Sequence</u>						
1.	A scope and sequence has been developed at the local level for home economics courses in grades 7 through 12 as identified in state guidelines.	5.43	5.64	5.62	4.83	5.08
2.	Courses are developed using an analysis of:					
	a. student needs and interests	5.43	5.68	5.69	5.18	5.42
	b. community needs and interests	5.43	5.46	5.43	4.90	5.08
3.	The curriculum of the feeder schools is coordinated with that of the high school.	5.57	5.54	5.60	4.81	4.52
4.	Introductory and advanced courses in the program are closely articulated.	5.43	5.60	5.76	5.18	5.22
5.	The curriculum provides for individual differences among students.	5.61	5.57	5.66	5.14	5.22

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
II. CURRICULUM						
B. <u>Goals and Objectives</u>						
1. The curriculum provides for:						
a. flexibility		5.61	5.71	5.69	5.26	5.55
b. innovation		5.64	5.61	5.69	5.20	5.51
2. Parental desires are considered in formulating policies and procedures for the guidance of the student.		5.07	5.15	5.38	4.61	4.73
3. Parental concerns are considered in the development of program goals and objectives.		4.96	5.33	5.24	4.66	4.75
4. Written objectives are used to design programs and are on file in the home economics department and administrative office.		5.29	5.68	5.69	5.47	5.49
5. The objectives of the program are reviewed annually and changed when needed.		5.46	5.71	5.66	5.33	5.62
6. The objectives focus on the shared needs and interests of male and female students as homemakers.		5.61	5.64	5.72	4.88	5.42
7. An outline of each course is on file.		5.04	5.82	5.59	5.50	5.57

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
II. CURRICULUM						
B. <u>Goals and Objectives</u> (continued)						
8. Curriculum offerings are based on:						
a.	interest and potential of students.	5.71	5.32	5.52	5.04	5.33
b.	evidence of needs as determined by advisory groups, surveys, and statistics.	5.68	5.25	5.17	4.86	4.65
9.	The objectives are realistic and obtainable within the school system and the community.	5.61	5.75	5.72	5.28	5.34
10.	The objectives of the program provide for individual differences among students.	5.50	5.71	5.72	5.22	5.23
11. The objectives give direction to:						
a.	program evaluation	5.54	5.71	5.72	5.22	5.23
b.	student evaluation	5.82	5.54	5.69	5.06	5.33
C. <u>Content</u>						
1.	Sex bias implications are eliminated in course titles and descriptions.	5.82	5.54	5.69	5.06	5.33

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
II. CURRICULUM						
C. Content (continued)						
2.	The curricular experiences in comprehensive courses emphasize daily life problems related to the major areas of home and family living through units in the following areas:					
a.	housing and home management	5.57	5.57	5.83	5.51	5.60
b.	consumer education and resource management	5.68	5.57	5.86	5.51	5.66
c.	child development and guidance	5.54	5.70	5.93	5.47	5.76
d.	family living and parenthood education	5.61	5.70	5.90	5.47	5.77
e.	foods and nutrition	5.61	5.67	5.83	5.56	5.81
f.	textiles and clothing	5.54	5.52	5.59	5.45	5.56
3.	Instruction in human relationships and citizenship is a part of the curriculum	5.61	5.67	5.59	5.45	5.56
4.	The curriculum provides for portrayal of a variety of cultural groups in positive and non-stereotyped ways.	5.64	5.11	5.48	4.94	5.00
5.	The following concepts are integrated into each area of instruction:					
a.	management of time and resources	5.79	5.48	5.61	5.16	5.61
b.	consumer education	5.71	5.68	5.71	5.38	5.65

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TC	TC
II. CURRICULUM							
C. Content (continued)							
6.	There is evidence that the following are incorporated into the content of the program:						
a.	creativity	5.43	5.61	5.07	5.30	5.53	
b.	flexibility	5.71	5.61	5.41	5.26	5.62	
c.	respect for human values	5.86	5.75	5.76	5.44	5.73	
7.	The program content has been revised within the past three years to reflect the changes created by society.	5.61	5.70	5.38	5.47	5.63	
8.	The program includes instruction in:						
a.	sex education	5.25	5.70	5.21	5.14	5.45	
b.	parenting	5.64	5.79	5.90	5.47	5.65	
c.	energy conservation	5.68	5.57	5.66	5.10	5.36	
9.	Home economics courses offer experiences and activities which contribute to the employability of youth and adults.	5.75	5.71	5.31	4.96	5.28	
10.	The curriculum is sufficiently flexible so that individualized instruction is available to students.	5.64	5.21	5.31	5.08	5.14	
11.	Instruction is provided in safety practices in the use of facilities and equipment.	5.57	5.57	5.62	5.47	5.66	

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
II. CURRICULUM						
D. Program Outcomes						
1.	Program outcomes reflect the student's ability to be self-directing.	5.46	5.63	5.41	5.02	5.19
2.	The program contributes to the employability of youth and adults in the dual role of homemaker and wage earner.	5.71	5.61	5.48	5.00	5.31
3.	There is evidence that students develop skills, attitudes and values in the program for working cooperatively with family members and employers.	5.79	5.54	5.83	5.22	5.27
III. ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION						
1.	Administrative personnel utilize advisory committees in program evaluation and improvement.	5.68	5.50	5.48	5.18	4.51
2.	Administrative personnel work with the vocational teacher in development of the total program.	5.79	5.32	5.55	5.38	4.71
3.	Administrative personnel encourage and support inservice training for teachers.	5.61	5.68	5.79	5.74	5.42
4.	Faculty meetings are attended regularly by the home economics teacher.	5.43	5.61	5.62	5.62	5.87
5.	Teaching assignments are based on qualification, experiences, and interests of the teachers.	5.75	5.70	5.79	5.54	5.45

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
III. ADMINISTRATION AND SUPERVISION (continued)						
6.	The home economics staff is considered in discussions related to general operational procedures of the department.	5.64	5.71	5.90	5.56	5.47
7.	The lines of authority, communication, and responsibility are defined and utilized.	5.68	5.57	5.83	5.46	5.17
8.	A home economics educator coordinates the total district program.	5.26	5.35	5.28	4.79	5.01
9.	Supervisory classroom visitations with follow-up conferences are scheduled.	5.46	5.48	5.31	4.90	4.40
10.	Supervision is adequate to assist teachers and students to progress jointly toward relevant goals.	5.50	5.25	4.97	5.02	4.27
11.	The teachers' lesson plans, materials, and performance are observed regularly by supervisory personnel to validate a quality instructional program.	5.50	5.25	4.97	5.02	4.27
12.	Teachers demonstrate responsiveness to supervision by implementing recommended modifications to improve program.	5.68	5.46	5.45	5.33	5.27
13.	A department chairperson coordinates activities of multiple teacher department.	5.57	5.71	5.55	4.76	4.60

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
IV. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT						
1.	Space and equipment are adequate to carry out a comprehensive program:					
a.	equipment for clothing construction is arranged for convenience, safety, and efficiency.	5.57	5.57	5.79	5.43	5.14
b.	closet space and storage drawers for students.	5.52	5.18	5.66	5.40	5.23
c.	conference area.	5.39	5.32	5.38	5.18	4.70
2.	Facilities and furnishings in the department are selected and arranged:					
a.	to illustrate a variety of choices within a range of costs and family situations.	5.29	5.21	5.66	5.02	4.62
b.	to illustrate a variety of energy sources.	5.36	5.43	5.45	4.88	4.47
c.	to provide maximum convenience and safety to students.	5.67	5.61	5.76	5.37	5.29
d.	to accommodate both male and female students.	5.57	5.68	5.83	5.31	5.32
3.	A stimulating learning environment is provided through facilities that are:					
a.	attractive.	5.79	5.64	5.79	5.52	5.50
b.	clean.	5.79	5.71	5.72	5.68	5.53
c.	organized.	5.74	5.74	5.79	5.58	5.51

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA	SDVP ¹				HETE				SSHE				TLVD				TCHT			
IV. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT (continued)																				
4. Designated classroom space is available for large group instruction.	5.60	5.74	5.72	5.18	4.98															
5. Equipment is provided to promote maximum learning in all areas of instruction.	5.68	5.50	5.79	5.21	5.31															
6. The following provisions in the department are satisfactory:																				
a. electrical outlets.	5.68	5.39	5.62	5.28	4.48															
b. lighting.	5.58	5.43	5.69	5.46	5.28															
c. heating.	5.71	5.57	5.69	5.42	5.17															
d. ventilation.	5.68	5.50	5.69	5.36	4.82															
e. accoustical factors.	5.64	5.59	5.12	5.24	5.12															
7. Materials and supplies are stored in a systematic way.	5.68	5.46	5.62	5.23	5.28															
8. Sufficient storage is provided for:																				
a. equipment	5.61	5.36	5.66	5.12	5.07															
b. teaching supplies	5.61	5.39	5.69	5.22	5.08															
c. instructional materials and aids	5.61	5.54	5.59	5.16	5.06															
9. Storage allows for easy accessibility by both the teacher and the students.	5.64	5.50	5.52	5.22	5.16															

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
IV. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT (continued)						
10.	The equipment and furnishings in the department are arranged to provide for flexibility and efficiency of working conditions for pupils and teacher.	5.67	5.50	5.52	5.22	5.16
11.	The appearance and arrangement of the department enhances the image of home economics.	5.50	5.68	5.41	5.30	5.26
12.	To supplement instruction for students with special needs, the following are available:					
	a. appropriate specialized facilities.	5.39	5.29	5.03	4.37	3.96
	b. appropriate movable equipment.	5.41	5.41	5.28	4.37	4.22
	c. appropriate instructional materials.	5.64	5.43	5.55	4.59	4.37
13.	The home economics department reflects current developments in types of equipment and furnishings for promoting maximum learning in all areas of instruction by providing:					
	a. equipment that is in good working order.	5.64	5.54	5.62	5.42	5.37
	b. equipment and furnishings which approximate those used in the home.	5.61	5.32	5.59	5.42	5.41
14.	Major equipment has been purchased within the last five years.	5.18	5.54	5.41	5.48	5.16

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
IV. FACILITIES AND EQUIPMENT (continued)						
15.	Current and long range plans are on file in the department for:					
	a. maintenance of equipment.	5.46	5.43	5.41	4.62	4.47
	b. replacement of equipment.	5.33	5.46	5.45	4.52	4.39
16.	Fire extinguishers are:					
	a. located in the department.	5.79	5.79	5.58	5.30	5.47
	b. inspected as required.	5.61	5.64	5.79	5.50	5.32
	c. usable by students and teachers.	5.68	5.68	5.83	5.47	5.23
17.	First aid supplies are conveniently located in the department.	5.71	5.46	5.76	4.90	4.25
V. FINANCIAL RESOURCES						
1.	A formal budget for the homemaking department has been established in compliance with state program standards.	5.71	5.75	5.55	5.82	5.35
2.	Funds allotted for the home economics program are used with maximum efficiency to meet instructional needs.	5.61	5.68	5.66	5.66	5.70
3.	Financial resources are adequate to provide experimental activities in selected areas.	5.15	5.36	5.24	5.22	5.14
4.	The budget indicates a 3-5 year projection.	5.32	5.54	5.38	4.70	4.31

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
V. FINANCIAL RESOURCES (continued)						
5.	Adequate reimbursement is available for homemaking teachers to attend professional meetings.	5.46	5.32	5.62	5.44	4.80
6.	Each teacher has money available for:					
a.	consumable supplies adequate for the course or grade level taught.	5.61	5.67	5.62	5.60	4.57
b.	the replacement of out-of-date equipment and materials.	5.39	5.52	5.55	4.76	4.99
c.	immediate repairs of equipment.	5.57	5.44	5.48	5.08	5.17
d.	purchase of new equipment.	5.39	5.52	5.52	4.66	4.81
VI. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF						
A. <u>Personal Qualities</u>						
1.	The teacher holds a bachelor's degree in home economics and a valid vocational homemaking education certificate.	5.82	5.82	5.72	5.94	5.90
2.	Teachers are knowledgeable and have all available materials about the scope of the total district and state home economics education program.	5.67	5.54	5.69	5.68	5.67
3.	The teacher has the leadership qualities to be an effective teacher.	5.81	5.86	5.72	5.58	5.74
4.	The home economics teacher is skilled in the organization of subject matter and the teaching-learning process.	5.75	5.89	5.66	5.58	5.73

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
VI. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF						
A. <u>Personal Qualities</u> (continued)						
5.	The teacher utilizes daily lesson plans developed from the objectives.	5.64	5.79	5.71	5.38	5.54
6.	The homemaking teacher has an instructional plan based on state and local curriculum guides.	5.68	5.71	5.83	5.60	5.71
7.	The teacher has knowledge and understanding of differences among families and in homes of varying social, economic, and cultural backgrounds and applies these directly in planning and carrying out the instructional program.	5.79	5.64	5.72	5.46	5.61
8.	The teacher demonstrates sensitivity to student needs and the ability to adapt materials and methods to stimulate individual students to learn and achieve.	5.75	5.75	5.66	5.48	5.63
9.	The teacher's organizational ability is demonstrated by effective classroom management.	5.82	5.75	5.68	5.50	5.55
10.	The teacher works with the students in such a way that they reflect a respect for her as a person and an interest in homemaking activities.	5.75	5.93	5.76	5.52	5.68
11.	The staff members in the department are able to work together productively, cooperatively, and professionally.	5.71	5.82	5.79	5.52	5.76
B. <u>Professional Growth and Development</u>						
1.	Meetings of the total school district home economics staff are scheduled regularly and utilized for program improvement.	5.36	5.61	5.38	4.98	5.06

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
VI. INSTRUCTIONAL STAFF						
B. <u>Professional Growth and Development (continued)</u>						
2.	School policy allows teachers to attend professional meetings.	5.64	5.75	5.59	5.48	5.45
3.	The teacher participates in available inservice and training programs to up-grade knowledge and skills.	5.68	5.82	5.72	5.45	5.71
4.	The teacher continuously reviews professional materials.	5.25	5.64	5.21	5.07	4.18
5.	The teacher demonstrates professionalism by being an active member of:					
	a. American Home Economics Association.	5.25	5.64	5.21	5.07	4.18
	b. American Vocational Association.	5.21	5.68	5.34	5.07	4.50
	c. State home economics association.	5.46	5.74	5.38	5.26	4.90
	d. State vocational association.	5.39	5.56	5.52	5.52	5.55
	e. Local professional and educational groups.	5.36	5.56	5.52	5.52	5.55
6.	The teacher's schedule provides at least one period of planning.	5.54	5.64	5.72	5.49	5.46
VII. INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS						
A. <u>Instructional Methods</u>						
1.	The instructional situation replicates the occupations of the home.	5.68	5.07	5.55	5.10	5.53

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
VII. INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS						
A. <u>Instructional Methods</u> (continued)						
2.	A variety of teaching methods and instructional activities are used daily.	5.61	5.79	5.62	5.32	5.65
3.	Instructional procedures show that the teacher used ingenuity and initiative in the development and use of methods, teaching aids, and techniques.	5.68	5.68	5.45	5.40	5.47
4.	Learning experiences conform to the maturity level of the students.	5.71	5.71	5.66	5.32	5.53
5.	Learning experiences are planned for varying abilities of the students.	5.75	5.71	5.66	5.30	5.43
6.	Learning experiences are selected in relation to behavioral outcomes desired.	5.61	5.75	5.72	5.18	5.42
7.	Instruction is individualized using various methods to meet specific needs and interests of students.	5.61	5.46	5.45	5.18	5.26
8.	The instructional procedures provide opportunities for individual and group participation in discussion and other activities.	5.86	5.61	5.69	5.48	5.65
B. <u>Instructional Materials and Supplies</u>						
1.	A sufficient quantity of materials and supplies for the teaching of consumer and homemaking are available to meet the educational needs of the students.	5.68	5.61	5.48	5.44	5.32

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
VII. INSTRUCTIONAL PROCESS						
B. <u>Instructional Materials and Supplies</u> (continued)						
2.	Chalkboards and bulletin boards are easily accessible within the classroom.	5.61	5.50	5.54	5.56	5.36
3.	Instructional materials are readily accessible to the students and the instructor.	5.57	5.54	5.55	5.14	4.96
4.	A sufficient quantity of up-to-date textbooks and reference materials in each of the major areas of home economics is available.	5.57	5.54	5.55	5.14	4.96
5.	Multi-media materials are available for all program areas.	5.50	5.57	5.66	5.14	5.13
VIII. MANAGEMENT AND HOUSEKEEPING						
1.	The following managerial records are available:					
a.	itemized budget.	5.57	5.70	5.48	5.27	4.65
b.	record of expenditures.	5.61	5.68	5.59	5.58	5.50
c.	inventory of equipment and materials.	5.71	5.68	5.66	5.62	5.50
d.	proposed budget for the next school year.	5.57	5.68	5.52	4.98	4.31
e.	inventory of instructional media	5.64	5.50	5.72	5.34	5.00
f.	current and long range plans for the purchase of teaching aids and supplies.	5.54	5.36	5.55	4.80	4.50
g.	financial report for FHA.	5.57	5.32	5.55	5.65	5.04

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
VIII. MANAGEMENT AND HOUSEKEEPING (continued)						
2.	Supplies and equipment in the laboratory are conveniently organized to provide an example of good housekeeping.	5.61	5.50	5.41	5.38	5.42
3.	Adequate provisions are made for care and maintenance of facilities by the custodial staff.	5.68	5.64	5.41	5.14	4.62
4.	Students assume managerial responsibility for housekeeping chores in the department.	5.71	4.96	5.31	5.34	5.27
5.	The department reflects an attractive, homelike atmosphere in which students show pride and which reflect desirable home living standards.	5.64	5.33	5.62	5.36	5.22
IX. STUDENTS						
1.	A system of recruitment exists through exploration programs and visits to elementary and junior high school by counselors, students, and teachers.	5.32	5.41	5.45	4.42	4.25
2.	All classes are open to both sexes.	5.64	5.89	5.79	5.64	5.67
3.	Students are made aware of occupational opportunities in home economics.	5.75	5.51	5.66	5.47	5.58
4.	Disadvantaged and handicapped students within the program are identified, and offerings are provided that will help them to become useful citizens in the community.	5.68	5.39	5.66	5.30	5.02
5.	Handicapped students are mainstreamed when it is mutually beneficial to students in a class.	5.57	5.54	5.59	5.32	5.04

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
IX. STUDENTS (continued)						
6.	Facilities and supplies are adequate for disadvantaged and handicapped students.	5.52	5.46	5.55	4.86	4.58
7.	An individual educational plan is on file for each handicapped student.	5.64	5.26	5.69	5.04	3.92
8.	Vocational guidance is provided for all students by a qualified counselor.	5.61	5.50	5.62	4.50	4.83
X. FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA						
1.	The home economics teacher sponsors a FHA chapter.	5.54	5.29	5.69	5.80	5.70
2.	The local chapter is affiliated with the state and national organization.	5.61	5.54	5.75	5.82	5.68
3.	The chapter members are active participants in:					
	a. local activities.	5.68	5.51	5.93	5.60	5.63
	b. district activities.	5.54	5.57	5.72	5.61	5.46
4.	FHA chapter experiences are included in the home economics program at all levels.	5.54	5.39	5.79	5.54	5.53
5.	The chapter has a program of work which contributes to the home economics instructional program.	5.64	5.54	5.69	5.42	5.35
6.	Student committees are formed and make contributions to the improvement of the student organization, school, and community.	5.57	5.54	5.62	5.40	5.24

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
X. FUTURE HOMEMAKERS OF AMERICA (continued)						
7.	The chapter has male and female members.	5.46	5.46	5.62	5.10	4.38
8.	The teacher/advisor helps chapter members plan (through ENCOUNTER and IMPACT processes) activities which contribute to home economics instructional program.	5.61	5.36	5.55	5.19	4.96
XI. ADVISORY COMMITTEES						
1.	The teacher has organized a formal advisory committee to assist in improving and expanding the home economics program.	5.57	5.66	5.59	5.36	5.26
2.	The advisory committee for the consumer and homemaking program is composed of:					
	a. a student.	5.71	5.68	5.69	4.66	3.98
	b. parent(s)	5.79	5.75	5.76	5.47	5.50
	c. administrator	5.64	5.61	5.62	5.18	5.15
	d. community members with consumer and homemaking interests.	5.68	5.75	5.69	5.10	5.56
3.	The advisory committee has met a least twice within the last year.	5.57	5.57	5.62	5.10	4.12
4.	There is evidence of a planned agenda for each meeting of the advisory committee.	5.57	5.68	5.66	5.18	4.51
5.	Minutes of the advisory committee's meetings are recorded and kept on file by the teacher.	5.61	5.46	5.52	4.98	4.31

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
XI. ADVISORY COMMITTEES (continued)						
6.	There is evidence that the advisory committee:					
a.	makes recommendations and suggestions to school authorities empowered to act upon advice.	5.61	5.46	5.59	5.00	4.45
b.	assists in the development of the home economics program.	5.64	5.29	5.28	4.94	4.50
c.	helps evaluate the home economics program.	5.61	5.36	5.31	4.98	4.45
d.	assists in interpreting the homemaking program to the community.	5.61	5.48	5.59	5.06	4.60
7.	Advisory committee membership appointments are staggered so that continuity is maintained.	5.54	5.57	5.55	5.00	4.81
8.	The advisory committee members have visited the program during the school day.	5.50	5.43	5.45	4.94	4.12
9.	A close liaison exists between the advisory committee and the:					
a.	vocational director.	5.46	5.39	5.59	4.98	4.15
b.	homemaking teacher.	5.50	5.68	5.69	5.32	4.83
XII. PUBLIC RELATIONS						
1.	A favorable image of home economics is created through information dissemination on a regular basis through the media.	5.61	5.57	5.66	5.06	5.17

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹	HETE	SSHE	TLVD	TCHT
XII. PUBLIC RELATIONS (continued)						
2.	Well-planned activities provide program visibility to administrators, students, teachers, parents, and community.	5.71	5.71	5.79	5.28	5.33
3.	The teacher enriches the curriculum with guest speakers and related resources.	5.68	5.71	5.79	5.42	5.68
4.	The teacher becomes familiar with the community through:					
	a. personal contacts.	5.68	5.75	5.86	5.40	5.56
	b. community involvement.	5.68	5.64	5.83	5.38	5.52
5.	The teacher involves parents in the program.	5.75	5.50	5.72	5.18	5.28
XIII. EVALUATION						
1.	Evidence of program strengths and weaknesses are used to make current and long range plans for program improvement.	5.64	5.61	5.86	5.26	5.39
2.	The evaluating process is utilized to modify and improve the home economics program.	5.75	5.61	5.75	5.27	5.51
3.	There is evidence that the following are involved in evaluating the homemaking program:					
	a. state staff.	5.75	5.36	5.66	5.42	5.24
	b. local administrators.	5.71	5.50	5.69	5.48	5.27

TABLE A-1. (continued)

CRITERIA		SDVP ¹				HETE				SSHE				TLVD				TCHT			
XIII. EVALUATION (continued)																					
3. There is evidence that the following are involved in evaluating the homemaking program:																					
c. home economics teachers.		5.89				5.61				5.69				5.44				5.61			
d. students.		5.82				5.54				5.72				4.94				5.38			
e. parents.		5.64				5.28				5.66				4.82				4.91			
f. community members.		5.68				5.32				5.49				4.84				4.73			
4. Evidence of teacher self-evaluation is utilized in the program.		5.75				5.37				5.66				5.24				5.50			
5. Qualified personnel and committees are designated for the purpose of evaluation of the program.		5.71				5.36				5.59				5.22				4.96			
6. Evaluation is conducted on a continuing basis to provide courses relevant to student needs.		5.75				5.64				5.83				5.06				5.37			
7. The program has evidence of student evaluation based on objectives.		5.75				5.56				5.69				5.17				5.18			

¹Mean Ratings by State Directors of Vocational Programs (SDVP), Home Economics Teacher Educators (HETE), State Supervisors of Home Economics (SSHE), Tennessee Local Vocational Directors (TLVD), and Tennessee Consumer and Homemaking Teachers (TCHT).

²Response scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Moderately disagree, 3 = Mildly disagree, 4 = Mildly agree, 5 = Moderately agree, and 6 = Strongly agree.

APPENDIX B

CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING PROGRAM EVALUATION FORM

Directions: The following classifications and criteria have been identified through research¹ as essential characteristics of consumer and homemaking programs and can therefore be used as criteria for evaluating such programs. Using the scale: 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, and 1-Weak, indicate your rating of the consumer and homemaking program for each criterion statement by placing a check in the appropriate box at the end of each statement. If unable to judge because not enough information is available, or the category is not applicable, check the "unable to judge" box. Comments may be made in the area below each category.

1. Development of Program

- a. Based on assessment of social and cultural conditions and needs of community
- b. Designed to strengthen family living and human relations
- c. Designed to develop improved consumer competence
- d. Designed to develop homemaking skills and managerial ability for the dual role of homemaker/wage earner

Comments:

Superior	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak	Unable to Judge
5	4	3	2	1	UJ

2. Written Philosophy

- a. Conforms with school's philosophy and objectives and is an integral part of the total school curriculum
- b. Serves as reference for program planning

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	UJ

3. Scope and Sequence

- a. Developed for grades 7 through 12
- b. State guidelines followed
- c. Introductory and advanced courses articulated
- d. Outline for each course available

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	UJ

4. Curriculum

- a. Based on student needs, interests, and aptitudes
- b. Based on community needs and interests
- c. Allows for flexibility and innovation
- d. Variety of cultural groups portrayed in positive and non-stereotyped ways

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	UJ

1. Criteria for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs were developed by Sherrel Buero and Joyce Harrison, 1979. Used by permission of authors.

		5	Superior
		4	Very Good
		3	Good
		2	Fair
		1	Weak
		UJ	Unable to Judge

- Written objectives available
- Reviewed annually for needed changes
- Realistic and obtainable objectives included
- Used to give direction to program and student evaluation

Comments:

[illegible]

- a. Includes comprehensive instruction including but not limited to: housing and home management, consumer education and resource management, child development and guidance, family living and parenthood education, foods and nutrition, textiles and clothing, human relationships and citizenship, and energy conservation.
- b. Emphasizes in each area:
 - 1. Daily life problems
 - 2. Management of time and resources
 - 3. Consumer education
 - 4. Occupational opportunities in home economics
- c. Provides for:
 - 1. Creativity
 - 2. Flexibility
 - 3. Respect for human values
- d. Based on state and local curriculum guides
- e. Reflects changes in society by being revised within past three years

Comments:

[illegible]

- a. Eliminates sex bias and discrimination implications in course titles and descriptions
- b. Opens all classes to both sexes
- c. Objectives focus on shared needs and interests of male and female homemakers
- d. Facilities and equipment accommodate male and female students
- e. Evidence exists of effort to recruit males
- f. FHA includes male and female members

Comments:

8. Future Homemakers of America

- a. Teacher sponsors an FHA chapter
- b. Affiliates with state and national organization
- c. Members actively participate in local and district activities
- d. Includes FHA experiences in home economics program at all levels
- e. Program of work contributes to instructional program
- f. Keeps FHA financial reports on file
- g. Student committees contribute to improvement of FHA, school, and community
- h. Uses ENCOUNTER and IMPACT processes

Comments:

Superior	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak	Unable to Judge
5	4	3	2	1	UJ

9. Program Outcomes

- a. Reflect students' ability to be self-directing
- b. Contribute to employability of youth and adults in the dual role of homemaker and wage earner
- c. Help students develop skills, attitudes and values for working cooperatively with family members and employers

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	UJ

10. Instructional Methods

- a. Replicate occupation of the homemaker
- b. Use variety of methods daily
- c. Demonstrate ingenuity and initiative
- d. Conform to maturity level of students
- e. Provide individualized instruction for varying abilities of students
- f. Selected in relation to behavioral outcomes desired
- g. Provide opportunities for individual and group participation

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	UJ

11. Instructional Materials and Supplies

- a. Sufficient quantity of:
 - 1. Materials and supplies
 - 2. Up-to-date textbooks and reference materials
- b. Readily accessible to students and teacher
- c. Multi-media materials available for all areas

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	UJ

Comments:

- a. Demonstrates sensitivity to individual student needs
- b. Demonstrates leadership qualities
- c. Possesses skills in the organization of subject matter and the teaching-learning process
- d. Utilizes daily lesson plans developed from objectives
- e. Understands differences among varying social, economic and cultural backgrounds and applies to program
- f. Demonstrates organizational ability by effective classroom management
- g. Respects and works well with students
- h. Works productively, cooperatively and professionally with other academic staff and guidance staff
- i. Demonstrates responsiveness to supervision by implementing recommended modifications to improve program

5	Superior
4	Very Good
3	Good
2	Fair
1	Weak
U	Unable to Judge

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	UJ

Comments:

[illegible]

[illegible]

21. Equipment

- a. Sufficient equipment provided to promote maximum learning in all areas of instruction
- b. Inventory of equipment, materials, instructional materials available
- c. Purchased within last five years or in good working order
- d. Reflects current developments and equipment used in average home
- e. Selected to illustrate a variety of costs and family situations

Comments:

Superior	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak	Unable to Judge
5	4	3	2	1	UJ

22. Safety

- a. Fire extinguishers are:
 1. Located in department
 2. Inspected regularly
 3. Usable by students and teachers
- b. Safety practices in use of facilities and equipment are included in instruction

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	UJ

23. Storage

- a. Allows for systematic, easily accessible storage
- b. Provides closet space and storage drawers for students
- c. Provides sufficient storage for equipment, teaching supplies, instructional materials and aids

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	UJ

24. Financial Resources

- a. Formal itemized budget established prior to the school year and on file
- b. Funds used with maximum efficiency
- c. Adequate funds provided for:
 1. Consumable supplies
 2. Experimental activities
 3. Immediate repairs of equipment
- d. Records kept for expenditures

Comments:

5	4	3	2	1	UJ

Consumer and Homemaking Program Evaluation Form

Page 8

Superior	Very Good	Good	Fair	Weak	Unable to Judge
5	4	3	2	1	UJ

25. Department Housekeeping

- a. Provides an example of good housekeeping
- b. Students assume responsibility for housekeeping chores
- c. Reflects attractive, home-like atmosphere, desirable living standards
- d. Includes adequate care and maintenance by custodial staff

Comments:

APPENDIX C

LETTER ASKING TEACHERS TO PARTICIPATE IN PILOT STUDY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Knoxville 37916
College of Education

Department of
Vocational-Technical Education

May 29, 1979

As a part of my doctoral work at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I am conducting a study under the direction of Drs. Ray Smith and Jackie McInnis to develop and validate an instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. I am asking ten consumer and homemaking teachers to participate in a pilot study to determine the reliability of the evaluation instrument that has been developed. The final product of this study will be an evaluation instrument that you could use for evaluating and improving your own program.

Your participation in this pilot study would involve using the instrument to evaluate your consumer and homemaking program, and returning the instrument by mail. The instrument should take less than one hour to complete. Two weeks later you will be asked to evaluate your program again using the same instrument, and returning it to me. The data from the instrument will be coded for analysis purposes to insure confidentiality. No personal identification will appear in written reports or summaries of the project.

Please indicate whether or not you will be willing to participate in this pilot study by checking the enclosed postcard and returning it by June 5, 1979. I will be happy to answer any questions or inquiries you have concerning the research project. Your help in conducting this study should aid in developing a useful, and practical instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.

Sincerely,

Cathy A. Lassiter
Graduate Student

Enclosure: Reply Postcard

APPENDIX D

FIRST LETTER TO TEACHERS PARTICIPATING IN PILOT STUDY

Knoxville 37916
College of Education

Department of
Vocational-Technical Education

June 8, 1979

I want to express my gratitude for your willingness to participate in the pilot study. Determining the reliability of the evaluation instrument is a very important part of the overall study.

Please evaluate your consumer and homemaking program using the enclosed evaluation instrument. Using the scale: 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, and 1-Weak, indicate your rating of the program for each criterion statement by placing a check in the appropriate box at the end of each statement. As was indicated in the first letter to you, the data will be coded for analysis purposes to insure confidentiality, and no personal identification will appear in written reports or summaries of the project.

When you have completed the evaluation instrument, please sign the enclosed informed consent form and return it with the evaluation instrument before June 25, 1979. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. The informed consent form will be filed separately from the evaluation instrument to insure confidentiality.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Cathy A. Lassiter
Graduate Student

Enclosures: Informed Consent Form
Evaluation Form (8 pages)
Return envelope

APPENDIX E

SECOND LETTER TO TEACHERS PARTICIPATING IN PILOT STUDY

Knoxville 37916
College of Education

Department of
Vocational-Technical Education

Thank you for completing the evaluation instrument and returning it earlier this month. Your response certainly adds to the future usability of the evaluation form. I really do appreciate your professional commitment to home economics.

In order to determine the reliability of the evaluation instrument, I now need you to evaluate your consumer and homemaking program again using the same instrument. Do not try to recall how you rated the program during the first evaluation. Respond to each criterion statement as if it were the first time you had seen the statement.

For your convenience in returning the form promptly, use the enclosed stamped, addressed envelope. It is extremely important that the form be returned as soon as possible in order to proceed with the study.

Thank you again for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Cathy A. Lassiter
Graduate Student

Enclosure: Evaluation Form
Return envelope

APPENDIX F
TEST-RETEST RELIABILITY DATA ON TEN EAST TENNESSEE
CONSUMER AND HOMEMAKING PROGRAMS

TABLE A-2. Test-Retest Reliability Data on Ten East Tennessee Consumer and Homemaking Programs

Criterion Statement	A T-R ¹	Program									
		B T-R	C T-R	D T-R	E T-R	F T-R	G T-R	H T-R	I T-R	J T-R	
1a	4-4 ²	3-3	4-4	3-3	5-5	4-4	4-5	4-4	4-4	4-3	
1b	2-2	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	3-3	
1c	3-4	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	3-4	4-4	
1d	4-4	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-4	
2a	3-3	UJ-UJ	5-5	4-3	3-3	4-5	5-5	4-5	5-5	5-4	
2b	3-4	4-4	5-4	2-2	3-5	4-4	4-5	4-4	5-4	4-3	
3a	UJ-UJ	UJ-UJ	3-5	3-3	2-2	5-5	5-5	UJ-4	5-4	2-1	
3b	5-5	4-5	5-5	3-3	3-3	4-4	5-5	3-4	3-3	3-3	
3c	4-4	4-5	5-5	3-3	5-5	4-5	4-5	5-5	4-4	3-2	
3d	5-5	4-5	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-4	2-3	
4a	4-4	3-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-5	4-4	5-4	4-4	
4b	4-4	3-3	5-5	4-4	4-5	4-4	4-5	4-4	4-4	3-4	
4c	3-4	4-3	5-4	4-4	5-5	4-5	5-5	3-4	5-4	3-3	
4d	2-3	2-2	4-4	4-3	5-4	3-3	5-5	1-4	4-3	3-3	

TABLE A-2. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program									
	A ₁ T-R	B T-R	C T-R	D T-R	E T-R	F T-R	G T-R	H T-R	I T-R	J T-R
5a	5-5	4-5	4-5	4-4	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-5	5-3
5b	5-3	4-5	3-4	4-4	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-5	5-5	5-3
5c	4-4	3-3	4-5	4-4	5-5	4-5	5-5	5-5	4-5	4-3
5d	3-3	4-3	4-5	4-4	5-5	4-5	4-5	4-5	4-4	4-3
6a	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-4
6b ₁	5-4	5-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-5	5-5	4-4	4-4	3-3
6b ₂	4-3	3-4	5-5	4-4	5-4	3-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	3-4
6b ₃	4-4	4-4	5-5	4-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	3-4	4-4
6b ₄	4-3	3-4	3-3	3-3	3-4	3-4	5-5	3-4	3-3	2-2
6c ₁	4-4	3-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	3-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-4
6c ₂	4-4	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-5	5-5	4-4	4-4	3-3
6c ₃	5-4	5-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-5	5-5	4-4	4-4	5-4
6d	4-5	4-5	5-5	4-4	3-3	4-4	4-4	4-5	3-3	5-4
6e	5-3	5-5	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-3

TABLE A-2. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program									
	A ₁ T-R	B T-R	C T-R	D T-R	E T-R	F T-R	G T-R	H T-R	I T-R	J T-R
7a	4-4	4-3	5-4	5-5	3-4	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-4
7b	3-3	5-5	5-5	4-3	3-1	4-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5
7c	3-4	5-4	5-4	4-4	5-3	4-5	5-5	5-5	4-4	4-4
7d	3-4	4-3	4-4	4-4	5-2	4-5	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-4
7e	4-4	5-3	4-5	4-4	5-5	4-5	5-5	4-4	4-4	3-3
7f	4-5	5-5	1-1	1-1	3-1	1-1	1-1	4-4	1-2	4-3
8a	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-4	3-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-5	5-5
8b	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-4	2-2	5-5	1-1	5-5	5-5	5-5
8c	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-3	5-5	3-3	5-5	2-3	5-5
8d	4-4	4-3	4-4	3-3	2-1	4-5	1-2	5-5	2-3	5-5
8e	4-4	4-3	4-4	4-4	1-3	4-4	2-2	5-5	1-2	5-5
8f	4-4	2-3	5-5	5-4	4-4	5-5	5-2	4-5	4-4	5-5
8g	3-3	4-3	4-5	4-4	5-5	3-4	3-3	5-5	3-3	5-5
8h	5-5	3-3	3-3	1-2	3-3	2-1	1-1	1-1	1-1	5-5

TABLE A-2. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program									
	A ₁ T-R	B T-R	C T-R	D T-R	E T-R	F T-R	G T-R	H T-R	I T-R	J T-R
9a	3-3	3-3	4-5	3-3	5-5	3-3	4-5	4-4	3-3	4-4
9b	4-3	3-3	3-4	3-3	5-5	3-4	4-5	4-4	UJ-3	3-3
9c	4-4	4-3	4-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-3	3-3
10a	4-4	4-3	4-4	4-4	5-4	4-4	4-5	4-4	4-3	4-3
10b	3-4	4-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	3-4	4-5	4-4	4-4	3-3
10c	3-4	4-3	5-4	4-4	5-5	3-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	3-3
10d	3-3	4-3	5-4	4-4	5-4	4-4	4-5	4-4	4-4	4-4
10e	2-2	3-3	5-5	4-4	5-4	3-3	3-5	3-4	4-4	2-3
10f	4-4	3-3	4-4	3-4	5-5	4-4	4-5	4-4	4-4	4-3
10g	3-4	4-3	4-4	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-4
11a ₁	4-4	2-2	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-5	5-5	5-5	4-4	4-4
11a ₂	3-4	1-1	5-5	4-4	5-3	4-5	3-4	4-4	4-4	4-4
11b	4-4	4-3	5-5	4-4	4-3	3-2	5-5	5-4	5-4	4-4
11c	3-3	3-2	5-5	4-4	3-4	3-4	5-5	5-4	5-5	4-4

TABLE A-2. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program									
	A ¹ T-R	B T-R	C T-R	D T-R	E T-R	F T-R	G T-R	H T-R	I T-R	J T-R
12a	4-4	3-3	5-5	3-3	4-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-4	4-3
12b	4-3	4-3	5-5	5-5	5-5	3-5	5-5	4-4	4-4	3-3
12c	4-4	3-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	3-4	4-4	4-3	5-4	2-2
12d	3-3	3-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	3-4	5-5	3-3	5-4	1-1
12e	2-3	3-3	5-4	3-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	1-4	UJ-4	1-1
12f	4-4	2-3	4-4	2-3	4-5	3-3	UJ-4	2-3	3-4	1-2
12g	4-5	4-3	4-5	3-2	5-5	3-3	UJ-4	2-3	3-4	1-2
12h	2-1	2-1	5-5	5-5	5-5	2-4	5-5	5-5	5-4	5-4
12i	2-4	UJ-UJ	5-5	5-5	5-5	2-3	UJ-5	4-4	3-4	4-4
12j	4-4	3-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-5
13a	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5
13b	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5
13c	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-3	5-5	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-4
13d	5-4	4-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-4	5-5	4-4	5-4	5-4

TABLE A-2. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program									
	A T-R	B T-R	C T-R	D T-R	E T-R	F T-R	G T-R	H T-R	I T-R	J T-R
14a	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-4
14b	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-4	3-4	4-3
14c	3-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-3	4-3	1-1	3-3	4-4	4-3
14d	4-5	5-5	4-4	4-4	3-4	5-5	UJ-5	4-5	3-4	4-3
14e	5-4	4-4	5-4	4-4	5-3	4-4	5-5	4-5	4-4	3-3
15a	3-4	3-3	4-5	5-5	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-3
15b	4-4	3-3	4-5	4-4	5-5	3-3	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-3
15c	4-4	3-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	3-4	5-5	5-4	4-4	4-3
15d	3-3	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-3	4-4	5-5	5-4	4-4	4-3
15e	4-4	3-3	4-4	4-4	5-3	3-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-4
15f	3-4	3-3	4-4	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-5	5-4
15g	4-4	3-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-4	4-4	4-4
15h	4-4	3-3	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-4	5-4	4-4
15i	4-4	4-3	5-5	4-4	5-4	4-4	5-5	5-4	5-4	UJ-UJ

TABLE A-2. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program									
	A ₁ T-R	B T-R	C T-R	D T-R	E T-R	F T-R	G T-R	H T-R	I T-R	J T-R
16a	3-3	3-3	5-5	4-4	4-3	3-4	4-5	4-4	4-4	4-3
16b	4-4	3-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-5	5-4	5-4	5-4
16c	4-4	3-UJ	5-5	4-4	1-3	3-4	UJ-UJ	5-4	4-3	5-3
16d	1-1	UJ-UJ	1-2	1-1	1-3	4-5	1-UJ	5-4	4-3	UJ-UJ
17a ₁	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	1-1	UJ-1	4-4	5-4
17a ₂	5-5	UJ-UJ	5-5	5-5	3-3	5-5	5-4	UJ-1	4-4	5-4
17a ₃	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-5	UJ-1	4-4	5-4
17b	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-5	UJ-1	4-4	3-3
17c	5-5	5-5	5-5	3-3	1-3	3-3	1-1	UJ-1	2-3	1-1
17d	5-4	2-2	5-5	1-1	3-4	4-5	1-2	UJ-1	4-4	1-1
17e	4-4	4-3	5-5	3-3	5-4	3-4	3-3	UJ-1	4-4	4-4
17f	5-5	3-2	5-5	3-1	4-5	5-5	4-5	UJ-1	2-3	1-1
17g	4-4	3-2	5-5	3-3	5-5	4-4	4-4	UJ-1	3-4	3-3

TABLE A-2. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J		
	T-R	T-R	T-R	T-R	T-R	T-R	T-R	T-R	T-R	T-R		T-R
18a	4-4	5-3	4-5	4-4	5-5	3-3	4-4	4-4	4-4	4-4		4-4
18b	4-4	5-3	4-4	4-3	5-5	1-1	4-5	4-3	1-2	5-4		5-4
18c	2-3	3-3	5-4	4-4	5-5	2-3	4-5	4-4	3-3	5-4		5-4
18d	3-3	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-5	3-3	3-3		3-3
18e	4-4	4-3	5-5	4-3	4-4	4-4	4-5	4-4	3-4	3-3		3-3
18f	2-2	3-3	5-5	4-4	5-4	3-4	1-1	4-4	3-3	2-2		2-2
19a	4-4	3-3	4-4	4-4	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-4	4-4	3-3		3-3
19b	4-4	3-3	4-4	4-4	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-4	4-4	3-3		3-3
19c	4-4	4-3	5-4	4-4	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-3		4-3
19d ₁	4-4	4-3	5-5	4-4	3-3	5-5	4-5	5-3	4-4	2-2		2-2
19d ₂	4-4	4-3	5-5	4-4	3-4	5-5	5-5	5-4	4-4	2-1		2-1
19d ₃	4-4	4-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-5	UJ-5	5-4	4-4	4-4		4-4
19d ₄	3-2	4-3	5-5	3-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-4	4-4	4-4		4-4
19e	4-4	4-3	5-5	4-3	5-5	4-5	5-5	3-3	4-4	4-4		4-4
19f	2-3	4-3	4-5	3-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-4		4-4

TABLE A-2. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program									
	A ¹ T-R	B T-R	C T-R	D T-R	E T-R	F T-R	G T-R	H T-R	I T-R	J T-R
20a	4-4	1-1	5-5	4-4	5-5	2-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	2-2
20b	4-4	2-2	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-3	4-4	4-4
20c	5-4	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	4-4	3-3
20d ₁	4-4	3-3	2-3	3-3	5-5	1-1	3-5	3-3	3-3	5-4
20d ₂	5-5	2-2	5-3	5-5	5-5	2-3	4-5	3-3	4-4	5-4
20d ₃	4-4	1-1	2-1	5-5	5-5	3-3	5-5	3-3	4-4	5-4
20d ₄	5-3	2-2	4-3	5-5	5-5	3-3	5-5	3-3	4-4	3-4
20d ₅	3-3	1-1	4-3	5-5	5-5	3-3	2-5	2-3	4-4	3-2
20e	5-3	2-2	5-5	4-4	5-5	2-3	3-5	4-4	4-4	4-3
20f	5-4	4-3	5-4	5-5	5-5	3-4	4-5	4-4	4-4	4-3
20g	5-5	4-2	4-4	2-2	5-5	4-4	4-4	4-4	5-5	4-4
21a	4-4	2-2	5-5	3-3	5-5	4-4	4-5	5-4	5-4	4-4
21b	2-5	5-5	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-5	5-5	5-4	5-5	3-3
21c	5-4	4-2	4-5	5-5	5-3	5-4	4-4	4-3	4-4	4-4
21d	4-4	4-4	5-4	5-5	5-3	4-4	4-5	4-3	4-4	4-4

TABLE A-2. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program									
	A T-R ¹	B T-R	C T-R	D T-R	E T-R	F T-R	G T-R	H T-R	I T-R	J T-R
21e	3-3	4-4	4-4	3-3	5-4	3-3	4-4	2-3	4-4	4-4
22a ₁	5-5	UJ-UJ	5-5	1-1	5-5	5-5	5-5	1-1	5-5	5-5
22a ₂	3-4	UJ-5	4-5	1-1	5-5	5-5	5-5	3-UJ	5-5	5-5
22a ₃	5-3	UJ-UJ	5-5	1-1	5-5	5-5	4-4	3-UJ	4-4	5-5
22b	5-3	5-3	4-3	4-4	5-5	5-5	5-5	4-3	4-4	5-4
23a	5-4	2-2	4-4	3-3	5-5	1-2	5-5	3-4	4-4	4-4
23b	5-5	2-2	5-5	3-3	5-5	2-3	4-4	3-3	4-4	4-3
23c	3-3	1-2	5-5	3-3	5-5	2-2	5-5	3-4	4-4	4-3
24a	4-4	2-3	5-5	3-3	5-5	1-1	4-5	1-1	2-4	4-3
24b	5-5	4-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-3	4-4	4-4
24c ₁	4-4	1-1	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-5	4-4	5-5
24c ₂	4-4	1-1	5-5	4-4	5-5	4-4	UJ-5	4-4	3-4	5-5
24c ₃	3-3	1-1	5-4	4-4	5-5	2-2	5-5	2-4	4-4	5-5
24d	5-5	4-3	5-5	4-4	5-5	5-5	5-5	3-4	4-4	5-3

TABLE A-2. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program									
	A T-R ¹	B T-R	C T-R	D T-R	E T-R	F T-R	G T-R	H T-R	I T-R	J T-R
25a	3-4	4-4	4-4	4-4	4-5	3-4	4-5	4-4	4-4	4-3
25b	4-4	4-4	5-4	4-4	3-4	4-4	4-5	4-4	4-4	3-3
25c	4-4	5-5	5-4	4-4	5-4	4-4	5-5	4-3	4-4	3-3
25d	4-4	1-1	2-3	4-4	5-5	3-2	2-3	3-2	4-4	2-1

¹First rating labeled "Test" (T); second rating labeled "Retest" (R).

²Rating Scale used was 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, 1-Weak, and UJ-Unable to Judge.

APPENDIX G

LETTER TO STATE SUPERVISORS OF HOME ECONOMICS

Knoxville 37916
College of Education

Department of
Vocational-Technical Education

May 24, 1979

I need your help to identify six consumer and homemaking programs in your state to participate in a validation study. As you may recall last year you were contacted by Joyce Harrison who was conducting a study to identify and verify criteria essential for the evaluation of consumer and homemaking programs. Using the criteria validated by Harrison's study, I am conducting a study to develop and validate an instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. The study is being conducted under the direction of Drs. Ray Smith and Jackie McInnis, Department of Vocational-Technical Education, The University of Tennessee. The final product of this study should provide a reliable, validated instrument for evaluating and improving consumer and homemaking programs.

In order to validate the evaluation instrument that has been developed, it appears appropriate to ask the same group of persons to respond to the instrument as will be using the instrument. Four groups of persons who will be using the instrument have been identified: the teacher of the program being evaluated, other consumer and homemaking teachers, regional home economics supervisors or state specialists, and home economics teacher educators.

Your state has been selected as one of five in the southeastern region of the United States to be represented in this study. I need you to identify on the enclosed forms six consumer and homemaking programs and the following four persons to evaluate each program:

1. The teacher of the consumer and homemaking program to be evaluated.
2. Another consumer and homemaking teacher who is familiar with the program.
3. A home economics regional supervisor (or state specialist) who is familiar with the program.
4. A home economics teacher educator who is familiar with the program.

These six programs should represent a cross section of programs in your state, not just the strong ones.

I will contact the persons you identify and ask them to evaluate the consumer and homemaking program using the evaluation instrument that has been developed. The amount of agreement among the four raters will be calculated. All data from the evaluation instrument will be coded for analysis purposes to insure confidentiality. No personal or state identification will appear in written reports or summaries of the project.

Will you please suggest six consumer and homemaking programs and four persons to evaluate each program on the enclosed forms. Please return these forms before June 15, 1979. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. I will be happy to answer any questions or inquiries you have concerning the research project. Your help in conducting this study should aid in developing a useful and practical instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs that could be used in your state.

Sincerely,

Cathy A. Lassiter
Graduate Student

Enclosures: 6 forms
Return envelope

APPENDIX H

FORM FOR IDENTIFYING PERSONS TO EVALUATE A CONSUMER
AND HOMEMAKING PROGRAM FOR INSTRUMENT VALIDATION STUDY

PERSONS TO EVALUATE A CONSUMER AND HOME MAKING PROGRAM
FOR INSTRUMENT VALIDATION STUDY

1. Teacher of consumer and homemaking program to be evaluated:

Name _____

Address _____

2. Another consumer and homemaking teacher who is familiar with the program:

Name _____

Address _____

3. Home economics regional supervisor (or state specialist) who is familiar with the program:

Name _____

Address _____

4. Home economics teacher educator who is familiar with the program:

Name _____

Address _____

APPENDIX I
LETTER TO FLORIDA SUPERINTENDENTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

176

Knoxville 37916
College of Education

Department of
Vocational-Technical Education

July 20, 1979

As a part of my doctoral work at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I am conducting a study under the direction of Drs. Ray Smith and Jackie McInnis to develop and validate an instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. , Occupational Program Director, Home Economics Education, Florida State Department of Education, has asked that I contact you before asking and High School, to participate in a study to determine the validity of the evaluation instrument that has been developed (Letter from attached). The final product of this study will be an evaluation instrument that could be used for evaluating and improving consumer and homemaking programs in your county.

and participation in the study would involve using the enclosed instrument to evaluate consumer and homemaking program, and returning the instrument by mail. The instrument should take less than one hour to complete. The data from the instrument will be coded for analysis purposes to insure confidentiality. No personal identification will appear in written reports or summaries of the project.

Please indicate whether or not you will be willing for and to participate in this study by checking the enclosed postcard and returning it by July 30, 1979. I will be happy to answer any questions or inquiries you have concerning the research project. and help in conducting this study should aid in developing a useful, and practical instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.

Sincerely,

Cathy A. Lassiter
Graduate Student

cc:

Enclosures: letter
Evaluation instrument
Return postcard

APPENDIX J

LETTER TO TEACHERS PARTICIPATING IN VALIDATION STUDY

Knoxville 37916
College of Education

Department of
Vocational-Technical Education

September 1, 1979

As a part of my doctoral work at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I am conducting a study to develop and validate an instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. The final product of this study will be an evaluation instrument that you could use for evaluating and improving your own program. State Supervisor, Home Economics Education, has identified your consumer and homemaking program to participate in this study. Will you please evaluate your consumer and homemaking program using the enclosed evaluation instrument. Using the scale: 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, and 1-Weak, indicate your rating of the program for each criterion statement by placing a check in the appropriate box at the end of each statement.

Consumer and homemaking programs in your state and in four other southeastern states are included in the study. In each case, the teacher of the consumer and homemaking program, another consumer and homemaking teacher, a home economics regional supervisor and a home economics teacher educator who are familiar with the consumer and homemaking program will be evaluating the same program. The amount of agreement among the four raters will be calculated to determine the validity of the evaluation instrument. All data from the evaluation instrument will be coded for analysis purposes to insure confidentiality. No personal or state identification will appear in written reports or summaries of the project.

When you have completed the evaluation instrument, please sign the enclosed informed consent form and return it with the evaluation instrument before September 21, 1979. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. Your help in conducting this study should aid in developing a useful and practical instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs that could be used in your state. Thank you very much for your cooperation in this very important part of the research project.

Sincerely,

Cathy A. Lassiter
Graduate Student

Enclosures: Evaluation instrument
Informed consent form
Return envelope

APPENDIX K

LETTER TO EVALUATORS PARTICIPATING IN VALIDATION STUDY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Knoxville 37916
College of Education

Department of
Vocational-Technical Education

September 1, 1979

As a part of my doctoral work at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I am conducting a study to develop and validate an instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs. The final product of this study will be an evaluation instrument that could be used for evaluating and improving consumer and homemaking programs. State Supervisor, Home Economics Education, has identified you to participate in the study. Will you please evaluate the following consumer and homemaking program using the enclosed evaluation instrument:

Teacher of Program _____

School _____

Address _____

Using the scale: 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, and 1-Weak, indicate your rating of the program for each criterion statement by placing a check in the appropriate box at the end of each statement.

Consumer and homemaking programs in your state and in four other southeastern states are included in the study. In each case, the teacher of the consumer and homemaking program, another consumer and homemaking teacher, a home economics regional supervisor and a home economics teacher educator who are familiar with the consumer and homemaking program will be evaluating the same program. The amount of agreement among the four raters will be calculated to determine the validity of the evaluation instrument. All data from the evaluation instrument will be coded for analysis purposes to insure confidentiality. No personal or state identification will appear in written reports or summaries of the project.

When you have completed the evaluation instrument, please sign the enclosed informed consent form and return it with the evaluation instrument before September 21, 1979. A stamped, addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience.

Your help in conducting this study should aid in developing a useful and practical instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs that could be used in your state. Thank you very much for your cooperation in this very important part of the research project.

Sincerely,

Cathy A. Lassiter
Graduate Student

Enclosures: Evaluation instrument
Informed consent form
Return envelope

APPENDIX L
FOLLOW-UP LETTER TO NONRESPONDENTS

THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

183

Knoxville 37916
College of Education

Department of
Vocational-Technical Education

September 26, 1979

On September 1, 1979, you were sent an evaluation instrument as part of a research study to determine the validity of an instrument for evaluating consumer and homemaking programs.

Head State Specialist, Home Economics Education, selected you as a person who could rate the consumer and homemaking program listed below:

Teacher _____

School _____

Address _____

Your evaluation instrument has not been received. If you have not as yet completed the evaluation instrument, would you please do so and return it in the enclosed stamped envelope before October 5, 1979. Your response is essential to the development of an instrument that you could use for assessing the adequacy of consumer and homemaking programs.

Since it is possible that the evaluation instrument could have been misplaced, I am enclosing an additional copy. Thank you for your cooperation in this very important part of a research project which is important to all home economics teachers and supervisory personnel.

Sincerely,

Cathy A. Lassiter
Graduate Student

Enclosures: Evaluation instrument
Informed consent form
Return envelope

APPENDIX M

PROGRAMS SHOWING A SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE IN EVALUATORS' RATINGS

GROUPED ACCORDING TO CRITERION STATEMENTS

TABLE A-3. Programs Showing a Significant Difference in Evaluators' Ratings Grouped According to Criterion Statements

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
1.a.	D	4 ³	3	4	5	2.7 *
	E	5	4	3	4	2.7 *
	H	2	4		5	2.0 *
	P	3	5	4	4	2.7 *
	U	3	4	5	3	2.7 *
	V	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	X	2	UJ	4	3	2.0 *
1.b.	V	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	5	3	4	4	2.7 *
1.c.	C	4	2		4	1.5 *
	O	5		5	3	1.5 *
	P	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	V	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	W		4	5	3	2.0 *
	X	3	4	5	3	2.7 *
1.d.	F	5	UJ	3		1.0 *
	H	3	4		5	2.0 *
	O	5		4	3	2.0 *
	P	3	5	4	3	2.7 *
	U	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	V	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	5	3	5	4	2.7 *
	Z	4		5	3	2.0 *
2.a.	C	5	2		5	1.5 *
	P	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	U	5	4	5	3	2.7 *
	W		4	4	2	1.5 *
2.b.	B	3	4	5		2.0 *
	C	4	3		5	2.0 *
	O	4		5	3	2.0 *
	P	4	5	5	3	2.7 *
	Q	3	5	4		2.0 *
	U	4	5	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	X	1	5	4	3	3.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				χ^2 ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
3.a.	F	UJ	5	3		1.0 *
	J	4	2	4	3	2.7 *
	P	UJ	5	4	2	2.0 *
	Q	1	4	5		2.0 *
	S	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	4	UJ	UJ	1	1.0 *
	V	5	5	4	1	2.7 *
	W		4	3	1	2.0 *
3.b.	Y	4	5	3	3	2.7 *
	E	5	4	3	5	2.7 *
	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	H	4	UJ		5	1.0 *
	U	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Z	3		5	2	2.0 *
	G	4	5	2		2.0 *
	H	3	4		5	2.0 *
3.c.	M	4		3	2	2.0 *
	T	5	3	4		2.0 *
	U	3	4	4	2	2.7 *
	X	3	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	1	3	3	2.7 *
	D	4	3	5	5	2.7 *
	Q	2	5	5		1.5 *
	U	5	4	5	1	2.7 *
3.d.	W		4	3	2	2.0 *
	Z	3		5	UJ	1.0 *
	D	3	4	4	5	2.7 *
	H	3	3		5	1.5 *
	T	5	3	4		2.0 *
	V	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	X	4	1	4	2	2.7 *
	Y	4	3	3	5	2.7 *
4.a.	E	5	4	3	4	2.7 *
	H	2	3		5	2.0 *
	Q	4	3	5		2.0 *
	V	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	D	4	3	4	5	2.7 *
	K	4	UJ	5	3	2.0 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	Y	4	3	3	5	2.7 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ² ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
4.d.	D	3	3	4	5	2.7 *
	E	5	4	3	5	2.7 *
	F	5	UJ	3		1.0 *
	G	2	4	4		1.5 *
	H	3	4		5	2.0 *
	N	5	3	UJ	4	2.0 *
	P	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	S	4	3	5		2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	V	5	5	4	1	2.7 *
	W		4	4	2	1.5 *
5.a.	P	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	Q	3	4	5		3.0 *
	U	5	1	4	3	4.0 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	X	1	5	4	4	2.7 *
5.b.	H	3	4		5	2.0 *
	P	5	3	4	3	2.7 *
	Q	3	4	5		2.0 *
	U	5	UJ	4	2	2.0 *
	V	5	5	5	2	1.8 *
	X	1	5	4	4	2.7 *
5.c.	P	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	Q	3	4	5		2.0 *
	T	5	3	4		2.0 *
	U	4	1	5	3	4.0 *
	V	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	X	2	5	4	3	4.0 *
	Y	4	UJ	2	UJ	1.0 *
5.d.	C	5	3		4	2.0 *
	K	3	UJ	5	4	2.0 *
	P	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	Q	3	4	5		2.0 *
	T	5	3	4		2.0 *
	U	4	1	5	2	4.0 *
	V	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	X	2	5	4	4	2.7 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ^{2 2}
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
6.a.	D	4	3	5	5	2.7 *
	I	4		3	2	2.0 *
	L	3	5	4	4	2.7 *
	P	5	4	5	2	2.7 *
	U	5	4	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	4	2	2.7 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Z	4		5	3	2.0 *
6.b.1.	B	3	4	5		2.0 *
	I	5		4	2	2.0 *
	L	3	5	4	4	2.7 *
	P	5	3	5	4	2.7 *
	V	5	5	4	2	2.7 *
	X	3	5	5	4	2.7 *
	Z	4		5	3	2.0 *
6.b.2.	C	5	3		5	1.5 *
	E	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	I	5		3	2	2.0 *
	K	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	L	3	5	4	4	2.7 *
	P	4	2	5	3	2.0 *
	T	5	3	4		2.0 *
	W		3	4	2	2.0 *
	X	3	5	4	4	2.7 *
6.b.3.	C	5	3		5	1.5 *
	E	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	P	4	2	5	3	4.0 *
	T	5	3	4		2.0 *
	W		3	4	2	2.0 *
	X	3	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Z	4		5	3	2.0 *
6.b.4.	C	4	2		5	2.0 *
	D	4	4	3	5	2.7 *
	I	5		3	2	2.0 *
	N	5	3	UJ	2	2.0 *
	P	4	1	4	3	2.7 *
	T	5	3	4		2.0 *
	V	4	4	4	2	1.8 *
	X	3	4	3	1	2.7 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ^{2 2}
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
6.c.1.	B	3	4	5		2.0 *
	K	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	L	3	5	4	5	2.7 *
	N	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	P	5	3	4	3	2.7 *
	U	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	W		4	3	2	2.0 *
	X	3	5	3	2	2.7 *
6.c.2.	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	L	3	5	4	5	2.7 *
	N	5	3	4	4	2.7 *
	P	5	3	4	3	2.7 *
	X	3	5	4	3	2.7 *
6.c.3.	L	3	5	4	5	2.7 *
	P	5	4	5	3	2.7 *
	T	5	3	4		2.0 *
	U	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	X	3	5	4	2	3.0 *
6.d.	L	3	5	4	5	2.7 *
	U	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Z	4		5	2	2.0 *
6.e.	A	2	4			1.0 *
	D	4	3	5	5	2.7 *
	I	5		4	3	2.0 *
	P	5	4	5	2	2.7 *
	S	4	3	5		2.0 *
	U	3	UJ	5	UJ	1.0 *
	Z	4		5	2	2.0 *
7.a.	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	L	3	5	5	4	2.7 *
	P	5	2	3	2	2.7 *
	U	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Z	4		5	3	2.0 *
7.b.	P	5	2	3	3	2.7 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
7.c.	P	5	2	3	3	2.7 *
	U	4	4	5	2	2.7 *
	W		5	4	3	2.0 *
	X	3	5	4	3	2.7 *
7.d.	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	L	2	5	4	5	2.7 *
	P	1	2	3	2	2.7 *
	S	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	3	4	5	3	2.7 *
	W		5	4	2	2.0 *
	X	4	5	5	2	2.7 *
7.e.	D	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	H	1	4		UJ	1.0 *
	I	5		UJ	3	1.0 *
	L	2	5	4	3	3.0 *
	M	4		3	2	2.0 *
	P	5	1	3	3	2.7 *
	S	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	4	UJ	5	2	2.0 *
	W		5	4	3	2.0 *
7.f.	I	5		3	UJ	1.0 *
	K	1	UJ	4	1	1.5 *
	L	1	5	1	3	2.7 *
	O	4		5	3	2.0 *
	Y	4	1	5	UJ	2.0 *
8.a.	D	5	4	5	3	2.7 *
	W		3	4	2	2.0 *
	X	4	5	3	4	2.7 *
8.b.	D	5	4	5	3	2.7 *
	X	4	5	3	5	2.7 *
8.c.	E	5	5	5	2	1.8 *
	X	4	5	3	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	3	3	2.7 *
	Z	4		5	3	2.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				χ^2 ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
8.d.	C	5	1		5	1.5 *
	D	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	H	4	1		UJ	1.0 *
	U	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	W		4	3	2	2.0 *
	X	4	5	3	3	2.7 *
8.e.	C	3	1		3	1.5 *
	D	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	H	3	1		UJ	1.0 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	X	4	5	3	3	2.7 *
8.f.	B	4	3	2		2.0 *
	D	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	E	5	5	UJ	3	1.5 *
	H	3	1		UJ	1.0 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	W		4	UJ	2	1.0 *
	X	4	5	3	4	2.7 *
	Z	3		5	UJ	1.0 *
8.g.	C	5	3		5	1.5 *
	D	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	H	5	1		UJ	1.0 *
	K	1	5	5	3	2.7 *
	Q	3	4	5		2.0 *
	X	3	4	3	2	2.7 *
8.h.	B	4	3	2		2.0 *
	D	2	2	5	3	2.7 *
	I	1		4	5	2.0 *
	K	3	UJ	4	2	2.0 *
	L	2	4	UJ	4	1.5 *
	O	5		3	UJ	1.0 *
	P	1	UJ	5	4	2.0 *
	Q	1	3	2		2.0 *
	R	5	5	3		1.5 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	3	UJ	1	UJ	1.0 *
	V	4	5	5	1	2.7 *
	W		2	3	1	2.0 *
	X	1	5	3	1	2.7 *
	Y	3	1	UJ	UJ	1.0 *
	Z	1		4	UJ	1.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ^{2,2}
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
9.a.	D	3	3	4	5	2.7 *
	K	4	3	5	4	2.7 *
	O	5		5	3	1.5 *
	P	4	3	5	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	3	4	5	2.7 *
9.b.	C	5	2		5	1.5 *
	D	3	3	4	5	2.7 *
	G	4	3	1		2.0 *
	O	5		4	3	2.0 *
	P	3	1	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	4	1	2.7 *
	X	3	5	3	4	2.7 *
9.c.	D	4	3	3	5	2.7 *
	H	5	4		3	2.0 *
	O	5		5	3	1.5 *
	P	4	3	5	3	2.7 *
	U	4	3	5	4	2.7 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	X	3	5	4	4	2.7 *
	Y	4	3	5	5	2.7 *
10.a.	E	5	4	3	4	2.7 *
	F	5	UJ	3		1.0 *
	H	4	3		5	2.0 *
	K	4	UJ	5	3	2.0 *
	L	3	4	5	4	2.7 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	3	4	5	3	2.7 *
10.b.	R	5	5	5	3	1.5 *
	U	4	UJ	5	3	2.0 *
10.c.	L	2	5	5	4	2.7 *
	P	4	3	5	3	2.7 *
	U	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	3	UJ	4	5	2.0 *
10.d.	E	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	H	4	3	5		2.0 *
	L	3	5	5	5	1.8 *
	P	4	3	5	4	2.7 *
	V	4	5	4	3	2.7 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
10.e.	D	3	3	4	5	2.7 *
	I	5		4	3	2.0 *
	K	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	P	4	UJ	5	3	2.0 *
	V	4	5	5	1	2.7 *
	W		3	4	2	2.0 *
	X	3	4	3	2	2.7 *
	Y	4	UJ	3	5	2.0 *
10.f.	C	4	3		5	2.0 *
	E	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	I	5		3	3	1.5 *
	L	3	4	5	5	2.7 *
	P	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	V	4	5	4	2	2.7 *
	X	3	5	4	4	2.7 *
10.g.	E	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	H	5	3		4	2.0 *
	I	5		3	4	2.0 *
	K	3	5	5	4	2.7 *
	L	3	3	5	5	2.4 *
	U	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	Z	4		5	3	2.0 *
11.a.1.	E	5	4	3	3	2.7 *
	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	K	5	3	5	4	2.7 *
	L	3	4	5	4	2.7 *
	N	2	3	4	4	2.7 *
	O	5		4	2	2.0 *
	R	5	3	4		2.0 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
11.a.2.	Y	3	5	4	5	2.7 *
	C	3	1		2	2.0 *
	K	5	3	5	4	2.7 *
	N	2	4	3	4	2.7 *
	O	4		3	2	2.0 *
	X	4	5	4	2	2.7 *
11.b.	Y	4	3	1	5	3.0 *
	C	3	2		5	2.0 *
	E	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	H	5	3		5	1.5 *
	L	3	4	5	5	2.7 *
	N	3	5	4	4	2.7 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				χ^2 ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
11.c.	C	5	2		3	2.0 *
	F	3	5	4		2.0 *
	H	5	3		4	2.0 *
	K	3	UJ	5	4	2.0 *
	L	2	4	UJ	5	2.0 *
	M	2		3	4	2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	Y	3	5	4	5	2.7 *
12.a.	D	5	3	5	5	1.8 *
	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	M	5		3	4	2.0 *
	O	5		4	2	2.0 *
	P	4	3	3	2	2.7 *
	U	5	4	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	5	1	1.8 *
	W	4	3	2		2.0 *
	X	4	5	5	2	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	5	3	2.7 *
	Z	5		3	UJ	1.0 *
12.b.	O	5		4	2	2.0 *
	P	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	U	5	4	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	Y	UJ	5	4	3	2.0 *
12.c.	D	4	3	5	UJ	2.0 *
	E	5	4	2	UJ	2.0 *
	H	3	5		UJ	1.0 *
	L	2	4	UJ	4	1.5 *
	O	5		4	2	2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	5	4	5	3	2.7 *
12.d.	E	5	5	2	UJ	1.5 *
	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	L	2	4	UJ	4	1.5 *
	O	5		4	2	2.0 *
	P	4	2	4	3	2.7 *
	U	5	4	5	3	2.7 *
	Y	3	5	4	UJ	2.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				χ^2 ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
12.e.	E	5	1	UJ	UJ	1.0 *
	G	3	5	3		1.5 *
	K	3	4	5	4	2.7 *
	L	2	4	UJ	4	1.5 *
	P	1	UJ	UJ	3	1.0 *
	U	4	4	5	2	2.7 *
	V	5	5	4	1	2.7 *
12.f.	C	3	4		5	2.0 *
	D	UJ	2	4	UJ	1.0 *
	G	3	5	3		1.5 *
	K	1	UJ	4	UJ	1.0 *
	M	1		3	UJ	1.0 *
	O	5		1	3	2.0 *
	U	4	4	4	2	1.8 *
	V	5	5	5	2	1.8 *
	X	4	UJ	4	2	1.5 *
12.g.	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	K	1	UJ	4	UJ	1.0 *
	M	1		3	UJ	1.0 *
	O	5		UJ	3	1.0 *
	P	2	1	UJ	3	2.0 *
	R	5	5	3		1.5 *
	V	5	5	5	2	1.8 *
	X	3	UJ	4	2	2.0 *
	Y	UJ	5	3	5	1.5 *
12.h.	H	3	5		4	2.0 *
	L	3	5	5	4	2.7 *
	O	5		4	2	2.0 *
	P	5	3	UJ	3	1.5 *
	V	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	W		5	3	3	1.5 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
12.i.	B	5	4	3		2.0 *
	I	4		UJ	2	1.0 *
	J	UJ	4	UJ	1	1.0 *
	L	1	4	UJ	UJ	1.0 *
	N	5	1	UJ	UJ	1.0 *
	O	1		3	2	2.0 *
	P	UJ	1	UJ	3	1.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
12.i. (continued)	V	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	W		5	UJ	2	1.0 *
	X	UJ	4	5	2	2.0 *
	Y	3	5	UJ	UJ	1.0 *
	Z	1		3	UJ	1.0 *
12.j.	P	5	5	UJ	2	1.5 *
13.a.		NONE				
13.b.		NONE				
13.c.	V	5	5	5	1	1.8 *
	W		5	3	2	2.0 *
13.d.	Z	UJ		5	3	1.0 *
14.a.		NONE				
14.b.	W		5	3	2	2.0 *
	Z	5		5	3	1.5 *
14.c.	B	1	2	5		2.0 *
	P	2	2	5	4	2.7 *
	S	5	4	3		2.0 *
	W		5	UJ	2	1.0 *
	X	2	3	3	5	2.7 *
	Y	5	3	1	3	2.7 *
14.d.	H	3	5		5	1.5 *
	P	5	3	5	4	2.7 *
	U	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	W		5	3	2	2.0 *
	X	2	5	4	5	2.7 *
14.e.	C	5	4		2	2.0 *
	P	5	3	5	3	2.4 *
	Q	3	5	UJ		1.0 *
	W		5	UJ	2	1.0 *
	X	3	5	UJ	4	2.0 *
	Z	3		5	UJ	1.0 *
15.a.	H	4	3		5	2.0 *
	L	3	5	5	4	2.7 *
	S	4	3	5		2.0 *
	Y	4	1	4	5	2.7 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ^{2 2}
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
15.b.	U	4	5	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
15.c.	U	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	X	4	5	5	3	2.7 *
	Z	4		5	3	2.0 *
15.d.	P	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	Q	3	4	5		2.0 *
	U	4	UJ	5	3	2.0 *
	V	5	5	4	2	2.7 *
	X	3	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Z	1		5	UJ	1.0 *
15.e.	L	3	5	4	5	2.7 *
	U	3	4	5	UJ	2.0 *
	V	5	5	4	2	2.7 *
	W		4	3	2	2.0 *
	Y	4	1	3	5	3.0 *
15.f.	H	5	3		4	2.0 *
	U	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	1	4	5	2.7 *
15.g.	H	4	3		5	2.0 *
	Y	4	3	4	5	2.7 *
15.h.	B	3	5	5		1.5 *
	E	5	5	2	4	2.7 *
	F	4	5	2		2.0 *
	L	3	5	UJ	4	2.0 *
	P	4	2	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	1	4	5	2.7 *
15.i.	M	4		3	2	2.0 *
	V	5	5	5	1	1.8 *
16.a.	D	3	4	4	5	2.7 *
	E	5	4	3	UJ	2.0 *
	L	3	5	UJ	4	2.0 *
	O	5		4	3	2.0 *
	P	4	3	3	2	2.7 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
16.a. (continued)	V	5	5	4	1	2.7 *
	X	3	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	UJ	3	5	2.0 *
	Z	3		5	UJ	1.0 *
16.b.	E	5	3	3	3	1.8 *
	H	3	5		4	2.0 *
	I	3		1	4	2.0 *
	J	UJ	UJ	1	5	1.0 *
	O	5		4	3	2.0 *
	P	4	4	3	2	2.7 *
	V	5	5	4	1	2.7 *
	X	3	5	3	4	2.7 *
	Y	UJ	UJ	3	5	1.0 *
	Z	3		4	5	2.0 *
16.c.	D	2	2	2	5	1.8 *
	P	4	4	3	2	2.7 *
	R	5	5	3		1.5 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	V	5	5	5	2	1.8 *
	X	3	5	3	4	2.7 *
16.d.	B	4	2	1		2.0 *
	C	2	4		2	1.5 *
	D	1	UJ	3	5	2.0 *
	E	3	5	3	UJ	1.5 *
	H	4	2		UJ	1.0 *
	M	1		3	UJ	1.0 *
	O	5		5	3	1.5 *
	P	5	UJ	3	3	1.5 *
	V	5	5	4	1	2.7 *
	W		3	UJ	1	1.0 *
	X	UJ	3	UJ	1	1.0 *
	Z	2		4	UJ	1.0 *
17.a.1.	C	5	1		5	1.5 *
	D	4	3	5	UJ	2.0 *
	K	1	UJ	4	5	2.0 *
	M	2		3	5	2.0 *
	O	5		1	4	2.0 *
	P	1	1	2	3	2.7 *
	S	1	4	UJ		1.0 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
17.a.2.	C	5	1		1	1.5 *
	D	4	3	5	UJ	2.0 *
	E	5	5	UJ	3	1.5 *
	H	5	3		UJ	1.0 *
	K	1	UJ	4	5	2.0 *
	M	3		3	5	1.5 *
	O	5		1	4	2.0 *
	P	1	1	2	3	2.7 *
	U	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	V	UJ	UJ	5	3	1.0 *
	X	5	5	4	2	2.7 *
17.a.3.	C	5	1		5	1.5 *
	D	4	3	5	UJ	2.0 *
	K	1	UJ	4	5	2.0 *
	M	2		3	5	2.0 *
	O	5		1	4	2.0 *
	P	1	1	2	3	2.7 *
	S	1	4	UJ		1.0 *
	U	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
17.b.	C	4	1		4	1.5 *
	E	5	5	3	3	1.8 *
	I	3		5	UJ	1.0 *
	K	1	UJ	3	4	2.0 *
	O	5		1	4	2.0 *
	P	1	1	2	3	2.7 *
	S	1	4	UJ		1.0 *
	U	4	4	4	1	1.5 *
	V	5	5	4	2	2.7 *
	X	3	5	4	3	2.7 *
17.c.	C	5	1		5	1.5 *
	D	4	3	5	UJ	2.0 *
	E	5	5	3	UJ	1.5 *
	H	1	3		UJ	1.0 *
	L	2	4	5	4	2.7 *
	O	5		1	4	2.0 *
	S	1	3	UJ		1.0 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	Y	UJ	1	3	UJ	1.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
17.d.	C	5	1		5	1.5 *
	D	4	3	5	UJ	2.0 *
	G	3	5	4		2.0 *
	H	1	3		UJ	1.0 *
	O	5		1	4	2.0 *
	U	5	3	4	UJ	2.0 *
	W		2	3	2	1.5 *
	X	4	3	4	2	2.7 *
	Y	UJ	1	3	UJ	1.0 *
	Z	1		3	UJ	1.0 *
17.e.	C	5	1		3	2.0 *
	E	5	5	3	UJ	1.5 *
	K	1	UJ	UJ	4	1.0 *
	O	5		1	4	2.0 *
	P	1	1	2	3	2.7 *
	Q	3	UJ	5		1.0 *
	S	1	4	UJ		1.0 *
	V	5	5	5	2	1.8 *
	X	2	5	4	2	2.7 *
	Y	4	1	3	UJ	2.0 *
17.f.	C	3	1		2	2.0 *
	G	2	3	4		2.0 *
	L	2	5	5	4	2.7 *
	O	5		1	4	2.0 *
	P	1	1	2	3	2.7 *
	S	1	3	UJ		1.0 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	W		3	UJ	1	1.0 *
	X	3	3	4	2	2.7 *
17.g.	B	5	4	3		2.0 *
	C	4	1		4	1.5 *
	D	4	3	5	UJ	2.0 *
	E	5	5	3	UJ	1.5 *
	K	1	UJ	UJ	4	1.0 *
	L	3	5	UJ	4	2.0 *
	O	5		1	4	2.0 *
	P	1	1	2	3	2.7 *
	S	1	3	UJ		1.0 *
	U	5	3	4	UJ	2.0 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	X	2	4	4	2	2.4 *
	Y	4	5	3	UJ	2.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				χ^2 ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
18.a.	H	3	2		4	2.0 *
	L	2	4	UJ	4	1.5 *
	M	3		5	4	2.0 *
	N	4	5	UJ	3	2.0 *
	P	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	T	5	3	4		2.0 *
	U	4	3	5	4	2.7 *
	W		4	3	2	2.0 *
	X	2	5	4	4	2.7 *
18.b.	B	3	2	5		2.0 *
	L	2	5	UJ	UJ	1.0 *
	M	2		4	UJ	1.0 *
	O	5		5	3	1.5 *
	P	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	W		4	3	2	2.0 *
	X	2	5	4	2	2.7 *
18.c.	C	5	2		2	1.5 *
	D	2	2	4	5	2.7 *
	E	5	4	3	UJ	2.0 *
	G	3	5	4		2.0 *
	K	3	4	5	4	2.7 *
	L	3	5	UJ	4	2.0 *
	M	2		4	3	2.0 *
	P	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	U	3	3	4	2	2.7 *
	W		4	3	2	2.0 *
	X	2	5	4	3	3.0 *
	Y	4	3	5	5	2.7 *
18.d.	E	5	5	3	UJ	1.5 *
	H	4	5		3	2.0 *
	L	2	5	UJ	3	2.0 *
	P	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	Q	4	3	5		2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	5	3	4	3	2.7 *
	X	2	5	4	4	2.7 *
	Y	4	3	5	5	2.7 *
18.e.	B	3	4	5		2.0 *
	C	5	3		4	2.0 *
	H	4	2		4	1.5 *
	L	3	5	UJ	4	2.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
18.e. (continued)	N	3	5	UJ	UJ	1.0 *
	P	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	Q	4	3	5		2.0 *
	X	2	UJ	4	3	2.0 *
	Y	4	3	5	5	2.7 *
18.f.	B	4	2	5		2.0 *
	C	2	1		4	2.0 *
	D	2	2	4	5	2.7 *
	K	3	UJ	5	4	2.0 *
	L	3	5	UJ	3	1.5 *
	N	4	5	UJ	3	2.0 *
	P	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	Q	2	UJ	5		1.0 *
	V	5	5	4	3	2.0 *
	X	2	3	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	3	3	5	2.7 *
19.a.	C	4	3		5	2.0 *
	G	3	5	4		2.0 *
	U	4	3	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	X	2	4	4	3	2.7 *
19.b.	U	4	3	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	5	1	1.8 *
	X	2	5	4	4	2.7 *
19.c.	U	4	3	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	5	2	1.8 *
	X	2	5	4	4	2.7 *
19.d.1.	C	3	4		5	2.0 *
	P	4	3	5	4	2.7 *
	U	4	3	5	UJ	2.0 *
	V	5	5	4	1	2.7 *
	X	2	5	4	4	2.7 *
19.d.2.	O	5		4	3	2.0 *
	P	4	3	5	4	2.7 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
	X	2	5	4	4	2.7 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
19.d.3.	G	3	5	4		2.0 *
	P	4	3	5	4	2.7 *
	V	5	5	5	2	1.8 *
	X	2	5	4	4	2.7 *
19.d.4.	G	3	5	4		2.0 *
	M	2		3	4	2.0 *
	P	4	3	5	3	2.7 *
	V	5	5	4	2	2.7 *
	X	2	5	4	3	3.0 *
19.e.	P	4	3	5	3	2.7 *
	X	2	5	4	2	2.7 *
19.f.	K	3	UJ	5	4	2.0 *
	M	1		4	4	1.5 *
	O	5		4	3	2.0 *
	P	1	3	5	3	2.7 *
	X	2	UJ	4	5	2.0 *
	Z	2		4	UJ	1.0 *
20.a.	E	1	2	2	3	2.7 *
	G	3	5	2		2.0 *
	J	3	4	4	5	2.7 *
	K	1	5	5	4	2.7 *
	L	2	5	4	4	2.7 *
	P	1	1	4	2	2.7 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	5	3	5	4	2.7 *
	X	3	5	5	2	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	3	5	2.7 *
20.b.	E	4	2	3	3	2.7 *
	F	3	5	4		2.0 *
	G	3	5	2		2.0 *
	H	5	3		4	2.0 *
	K	2	5	5	4	2.7 *
	L	2	5	4	5	2.7 *
	M	4		5	3	2.0 *
	N	3	UJ	4	5	2.0 *
	U	5	3	5	4	2.7 *
20.c.	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	J	3	4	4	5	2.7 *
	L	3	5	4	4	2.7 *
	M	4		5	3	2.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				χ^2 ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
20.d.1.	C	5	2		4	2.0 *
	E	1	1	3	4	2.7 *
	J	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	K	1	UJ	5	4	2.0 *
	O	5		3	4	2.0 *
	P	1	1	3	2	2.7 *
	S	2	4	3		2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	4	3	5	4	2.7 *
20.d.2.	E	2	3	3	4	2.7 *
	H	4	5		3	2.0 *
	I	2		3	4	2.0 *
	J	4	4	5	3	2.7 *
	K	3	4	5	4	2.7 *
	L	3	5	4	3	2.7 *
	O	5		3	2	2.0 *
	Y	4	5	3	5	2.7 *
20.d.3.	E	2	2	3	4	2.7 *
	K	3	4	5	4	2.7 *
	M	2		5	5	1.5 *
	P	4	2	3	2	2.7 *
	S	2	4	3		2.0 *
	U	5	3	5	4	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	3	5	2.7 *
20.d.4.	E	2	3	3	4	2.7 *
	G	3	4	2		2.0 *
	H	2	5		3	2.0 *
	I	3		2	4	2.0 *
	K	3	5	5	4	2.7 *
	S	1	4	3		2.0 *
	U	5	4	2	4	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	3	5	2.7 *
20.d.5.	C	3	2		1	2.0 *
	E	1	2	3	4	3.0 *
	K	3	4	5	4	2.7 *
	L	2	3	4	4	2.7 *
	P	4	2	3	3	2.7 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	Y	4	5	3	4	2.7 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ^{2 2}
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
20.e.	D	5	3	4	5	2.7 *
	G	3	4	1		2.0 *
	L	3	5	4	4	2.7 *
	O	5		4	2	2.0 *
	P	4	2	3	3	2.7 *
	U	5	4	3	3	2.7 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
20.f.	C	4	2		3	2.0 *
	E	5	3	4	3	2.7 *
	G	4	5	2		2.0 *
	L	2	5	4	5	2.7 *
	M	4		5	3	2.0 *
	P	4	4	4	2	1.8 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	3	5	5	2.7 *
20.g.	E	5	3	3	4	2.7 *
	I	3		2	5	2.0 *
	K	1	5	5	4	2.7 *
	L	3	5	4	5	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	3	5	2.7 *
21.a.	C	5	3		3	1.5 *
	E	5	3	2	UJ	2.0 *
	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	M	3		5	4	2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	3	4	5	3	2.7 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
21.b.	E	5	5	3	UJ	1.5 *
	G	3	5	3		1.5 *
	I	5		3	4	2.0 *
	L	3	4	UJ	5	2.0 *
	P	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	W		4	UJ	2	1.0 *
21.c.	C	4	3		1	2.0 *
	D	5	3	4	5	2.7 *
	E	5	5	1	UJ	1.5 *
	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	I	5		3	4	2.0 *
	L	2	4	UJ	3	2.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
21.c. (continued)	O	5		3	UJ	1.0 *
	Q	3	4	5		2.0 *
	X	4	5	3	4	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	3	4	2.7 *
21.d.	C	4	2		1	2.0 *
	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
	M	3		5	UJ	1.0 *
	N	2	UJ	4	3	2.0 *
	Q	4	3	5		2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	Y	4	5	3	5	2.7 *
21.e.	C	4	1		2	2.0 *
	I	5		4	3	2.0 *
	L	2	4	UJ	4	1.5 *
	M	3		5	3	1.5 *
	O	5		3	3	1.5 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	V	4	5	3	4	2.7 *
	W		4	3	2	2.0 *
	X	4	5	3	2	3.0 *
	Y	4	5	3	UJ	2.0 *
22.a.1.	F	2	5	UJ		1.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	5	3	UJ	3	1.5 *
	Y	4	5	3	5	2.7 *
22.a.2.	H	3	5		UJ	1.0 *
	J	3	4	5	UJ	2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	X	1	4	UJ	5	2.0 *
22.a.3.	F	3	5	UJ		1.0 *
	H	1	5		UJ	1.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	W		4	UJ	2	1.0 *
	X	4	4	UJ	2	1.5 *
22.b.	F	3	5	4		2.0 *
	G	4	4	2		1.5 *
	N	2	UJ	UJ	4	1.0 *
	U	5	3	3	3	1.8 *
	X	4	5	3	5	2.7 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
23.a.	G	4	4	1		1.5 *
	K	3	3	5	4	2.7 *
	M	3		5	4	2.0 *
	U	5	3	4	3	2.7 *
	X	4	5	3	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	3	5	2.7 *
	Z	2		3	4	2.0 *
23.b.	G	4	4	1		1.5 *
	H	3	4		5	2.0 *
	K	2	3	5	4	3.0 *
	M	3		5	4	2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	5	3	4	3	2.7 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	3	4	2.7 *
	Z	2		3	4	2.0 *
23.c.	E	1	3	2	UJ	2.0 *
	G	4	4	1		1.5 *
	K	2	3	5	4	3.0 *
	M	2		5	4	2.0 *
	O	5		2	2	1.5 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	5	3	4	3	2.7 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	2	5	2.7 *
	Z	2		3	4	2.0 *
24.a.	G	3	4	2		2.0 *
	H	4	2		UJ	1.0 *
	J	3	4	UJ	5	2.0 *
	M	1		3	UJ	1.0 *
	N	1	UJ	UJ	4	1.0 *
	O	5		1	UJ	1.0 *
	P	2	UJ	4	4	1.5 *
	S	2	4	4		1.5 *
	U	3	UJ	UJ	1	1.0 *
	W		4	UJ	1	1.0 *
	X	4	3	4	1	2.7 *
24.b.	C	3	4		5	2.0 *
	M	1		4	UJ	1.0 *
	N	2	UJ	UJ	4	1.0 *
	Q	3	4	5		2.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				Xr ²²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
24.b. (continued)	U	4	3	4	1	2.7 *
	V	5	5	5	3	1.8 *
24.c.1.	E	4	5	3	UJ	2.0 *
	G	3	5	2		2.0 *
	J	3	4	4	5	2.7 *
	N	3	1	4	4	2.7 *
	O	3		1	2	2.0 *
	Q	4	3	2		2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	2	3	4	3	2.7 *
	X	5	5	4	3	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	3	5	2.7 *
24.c.2.	E	4	5	3	UJ	2.0 *
	G	3	4	2		2.0 *
	J	3	4	4	5	2.7 *
	N	3	1	UJ	4	2.0 *
	O	3		1	2	2.0 *
	P	2	1	3	3	2.7 *
	Q	4	3	2		2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	2	UJ	4	3	2.0 *
	W		4	3	1	2.0 *
	X	5	5	3	1	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	3	5	2.7 *
	Z	3		4	5	2.0 *
24.c.3.	E	4	5	3	UJ	2.0 *
	G	3	4	2		2.0 *
	N	3	1	UJ	4	2.0 *
	Q	4	3	2		2.0 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	X	5	5	3	2	2.7 *
	Y	4	5	3	4	2.4 *
	Z	3		4	5	2.0 *
24.d.	L	3	5	UJ	5	1.5 *
	M	1		4	5	2.0 *
	P	5	4	4	3	2.7 *
	T	5	4	3		2.0 *
	U	4	5	UJ	2	2.0 *

TABLE A-3. (continued)

Criterion Statement	Program	Ratings ¹				χ^2 ²
		TP	CHT	RSHE	HETE	
25.a.	B	3	4	5		2.0 *
	F	3	4	5		2.0 *
	G	4	5	3		2.0 *
25.b.	B	3	4	5		2.0 *
	D	5	3	4	5	2.7 *
	E	5	4	3	3	2.7 *
	G	3	5	2		2.0 *
	X	4	5	4	2	2.7 *
25.c.	E	5	4	3	4	2.7 *
	G	4	5	2		2.0 *
	R	5	5	3		1.5 *
	X	4	5	4	3	2.7 *
25.d.	A	4	2			1.0 *
	F	3	4	5		2.0 *
	G	3	5	1		2.0 *
	H	2	4		3	2.0 *
	O	5		UJ	3	1.0 *
	T	3	4	2		2.0 *
	X	4	5	UJ	2	2.0 *

¹Ratings by Teacher of the Program (TP), another Consumer and Homaking Teacher (CHT), Regional Supervisor for Home Economics (RSHE), and Home Economics Teacher Educator (HETE).

²Friedman Analysis of Variance.

³Rating Scale used was 5-Superior, 4-Very Good, 3-Good, 2-Fair, 1-Weak, and UJ-Unable to Judge.

VITA

Cathy Arendall Lassiter was born in Jackson, Tennessee, on June 27, 1949. She graduated from Hopkinsville High School in May 1967. The following September she entered Murray State University, and received the Bachelor of Science degree in Home Economics in May 1971. In the fall of 1971, she accepted a graduate assistantship at Murray State University and began study toward a Master's degree in Home Economics. This degree was awarded in August 1973.

The author taught vocational home economics at Hopkinsville High School, Hopkinsville, Kentucky, from 1972 to 1976. In September 1976, she entered the Graduate School of the University of Tennessee at Knoxville. In 1978, she was awarded a Hilton A. Smith Fellowship. She received the Doctor of Education degree with a major in Vocational Technical Education in March 1980. The author is a member of Alpha Chi, Kappa Omicron Phi, Omicron Tau Theta, Phi Delta Kappa, and the American Vocational Association.

On December 26, 1970, she married Thomas Warren Lassiter of Murray, Kentucky.