

ED 023 050

AC 002 991

By-Alexander, Frank D.

Evaluation of Selected Aspects of the Homemaking Service Program in the City of Rochester, New York.
State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Agriculture at Cornell.. State Univ. of New York, Ithaca. Coll. of Home
Economics at Cornell Univ.

Pub Date Oct 68

Note-161p.

EDRS Price MF -\$0.75 HC -\$8.15

Descriptors-Educational Objectives, *Extension Education, Family Income, *Homemaking Education, Marital
Status, Mobility, Participant Characteristics, *Program Evaluation, Program Improvement, *Program Length,
Socioeconomic Background, Teacher Characteristics, *Teacher Education, Teacher Selection

Identifiers-New York, Rochester

The objectives of the study were: to describe the socioeconomic characteristics of the teaching homemakers and of the women with whom they worked; to indicate the influence of selected training on the teaching homemakers; and to show the training program input. Data were collected through the pre- and post-testing of teaching homemakers, and a variety of other methods. Of the fourteen teaching homemakers involved, eleven were Negroes and three Puerto Ricans. The mean age was 37.4 years of schooling ranged from 5 to 14, and one half of them lived in homes owned by their families. Ten of the women were married, three divorced or separated, and one single. Stated also are the occupations of husbands and wives, mobility, participation, and family income. There was a total of 242 training hours covering the following subject matter areas: clothing, food, furnishings, and orientation. Extension staff devoted 16% of 269 hours of their time to the training. Recommendations for improvement of training programs include longer and unbroken periods, more group teaching, supervision of teaching homemakers, survey of participants' interests, and greater attention to training in methodology. (nl)

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION
POSITION OR POLICY.

Evaluation of Selected Aspects of the Homemaking Service Program in the City of Rochester, New York

Conducted by the Home Economics Division
of Monroe County Cooperative Extension
in Cooperation with
Action for a Better Community, Incorporated, Monroe County

by

Frank D. Alexander

Extension Study No. 17

Office of Extension Studies
New York State Colleges of Agriculture and Home Economics
Statutory Colleges of the State University
at Cornell University
Ithaca, New York

October, 1968

ED023050

ED023020

AC002991

PREFACE

This study was initiated at the request of Mildred Roland, Leader of the Home Economics Division of Monroe County Cooperative Extension. It was her conviction that an evaluation of the division's cooperative efforts with the Homemaking Service Program of ABC was required for future program planning and for obtaining financial support. Since the major interest of the Home Economics Division has been in the teaching homemakers' activities, this aspect of the Homemaking Service Program was chosen for study with special attention being given to a furniture painting project designed for Head Start mothers.

Because of the complex nature of the ABC Program and the varied definitions of the roles of cooperating agencies, the effort to design and conduct an evaluation of a limited phase of the program encountered a number of difficulties in obtaining adequate evaluation data. However, these difficulties had their positive side in that they stimulated the researcher to undertake a variety of methods for obtaining relevant data.

For the unstinted help which Mrs. Audrose Harvey, Home Economics Agent responsible for conducting Extension activities under the Homemaking Service Program, gave in obtaining data for the study, the author is deeply indebted. The patient efforts of the clerical staff of the Office of Extension Studies in assisting with the organization of the data and preparation of the manuscript are also gratefully acknowledged.

It is hoped that the findings and implications of the study will provide useful guidelines whereby the Monroe County Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension in cooperation with ABC can make a substantial contribution in teaching the low-income housewives of Rochester to improve their understanding and skill in the management of family living.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Summary of Findings.	1
Implications of Findings	14
Design of Study.	19
Scope and Objectives.	19
Methodology	20
Policy and Program Design.	24
Concern of Home Economics Extension for the Culturally or Economically Disadvantaged.	24
Design of the Rochester Homemaking Program.	25
Contracts between Cooperative Extension and ABC.	25
Homemaking Service Advisory Committee.	28
Statement of the Home Economics Educational Program.	30
Cost Estimates for Teaching Homemaking Personnel.	33
Teaching Homemakers Involved in Furniture Painting	34
Race.	35
Age	35
Years of School Completed	36
Tenure and Dwellings.	37
Marital Status.	38
Family Composition.	39
Occupations of Husbands and Wives	39
Mobility.	41
Formal Participation Score.	42
Net Family Income: 1966.	43
Comparison of Rochester Teaching Homemakers and Clinton County Family Service Aides	44
Race	44
Age.	44
Years of school completed.	44

	<u>Page</u>
Place of residence	44
Tenure	44
Marital status	44
Family size.	46
Household size	46
Occupations of husbands.	46
Mobility	46
Formal participation score	46
Estimated net income	46
Summary.	46
Recruitment by Teaching Homemakers of Participants for Furniture Painting	47
Interest in improving home and furniture	49
Information given about furniture painting class.	50
Open house, party, tea, or coffee to invite participation in classes.	50
Visits and other personal contacts	51
Positive attitude to social aspects of a study group.	51
Head Start teachers' assistance in recruitment.	51
Excuses for not agreeing to participate.	51
Evaluation of Training of Teaching Homemakers for Furniture Painting.	51
Attendance at training sessions.	51
Pre- and post-testing.	52
Observations of teaching furniture painting	53
Subject Matter Taught by Teaching Homemakers: 1966-67	54
Complete Roster of Teaching Homemakers	56
Over-all Training of Teaching Homemakers and Other Staff Members of Homemaking Service: 1966-67.	57

	<u>Page</u>
Participants as Reported in Taped Accounts	60
Characteristics of Participants	60
Age of women	61
Marital status	62
Family composition	63
Occupations of husbands.	64
Occupations of women	65
Welfare recipients	65
Topics Discussed.	66
Things Done	67
Problems of Participants.	70
Accomplishments with Participants	73
Things Discussed and/or Done as Reported on Visitation Cards by Teaching Homemakers.	74
Things Discussed and Those Done as Reported on Visiting Charts Kept by Teaching Homemakers.	77
Summary of Reports of What Discussed and Done in Interaction Between Participants and Teaching Homemakers	81
Evaluation of the Furniture Painting Project	83
Partial Record of Visits by Teaching Homemakers.	86
Viewpoints of ABC Supervisors and Administrators Concerning Teaching Homemaking Program	88
Training Which Teaching Homemakers Are Receiving	88
Are Teaching Homemakers Ahead of Their Participants.	89
How Should Teaching Homemakers Recruit Participants.	89
Individual Versus Group Teaching.	90

	<u>Page</u>
How Subject Matter for Study Groups Should Be Determined	91
Reactions of Participants to Efforts of Teaching Homemakers	91
Distinction Between Teaching and Visiting Homemakers.	92
Supervision of Teaching Homemakers.	93
Administrative Arrangements for Teaching Homemakers.	93
Accomplishments of Teaching Homemakers.	94
Role of Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension	94

EVALUATION OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF THE HOMEMAKING
SERVICE PROGRAM IN THE CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW YORK

Conducted by the Home Economics Division
of Monroe County Cooperative Extension
In Cooperation with
Action for a Better Community, Incorporated, Monroe County

Summary of Findings

I. Introduction

This study was initiated at the request of the Leader of the Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension in Monroe County. It was considered a necessary commitment in securing financial support from the Monroe County Legislature. While the study was initially planned to focus on the teaching of furniture painting by the teaching homemakers and their home visits during a limited period, it was considered desirable to include data on other phases of the involvement of the Home Economics Division in the ABC Homemaking Service Program.

The objectives of the study as presented in this report are: 1) to describe the socio-economic characteristics of the teaching homemakers and of the women with whom they worked during all or part of 1966-67, 2) to indicate the influence of selected training on the teaching homemakers and in turn the influence of the teaching homemakers on the participants for selected activities, and 3) to set forth in an analytical manner training and program input.

Many different approaches were devised for obtaining data. A number of these approaches proved to be ineffective. Testing of participants was prohibited by the Director of ABC. The difficulty of isolating a teaching activity that was adequate for research purposes was another problem. The

character of the organization through which the teaching homemakers operated seemed to affect adversely the participation of these people in the research. Despite these problems, a considerable amount of information was obtained. While adequate sampling and clearly defined time periods were impossible, it is believed that the study provides a fair indication of program input and some valid evaluation data.

II. Program Design and Organization

A. Examination of the 1966 and 1967 contracts between the Home Economics Division and ABC indicates a definite restriction of responsibility of the Home Economics Division. Under the 1966 contract the division had major responsibility for conducting a home economics educational program in cooperation with ABC. Developing the program, selecting, training, and supervising the staff which was to conduct the program was also a part of the division's responsibility. Although the coordinators of the homemaking services, the teaching homemakers, and visiting homemakers were considered the employees of ABC, their functions were under the direction of the Home Economics Division. The 1967 contract, while still maintaining a cooperative relationship on program development and supervision, seemed definitely designed to give major emphasis to the training of teaching homemakers, and to a lesser extent, the visiting homemakers, by the staff of the Home Economics Division.

B. Although the Advisory Committee which was set up to advise on the activities of the homemaking services of the neighborhood centers has apparently done some work in interpreting the homemakers' role to people, no very great success has been attained in securing the participation on the committee of parents living in the areas

serviced by the centers. From the beginning the active membership has consisted predominantly of agency representatives, and apparently much of the concern at meetings has been on interagency relationships with only minor attention to program content.

- C. Program activities called for under the 1967-68 program plan developed by the home economist responsible for the program listed 13 activities. Of these 13 the study found the major program inputs related to two, possibly three, of these, i.e., painting furniture, housekeeping shortcuts, and perhaps adding color to the homes by making curtains and home furnishings. Some input was also related to planting flowers and grass, and probably some to making storage spaces from easily obtained materials.
- D. Fifty-nine percent of the wages and salaries of the staff devoting time to the teaching homemaking program is provided by the Monroe County Legislature and 76 percent of the funds going into these wages and salaries is for the services of the teaching homemakers.

III. Teaching Homemakers Involved in Furniture Painting

- A. The focus of the evaluation was on a furniture painting teaching program conducted in the summer of 1967.
- B. Fourteen teaching homemakers were trained for this teaching, one of whom never recruited anyone to teach.
- C. Socio-economic characteristics of the 14 teaching homemakers.
 - 1. Race: Eleven of the 14 were Negroes and three were Puerto Ricans.
 - 2. Age: Mean age was 37.4, with three teachers under 30 and three 50 and over.

3. Years of school completed: The mean was 10.0 years with a range from five to 14. Nine of the Negro women had received all or part of their schooling in southern states. Nine of the 14 had had some exposure to home economics in their formal education.
4. Tenure and dwelling: Half of the 14 lived in homes which their families owned. Six lived in one-family dwellings, five in multiple-family dwellings, and three in apartment buildings.
5. Marital status: Ten of the women were married, three divorced or separated, and one was single.
6. Family and household size: The mean number of members at home in the 14 families was 4.4 and the mean number in the 14 households was 5.0.
7. Occupations of husbands and wives: The occupations of the husbands of the 10 teaching homemakers who had husbands in the family covered a wide range, from laborers to managers, officials, and proprietors. All of the 14 teaching homemakers had had some type of employment before becoming a teaching homemaker. Eight of the 14 had had work experience such as nurse's aide, hospital aide, private duty nurse, housekeeper or cleaner, and foster mother.
8. Mobility: Since marriage the 14 teaching homemakers had on the average moved about every three and a half years. Five of the women first came to Rochester in 1963 or later, five in the 1950's, three before 1950, and one was a native.
9. Formal participation score: The mean score was 5.4. Four women, however, had scores ranging from 12 to 14. Except for church membership most of the women had no other organizational affiliations.
10. Net family income, 1966: The median estimated net family income in 1966 of the 14 teaching homemakers was \$5,500 with a range in class intervals from \$1,000-1,999 to \$10,000+.

11. Comparison with family service aides in rural Clinton County: On three of 12 socio-economic characteristics, i.e., age, marital status, and formal participation score the two groups resemble each other fairly closely. For five characteristics there was some difference, i.e., tenure, years of school completed, family size, household size, and mobility. The Clinton aides were more frequently from owner families and had larger families and households, but the Rochester teachers were more mobile. The Clinton aides had more schooling of probably better quality. The occupations of the two groups of husbands present a mixed picture. The two groups differ completely on racial composition and place of residence, with all of the aides in Clinton being white, while the Rochester women were Negro or Puerto Rican, and the aides were all rural, whereas the teaching homemakers were all urban. The estimated net family incomes for 1966 were somewhat different with the Rochester teaching homemakers having the advantage.

- D. Recruitment by teaching homemakers of participants for furniture painting.
1. The teaching of furniture painting was designed for mothers whose children were enrolled in the summer Head Start classes and was aimed not only at teaching the mothers about painting furniture but also at creating in them an interest in improving the area or rooms used by their children.
 2. The teaching homemakers reported their recruitment experiences by means of taped recordings. Since a majority of the teachers used a social (open house, tea, coffee, etc.) as the principal occasion for

recruiting, their accounts gave considerable attention to what happened at these socials. A classification of ideas mentioned in these accounts yielded 28 categories. Those categories having 15 or more ideas mentioned were:

- a. Interest in improving house and furniture-- considerable interest detected.
- b. Information given about furniture painting class-- teaching homemakers appeared to know what they were proposing to teach.
- c. Open house, party, tea, or coffee to invite participation in classes--fair attendance and some success in securing agreement to participate.
- d. Visits and other personal contacts--a number of teaching homemakers supplemented open houses by home visits in recruiting participants.
- e. Positive attitude to social aspects of study groups--teaching homemakers generally thought women would be interested in social life classes would provide.
- f. Head Start teachers' assistance in recruitment-- an example of a cooperative effort to promote a program.
- g. Excuses for not agreeing to participate--care of small children and illness frequent excuses.

E. Evaluation of training of teaching homemakers for furniture painting.

1. Attendance: Only six of the 14 teaching homemakers attended all five training sessions; four attended four, and four attended only three.
2. Pre- and post-test of training: A test consisting of 25 items was given each of the trainees before and after the training lessons.

- a. The mean pre-test percent score of the 13 teachers who took both the pre- and post-test was 69.8 and their mean post-test percent score was 83.0. The gain was significant at $<.001$. The range of pre-test percent scores was from 50 to 81, and of the post-test scores from 56 to 100. The range of the gains (no losses) was from three to 25 percentage points.
3. Observations of teaching furniture painting by home economist trainer.
 - a. Ten teaching sessions were entirely or partially observed.
 - b. From these observations and as a result of stimulation by them the home economist concluded:
 - 1) That she was impressed with the manner in which the classes were conducted.
 - 2) That the learners were working hard.
 - 3) That the teachers were enthusiastic.
 - 4) That considerable interest in participating in other classes, especially sewing, had been generated.
 - 5) That in some instances excessive attention was given to details in the painting operations.
 - 6) That the teaching homemakers should not be responsible for finding adequate teaching space.
 - 7) That difficulties with securing and storing supplies should be dealt with.
 - 8) That there was need for a workshop for conducting certain classes so that people could come and go and thus manage their babysitting.

- 9) That there was a need to have babysitters who could go to the homes of participants.
- 10) That recruitment for classes should hereafter not be restricted to one group, as was done in the case of the furniture painting classes which were largely restricted to Head Start mothers.

F. Subject matter taught by teaching homemakers: 1966-67

1. Classes have been taught in the following subject matter areas: furniture painting, cooking, sewing, better shopping including shopping tours, house-keeping, mother and baby care, grooming, knitting, money saving, babysitting, and a few miscellaneous areas.
2. Nine of the 15 teachers had taught from five to seven different subjects.

IV. Complete Roster of Teaching Homemakers

- A. Of the 26 women who had ever been teaching homemakers, 15 still held their positions in September, 1967.

V. Over-all Training of Teaching Homemakers and Other Staff Members of Homemaking Service: 1966-67¹

- A. A total of 242 training hours were provided the learners during 1966-67 by home economics extension personnel.
- B. The subject matter areas receiving major attention were: clothing (47 hours), food (35 hours), furnishings (33 hours), painted finishes (30 hours), and orientation (17 hours).

¹The time input on training which is summarized here does not include staff time devoted to counseling the teaching homemakers nor time spent in preparation for training.

- C. The total number of extension staff hours devoted to this training was 269 (or 16 percent of a man-year), 14 hours of which was by college staff.¹
- D. A grand total of 313 hours of training was given the trainees by extension staff and others, of which 77 percent was provided by extension personnel.
- E. The grand total number of hours devoted to training¹ by all trainers was 347, with extension personnel providing 78 percent of the total.

VI. Participants as Reported in Taped Accounts by Teaching Homemakers

- A. Socio-economic characteristics were reported for 91 participants² of whom 61 were visited only, 23 participated in furniture painting in a class or as individuals and were visited one or more times, and seven participated in furniture painting in a class or as individuals but were not visited.
- B. A summary of the socio-economic characteristics provided by the teaching homemakers on the basis of their observations follows:
 1. Mean age: 34.4 years for the 89 women
 2. Marital status: 70 percent of the 84 women reported on had husbands present.
 3. Family size: Mean of 6.8 for 84 families reported on
 4. Occupations of husbands: For 37 husbands reported on highest percentages were operatives and kindred workers (27) and laborers (27).

¹Occasionally more than one staff member participated in the same training sessions.

²Two of these were males.

5. Occupations of women: 13 of the 89 women were working.
6. Welfare recipients: 34, or 41 percent, of 82 families reported on

C. Topics discussed with 68 of the 87 participants on whom taped accounts were taken

1. Painting of furniture (45 mentions) and children (34 mentions) ranked first and second for number of times mentioned.

D. Things done with 68 of the 87 participants

1. Painting or repairing furniture (32 mentions) and cleaning and arranging house (20 mentions) ranked first and second for number of times mentioned.
2. Mentions of things done fell into the following three classes:

	<u>No. of mentions</u>
a. For participant by teaching homemaker	71
b. Participant and teaching homemaker together	66
c. By participant	22

E. Problems of 67 of the 87 participants

1. Children (45 mentions), illness or physical disability of housewife or husband (24 mentions), and housing (21 mentions) ranked first, second, and third for number of times mentioned.

F. Accomplishments of 42 of the 87 participants

1. Positive results were mentioned 49 times. The first and second ranking positive mentions were did a good job on painting something (18 mentions) and positive attitude shown (13 mentions).
2. No progress or considered hopeless received 10 mentions.

VII. Things Discussed and/or Done as Reported on Visitation Cards by Teaching Homemakers

A. Things discussed and/or done with 187 participants were classified under 21 major categories. The categories ranking from one to five according to number of mentions were:

1. Children (88 mentions)
2. ABC homemakers' program (85 mentions)
3. Refinishing furniture (30 mentions)
4. Housekeeping (71 mentions)
5. Housing (66 mention)

VIII. Thing Discussed and Those Done as Reported (Checked) on Visiting Charts Kept by Teaching Homemakers

A. Things discussed and reported for 47 participants: Cleaning house led the list with 35 checks, followed by painting walls and repairing house with 33 checks each.

B. Things done and reported for 26 participants: Refinishing furniture led the list with eight checks, followed by buying children's clothing or shoes and painting walls with seven checks each.

IX. Summary of Reports of What Discussed and Done in Interaction Between Participants and Teaching Homemakers

A. From five different listings of information on the activities (topics discussed and things done) of the teaching homemakers it was found that there was considerable agreement for the activities reported most frequently.

1. Topics relating to children; housing; and cleaning, or arranging the house, or housekeeping occurred with relatively high frequency in all five lists.

2. Painting and/or repairing furniture or refinishing furniture ranked first in three of the lists.

X. Evaluation of the Furniture Painting Project

- A. The projects of 34 participants were rated by the teaching homemakers with some assistance from their homemaking supervisors.
- B. Almost half (47 percent) received outstanding ratings and another 29 percent were given very good ratings.
- C. Twenty-eight, or 82 percent, of the 34 participants were reported by the teaching homemakers as wanting to do more painting of furniture.

XI. Partial Record of Visits by Teaching Homemakers

- A. No complete record of visits was available.
- B. The available visiting records for the approximate period, July - June, 1966-67 provided data on frequency of visits for a total of 319 different families.
 1. The mean number of visits made to these 319 families was 4.7. About two fifths of the families had received either one or two visits; 17 families, or 5.3 percent of the 319 had been visited from 13 to 49 times.
- C. When all usable records were combined a total of 676 different families were visited one or more times during the approximate period, July - June, 1966-67.

XII. Viewpoints of ABC Supervisors and Administrators Concerning Teaching Homemaking Program

- A. These viewpoints were contributed by the three homemaking supervisors and the three directors associated with the three neighborhood centers.

- B. Selected views of these ABC officials concerning the teaching homemaking program were:
1. Training of the teaching homemakers should be for longer and unbroken periods.
 2. More attention should be given to training in methodology.
 3. While the teaching homemakers should keep ahead of the participants, they should avoid becoming "professionals."
 4. The teaching homemakers should have considerable responsibility for recruitment of participants, and house-to-house visiting was considered important.
 5. While both individual and group teaching were considered desirable, there was some indication that group teaching was a desirable direction for the future.
 6. Emphasis was put on the participants deciding what should be taught. A survey of participants' interests was suggested.
 7. While in general it was thought that the teaching homemaking program was fairly well received, there was some skepticism about the program's acceptance.
 8. While the distinction between the role of visiting and teaching homemakers is generally recognized, there is need for clarification.
 9. While it was recognized that the teaching homemakers should be supervised by the homemaking supervisors, there was some thinking that this was also a role for the home economist.
 10. When circumstances require, teaching homemakers may be assigned tasks other than teaching.
 11. In general it was thought that the teaching homemakers had done an acceptable job.

12. There is a need to develop a more effective relationship between the Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension and ABC in conducting the teaching homemaking program.

Implications of Findings

1. There is need to clarify the role of the Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension in the Teaching Homemaking Program. Basic to this clarification should be the recognition that the division is an educational agency and that education is a process that extends over time. Moreover, for an educational program to be successful, responsibility should be well defined. There are alternatives which the Home Economics Division might accept as a definition of its role. These are:
 - a. It could accept a role of training the teaching homemakers of the ABC Homemaking Service. Its concern would not go beyond this training function. The content of the training would, of course, be in the field of home economics subject matter, but the specific training given would be indicated by the ABC homemaking departments of the neighborhood centers. This content would depend on whatever teaching program the homemaking departments developed. The Home Economics Division would simply indicate the amount of time and periods when its staff would be available for training. It would, of course, be possible and perhaps desirable to include in this training the visiting homemakers. If this alternative should be decided on, it should be clearly outlined in an agreement with ABC. This alternative tends to be in the direction of the 1967 contract.
 - b. The other alternative would be for the Home Economics Division to take over the teaching homemaking program

of ABC. This would exclude the visiting homemaking operation which is essentially a social work function. (The staff of the division might, however, provide a limited amount of training in home economics for the visiting homemakers.) The 1966 contract with ABC was basically in this direction. The present extensive financial support by the Monroe County Legislature of the teaching homemaking program including a large proportion of the teaching homemakers as well as two of the homemaking supervisors lends support to this alternative in that it would be relatively easy for this financing to be directed to the Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension. The entire teaching and supervisory staff of the homemaking program would become extension employees. The Home Economics Division would be responsible for program determination including the training of the teaching homemakers. While the homemaking supervisors and teaching homemakers would be located at the three neighborhood centers, they would look to the Home Economics Division for program and direction. The training, counseling, and reporting of the teaching homemakers would be carried out at the Farm and Home Center.¹ The teaching homemakers would be responsible to their supervisors who in turn would be responsible to the Home Economics Division. The supervisors would maintain relations with the ABC referral system and would participate in staff conferences of the centers, but the relationship with the center directors and their staffs would be a cooperative one. The home economist in charge of the program would have periodic meetings with the directors of the neighborhood centers to assure cooperation and

¹This utilization of the Farm and Home Center would undoubtedly require some space adjustments at the center since space for a secretary to the home economist responsible for the program and for files would be required.

the stimulus which ABC with its positive concerns for disadvantaged people can so effectively provide. At the same time the home economist should continually evaluate the time devoted to the ABC organization always being concerned to give first priority to program with emphasis on training and supervising the teaching homemakers and their supervisors. Under this alternative, the teaching homemaking program would be defined as an educational activity with a minimum of welfare implications so that designation of those involved would be participants, not clients, and, while records would be kept of those who participated, intake procedures would be discarded.¹

2. Under whatever alternative is finally accepted for conducting the teaching homemaking program, the study indicates that consideration should be given to the following:²
 - a. Recruitment for individual or group teaching should be considered the primary responsibility of the teaching homemakers. Referrals from other ABC staff members (community aides) and various agencies should also constitute a source of participants. The homemaking supervisors and the home economist in charge of the program might also assist in recruitment through contacts with various organizations in the neighborhoods.
 - b. While it is clear from the study that participants can and will learn, efforts to enlist greater numbers in

¹ Except for their possible training, no indication of the organizational placement of the visiting homemakers is given under this alternative. Consideration should be given to their placement with the Social Service Department. It is also appropriate at this point to observe that the second alternative should be considered as a sort of model for planning a more effective teaching homemaking program.

² It is recognized that, if the first alternative should be chosen, some of the recommendations that are presented here would become a concern of ABC and not the Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension.

study groups are required. The teaching homemakers should be made aware of the necessity of moving participants from individual teaching to group teaching. This should be done with full recognition that work with the individual is often initially necessary.

- c. The evidence indicates that those who have participated in the teaching program are people who need this kind of experience, but there is a problem of continuous participation with sufficient contact between teacher and participant for effective influence on the latter.
- d. The problem of deciding what to teach is continuous and difficult. Questions were raised by both participants and teachers concerning the appropriateness of teaching furniture painting. Yet the interest of the participants, even though the number was small, and the relevance of the activity to the monotony and bareness of living quarters argued for the project. The teaching homemakers reported things discussed and done with participants as well as their problems. These are presented in the study and should provide a firm basis for planning program content.
- e. In the case of furniture painting, the training of teaching homemakers, when tested, was found to be effective. However, in order to attain a higher level of performance, the training program could be improved by:
 - 1) Better attendance at training lessons.
 - 2) A training curriculum which is built on a better planned teaching program based on the needs of participants and with clearly stated objectives and program inputs.
 - 3) A substantial increase in time devoted to training with well planned scheduling thereof.

- 4) Greater attention to make-up training for newly employed teaching homemakers.
- f. While the teaching homemaking staff has been unusually stable, greater attention should be given to the selection of qualified persons within the limitations imposed by selecting teachers who are a part of the community. This also applies to the homemaking supervisors.
 - g. There is indication in the study of the need to help teaching homemakers in their work with individuals to progress from providing services to them to that of teaching them. This progression is a delicate matter but should be held before the teaching homemakers as an important goal.
 - h. Attention should be given to a more systematic planning and scheduling of study groups so that teachers, supervisors, and the home economist can all be fully aware of what is being undertaken.
 - i. Conducting the study has emphasized the lack of adequate records. As a minimum each teaching homemaker should provide her supervisor each month with a list of persons visited, with number of times visited and attendance records of each study group taught. In addition, as a part of supervision, each teaching homemaker should be asked to tape an account of her work during each month with at least five individuals. These taped accounts would be reviewed with the teachers by their respective supervisors. The accounts would then be turned over to the home economist trainer for her guidance in training and for filing. At least one study group session of each teacher would be visited each month by her supervisor who would use a rating form for observing. This form would be reviewed with the teaching homemaker and then passed to the home economist trainer for her review and filing.

EVALUATION OF SELECTED ASPECTS OF THE HOME MAKING
SERVICE PROGRAM IN THE CITY OF ROCHESTER, NEW YORK

Conducted by the Home Economics Division
of Monroe County Cooperative Extension
in Cooperation with
Action for a Better Community, Incorporated, Monroe County

Design of the Study

Scope and Objectives

This study was initiated at the request of the Leader of the Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension in Monroe County. It was considered a necessary commitment in securing financial support from the Monroe County Legislature. Since the Action for a Better Community Program in the City of Rochester was both extensive and complex, and the participation of the Home Economics Division in the program encompassed several activities, it was recognized that with limited resources the design of an evaluation would have to be focused on a restricted area. Accordingly, it was decided to direct the study to the activities of the teaching homemakers, an area especially relevant to Extension as an educational agency. Plans had already been made to conduct a teaching program on the painting of furniture for those mothers who would enter their children in the Head Start program which had been planned by the three neighborhood centers. This specific teaching program was selected as the major activity on which the evaluation study would focus. Since the teaching homemakers also work with individual homemakers in a teaching capacity, examination of this function during a limited period was also included in the scope of the study.

While the study was planned to focus on the furniture painting project and the work of the teaching homemakers with individual homemakers whom they were currently visiting, it was

considered desirable to include data on other phases of the involvement of the Home Economics Division in the ABC Homemaking Service Program. Accordingly, the organizational relationship of the division to the ABC Homemaking Service, the training input of the division for the period July, 1966 to June, 1967, the roster of visiting homemakers for the entire period of the program, and the total number of women visited from approximately July, 1966 to June, 1967 were examined. Because of the inclusion of these areas and as a result of the availability of certain data and unavailability of other data, the study presents not only evaluation of the influence of the program and the characteristics of teaching homemakers and participants, but also presents in some detail program input data. This analytical presentation of program input is a modified type of evaluation in that it provides an opportunity for determining what is being done so that in the absence of adequate measurement data, at least informal judgments can be made regarding program efforts.

Stated in summary form the objectives of the study as presented in this report are: 1) to describe the socio-economic characteristics of the teaching homemakers and of the women with whom they worked during all or part of 1966-67, 2) to indicate the influence of selected training on the teaching homemakers and in turn the influence of the teaching homemakers on the participants for selected activities, and 3) to set forth in an analytical manner training and program input relative to the teaching homemaking program.

Methodology

Recognizing the difficulties involved in obtaining data on a volunteer adult educational program that is in a formative, experimental stage, a number of research operations were undertaken. These included the following:

From whom data were to be obtained					
	Teaching homemakers	Participants in study groups and individuals	Home economics agent responsible for the program	Chairman of Advisory Committee	Directors of neighborhood centers and supervisors of homemaking departments
<u>Operations</u>					
Pre-testing on furniture painting subject matter--using an objective pencil and paper test	X	-- 1	--	--	--
Post-testing on furniture painting subject matter using the same test used for pre-testing	X	-- 1	--	--	--
Rating of piece of painted furniture or other object by means of rating form	--	--	X	--	--
Interviewing with reference to:					
Experience in recruitment--using a list of interview questions with answers taped	X	-- 2	--	--	--
Characteristics--using structured schedule	X	X	--	--	--
Lessons and printed material--using structured schedule	--	X	--	--	--
Work with individuals--using a list of interview questions; major part of interview taped	X	--	--	--	--
Viewpoints of ABC officials--using a list of interview questions	--	--	--	--	X
Viewpoints of chairman of Advisory Committee to Homemaking Service--using a list of interview questions	--	--	--	X	--

	From whom data were to be obtained				
	Teaching homemakers	Participants in study groups and individuals	Home economics agent responsible for the program	Chairman of Advisory Committee	Directors of neighborhood centers and supervisors of homemaking departments
<u>Operations</u>					
Reporting on visits to homes-- using cards for each visit and summary charts for each individual	X	--	--	--	--
Before and after observations of homes with respect to areas used by children-- using a checklist	X	--	--	--	--
Recording of participants' attendance at furniture painting classes using attendance form	X	--	--	--	--
Recording of attendance of teaching homemakers at training class on furniture painting--using attendance form	--	--	X	--	--
Providing records, reports, documents, etc.			X		

¹The Executive Director of ABC asked that testing of the participants not be undertaken because of possible negative reactions.

²This operation had to be modified since both individual visiting and group meetings were used in recruitment.

The pre- and post-testing of the teaching homemakers was conducted by the author and the home economics agent responsible for the Teaching Homemaking Program. The rating of the piece of furniture painted by participants was done by the teaching homemakers with assistance from their homemaking supervisors. Interviewing relating to experience of teaching homemakers in recruitment, characteristics of teaching homemakers, and their work with individuals was done by the author. The teaching homemakers undertook to interview their class participants to ascertain characteristics and information regarding the participants' reactions to lessons and printed material given them at class sessions, but were unable to obtain a sufficient number of interviews to provide any useful data.¹ The teachers were trained by the author for this interviewing. The author interviewed the directors of the neighborhood centers and the supervisors of the homemaking departments in these centers. The teaching homemakers were asked to fill out cards and charts reporting their home visits, forms for recording before and after observation of homes with respect to areas used by children, and class attendance forms. While these operations were carried out by some of the teachers, not all of them did so. The home economics agent responsible for the program interviewed the chairman of the Advisory Committee, did the attendance records for the training lessons on painting furniture, and provided reports, documents, and other records. (See Appendix A for examples of various instruments used.)

The topics for the furniture painting classes around which the pre- and post-tests were prepared were: 1) What to Paint and Why, 2) Paint and Equipment, 3) Color Selection for Painted Furniture, and 4) How to Paint. The core of the teaching was

¹The homemaking teachers were reluctant to undertake the assignment of interviewing the participants. The excuse that was sometimes given was that the participants were weary of surveys. The few participant schedules that were obtained were not particularly well filled out.

the actual painting of an old piece of furniture or other object which the participant had selected.

Policy and Program Design

Concern of Home Economics Extension for the Culturally or Economically Disadvantaged

The Teaching Homemaking Program in the City of Rochester was initiated in the latter part of 1965. A statement of the Contribution of Home Economics to Cooperative Extension Program Efforts Designed to Reach Culturally or Economically Disadvantaged Youth and Adults was released by a Task Force of the College of Home Economics at Cornell in the early part of 1966. This statement provides the supporting policy of the college for programs such as the Rochester Teaching Homemaking Program. The opening paragraph reads as follows:

Cooperative Extension is actively seeking ways to reach more of the disadvantaged than it has served in the past. In the College of Home Economics a Task Force has developed the following statement to guide the total Cooperative Extension staff in designing and carrying out educational programs for economically or culturally disadvantaged persons and families. It is hoped that these guides will help the Home Economics staff of Cooperative Extension work together to meet this common goal.

The statement continues with these comments:

. . . Historically, Cooperative Extension's educational thrust has been disciplined by the needs of society and the knowledge available to assist in the solution of problems.

. . . Years of experience in work with large numbers of New York State youth and adults form a valuable base from which to design new program efforts for those who have had fewer advantages than many of Cooperative Extension's audiences.

. . . County personnel are encouraged to develop and implement exploratory programs aimed at the solution of specific problems in collaboration with appropriate members of the Extension faculty.

Design of the Rochester Homemaking Program .

Contracts between Cooperative Extension and ABC. Under the initial contract made between Action for a Better Community, Inc., of Monroe County (Agency) and the Cooperative Extension Association of Monroe County (Contractor) in July, 1966, the Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension assumed the following responsibilities:

1. The Home Economics Division Leader of the Cooperative Extension Association of Monroe County staff will be responsible for this educational program. The supervision of the total Home Economics program in the Neighborhood Service Information Centers may be assigned by her to one or more other members of the Division staff. The development of the total educational program meeting the needs of the community; selection, training, and supervision of staff performing services in conduct of this educational program in homemaking will be included. . . The entire homemaking staff within a Center (Coordinator of Homemaking Services, Teaching Homemakers and Visiting Homemakers, Clerk-Typist) shall be employees of the Agency.
2. The selection of the homemaking staffs shall be the joint responsibility of the Contractor and the Agency.
3. Administration of the program shall proceed as follows:
 - a. The Home Economics Division Leader will have overall responsibility for planning and conducting program in Home Economics, suitable to the needs and interests of the community. Consultation will be done with the Unit Director as is necessary to be sure plans fit in with overall objectives of total program and Center philosophy and objectives.
 - b. The Home Economics Division Leader will clearly delegate to the Extension Home Economist and Coordinators of Homemaking Services supervision and teaching responsibilities.
 - c. Hiring of personnel, as spelled out in job descriptions, will be followed. (The Extension Home Economist assigned to the program was to be a party to the interviewing and selection of Coordinators of the Homemaking Services and of Teaching and Visiting Homemakers.)

- d. The Home Economics Division Leader will be responsible for supervision of the homemaking staff. The Unit Directors will be responsible for dismissal or replacement of such personnel, but this should be in consultation with the Home Economics Division Leader.
- e. Personnel policy of the Agency shall be in effect for all employees of said Agency.
- f. Total services of the Neighborhood Service Information Centers are essential to the proper operation of the total homemaking program.¹

Under the 1967 contract between the Agency (ABC) and the Contractor (Cooperative Extension Association of Monroe County) the Home Economics Division of the Monroe County Cooperative Extension Association accepted considerably restricted responsibilities. The major responsibilities spelled out in the contract were:

1. Providing in-service training in Home Economics subject matter for the teaching homemakers. Personnel hired to fill vacancies will be trained in Home Economics subject matter before beginning work in the field. Follow-up training will be a continuing part of the homemaking program to develop maximum competency of staff.
2. Planning with the teaching homemakers and coordinators the use of the educational training they have received to carry out the Home Economics program.
3. Working with coordinators² and teaching homemakers on content, methods, and evaluation of the educational program in Home Economics.

¹Contractual Agreement Between ABC and Cooperative Extension Association of Monroe County for Conduct of the Educational Home Economics Program in the Neighborhood Centers, #1, #2, #3, 1966, pp. 1-2. (The sentence in parentheses in 3-c is not a direct quote.)

²The coordinator of the homemaking service is designated as supervisor of homemaking service in the unofficial 1968 agreement.

4. Working with a consultant who would set up an in-service training program for visiting homemakers. Approximately 12 to 15 days per year of consultant time will be necessary. Consultant will be recruited by Cooperative Extension and paid by ABC funds. Cooperative Extension will provide the training only in the Home Economics area.¹

Under the 1967 contract the equivalent of one full-time staff member was expected to devote time to the program. The teaching homemakers, visiting homemakers, and coordinators of the homemaking service were to be employees of ABC. Their recruitment and selection was the responsibility of ABC with the extension home economist being a party to the selection. Administration of the Homemaking Service Program in the neighborhood centers was to be the responsibility of the director and the homemaking coordinator in each of the centers. These administrative functions included budgeting, center recruitment and supervision, scheduling, and management of facilities. The extension home economist was to be responsible for home economics training of staff and the quality and nature of the educational program.²

The coordinator of homemaking services in each neighborhood center, who is under the supervision of the center's director, was to accept and study requests for homemaker services through

¹ Contractual Agreement Between ABC and Cooperative Extension Association of Monroe County for Conduct of the Educational Home Economics Program in the Neighborhood Centers, #1, #2, #3. The unofficial agreement prepared for 1968 adds an item 5 to these responsibilities, i.e., "Organizing and teaching groups of neighborhood residents in Home Economics areas, as time permits and need and program dictate."

² The unofficial agreement for 1968 states that "Extension's role and responsibility are subject to revision contingent upon recommendations made as a result of the evaluation which is not yet complete." This agreement also contains a reference to the fact that teaching homemakers and supervisors on the Monroe County payroll under ABC supervision will be continued depending on continued county support.

direct application or referral from the center staff or community agency, assign teaching and visiting homemakers as indicated by needs of families, visit homes in which homemaking service was provided, analyze need for continuing service, arrange for termination of service, cooperate with the center's director and employment counselor in recruiting and selecting teaching and visiting homemakers, and provide in-service training and Home Economics Information Center programs for staff members of the Homemaking Service. The teaching and visiting homemakers were under the supervision of the coordinator of homemaking services.¹

Under the 1966 contract the Extension Home Economics Division had major responsibility for conducting a home economics educational program in cooperation with ABC. Developing the program and selecting, training, and supervising the staff which was to conduct the program was also a part of the division's responsibility. While the coordinators of the homemaking services, teaching homemakers, and visiting homemakers were considered the employees of ABC, their functions were to be under the direction of the Home Economics Division. The 1967 contract, while still maintaining a cooperative relationship on program development and supervision, seemed definitely designed to give major emphasis to the training of teaching homemakers, and to a lesser extent, the visiting homemakers, by the staff of the Home Economics Division.

Homemaking Service Advisory Committee. The Neighborhood Service Information Center Advisory Council of the one center that was in existence in November, 1965 appointed one person

¹In the 1967 agreement and unofficial 1968 agreement the job description of the visiting homemaker calls for special training by the Extension home economist with no indication of other kinds of training, but in both agreements the Extension home economist is expected to provide training only in the home economics area.

to serve as chairman for each program associated with the center. The person appointed as chairman of the Homemaking Service was unable to serve. However, some 42 individuals were invited to a meeting. The meeting was held in December of 1965 and at the meeting a committee was formed. Approximately 26 people attended this meeting. Among those who attended were members of families who had been served by the center and representatives from various agencies which would be using the Homemaking Service. About two thirds of the attendants were from the latter group. The Executive Committee of the Home Economics Division appointed two representatives to serve on the committee.

A number of meetings were held at first, but more recently the committee has met only when there have been important matters to consider. From time to time the committee has heard progress reports of the Extension home economist assigned to the program. The committee has had at least one meeting with the Home Economics Executive Committee and explained what the people in the neighborhood areas want and how to cope with going into the homes of the disadvantaged. It has sought financial support from political leaders. Leaflets about the homemaking service have been distributed by members. Contacts have also been made with reporters for newspaper publicity for the homemakers' activities. Committee members have sought to interpret to their neighbors the work of the homemakers, and according to the committee's chairman have persuaded people to accept these workers. The chairman of the committee has a very positive attitude regarding the effectiveness of the teaching homemakers and considers the home economist assigned to the program an effective leader both as a teacher and planner. Regarding the teaching homemakers, the chairman states, "I might say in the past I've seen some real good teaching from the homemakers. . . I've seen them clean up a home and teach the right way of budgeting, cooking, sewing, and even caring ✓

for a little one." When she was interviewed by the home economist assigned to the program, she had this to say, "I might say that homemaking is a function under your supervision, your teaching, your guidance. . . I think what you have been doing has been a great deal of planning and helping the homemakers and teaching them and I think this should continue because I feel that you have the experience of teaching someone how to get into a person's home and I see where this should be continued."

While the scope of the committee has been expanded to include all three of Rochester's ABC Centers, the home economist assigned to the program states that it has continued to face the problem of securing the participation of parents living in the areas served by the neighborhood centers. She also thinks that since the participating members of the committee have consisted largely of agency representatives, much of its concern has centered on interagency relationships with only minor attention to program content.

Statement of the Home Economics Educational Program. Supplement #1 to the 1966 contract projected a basic program which the Home Economics Division anticipated conducting. This program statement consisted of four elements, i.e., 1) characteristics (situational statements), 2) what is needed, 3) who needs it, and 4) methods. The statement has provided the basis for subsequent program activities of the division. In 1967-68, the characteristic (or situation) which was selected for program emphasis was deteriorated and dilapidated physical condition of housing. The plan stated that what is needed with respect to this characteristic was to create awareness of how landlord and tenant can work together toward objective of creating more livable, attractive homes and a better neighborhood. Under who needs it the plan indicated all tenants and landlords in community. Several methods were listed. These, however, were restated and made more explicit in a statement prepared by the Home Economics Division under the title, The 1967-68 Plan for

Action and Results. The objectives of this plan were:

1. To plan, prepare and conduct activities with families that will create more livable, attractive homes and better neighborhoods through:
 - ... "Home beautification" programs
 - ... Better resident-landlord relations
 - ... Recruitment, requests and referrals for home management classes in the home (Classes other than home management will be conducted only on a referral or request basis)

2. To plan, prepare and distribute educational information to:
 - ... Recipients of surplus foods. This information will show ideas for getting more variety in meals with dishes made from surplus foods. Two thousand families will receive information monthly. Center #3 staff.
 - ... Residents of Public Housing on money management. This information might influence and help tenants to pay rent promptly, which would change this statement--'about 20% of tenants are tardy in paying their rent.' [From Democrat and Chronicle, March 9, 1967.] Four hundred families to receive information through a major effort. Centers #1 and #2 staffs.

3. To follow up and work side by side with families to apply the information so that the following will take place:
 - ... Families will develop and use their problem-solving, decision-making skills.
 - ... Each Teaching Homemaker staff will have many families in a selected block making progress in home beautification and home management to the extent that the changes are observable by Feb. 28, 1968. This block will receive priority for Homemaker Services.
 - ... Each Teaching Homemaker will have at least five sets of before and after pictures, illustrating her work with at least five families by Feb. 28, 1968.

4. To work with other services to get maximum results from our efforts. Our objectives may be accomplished by working through an existing neighborhood program, if there is one. Every effort will be made to coordinate with other programs. For example - we will work with other ABC Neighborhood Center services, because most families need more than homemaking information to change their living habits.¹

These objectives were to be obtained by use of the following methods: 1) classes in the home (work with individual families), 2) demonstration and workshops in the center or community buildings, 3) mass media to be used as available, and 4) contests and field trips.

Some of the activities proposed for reaching objectives were:

Paint furniture
 Plant flowers and grass
 Make storage spaces from bricks and board, lumber, old furniture, jars, boxes, broom handles, pipes, etc.
 Add color to the homes by making curtains and home furnishings
 Housekeeping shortcuts
 Safe use and care of household equipment
 Chuck and clutter day
 Make wastepaper baskets
 Home safety programs
 Home decoration contests
 Trips to see what other families are doing
 Saving clubs
 Coffee clubs to meet your neighbors²

¹1967-68 Plan for Action and Results to Carry Out the ABC-NSIC Homemaker Service Work Program in Three Target Areas in Rochester, New York, Monroe County, pp. 2-3.

²Ibid. pp. 3-5.

It will be observed that the first activity on the above list, i.e., paint furniture, was chosen as the focus for this evaluation study.

Cost Estimates for Teaching Homemaking Personnel

No attempt is made here to give a complete picture of costs for the teaching homemaking program which the Home Economics Division has been conducting in cooperation with ABC. The data presented are intended to indicate the scope of the teaching program and to show the basic sources of funds. The cost estimates which are presented here are based on the number of positions currently set up for the teaching program and the going wages or salaries. The wage estimates are for an annual period of 52 40-hour weeks, and the home economist's salary is the current annual salary of the division's staff member assigned to the program.

The total estimated annual cost of the teaching homemaking program personnel would amount to \$109,973 based on the wages and salaries of positions presently set up (Table 1). While on the one hand this estimate may appear to be inflated because the homemaking supervisors are also responsible for the administration and supervision of visiting homemakers and the home economist provides some training for these visiting homemakers and no attempt here is made to reduce the estimate by the deduction of the cost for these functions, on the other hand, no fringe benefits are included in the estimate. Monroe County is responsible for \$64,355, or 59 percent of the total estimated amount. By far the largest portion of the total estimated cost is for the wages of the sub-professional group of teaching homemakers, 76 percent of the total amount.

Table 1
 Estimated Annual Cost of Personnel
 Involved In Homemaking Teaching Program^a

	Source of funds					
	Monroe County Legislature		ABC		Total	
	No.	Salary or wages	No.	Salary or wages	No.	Salary or wages
Teaching homemakers	10	\$52,000.00	6	\$31,200.00	16	\$83,200.00
Homemaking supervisors	2	12,355.20	1	6,177.60	3	18,532.80
Extension home economist	--	---	1	8,239.92 ^b	1	8,239.92
Total	12	\$64,355.20	8	\$45,617.52	20	\$109,972.72

^aThe estimates for teaching homemakers were calculated at \$2.50 per hour for 40 hours per week and 52 weeks per year; those for homemaking supervisors were calculated at \$2.97 per hour for 40 hours per week and 52 weeks per year. No fringe benefits were used in calculating the estimates.

^bSalary of extension home economist for 1967.

Teaching Homemakers Involved In Furniture Painting

In a sense, the major contribution of the Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension to the ABC Program lies in the training given the teaching homemakers. If a limited view of the extension effort is taken, a description of the socio-economic characteristics of these teachers and an evaluation of the immediate influence on them of their training by the home economics agents for the furniture painting class conducted in the summer of 1967 becomes the major concern of the study. Of course, this limitation leaves unanswered a question that it is legitimate to ask: How did the trained teaching homemakers influence the low-income or underprivileged women with whom they worked? This question will be pursued in a subsequent section

of the report where because of the limited evaluation data, the principal emphasis will be on what the teaching homemakers did with these participants. This part of the study will concern itself with the limited view of Extension's effort and deals, therefore, with the 14 teaching homemakers who were trained for conducting lessons in furniture painting.¹

Race

Eleven of the 14 women were Negroes and three were Puerto Ricans.

Age

The mean age of the 14 teaching homemakers was 37.4 years (Table 2). Three of the teachers were under 30 and three were 50 and over.

Table 2
Number and Percentage Distribution of
Teaching Homemakers According to Age

<u>Age</u>	<u>Teaching homemakers</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
20 - 29	3	22
30 - 39	6	43
40 - 49	2	14
50 - 59	2	14
60 - 69	<u>1</u>	<u>7</u>
Total	14	100
Mean	37.4	

¹One of the 14 did not participate in the furniture painting project because she was unable to recruit any participants.

Years of School Completed

The range in years of school completed was from five to 14, with a mean of 10.0 (Table 3). Two of the women had received only five years of schooling. Five had completed high school, and one of these five had two years of education beyond high school.

Table 3
Number and Percentage Distribution of Teaching Homemakers According to Number of Years of School Completed

Number of years of school completed	Teaching homemakers	
	Number	Percent
5	2	14
6	--	--
7	--	--
8	1 ^a	7
9	1	7
10	4	29
11	1	7
12	4	29
13	--	--
14	1	7
Total	14	100
Mean	10.0	

^aIn addition, this teaching homemaker had two years of English and typing in a New York City high school.

Twelve of the 14 teaching homemakers had received all or part of their education outside of New York State. Six of these 12 received their schooling in southern states and three of them in both southern states and New York State. One of the 12 had all of her education in Puerto Rico, one in both Puerto Rico and New York, and one in both Jamaica and Iowa. In view of the usually lower quality of education provided Negroes in southern states, the quality of education received by a number of these

teaching homemakers is questionable.

Six of the 14 teachers had had no special training beyond their formal public school training. Each of the remaining women had had some special training. The kinds of training taken by eight was as follows:

Hospital aide and obstetrics technician
Modelling
Sociology course at Community College
Typing and receptionist at a business school
Typing, English, mathematics, and charm class--
Manpower Training
Beautician course
Typing and English
Beauty culture, rural sociology, nurse's aide

Nine of the teaching homemakers have had some exposure to home economics in their formal education. The following tabulation indicates the educational levels at which the women had taken one or more courses in home economics:

	<u>No. of teaching homemakers</u>
In elementary school only	1
In high school only	4
In elementary school, high school, and adult education	1
In high school and adult education	1
In elementary school, high school, and Y.W.C.A.	1
In elementary school and high school	1
No courses	<u>5</u>
Total	14

Tenure and Dwellings

All of the 14 women lived in the City of Rochester. Half of the 14 lived in homes which their families owned (Table 4).

Five of these residences were one-family dwellings and two were multiple-family dwellings. Of the seven renters, one lived in a one-family dwelling; three, in a house occupied by two or more families; two in an apartment building owned by a private landlord; and one in an apartment building that was a public housing project.

Table 4
Number and Percentage Distribution of Teaching Homemakers According to Tenure and Type of Dwelling

<u>Tenure and type of dwelling</u>	<u>Teaching homemakers</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Owner of one-family dwelling	5	36
Owner of multiple-family dwelling	2	14
Renter of one-family dwelling	1	7
Renter of a house occupied by two or more families	3	22
Renter in an apartment building owned by private landlord	2	14
Renter in an apartment building which is a public housing project <u>1</u>		<u>7</u>
Total	14	100

The mean number of rooms in the houses or apartments occupied by the households of the 14 teachers was 6.3 with a range from four to nine. The mean number of persons per household was 4.5. Thus, the houses in which the 14 women lived had space for about one and a half persons per room.

Marital status

Ten of the 14 women were married, three were divorced or separated from their husbands, and one was single.

Family Composition

The mean number of members at home in the 14 families of the teaching homemakers was 4.4 (Table 5). Only two families consisted of husband and wife only. Two families had six members and three had seven. The mean number of children living at home was 2.7. Two families had no children, and four had as many as five. One family had one child away from home and another, seven. One family had one relative other than the immediate family in the household and another had seven. None of the families had nonrelatives in the household.

Table 5
Number and Percentage Distribution of Teaching Homemakers
According to Number of Family Members Living at Home

Number in family	Teaching homemakers	
	Number	Percent
2	2	14
3	4 ^a	29
4	2	14
5	1	7
6	2	14
7	3	21
Total	14 ^b	99 ^c
Mean	4.4	

^aOne of these women had a husband away in the service. He was counted as a member of family.

^bThree of these women were divorced and one had never married.

^cDoes not add to 100 because of rounding.

Occupations of Husbands and Wives

The occupational classes to which the husbands of the 10 teaching homemakers who had husbands in the family covered a

wide range, from laborers to managers, officials, and proprietors (Table 6). The largest number (3) belonged to the craftsmen and foremen category. Two husbands were operatives and two laborers. One was a service worker and one, retired. The service worker was also a minister. The four women who had no husbands worked solely as teaching homemakers. Two of the 14 teaching homemakers had jobs in addition to their teaching. One is a sales clerk and the other works one day a week in a beauty shop of which she is the owner.

Table 6
Number and Percentage Distribution of
Teaching Homemakers With Husbands According
to Major Occupational Class of Husbands

<u>Major occupational class of husbands</u>	<u>Teaching homemakers</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Retired	1	10
Managers, officials, and proprietors	1	10
Craftsmen and foremen	3	30
Operatives	2	20
Service workers	1 ^a	10
Laborers	<u>2</u>	<u>20</u>
Total	10	100

^aSecond occupation--minister

All of the 14 teaching homemakers had had some type of employment before becoming a teaching homemaker. The following tabulation gives the kinds of employment the teachers had engaged in before serving as teaching homemakers:

<u>Previous employment</u>	<u>Number of teaching homemakers</u>
Nurse's or hospital aide	3
ABC visiting homemaker	1
Private duty nurse and ABC visiting homemaker	1
Nurse's aide, housekeeper (house cleaning), and ABC visiting homemaker	1
House cleaning and foster mother	1
House cleaning, waitress, nurse's aide, and hospital supply person	1
House cleaning, cashier, assembly line worker, and ABC visiting homemaker	1
Machine operator and assembly line worker	1
Assembly line worker	1
Cashier and ABC visiting homemaker	1
Beautician	1
Tailor	<u>1</u>
Total	14

Eight of the 14 women had had work experience, such as nurse's aide, hospital aide, private duty nurse, housekeeper or cleaner, and foster mother, that was not entirely foreign to becoming a teaching homemaker and five were promoted from ABC visiting to teaching homemakers.

Mobility

Since their marriages, the 14 teaching homemakers had made an average (mean) of .29 moves per year of married life, or one move every 3.4 years.¹ The range for average number of moves per year was from .04 to .50. The average number of moves made by the 14 women irrespective of number of years married was 3.9 with a range from one to eight moves. The

¹For one of the 14 who was not married, the number of years used as the basis for calculating her average was number of years since the birth of her first child.

average number of years lived at each dwelling place since their marriages was 6.0. The range was from 1.5 to 12.5 years.

Five of the women first came to Rochester between 1963 and 1967, five came in the 1950's, three came between 1930 and 1947, and one was a native of the city. The mean number of years lived in Rochester since their last move there including the one who was native was 12.8.

Formal Participation Score

This score is the sum of the number of different organizations to which one belongs plus the number of leadership positions held times a weight of three. The mean score for the 14 teaching homemakers was 5.4 (Table 7). Nine of the teachers belonged to from one to three organizations, but held no leadership positions. Four of the women had fairly high scores, ranging from 12 to 14.

Table 7
Number and Percentage Distribution of Teaching
Homemakers According to Formal Participation Scores

Formal participation score	Teaching homemakers	
	Number	Percent
1	4	29
2	4	29
3	1	7
4	--	--
5	--	--
6	--	--
7	1	7
8	--	--
9	--	--
10	--	--
11	--	--
12	1	7
13	1	7
14	<u>2</u>	<u>14</u>
Total	14	100
Mean	5.4	

Thirteen of the 14 teachers were members of churches. Except for church membership or membership in organizations within the church, most of the women had no other organizational affiliation. Four belonged to the Eastern Star and three were members of the Elks.

Net Family Income: 1966

The median estimated net family income of the 14 teaching homemakers was \$5,500 in 1966 (Table 8). Two of the families had net incomes under \$3,000. On the other hand, four families had incomes of \$8,000 or more; two of these reported incomes of \$10,000 and over. The range in class intervals for the 14 families was from \$1,000 - 1,999 to \$10,000 and over.

Table 8
Number and Percentage Distribution of Families of Teaching Homemakers According to Estimated Net Family Income: 1966

<u>Estimated net family income</u>	<u>Teaching homemakers</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
\$1,000 - 1,999	1	7
2,000 - 2,999	1	7
3,000 - 3,999	4	29
4,000 - 4,999	--	--
5,000 - 5,999	2	14
6,000 - 6,999	2	14
7,000 - 7,999	--	--
8,000 - 8,999	2	14
9,000 - 9,999	--	--
10,000 and over	<u>2</u>	<u>14</u>
Total	14	99 ^a
Median = \$5,500		

^a Does not add to 100 because of rounding.

Comparison of Rochester Teaching Homemakers and Clinton County Family Service Aides

Since information was available on the characteristics of the family service aides in Clinton County, New York, who were performing a teaching function somewhat similar to that of the teaching homemakers in Rochester, it was thought that a comparison of the two groups of teachers would be enlightening, since the Clinton County family service aides were working in an essentially rural environment whereas the teaching homemakers were operating in an inner city urban setting (Table 9).

Race. The two groups of subprofessionals differed greatly in racial composition. The Rochester teaching homemakers were predominantly Negro plus a few Puerto Ricans, while the Clinton County aides were all whites.

Age. The two groups differed very little in average (median) age with the Rochester women being slightly younger.

Years of school completed. The Clinton aides had had on the average (median) one year more of schooling than the Rochester teachers. The average for the former was about three years of high school completed and for the latter about two years. However, much of the schooling of the teaching homemakers in Rochester was in southern Negro schools where the quality of education may have been inferior to that received by the Clinton family service aides.

Place of residence. The Rochester teaching homemakers were entirely urban while none of the Clinton County family service aides were urban.

Tenure. The two groups differed somewhat with respect to tenure. Slightly over 70 percent of the Clinton family service aides were from owner families but only 50 percent of the Rochester teaching homemakers were owners.

Marital status. The percent of Clinton's aides who were married was 83 compared to 71 for the Rochester teachers.

Table 9
Comparative Socio-Economic Characteristics of
Rochester, New York, Teaching Homemakers and
Clinton County, New York, Family Service Aides

	Rochester teaching homemakers (N=14) ^a	Clinton County family service aides (N=18) ^b
<u>Race</u>		
White--percent	0	100
Negro--percent	79	0
Puerto Rican--percent	21	0
<u>Age</u>		
Median	36.7	38.8
<u>Years of school completed</u>		
Median	10.2	11.2
<u>Place of residence</u>		
Urban--percent	100	0
Rural--percent	0	100
<u>Tenure</u>		
Owner--percent	50	72
Renter--percent	50	28
<u>Marital status</u>		
Percent married living with husband	71	83
<u>Family size</u>		
Mean	4.4	5.7
<u>Household size</u>		
Mean	5.0	5.8
<u>Occupations of husbands</u>		
Occupational class with highest percent	Craftsmen and foremen: 30%	Operatives: 40%
Occupational class with second highest percent	Operatives: 20% Laborers: 20%	Craftsmen: 13% Laborers: 13% Service: 13%
<u>Mobility</u>		
Mean number of moves per year	.3	.2
<u>Formal participation score</u>		
Mean	5.4	4.7
Organization with highest percent of members	Church: 93%	Church: 78%
<u>Estimated net family income: 1966</u>		
Median	\$5,500	\$4,786

^aThe N for occupations of husbands was 10.

^bThe N for occupations of husbands was 15.

Family size. The Rochester women had smaller families than did the Clinton women, 4.4 compared to 5.7.

Household size. The Rochester women lived in smaller households than did the Clinton women, 5.0 compared to 5.8.

Occupations of husbands. The occupational class with the highest percent of Rochester husbands of teachers was craftsmen and foremen and in the case of the Clinton husbands, the operative class had the highest percent. While laborers was one of the occupational classes with the second highest percent for both groups of husbands, the percent of laborers among the Rochester husbands was somewhat higher than among the Clinton husbands.

Mobility. The Rochester teaching homemakers had moved a little more frequently than had the Clinton family service aides.

Formal participation score. Although both were relatively low, the Rochester women had a mean score slightly higher than that of the Clinton women. In both cases the organization with the highest percent of members was the church.

Estimated net income. The average (median) 1966 net family income of the Rochester teachers was somewhat above that of the Clinton aides, \$5,500 compared to \$4,786.

Summary. On three of 12 socio-economic characteristics, i.e., age, marital status, and formal participation score, the two groups resembled each other fairly closely. For five characteristics there were some differences, i.e., tenure, years of school completed, family size, household size, and mobility. The Clinton aides were more frequently from owner families and had larger families and households, but the Rochester teachers were more mobile. The Clinton aides had more schooling of probably better quality. The occupational status of the two groups of husbands presents a mixed picture. While it would be difficult to make any claim for difference in the leading occupations of the two groups, the Rochester husbands had a somewhat higher percent of laborers. The two groups differed

completely on racial composition and place of residence, with all of the aides in Clinton being white, while the Rochester women were Negro or Puerto Rican, and the aides were all rural, whereas the teaching homemakers were all urban. On estimated net family income for 1966 there was a fairly marked difference with the Rochester women having the advantage.

Recruitment by Teaching Homemakers of Participants for Furniture Painting¹

The teaching of furniture painting was designed for mothers whose children were enrolled in the summer Head Start classes and was aimed not only at teaching the mothers about painting furniture but also at creating in them an interest in improving the area or rooms used by their children. Because the teaching was to be confined largely to Head Start mothers, the potential participants were fairly well defined.

Since securing participation in a teaching program is crucial to its operation, the teaching homemakers were asked to tape accounts of their recruitment activities following a brief outline prepared by the author. Since a majority of the teachers used a social (open house, tea, coffee, etc.) as the principal method for recruitment, their accounts gave considerable attention to what happened at these socials. However, about half of them had also contacted individuals in their recruitment efforts.

A list of the classes of ideas occurring in the teaching homemakers' accounts of their recruitment experiences follows:

¹ Fourteen teaching homemakers gave taped records of their recruitment activities. Some of these accounts were general and some dealt with individual housewives.

<u>Classes of ideas found in accounts</u>	<u>No. of ideas mentioned</u>
1. Interest in improving home and furniture which teaching homemaker discerned in the mothers.	36
2. Information given mothers regarding the class on furniture painting.	30
3. Open house, party, tea, or coffee for mothers to invite participation in furniture painting	24
4. Relating to visits and other personal contacts to interest mothers	21
5. Positive attitude of mothers to social aspects of study groups as discerned by teaching homemakers	18
6. Head Start teachers take initiative in recruiting mothers for furniture painting classes and other cooperation by them.	16
7. Excuses offered by mothers for not agreeing to participate in furniture painting classes	15
8. Observations about women and interaction with them by teaching homemakers	14
9. Mothers who had no problem about caring for children during furniture painting classes.	13
10. Problems of child care and information about provision of babysitters at neighborhood centers	13
11. Interest mothers had in improving rooms for children	12
12. No excuses offered by mothers regarding participation in furniture painting classes.	10
13. Transportation to furniture painting classes not needed by mothers.	10
14. Transportation of mothers to furniture painting classes needed--personal or piece of furniture to be painted	10
15. What told women about ABC program.	9
16. Mothers wanted to be taught furniture painting at home	9

<u>Classes of ideas found in accounts</u>	<u>No. of ideas mentioned</u>
17. Arrangements made by teaching homemakers for class space.	8
18. Cooperation of Catholic Church, especially Sisters, with teaching homemakers for conducting furniture painting classes.	8
19. Failure of mothers to come to open house, etc., meetings for recruitment in furniture painting classes.	8
20. Language problems of Puerto Rican mothers.	8
21. Preparation and/or delivery by teaching homemakers of invitations to mothers to attend open house, etc., for recruitment for furniture painting classes	8
22. Promises by mothers to attend furniture painting classes	8
23. No interest on part of mothers in furniture painting	8
24. Questions raised by mothers relative to classes on furniture painting.	6
25. Miscellaneous.	4
26. Small group possibilities.	3
27. Mothers would consider attending furniture painting classes	2
28. Interest of mothers in sewing.	2

The variety of ideas reported in the accounts was fairly extensive. Twenty-eight categories were developed from the content analysis. Only those categories having 15 or more ideas mentioned are discussed in any detail.

Interest in improving home and furniture. The teaching homemakers seemed to detect considerable interest in home and furniture improvement among the women who attended their open houses or whom they visited. This category headed the list with 36 mentions. Some housewives had never thought of painting their old furniture. A number had specific pieces they thought they could refinish. Others had a room or the

interior of their house they would like to paint. While the final response to participation in the furniture painting classes was not particularly large, the teaching homemakers reflected considerable enthusiasm in initiating the activity and this enthusiasm appeared to be derived in part from their contacts with potential participants.

Information given about furniture painting class. Thirty ideas were classified under this category. Some of these were very general, such as "came to see her about a class on refinishing furniture," but others were more specific, as "I told her I had just finished study in a class on furniture painting and gave her some ideas of color coordination, etc. I gave her date class would start." At several of the socials the teachers showed slides on furniture painting. One of the teachers showed the group at the party a piece of furniture she had painted as a part of her training. Another was rather specific about her own experience, telling them how she painted before she knew the proper way: "I would just take the brush and paint it on and get the color, what color I wanted, but I wasn't mindful about the drips." The teaching homemakers appeared to have a sufficiently adequate understanding of what they were proposing to teach to give to their potential pupils an appreciation of what they were being asked to do if they agreed to come to the classes.

Open house, party, tea, or coffee to invite participation in classes. There were 24 mentions in the contact accounts of the open houses, etc., which the teachers held to acquaint the women with their furniture painting classes. The attendance at these parties appeared to range from about five to around 17, and a number of the women agreed to attend the classes. Slides showing pieces of painted furniture were shown by the teachers at some of these socials. The teachers connected with one of the neighborhood centers joined together to hold their open house. The use of this middle-class type of social to attract

the women is in itself an interesting technique.

Visits and other personal contacts. Although a majority of the teaching homemakers used an open house, etc., to acquaint the mothers with the proposed furniture painting classes, visits to the homes of the mothers were made, some before and some after the socials. There were 21 references to visits or individual contacts. Sometimes more than one visit was made to the same person. From the accounts it is quite evident that a number of the teaching homemakers supplemented their open houses with home visits to enlist participation in their classes.

Positive attitude to social aspects of a study group. There were 18 mentions by the teachers of positive attitudes of the women with respect to socializing with others. In general the teaching homemakers thought the mothers would be interested in the social life which the classes would provide. Several of them commented on the apparent satisfaction which the women found in the open house parties.

Head Start teachers' assistance in recruitment. The accounts of the teaching homemakers contained 16 mentions about the Head Start teachers' cooperation. These teachers actually took the initiative in planning several of the socials to which the Head Start mothers were invited so the teaching homemakers could explain their proposed classes in furniture painting. This relationship is a good example of how program efforts can be coordinated.

Excuses for not agreeing to participate. The accounts of the teaching homemakers contained 15 mentions that fall into this category. The more frequently mentioned excuses related to the care of small children and illness of some kind.

Evaluation of Training of Teaching Homemakers for Furniture Painting

Attendance at training sessions. Only six of the 14 teaching homemakers attended all five of the training sessions

which the home economics agent taught in preparation for their furniture painting teaching, the phase of the Homemaking Service Program which was originally chosen as the focus of the evaluation study. Four attended four, or 80 percent, of the sessions; and four attended only three, or 60 percent, of the five sessions.

Pre- and post-testing. A test to ascertain the knowledge level of the teaching homemakers before and after they were trained by the extension home economist was developed. The test was prepared by the extension home economist who did the training with assistance from the author. The same form was used for both pre- and post-testing. The test consisted of 25 items and the maximum raw score was 32. In scoring the test no correction was made for guessing.

The mean pre-test percent score of the 13 teachers who took both pre- and post-tests was 69.8 and their mean percent score on the post-test was 83.0 (Table 10). Thus, the teachers gained on the average 13.2 percentage points. This gain was highly significant. The P for t of the difference was $<.001$.

Table 10

Percentage Scores of 13 Teaching Homemakers on Pre- and Post-Test Knowledge of Furniture Painting With Difference Between Pre- and Post-Test Scores

Identification number of teaching homemakers	Percent scores		Percentage difference between pre- and post-test
	Pre- test	Post- test	
1	69	78	9
2	72	94	22
3	72	88	16
4	69	84	15
5	72	78	6
6	69	72	3
7	78	91	13
8	66	91	25
9	50	56	6
10	59	78	19
11	69	75	6
12	81	100	19
13	81	94	13
Mean	69.8	83.0	13.2

P for t of difference $<.001$.

Two of the teaching homemakers had percentage scores on the pre-test as high as 81, and two had pre-test scores in the 50's. No teacher had a post-test score that was below her pre-test score, although one gained only three percentage points and three gained only six points. The range of pre-test percentage scores was from 50 to 81; of the post-test scores, from 56 to 100; and of the gains in percentage scores from pre- to post-test was from three to 25 percentage points.

Observations of teaching furniture painting. The home economist who trained the teaching homemakers observed entirely or partially 10 teaching sessions. For five of the 10 sessions only one person was present. For the other five sessions the numbers varied from around two to five. It should be noted that before the furniture painting classes were started it was generally agreed that it would be desirable to keep the classes to about five persons. For at least half of the sessions observed the home economist thought the teachers were doing a good job, especially with respect to illustrating how to do various steps in the painting. She also noted that babysitting arrangements were provided at all of the places where classes were held. For nine of the sessions observed the home economist thought the participants showed a good attitude, often real enthusiasm, and considerable effort on their painting projects. It was also observed that seven of the sessions were held in rooms that ranged from fairly adequate to excellent. The home economist further learned that several of the groups were having difficulties with supplies for teaching painting, particularly having needed materials and moving and storing them.

The home economist reached several positive conclusions from her observations, i.e., 1) that she was impressed with the manner in which the classes were conducted, 2) that the learners were working hard, 3) that the teachers were enthusiastic, 4) that considerable interest in participating in other

classes, especially sewing, had been generated. On the negative side she thought that in some instances excessive attention was given to details in the painting operations.

Other conclusions of the home economist which were stimulated by her observations were: 1) that the teaching homemakers should not be responsible for finding adequate teaching space, 2) that difficulties with securing and storing supplies should be dealt with, 3) that there was a need for a workshop for conducting certain classes so that people could come and go and thus manage their babysitting, 4) that there was a need to have babysitters who could go to the homes of participants, and 5) that recruitment for classes should hereafter not be restricted to one group, as was done in the case of the furniture painting classes which were largely restricted to Head Start mothers.

Subject Matter Taught by Teaching Homemakers: 1966-67

It was not possible to obtain accurate information on the number of different classes taught by the teaching homemakers in 1966-67 and the attendance at these classes. However, Table 11 presents for 15 teaching homemakers the number who taught one or more classes in each subject-matter area listed.¹ The list of subjects provides an indication of the teaching coverage through classes.

Furniture painting leads the list with 13 teachers having had at least one class on this topic.² Cooking and shopping tours are second and third with eight and seven teachers having taught classes in these areas.

¹ It is not known how many of the classes had only one participant, but some of them did.

² Two of the 15 teaching homemakers included in this section did not teach the furniture painting project, but one of these two received training for teaching it.

Table 11

Number of Teaching Homemakers According to Subjects
On Which They Taught One or More Classes: 1966-67

<u>Subjects</u>	<u>Number of teaching homemakers teaching one or more classes</u>
Furniture painting	13
Cooking	8
Shopping tours	7
Sewing	6
Be a better shopper	5
Housekeeping	4
Mother and baby care	3
Grooming (charm)	2
Knitting	2
Money saving	2
Babysitting	1
Other	6 ^a

^a Includes seven different subjects, i.e., crocheting, food demonstrations, rug making, Christmas decorations, alterations, using cash register, changing money.

Nine of the 15 teachers taught from five to seven different subjects (Table 12). This is a fairly wide range of topics and emphasizes the importance of adequate time for training.

Table 12

Number and Percentage Distribution of 15 Teaching Homemakers According to Number of Different Subjects Taught to One or More Classes: 1966-67

Number of different subjects taught	Teaching homemakers	
	Number	Percent
1	3	20
2	1	7
3	1	7
4	1	7
5	4	26
6	4	26
7	1	7
Total	15	100

Complete Roster of Teaching Homemakers

During the period from the beginning of the Teaching Homemaking Program in November, 1965 to September, 1967, a total of 26 teaching homemakers have been employed at some time. The following tabulation presents as of September, 1967 the employment status of these 26 women:

	<u>Number</u>
Teaching homemakers employed as of September, 1967.	15
Former teaching homemakers who have transferred to other ABC positions	4
Former teaching homemakers who have taken non-ABC jobs	4
Former teaching homemakers who are unemployed housewives.	<u>3</u>
Total number ever teaching homemakers.	26

Over-all Training of Teaching Homemakers and
Other Staff Members of Homemaking Service: 1966-67

The Home Economics Division's major responsibility in the Homemaking Service Program of ABC has been that of training the teaching homemakers, the visiting homemakers, and to a limited degree the homemaking supervisors (coordinators). A total of 242 training hours constituted the 1966-67 extension training input for the learners. The subject matter of this training is indicated in the following tabulation:

	<u>Number of hours</u>
1. <u>Clothing</u>	<u>47</u>
a. Smart dressmaking	35
b. Selection and care of clothing	10
c. Use of sewing machine	2
2. <u>Food</u>	<u>35</u>
a. Food in the morning (workshop)	9
b. How to give food demonstration	9
c. Meal planning, purchasing, and preparation	7
d. Surplus foods: planning meals using the food on hand	7
e. What food means to people	2
f. Food storage, sanitation	1
3. <u>Furnishings</u>	<u>33</u>
a. Furnishing model apartment with used drapes, etc.	30
b. Inexpensive curtains	3
4. <u>Painted finishes</u>	<u>30</u>
5. <u>Orientation</u>	<u>17</u>
a. Orientation to homemaking service	4
b. Working in the homemaking service--orientation and getting acquainted	3
c. Working in the homemaking service--overview of homemaking program, duties of ABC homemakers	3
d. Orientation	6
e. Orientation to Cooperative Extension of Monroe County	1

	<u>Number of hours</u>
6. <u>Develop plan for action</u>	<u>12</u>
7. <u>Kit preparation for you and your family series</u>	<u>12</u>
8. <u>Job readiness</u>	<u>11</u>
9. <u>Shopping</u>	<u>11</u>
a. Be a better shopper	5
b. Shopping for a bargain	3
c. Shopping for credit	3
10. <u>Working with and understanding people</u>	<u>10.5</u>
a. Art and science of helping	2
b. What we can expect in dealing with people	2
c. Understanding people:	3.5
1) What we can expect in dealing with people ¹	
2) Art and science of helping ¹	
d. Understanding people:	3
1) Growth and development of children and teenagers	
2) Care of children	
3) Care of aged	
11. <u>Management of work</u>	<u>8.8</u>
a. Cleaning the house	2.7
b. Time and energy management	2.6
c. Managing the home, your time and energy:	
1) Cleaning the house	
2) Money management	3.5
12. <u>Financial management</u>	<u>5.7</u>
a. Some leaks in the food budget	3
b. Money management	2.7
13. <u>Christmas decorations</u>	<u>5</u>
14. <u>Laundering and care of today's fabrics</u>	<u>2</u>
15. <u>"You Are a VIP"</u>	<u>2</u>

¹ Although topics c-1 and c-2 are identical with topics b and a respectively, they were taught by different extension staff members and c-1 and c-2 were subtopics of a broader topic.

Clothing with 47 hours of training led the list. Other categories with relatively large numbers of hours were food with 35 hours, furnishings with 33 hours, and painted finishes with 30 hours.

Seventeen hours taught by extension personnel were devoted to orientation. This orientation was primarily directed to the homemaking service of ABC. Only one hour of the 11 hours identified as to direction was devoted to Cooperative Extension.

While kit preparation for you and your family series, which covers a wide range of topics, had 12 hours of training, the number of topics included were probably too numerous to permit any significant amount of time being given to any one topic.

Shopping was given 11 hours of time, but financial management only 5.7 hours of attention. And management of work, an area to which the teaching homemakers appear to have given considerable attention, had only 8.8 hours devoted to it.

Four of the staff members of the Monroe County Home Economics Division devoted time to training the staff of the ABC Homemaking Service. The number of hours spent by these four staff members was as follows:

<u>Staff member</u>	<u>Number of hours</u>
1	145
2	72
3	34
4	<u>4</u>
Total	255

Thus, the county staff spent a total of 255 hours in training the staff of the ABC Homemaking Service. In addition, two extension staff members from the College of Home Economics gave 14 hours to this activity. The total extension time given to training (exclusive of preparation) was 269 hours.¹ If a

¹This 269 hours is greater than the 242 hours of training the learners received. The additional 27 hours of extension personnel time results from more than one staff member participating in the same training sessions.

workday is considered to be seven hours,¹ then about 38 days of extension time was devoted to training. Since the average extension work year is 232 days, this would mean that approximately 16 percent of a man-year was devoted to training.

During 1966-67 the Homemaking Service staff received a total of 313 hours of training. The training program was developed and conducted under extension leadership, and the extension personnel taught 77 percent of the 313 hours. Since both the extension training staff and other personnel used for training sometimes taught in sessions involving more than one teacher, the total number of hours of time devoted to training by all trainers amounted to 347 with extension staff members providing 78 percent of the total.²

Participants as Reported in Taped Accounts

Characteristics of Participants³

In order to ascertain what the teaching homemakers discussed and did with the women whom they visited or who had participated in the furniture painting (as individuals or in groups), what the problems of these women were, and accomplishments with them, the teachers made lists of the women and then gave taped accounts of their work with them. The participants

¹The workday of the professional staff of the Home Economics Division in Monroe County is seven hours.

²It should be noted that the time input on training discussed in this section does not include staff time devoted to counseling the teaching homemakers nor time spent in preparation for training.

³The data on characteristics which are in this section were not obtained by means of a schedule but were derived from information (in most cases estimated) which the teaching homemakers had gotten in the course of their work with the participants.

visited included most of the women who took the furniture painting lessons or who were currently considered to be active visitation cases. In some instances, where the lists were long or time was limited, a random sample was chosen for the taped accounts. In other instances, all of the women on the lists were used.

Records of characteristics were obtained on 91 individuals, but accounts of work done with them were taped for 87 of these people.¹ Table 13 presents a general picture of how the teachers worked with the 91 individuals:

Table 13
Number and Percentage Distribution of 91 Participants
According to Ways Worked with by Teaching Homemakers

<u>Ways worked with</u>	<u>Participants</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Visited only	61	67
Participated in furniture painting lessons in class or as individuals and also visited one or more times	23	25
Participated in furniture painting lessons only in class or as individual	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
Total	91	100

Age of women. The mean estimated age of the 89 women on whom characteristic records were obtained was 34.4 years (Table 14). This average indicates a fairly young group of women.

¹One of these was about a 15 year-old son of one of the participating mothers and another was about a 57 year-old minister.

Actually, 47 percent of them were under 30 and only seven percent were 50 and over. The range was large, from 21 to 82 years.

Table 14
Number and Percentage Distribution of
Participants According to Estimated Age

Age	Participating women	
	Number	Percent
20 - 29	42	47
30 - 39	23	26
40 - 49	18	20
50 and over	6	7
Total	89 ^a	100
Mean	34.4	

^aTwo male participants, 15 and 57 years of age, are not included.

Marital status. Seventy percent, or 59, of the 84 women on whom data were obtained had a husband who was present in the family (Table 15). Eighteen, or 21 percent, of the women had no husband present. Three of the women were widows, and four had never married.

Table 15
Number and Percentage Distribution of
Participating Women According to Marital Status

Marital status	Participating women	
	Number	Percent
Husband present	59	70
Husband not present	18	21
Widowed	3	4
Never married	4	5
Total	84 ^a	100

^aNo information for five; in addition, a 15 year-old boy and an adult male who was married were excluded.

Family composition. The mean size of the 84 families on whom information was given by the teaching homemakers was 6.8 persons (Table 16). The number of persons in the families ranged from one to 15. Thirteen, or 15 percent, of the families had from 10 to 15 members.

Table 16
Number and Percentage Distribution of Participant Families According to Number of Persons in Family

<u>Size of family</u>	<u>Participant families</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
1	3	4
2	5	6
3	5	6
4	4	5
5	8	10
6	17	20
7	12	14
8	8	10
9	9	10
10	5	6
11	3	4
12	1	1
13	--	--
14	2	2
15	2	2
Total	84 ^a	100
Mean	6.8	

^aNo information on six families, and one participant, a boy 15 years of age is excluded.

The number of children at home reported for 88 families was 4.95 (Table 17). Eight, or nine percent, of the families had no children at home. Fourteen, or 15 percent, of the families had from eight to 14 children. The range for number of children was from zero to 14.

Table 17

Number and Percentage Distribution of Participant Families According to Number of Children at Home

Number of children at home	Participant families	
	Number	Percent
0	8	9
1	3	3
2	8	9
3	4	5
4	20	23
5	11	13
6	9	10
7	11	13
8	3	3
9	6	7
10	1	1
11	--	--
12	2	2
13	1	1
14	1	1
Total	88 ^a	100
Mean	4.95	

^aNo information for two families, and one participant, a boy 15 years of age, is excluded.

Occupations of husbands. The teaching homemakers were not too well informed about the occupations of the husbands in the families with which they were working. Thus, they thought they knew this information in 37 instances, but did not know in 27 cases.

The occupational classes having the highest percentages of the 37 husbands whose occupations the teachers thought they knew were operatives (27 percent) and laborers (27 percent) (Table 18). Five, or 13.5 percent were unemployed.

Table 18

Number and Percentage Distribution of Husbands of
Participating Women According to Occupational Classes

<u>Occupational classes</u>	<u>Husbands</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Clerical workers	1	3
Sales workers	1	3
Craftsmen and foremen	5	13.5
Operatives	10	27
Service workers	2	5
Laborers	10	27
Retired	3	8
Unemployed	<u>5</u>	<u>13.5</u>
Total	37 ^a	100

^aFor 22 husbands the teaching homemakers did not know their occupations. In five additional cases, the teaching homemakers did not know if a husband was present. In addition, there were a minister and a boy 15 years of age who participated in the furniture painting classes.

Occupations of women. Thirteen of the 89 women worked.

The jobs held by these women were:

	<u>Number</u>
Teacher's aide	2
Nurse	1
Nurse's aide	1
Beautician	1
Assembly line	1
Work at belt-making factory	1
Laundry	1
Office cleaner	1
Babysitter	1
Odd jobs	1
No information	<u>2</u>
Total	13

Welfare recipients. Of the 82 families on which the teaching homemakers gave information, 34, or 41 percent, received Welfare assistance.¹

¹There was no information on eight families, and the boy 15 years of age was excluded.

Topics Discussed

The taped accounts of the 14 teaching homemakers contained one or more mentions of topics discussed with 68 of the 87 individuals on whom these accounts were obtained. A classified list of these topics follows:

<u>Topics Discussed with 68 Participants</u>	<u>Number of mentions</u>
1. Painting or repairing furniture	<u>45</u>
2. Children	<u>34</u>
a. Children's clothing	9
b. Child care	5
c. Children's problems	5
d. General discussion of children	5
e. Children's responsibilities	3
f. Miscellaneous	3
g. Education of children	2
h. Room for child	2
3. Painting or repairing house	<u>12</u>
4. Housing--moving, adequate place, buying	<u>10</u>
5. Budgeting and finances	<u>9</u>
6. Cleaning and arranging house	<u>9</u>
7. Preparation of food	<u>9</u>
8. Obtaining assistance (Welfare, etc.)	<u>8</u>
9. Interest in sewing or sewing class	<u>7</u>
10. Health and related matters--medicine	<u>6</u>
11. Marital or family problems	<u>6</u>
12. Miscellaneous	<u>6</u>
13. Shopping	<u>5</u>
14. Welfare Rights Groups	<u>5</u>
15. Employment	<u>4</u>
16. Homemaking Department	<u>4</u>
17. Yard or flowers	<u>4</u>
18. Community problems	<u>3</u>
19. Continuing contact with housewife	<u>3</u>
20. Storage	<u>3</u>
21. Planning work	<u>2</u>
22. Things in general (visiting with)	<u>2</u>

Since the painting of furniture was the activity around which the evaluation study was developed, it is not unexpected that this topic is the one most frequently mentioned with 45 mentions. Children was second with 34 mentions. These 34 mentions fell into eight different subcategories. The subcategory with the most frequent number of mentions was children's clothing. Other classes of topics mentioned frequently were painting or fixing the house, 12 times and housing including moving, adequate space, buying, 10 times. A total of 22 different major classes of topics were found in the taped accounts. This list of topics gives some indication of the scope and type of concerns with which the teaching homemakers have dealt.

Things Done

The 14 teaching homemakers mentioned one or more things done with 68 of the 87 participants on whom they gave taped accounts. Below is a classified list of these activities with three subcategories under each class, i.e., 1) for participant by T.H., things done for the participants; 2) participant and T.H. together, things done with both being active; and 3) by participant, things she did herself.¹

<u>Things done with 68 participants</u>	<u>Number of mentions</u>
1. Painting or repairing furniture	<u>32</u>
For participant by T.H.	0 ²
Participant and T.H. together	26
By participant	6
2. Cleaning and arranging house	<u>20</u>
For participant by T.H.	10
Participant and T.H. together	6
By participant	4

¹ It is quite obvious that for many, if not all, of the things done, it would be reasonable to have included the same thing in the list of things discussed. In some instances this was done but only where the account plainly indicated the matter was discussed.

² One of these was a young boy and another was a minister.

<u>Things done with 68 participants</u>	<u>Number of mentions</u>
3. Things done for and with children	<u>13</u>
For participant by T.H.	8
Participant and T.H. together	3
By participant	2
4. Preparation of food--cooking	<u>13</u>
For participant by T.H.	6
Participant and T.H. together	7
By participant	0
5. Shopping	<u>12</u>
For participant by T.H.	7
Participant and T.H. together	5
By participant	0
6. Securing food, clothes, and furnishings	<u>9</u>
For participant by T.H.	8
Participant and T.H. together	0
By participant	1
7. Looking for housing	<u>8</u>
For participant by T.H.	7
Participant and T.H. together	1
By participant	0
8. Washing or ironing	<u>7</u>
For participant by T.H.	7
Participant and T.H. together	0
By participant	0
9. Decorating including drapes or slipcovers	<u>6</u>
For participant by T.H.	1
Participant and T.H. together	2
By participant	3
10. Painting or fixing house	<u>6</u>
For participant by T.H.	0
Participant and T.H. together	1
By participant	5

<u>Things done with 68 participants</u>	<u>Number of mentions</u>
11. Budgeting	<u>4</u>
For participant by T.H.	0
Participant and T.H. together	4
By participant	0
12. Care of yard (flowers)	<u>4</u>
For participant by T.H.	0
Participant and T.H. together	3
By participant	1
13. Help with agencies other than Welfare	<u>4</u>
For participant by T.H.	3
Participant and T.H. together	1
By participant	0
14. Help with Welfare matters	<u>4</u>
For participant by T.H.	2
Participant and T.H. together	2
By participant	0
15. Washing dishes	<u>4</u>
For participant by T.H.	4
Participant and T.H. together	0
By participant	0
16. Altering or repairing clothes	<u>2</u>
For participant by T.H.	1
Participant and T.H. together	1
By participant	0
17. Visits to check on participant and for companionship	<u>2</u>
For participant by T.H.	2 ¹
Participant and T.H. together	0
By participant	0
18. Planning work schedule	<u>2</u>
For participant by T.H.	0
Participant and T.H. together	2
By participant	0
19. Miscellaneous	<u>7</u>
For participant by T.H.	5
Participant and T.H. together	2
By participant	0

¹This classification of these two mentions is based on the idea that the T.H. did this for the participant, even though the latter interacted with the T.H.

Nineteen classes of things done were found in the accounts. The most frequently mentioned things were: 1) Painting or repairing furniture with 32 mentions, 2) Cleaning and arranging house with 20 mentions, 3) Things done for and with children with 13 mentions, 4) Preparation of food--cooking with 13 mentions, and 5) Shopping with 12 mentions. The fact that Painting and repairing of furniture heads the list is associated with the emphasis on this activity during the evaluation period.

The sums of the mentions classified under the three sub-categories of the major classes provide an interesting picture of the manner in which the teaching homemakers work. The following tabulation presents these sums:

For participant by T.H.	71
Participant and T.H. together	66
By participant	22

These figures show the teaching homemaker performing a large number of services for the participants, perhaps indicating that the supervision of the teaching homemakers may require that the teacher should be given guidelines for performing her teaching role.

Problems of Participants

Of the 87 individuals with whom the 14 teaching homemakers had worked and about whom they gave taped accounts, 67 had one or more problems which the teachers mentioned. A classified list of these problems with number of mentions follows:

<u>Problems of 67 participants</u>	<u>Number of mentions</u>
1. <u>Children</u>	<u>45</u>
a. Physical or mental illness or disability	9
b. Children need clothing	7

<u>Problems of 67 participants</u>	<u>Number of mentions</u>
c. Management and care of children	7
d. Neglect of children	5
e. Children's responsibilities for household duties	3
f. Delinquency of boys	3
g. Educational problems	3
h. Father's burden of children when wife is sick	2
i. Physical appearance of girls	2
j. Sexual behavior of girls	2
k. Number of children and finding housing	1
l. Playground problems of children	1
2. <u>Illness or physical disability of housewife or husband</u>	<u>24</u>
a. Illness or physical disability of housewife	16
b. Illness or physical disability of husband	6
c. Illness or physical disability of old couples	2
3. <u>Housing</u>	<u>21</u>
a. Need for improved maintenance, painting, cleaning walls, etc.	6
b. Poor housing	5
c. Need for more space	3
d. Decorating interior	2
e. Feel need to move to another place	2
f. Need for storage space	2
g. Wants larger house in better neighborhood	1
4. <u>Finances</u>	<u>17</u>
a. Not enough income	8
b. Debts	4

<u>Problems of 67 participants</u>	<u>Number of mentions</u>
c. Financial problems, budgeting	2
d. Irresponsible use of money	1
e. Long-term Welfare client	1
f. Pawns equipment provided	1
5. <u>Poor housekeeping</u>	<u>15</u>
6. <u>Difficulties with husband</u>	<u>7</u>
7. <u>Mental illness of housewife</u>	<u>7</u>
8. <u>Need furniture or furniture repairing</u>	<u>7</u>
9. <u>Problems connected with surplus foods, especially how to use</u>	<u>6</u>
10. <u>Lack of food</u>	<u>4</u>
11. <u>Problems with Welfare</u>	<u>4</u>
12. <u>Housewife wants employment</u>	<u>3</u>
13. <u>Companionship--someone to talk with</u>	<u>2</u>
14. <u>Inability to plan work</u>	<u>2</u>
15. <u>Many problems</u>	<u>2</u>
16. <u>Didn't want to be bothered--negative to approach of teaching homemaker</u>	<u>1</u>
17. <u>Forced to move, building being torn down</u>	<u>1</u>
18. <u>Lack of cooking know-how</u>	<u>1</u>

Eighteen problem areas appeared as a result of the classification of the problems mentioned by the teachers. It is recognized that the accounts of the teaching homemakers were relatively free-flowing stories and hence no claim for systematic coverage can be made, yet it is very likely that the major problems of the 67 participants were given. Children's problems were mentioned more frequently than any others. Next in order of

frequency of mention was illness or physical disability of housewife or husband. Undoubtedly, finances were more frequently a problem than is indicated by the frequencies. Perhaps the rather universal low level of income is so commonplace, the teaching homemakers mentioned finances only when they were really a serious matter.

Accomplishments with Participants

The taped accounts which were given by the teaching homemakers of their work with the 87 participants through home visits and group teaching contained mentions of accomplishments for 42 participants. A classification of these accomplishments is given in the following tabulation:

<u>Accomplishments for 42 participants</u>	<u>Number of mentions</u>
1. <u>Positive results</u>	<u>49</u>
a. Did a good job on painting something	18
b. Positive attitude shown	13
c. Improvement in housekeeping	4
d. General improvement	4
e. Improvement in financial matters	3
f. Improvement in relationship of mother and children	2
g. Improvement made on house (other than painting)	2
h. A school drop-out persuaded to return to school	1
i. Improvement in personal appearance of housewife	1
j. Attending class in painting gave relief from children	1
2. <u>No progress or considered hopeless</u>	<u>10</u>
3. <u>Too early to see any results</u>	<u>2</u>
4. <u>Not physically able to complete furniture painting</u>	<u>1</u>

Under positive results are 10 subclasses. The class with the most frequent number of mentions is did a good job on painting something. This accomplishment leads the subclass list because the activity in which the teachers and participants had been immediately involved was the furniture painting project. The second ranking subclass under positive results is positive attitude shown. While this is an attitudinal achievement, it deserves to be considered an important step forward in working with underprivileged people.

Ten of those worked with were considered by the teaching homemakers to have made no progress or to be hopeless cases.

Things Discussed and/or Done as Reported
On Visitation Cards by Teaching Homemakers

Another approach to securing information on the activities of the teaching homemakers was through visitation report cards, covering the period from the latter part of June to the first part of September, 1967. Three kinds of report cards were used, i.e., a first visit card, between-first-and-last visit card, and the last visit card. The use of the three kinds of cards did not prove to be very effective in terms of yielding information on sequences of visits; however, the teaching homemakers did enter on the cards what was discussed and/or done. The things discussed and/or done with 187 participants reported on these cards were classified under the following categories:¹

¹ Things done include those done for the participant (or family) by the teaching homemaker, things done together, and things done by the participant.

<u>Things Discussed and/or Done as Reported by Teaching Homemakers on Visitation Report Cards for 127 Participants</u>		<u>Number of mentions</u>
1. <u>Children</u>		<u>88</u>
a. General discussion	22	
b. Care or upbringing	20	
c. Need for clothing	16	
d. Head Start Program	13	
e. Children and school	7	
f. Babysitting or nursery at Center	5	
g. Dirty children	5	
2. <u>ABC Homemaking Program</u>		<u>85</u>
a. Explained services	49	
b. Discussed classes offered	10	
c. Took intake on family	8	
d. Reference to the Center for specific needs	7	
e. Need for visiting homemaker	6	
f. Invited to open house	5	
3. <u>Refinishing furniture</u>		<u>80</u>
a. Painting classes	75	
b. Upholstering and repairing	5	
4. <u>Housekeeping</u>		<u>71</u>
a. Checking and observing the condition of house or apartment	42	
b. Cleaning house--specific jobs	12	
c. Homemaking and housecleaning--general	12	
d. Suggested work schedule	5	
5. <u>Housing</u>		<u>66</u>
a. Decorating, painting, and color schemes	19	
b. Moving or looking for house	20	
c. General discussion	12	
d. Home beautification--fixing up surroundings	10	
e. Neighborhood and yard	5	

<u>Things Discussed and/or Done as Reported by Teaching Homemakers on Visitation Report Cards for 187 Participants</u>	<u>Number of mentions</u>
6. <u>Health problems</u>	<u>28</u>
a. Adults	21
b. Children	7
7. <u>Preparation of food and meal planning</u>	<u>22</u>
a. General	12
b. Use of surplus food	10
8. <u>Nonattendance at classes</u>	<u>20</u>
a. Not interested, no reason given	6
b. No babysitter	5
c. Working	5
d. General excuses	4
9. <u>Sewing</u>	<u>19</u>
10. <u>Budgeting and finances</u>	<u>16</u>
11. <u>Welfare</u>	<u>16</u>
12. <u>Agreed to attend classes</u>	<u>14</u>
13. <u>Interest in employment</u>	<u>14</u>
14. <u>Family problems and needs</u>	<u>13</u>
15. <u>Shopping--groceries or furniture</u>	<u>10</u>
16. <u>Laundry</u>	<u>8</u>
17. <u>Problems of today</u>	<u>3</u>
18. <u>Miscellaneous</u>	<u>7</u>
19. <u>Grooming (improvement in appearance)</u>	<u>3</u>
20. <u>Planned parenthood</u>	<u>3</u>
21. <u>Gave referral of family needing help</u>	<u>2</u>

Twenty-one different classes of things discussed and/or done were derived from the visitation report cards. The five classes with large numbers of mentions were: 1) Children with 88, 2) ABC Homemaking Program with 85, 3) Refinishing furniture with 80, 4) Housekeeping with 71, and 5) Housing with 66. These statistics on frequency of mention can be taken as an indication of the emphasis of the teaching homemakers and perhaps reflect to a lesser extent the concerns of the participants.

Things Discussed and Those Done as Reported on
Visiting Charts Kept by Teaching Homemakers¹

The teaching homemakers were provided with charts for reporting on home visits. The charts were to be kept for each homemaker's visits primarily during July and August of 1967.² The chart listed 32 different topics with blanks for adding others. Under each visiting date recorded on the chart the teacher was to place a check opposite each topic discussed and also one opposite each topic about which something was done by either the housewife, the teacher, or the two together.³ In addition to the 32 topics listed on the chart, 16 other topics discussed were added by one or more of the teaching homemakers and three other topics done were added. Charts were kept on 47 participants for 85 visits. One or more topics were discussed with each of these participants and with 26 of the participants on 43 visits one or more things were done.

¹ Since these charts were kept for about the same period in which the report cards whose data are reported in the preceding section, many of the same participants were reported by both methods.

² A few of the charts were for visits as early as April and as late as October.

³ There was no opportunity for distinguishing which of these three categories of doers was involved.

The things discussed arrayed according to frequency with which checked are presented below:

<u>Things discussed on home visits</u>	<u>Number of times discussed</u>
1. Cleaning house	35
2. Painting walls	33
3. Repairing of housing	33
4. Explaining ABC	30
5. Making drapes or chair covers	30
6. Spending money	29
7. Place for children to play	26
8. Buying children's clothing or shoes	24
9. Painting or refinishing furniture	21
10. Buying furniture	19
11. Personal illness	18
12. Debts	16
13. Care of pre-school child	15
14. Employment of wife	15
15. Planning meals	14
16. Employment of husband	11
17. Medical care	11
18. Pregnancy	11
19. Repair clothing	11
20. Housing	9
21. Care of children while working	8
22. Rental bill	7
23. Making and sewing clothes	6
24. Recipes	6
25. School problems of a child	6
26. Shampooing hair	6
27. Sick child	5
28. Head Start	4
29. Lack of needed food	4

<u>Things discussed on home visits</u>	<u>Number of times discussed</u>
30. Welfare Department care	4
31. Drug costs	3
32. Problem with police	3
33. Water pipes broken	3
34. Dental care	2
35. Sick husband	2
36. Vacation	2
37. Washing	2
38. Children had to be deloused	1
39. Heating and cost	1
40. Knitting and crocheting	1
41. Made appointment with Salvation Army to get mattress and bed linen	1
42. Needs of children	1
43. Open house	1
44. Planned cabinets for storage	1
45. Reducing	1
46. Teenagers and problems	1
47. Transportation	1
48. Water trouble (on uniform chart list)	0

Cleaning house leads the list of topics discussed, having been checked 35 times. It is followed by painting walls and repairing house, each with 33 checks. Explaining ABC and making drapes and chair covers each received 30 checks. Thus, care of living quarters and decorating the interior were rather significant topics involved in the interaction between the housewives and the teachers. Forty-seven participants with a total of 87 visits made were involved in the reports on topics discussed.

A list of things done with their frequencies follows:

<u>Things done on home visits</u>	<u>Number of times done</u>
1. Refinishing furniture	8
2. Buying children's clothing or shoes	7
3. Painting walls	7
4. Care of children while working	6
5. Cleaning house	6
6. Repairing of housing	6
7. Explaining ABC	5
8. Debts	4
9. Buying furniture	3
10. Dental care	3
11. Pregnancy	3
12. Repair clothing	3
13. Shampooing hair	3
14. Sick child	3
15. Spending money	3
16. Care of pre-school child	2
17. Employment of husband	2
18. Lack of needed food	2
19. Medical care	2
20. Place for children to play	2
21. Planning meals	2
22. Rental bill	2
23. Sewing	2
24. Welfare Department care	2
25. Drug cost	1
26. Employment of wife	1
27. Making drapes or chair covers	1
28. Recipes	1
29. School problem of a child	1
30. Sick husband	1
31. Washing	1

<u>Things done on home visits</u>	<u>Number of times done</u>
32. Personal illness (on uniform chart list)	0
33. Problem with police (on uniform chart list)	0
34. Water pipes broken (on uniform chart list)	0
35. Water trouble (on uniform chart list)	0

The things done which were reported were much less frequently checked than those discussed. The range in frequency of the latter (discussed) was from one to 35, while for the former (done) the range was from one to eight with four of the listed topics having no checks. The reports of something done involved 26 participants on 43 visits.

Refinishing furniture was reported eight times. Buying children's clothing or shoes and painting walls were each checked seven times. Care of the children while working, cleaning house, and repairing of housing were each checked six times. The first two of these three were probably things done by the teaching homemakers.

Summary of Reports of What Discussed and Done in Interaction Between Participants and Teaching Homemakers

The seven classes with the highest frequencies of mentions (or checks) for 1) topics discussed with participants as reported in accounts taped by the teaching homemakers, 2) things done as similarly reported, 3) things discussed and/or done as given on visitation report cards by the teachers, 4) a uniform list of topics discussed, and 5) the same list of topics about which things were done are presented in Table 19.

Comparative Lists of Principal Classes (Upper Seven in Terms of Frequency) of Topics Discussed and Things Done Based on Information Obtained from Taped Accounts, Visitation Report Cards, and Charts of Home Visits of the Teaching Homemakers^a

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Principal classes of topics discussed as reported for 68 participants in accounts taped by teaching homemakers (Frequency range: 9 - 45)	Principal classes of things done as reported for 68 participants in accounts taped by teaching homemakers (Frequency range: 8 - 32)	Principal classes of things discussed and/or done as reported for 187 participants on visitation report cards by teaching homemakers (Frequency range: 22 - 88)	Principal classes of topics discussed as reported on a checklist of topics involving 47 participants to whom 83 visits were made (Frequency range: 26 - 35)	Principal classes of things done as reported on a checklist of things done involving 26 participants to whom 43 visits were made (Frequency range: 5 - 8)
Painting or repairing furniture Children Painting or repairing house Housing Budgeting and finances Cleaning and arranging house Preparation of food	Painting and repairing furniture Cleaning and arranging house Things done for and with children Preparation of food Shopping Securing food, clothes, and furnishings Looking for housing	Children ABC Homemaking Program Refinishing furniture Housekeeping Housing Health problems Preparation of food and meal planning	Cleaning house Painting walls Repairing of housing Explaining ABC Making drapes or chair covers Spending money Place for children to play	Refinishing furniture Buying children's clothing or-shoes. Painting walls Care of children while working Cleaning house Repairing of housing Explaining ABC

^aTopics under each of five column headings are arrayed from highest to lowest frequency of mention or occurrence.

The five lists providing information on the activities of the teaching homemakers are fairly similar for those activities which were reported most frequently. Topics relating to children and to housing were among the upper seven topics for the five lists. Either cleaning, or arranging the house, or housekeeping also occurred among the upper seven for all five lists. Topics dealing with painting and/or repairing furniture or refinishing furniture ranked first for three of the lists. The relative importance of this kind of activity is associated with the emphasis on furniture painting which occurred during the period of the study.

Evaluation of the Furniture Painting Project

The projects of 34 participants in the furniture painting program were evaluated. The distribution of teaching homemakers according to number of participants whose projects were rated is given in the following tabulation:

<u>Number of participants (per teacher) whose projects were rated</u>	<u>Number of teaching homemakers</u>
1	5
2	4
3	-
4	1
5	2
6	-
7	1
	<hr/>
Total	13

While it was recognized from the beginning that the number of participants which each teacher would have for the furniture painting instruction should be around five, only two teachers had as many as five participants whose painting projects were rated, with one having seven. A majority of the teachers had either one or two participants.

The participants were recruited principally from the mothers who entered children in the Head Start Program. There was a total of 433 Head Start mothers from whom the teaching homemakers could have recruited participants for furniture painting instruction. Of this number, only 23, or five percent, pursued their painting projects to a point at which they could be rated. In addition, 11 participants were not Head Start mothers; two of these 11 were males.

The 34 participants¹ worked on the following objects:

<u>Objects painted</u>	<u>Number of participants</u>
Chair	13
Table	10
Sewing machine	1
Smoker	1
Phonograph cabinet	1
Chest	1
Bread box	1
Two chairs	1
Chair and stool	1
Chair and bread box	1
Bookshelf and magazine rack	1
Two chairs and a table	1
Phonograph cabinet, magazine rack, and end tables	<u>1</u>
Total	34

The record of completion for painting undertaken is presented in Table 20.

¹An adult male (a minister) and a young boy, both of whom completed a painting project, are included among these 34 participants. Another young boy participated but worked with his mother.

Table 20
 Number and Percentage Distribution of Participants
 According to Degree of Completion of Painting Project

<u>Degree of completion</u>	<u>Participants</u>	
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Fully	27 ^a	79
Partially	3	9
Very little done	<u>4</u> ^b	<u>12</u>
Total	34	100

^aOne of these partially completed a second object.

^bTwo of these finally dropped out completely.

The teaching homemakers with some assistance from their homemaking supervisors rated the object painted on seven aspects, i.e., 1) a satin finish, even, satin-like lustre, 2) smooth surface, no brush marks or runs, 3) smooth surface, no dust, 4) dry, hard finish to give good service, 5) color suitable to the room, 6) appearance of furniture improved, and 7) suitable for place used. Each aspect could be given a rating from zero to three, with three being very good; two, good; one, fair; and zero, poor. The maximum score was 21. Where participants had painted more than one object, the ratings were applied to all of the objects as a unit. The seven ratings were added together for a total score.

The distribution of the total scores indicate that the raters were rather generous (Table 21). Almost half (47 percent) of the participants received outstanding ratings and another 29 percent were given very good ratings.

Twenty-eight, or 82 percent, of the 34 participants were reported by the teaching homemakers as wanting to do more painting of their furniture. Only five, or 15 percent, were uncertain, and one was interested not in painting but in upholstering.

Table 21

Number and Percentage Distribution of Participants
According to Total Rating Score on Painting Project

Total rating score (sum of seven-item ratings)	Participants	
	Number	Percent
Outstanding (18 - 21)	16	47
Very good (14 - 17)	10	29
Good (10 - 13)	3	9
Fair (6 - 9)	1	3
Incomplete (0 - 5)	4	12
Total	34	100

Partial Record of Visits by Teaching Homemakers

A complete record of visits by the teaching homemakers has been impossible to obtain. Listings of individuals visited during the period July - June, 1966-67 with indications of number of visits were obtained from 10 teaching homemakers, but for at least two of these the numbers were small. The data obtained from these lists cannot be considered to represent the total number of visits made. However, these data are presented in Table 22 as a kind of sample of the frequency with which the teaching homemakers have visited families. The percentage distribution and mean but not the absolute figures are the important elements of the table.

The mean number of visits made by the teaching homemakers to the 319 families was 4.7. About two fifths of the 319 families had received either one or two visits. A few of the families had received considerable attention. Thus, 17 families, or 5.3 percent of the total had been visited from 13 to 49 times. Eight of these 17 families had received 25 or more visits.

From various available records a total of 676 different families (this includes the 319 reported in Table 22) were contacted by

visits or through classes one or more times during the period July - June, 1966-67.¹ Since the records were incomplete, especially for the teaching homemakers connected with one of the neighborhood centers, this figure undoubtedly represents an understatement of the total number of contacts.

Table 22

Number and Percentage Distribution of 319 Participant Families According to Number of Times Visited by Teaching Homemakers: July - June, 1966-67

Number of visits made by teaching homemakers	Families	
	Number	Percent
1	47	14.7
2	86	27.0
3	42	13.2
4	47	14.7
5	24	7.5
6	14	4.4
7	14	4.4
8	6	1.9
9	8	2.5
10	6	1.9
11	3	.9
12	5	1.6
13+	17	5.3
Total	319	100
Mean	4.7	

¹ In a limited number of instances these contact reports extended into September, 1967.

Viewpoints of ABC Supervisors and Administrators
Concerning Teaching Homemaking Program

Each of the three Neighborhood Information Service Centers connected with the Rochester ABC Program has a director, and also a homemaking department which is under the direction of a homemaking supervisor. The Monroe County Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension carries on its activities under its ABC contract primarily with the three homemaking departments. In view of this relationship, it was considered advisable to obtain the points of view of both the directors and homemaking supervisors relative to the teaching homemakers with whom this study is primarily concerned. Accordingly, the three directors of the centers and the three homemaking supervisors were interviewed by the author. Eleven questions formed the core of these interviews and the information thus obtained is summarized here.

Training Which Teaching Homemakers Are Receiving

The homemaking supervisors made a number of observations and suggestions with respect to the training of teaching homemakers. These included:

1. Longer and unbroken training periods--perhaps eight hours a day for a month in such areas as child care, sewing, social work, psychology, family problems, and knowledge of agencies.
2. Selection of trainees with consideration of adequate backgrounds.
3. Content should be wider, including especially consumer buying.
4. More attention in training to methodology with due concern for maintaining informality.
5. Training plan that gives new teaching homemakers the same training that older ones received.

One of the supervisors thought the subject matter of the training was well covered and also that the training has given the teaching homemakers a sense of their importance.

The three directors of the centers, being more removed from day-to-day operations, were not so specific in their observations and suggestions relative to training as were the supervisors. All three felt the present training was adequate or well done. One of them indicated a need to shift to consumer education and to work with the whole family.

Are Teaching Homemakers Ahead of Their Participants

One of the homemaking supervisors thought the teachers felt they needed more knowledge, but that there was no need to be worried over relative levels since the teachers were almost sure to be above those who needed them most. Another supervisor thought they were ahead of those whom they taught, but that they should not become too professional if they wanted to maintain contact with the people. A third supervisor thought the situation was mixed, and in some ways thought the teachers were ahead and others not. This supervisor felt that some teaching homemakers had failed to move ahead and a few were hopeless.

All three of the directors thought the teaching homemakers were far ahead of the people whom they taught.

How Should Teaching Homemakers Recruit Participants

One of the homemaking supervisors thought the recruitment of individuals for work in the home was not too difficult, since it was relatively convenient for the participants. This supervisor considered securing group participation a very difficult task, with most groups having only one or two regular attendants. The same supervisor would like to see more study groups and indicated that the way to give the groups greater stability

was to form permanent homemakers' clubs. This supervisor also thought that recruitment through referrals had not been effective, commenting that the community aides were not a dependable referral source, yet the teaching homemakers thought the aides should be primarily responsible for recruitment. Two of the supervisors thought house-to-house calling was best, but as one of them saw it, this method often resulted in only a few active participants. As others saw it, it secured participants having little interest in the offerings of the homemaking department.

The third supervisor thought the best way to secure participants was by referrals, insisting that a referral from an agency (presumably Welfare) should carry with it mandatory participation. This supervisor mentioned effective contacts made by the homemaking department with other agencies, such as schools, Housing Authority, and YWCA.

Two of the directors thought the best method for recruitment was house-to-house calls by the teaching homemakers. The third director thought recruitment for the homemaking department's participants should be done by both the community aides and the teaching homemakers. The former would do visiting and the latter would primarily work through agencies, namely the schools and Housing Authority.

Individual Versus Group Teaching

All three of the supervisors thought both methods should be used. They also thought there was a trend toward more group teaching. One of the supervisors indicated that classes of children and youth were being initiated by the teaching homemakers.

The directors thought that both individual and group teaching should be used. One of them thought group teaching was being done more than formerly. Another thought that the teaching homemakers might specialize in either individual or group teaching according to aptitude for one or the other approach.

How Subject Matter for Study Groups Should Be Determined

The homemaking supervisors thought the participants should choose what they wanted to study from what the homemaking departments had to offer. One of them thought the teaching homemakers should be allowed to influence choices according to their interests and talents or at least to indicate what they thought they were best qualified to teach. This supervisor had doubts about the people really knowing what choices of subject matter they should make.

One of the directors thought the people should be gotten together so they could inform workers what they wanted to study. Another thought the teaching homemakers and community aides should let people know what is available and let the people choose. The third director thought a survey should be conducted to ascertain what people wanted to study. The community aides would be responsible for the survey.

Reactions of Participants to Efforts of Teaching Homemakers

One of the supervisors thought the participants were very pleased with their classes, citing their willingness to attend other classes as evidence. Another supervisor had gotten only a few reactions but these were favorable. This supervisor had had little contact with the teaching homemakers' work with individuals. Another supervisor thought some people liked the work of the teaching homemakers and had really profited by it. This supervisor thought that some participants had used the teaching homemakers to do their work and had warned the teachers to be aware of this abuse.

One of the directors indicated some doubt about a general positive reaction to the teaching homemakers' efforts, noting that it was hard to stimulate interest in classes and that the total homemaking program was not well received. Another thought that on the basis of participation the people may be satisfied with what the teaching homemakers are doing. The third director

thought that some people could see no need for teaching homemakers. These people thought that since many women work as domestics they already know what the teachers can give them. This director noted, however, that the people the teaching homemakers work with are not domestics. The same director also pointed out that the Center's Advisory Council was going to work on the problem of people's inertia.

Distinction Between Teaching and Visiting Homemakers

One of the homemaking supervisors was very positive about this distinction indicating that visiting homemakers were defined as substitute mothers. This supervisor seemed confident that when a visiting homemaker was promoted to a teaching homemaker she shifted her functions. Another supervisor admitted that sometimes a teaching homemaker did the work of a visiting homemaker. This was because there were not enough visiting homemakers. This supervisor said that only one of the visiting homemakers, when promoted to a teaching homemaker, had had any difficulty changing her role. The third supervisor indicated that only in an extreme emergency was a teaching homemaker used as a visiting homemaker. This supervisor thought, however, that visiting homemakers, when promoted to a teaching homemaker job, often carried on as a visiting homemaker. It was pointed out that, when a promotion occurs, the individual should be given training for her teaching role but this was not being done.

The directors of the centers appeared to be aware of a difference in the role of the teaching and visiting homemakers. One of them pointed out, however, that the teaching homemaker did work other than teaching. Another thought that in the past the people had seen no difference between the two jobs, but he felt that they were getting a clearer idea of this now. The two who commented on promotion of a visiting homemaker to a teaching homemaker either saw no problem involved in this shift of role or had not encountered it.

Supervision of Teaching Homemakers

The three homemaking supervisors from time to time observe the group teaching of the teaching homemakers. One of them keeps up with the visiting activities of the teachers and advises on their work with individuals. Another does no supervision of work with individuals. Two of the supervisors thought the home economist who does the training should supervise some of the teaching; one thought she should not supervise, but should depend on the homemaking supervisor to inform her of how the teaching was being done.

The three directors thought the homemaking supervisor should supervise the teaching homemakers. Two of them thought the home economist should supervise the homemaking supervisor. One thought the home economist should also visit the classes of the teaching homemakers but two did not comment on this. One indicated that the role of the home economist was not entirely clear.

Administrative Arrangements for Teaching Homemakers

According to the homemaking supervisors, the teaching homemakers are left free to arrange their class schedules and individual visits. The homemaking supervisors handle house-keeping problems relating to time records, supplies for classes, etc. One supervisor emphasized keeping a log of the teachers' visits, i.e., name and address of family visited and what the teacher does while there. Another supervisor reported having to buy supplies for classes just before class because of inadequate storage space at the center.

The directors generally leave administrative matters relating to the teaching homemakers to the homemaking supervisors. Two directors indicated that teaching homemakers are sometimes assigned to tasks other than teaching. One of the two commented that the teaching homemakers should be available to do whatever they are called on to do.

Accomplishments of Teaching Homemakers

Two of the homemaking supervisors thought the teaching homemakers had done an acceptable job. One of these cited such successful projects in which the teachers were evidently involved as home beautification including a mass clean-up job, Easter egg hunt, Halloween party for children, registering people for an ABC election, food of the morning in a school, and furniture painting classes. The third supervisor was more conservative, stating that the teachers had not done as much as they could. This same supervisor indicated, however, that several families had improved their financial condition, fixed up their houses, been enabled to buy needed things, made better use of surplus foods, and improved shopping practices.

All three of the directors thought the accomplishments of the teaching homemakers were good. Two of the directors pointed out that it was difficult to evaluate the teachers' accomplishments because the results were intangible or not easily seen. One of the directors also commented that the teaching homemakers had suffered in the eyes of the low-income people because of newspaper reports about their finding rats and deplorable conditions in homes.

Role of Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension

All of the homemaking supervisors appeared to favor a tightening up of relationships with the home economics agent. Joint planning among the supervisors and the agent was considered desirable, although one of the supervisors indicated that ABC should have major responsibility for the homemaking program. Two of the supervisors emphasized the training role of the home economist with the training involving both teaching and visiting homemakers, as well as the homemaking supervisors. One supervisor thought it would be an improvement to take the homemaking departments out of the centers and establish a homemaking center which would service the three neighborhood centers.

One of the directors noted that the homemaking department or service appeared to have a low status in OEO. This director thought that perhaps Home Economics Extension could provide this service, although it would be preferable to have the activity stay in the neighborhood centers. The same director observed that Monroe County was now carrying the cost of several teaching homemakers. Even if the county should take over all of the cost, it would be desirable to work out some relationship with the centers. Another director thought teaching homemakers had an important role and that more training of these teachers by the extension home economist was needed. To do this, attention should be given to developing a curriculum for this training. This director would involve Extension in determining through a sample survey the subject matter to be taught by the teaching homemakers. The same director thought the home economist should supervise the teaching of the participants. The third director indicated that it would be desirable to have more teaching homemakers connected with the centers. But if it should be impossible for ABC to continue the teaching homemaking program, it was hoped that the Home Economics Division of Extension would carry on the teaching program in contact with the centers. While recognizing that OEO in Washington was not clear about the home economics function, this director thought its contribution was badly needed by the poor. The same director was especially concerned about Extension's training subprofessionals to work with these people.

APPENDIX A
PRE- AND POST-TEST ON FURNITURE PAINTING
SUBJECT MATTER WITH CORRECT ANSWERS INDICATED

1. Which colors do you like? (check as many as you want to)
 - a. reds
 - b. yellows
 - c. blues
 - d. greens

2. What color necktie do you like on men? (check as many as you want to)
 - a. blue
 - b. green
 - c. red
 - d. other

3. A large, awkward piece of furniture may be painted to make it less conspicuous by: (check one)
 - a. painting it the same color as the wall behind it
 - b. painting it a brighter color than the wall

4. In general, relaxing colors are: (check one)
 - a. cool
 - b. warm

5. What color scheme would you like in your children's room?
(Paste in colored pieces of paper)

	WALL
	FLOOR
	CURTAINS
	FURNITURE COLORS
	ACCESSORIES

6. To paint over old varnish that is sound and smooth: ..
(check one)
 - a. the varnish needs to be removed
 - b. the varnish does not need to be removed

7. Paint cloths and papers should be: (check one)
- a. put in a metal can to be used the next time
 - b. put in a metal can to be thrown away on trash day
8. For a dark room, you can make it sunnier by using: (check one)
- a. cool colors
 - b. warm colors
9. Check the two things you would do to prepare a piece of used varnished furniture that is in good condition for painting:
- a. remove the finish
 - b. wash with granular type detergent and warm water, rinse well
 - c. smooth with coarse sandpaper
 - d. smooth with an abrasive finishing paper
10. The most satisfactory paint to use on furniture is: (check one)
- a. latex base paint
 - b. alkyd resin base paint
11. A sealer should be used on: (check one)
- a. new unfinished wood
 - b. old painted wood
12. To paint with gloss enamel over gloss enamel in good condition: (check one)
- a. sand the old enamel and undercoat with a flat paint
 - b. sand and paint carefully with the gloss enamel
13. Old mahogany stained and varnished pieces: (check one)
- a. need a sealer or primer before painting
 - b. do not need a sealer or primer before painting
14. The hardest paint finish is: (check one)
- a. gloss enamel
 - b. flat enamel

15. Color for painted furniture in a room should be selected from colors: (check one)
- a. that blend with the walls, floors, and curtains
 - b. that are like your friend's
16. Light walls will make a room appear: (check one)
- a. larger
 - b. smaller
 - c. no differently
17. Blues and greens are: (check one)
- a. warm
 - b. cool
18. The simplest way to make odds and ends of furniture go together is: (check one)
- a. to paint the pieces the same color
 - b. to rearrange the furniture in the room
19. Paint is dry enough for the second coat when: (check one)
- a. it is dry to the touch
 - b. a thumb print is not left if you press hard
 - c. a thumb print is left if you press hard
20. Lumps and scum in paint may be prevented by putting the lid on tightly: (check one)
- a. and stirring before using
 - b. and pouring a small amount of thinner over the paint at the end of a painting job
21. Dark colors make a piece of furniture appear: (check one)
- a. smaller
 - b. larger
22. A good color to paint a piece of furniture so that it will blend in with most rooms is: (check one)
- a. yellow
 - b. gray or white
 - c. light blue

23. Check the three things you would do to paint furniture after it has been prepared for painting:
- a. open windows for fresh air
 - b. apply undercoat after stirring
 - c. apply undercoat without stirring
 - d. apply enamel as soon as the undercoat is dry to the touch
 - e. let undercoat dry for 24 hours before applying enamel
24. The least expensive way to get a "new" room is: (check one)
- a. to change the colors or add a color
 - b. to change the furniture or add furniture
25. Which of the following color combinations would be most restful in a bedroom? (check one)
- a. yellow and yellow-orange
 - b. blue and blue-green
 - c. red and white
26. If you want an object to appear smaller, paint it. (check one)
- a. black
 - b. red
 - c. white
27. Good color in one's room requires: (check the one considered most important)
- a. lots of money
 - b. planning
 - c. lots of time

Name _____

APPENDIX B
FORM FOR RATING OF PAINTED FURNITURE OR OTHER OBJECT

Form for Rating of Painted Furniture or Other Object

1. Name _____
2. Address _____
3. What was the piece of furniture that was painted? _____

4. Was it completed?

1. _____ Fully
2. _____ Partially
3. _____ Very little done
4. _____ Dropped out

5. Rating by teacher on performance: (enter values for each)

Rating scale for Items of Question 5	Maximum Score 21
Very good - 3	<u>Qualitative Levels</u>
Good - 2	Outstanding - 18-21
Fair - 1	Very good - 14-17
Poor - 0	Good - 10-13
	Fair - 6-9
	Incomplete - 0-5

1. _____ a satin finish, even satin-like lustre
 2. _____ smooth surface, no brush marks or runs
 3. _____ smooth surface, no dust
 4. _____ dry, hard finish to give good service
 5. _____ color suitable to the room
 6. _____ appearance of furniture improved
 7. _____ suitable for place used
6. Does this participant want to do more of this kind of work for her furniture?
1. _____ Yes
 2. _____ No
 3. _____ Uncertain

APPENDIX C
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ON RECRUITMENT EXPERIENCE
OF TEACHING HOMEMAKERS (ANSWERS TAPED)

Interview Questions on Recruitment
Experience of Teaching Homemakers¹

(Use Tape Recording)

Name of Teaching Homemaker _____ No. _____
Name of class participant _____ No. _____

1. Describe for this participant how you got her to agree to participate in your class:
 - a. How you arranged to talk to her and where?
 - b. What did you tell her about the class on refinishing furniture?
 - c. What did you tell her about care of her children while attending class?
 - d. What did you tell her about transportation to class?
 - e. What excuses did you have to deal with?
 - f. What seemed to appeal to her about the class?
 - g. Did she seem to see the class as a way to improve conditions for her children?
 - h. Did she have a real concern about fixing up her home?
 - i. Do you think she was influenced to participate because she could meet with others and work with them?

¹This approach had to be modified since most of the teaching homemakers used open house group meetings for recruitment, although some individual visiting was also used.

APPENDIX D
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR TEACHING HOMEMAKERS

A Phase of the Homemaking Program of Home Economics
Division of Monroe County Cooperative Extension

Schedule No. _____

Date _____

Interviewer _____

Schedule for Homemaking Teachers

1. Name of Interviewee _____
2. Marital status (check one):
 - a. _____ Married
 - b. _____ Divorced or separated
 - c. _____ Widowed
 - d. _____ Single
3. Residence and tenure (check the one that best describes where you live):
 - a. _____ Owner of private one-family dwelling
 - b. _____ Owner of private multiple-family dwelling
 - c. _____ Owner (other--write in)
 - d. _____ Renter of private one-family dwelling
 - e. _____ Renter of a separate house occupied by two or more families
 - f. _____ Renter in an apartment-house type building owned by a private landlord
 - g. _____ Renter in an apartment-house type building which is a public housing project
4. Number of rooms in dwelling or apartment: _____
5. Educational experience:
 - a. Years of schooling (circle highest grade completed):
 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6; 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15,
 16, over 16
 - b. How many different courses in home economics have you had before teaching in this program?
 - 1) _____ In elementary school (7-8 grades)
 - 2) _____ High school (9-12 grades)
 - 3) _____ In college

4) _____ In any type of adult education

5) _____ Other: _____

c. What special training in addition to that received in public schools or colleges have you had? _____

6. Your age: _____

7. Information about family composition: (NOTE: If single and living with your family, fill out; otherwise check here: single living alone _____)

a. Children living at home

1) If no children at home, check here and go on to (b): _____

2) Males (list by giving age of each): _____
 _____ (circle any away from home
 in school)

3) Females (list by giving age of each): _____
 _____ (circle any away from home
 in school)

b. Children (married or unmarried) living away from home
 (include stepchildren)

1) If no children living away from home, check here and go on to (c): _____

2) Males (list by giving ages): _____

3) Females (list by giving ages): _____

c. Other relatives living with family (same house and board)

1) If no others as described in (c), check here and go on to (d): _____

2) Males (list by giving age of each): _____

3) Females (list by giving age of each): _____

- d. Others (nonrelatives) living with family (same house and board)
- 1) If no others as described in (d), check here and go on to (e): _____
 - 2) Males (list by giving age of each): _____

 - 3) Females (list by giving age of each): _____

8. Employment

- a. What jobs did you hold in the two years (1964 and 1965) preceding your employment as a homemaking teacher?
- 1) _____ Did not have a job
 - 2) Name of occupations (describe the jobs as specifically as possible--place and kind of work):
 - 1) _____
 - 2) _____
 - 3) _____
- b. Do you have a job now in addition to your homemaking teaching?
- 1) _____ Do not have an additional job
 - 2) Name of occupation (describe the job as specifically as possible--place and kind of work): _____

 - (a) Number of hours devoted to per week: _____
- c. Occupation of head of household (husband)
- 1) Major occupation (describe the job as specifically as possible--place and kind of work): _____

 - (a) Number of hours devoted to per week: _____
 - 2) Second occupation (describe the job as specifically as possible--place and kind of work): _____

 - (a) Number of hours devoted to per week: _____
- d. If no husband in this household, occupation of person who is head (indicate whether mother, son, daughter, etc.)
- 1) Major occupation (describe the job as specifically as possible--place and kind of work): _____

 - (a) Number of hours devoted to per week: _____

2) Second occupation (describe the job as specifically as possible--place and kind of work): _____

(a) Number of hours devoted to per week: _____

9. Mobility:

a. Date of first marriage: _____

b. Number of moves (enter "0" if none) made since married (first marriage): _____

c. If single (no children, or other relative or others dependent on her), number of moves since left parental home _____; age left parental home _____

10. Your membership in formal organizations:

a.	b.	c.
<u>Name of organization</u>	<u>Check if member (if none, enter "0")</u>	<u>Enter number of offices now holding (include committee chairmanships and Sunday school teacher or project leader in home demonstration unit) (if none, enter "0")</u>
Home demonstration unit	_____	_____
County home demonstration executive committee	_____	_____
County extension association board of directors	_____	_____
Church or Synagogue	_____	_____
Sunday or Sabbath school	_____	_____
Other church organizations (list):	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
PTA	_____	_____
Home Bureau	_____	_____
Grange	_____	_____
4-H leaders association or council	_____	_____
League of Women Voters	_____	_____
Sorority, Lodge, or Fraternal (list):	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
Auxiliary of veterans (list):	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
Women's Club	_____	_____
Garden Club	_____	_____
Sports or hobby (list):	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
Other (list):	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

11. Income [check one of the following which comes closest to your total family (wife, husband, and other members combined) net income after farm or business expenses were deducted for the calendar year 1966]:

a. _____ Less than \$1,000

b. _____ \$1,000 - 1,999

c. _____ \$2,000 - 2,999

d. _____ \$3,000 - 3,999

e. _____ \$4,000 - 4,999

f. _____ \$5,000 - 5,999

g. _____ \$6,000 - 6,999

h. _____ \$7,000 - 7,999

i. _____ \$8,000 - 8,999

j. _____ \$9,000 - 9,999

k. _____ \$10,000 and over

12. How were you recruited for this program? (Start with what you first did in ABC--visiting homemaker, community aide, etc.)

13. What have you as an individual gained from your training and work as a homemaking teacher? _____

14. What else do you want to tell me about your work as a homemaking teacher? _____

Supplementary Questions

1. In what state or states did you receive your education?
(fill in as many blanks as required)
 - 1) _____ grades; _____
 - 2) _____ grades; _____
 - 3) _____ grades; _____
 - 4) _____ grades; _____

2. When did you first move to Rochester? (fill in or check)
 - 1) _____ date
 - 2) _____ lived here all my life (check if true)

3. If (1) to question 2 is filled out, have you lived in Rochester?
(check or fill in)
 - 1) _____ continuously since that date (check if true)
 - 2) _____ number of times moved away
 - 3) _____ Date moved back last time

APPENDIX E
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PARTICIPANTS

Part I

1. What do you think about the helpfulness of the various classes which you have attended?

	(Check one)				Useful Idea:
	(1) Did not attend	(2) Remember as very helpful	(3) Remember as giving some help	(4) Remember as not at all helpful	
Classes					If either (2) or (3) is checked, state what useful idea you got that you consider especially helpful (write in interviewee's statement).
What to Paint & Why					Useful Idea:
Paint & Equipment					Useful Idea:
Color Selection for Painted Furniture					Useful Idea:
How to Paint					Useful Idea:

2. We would like to ask you some questions about mimeographs which you were given for the different lessons. These questions are at the heads of the columns in the chart which we have given you.

List of mimeographs	(1)		(2)				(3)	
	Do you recall having received? (check yes if recognize when shown, otherwise no*) Yes No*		If <u>yes</u> to (1) have you? (check one)				Remember nothing (check)	State what remember
		(a) Read all of it	(b) Read part of it	(c) Glanced through	(d) Not read or glanced through			
1. What to Paint & Why								
2. Paint & Equipment								
3. Color Selection for Painted Furniture								
4. How to Paint								

*If no is checked for a mimeograph stop here for that publication.

3. Have you looked forward to attending the class meetings?
- a. Yes
- b. No
4. If yes to 3, will you tell me why? _____

5. Assuming classes were made available, on which of the following subjects or activities would you like to have a class if it was similar to the one you have been attending? (check as many as you would like to attend)
- a) Meal planning and preparation (includes ideas on using surplus foods)
- b) Shopping trips to department stores, supermarkets, and public market on Union St.
- c) Money management including making a budget for family and instalment buying
- d) Beginning sewing including remodeling and mending clothes
- e) Storage secrets
- f) Home decorating
- g) Housecleaning shortcuts
- h) Care of house plants
- i) Savings club
- j) Child development and family living
- k) Charm class involving weight-control in cooperation with Medical Service
- l) Refinishing furniture
- m) Other (write in) _____
6. If you checked one or more or wrote in an other, would you attend the class or classes if neither transportation nor child care (babysitting) are provided?
- a) Yes
- b) No

7. The classes which you have attended were planned to help women with improving their homes, especially for their children. In planning classes in the future a better job could be done if we really knew what the more important problems of families are. Will you please tell us what you consider your three most serious homemaking problems?

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

8. What have you done to improve the interior of your living quarters which you think is the result of your participation in the furniture painting classes?

9. What do you plan to do to improve the interior of your living quarters which you think has come about because of your participation in the furniture painting classes?

Part II

1. Marital status (check one):

a) Married

b) Divorced or separated

c) Widowed

d) Single

2. Residence and tenure (check the one that best describes where you live):
- a) Owner of private one-family dwelling
 - b) Owner of private multiple-family dwelling
 - c) Owner (other--write in) _____
 - d) Renter of private one-family dwelling
 - e) Renter of a separate house occupied by two or more families
 - f) Renter in an apartment-house type building owned by a private landlord
 - g) Renter in an apartment-house type building which is a public housing project
3. Condition of housing: (ask interviewee to give her view and check one for her)
- a) In excellent condition
 - b) In average condition (some repairs needed but not serious)
 - c) In poor condition (many repairs needed)
 - d) In very poor condition (should not be used for dwelling place)
4. Number of rooms in dwelling or apartment: _____
5. Years of schooling (circle highest number completed):
- a) You--
0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, over 16
 - b) Husband--
0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, over 16
 - c) In what state or states did you receive your education? (fill in as many blanks as required)
- 1) _____ grades; _____
 - 2) _____ grades; _____
 - 3) _____ grades; _____
 - 4) _____ grades; _____

6. What special training in addition to that received in public schools or colleges

a) You have had:

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

b) Your husband has had:

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

7. Age

a) Your age _____

b) Husband's age _____

8. Please give the following information about your family composition (NOTE: If single and living with your family, fill out; otherwise check here: single living alone _____)

a) Children living at home

1) If no children at home, check here and go on to (b): _____

2) Males (list by giving age of each): _____

_____ (circle any away from home in school)

3) Females (list by giving age of each): _____

_____ (circle any away from home in school)

b) Children (married or unmarried) living away from home (include stepchildren)

1) If no children living away from home, check here and go on to (c): _____

2) Males (list by giving age of each): _____

3) Females (list by giving age of each): _____

c) Other relatives living with family (same house and board)

1) If no others as described in (c), check here and go on to (d): _____

2) Males (list by giving age of each): _____

3) Females (list by giving age of each): _____

d) Others (nonrelatives) living with family (same house and board)

1) If no others as described in (d), check here: _____

2) Males (list by giving age of each): _____

3) Females (list by giving age of each): _____

9. Employment

a) Do you work for pay (wages or salary) as an employee of someone? (check one)

1) _____ Yes, work full-time (35 hours a week or more)

2) _____ Yes, work part-time (less than 35 hours a week)

3) _____ If yes, name of occupation (describe the job as specifically as possible): _____

4) _____ Do not work for pay for someone

b) Are you self-employed (sewing, foster mother, etc.) from which you earn money, or do you work in a family business (store, for example) from which you share the income but do not receive wages or salary? (check one):

1) _____ Yes, I work full-time in one or more of the ways listed above (35 hours a week or more)

2) _____ Yes, I work part-time in one or more of the ways listed above (less than 35 hours a week)

3) _____ If yes, name of occupation (describe as specifically as possible): _____

4) _____ Not self-employed

c) Occupation of husband (see (d) if no husband)

- 1) Major occupation (describe the job as specifically as possible: if unemployed or retired, indicate):

(a) Number of hours devoted to per week: _____

- 2) Second occupation (describe the job as specifically as possible): _____

(a) Number of hours devoted to per week: _____

d) If no husband in this household, occupation of person who is head (indicate whether mother, son, daughter, etc.; refer to 9a and/or 9b if you are head and already gave information)

- 1) Major occupation (describe the job as specifically as possible; if unemployed or retired, indicate):

(a) Number of hours devoted to per week: _____

- 2) Second occupation (describe the job as specifically as possible): _____

(a) Number of hours devoted to per week: _____

10. Mobility:

a) _____ Date of first marriage

b) _____ Never married

c) _____ Number of moves (enter "0" if none) made since married (first marriage)

d) _____ If never married, give number of moves since 21 years of age (enter "0" if none)

e) _____ When did you first move to Rochester? (fill in or check)

1) _____ Date

2) _____ Lived here all life (check if true)

f) If (1) to question (e) is filled out, have you lived in Rochester? (check or fill in)

1) _____ Continuously since that date (check if true)

2) _____ Number of times moved away

3) _____ Date moved back last time

11. Your membership in formal organizations:

a.	b.	c.
<u>Name of organization</u>	<u>Check if member (if none, enter "0")</u>	<u>Enter number of offices now holding (include committee chairmanships and Sunday school teacher) (if none, enter "0")</u>
Home demonstration unit or club	_____	_____
Church or Synagogue	_____	_____
Sunday or Sabbath school	_____	_____
Other church organizations (list):	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
PTA	_____	_____
Home Bureau	_____	_____
Grange	_____	_____
4-H leaders association or council	_____	_____
League of Women Voters	_____	_____
Benevolent Society	_____	_____
Sorority, Lodge (as Elks, Eastern Star) or Fraternal (list):	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
Auxiliary of veterans (list):	_____	_____
Women's Club	_____	_____
Garden Club	_____	_____
Sports or hobby (list):	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
Other (list):	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

12. Give list of physically or mentally handicapped living in this household:

Write in mother, father, son, daughter, other relative, other occupant _____

<u>Age</u>	<u>How handicapped</u>
_____	_____
_____	_____

13. Do you have a television set?

- a) Yes
- b) No

14. If yes to question 13, which of the following channels do you watch frequently? (check as many as you want to)

- a) Channel 8
- b) Channel 10
- c) Channel 13
- d) Channel 21
- e) Other (write in number)

15. Do you have a radio?

- a) Yes
- b) No

16. If yes to question 15, what station do you listen to most often?

17. Do you have?

- a) A deep freezer (separate from refrigerator)
- b) Automatic washer
- c) Wringer type washer.
- d) An electric or gas dryer
- e) Electric or gas refrigerator
- f) A sewing machine

(check)
Yes No

18. Income (check one of the following which comes closest to your total family (wife, husband, and other members combined) net income for the calendar year 1966):

- a) Less than \$1,000
- b) \$1,000 - 1,999
- c) \$2,000 - 2,999
- d) \$3,000 - 3,999
- e) \$4,000 - 4,999
- f) \$5,000 - 5,999
- g) \$6,000 - 6,999
- h) \$7,000 - 7,999
- i) \$8,000 - 8,999
- j) \$9,000 - 9,999
- k) \$10,000 and over

Supplementary Questions

Will you please tell me the following about each of your children at home? (See page 6, questions 8a and enter each child according to sex and age in column 1 below and then ask the mother to give you the indicated information about each child.)

Col. 1	Col. 2 What about child are you especially proud of? (Write in)	Col. 3 What is your major problem with this child? (Write in)	Col. 4 What is your major ambition for this child (Write in)
<u>Males:</u>			
1) _____ age			
2) _____ age			
3) _____ age			
4) _____ age			
5) _____ age			
6) _____ age			
7) _____ age			
<u>Females:</u>			
1) _____ age			
2) _____ age			
3) _____ age			
4) _____ age			
5) _____ age			
6) _____ age			
7) _____ age			

Post-teaching Information
on Participants

(To be filled out by Homemaking Teacher
who interviews this person)

Name of Homemaking Teacher _____

Name of participant _____ No. _____

1. Will you write down for this homemaker what you found to be her major problem in improving the interior of her house, especially for her children.

2. Do you think this woman received any help on this problem through the lessons in which she participated?

1) _____ Yes

2) _____ No

3) _____ Don't know

- 4) If yes will you state what you think the help was.

APPENDIX F

**INTERVIEW QUESTIONS ON WORK OF TEACHING HOMEMAKERS
WITH INDIVIDUALS (WITH MAJOR PART OF ANSWERS TAPED)**

Interview Questions on Work of Teaching Homemakers
With Individuals (Question 11 Taped)

No. _____

1. Name _____
2. Address _____
3. Type of participant:
 - 1) _____ Visited only
 - 2) _____ Member of furniture painting class and visited
 - 3) _____ Member of furniture painting class only
4. Number of children _____
5. Is there a husband? _____ Yes
_____ No
6. What is husband's occupation? _____
7. Does homemaker work? _____ Yes
_____ No
8. If yes to (7), what is her occupation? _____
9. Age of homemaker: _____
10. Is this a welfare family? _____ Yes
_____ No
11. Please give the story of your work with this homemaker.
 - 1) How happened to contact?
 - 2) First visit:
 - (1) What talked about?
 - (2) What done?
 - 3) Subsequent visits
 - (1) What talked about?
 - (2) What done?
 - 4) Last visit
 - (1) What talked about?
 - (2) What done?
 - (3) Will continue or drop?
 - 5) Summarize accomplishments and also failures
12. Name of teaching homemaker: _____

APPENDIX G
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR ABC OFFICIALS

Interview Questions for ABC Officials

1. What do you think of the training the teaching homemakers are receiving?
2. Are the teaching homemakers far enough ahead of the women whom they teach to really perform a teaching role?
3. How should the teaching homemakers recruit either individual or group participants?
4. Will you comment on their individual teaching versus group teaching.
5. How should the subject matter of their study groups be determined?
6. What have you found to be the reaction of participants to the teaching homemakers' efforts?
7. What distinction do you make between the work of the teaching and visiting homemaker?
8. How should the teaching homemakers be supervised?
9. What is the present administrative arrangement for the teaching homemakers? Do you feel it is satisfactory or should it be changed?
10. Will you comment on the accomplishments of the teaching homemaker.
11. What do you think the role of the Home Economics Division of Cooperative Extension should be in the Homemaking Service Program?

APPENDIX H
VISITATION REPORT CARDS USED BY TEACHING HOMEMAKERS

Visitation Report Cards Used by Teaching HomemakersVisiting Record Card
(First Visit)

Date of visit: _____

1. Name: _____
2. Address: _____
3. Telephone: _____
4. How contact was initiated (check ones that apply):
 - 1) _____ Referral to teaching homemaker by agency (Welfare Dept., Neighborhood Coordinator, some other social agency)
 - 2) _____ Referral to teaching homemaker by minister
 - 3) _____ Through house-to-house visiting of teaching homemaker
 - 4) _____ Referral to teaching homemaker by a neighbor or friend
 - 5) _____ This person contacted teaching homemaker
 - 6) _____ Other (write in) _____
5. Brief account of major topics talked about and major things done with homemaker: _____

6. Impression of home situation at first visit:
 - 1) Condition of household: (check one)
 - a) _____ Very orderly
 - b) _____ Orderly
 - c) _____ Somewhat disorderly
 - d) _____ Very disorderly
 - 2) Attitude of homemaker to visitor: (check one)
 - a) _____ Open and friendly
 - b) _____ Neutral
 - c) _____ Noncommunicative
 - d) _____ Negative
 - 3) Condition of housing: (check one)
 - a) _____ Excellent
 - b) _____ In average condition
(some repairs needed but not serious)

- c) _____ In poor condition
(Many repairs needed)
- d) _____ In very poor condition
(should not be used for dwelling place)
- 4) Material possessions
- a) _____ Electric or gas stove
- b) _____ Refrigerator
- c) _____ Television
- d) _____ Radio
- e) _____ Record player
- f) _____ Piano
- g) _____ Washing machine
- h) _____ Electric iron
- i) _____ Ironing board
- 5) Books, magazines, daily paper observed
- a) _____

- 6) Family
- a) _____ Husband present in household
- b) _____ Number of children
- c) _____ Number of others in household
7. Name of teaching homemaker: _____

Visiting Record Card
(For use between first and last visits)

Date of visit: _____

1. Name: _____
2. Address: _____
3. Brief account of major topics talked about and major things done with homemaker: _____

4. Specific improvements noted since preceding visit (from observations, from what told, and from what person can do):

No improvements could be seen (check if true): _____

Visiting Record Card
(For use on last visit)

Date of visit: _____

1. Name: _____

2. Address: _____

3. Brief account of major topics talked about and major things done with homemaker: _____

4. Specific improvements noted since preceding visit: (from observations, from what told, and from what person can do):

No improvements could be seen (check if true): _____

5. Summarize accomplishments with this homemaker:

6. If decide no more visits desired (anytime from July 1 to Aug. 31), check here _____

7. If 6 is checked, indicate why no more visits desired:

8. Impression of home situation at last visit:

1) Condition of household (check one)

- a) _____ Very orderly
- b) _____ Orderly
- c) _____ Somewhat disorderly
- d) _____ Very disorderly

APPENDIX I
CHART OF VISITS OF TEACHING HOMEMAKERS

Chart of Home Visits

1. Name of homemaker: _____
2. Address _____
3. Check for each visit the topics talked about and those about which something was done on the visit (add at end any topics not on list):

Enter visiting dates and
check each column under

Topics	Date	Did	Date	Did	Date	Did
	Dis- cussed	some- thing	Dis- cussed	some- thing	Dis- cussed	some- thing
1. Buying children's clothing (shoes)						
2. Buying furniture						
3. Care of children while working						
4. Care of pre-school child						
5. Cleaning house						
6. Debts						
7. Dental care						
8. Drug costs						
9. Employment of husband						
10. Employment of wife						
11. Explaining ABC						
12. Lack of needed food						
13. Making drapes or chair covers						
14. Medical care						
15. Painting walls						
16. Personal illness						

Enter visiting dates and
check each column under

Topics	Date	Did	Date	Did	Date	Did
	Dis- cussed	some- thing	Dis- cussed	some- thing	Dis- cussed	some- thing
17. Place for children to play						
18. Planning meals						
19. Pregnancy						
20. Problem with police						
21. Recipes						
22. Rental bill						
23. Repair clothing						
24. Repairing of housing						
25. School problem of a child						
26. Shampooing hair						
27. Sick child						
28. Sick husband						
29. Spending money						
30. Water pipes broken						
31. Water trouble						
32. Welfare Dept. care						
33. Other						

Name of teaching homemaker _____

APPENDIX J
FORM FOR BEFORE OBSERVATION OF PARTICIPANTS' HOMES

Form for Before Observation of Participants' Homes

Immediately following the first lesson, will you visit the homes of those in your study groups, observe and check* each of the items for the following three areas which one or more of the children may use.

1. Name _____
2. Address _____
3. Sleeping Area: (check ones that apply)
 - 1) _____ Is color attractively used in the sleeping area?
 - 2) _____ Can the bed be made easily by a child?
 - 3) _____ Is the sleeping area used for ironing or other household work?
 - 4) _____ How many share the room?
 - 5) _____ No such area can be identified.
4. Dressing Area: (check ones that apply)
 - 1) _____ Is there drawer space for clothing?
 - 2) _____ Is there a mirror?
 - 3) _____ Is there a closet?
 - 4) _____ Are the clothes easy for a child to reach?
 - 5) _____ Is color attractively used in the dressing area?
 - 6) _____ No such area can be identified.
5. Study and Storage Area: (check ones that apply)
 - 1) _____ Is there a table or desk?
 - 2) _____ Is there a place to store crayons, toys and books?
 - 3) _____ Is there a good light for reading?
 - 4) _____ Is there a waste basket?
 - 5) _____ Is the study and storage area attractive?
 - 6) _____ No such area can be identified.

Name of teaching homemaker _____

*Checklist may be filled out in the Center and your observations should be helpful to your teaching.

APPENDIX K
FORM FOR AFTER OBSERVATION OF PARTICIPANTS' HOMES

Form for After Observation of Participants' Homes

Following the last lesson, will you visit the homes of those in your study groups, observe and check* each of the items for the following three areas which one or more of the children may use.

1. Name _____
2. Address _____
3. Sleeping Area: (Check ones that apply.)
 - 1) _____ Is color attractively used in the sleeping area?
 - 2) _____ Can the bed be made easily by a child?
 - 3) _____ Is the sleeping area used for ironing or other household work?
 - 4) _____ How many share the room?
 - 5) _____ No such area can be identified.
4. Dressing Area: (Check ones that apply.)
 - 1) _____ Is there drawer space for clothing?
 - 2) _____ Is there a mirror?
 - 3) _____ Is there a closet?
 - 4) _____ Are the clothes easy for a child to reach?
 - 5) _____ Is color attractively used in the dressing area?
 - 6) _____ No such area can be identified.
5. Study and Storage Area: (Check ones that apply.)
 - 1) _____ Is there a table or desk?
 - 2) _____ Is there a place to store crayons, toys and books?
 - 3) _____ Is there a good light for reading?
 - 4) _____ Is there a waste basket?
 - 5) _____ Is the study and storage area attractive?
 - 6) _____ No such area can be identified.

Name of teaching homemaker: _____

*Checklist may be filled out in the Center.

APPENDIX L
INTERVIEW QUESTIONS FOR CHAIRMAN OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Interview Questions for the Chairman of the Advisory Committee

1. Will you comment on the relationship of the Advisory Committee to the Home Economics Executive Committee.
2. Will you comment on the relationship of the Advisory Committee to the three neighborhood centers.
3. Will you discuss briefly the participation of lay people on the Advisory Committee.
4. To what has the Advisory Committee given its attention?
 - a. Of the things it has considered which were given the greatest attention and why?
5. What has the Advisory Committee actually accomplished?
6. Will you describe what you consider to be the functions of the Home Economics Extension Division in the ABC Homemaking Service.
7. How should the home economics agent assigned to the Homemaking Program relate to the homemaking departments of the neighborhood centers?
8. What is your evaluation of the work of the teaching homemakers?
 - a. With regard to their methods
 - b. With regard to their accomplishments

