Family and Consumer Sciences in Higher Education:

Common Elements in Undergraduate Curriculum

Susan Burroughs Lovett

A dissertation submitted to the

Faculty of the Graduate School of Education

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For a degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

Dissertation Committee:

Kathie C. Johnson, Ed.D., Chair

Karen L. Parker, Ed.D

Ronald E. Hawkins, D.Min., Ed.D.

Liberty University

Lynchburg, Virginia

March 2, 2005

Family and Consumer Sciences in Higher Education:

Common Elements in Undergraduate Curriculum

by

Susan Burroughs Lovett

Has been approved

March 2005

Approved:

Kathie C. Johnson, Ed.D., Chair

Karen L. Parker, Ed.D.

Ronald E. Hawkins, D.Min., Ed.D.

Supervisory Committee

Accepted:

Dean, School of Education

Table of Contents

Title Page i

Approval Page ii

Table of Contents iii

Tables vi

Abstract vii

Chapter 1: Statement of the Problem 1

Introduction to the Study 1

General Background of the Study 2

Problem Statement 3

Purpose and Research Question 4

Professional Significance / Rationale 5

Overview of Research Design / Methodology 8

Delimitations of the Study 10

Definitions of Key Terms 10

Chapter 2: Review of Literature 12

Name Change 12

Family and Consumer Sciences Curriculum Models 15

History of Curriculum Development in Family and

Consumer Sciences. 21

Accreditation 1958-1970 36

Secondary School Curriculum. 51

Specialization Increases in FCS Undergraduate Curriculum . . 53

Negative Effects of Specialization of FCS Curriculum 59

The Generalist Argument 62

Categorizing FCS Content or Subject Matter 74

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology 83

Descriptive Research 83

Population 83

Procedure / Method 83

Data and Analysis 88

Chapter 4: Results and Findings 90

Description of the Population 90

Curricular Element Evaluation 97

Curricular Elements 97

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations 102

Significance of the Study 103

Discussion of Findings 104

Implications for Practice 105

Limitations of the Study 111

Questions and Recommendations for Further Study 112

Final Summary 113

References. 114

Appendix A: Categories Commonly Used to Describe Content

Areas within the Family and Consumer Sciences Body of

Knowledge. 130

Appendix B: FCS Content Categories: 28 Literature Related Categories 140

Appendix C: FCS Content Categories: 16 National Standards for FCS Secondary Education 144

Appendix D: Coding Form for Evaluation of Curriculum Content . . 146

Appendix E: Variety of Organizational Structures and Names of Population Schools 148

Tables

Table 1: Student Populations of FCS Institutions 94

Table 2: Frequencies of Words by which FCS Units are Named . . 96

Table 3: Majors Offered in FCS Academic Units 98

Table 4: Ranked Order of Presence of 28 Historical FCS Categories 103

Table 5: Ranked Order of Presence of 16 Secondary FCS Categories 106

Abstract

This study of undergraduate programs was undertaken to create a current portrait of Family and Consumer Sciences programs and to determine whether common ground exists among the various academic units particularly in the area of curriculum content. The thirty four schools having accreditation with SACS and AAFCS were chosen as the population to be studied. Two lists of curricular element categories were created to evaluate the programs: a 28 item list derived from historical categorizations used in professional journals and educational reporting and a 16 item list taken from the national standards for FCS in secondary programs. The subject matter categories or curricular elements were used to evaluate the course titles and course descriptions of a unit's course catalog. Using a content analysis, curricular elements were identified as present or absent in the curriculum of the FCS units examined. Elements included in the curriculum of a majority of the FCS units were determined to constitute the common ground or knowledge base among FCS units.

The answer to the research question, "Are there common curricular elements that constitute a general consensus regarding the body of knowledge for Family and Consumer Sciences higher education programs," is a definite "yes." Specifically, 85% or more of the programs included child development, family studies, nutrition, clothing, foods, resource management, food service management, merchandising, early childhood education, human development, and textiles. Further, 70% or more of the programs also included education, equipment and furnishings, and housing. This high level of common offerings reflects the core of the FCS body of knowledge.

The significance of the study is that it contributes to the specific identity of the body of knowledge for FCS, it sets benchmarks for curriculum content in FCS undergraduate programs, and it reveals the low incidence of current curriculum offerings in the areas of FCS history, philosophy, and the integrative nature of the discipline. This study serves as a challenge to national leadership in the discipline to publish national standards for the body of knowledge that delineate clearly what constitutes a healthy undergraduate FCS program.

Chapter 1: Statement of the Problem

Introduction to the Study

The discipline of Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS) is an academic and scientific study of the business of the home and the care of the family. Universities and colleges transmit the knowledge base necessary to promote the well-being of the family through the courses and experiences that make up the undergraduate FCS curriculum. Through nearly one hundred years of existence FCS programs, which had had a measure of unity, have grown and evolved in response to a changing society and thus the changing needs of the family. Historically, FCS programs have integrated knowledge from the natural sciences, behavioral sciences, and the arts to create an curriculum comprised of various content areas that synergistically bear on the welfare of the family. However, the last forty years of higher education programming has been characterized by increased specialization and reduced membership in the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS). The consequent identity crisis which is evident in a reduction of historically integrative courses, unit restructuring, and name differences has created uncertainty as to whether consensus exists concerning the body of knowledge in higher education programs. This study will provide a foundation for educational evaluation and planning by reviewing the past, assessing the present, and making recommendations for the future regarding the body of knowledge that should constitute a healthy FCS program.

General Background of the Study

At the turn of the Twentieth Century and in the midst of immigration, urbanization, and social change, a group of professionals from diverse fields of

study met together to discuss the welfare of the family. These meetings, known as the Lake Placid Conferences, gave birth to the American Home Economics Association (AHEA), now called the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS). This association of professionals was devoted to the improvement of family life through the application of scientific principles and research. The association provided national leadership to those concerned about the family and provided a means for the exchange of ideas through published journals and national meetings. Further, AAFCS gave direction as to the appropriate course of study and body of knowledge appropriate to prepare students to meet the needs of families. Higher education units which had been diversely named and independently created before the existence of AAFCS began to work from a similar frame of reference, following the lead of the AAFCS and using the first national syllabus of 1913 as a guide for their programs of study. Commissioned by the AAFCS, the Committee on Membership Standards of the AAFCS met in November of 1946 for “the establishment of criteria for evaluating home economics” (Branegan, 1946b). To aid that primary task, it was decided that a good starting point was to choose a representative group of colleges to examine the characteristics of FCS programs, facilities, faculty, administration, etc. This study was a forerunner to the formation of the AAFCS Council for Accreditation that now reviews and evaluates higher education FCS programs.

The Council for Higher Education Accreditation (CHEA), a non-profit, private national organization that coordinates accreditation activity in the United States and reports to the Department of Education, recognizes AAFCS as the

official accrediting body for family and consumer science undergraduate programs. The standards and criteria of the AAFCS accreditation document include standards pertaining to mission and goals, organization and administration, program foundations, professional programs, faculty, students, learning resources, and learning environments. This present study would directly relate to two of these AAFCS standards: program foundations and professional programs. The standard of program foundations refers to the incorporation of human systems theory as the integrative component of the body of knowledge. The standard of professional programs examines the specializations offered. Ideally, the examination of course titles and descriptions will reveal the explicit focus on the integrative nature of course offerings as well as the nature of the specific content areas included in the program.

Problem Statement

As the technological and societal contexts have changed, higher education programs have changed to respond to the contemporary needs of the family and the workplace. Today's affluent, technological, and service-driven society is far different from the agricultural and industrial lifestyles in which FCS was birthed. Ten years ago (1994), the organizing professional society changed its name from the American Home Economics Association (AHEA) to the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS). Many of the higher education units followed AAFCS and adopted the name of Family and Consumer Sciences, but others maintained their own unique name, such as Human Ecology or Human Environmental Sciences. Thus, FCS units are called by a great variety of names today. Now, greater specialization and declining

membership in the national association raise the question as to whether the consensus concerning the appropriate course of study that existed in the past still exists. The body of knowledge has grown and become specialized in such a way that a common experience among FCS higher education students may no longer exist (Harper & Davis, 1986). However, this researcher seeks to identify a common body of knowledge if it does indeed exist. On the secondary education level, national standards very specifically delineate the content of family and consumer sciences, but the discussion is much broader and open-ended for the body of knowledge in higher education. Do the changing contexts and the variety of names also reflect diverse curriculum within FCS higher education units, or are there common elements among them? The move into the new century calls for new looks at the body of knowledge and the systems approach within FCS higher education programs.

Purpose and Research Question

The purpose of this study is to examine selected higher education units of Family and Consumer Sciences in the Southeast United States to create a current portrait of the curriculum of Family and Consumer Sciences programs and to ascertain whether the body of knowledge currently at the center of FCS shows uniformity across higher education units.

Are there common curricular elements that contribute to the development of a general consensus regarding the body of knowledge for Family and Consumer Sciences in higher education programs accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and AAFCS?

Professional Significance / Rationale

A study comparing the curriculum of FCS higher education units will make professional contributions on the institutional level as well as the national level. This researcher's institution has a cycle of program review that currently includes a sample of benchmark institutions. This study would include all the AAFCS accredited programs that are also accredited by SACS and as well would scrutinize the programs more carefully in matters of curriculum. Such a study would give a basis for regional comparison of programs.

The internal process of regular self-examination is consistent with the reaffirmation of regional accreditation that occurs every ten years. Liberty University is accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS), a regional division of the Commission on Colleges. While this accreditation process is highly individualized and based on the institutions' stated purposes as described in a detailed self-study, comparing one's institution to other accredited institutions can be an effective tool for self-evaluation. The purpose of research and assessment is to improve and maintain quality in the educational experience. Since the reaffirmation of Liberty University's accreditation is scheduled for 2006, this study of Family and Consumer Sciences curriculum is also timely for institutional purposes.

This study also provide dialogue that was possibly helpful to the future direction of the discipline, as well as the revision of accreditation guidelines. Nationally, a study of the undergraduate curriculum of FCS education units throughout the southeast region creates a basis for peer review, indicating strengths and weaknesses. This is true even though the study is limited to the

southeast region because two-thirds of the accredited AAFCS programs fall into this geographical area. While programs of FCS would certainly not be expected to be identical, a portrait of current curricular practices would be useful as a guide for peer comparisons. Standards of national associations that represent their respective disciplines are generally accepted as appropriate as a means of assessing strengths and weaknesses of a program. Thus, the standards of the AAFCS Council for Accreditation would provide appropriate guidelines for the assurance of quality in educational units teaching Family and Consumer Sciences.

A proposal has been set forth in the April 2004 edition of the *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences* that suggests changes in the accreditation process (Moran, Smith, Kellett, Collier, Purcell, Akers, 2004). This proposal did not recommend explicit changes to the criteria for accreditation, but rather, allowed for the accrediting of specific FCS programs or majors rather than only FCS units which oversee the FCS programs. Specific programs of study or particular majors would now be eligible for accreditation irrespective of their placement or organization within a particular academic unit. For example, a child development major that is housed within a college for teacher education could be accredited by AAFCS even though it is not housed with other human development / family studies or FCS units. This seems to implicitly affect the significance of the integrative nature of the FCS discipline. This move could negatively impact the basic integrative nature of FCS that has historically given identity and synergy to the discipline as integration is de-emphasized with the focus on highly specialized undergraduate majors that may or may not be

organizationally related to the other “parts” of Family and Consumer Sciences. Many have expressed concern about the continuing move toward specialization (McGrath, 1968; Vincenti, 1990). Vincenti suggests that facilitating integration begins with a clear understanding of each content area and the development of shared meanings and values.

Two further uses of the present study would include contributing to the efforts to articulate the current body of knowledge and to certify FCS graduates through a national certification exam. The literature of current AAFCS leaders seeking to define the body of knowledge for the profession includes, *Body of Knowledge of Family and Consumer Sciences* (Baugher et al., 2000), *The Essence of our Being* (Anderson & Nickols, 2001), and *Human Eco-system Theory: A Tool for Working with Families* (Nickols, 2003). This ongoing work has resulted in philosophical and theoretical foundations, but has not as yet resulted in a clear delineation of the knowledge base such as that produced for secondary educators.

Finally, this study might be useful in the continuing revision of certification exams. The FCS credential is given to those with a degree in Family and Consumer Sciences who verify their mastery of the knowledge base through a certification exam. This exam was updated in 2003 based on the national standards for Family and Consumer Sciences used in secondary programs because there was no other nationally recognized undergraduate standard. Perhaps a more appropriate gauge of college graduates would be based on the program content commonly used in undergraduate programs.

Overview of Research Design / Methodology

Descriptive research. This study would investigate particular descriptive characteristics of FCS higher education units with a focus on the discovery of whether a common body of knowledge exists in AAFCS accredited units in the Southeast.

Population. The chosen population includes those schools which are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools and the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences. Thirty-four schools meet these criteria.

Instrument. An EXCEL database will be developed so that similar information was gathered from each institution. The majority of the information was retrieved from the 2003-2004 official catalog of the school, college, or university or the official website.

Procedure / method. First, each school's curriculum was evaluated according to the divisions of content areas commonly used in professional journals related to FCS. Secondly, the curriculum was evaluated against the 16 national standards for FCS education. All curricular elements will be categorized according to their presence or absence. Specific titles and descriptive words in the course description were used to determine that a particular curricular element was present or absent. If explicit terms were not used pertaining to a certain area of study, the curricular element was defined as absent. If the data was incomplete or confusing, the school will be contacted and attempts will be made to clarify the information regarding the school's curriculum.

Data and analysis. Demographic data: Basic information regarding school size, name of unit, and organizational structure were gathered. Nominal data: The curricular elements were coded as present or absent in each school's program. Frequency counts were tabulated to reveal elements that were common to the majority of programs. This was also be expressed in percentages. High and low counts and percentages were particularly important to note. Analysis: A description summary created a portrait of common curricular practices in AAFCS accredited programs.

Expected results. Since names of higher education units are known to be diverse and FCS curriculum guides and AAFCS accreditation standards have never been prescriptive, but suggestive, this researcher expects to find wide variety among the structure and curriculum of higher education units, but it was also expected that common ground would be found. This researcher expects that a common core of knowledge will be discernable across academic programs.

Delimitations of the Study

This study has several inherent limitations:

- The catalogs and web pages from which the data are drawn are imperfect.
- Only FCS programs in the Southeast are included.
- Catalogs are dated when published.
- Course descriptions are limited in their ability to communicate course content.
- Subjective judgment is used to categorize data.

Definitions of Key Terms

Body of knowledge – the sum of the content areas and integrative components that define the discipline of Family and Consumer Sciences

Content areas – specialized areas of study usually including such subjects as food and nutrition, clothing and fashion, interiors and housing, human development and family relationships, and consumer economics

Core curriculum – courses required of all FCS students regardless of specialization

Curricular elements – content areas or concepts emphasized in a particular course

Curriculum – courses offered within the academic units, including required courses and elective courses

FCS – Family and Consumer Sciences

FCS program – a prescribed course of study related to undergraduate degree requirements in an educational institution

FCS unit - structural organization of educational governance such as a department, a division or a college that oversees the FCS program

HEU – designation for membership of colleges and universities FCS units in AAFCS higher education unit (HEU), formerly Home Economics unit, required for consideration of AAFCS accreditation. The HEU was originally called Agency Member Unit (AMU).

Higher education unit – structural organization of educational governance such as a department, a division or a college

Home Economics – the name given to a profession founded in 1909 that integrates knowledge from the sciences, humanities, and the arts in the interest of family well-being, renamed Family and Consumer Sciences in 1994.

Integrative nature of FCS – the synergy resulting from an understanding and application of the interrelatedness of people with their physical and social environments

Specialization – specific area of study within FCS, usually pertaining to a particular content area such as food and nutrition, clothing and fashion, interiors and housing, human development and family relationships, and consumer economics.

Systems approach – a point of view that emphasizes the family system and the interrelatedness of the factors that impact its well-being.

Chapter 2: Review of Literature

Name Change

The American Home Economics Association (AHEA) was organized on December 31, 1908 in Washington DC. The organization quickly grew and flourished under a united banner. However, in the sixties, rapid societal change also brought about many changes to the discipline of home economics. Schools slowly began moving away from the historic name of home economics for as many reasons as there were schools. Debate surrounded the issue of name change with strong opinions on each side. Because the historical name was recognized and respected internationally, some felt that it was unwise to change it. "With reference to terminology or name, there is a definite advantage in keeping the title of 'home economics' " (O'Toole, 1961, p. 348). Nonetheless, during the 1962-1972 decade, 10% of responding higher education units had undergone a name change (East & Weis, 1974). By 1993, 58% of higher education units were called by names other than home economics (Haley, Peggram, & Ley, 1993). In 1994, after nearly eighty-five years of existence, the organizing professional society changed its own name from the American Home Economics Association (AHEA) to the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS). The change was surrounded by disagreement and dismay, but most of all, hope.

The move to change the name of AHEA, the then national organization representing home economic interests, was precipitated by the 1993 meeting held in Scottsdale, Arizona with the theme of "Positioning the Profession for the 21st Century" (AHEA, 1993). In an effort to regain the unity and recognition that

the profession enjoyed in the 1950's, four professional organizations, including AHEA, the Association of Administrators of Home Economics, the American Vocational Association – Home Economics Education Division, the National Association of Extension Home Economists, and the National Council of Administrators of Home Economics sponsored a joint meeting. Although much significant work was accomplished during the meeting, perhaps the most significant outcome of the event occurred later at the national convention when AHEA proposed that its name be changed to the AAFCS (AHEA, 1993). Many of the higher education units followed AAFCS and adopted the name of Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS), but others maintained their own unique name, such as Human Ecology, Human Environmental Sciences, or Human Sciences. Why did some units change their name while others did not? Perhaps the influence of the national organization was not strong enough. Maybe the need to associate with direct name correspondence simply didn't resonate with every school. It could have been that the political and economic difficulties in making such a change were too great: for some schools, it was simply too late. They had already gone through one name change in the past few decades and were not prepared to do it again. Whatever the cause, FCS units are identified by a great variety of names today. The multiple identifications thus beg the question: Do the variety of names also reflect diverse curriculum within FCS higher education units, or are there common elements among them?

The Scottsdale meeting sought to bring unity and articulate the common understandings of those in the profession. The one hundred participants produced a conceptual framework for the profession at the same time they

recommended a name change and developed sound bytes for the general public to define Family and Consumer Sciences (FCS). The recommended response was that Family and Consumer Sciences is about “empowering individuals, strengthening families, and enabling communities” (AHEA, 1993, p. A-5). As a unifying focus, “FCS uses an integrative approach to the relationships among individuals, families, and communities and the environments in which they function” (p. A-5). Further and more specifically, these FCS professionals identified the leadership roles, concerns, and outcomes of the professional practice of FCS as follows:

The profession takes leadership in:

- improving individual, family, and community well-being;
- impacting the development, delivery and evaluation of consumer goods and services;
- influencing the development of policy;
- shaping societal change; thereby enhancing the human condition.

The profession is concerned with:

- the strength and vitality of families;
- the development and use of personal, social and material resources to meet human needs;
- the physical, psychosocial, economic and aesthetic well-being of individuals and families;
- the role of individuals and families as consumers of goods and services;

- the development of home and community environments that are supportive of individuals and families;
- the design, management and use of environments;
- the design, use of and access to current and emerging technologies;
- the critique, development and implementation of policies that support individuals, families and communities. (p. A-5)

The outcomes of our professional practice are:

- the enhancement of social, cognitive, economic, emotional and physical health and well-being of individuals and families;
- the empowerment of individuals and families to take charge of their lives, to maximize their potential, and to function independently and interdependently;
- the enhancement of the quality of the environments in which individuals and families function. (p. A-7)

Family and Consumer Sciences Curriculum Models

Several theoretical models are presented as the foundation for curriculum development within FCS: a classic model, a perennial problems model, and a critical science model. First, one prominent curriculum model comes from American educator and scholar, Ralph W. Tyler, who was closely associated with curriculum theory and development and educational assessment and evaluation. His model of curriculum development has been considered the paradigm for the field of curriculum development since his first text, *Basic Principles of Curriculum*

and Instruction, was published in 1949 (Oliva, 2001). He served the profession of Family and Consumer Sciences as an advisor to the AHEA Committee on Criteria for Evaluating College Programs of Home Economics and wrote the forward in the resulting classic, *Home Economics in Higher Education* (Branegan, 1948; Spafford, 1949). He also spoke before the annual meeting of the AHEA in 1962 (Tyler, 1962).

Tyler's model. Following Ralph Tyler's model of curriculum development, one would begin to identify general educational objectives by surveying three sources: the needs of the student, the needs of society, specifically its needs and aims for its citizenry, and the disciplines themselves (1949). These broad objectives would then be reduced by filtering them through two screens: an educational and social philosophy screen that determines congruence with the value system and a psychology of learning screen that clarifies realistic expectations of the learner. Through this process, general objectives emerge that form the basis of small, more specific classroom objectives. Evaluating the learning process acts as feedback to the cycle of curriculum development. Evaluation takes place in order to determine whether the smaller and larger objectives were met. Evaluation also requires that the original objectives are assessed on a regular basis because change inevitably occurs in the students, society, and the discipline over time, so goals and objectives must be reevaluated to keep pace with a changing world (Tyler, 1949).

Perennial problems model. A second model comes from Virginia Vincenti, past AAFCS president and historian, who urged FCS undergraduate educators to build FCS curriculum around the needs of society, training students to solve

"perennial, practical problems" rather than training them solely for narrow, designated careers (1990, p.189). Organizing FCS curriculum using this approach makes major assumptions about the profession of home economics:

> (a) that the uniqueness of the field in general, and our own higher education programs in particular, does not come from its content, but rather from the formulation and ordering of knowledge around the problems to be solved—problems directly related to our mission; and (b) if home economics is concerned with helping our students and clients make morally defensible judgments regarding practical problems, then curriculum content should reflect the student's thought processes as well as the types of knowledge involved in making such judgments. (Vincenti, 1990, p.189)

Vincenti draws from the work of Marjorie Brown, who in her curriculum written in 1977 for the Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction, included a description of the characteristics of perennial problems:

1. They are common and recur from one generation to the next.
2. They present questions that must be answered.
3. The grounds on which decisions should be made are uncertain.
4. In solving such problems, an existing state of affairs must always be taken into account.
5. Each solution is in some ways unique, belonging to a specific time and context.

6. Questions will require choices between competing goals and values.
7. The outcome of the solution chosen can never be precisely predicted.
8. Grounds for answering the question lead us to suppose that if appropriate action is taken, a desirable state of affairs will result. (p. 142)

By focusing the curriculum around practical, perennial problems, students would learn to integrate their knowledge as well as to cooperate with others to fulfill the mission of improving life for individuals, families, and communities. This type of approach would by necessity include "cognitive and affective processes, knowledge and values . . . . analysis of life situations, solving of social problems, generation and criticism of alternative actions, and the making of value judgments" (Vincenti, 1990, p. 189). Another impact of this curriculum approach is that it constantly requires the assessment of the current context in order to pursue new answers to age old problems. The emphasis is on the process of problem solving, not on time dated solutions. This allows the curriculum to adjust to the current culture and environment instead of becoming outdated because the best solutions today may be different from those of yesterday.

Building the FCS curriculum around perennial problems faced by families and communities is not a new model, but rather a return to the roots of FCS. The original constitution of AHEA declared that the mission of the organization was to improve the quality of life in homes, institutions, and communities through "the study of problems related to the home" (American Home Economics Association

[AHEA], 1914, p.29). Consequently, research, development of curriculum, and dissemination of knowledge through education was the strategy of professionals at that early date.

Changing societal contexts and the call to focus upon perennial problems requires FCS educators to continually assess their curriculum and their methods. Unlike some disciplines in which the same answer is always correct, FCS lives in the sphere of multiple solutions dependent upon the current conditions. Olga Brucher, former AHEA president, must have sensed the impending changes in American culture that began in the sixties as she wrote in 1959:

> We must continue to emphasize—perhaps more strongly than heretofore—the importance of research in helping us gain knowledge in all areas, test out new theories and possibilities with scientific accuracy, and adjust our programs in all areas of the profession to best meet the challenge of a changing environment. (p. 529-530)

The changing needs of students and society call for corresponding changes in the FCS curriculum. This broad, integrative, problem solving nature of FCS must be responsive to its context. “The challenge for the discipline of home economics is much like that of the area of general education for professionals preparing for a vocation. Continual reassessment of essential knowledge needed is crucial” (Smith, 1995, p.363).

Earl McGrath points to the ultra importance of assessment for the discipline in his book, *The Changing Mission of Home Economics*. With the Institute of Higher Education at Columbia University, McGrath saw the forces of

urbanization and globalization requiring that home economics redirect its programs to the needs of the urban family and the international community rather than the rural, agricultural family that was predominant during the conception years of home economics (McGrath, 1968). McGrath saw a change in mission, but this researcher would challenge the use of the word “mission,” because the purpose of FCS had not changed (Horn, 1993, p.B-4), even if the means of accomplishing the mission was in need of change. McGrath was correct in his accurate description of the changing societal fabric and the need of FCS professionals to adjust their methods and their curriculum to remain relevant to family problems.

Critical science model. Curriculum today must also address the needs of students to think, reason, analyze, define values and priorities, and make wise decisions. These thought processes are not developed arbitrarily or from the traditional lecture and note taking method of education. Students must be taught how to exercise their intelligence and think critically if they are to tackle real-life and practical problems. Thus, the purpose of FCS curriculum is not just to impart knowledge for the well-lived life, but to produce students who also have the critical thinking skills to solve problems in a changing world.

> The purpose is not to train expert homemakers. Is it not a fair analogy to point out that the purpose of medical education is not to turn out exemplars of health . . . . [but] to teach our students to think like home economists.
> (Sweetman, 1961, p.8)

Clearly, FCS is a “practical science” that calls for reasoned action to solve problems, according to Brown and Paolucci’s, *Home Economics: A Definition* (1978, p.11). They explain the relationships between the empirical, interpretive, and critical sciences and the necessity of integrating these approaches to meet the needs of a changing society. Values, context, and data work together to compel the questions of “what should one do?” and “why?”, rather than simply asking “how?” a given task is to be accomplished. “A fundamental characteristic of critical science curriculum is that questions about ends are as essential as questions about means, and that inquiry into values is the central focus of these questions” (Plihal, Laird, & Rehm, 1999, p.16). Assumptions are questioned, as are the valued ends, so that one critically approaches solutions to the problems where there is no single right answer. “Using critical and creative thinking skills to address problems in diverse family, community, and work environments” is part of the mission statement of the Family and Consumer Sciences Educators (FCS Education, 2004). Thus, the prevailing school of thought regarding FCS curriculum is that a critical science approach supports the mission of FCS in solving perennial problems of the family. Developing these skills then becomes the responsibility of FCS educators at every academic level, but particularly the undergraduate level.

History of Curriculum Development in Family and Consumer Sciences

Understanding the past helps people appreciate their roots and develop a plan for the future. In her inaugural address to the AAFCS, President Virginia Vincenti mentioned the essential element of a shared history and culture to a vibrant community life. “Shared history and culture also contribute to

development and maintenance of distinctive individual and group identity—pride, purpose, and loyalty…. encouraging historical research to help strengthen our identity and gain insights from our past to improve our future" (Vincenti, 2003, p. 6).

Conception at Lake Placid. According to Marjorie East, "A good way to start an argument among home economists is to ask the simple question 'What is home economics?'" (1980, p.7). Answering this question perhaps requires beginning with a historical understanding of the ideas of the founders of the profession at the turn of the Twentieth Century. In the midst of the immigration, urbanization and social change, Mrs. Ellen Richards, Massachusetts Institute of Technology chemistry professor and co-founder of the American Association of University Women, chaired the meetings that eventually brought home economics to American society. The 1902 Lake Placid Conference defined home economics in this way:

> Home economics in its most comprehensive sense is the study of the laws, conditions, principles and ideals which are concerned on the one hand with man's immediate physical environment and on the other hand with his nature as a social being, and is the study specially of the relation between those two factors . . . . In forming a complete definition, however, it may be possible to consider home economics as a philosophical subject, i.e. a study of *relation*, while the subjects on which it depends, i.e. economics, sociology, chemistry, hygiene and others, are empirical in their nature and concerned with *events* and *phenomena* (1902, 70-71).

The conferences fostered much discussion about the nature of home economics and its potential contribution to American society and were so popular that they continued for ten years, gaining numerically each year from 11 to 143 delegates, meeting from 1899-1908 (Lake Placid Conferences; Hunt, 1958). On December 31, 1908, the group officially organized as AHEA. Their purpose was to provide national leadership to those concerned about the family and a means for the exchange of ideas through published journals and national meetings. The first issue of the Journal of Home Economics was published in February 1909 (Pundt, 1980).

Further clarification of the nature of home economics came in 1910, the second year of publication, when the Journal of Home Economics detailed a recommended sequence for a full collegiate course in Home Economics. The program included a first year of science, literature, language, and economics. The second year continued the liberal arts studies but added courses such as "domestic science, the home, principles of teaching, household sanitation, bread making, and general bacteriology" (Shepperd, 1910, p. 406). The junior year included courses such as "physiology and ecology, position of woman, advanced designing, methods in domestic science, industrial education, quantitative chemistry, chemistry of foods, floriculture, domestic art, domestic science practice teaching, analysis of foods, farm structures, designing, and textiles" (Shepperd, 1910, p. 406). The senior year included more of the same. Electives were available the junior and senior years and included, "agriculture, agricultural engineering, animal nutrition, botany, dairy husbandry, domestic art, domestic

science, drawing and designing, economics, education, entomology, geology, horticulture, psychology, political science, and vegetable pathology" (Shepperd, 1910, p. 406) .

1913 syllabus. At the Second Annual Meeting of the AHEA, in 1910, a "Committee on Nomenclature" was appointed for the purpose of "studying usage and comparing data in order that terms and definitions might be proposed which would make for accuracy and uniformity" (1913, p.8). Thus the main purpose of writing such a document was to encourage unity and standards among FCS educators. They contemplated the most appropriate name, adopted a definition for the profession, and suggested a common syllabus outlining the subject matter of the new discipline (Committee on Nomenclature, 1913).

This document, a 49 page syllabus produced in 1913 was written in very broad terms, so as to be used by elementary schools as well as colleges and universities. The syllabus did not prescribe a scope and sequence for the curriculum, but left that for individual educators to decide with consideration for what would be appropriate to their particular setting. Home economics was intended to meet needs on all educational levels whether through liberal arts education, career preparation, or vocational preparation. The specific emphasis of the program toward the cultural, technical, or manual aspects of the subject would determine its outcomes (Committee on Nomenclature, 1913).

Led by Isabel Bevier, the AHEA president who served as the chairman of the committee after the death of Ellen Richards, the committee composed of an elite group of academics, first considered what name should be used for the field of study that had been taught under a variety of names such as domestic

science, household arts, domestic economy, domestic science and art. "It was the conclusion of the Committee that 'Home Economics' . . . is the most satisfactory of the names which have been proposed at different times for the subject as a whole" (Committee on Nomenclature, 1913, p.4).

Second, the committee proposed a definition for home economics which was later adopted by AHEA at the Fourth Annual Meeting. This definition characterized the discipline very narrowly and laid out the basic tenets of the first official syllabus.

> As a definition for 'Home Economics', the Committee proposed the following: 'Home Economics as a distinct subject of instruction is the study of the economic, sanitary, and esthetic aspects of food, clothing, and shelter as connected with their selection, preparation, and use by the family in the home or by other groups of people.' (Committee on Nomenclature, 1913, p.4)

Third, the most significant work of this committee was in the publication of the *Syllabus of Home Economics: An Outline of Subject Matter*. In this document, they proposed:

> [that the] subject of Home Economics be divided into four main divisions, (1) food, (2) clothing (3) shelter, and (4) household and institution management . . . .The plan of arrangement of material finally adopted subdivides the three main divisions, Food, Clothing, and Shelter, into (1) selection, (2) preparation, and (3) use, and the fourth main division, Household and Institutional Management, into (1) material basis, (2) social contacts, (3) activities and functions,

> and (4) aims and results . . . further subdivided with reference to economic, scientific, sanitary, and esthetic aspects (Committee on Nomenclature, 1913, p.5).

Further, the committee's self proclaimed purpose was declared:

> to show in a general way the content of home economics as a distinct branch of knowledge, and . . . [to] be found a useful outline on which to base further consideration of the subject, and out of which to construct courses of instruction for various purposes. (Committee on Nomenclature, 1913, p.6)

Also in the syllabus, the committee recognized the broad base of contributing disciplines and provided a list that included "art, history, anthropology, sociology, esthetics, economics, physiology, hygiene, mathematics, chemistry, physics, and biology." They also acknowledged that "as is the case with other complex subjects, the line of division between home economics and the contributing subjects is not well defined" (Committee on Nomenclature, 1913, p.6) This lack of clear boundaries would decades later result in various academic units being dispersed to related disciplines. The committee also suggested that "laboratory work" or "practice work" be included in the teaching method. That is, they expected that such work would involve "books and other literary material . . . accounts . . . tools," as well as "the equipment of the chemical, physical, and biological laboratory" (Committee on Nomenclature, 1913, p.6-7). Thus began the traditional practice of incorporating lab experiences and hands on applications with real life training into the curriculum, all of which now characterize the traditional applied science of home economics.

Social sciences included. By the 1920's, the structure of FCS was established in higher education and its major emphasis was already the preparation of secondary school teachers (McGrath, 1968). "The first college teachers in home economics had drawn heavily on the physical and biological sciences", as seen in the 1913 model curriculum (p.14).

> But with the development of the social sciences, professors of home economics saw in social research additional material for the curriculum. To their original concerns with food, clothing, and shelter, they added the relation of human beings to each other, and as a consequence the emphasis of home economics curricula expanded from housekeeping skills to home and family management. (McGrath, 1968, p.14)

Revision of the syllabus 1927-1941. The next national revision of the home economics curriculum which attempted to offer identity to home economics came 14 years later in June 1927. The executive committee of AHEA appointed a committee called the "Committee on the Revision of the Syllabus," which in turn appointed sub-committees, one each to work with a subject matter section or general field within home economics. Each of these subject sections would be responsible to write an outline of the material included in its respective area. In light of the many professionals brought to the task of revision, the executive committee hypothesized that the syllabus revision could be accomplished during the 1929-29 program of work (Justin, 1928).

The fact that this work ultimately took, not one, but fourteen, years to complete suggests the complexity of the task. After having lost a chairman, the

Committee on the Revision of the Syllabus appointed Wylle McNeal from the University of Minnesota as chairman. The report of the committee's work, published in the 1930 Bulletin of AHEA, suggested the committee's priorities: First, the subject matter from the sub-committees should be presented in logical form, although the organization did not have to correspond exactly to the divisions within the organization of AHEA. Second, deviating from its original focus, the committee would make no attempt to dictate objectives, scope, or sequence for the various subject matter sections. Finally, these revisions would not focus on elementary and secondary curriculum, but on higher education, nor would this syllabus be prepared as a syllabus for instruction, but would simply delineate the content in outline form. Apparently the original ambitious purpose to review objectives and practices across the various educational levels and organizations was found to be not only a "heavy task," but unattainable at the time (Justin, p.41; Report from the Committee on Revision, 1930).

Although the exact titles were left to the subcommittees, it was in this 1930 report that the subject matter sections for the outline were defined. The assignments for the subcommittees were "the family, family finances, the house, food and nutrition, and clothing and textiles" (Report from the Committee on Revision, p.29). The 1913 syllabus had been changed and expanded from its original divisions that included only food, clothing, shelter, and management. Institutional management was separated into its social and financial components. Awareness of the importance of family relationships had increased to keep pace with the developing social sciences. The economics of the family touched all

other areas, but as the family experienced an increasing societal shift from producer to consumer, this area had also expanded to be a specialty all its own.

The work of the committee was slow, due to various factors (McNeal, 1931), and it would be 1935 before any of the committees' work would be published in the Journal of Home Economics. The decision had been made to publish each sub-committee's outline as they were made ready, so as to encourage use and feedback by educators in the schools. The individually published materials were "tentative" and considered a draft until each of the five committees produced its division's outline, and one volume could be edited and produced as the updated syllabus of home economics. Every revision included a statement reminding the readers that these outlines were not prescriptive teaching tasks, but subject matter outlines. *The Family and Its Relationships* was the first division report to be published in January of 1935 with *The House* report following soon after in March of the same year (McNeal, 1935; Wood et al., 1935; Wilson, Gross, Gunselman, & Morin, 1935). A year later in March of 1936, *Family Economics* was released (Kyrk, 1936). The last of the tentative revisions was finally published fourteen years after the original committee had been commissioned. *Food and Nutrition* was published in December 1940 and *Textiles and Clothing* in June of 1941 (Biester, Giddings, Koehne, & Munsell, 1940; Callahan, Denwy, Whitlock, Rathbone, & Jacobson, 1941). In her 1936 report, following the publication of *Family Economics*, McNeal reported that letters had been sent to teachers in each of the first three published areas requesting suggestions and criticism for the final syllabus. The responses and

generosity of time devoted to the task had been encouraging and these were to be used to improve the finished product (McNeal, 1936).

Revision of this syllabus had taken a total of 14 years. Clearly, the weariness of McNeal with this task was apparent in her brief annual report of September 1940:

> I recommend that the syllabus committee be automatically discharged when all of the first outlines have appeared in the Journal of Home Economics. If a thorough study seems to indicate that further work should be done on the syllabus, a new committee should be formed (McNeal, 1940, 38).

McNeal recommended dissolving the committee before the final work of revising the tentative outlines based on teacher analysis, choosing a standardized format, and publishing the syllabus was accomplished. The revision of the syllabus of home economics, outlining the content of the field of home economics, was never published as a whole document though it did appear in various issues of the Journal of Home Economics as individual components. The scope of the task was ambitious at the outset of the vision, but changes in leadership, the death of a committee member, the ongoing institutional responsibilities of committee members who were geographical separated, and finally the national emergency of World War II all contributed to the ultimate incompletion of this project.

1945 "Blue Book". *The Syllabus of Home Economics*, published in 1913, gave guidance and some degree of standardization to the undergraduate programs of home economics around the nation. The revisions of the syllabus,

begun in 1927 and finished in 1941, attempted to bring up to date the first work, but it was never published in complete form. Nonetheless, AHEA was interested in assuring quality and professionalism, and according to Zuill, “as early as 1923 a resolution was introduced in regard to accreditation of home economics in colleges” (1959, p. 521). In 1937, the Land-Grant College Association appointed a“Criteria Committee for Home Economics. While this committee was conducting its work, it realized that any program of evaluation that they might develop would be of interest beyond land-grant institutions. They therefore recommended that the AHEA appoint a committee with similar purposes.

Thus the committee on “Criteria for Home Economics” was appointed to study the quality of home economics work in land-grant institutions and in smaller colleges whose students frequently transferred to the land-grant schools. (Branegan, 1947, Appendix A) Near the same time, AHEA was changing its membership requirements. In 1940, the association voted to require a college degree from an accredited school of higher education for all new members. Previously, anyone who had an interest in the welfare of the home was welcomed to membership (AHEA, 1914). Furthermore, in 1943, AHEA conducted a membership campaign in which it recruited college seniors to join the association (Branegan, 1947). No regard was given to the quality of the program they had attended, as long as the school was among those listed in the 1938 United States Department of the Interior Bulletin No. 16 as an accredited higher institution (Harris, 1941). At this time, Jessie Harris, member of the Land-Grant Criteria committee and president of AHEA, recommended that a committee

on Standards for Memberships be established in AHEA. (Branegan, 1947, Appendix A)

Thus, in 1944, the AHEA appointed a committee which was given the task of studying standards for membership in other professional associations, investigating methods of choosing membership standards and making recommendations to the Association. The committee collected and studied accrediting systems of various professional fields including law, medicine, engineering, nursing, library, journalism, and dentistry. Several guiding principles directed their work; they would only study institutions that were regionally accredited; focusing on undergraduate programs and would judge them on the basis of their published objectives. Further, they would establish standards that were flexible enough to allow for educational experimentation. Finally, they would try to serve the institutions without cost. A pilot survey for home economics programs was written and used in sixteen institutions. Revisions were made on the basis of their findings (Branegan, 1946a).

In November of 1946, the Committee on Membership Standards conducted a week-long workshop to train 24 home economists to conduct site visits and administer the surveys in 60 representative schools. The committee was addressed as a collective body by several guest speakers in regard to accreditation issues and also spent designated time working in subcommittees to address specific problems or questions necessary to the project. Among the subcommittees appointed, five were appointed to determine the significant characteristics in designated instructional areas. The instructional areas were divided as follows:

1. Foods, Nutrition and Institutional Management,
2. Textiles and Clothing and Related Arts,
3. Child Development and Family Relationships,
4. Home Management, Family Economics, Housing, Equipment, and
5. Home Economics Education and Extension

A separate committee was appointed to study the core curriculum, while other committees completed tasks related to the selection of the schools or the establishment of procedure for the school visits (Branegan, 1946b).

As a collective body, the group spent time learning from Clara Brown Arny in regards to her experiences in the study of home economics in 20 small liberal arts colleges, reviewing methodology, problems, recommendation and outcomes of the study. Dr. George Barton, from the University of Chicago, discussed reaching consensus about standards amidst philosophical differences. Dr. Norman Burns, representing the North Central Association, addressed the group regarding the shifting emphasis in accreditation from quantitative aspects to qualitative ones. Dr. R. F. Thomason, from the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, continued the discussion regarding the significant questions to ask in accreditation. Dr. H. H. Horner, from the American Dental Association, and Dr. D. B. Prentice, President of Rose Polytechnic Institute described the histories of their accrediting agencies, the perseverance required to accomplish the task, and the importance of qualitative measures of growth rather than quantitative measures of an institution (Branegan, 1946b).

Dr. Ralph Tyler, author of *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction* and dean of the Social Sciences division at the University of Chicago, led a

discussion about evaluation of a curriculum based on its objectives. Stressing the need for clear objectives and evidence of meeting them, as well as providing opportunities for students to attain the objectives and determining if students achieve those objectives, Dr. Tyler encouraged the committee by suggesting that the very process of examining schools to determine their current status would probably in itself stimulate the schools to do a better job (Branegan, 1946b).

The committee concluded its workshop by selecting a tentative list of sixty schools to be visited. The schools were selected based on regional representation, college type, department size based on enrollment, and accreditation status (Branegan, 1946b). They also established a tentative schedule for the study. Schools would be visited by March. By June, the data would be analyzed with Dr. Ivol Spaffod giving oversight, and in August, the committee would meet for a two-week workshop in Chicago with Dr. Ralph Tyler and Dr. Norman Burns to study the data and formulate tentative criteria. The

> report should give a representative picture of home economics college programs in this country, together with a statement of criteria worked out by the Committee which should be of value not only to institutions for use in self-evaluation but also to interested educators and laymen and to college administrators responsible for college home economic programs. (Branegan, 1947)

As is apparent in the nature of their study, the membership standards were not directed toward individuals, but institutions. After their workshop in November 1946, they asked that they be renamed from Committee on Standards

for Membership to Committee on Criteria for Evaluating College Programs of Home Economics (Branegan, 1946b).

During the August 1947 Chicago workshop, most of the work was conducted through five subcommittees: students, curricula, staff, physical facilities, and administration. Two hours a day were spent with Dr. Tyler to consider general aspects and foster communication. Each subcommittee developed material that was then adopted by the whole body. Criteria were established and the basis for a rating scale established. The five years of work of the Committee on Criteria for Evaluating College Programs of Home Economics resulted in 1949 publication of *Home Economics in Higher Education: Criteria for Evaluating Undergraduate Programs* or “The Bluebook” as it was nicknamed (Spafford, 1949).

In the foreword of the book, Dr. Ralph Tyler writes, “I believe that this report is a milestone in the continuous improvement of college home economics” (Spafford, 1949, p. vi). In the introduction, Gladys Branegan “presents this report with the purpose of stimulating colleges and universities to a greater interest in continuous evaluation of their home economics departments and to provide material for evaluating and strengthening their programs” (p. xi).

Home economics is defined in “The Blue Book” as dealing “with the social, economic, esthetic, managerial, health, and ethical aspects of family relations, child development, foods, clothing, and housing” (Spafford, 1949, p.26). The recommended curriculum is also discussed:

> An effective curriculum is well balanced and functional. Home economics is a broad field involving many phases of subject matter

> and a wide variety of experiences. Family relations, child development, home management, family economics, foods and nutrition, clothing and textiles, housing, house furnishings and equipment, and family health are titles given to home economics courses. (Spafford, 1949, p.27)

Accreditation 1958-1970

The next significant examination of undergraduate programs began in 1958, when the Colleges and Universities section of the AHEA appointed a committee to study ways to improve standards for college and university programs of home economics. The committee's purpose was to explore accreditation. The committee met with William Selden, executive secretary of the National Commission on Accreditation. Three possibilities for improving home economics programs were suggested: pursuit of accreditation, preparation of criteria for regional accrediting bodies to use or reporting inferior programs to the regional accrediting body. During the following annual meeting in 1959, the committee asked to be released from its duty and recommended that the AHEA executive committee appoint a committee to represent the entire AHEA body to explore the possibilities of an accreditation program, recommending the establishment of minimum standards and a program of accreditation for college and university programs. They included in their report a listing of many advantages and favorable outcomes of accreditation and suggestions for a plan of work should a committee be appointed to pursue it (Hill, 1961).

In Lela O'Toole's commentary about higher education before the American Association of Land-Grant and State Universities, she echoed the

thoughts of those on the exploration committee. She stated that one "responsibility of the home economics faculty is to strive to achieve the best combination of liberal and professional education through an effective program of guidance, self-examination, and continuous evaluation and planning, within the framework of the institutional purposes and offerings" (O'Toole, 1961, p.346). It looked to some that this could best be achieved through accreditation of higher education programs.

A committee on accreditation was appointed in 1961 and adopted the program of work suggested by the former committee. During the fall of 1961, the committee attended regional conferences sponsored by the National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards to familiarize themselves with the process, procedures, and problems of accreditation. They met in March of 1962 and decided first to examine the professional program in home economics. The committee desired broad representation in establishing criteria for evaluation, thus, the subject-matter sections were asked to recommend a possible core course from each area for inclusion in the professional core program. In May, several committee members met with the chairman of the National Commission on Accreditation and though somewhat discouraged with his comments about the difficulty of establishing an accreditation body, set a tentative date for completion of the program for 1970 (Horn, 1962).

The question of whether AHEA should take on the task of accrediting college and university programs of home economics began to be discussed regularly at annual meetings. Progress was regularly reported in the Journal of

Home Economics (AHEA Committee on Accreditation, 1968; East, 1967, 1968a, 1968b, 1971; East & Weis, 1968; Horn, 1962, 1964a, 1964b, 1965; Jefferson, 1967a, 1967b; Paul, 1963; Vail, 1969, 1970, 1973; Walters, 1976; Wyse, 1965).

Dr. Pauline Paul, of the University of California, reviewed the work of the committee in the November 1963 issue of the Journal of Home Economics. The proposed criteria for undergraduate teacher education programs were included in detail as well as highlights from discussion from the floor of the annual meeting held in June. The criteria included information regarding minimum academic requirements, student admissions, administration, facilities, and faculty. The academic requirements were divided into general education requirements, home economic requirements, and professional education requirements. The section on home economics required courses in clothing and textiles, food and nutrition, child development and family relations, housing equipment and furnishings, family economics and home management, with at least 12 hours in one of the aforementioned areas. The section on administration simply referred to chapter 10 of *Home Economics in Higher Education* (Paul, 1963). Marilyn Horn's second progress report presented a sampling of the membership reactions to the proposed criteria for home economics education. Those opinions were widely dispersed since suggestions offered from the membership often counteracted one another (Horn, 1964b).

In 1963, five subcommittees of four members, each member representing the professional sections of extension, health and welfare, business, colleges, universities and research, and institution administration were formed. Working both ndependently and collectively, a tentative proposal for a core or foundation

for all majors regardless of areas of specializations was formed. This proposal, presented at the 55th annual meeting in Detroit, attempted to make clear its objectives and consequent agenda:

> The objective of education in home economics, as exemplified in the constitution of the American Home Economics Association, is to provide training basic to the attainment and maintenance of the well-being of individuals, families, and homes, and the preservation of values significant in home life. In order to fulfill this purpose, it is essential that each member of the profession experience a common comprehensive core of subject matter in order to provide the unique understandings and appreciations which under gird the individual's special contribution to the profession. In addition, this background will provide a foundation to the profession which is so vital for its function and advancement. This basic knowledge should include emphasis in the following areas:
>
> A. The role of individuals in the family at all levels of society.
>
> B. Human growth and development, and the needs of individuals at all ages.
>
> C. Management of personal and family resources in the solution of problems of providing food, clothing, shelter, and emotional support for each member of the family.
>
> D. The interrelationship of individuals, families, and communities—locally, nationally, and internationally.

E. The role of values, communication, and creativity in family development and functioning.

Members and prospective members of the profession must have an awareness of these areas and their interrelationships. Singly and in combination, all are necessary for a strong and common professional discipline. While other professions may deal with one or more aspects of the above areas, home economics is the only discipline which is concerned with all of them. Therefore, home economics can make a unique contribution to the betterment of families in the world as they are confronted with evermore complex problems of living. It is this purpose which justifies our professional existence. (Horn, 1964b, pp.660-661)

The same five subject matter areas listed for home economics education were repeated in this proposal, but there was no attempt to determine the specific content or titles of specific courses. Questions from the floor regarding this proposal dealt with the appropriateness of every root discipline to every specialization, the structure intended to fulfill these requirements, and the focus on undergraduate education toward liberal education or professional preparation (Horn, 1964b; Horn, 1964a). At this time, the accreditation committee recommended the appointment of a staff member to assist them in their work. In January 1967, Dr. Ruth Bryant Jefferson was appointed as the AHEA Staff Consultant on Accreditation.

Before the 1967 summer convention, in a series of three articles in the Journal of Home Economics, the membership of AHEA was asked to carefully

consider the issue of minimum standards for undergraduate programs and if the vote affirmed the need to establish standards, then the delegates should also be prepared to vote on the issue. In the first article, Jefferson explained that one benefit of establishing minimum standards was that “the breadth of knowledge desirable and the depth of knowledge essential for professional competency can be seen” (Jefferson, 1967a, p. 254). The possible methods to be used to establish minimum standards for undergraduate programs were set forth in the second article and included: accreditation, certification, membership eligibility, list of approved schools, guidelines, and guidelines for voluntary use (Jefferson, 1967b). Responses to the first two articles with differing opinions were published in the June issue (East, 1967).

The delegates to the 1967 annual convention in Dallas voted affirmatively to support minimum standards for undergraduate programs and to do so through the process of accreditation. An interim accreditation committee was then appointed to begin the work on minimum standards for undergraduate professional education (For the Record, 1967). During February and March of 1968, this committee invited deans, directors, chairs, board members, state association officers and others to participate in discussions regarding the draft proposal for minimum standards in six sessions held in various locations around the United States. Sears-Roebuck Foundation funded the facilities and lodging for the sessions (For the Record, 1968). After the meetings were concluded and input from all concerned was gathered, the committee met to revise the policies and procedures for accreditation.

In December of 1967, another AHEA committee, *National Committee to Study What Factors Contribute to Cohesiveness in Home Economics*, was charged to determine criteria for effective organization of both traditional and innovative programs. Appointed after the McGrath (1968) study but before it was published, the report of the committee affirmed the necessity of a central focus and identified various types of organizational structures that would enable home economics units to prepare professionals effectively. One statement in particular seems to be relevant to current concerns.

> As any unit increases in generality it tends to move toward the so-called general education and away from professional orientation. As it moves toward the specialty, without the essential central focus, it tends to be absorbed by the disciplines in the natural or social sciences or the arts. (Mangel, 1978, p. 232)

This “Cohesiveness Committee” considered itself as helping to develop the first steps of what eventually became accreditation (Mangel, 1978).

In June of 1968, a summary of proposed policies and procedures for accreditation was published in the *Journal of Home Economics* by the accreditation committee. Full statements of the policies and procedures for accreditation and detailed analysis of the written comments of the 296 persons who attended the winter of 1968 discussion meetings were made available to the AHEA membership. The proposal included the objectives of accreditation, the common discipline, the scope of accreditation, and the structure, financing, and procedures. The portion of the proposal that described the common discipline included five points:

1. The roles of individuals in the family at all levels of society and as they change over time
2. Human growth and development and the needs of individuals at all ages
3. Management of personal and family resources in the solution of problems of providing food, clothing, shelter, and emotional support for each individual
4. The interrelationship of individuals, families, and communities locally, nationally, and internationally
5. The functioning of values, communication, and creativity in family development and daily living

(East & Weis, 1968, p. 444)

Students who graduate from an accredited FCS program, based on the common discipline, should have mastered the following professional skills:

1. Identify needs, values, and problems of individuals, families, and groups of families in various levels of society
2. Recognize the unique contribution of home economics to those needs and also the contribution of other related professions
3. See out the specific knowledge appropriate to the solution of individual and family problems
4. Use the most effective means for applying the knowledge to meet the need

5. Evaluate the results of the process, the knowledge brought to bear, and the diagnosis of need in order to improve the professional performance

(East & Weis, 1968, p. 445)

Also revealed in the 1968 proposal was an analysis of the written reactions of the winter meetings discussion participants. Ninety percent of the participants who filled out a reaction sheet agreed with the objectives of accreditation and the statement of the common discipline. Respondents ranked several criteria in order of their importance for evaluating a program. Although there were differences among smaller and larger programs, the whole group produced a ranked order of criteria which follows:

1. Size and quality of faculty
2. Curriculum
3. Competence of graduates
4. Facilities and library
5. Quality of students
6. Financing, administration of program.

(East & Weis, 1968, p. 446)

Another outcome of the 1968 winter discussions was the committee's proposal for a new class of AHEA membership, the Agency member, a category which was a necessary component of becoming a recognized accrediting body. Up until this point, membership had been available only to individuals. This proposal, however, would create a class of membership for institutions of higher learning. These member institutions, as a group, would become responsible for

establishing the criteria, policies, and procedures for accreditation in accordance with the requirements of the National Commission on Accrediting (NCA). The NCA requires institutions who seek accreditation from some recognized group to have membership within the group (East, 1968a). Therefore, any school, college or, university desiring to have stamp of approval through accreditation by the AHEA must first be a member of AHEA. This new class of membership proposal was approved at the 1968 annual AHEA meeting in Minneapolis, at which time the interim committee on accreditation was dissolved (East, 1968b) and a new accreditation committee was formed out of the pool of agency members.

The next major step for defining a quality FCS program came when representatives of the newly formed Agency Member Unit (AMU) met in Minneapolis, during the annual meeting, to elect both their officers and a procedural rules committee. Following the suggested structure from the accreditation committee, three commissions with seven committees working under them were established. The undergraduate commission has four committees: home economics in business, home economics in dietetics and food service, home economics in education, and home economics in extension and community agencies. The commission on graduate programs has one committee and the commission on nonprofessional programs has two committees: the committee on the contribution of home economics to general education and the committee on home economics in junior and community colleges and in post-secondary vocational and technical programs. These committees were responsible for the final version of the criteria for accreditation (Vail, 1969). Appointments for these committees were announced in the

November issue of the *Journal of Home Economics* (AHEA Committee on Accreditation, 1968).

The AMU appointed the Council for Professional Development (CPD) for the purpose of carrying out the work of accreditation. The CPD would review the self-study documents of programs seeking accreditation and the recommendations of the site visitors and make rulings for or against accreditation. Appointments to the CPD were announced in 1969 following the suggestions of the interim accreditation committee (Vail, 1969). After meeting with the procedural rules committee of the AMU, the CPD reviewed the criteria and guidelines for undergraduate programs in home economics, as well as the procedures and self-evaluation forms, and then made plans to conduct a pilot study in the spring of 1970 of selected volunteer institutions (Vail, 1970; Crenshaw, 1970). The pilot studies enabled the CPD to make fine adjustments to the accreditation procedures and then they recommended the entire process be approved by the AMU. As for the seven volunteer institutions included in the pilot study, it is interesting to note what eventually became of their accreditation status. Five of the schools were soon accredited: of these, three were accredited by December 1972 and were listed in the March 1973 *Journal of Home Economics* and two others joined the list in 1974. Two of the schools were never accredited (Vail, 1973; Accredited Institutions, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1976, 1977, 1978, 1993, 2003) which might indicate a mismatch between the school and the accreditation process. Either there was a deficit in the school's program and accreditation was presumably out of reach or the institution lost interest or failed to continue the pursuit of accreditation.

Following the pilot studies, the AMU voted to approve the “Proposed Accreditation Documents for Undergraduate Programs in Home Economics,” in the June 1971 meeting, and they also decided to pursue national recognition from NCA as an accrediting body for FCS programs. They submitted the necessary documents to the NCA on January 20, 1971, and “the board of commissioners of the NCA voted on March 26, 1971 to give official recognition to the AHEA for accrediting programs in the field of home economics at the undergraduate level in colleges and universities in the U.S” (Hovermale, 1971, p. 429; Bates, 1971).

In 1972, one year after the AHEA became the official accrediting body for home economics in the U.S., hundreds of institutions joined the AMU. Invitations to join the AMU had been extended to 383 institutions offering baccalaureate degrees in home economics. By March, 213 institutions had paid their dues and joined, 32 more intended to pay their dues, 31 institutions had requested accreditation paperwork, 13 had submitted applications for accreditation and 3 had submitted their self-studies and requested accreditation site visits (First Year’s, 1972). By June, a few months later, 261 institutions had joined the agency member unit by paying their dues, 42 requests for accreditation documents and 22 applications for accreditation had been submitted (Crenshaw, 1972).

A few years into accreditation, member and chairman of the CPD, Margaret Mangel stated she was “favorably impressed with what accreditation could and was doing, both directly and indirectly, to stimulate self-examination of institutional units and to improve professional education” (1978, p. 232). Rather

than viewing accreditation as an “outside process,” she encouraged faculty to see it instead as one in which they have considerable influence (p. 232). She took exception to the general hard lines of some accreditation systems, particularly if they “stifle some of the creativity needed to assure adaptation of professional education to changing needs of society” (p. 232), but was pleased with the ability of the AHEA criteria to accommodate innovative programs.

Clearly, the arduous process of committee work for the sake of accreditation would also accomplish the work of defining the core of the discipline. Included among the accreditation criteria by which the CPD deliberates a school’s accreditation is this statement:

> There is a common body of knowledge derived from the general studies component and from special courses in home economics which provide for a general program in home economics and which is also relevant to each of the areas of specialization. The concepts (common to all programs) include some understanding of: the family in society, human growth and development in relation to nutrition, human development and its relation to the family, management of human and material resources, aesthetic qualities in the environment, the influence of science, technology and consumer economics upon families and family members, the philosophical base of home economics and the relation of its specialties to the field as a whole. (Walters, 1976, p.38; Vail, 1973, p.29)

This statement taken from Criterion 5.1 of the 1971 Accreditation Documents describes the common body of knowledge, the core content, and the integrative focus expected of a program in home economics. Although the AHEA has revised the wording several times since the original document, they have continued to maintain this original statement's strong expectation of a common perspective regardless of particular subject matter. The 1984 revision restates the accreditation criteria:

> Each member of the home economics profession shares a common set of understandings as well as the specialized awareness and abilities needed for a particular type of professional contribution. There are many ways to achieve the common body of knowledge, which is defined to include an integration of concepts from the following:
>
> - The family and the interaction of individuals and families with their near environment;
> - Human growth and development including physical, intellectual, emotional, and social development and the needs of individuals throughout the life span;
> - The roles and interrelationships of individuals in the family over the life span on all socioeconomic levels of society;
> - The interdependence of the principles of human nutrition and of food in the behavior and health of individuals;
> - The relationship of design, changing technology, and environment to human behavior; and

- Management theory and application, including individual and family decision-making behavior related to identification and allocation of resources. (AHEA Council for Accreditation, 1984)

The 2001 version of the Accreditation Documents describes the expectation of a common body of knowledge in Standard 3:

> Students understand the synergistic, integrative nature of the family and consumer sciences profession with its focus on the interrelationships among individuals, families, consumers, and communities as taught in human systems theory and life course development and students apply this understanding to the study of their areas of specialization.
>
> Each program offered by the unit contributes to the integrative focus. Students understand the interaction and interrelatedness of individuals, families, consumers, and communities, through their study of human systems theory and life course development. Students understand the dynamics of capacity building of individuals within families, communities, work environments, and other contexts. Students apply knowledge from their programs of study to the issues of individuals, families, consumers, and communities in the environments in which they function to enable the wellness of those entities. Students integrate concepts of global interdependence as they related to individuals, families, consumers, and communities to their areas of

> specialization. Students understand resource development and sustainability and the impact that those concepts have on the growth of individuals, families, consumers, and communities. (AAFCS Council for Accreditation, 2001)

Besides the program foundations described by Standard 3, the other seven standards addressed in the 2001 accreditation document include: mission and goals, organization and administration, professional programs, faculty, students, learning resources, and facilities (AAFCS Council for Accreditation, 2001).

Secondary School Curriculum

While colleges and universities were developing an accreditation system, secondary schools were establishing guidelines for curriculum. In February 1961, a conference on home economics curriculum in secondary schools took place in Washington, DC. This conference sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education, marked the beginning of a national project which undertook identification of basic concepts and generalizations in five subject-matter areas of home economics important at the high school level (AHEA, 1967). Provoking the analysis of basic concepts was a 1959 study of secondary schools directed by Beulah Coon of the Home Economics Division of the U.S. Office of Education. Eight areas were identified as occurring in almost all secondary home economic courses: child development, clothing, consumer education, family relations, food / nutrition, health / first aid / home care of the sick, home furnishings / equipment, and management of resources. However, “in grades 7 through 11, one-half to three-fourths of the home economics class time was spent on the areas of food and clothing. Class time in the 12th grade was more evenly distributed among

the eight areas of instruction." The emphasis in foods was preparation and in clothing, the emphasis was construction (Coon, 1962). Clearly, the unbalanced focus of attention called for evaluation and reorganization.

On July 24-28, 1961, in French Lick, Indiana, a seminar was conducted by the Home Economics Division of the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges and State Universities to address a growing concern among college and university faculties over "problems of articulation and differentiation in home economics subject matter at the secondary, college, and adult education levels. . . . [The seminar's focus was the exploration of] the "concept approach" as a possible means of identifying, organizing, structuring, and unifying significant subject-matter content in the field of home economics" (Stage & Vincenti, 1997, p. 302).

Another conference was held in Washington, D.C. in January 1962 followed by seven workshops sponsored jointly by the Office of Education and various institutions of higher education beginning in the summer of 1962 and ending in June 1964. Outlines of concepts and generalizations for teaching five areas of home economics were developed in these conferences and workshops. The five areas organized were: human development and family, home management and family economics, foods and nutrition, textiles and clothing, housing. The outlines of concepts and generalizations followed a broad format similar to the early syllabus of 1913 and the 1930 syllabi revisions and were widely accepted and published in what was nicknamed, The Bird Book, derived from the soaring bird image on the front cover (AHEA, 1967). Secondary educators revised the content and in 1989 published *Home Economics*

Concepts: A Base for Curriculum Development (AHEA). More recently, in 1998, national standards for FCS education, delineating 16 standards for FCS secondary curriculum, were developed by the National Association of State Administrators for Family and Consumer Sciences (NASAFACS) in partnership with VTECS, Vocational and Technical Education Consortium of States (National Standards, 1998). These were published in the Yearbook 18 of the Education and Technology Division of the AAFCS and have been the subject of much discussion (Pullen, 2001; Reichelt, 2001, Good, 2000).

Specialization Increases in FCS Undergraduate Curriculum

While there are multiple forces that have influenced FCS undergraduate curriculum's move toward specialization, four have contributed significantly: women's education, feminism, the urban environment and university paradigms. All of these factors, in concert, impacted the American lifestyle, as well as the job market.

Role of women. When FCS was established as a discipline, few women attended college, and even fewer pursued interests outside the home (Blackwell, 1962). Gender discrimination was common and the need to educate women was often questioned and limited by school policy. During the progressive era of American history, the field of FCS provided a legitimate and socially accepted discipline for women's undergraduate studies, thus furthering the cause of women's education and careers. Many of the unmarried women educated in FCS of that period found employment in education or institutional management, but others pursued homemaking with their elevated status as a professional. Some viewed FCS simply as the preparation of women to fulfill their traditional

roles with the under girding of science, although more progressive thinkers envisioned FCS as an opportunity for “municipal housekeeping,” which was a term often used at the turn of the century to refer to social reform and public policy related to matters of the home and decent living (Stage, 1997).

After 40 years of existence, professionals in the field clearly understood the advantages of learning for the sake of both home and career. In fact, “home economics in most institutions of higher learning serves a triple purpose, namely, educating for personal development, for family living, and for professional specialization (Spafford, 1949, 26). This range of options available to FCS graduates was a selling point of the discipline in the first half of the century. “One of the greatest strengths in home economics is that it not only affords an opportunity to prepare for marriage and family living but also makes possible preparation for remunerative work in closely allied fields” (Spafford, 1949, 43). During the fiftieth anniversary celebration of AHEA in 1959, the clear appreciation for both homemaking and career as viable options for the FCS graduate, married or unmarried, is evident in the comments of Olga Brucher, president of AHEA:

> Where our first pioneers established the link between the academic and scientific approach and homemaking, we, the pioneers of today and tomorrow, can add a third dimension to this relationship through our contribution to the women in the home and in paid employment, whether this be sequential or simultaneous activity. (1959, p.10)

In fact, prospects for employment of graduates today have become increasingly important as a genuine concern of undergraduate programs, even more so that

its suitability for professional homemaking. Dr. Lela O'Toole, Dean of the College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University, admonished higher education to carefully plan curriculum so as to consider realistic career opportunities. She wanted to know, "Are our professional curriculums realistically planned so as to permit students to find employment in positions for which they are directly prepared?" (O'Toole, 1961, p.346) The move to more specialized FCS curricula began with a change in the graduate's priorities from homemaking to career opportunities in the job market.

Feminism and women's nontraditional pursuits. As the ideas of feminism took root in American culture during the 1970s and 1980s, FCS found itself the target of attack. Even though historically FCS had made significant contributions to the educational and career opportunities for women, the discipline was criticized by radical feminists of the day and found to be the enemy of social progress for women because of its perceived traditional values (Morgan, 1973; Berlage, 1998; Schneider, 2000). Addressing the 1972 annual meeting of AHEA, Robin Morgan, editor of the magazine *Ms.*, then called, *Sisterhood Is Powerful*, she opened her comments in this way:

> I gather from your literature and from the way home economics has functioned in this country that the main emphasis of your organization is to reinforce three primary areas: marriage, the family, and the issue of consumerism, which you may euphemistically call consumer protection. Now those three areas—the institution of marriage, the institution of the nuclear family, and the incredible manipulation of women as consumers—are three of

> the primary areas that the radical women's movement is out to destroy. So one could say that as a radical feminist, I am here addressing the enemy. (1973, p.13)

Morgan furthered her attack by stating that FCS women who wanted to improve the condition of women could begin by quitting their jobs as propagators of gender stereotypes (1973). Clearly, her inflammatory remarks were judged to hold some merit because Morgan's comments resulted in the formation of a committee on women's roles to consider these issues. Ultimately, the effect of the feminist movement on FCS undergraduate programs was the increased orientation toward careers and a de-emphasis on the role of homemaker. Women began to pursue non-traditional areas of study and the accompanying careers outside of FCS.

> The recent influx of women into higher education at all levels of study is one of the biggest changes in higher education. . . . women are, in dramatic numbers, moving into areas of study formerly considered nontraditional for them, while men largely do not venture into nontraditional areas. (Harper & Davis, 1986, p.15)

New educational choices for women in nontraditional areas would prove McGrath and Johnson accurate in their prediction that, "the occupational emancipation of women is steadily being realized" (1968, p. 82). In institutions across the United States, the purpose of education had been slowly shifting throughout the century from preparing liberally educated men and women for responsible citizenry to preparing graduates to earn an income (Tyler, 1962).

Urbanization and increased labor participation by women. McGrath and Johnson pointed out that other societal forces at work in 1968, such as the decreasing proportion of farm families and the trend toward urbanization, were also interwoven with the change in women's roles. "Urbanization has been accompanied by an increasing proportion of women who combine homemaking with careers outside the family" (p.81). They also noted that the move from the farm to the city decreased the need to teach certain domestic skills because families were less involved in household production. For example, city dwellers, unlike their rural counterparts, were less likely to grow, preserve, or prepare their own food.

> The American family has been transformed over the past century from a producing to a consuming unit. Hence families today are largely concerned with consumer needs, and home economics has responded with increased attention to problems of family finances and consumer education and protection. (p.82)

However, the wording of federal legislation targeting the needs of the rural homemakers through the programs of extension agencies and vocational education made the needed curricular adaptations to focus on urban families difficult politically and financially.

The increased labor force participation of women, combined with technological advances, drastically changed the day-to-day operation of the household, particularly the living patterns. These societal forces also impacted FCS curriculum as new solutions were devised to meet the changing needs of the family.

> Currently changes in living patterns are already creating different types of careers using home economics knowledge and skills and a reorientation within present career opportunities. A retooling of the applications of home economics subject-matter areas of study is again in order to help prepare leaders in home economics to apply and create technological developments that will increase potential benefits to day-to-day living patterns for individuals and families—a nontraditional approach to the day-to-day activities of individuals and families who, themselves, are already moving into nontraditional modes of living. (Harper & Davis, 1986, p.16)

University system of specialization. Higher education was influenced by the myriad of societal changes, not the least of which was the vast expansion of knowledge. Universities and colleges have responded to an ever increasing knowledge base and the pressure to expand it further through research by emphasizing specialization in their curriculum. As the volume of knowledge has increased, man's ability to know and learn has been stretched, trying to keep pace with the expansion of knowledge. In addition to a greater body of knowledge, a greater emphasis on research has also influenced the move toward intensive specialization. Specialization allows one to limit the area of knowledge to be studied, in order to learn it in great detail. However, accompanying this depth of knowledge in one area is a lack of breadth of knowledge gained from study in other areas. This has resulted in a general decrease of the integrative nature of the discipline. Increased specialization, which can be seen in the increasing complexity within colleges, schools, divisions, and departments, is the

university's solution to vastly expanded knowledge. This creates its own problems since more specialized research reduces the faculty's emphasis on teaching, and creates a narrower mindset in order to solve specific research problems rather than broadening its view to understand the interrelatedness of knowledge. Moreover, even the graduate training of most faculty members increasingly moves them toward specialization as they pursue the next level of graduate degree (Vincenti, 1990).

All of these influences moved FCS from its integrative roots with its strong emphasis on the interrelationships between people and their environment toward the demand for specialized, career-oriented curricula at the undergraduate level.

Negative Effects of Specialization of FCS Curriculum

Not everyone was pleased with the move toward specialization. One analyst, a professor and scholar of the history and philosophy of FCS, strongly warns FCS professionals of imminent disintegration if the course of specialization was continued.

> Its effectiveness and continued existence both as a discipline and a profession are threatened by specialization. . . . With continued emphasis on subject matter as it is organized into discrete disciplines rather than on interdisciplinary perspectives on such complex problems, our students will be at a disadvantage in today's world. Without a common commitment to a mission, a set of problems or concerns, and a philosophy, home economics higher education units and the profession as a whole seem to be heading for disintegration or dissolution. Our existence as a field is difficult

> to rationally and morally justify, if trends in the job market determine the establishment or elimination of higher education programs and if research funding sources heavily influence faculty research interests and therefore course content. (Vincenti, 1990, pp.187, 189-190)

Loss of integration. The roots of FCS were interdisciplinary as scholars and professionals from a wide range of academic interests met at Lake Placid to discuss this new integrated discipline. "From its inception, collegiate home economics was multidisciplinary and integrative with an emphasis on science applied to the real world of the home, families and communities" (From domesticity, 2001). Drawing from the fields of chemistry, biology, art, psychology, and economics, the discipline synthesized knowledge to create a new field of study with direct application to the improvement of daily living. The greatest concern for those with a historical appreciation for FCS was the apparent loss of integration that accompanied specialization.

While the field is becoming increasingly specialized, it is neglecting or deliberately weakening the integrative aspects of its individual higher-education curricula and of its accreditation standards. Concern about neglect of home economics' interdisciplinary potential has been documented for decades. Henderson (1954), McGrath (1968), Hook and Paulucci (1970), Horn and Nichols (1982), Green (1984), Brown (1985), McCullers (1987), Horn (1988), and Ley and Webb-Lupo (1988) are just a few of the many professionals who have expressed concern that home economics is losing its integrative perspective and mode of functioning. (Vincenti, 1990, p.187)

Losing integration, though, isn't just about historical sentimentality. In fact, professionals have decried that there has been a practical loss in that "home economists are less effective in their work to improve the lives of individuals and families" (Vincenti, 1990, p.187).

Societal fragmentation. Perhaps even more serious than the loss of historical tradition or even immediate and practical benefit to FCS practitioners due to overspecialization is societal fragmentation. Specialists working separately cannot solve the problems of today's society:

> [This requires] the ability to analyze situations, define problems, understand and critique personal and cultural values and meanings, seek appropriate information from many specialized fields, weigh it against conflicting value positions, make morally and rationally justifiable decisions, and subsequently take appropriate action. (Vincenti, 1990, p. 186)

Loss of connection to AAFCS. Membership of FCS professionals in the national association is declining for a few discernable reasons. First, specialists do not relate to the broad umbrella represented by AAFCS, but they rather choose to associate with the professional organizations that represent their particular area of specialization. For example, a FCS graduate majoring in foods and nutrition is more apt to relate to the American Dietetics Association than the AAFCS. The lack of public understanding of and appreciation for the mission of FCS may be also shared by specialized graduates within FCS so that they fail to identify with the broader discipline. Graduates might see themselves primarily as dieticians, not as FCS professionals. Second, some have tired of a general

disrespect toward their profession. “The struggle for legitimacy, as well as changes in academia itself, seem to have influenced the trend for home economics specializations to look outward toward their related disciplines rather than to focus on their original reason for being created” (Vincenti, 1990, p.184). Even faculty, with their great varieties of academic background can have stronger commitments to their specializations than to the discipline as a whole (McGrath, 1968; Bailey, Firebaugh, Haley & Nichols, 1993).

The Generalist Argument

Generalists within the FCS ranks would insist on the absolute priority of the problems of the family in understanding and appreciating FCS. When FCS is defined by describing its content areas in an attempt to break down a complex concept into its simpler parts, valuable meaning is lost because the whole of FCS is far more than the sum of the parts.

> Problems of families do not fit conveniently into narrow categories or disciplines. The family is a whole system which cannot be reduced to the sum of its parts; we must find ways to deal with all aspects of family life in terms of the interactions and relation between the parts. Clearly, home economics has the philosophical foundation for this kind of interdisciplinary activity – it is, in fact, the very essence of home economics. . . . The transition to interdisciplinary integrative approaches marks a significant stage in the developmental process of home economics becoming a true profession rather than a mere collection of specialties. (Horn, 1993, B-94)

To define FCS as a collection of specialties is to deny the first definitions of the field crafted at the Lake Placid conferences. It has been clearly understood, both historically and today, to be an interdisciplinary discipline, a study of the interrelatedness of man and his environment (Vincenti, 1990; AHEA, 1993).

> Home economics in its most comprehensive sense is the study of the laws, conditions, principles and ideals which are concerned on the one hand with man's immediate physical environment and on the other hand with his nature as a social being, and is the study specially of the relation between these two factors. In forming a complete definition . . . it may be possible to consider home economics as a philosophical subject, i.e., a study of relation, while the subjects upon which it depends, i.e., economics, sociology, chemistry, hygiene, and others, are empirical in their nature and concerned with events and phenomena. . . .Such a binding together is what is meant by home economics. (Lake Placid Conference, 1902, p.31)

The conclusion of McGrath and Johnson's 1968 study strongly supported the generalist's view.

> Home economics at the undergraduate level can best confirm its heritage and meet present challenges by retaining a strong generalist major, while expanding its interdisciplinary base in order to fully comprehend contemporary social problems and those of family life. . . .To achieve this goal, the broad curriculum, whether in

> home economics education or general home economics, must be systematic and interdisciplinary rather than a congeries of snippets of specialization. . . . In conclusion, the broad undergraduate home economics major that offers this wide cultural perspective cannot be neglected in favor of the home economic specialties. It offers greater potential for a systematic and comprehensive understanding of the family and community than do most other college majors, and it should continue to serve as the fundamental professional preparation for most students who plan to enter home economics in teaching and business. (McGrath & Johnson, 1968, pp. 88, 90)

Integrative nature of FCS. Creekmore would describe the integrative components of FCS as natural sciences, behavioral sciences, and expressive arts (1968). These thoughts are mirrored in Brown & Paolucci's description of a practical science that uses multiple scientific approaches to solve family problems, analytical-empirical, interpretive, and critical (1978).

> Interdisciplinary approaches to solving problems seem to have a wide range of support. We have lived with the scientific revolution long enough not only to have gained a great deal from it, but also to have recognized that the narrowness of its approach has created many problems. It is now becoming increasingly apparent that in today's world we need both depth and breadth of understanding. (Vincenti, 1990, p.187)

Human development / relationships, values and management are central to the concepts approach from the 1967 *Concepts and Generalizations*.

> Taken together, they provide a conceptual framework which can give the learner a view of home economics as a whole and which can help him to see the relationship of specific topics or skills to the basic concepts in both depth and breadth by teaching in such a way as to encourage the development of pertinent generalizations from all subject areas in home economics. (AHEA, 1967, p.54)

At the conference on Art in Home Economics, the integrative nature of home economics was brought to the forefront. Gertrude Nygren spoke to the attendees regarding the dynamic forces at work between the behavior of people and their environment. The resources of food, clothing, and shelter are "important because the nature of decisions about these resources create impacts which affect the quality of living" (True, 1962, p.828). Nygren used the term "interrelated humanized approach of the home economist to describe a way of thinking that focuses on the "improvement of the condition of man" (True, 1962, p 828). Dorothy O'Donnell concluded the conference on art and home economics by differentiating a home economics view from other viewpoints. "Our art aim in home economics is not to develop creative expression in the fine arts but rather to develop a creativity toward art in living" (True, 1962, p.829).

According to McGrath and Johnson, the body of knowledge for FCS encompasses many subject areas, but with a clear focus on the family, it can justify its breadth.

> Home economics is not a profession with a single distinct body of knowledge, skills and ethics. Like the whole of the educational enterprise, home economics is an area of human interest and concern that encompasses and impinges on a number of occupations and other life activities. From its beginnings, the preoccupation of the field has centered in the family as the milieu in which individuals grow and gain their basic learning in preparation for a productive, rewarding, and satisfying life. As the constitution of the AHEA declares, it has been concerned with the 'well-being of individuals and of families, the improvement of homes, and the preservation of values significant in home life.' (McGrath and Johnson, 1968, p.84)

Besides improving the well-being of particular families, as an applied profession, it also provides professional service to the well-being of families in society. This gives it a unique position within American culture.

> 'Family service' remains the integrative center of home economics, just as the phrase 'patient care' forms the core of nursing. If a single term is needed to indicate the core of home economics, we believe 'family service' to be as good as any. Although other professions ranging from medicine to social work encompass in their purview one or another kind of service to families, none of them so directly aims to serve the over-all well-being and maintenance of the family unit as does home economics. (McGrath & Johnson, 1968, p85)

Evolution of a core. To resolve the conflict between the specialists and the generalists, many professionals have suggested the identification and requirement of a common core of knowledge that reflects the needs of the majority of FCS students (Byrd, 1970; Green, 1989; Smith, 1990, 1995). In the first 50 years of the discipline, an intentionally defined core was not necessary because students within any given institution followed a general curriculum that was common to all.

> The traditional home economics content areas of textiles and clothing, housing and interior design, home management and consumer studies, foods and nutrition, and child development and family relations defined the field for the first 60 years of the 20th century. In higher education this content developed into courses which formed the home economics core curriculum. Most colleges and universities offering a baccalaureate degree in home economics required all home economics majors to take a similar core group of subjects. (Richards, 1998, p. 5)

The 1982 and 1984 Accreditation Criteria of AHEA identifies a common body of knowledge as a requirement of accredited programs in home economics. Requiring students to enroll in selected core classes has generally been the method of accomplishing this goal (LeBleu & Smith, 1994). Students may or may not however understand the relationship of these courses to one another or the bearing they have on the common body of knowledge (Smith, 1990).

McGrath and Johnson made specific recommendations regarding the FCS core in their 1968 study.

> Its instructional core ought to be the analysis of family structure and functioning; its value orientation, that of assistance to families, and its goal, the creation and enhancement of viable family life. These integrating principles provide the unity of concepts, skills, and values distinctive and necessary to the core of home economics. Without them, the generalist major will dissolve into chameleon-like eclecticism and the specialist majors will be mere technical preparation for specific jobs which are likely to be outdated in a few years. (1968, p. 88)

Blue Book's core curriculum.

In 1946, Mrs. Dora Lewis, in the course of her work with the committee that produced the Blue Book, gave a preliminary report regarding core curriculum noting that of the 19 institutions represented by the committee, the majority of them required "English, chemistry, psychology, economics, sociology, food preparation, nutrition, clothing construction, home management, family life, child development, and housing. However, no one thing was required by all curricula in all institutions" (Branegan, 1946b, p.10). "The Blue Book" later asserted that "The curriculum of a good home economics department provides an integrated program in education for home and family living required of all home economics majors. Such offerings are designated as the home economics core in many institutions" (Spafford, 1949, p.7). Expanding on that thought, the Blue Book further delineated the responsibilities of a department of home economics:

> [It] should take major responsibility for the courses focused specifically on problems of family living. These courses should be

> a unifying core provided for majors in home economics and available to students throughout the institution who wish to elect single courses or groups of courses of interest and value to them. Such a core in home economics should form the foundation for all the professional curricula offered in the home economics department. (Spafford, 1949, p. 32)

Then, specific curriculum suggestions were made:

> Suggested objectives in family life that would guide the development of a home economics curriculum include:
>
> - the understanding of the social and personal values in home and family life,
> - the understanding of the essential ways in which these values are attained,
> - a desire to achieve successful home and family life,
> - basic skills and abilities necessary for successful family life, and
> - an appreciation of the increasing satisfactions through growth of skills and maturity in family life
>
> The specific areas of learning include:
>
> - personal development,
> - family relations and development,
> - child growth and development,
> - personal and family health,

- management,
- housing, furnishings, and equipment,
- food and nutrition for personal and family needs,
- clothing and textiles for personal and family needs, and
- community aspects of family living

(Spafford, 1949, pp.36-37)

Smith's core curriculum.

The family is the centerpiece of all the content areas of Family and Consumer Sciences (O'Toole, 1961). It is the hub of the wheel from which all others radiate. Based on the 1984 Accreditation standards, Frances Smith identified this central focal point and commented that the student's ability to "conceptualize the synergistic, integrative nature of the home economics profession in its entirety would be a desired outcome in required core experiences" (1990, p.17). Using the work of Beavens, Bobeng, Crey, Miler, Norem, and Shibles , published in 1980, which included four specific courses: Introduction to Home Economics, Family Life Development, Human Nutrition, and Home Economics as a Profession, Smith developed a home economics core for her purpose of evaluating undergraduate student outcomes. The accreditation documents of 1982 list the following content areas as essential to the program of an accredited home economics program: "family, human growth and development, nutrition, management of human and material resources, aesthetics, influence of science, technology, and consumer economics and philosophical base of home economics" (Smith, 1995). Based on the recommended core curriculum of one large state university and the accreditation

documents of 1982 and 1984, Smith identified seven areas of competency. The areas were human development, nutrition, professional development, educational principles, design or aesthetics, public policy, and management. She also included computer literacy because it seemed relevant to the coming technology flood. Smith wrote behavior statements that reflected the "integrative nature of home economics and . . . its focus on the family" (Smith, 1990, p.19). Later, Smith wrote that "Home economics is viewed not as a single discipline but as a professional field dealing with the practical, domestic, and private aspects of human life (family life) in the broad environment" (1995, p. 351). Her revised list for the common knowledge base is as follows:

> Human / family development over the life span, human nutrition, resource management, aesthetics / design, and the home economics profession. The integrative relationships among categories are facilitated by the focus on the practical problems of home and family. The processes are education (communication), public policy, and professional development (LeBleu & Smith,1991b).
>
> (Smith, 1995, pp.351-352)

Smith then provides greater detail as she describes exactly what was meant by these core areas:

- Human development: knowledge of stages in the life cycle that builds on the similarities among people and fosters personal and global understanding among peoples in

families of different racial, ethnic, and national origins (Nolan & Clawson, 1992).

- Nutrition: the interrelatedness of food, culture, and nutrient needs during the different stages of the life cycle.
- Management: interrelatedness of the family and its environment in evaluation of resources, consideration of alternative actions, and initiation of communication.
- Design: the role of design (its components and principles) in the home and community to enhance well-being.
- Home economics profession: the discipline, its basic books and primary documents, the understanding of the experiences of outstanding people, and the ideas and events that have shaped the discipline.
- Education principles: the ability to plan, to prepare, to use, and to evaluate mateials for appropriate audiences.
- Public policy: participation not only in civic and cultural affairs (Pace, 1979; Pascarella, Ethington, & Smart, 1988; Sims, 1992) but also in the formation and evaluation of public policy as it affects families.
- Professional development: use of management and communication skills to keep up-to-date in doing the work of the profession.

(Smith, 1995, p. 352)

Richards' types of core curriculum. Virginia Richards describes six different types of FCS core curriculums utilized by 19 historically significant colleges and universities: the *evolving* core, the *full* core, the *partial* core, the *exempted* core, the *elective* core, and *no* core. The evolving core describes the curriculum in which only one major was offered, so all students experienced a similar program. The full core describes a program that required all students within a FCS unit to take at least one course from each of the six content areas: child development and family studies, foods and nutrition, clothing and textiles, consumer and management, housing and interior design, and professional foundations or development. The partial core is similar to the full core except that only one to five courses were required, marking the lessening of the importance of a generalist's view. The exempted core allowed some less traditional majors, such as hotel and restaurant management to be exempted from the core, while the other majors were required to take the core courses. The elective core required students to take a certain number of courses within FCS, but outside their major. The students were allowed to choose which courses they would take. Lastly, no core designated very specialized programs that did not have even one course common to all its students (Richards, 1998, pp. 68-70).

> During the last thirty years, the traditional core subjects have applied diminishing influence on the profession. Forces such as changing family patterns, increasing numbers of women in the labor force, technological changes, specialized accreditation, the women's movement, the increase of men entering the field,

> government priorities, and research agendas have altered home economics programs in higher education into more fragmented and departmentalized specialties (Bailey, Firebaugh, Haley and Nickols, 1993). (Richards, 1998, p.6)

Categorizing FCS Content or Subject Matter

Defining FCS is a difficult task, though many have offered their thoughts on the matter. (Lake Placid Conferences, 1899-1908; Alderman, 1948; AHEA Committee on Philosophy, 1959; East, 1965; Creekmore, 1968; McGrath, 1968; Byrd, 1970; Brown & Paolucci, 1978; Mangel, 1978; Vincenti, 1990; AHEA, 1993; Davis, 1993; Richards, 1998; Anderson & Nickols, 2001; From Domesticity, 2001). Clarity seems to be the issue. In 1970, speaking for the Association of Administrators of Home Economics, Dr. Flossie Byrd gave criteria for a good definition of FCS: It must identify and verbalize “an inner center or wholeness” and a “knowledge spectrum [that] is delineated” (p. 414). She expresses both the general breadth of knowledge that’s integrative, while also including the depth of knowledge necessary within a defined content area.

In this section of the literature review, the multiple ways that FCS content areas have been categorized by different organizations and institutions in the past will be described. This will be considered at length in order to develop a basis for categorizing curriculum for this present research study. In no way is this categorization to be interpreted as a definition of FCS since it has already been established that FCS is far more than the sum of its parts. Some organizational strategies will not be considered appropriate for this particular study, but they will be included to show the complexity of the matter and the

great diversity of approaches. Also to be remembered is that the content areas have evolved as society has changed and the discipline itself has grown.

Historical categories of FCS subject matter. FCS subject matter has expanded and the depth of specialization into specific content areas has increased, but at least some FCS professionals would agree with Harper and Davis that "the subject-matter areas subsumed under home economics continue to be well defined and easily recognized with succinct title descriptions (1968, p.15). However, the designations for the same content area were often variously named. For example, in the area of family studies, some would divide this into child development, early childhood education, and family relations, while others would include all of these content areas broadly under the title of human development. The 1913 Syllabus of Home Economics, published by AHEA, divided the content of the discipline into four distinct areas: food, clothing, shelter, and institutional management (AHEA Committee on Nomenclature and Syllabus. (1913). The 1930 revisions to the syllabus included: the family and its relationships, family economics, the house, food and nutrition, and textiles and clothing (McNeal, 1931, 1935, 1936, 1940; Wilson, Gross, Gunselman, & Morin, 1935; Wood, Lindquist, Robinson, Staples, Vincent, Wylie, et al.,1935; Kyrk, Andrews, Monroe, & Reid, 1936; Biester, Giddings, Koehne, & Munsell, 1940; Callahan, Denwy, Whitlock, Rathbone & Jacobson, 1941) . These same five broad divisions of content are commonly used today, although the 1949 Blue Book added education and extension as a content area and combined home management, family economics, housing and equipment as one area. Coon's 1959 Office of Education study divided child development and family relations

into two areas, expanded consumer education, management of resources, and home furnishings / equipment into three separate areas, and then added health, first aid, and home care of the sick as an eighth category. The Department of Education divided FCS into 13 divisions for degree reporting. Added to the basic five divisions mentioned earlier were eight additional divisions including:

- general home economics
- home economics education
- extension, welfare, and community service
- art and interior design
- business
- communications, journalism
- institution, hotel, restaurant, and management
- other

The 1967 Bird Book returned to the basic five: human development and the family, home management and family economics, foods and nutrition, textiles and clothing, and housing. Today the Classification of Instructional Program (CIP) codes used by the U.S. government for degree reporting lists 27 areas under FCS. For a detailed listing of the various divisions used to describe FCS subject areas, see Appendix A.

AAFCS sections and divisions. The AHEA is organized in such a way that it has two descriptive categories for individual members, professional sections which designate members according to their professional work environments and subject-matter divisions which categorize members according to their special subject matter interest. The professional sections include

business, colleges / universities / research, elementary / secondary / adult education, extension, home and community, and human services. The divisions include apparel and textiles, family economics and resource management, family relations and human development, housing and environment, nutrition / health / food management, art and design, communication, education and technology, and internationals (AAFCS Professional and Subject, 1971; AAFCS, 2003). Communications was added as a subject-matter division in 1971.

HEARTH topic organization. Home Economics Archives: Research, Tradition, and History (HEARTH) is the online archive of Home Economics documents, housed at the Albert R. Mann Library of Cornell University in Ithaca, New York. The first phase of this project has made available 934 books and 218 volumes from 8 journals dating from 1850 to 1925. More recently added documents are dated through the 1970s. These early documents have been divided into the following topics:

- applied arts and design
- child care, human development and family studies
- clothing and textiles
- food and nutrition
- home management
- housekeeping and etiquette
- housing, furnishing, and home equipment
- hygiene
- institutional management

- retail and consumer studies
- teaching and communication

FCS body of knowledge. In January 2000, a group of 20 FCS professionals gathered at the headquarters of the AAFCS to begin the work of articulating the body of knowledge for the beginning of the new century. They reviewed many of the historically significant documents, engaged in dialogue, and reached consensus concerning a philosophical framework for the Family and Consumer Sciences body of knowledge including integrative concepts and specific content areas. The integrative concepts and specific content areas shared "the basic assumption that the focus of work was within a family and community system with ecological perspective." (Baugher et al., p. 4)

The FCS body of knowledge emerged as an image of fabric woven together with integrative threads cutting across the threads of the specializations. The cross cutting threads were listed as basic human needs, communication skills, public policy, critical thinking, diversity, global perspectives, professionalism, independence, dependence and interdependence of creativity thinking, community development, technology, and
moral, ethical, and spiritual development. The threads of specialization listed in this early draft included health, food for basic nutrition and health, and future scientific developments in creation of foods, clothing and textiles, shelter, economics and management, relationships and social leadership, and wellness.

One premise of the presented model was that "family and community systems, resource acquisition and management, and human lifespan development is fundamental to the knowledge base" (Baugher et al., 2000, p. 4).

While “basic human needs” is central to the model, “a continuing trend in the field is the need for FCS professionals to function as specialists, requiring both considerable depth in one subject area specialization and the ability to integrate concepts from other areas of the FCS knowledge base” (Baugher et al., 2000, p.4). This meeting and the resulting journal article were seen as the beginning of an “evolutionary [process that will] continue to be refined” (Baugher et al., 2000, p.5).

Since 2000, two related articles were published in the Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences: one that describes the use of human systems theory in focusing the content of family and consumer sciences and the other that defines the conceptual model of the body of knowledge that was given a skeleton form in the 2000 article (Nichols, 2003; Anderson & Nichols, 2001).

Undergraduate programs and graduation trends by content area. The Committee on Standards for Membership included a chapter in the Blue Book of the most frequently offered professional curricula at the undergraduate level.

> These include Family Development; Child Development, emphasizing nursery school teaching; Teacher Education; Extension Teaching; Foods, Nutrition, and Institution Administration, emphasizing dietetics, institution management, and commercial work in foods; Clothing and Textiles, emphasizing retailing, and fashion and design; Related Art; and Household Equipment. (Spafford, 1949, p. 42)

According to McGrath (1968), wide variety in breadth and depth exists in curricula in home economics. In the early sixties, a comparison of one of the

smallest programs and the largest program illustrated the large range among home economics programs. A small program graduated five students in two programs and taught 12 courses a semester while a large program had 292 graduates across 27 majors and taught 137 courses during a semester. “Indeed, with the variety of specialties offered by most of the institutions the only simple conclusion is that variety abounds among them (McGrath,1968, p.25).

The FCS degrees offered by state and land grant institutions in 1965 were recorded by McGrath (1968, p.23) as well as the FCS degrees offered by American colleges and universities in 1963-64 (p.21). In rank order, with the most frequently chosen major first, the FCS degrees offered were as follows:

- Home Economic Education
- Textiles, clothing design
- Foods, nutrition, dietetics
- Child development, family life
- General home economics
- Home management/equipment/economy
- Institutional/hotel/restaurant management
- Home economics extension
- Communications
- Other

The students in the early sixties majoring in home economics education and general home economics account for nearly three-fourths of the home economic degrees awarded in the U.S. (McGrath, 1968). Larger state institutions and land

grant institutions offered greater choice in home economic programs. Among these institutions, nine out of ten offered a major in home economics education, eight out of ten offered foods, nutrition, or dietetics, seven out of ten offered textile and clothing design five out of ten offered child development or family relations, five out of ten offered general home economics, and one fourth to one eighth offered home management, institutional management, extension, and communications.

The U.S. Office of Education divides home economics into thirteen subject-matter divisions. “Historically six areas have provided approximately 90% of baccalaureate degrees awarded annually in home economics” (Harper, 1986, p.6). The six most popular areas of undergraduate study were identified as follows:

- art / interior design
- child development / family relations
- food / nutrition / dietetics
- general home economics
- home economics education
- textiles / clothing / science, design and merchandising

As specializations increased in popularity, the number of graduates in general programs declined. By the 1980’s, the numbers had shifted so that a major in clothing and textiles ranked first as the choice of home economics graduates, followed by foods and nutrition, and then family and child studies (Harper, 1986). “More than 90% of the programs included instruction in the areas of food and nutrition; child development / family relationships; clothing and textiles; family

economics and home management; home economics education; and housing, equipment, and interior design" (Robertson, 1998, p.174).

Hospitality education was expected to become a popular major and an area of high positive growth for FCS programs (Harper & Davis 1968), but its success has been somewhat modest. It seems reasonable that the integration of business, foods, lodging, and service would find a good fit in FCS programs and provide students with many career opportunities in a growing industry and many argued for its inclusion in FCS programs (Schmelzer, Costello, Blalock, & Meszaros, 1989). However, in 1982-83, only 50 of the 339 undergraduate units of home economics awarded degrees in Institution / Hotel / Restaurant Management producing 771 of 20,510 FCS graduates (Harper, 1986, pp.7, 14).

According to the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Educational Statistics Fall 2002 survey, 18,153 students graduated in 2001-2002 with bachelor's degrees in FCS. The greatest numbers of graduates were in family development studies with over 30% of the total degrees. Next in rank order was food and nutrition studies, followed by general home economics, clothing and textile studies, and family and consumer resource management.

Harper and Davis (1986) asked, "How many subject-matter areas should be available in a college or university unit of home economics in order to form a sound basis for a productive baccalaureate program?" (p.15) While this study may not answer this question directly, it will attempt to clarify the current practices of FCS undergraduate programs in regards to the inclusion of particular content areas in the course offerings.

Chapter 3: Research Design and Methodology

Descriptive Research

Given the purpose of this research study, a quantitative approach was considered to be appropriate. Descriptive characteristics of FCS higher education units are examined with a focus on the curriculum content. The presence or absence of particular parts of the body of knowledge is discovered through a content analysis (Neuendorf, 2002; Robson, 2002) of course titles and course descriptions in the catalogs of AAFCS accredited units in the Southeast.

Population

The chosen population includes those schools that offered FCS programming leading to the bachelor's degree which are accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) and the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS). Thirty-four schools meet these criteria.

Procedure / Method

Demographic information pertaining to the schools and their FCS programs was obtained from their respective 2003-2004 catalogs, web pages, and the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) of the National Center for Education Statistics of the US Department of Education. An EXCEL database was developed to record the data so that similar information was gathered from each institution. The data gathered includes demographic, program, and course information; specifically, the name, state, and student enrollment of the school, the organizational structure of the FCS unit, published

mission statement, contact information, names of majors and specializations offered in the FCS bachelor's program, and course offerings.

In order to explore the curriculum from a variety of perspectives, two different sets of categories were used to analyze the course offerings. The first set listed 28 curricular elements commonly used to describe FCS content areas that were gleaned from the review of literature. The second set of curricular elements was drawn from the 16 national standards for secondary programs published in 1998. A curricular element was described as present or absent based on the presence in the course title or course description of the identical language of the category name or other specific keywords. Keywords were words judged to be synonyms or commonly used descriptive words that convey equivalent ideas. These words were identified and used to guide the coding of the curriculum of each institution. The exact worksheet that includes the categories and keywords that were used for coding purposes is included in Appendix D.

Determining the appropriate key words was in some cases very simple and in others quite complex. A straightforward example of the selection of a keyword would be the use of *apparel* as an acceptable equivalent for *clothing*, and *retailing* was accepted for *merchandizing*. Others were slightly more difficult; for example; *family relations* was coded to include *parenting* or *marriage*, and the category of *early childhood* was accepted as present if such keywords as *infancy, preschool,* or *child development* were used in the course title or description. The most difficult to code involved those items with either nonstandard or vague descriptives, which then necessitated perhaps subjective

inclusion or exclusion. For example, *consumer economics* was differentiated from *resource management*, so that even if the exact terms were used, the meaning of the title, elaborated upon in the course description, had to convey meaning along the lines of economic theory, not just decision making and consumer roles. *Public policy* was coded as present only if the main thrust of the course was government or business policy related to FCS areas, such as accessibility codes in housing, family policy, or consumer protection law. *Human development* was present if courses with keywords like *lifespan development* or *human needs over the lifecycle* were used, or if smaller divisions of human development such as *adolescent development* or *adult development* were used.

Guidelines were also developed so that the presence or absence of category names or keywords was not the only criteria for counting a content area to be present or absent in the curriculum. In some cases, judgment was required due to the unusual context or use of words. For instance, some courses were rejected or counted absent even though the exact title of the category was used if the course description did not confirm the category. In addition, a course could be counted for more than one category of content, perhaps even three, although it was judged unlikely that one course could with any depth or sufficiency convey the content of several areas. When such broad course descriptions were coded, an attempt was made to choose and count as present the primary content area alone. A content area was not counted as present if it did not have at least one course primarily devoted to its study. Likewise, if the category was mentioned in the course description, but it was obviously not the main thrust of the course, the mere mentioning of that keyword was not enough to count the element present.

For example, applied art and design might be mentioned in any number of courses, but if a course was not primarily aimed at teaching or applying art and design, it was not counted for that category of the curriculum. Another example of this circumstance involves the category *interpersonal relationships*. Many family courses include a mention of interpersonal relationships, but the context was clearly within the family, so that course was not used to count interpersonal relationships present. *Nutrition and wellness* was a category in the standards that had similarity to the standard for *food science, dietetics, and nutrition*, so the emphasis on the former category became *wellness*. If a significant part of the course didn't emphasize wellness, then it would not have been counted as present, although it would possibly have counted as a nutrition course.

As each curriculum was examined, judgment continued to be necessary for determining the presence or absence of a content area and thus the need for clear explanation of the reasoning behind these judgments. *Consumer services*, *human services, extension* or *community services*, or *family and community services* had to show some specific training, knowledge of, or preparation for agencies or organizations providing *services* in these content areas, rather than just knowledge of those content areas alone. *Facilities management* was not considered food service facilities, but rather some other kind such as housing, hotels, etc., since there was already a specific category for food service management. Similarly, *hospitality, tourism,* and *recreation* was considered separate from restaurant management which would have been included under food service. *Food technology* was considered more advanced than food science. It would also be experimental in nature or include the potential of recipe

development or new food processing techniques. *Apparel design* was more than construction, alterations, or tailoring, but would include the creation of a pattern or concept. *Equipment and furnishings* would include a broad array of items from household systems such as heating and cooling units to household appliances to furniture and decorative items. *FCS history and philosophy* was counted present if the keyword *foundations* was used, but not if the course involved simply a definition of the discipline or an exploration of careers in the field. *Communication* was some sort of media that provided information about FCS content, like journalism or web page development, or demonstrations. *Technology* was more than library research tools or basic word processing skills; the technology had to have a specific application to FCS like computer assisted design, diet analysis programs, or financial software. *Integration* was not counted present because a course had integrative components like psycho-social aspects of clothing, but was counted as present if the purpose of the course was to demonstrate the interrelated and/or synergistic nature of FCS content address family problems. Specific words like interaction, synergy, or wholeness had to be used. *International* described more than the multicultural nature of the United States. It was used for courses such as international trade, international foods and cuisine, international views of family systems in a global manner.

Once the categories were chosen, keywords were identified, and guidelines developed, the researcher attempted to exercise consistency and accuracy in the coding of the curriculum. The course information was evaluated multiple times. The purpose of the first analysis was to develop the keywords and test the

usefulness of the categories chosen. In the second analysis, keywords and categories were highlighted in the catalogs and marked on the keyword evaluation worksheet. Once a course was determined to contain a particular curricular element, that element was counted as present. The strength of a school's curriculum in a particular content area was not noted, but only its presence or absence was noted. Every course was examined carefully so that no category was counted absent when it was actually present. At the same time, once a category was counted as present, the purpose of this study had been served, so there was no need to mark or note similar courses. Any judgment that wasn't clearly defined by the category names and keywords was noted, and after consideration, the decision rendered became a guideline for similar cases encountered again in another school's curriculum. A pilot test for intercoder reliability was helpful to clarify the keywords and guidelines. After one minor adjustment to the keywords, the reliability check revealed no further problems. Finally, the courses were then evaluated a third time by the researcher, to ensure consistency and to eliminate or reduce errors in the data.

Data and Analysis

In regard to the demographic data, basic program descriptions were gathered so that the curriculum content areas might be found to show patterns in small or large schools or according to the majors and specializations offered.

Nominal data was the curricular elements or content areas that were coded as present or absent in each school's program. Frequency counts were tabulated to reveal elements that are common to the majority of programs. This

was also expressed in percentages. High and low counts and percentages were particularly important to note.

Chapter 4: Results and Findings

Description of the Population

First, this research study limits its focus to include only those schools accredited by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). This includes the Southeastern states of Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia. Second, the schools offered a bachelor's degree in one or more areas of FCS. Third, the FCS unit must be accredited by the American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS). Thirty-four schools meet these three criteria. AAFCS currently lists 53 schools nationwide that are accredited, so although this research field was limited to the Southeastern region, this nonetheless represents a majority of the accredited AAFCS institutions.

Additional distinctions of the population can be made. Of the 34 schools that qualified for the study, 33 were universities and 1 was a college. Also, 32 were public schools, 2 were private, 19 were state schools, while 13 were land-grant institutions. These facts speak to the wide variety that exists among these FCS units.

Student population. The schools can be described by the size of the institution as measured by student population. The broad range of student populations was found to be 2,446 – 32,941, with an average student population of 14,120. The distribution is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Student Populations of FCS Institutions

Size by Student Population		Actual Population	Number of Schools
Small	1,000 - 5,000	2,446 – 4,568	6
Medium	5,000 - 10,000	5,728 – 9,115	9
Large	10,000 - 20,000	10,159 – 19,584	11
Mega	over 20,000	21,163 – 32,941	8

Organization and names of FCS units. A distinctively difficult element of researching FCS programs is the diversity of their organizations and names. Organization begins with the institution itself—is it a university or college? Six universities housed FCS units within colleges or schools. These units were named variously: three were called the College [or School] of Human Sciences, one was the College of Human Environmental Sciences, one was the College of Family and Consumer Sciences, and one was the School of Human Ecology. Determining the presence of the discipline of FCS at an institution becomes more difficult when it is subsumed within apparently non-related disciplines or below various organizational levels. Of the institutions studied, various organizational structures existed, beginning with the whole university or college, then moving downward into smaller units such as a college or school, then another layer of college or school reversed according to the first layer, followed by divisions, groups of departments, departments, and even one special program without a particular organizational designation. One might not easily find the FCS unit within a School of Agriculture or Health or in a department within a school within a college within a university. Four FCS units in this study were organized in a school or college within a college or school which was within a university. For example, they were located within the College of Human Environmental Sciences in the School of Agriculture, the School of Human Resources in the College of Applied Life Sciences the School of Family and Consumer Sciences in the College of Health and Human Sciences, and the School of Human Ecology in the College of Agriculture and Human Ecology.

The most difficult organizational pattern to discern existed when there was no single cohesive model, for example choosing which departments out of a larger unit made up the FCS unit. A FCS unit could be either a group of several departments within a larger college or school, or as they were sometimes organized, a division within a college or school. These were the division of FCS in the College of Education, the division of FCS in the College of Agricultural, Family and Consumer Sciences or several departments within the College of Education, Health, and Human Sciences. Twenty units were organized as departments within a larger college or school with 15 using the name Family and Consumer Sciences, 3 Human Sciences, 1 Human Environment and Family Sciences, and 1 Human Ecology. For a complete listing of the FCS units by name and organization, see Appendix E.

FCS units were called by a variety of names, with the greatest diversity occurring on the school or college level. Nineteen units were called Family and Consumer Sciences, fourteen used some form of Human Sciences, eleven used some form of Arts and Sciences, ten used some configuration of Agriculture, and five used some form of Education. Overall, there were 28 different configurations of 22 words used to compose the titles of these FCS units. The most highly used words were Sciences, Family, Consumer, Human, Agriculture, and Applied. Table 2 shows the occurrences of the most commonly used words.

Majors and specializations offered. Compounding the difficulty of FCS programs being variously named, each unit offers various types of programs as well. The FCS units in this study offered 1 to 12 majors in FCS related areas. Seven units offered a single major in Family and Consumer Sciences, nine

Table 2

Frequencies of Words by which FCS Units are Named

Frequently Used		Occasionally Used		Used Once	
Sciences	47	Environmental	5	Home Economics	1
Family	22	Education	5	Allied Programs	1
Sciences	22	Ecology	4	Resources	1
Human	16	Arts	4	Natural	1
Agriculture	10	Life	2	Professional	1
Applied	8	Technology	2	Fine	1
				Behavioral	1

units offered two or three majors, ten units offered four or five majors, and eight units offered six to twelve majors. Some FCS related areas were also offered in other academic units in the institution, but those were not included in this study. For example, some universities would have interior design or hospitality or early childhood education housed in an academic unit other than FCS. Twenty-three FCS units included a major in Family and Consumer Sciences. A major in Foods and Nutrition was included by 20 units and next in frequency were majors in FCS education, Child and Family Studies, and Child Development or Early Childhood. All the majors offered in the various programs are clustered by category in Table 3.

Of the units offering a major entitled Family and Consumer Sciences, specializations or concentrations were often also offered within the major. The two most frequently offered concentrations were FCS education / Teacher licensure or Foods / Nutrition. Child Development and Family Studies, Fashion Merchandizing, General FCS, and Interior Design ranked next in the concentration offerings. Last of all, some programs offered Child Development, Consumer Relations, and Food Service Management as a concentration within the FCS major.

The most commonly offered major among these Southeastern schools was general FCS and FCS education, even though the fall 2002 report of 2001-2002 FCS graduates from the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) show a national pattern with general FCS as the third most chosen major behind family development and foods and nutrition. According to the NCES data base for 2002-2003 graduates, this Southeastern population of AAFCS accredited

Table 3

Majors Offered in FCS Academic Units

Category Cluster	Number of Units Offering Major	Typical Names of Majors
Family and Consumer Sciences 38 majors in this area	23 15	Family and Consumer Sciences Family and Consumer Sciences Education
Child and Family Studies 31 majors in this area	13 13 5	Child and Family Studies Child Development or Early Childhood Human Development and Family Studies
Apparel and Textiles 23 majors in this area	9 6 4 4	Fashion Merchandizing Apparel, Design, and Merchandizing Apparel & Textiles Apparel Design
Foods and Nutrition 23 majors in this area	20 3	Foods and Nutrition Nutrition and Hospitality
Consumer Services and Merchandizing 11 majors in this area	5 6	Consumer Services Merchandizing
Housing and Interiors 10 majors in this area	8 2	Interior Design Housing
Hospitality	7	Hospitality
Health Related 5 majors in this area	2 1 1 1	Athletic Training Diet, Nutrition, Fitness Exercise Science Health

schools reported 2664 graduates in FCS programs. The largest number of graduates was in the area of Family and Child Development with 1092, followed by 767 general FCS majors, then 291 Apparel and Textiles graduates, 241 Consumer Economics graduates, 169 Foods and Nutrition graduates, 54 Housing graduates, and 23 Family Communication graduates. Unfortunately, this data reported on a school-by-school basis, was found to conflict with the majors listed as available from that institution on more than one occasion. Perhaps some merchandising majors were listed as incorrectly as consumer economics majors. At any rate, these inconsistencies cause the researcher to refrain from drawing any conclusions based on these particular findings.

Curricular Element Evaluation

Basic program descriptions were gathered so that the curriculum content areas might be found to show patterns in small or large schools or according to the majors and specializations offered. However, the only correlation found between the descriptive variables collected from each institution indicated a significant positive relationship between the school's student population and the number of FCS majors offered [r(32)=.617, p. 01]. However, there was no correlation found between the total number of curricular elements present and the number of majors offered by an institution, nor was there any correlation between the total number of curricular elements and the student population.

Curricular Elements

In order to discover the curricular elements held in common, the course offerings of each FCS unit were analyzed using two sets of categories of curricular elements. The first set listed 28 elements, derived from the FCS

literature, that were commonly used divisions of FCS content areas (see Appendix B). The second set of elements came directly from the 16 national standards for secondary programs published in 1998 (See Appendix C). The curricular elements or content areas were coded as present or absent in each school's program. Frequency counts were tabulated to reveal elements that were common to the majority of programs. This was also expressed in percentages. High and low counts and percentages were particularly important to note. Those elements that were present in 85% of the schools were considered to show a very strong presence. Those elements present in 70-84% of the schools were considered to show a strong presence. Presence, some presence and little presence were indicated by percentages of 55-69%, 40-54%, and 25-39%.

28 literature derived categories. When the course offerings were evaluated using the 28 literature derived categories, the elements with very strong presence included child development, family studies, nutrition, clothing, foods, resource management, food service management, merchandising, early childhood education, human development, and textiles. The elements with a strong presence were education, equipment and furnishings, and housing. The elements with a fair showing of presence were international, technology, food technology, public policy, human and community service / extension, apparel design, interior design, integrative, and FCS history and philosophy. Elements with some presence were consumer economics and applied art / design. The elements with the lowest presence across FCS programs were communication,

health, and hospitality. Table 4 gives the ranked order of presence of the curricular elements using 28 historically derived categories.

16 secondary standards categories. When the 16 secondary standards were used to categorize undergraduate course offerings, eight categories indicated a very strong presence with at least 85% of the schools offering the element in their curriculum. The elements indicating a very strong presence were early childhood, resource management, family, food science / dietetics / nutrition, food production services, textiles and apparel, parenting, and housing / interiors / and furnishings. The elements indicating strong presence in the undergraduate curriculum were human development and nutrition and wellness. The curricular element of family and community services was present in 68% of the schools, indicating a fair presence. Five elements were found to have little presence or very little presence, designated by a percentage of 3-32%. These elements were facilities management, hospitality / tourism / recreation, interpersonal relationships, consumer services, and balancing work and family. Table 5 gives shows the specific percentages and numbers of schools that included these 16 curricular elements in their course offerings.

Table 4

Ranked Order of Presence of Literature Derived FCS Categories

	Curricular element was present in this . . .		Categories of Curricular Elements
	percentage of schools	number of schools	
Very Strong Presence	85-100%	29-34	
	100	34	Child Development
	100	34	Family Studies
	97	33	Nutrition
	94	32	Clothing
	94	32	Foods
	94	32	Resource Management
	91	31	Food Service Management
	91	31	Merchandising
	88	30	Early Childhood Education
	85	29	Human Development
	85	29	Textiles
Strong Presence	70-84%	24-28	
	74	25	Education
	74	25	Equipment & Furnishing
	74	25	Housing
Presence	55-69%	19-23	
	68	23	International
	68	23	Technology
	65	22	Food Technology
	65	22	Public Policy
	65	22	Human & Community
	61	21	Services / Extension
	59	20	Apparel Design
	56	19	Interior Design
	56	19	Integrative
			FACS History & Philosophy
Some Presence	40-54%	14-18	
	53	18	Consumer Economics
	41	14	Applied Art / Design
Little Presence	25-39%	9-13	
	38	13	Communication
	35	12	Health
	32	11	Hospitality

Table 5

Ranked Order of Presence of 16 Secondary FCS Categories

	Curricular element was present in this . . .		Categories of Curricular Elements
	percentage of schools	number of schools	
Very Strong Presence	85-100%	29-34	
	100	34	Early Childhood
	97	33	Resource Management
	97	33	Family
	97	33	Food Science / Dietetics / Nutrition
	94	32	Food Production Services
	94	32	Textiles & Apparel
	91	31	Parenting
	88	30	Housing / Interiors / and Furnishings
Strong Presence	70-84%	24-28	
	82	28	Human Development
	74	25	Nutrition & Wellness
Presence	55-69%	19-23	
	68	23	Family and Community Services
Some Presence	40-54%	14-18	
Little Presence	25-39%	9-13	
	32	11	Facilities Management
	32	11	Hospitality / Tourism / Recreation
	26	9	Interpersonal Relationships
Very Little Presence	0-24%	0-8	
	15	5	Consumer Services
	3	1	Balancing Work & Family

Chapter 5: Conclusions and Recommendations

This study of undergraduate programs was undertaken to create a current portrait of Family and Consumer Sciences programs and to determine whether common ground exists among the various academic units particularly in the area of curriculum content. Thirty-four schools having accreditation with SACS and AAFCS were chosen as the population to be studied. Two lists of curricular element categories were used to evaluate the programs: a 28 item list derived from historical categorizations used in professional journals and educational reporting and a 16 item list taken from the national standards for FCS in secondary programs. The subject matter categories or curricular elements were used to evaluate the course titles and course descriptions of a unit's course catalog. Curricular elements included in the curriculum of a majority of the FCS units were determined to constitute the common ground or knowledge base among FCS units. The answer to the research question, "Are there common curricular elements that constitute a general consensus regarding the body of knowledge for Family and Consumer Sciences higher education programs," is a definite "yes." Specifically, 85% or more of the programs included child development, family studies, nutrition, clothing, foods, resource management, food service management, merchandising, early childhood education, human development, and textiles. Further, 70% or more of the programs also included education, equipment and furnishings, and housing. This high level of common offerings reflects the core of the FCS body of knowledge.

Significance of the Study

This research study has identified some areas of common ground in the undergraduate curriculum of FCS units. This is significant in light of recent discussions in the *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences* seeking to clarify the body of knowledge. It is also possible that this study could serve as a benchmark for academic programs to use in comparing their programming to that of their peers in the discipline. Since the programs evaluated were AAFCS accredited, there is some assurance of quality in these programs that is only strengthened when they are considered collectively. This study could be a starting point for further efforts to determine appropriate national standards for FCS undergraduate programs.

On a negative note, this study also reveals a relatively low incidence of course offerings in the important areas of FCS history, philosophy, and integration. There is a definite shortage of explicit discussion of the discipline's history, philosophy and integrative nature on the undergraduate level. Only 56% showed this curricular element through the course titles and descriptions of their program. While some might argue that the history, philosophy and integrative nature of the discipline is woven into a core of required courses or achieved in some implicit manner, it might also be argued that students often fail to make connections that aren't emphasized or specifically identified for them.

Finally, this study used two sets of categories to evaluate undergraduate curriculum content. This created a comparison of secondary and undergraduate content by showing the match or lack thereof between the secondary school standards and undergraduate programs. Since the national secondary standards

were used to design the certification exam, this study provides an alternative basis for choosing the content to be included in the national certification exam for FCS professionals.

Discussion of Findings

The rich tradition of Family and Consumer Sciences continues in the majority of FCS undergraduate programs even amidst tremendous technological and societal change. It is interesting to note that the highest levels of common ground, 100%, 97%, and 94% of schools including these elements, were found among traditional content areas. Categorized as core content areas repeatedly throughout the 100 years of FCS history, these areas were child and family studies, foods and nutrition, clothing, and resource management. Housing, the remaining traditional core area, had a strong presence at 74%, though it lagged behind the other areas. The longevity of the core content areas speaks well of the foresight and vision of Ellen Richards and the early leaders of the discipline because the foundation they laid stands firm.

No correlation was found between the student population of the institution and the number of curricular elements present. Institutions ranged in size from small (1,000-5,000), medium (5,000-10,000), large (10,000-20,000), to mega (over 20,000). Institutions of each size range were found to include similar configurations of curricular elements. However, a positive correlation was found between the student population and the number of majors offered within a FCS unit, thus implying that programs within larger institutions would have greater depth of programming. Nevertheless, the breadth of course content was remarkably similar.

Hospitality as a content area was present in only 32% of these accredited programs. This was surprising in light of the hopeful predictions made concerning this area of study in the mid eighties. It is also of importance to note that this area was included in the content of the certification exam as if it represented the core knowledge expected of an FCS graduate, when it was actually found to have a very little presence in these schools.

Implications for Practice

Colleges and universities The diversity of name and organization among FCS units implies great differences between FCS units, but this study demonstrates that on the contrary, there exists a great deal of commonality. Colleges and universities would do well to recognize the common ground among FCS units and strive to cooperate and work in harmony as they fulfill their institutional and unit mission. They would also do well to consider supporting a stronger accreditation process and engage in it as a means to improve the quality of the program. They might be advised to examine the curricular elements of their own institution, compare them to the composite course offerings of other institutions, and make adjustments for any gaps. They could perhaps also examine course requirements to ensure that this common understanding isn't merely offered to the students, but is built into the requirements of their program. This common foundation creates a national effort among FCS professionals to train students with a similar knowledge base and philosophy for a common mission.

Colleges and universities could possibly strengthen the national public image if they would consider aligning their unit's name with the name of AAFCS,

the national association. The diversity of names found in just these thirty four institutions was overwhelming and left an impression of the priority of individuality over corporate unity. Given the large measure of common territory in the curriculum, the diversity of names doesn't relate to vast differences in the knowledge base but only serves to confuse the outsider and cloak any relation to other institutions with a FCS program. Colleges and universities might also benefit from secondary programs bearing the name of Family and Consumer Sciences, because beginning college students would have some recognition of Family and Consumer Sciences as a discipline, based on their secondary school experience.

FCS units should recognize and celebrate the importance of their mission and make curricular decisions according to that mission and not the waves of popular opinion. It appears that some of the drive toward specialization in FCS curriculum was as motivated by the desire to improve the public image as the drive to solve current family problems. Since the study of family well-being is everyone's responsibility, institutions would do well to consider creating general education offerings and cross-discipline courses for every college student, male and female. Although the FCS unit has much to offer the university community, this is often the best kept secret on campus. Indeed, administrators and faculty should build relationships across departmental lines and foster cooperative efforts not only to build the strength of their programs, but to support the efforts of the missions within the programs to build the family. Based on current family patterns in which the majority of parents are working, single or married, the need for knowledge and skills to strengthen the management skills and nurturing ability

of the home is more pressing than ever and can no longer be perceived as a strictly feminine obligation, but a goal for fathers, employers, and communities as well. Furthermore, why shouldn't business majors study the issues of home and work relationships as a matter of good business practice? Why shouldn't government and law students consider the prevention of juvenile delinquency through sound home environments?

AAFCS Perhaps a resounding issue that comes from this study regards the nature of the leadership provided by AAFCS. Clearly, the national organization for FCS professionals desires to give strong and courageous leadership to the thousands of members it represents. Several issues of great importance to FCS professionals in higher education include national undergraduate curriculum standards, stronger accreditation criteria, increased benefits to accredited units, and a certification exam aligned with undergraduate curriculum, all for the purpose of strengthening FCS undergraduate programs.

Just as the secondary schools have explicitly defined national standards, undergraduate programs should have an even higher standard for clear direction and unity. This study could be a valuable beginning toward defining a recommended higher education curriculum. Certainly the institutions in the past had this unity beginning with the syllabus of 1913, the revisions of the 1930s and the Blue Book of 1949. The accreditation standards in 1971 included a list of general subjects that together described the common body of knowledge. The 1984 version of the accreditation criteria likewise includes similar descriptions of the common body of knowledge, but softened its declaration by an acknowledgement that there are many ways to achieve the common body of

knowledge. The 2001 version deviates further from a clear definition by dropping the expression “common body of knowledge” and in its place discusses the “synergistic, integrative nature” of the profession without a simple list of desired content. In this author’s opinion, accreditation standards could be strengthened if a clear set of curriculum guidelines were a part of the process. Presently, the third criterion of the accreditation document that expects the students to understand the integrative focus of the discipline could be strengthened if accredited programs were required to include in each FCS program at least one entire course to address explicitly the integrative nature of the FACS discipline. This study revealed that only 56% of the AAFCS accredited units expressly met this criterion through the course titles or course descriptions in their program. Stringent requirements are not a deterrent to academic units pursuing accreditation, but rather in addition to improving quality, they increase the respect associated with the accreditation. Certainly the American Dietetics Association (2005), having approved 279 didactic or coordinated programs and the Foundation for Interior Design Education Research (2005), having accredited 128 programs, have not been hindered by their requirements.

The number of accredited units has continued to decline in recent years, a trend which must be addressed. From the initiation of this research project to its completion, the number of accredited units declined from 57 to 53. Strengthening the standards with a clear body of knowledge is one step in the right direction, but in addition, the AAFCS should increase the recognition given to accredited units so as to make accreditation more beneficial and attractive to institutions. Simply highlighting accredited programs on the AAFCS web page

with program descriptions and institutional links would be a start. Informing secondary educators of the nearby accredited schools, encouraging the high school administrators to include these schools in college recruitment fairs, and targeting high school guidance counselors for informative brochures are also possible tangible benefits to accredited units. Certainly, it would be helpful to publish and widely disseminate national recommendations or evidences of quality undergraduate FCS curriculum. The accreditation criteria could be published online for greater access.

Another challenge to the AAFCS is to continue efforts to improve the certification exam by using national undergraduate standards to determine the common body of knowledge. In the beginning of certification, the Certified Family and Consumer Sciences (CFCS) credential was bestowed upon professionals at their request if they met certain criteria, but the opportunity to be *grandfathere*" soon passed. Now, in order to receive the CFCS credential, FCS graduates must pass the certification exam. The potential for this certification is enormous both in terms of verifying the accomplishments of FCS graduates and in assessing the effectiveness of FCS programs. However, while the most recent edition of the exam is far superior to earlier ones, it was crafted based on the secondary national standards because no undergraduate national curriculum standards existed. This author sees this as a tremendous problem. This study evaluated undergraduate content using both historically related categories of content areas and the content areas defined by the secondary standards. Comparing them is difficult at best because not only did the categories not correspond to one another, but also the general level of agreement between the

historical content categories and the undergraduate curriculum was greater than between the secondary content categories and the undergraduate curriculum. The combined percentages of elements present, strongly present, or very strongly present in undergraduate programs were 82% using the historical categories and 69% using the secondary categories. This difference doesn't imply a problem with the secondary standards, but it highlights the fact that they were not created to guide undergraduate programs. While some critics may not consider this difference to be very great, the coding process generously counted an element present using the secondary standards if any of its parts were present. For example, the curricular element of *housing / interiors / and furnishings* was counted present if any one course emphasized a single one of these subjects, not all three. So the level of agreement may be overrated since the categories themselves were so broad.

The issue of name and identity has been discussed at great lengths in numerous professional articles and meetings, but at the risk of being redundant, the issue is raised yet again. Though the timing of the name change in 1994 from Home Economics to Family and Consumer Sciences occurred after many institutions had already committed themselves to other names, the national organization should still yet encourage institutions to consider adopting the name of Family and Consumer Sciences. Certainly, each institution will ultimately make its own decision, but every academic unit, as well as the national organization, would benefit from a strong sense of national cohesiveness and public name recognition.

Limitations of Study

This study had several limitations to note. First, the population examined for this study was limited to those FCS units offering bachelor's degrees that were accredited by both SACS and AAFCS. Thirty-four academic units were studied, but the descriptions of these institutions and their course offerings might not be applicable to those AAFCS accredited units located outside the Southeast United States because of geographical and cultural differences. Also, this study might not accurately describe non-accredited FACS units within the Southeast. Having seen the variety of names and programs within accredited programs, one could reasonable expect even greater differences in non-accredited programs. Furthermore, there are over 300 institutions offering FCS programming, the majority of which are not AAFCS accredited, and neither are they affiliated with the HEU of AAFCS. The characteristics of FCS units discovered in this study might not correspond with non-AAFCS affiliated academic units.

Another limitation of this study regards the use of institutional catalogs and bulletins as definitive sources of information. Although the catalogs that included the 2003-2004 academic year were used to gather information, these documents are subject to on-going constant revision, so while an attempt was made to gather data at a certain point, it is possible that the information is now already out of date. Also, due to the constant revision of these documents, they tend to contain errors, some that were apparent to the researcher and others that were undetected. The official document of the institutions studied was accepted as written, even when errors were suspected. If discrepancies occurred between

the information on a FCS unit's web site and the official institution catalog, the catalog was given precedence.

Still another limitation of this study is that all courses in the catalog were considered to reflect the program of the unit with no regard to whether the courses were required or elective courses. No judgment was made as to the appropriateness of the program of study for a particular major and no attempt was made to evaluate the depth of the content areas. Also, nothing was done to identify a FCS core of courses that was required of all students in the academic unit.

Questions and Recommendations for Further Study

The limitations just mentioned might be considered a source of further study. A similar study conducted of the remaining 19 accredited units would allow a nationwide compilation of characteristics and create a complete portrait of AAFCS accredited programs. A study comparing non-AAFCS affiliated groups could be conducted in order to determine the impact of AAFCS affiliation on curriculum. Would these results differ if derived from non-accredited programs or non-member programs? What difference does AAFCS affiliation make in programming? Do fragmented pieces of FCS academic programs compare well to intact units? The difficulty in studying fragmented FCS departments is that they seldom identify themselves with FCS as a discipline and very often have completely lost a sense of association with the integrative nature of the discipline.

A possible extension of this present study would be to examine the learning outcomes associated with curriculum content. While this study

examined course titles and course descriptions, specific learning outcomes might provide valuable insight regarding the content of the FCS curriculum.

This researcher would like to offer for use the coding form for curriculum content evaluation in Appendix D. These categories used to describe FCS content and the resulting coding form could provide a convenient tool to facilitate future studies.

Another way to attempt to understand and define FCS would be to examine the textbooks used in the university classroom. Could the textbooks published in the various content areas of FCS describe the discipline? If so, could a comprehensive listing of available texts and resources be created such as the Basic Book List published in 1942 by the Iowa State College Press? Further, should AAFCS be active in promoting the writing of textbooks that reflect the mission of the discipline?

Final Summary

This study of undergraduate programs was undertaken to create a current portrait of Family and Consumer Sciences programs and to determine whether common ground exists among the various academic units particularly in the area of curriculum content. After compiling a list of literature related categories and using a content analysis, clear commonalities were found among the curricular elements of the academic units studied. Even with all the variety of names, organizations, types of programs, and individual characteristics, the kinship of a common body of knowledge is clearly evident in the evaluation.

References

Accredited Institutions. (1973a). *Journal of Home Economics, 65*(3) 29.

Accredited Institutions. (1973b). *Journal of Home Economics, 65*(6) 40.

Accredited Institutions. (1974a). *Journal of Home Economics, 66*(3) 52.

Accredited Institutions. (1974b). *Journal of Home Economics, 66*(6) 52.

Accredited Institutions. (1975). *Journal of Home Economics, 67*(2) 2.

Accredited Institutions. (1975). *Journal of Home Economics, 67*(5) 43.

Accredited Institutions. (1976). *Journal of Home Economics, 68*(4) 35.

Accredited Institutions. (1977). *Journal of Home Economics, 69*(2) 50.

Accredited Institutions. (1978). *Journal of Home Economics, 70*(2) 48.

Accredited Institutions. (1978). *Journal of Home Economics, 70*(4) 10.

Accredited Institutions. (1993). *Journal of Home Economics, 85*(3) 58.

Accredited Institutions, (2003). *Journal of Home Economics, 98*(3).

Alderman, K. (1948). Expressing our philosophy. *Journal of Home Economics, 40*(1)1-2.

American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (2003). *AAFCS professional sections and divisions*. Retrieved September 13, 2003 from http://www.acfcs.org

American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences. (2003). *Strategic direction 2002-2005.* Retrieved July 8, 2003 from http://www.aafcs.org

American Dietetics Association. (2005). Retrieved February 1, 2005 from http://www.eatright.org/Public/7782.cfm

American Home Economics Association. (1914). Constitution of the American Home Economics Association. *Bulletin of the American Home Economics Association, 2*(3) 29-35.

American Home Economics Association. (1967). *Concepts and generalizations: Their place in high school home economics curriculum development.* Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association.

American Home Economics Association. (1989). *Home economics concepts: A base for curriculum development.* Alexandria, VA: American Home Economics Association.

American Home Economics Association. (1993). *The Scottsdale meeting: Positioning the profession for the 21st century.* Alexandria, VA: American Home Economics Association.

AAFCS Council for Accreditation. (2001). *Accreditation documents for undergraduate programs in family and consumer sciences.* Alexandria, VA: American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences.

AHEA Council for Accreditation. (1984). *Accreditation documents for undergraduate programs in home economics*. Alexandria, VA: American Home Economics Association.

AHEA Committee on Accreditation. (1968). *Journal of Home Economics, 60*(9) 747-748.

AHEA Committee on Nomenclature and Syllabus. (1913). *Syllabus of Home Economics* [electronic form]. Baltimore, MD: American Home Economics Association. Retrieved February 1, 2004 from http//hearth.library.cornell.edu

AHEA Committee on Philosophy and Objectives. (1959). Home economics: New directions. *Journal of Home Economics, 51*(8) 679-687.

AHEA Committee on Standards for Membership. (1946). Study of college undergraduate home economics programs of sixty representative schools or departments. Unpublished document.

AHEA Council for Professional Development. (1971). *Accreditation documents for undergraduate programs in home economics.* Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association.

Anderson, C.L., & Nickols, S.Y. (2001). The essence of our being: Synopsis of the 2001 commemorative lecture. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 93*(1) 15-20.

Bailey, L., Firebaugh, F.M., Haley, E.G. & Nickols, S. (1993). Human ecology in higher education: Surviving beyond 2000. *Journal of Home Economics,* 85(1) 3-10.

Bates, M. (1971). 1970-71 Report of AHEA activities: From the president. *Journal of Home Economics, 63*(6) 417-418.

Baugher, S.Y., Anderson, C.L., Green, K.B., Nickols, S.Y., Shane, J., Jolly L. et al. (2000). Body of knowledge for family and consumer sciences. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences,* 92(1) 29-32.

Berlage, N.K. (1998). The establishment of an applied social science: home economists, science, and reform at Cornell University, 1870-1930. In H. Silversberg (Ed.), *Gender and American social science*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Berger, P.S. (1984). Home management research: State of art 1909 -1984. *Home Economics Journal, 12*(3) 252-264.

Biester, A., Giddings, M., Koehne, M. & Munsell, H. (1940). Tentative revision of the syllabus of home economics: Food and Nutrition. *Journal of Home Economics, 32*(10) 676-680.

Blackwell, G.W. (1962). The place of home economics in American society. *Journal of Home Economics, 54*(6) 447-450.

Branegan, G. (1946a). *Study of College Undergraduate Home Economics Programs of Sixty Representative Schools or Departments: Report and Proposal from the Committee on Standards for Membership*. Unpublished report in the Archives of the American Home Economics Association.

Branegan, G. (1946b, November). *Workshop for Committee on Membership Standards: Agenda and Minutes.* Unpublished report in the Archives of the American Home Economics Association.

Branegan, G. (1947, August). *Report from the Committee on Criteria for Evaluating College Programs of Home Economics*. Unpublished report in the Archives of the American Home Economics Association.

Branegan, G. (1948). Annual Report by Committee on Criteria for Evaluating College Programs of Home Economics. *Journal of Home Economics,* 40(7) 398-9.

Brown, M. (1977). Conceptual scheme and decision-rules for the selection and organization of home economics curriculum content. (Contract Project No. 7-4743-H). Madison: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.

Brown, M. & Paolucci, B. (1978). *Home economics: A definition*. American Home Economics Association.

Brucher, O.P. (1959). Our anniversary year. *Journal of Home Economics, 51(*1) 9-11.

Brucher, O.P. (1959). Our future. *Journal of Home Economics,* 51(7) 526-530.

Byrd, F.M. (1970). A definition of home economics for the 70's. *Journal of Home Economics, 62*(6) 411-415.

Callahan, E., Denwy, G., Whitlock, M., Rathbone, R. & Jacobson, C.V. (1941). Tentative revision of the syllabus of home economics: Textiles and clothing. *Journal of Home Economics, 33*(6) 387-389.

Classification of Instructional Programs (CIP). (2000). Retrieved February 1, 2005 from http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2002/2002165_2.pdf

Coon, B. (1955). Education in home economics. In Blauch, L. *Education for the Professions* (pp. 88-95). Washington DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Coon, B. (1962). Home Economics in the public secondary schools: A report of a national study. Washington, D.C.: Office of Education.

Creekmore, A.M. (1968). The concept basic to home economics. *Journal of Home Economics, 60*(2) 93-102.

Crenshaw, M.A. (1970). Council for professional development. *Journal of Home Economics, 62(7*) 483-484.

Crenshaw, M.A. (1972). Professional development. Journal of Home Economics, 64(6) 47.

Davis, M.L. (1993). Perspectives on home economics: unity and identity. *Journal of Home Economics,* 85(1) 27-33.

East, M. (1965). What is home economics? *Journal of Home Economics, 57*(5) 387.

East, M. (1967). Which shall it be: Yes or no to establishing minimum standards for undergraduate education in home economics? *Journal of Home Economics, 59*(6) 456-462.

East, M. (1968a). Report from interim committee on accreditation. Journal of Home Economics, 60(4) 248.

East, M. & Weis, S.F. (1968). Progress toward accreditation. *Journal of Home Economics, 60*(6) 444-447.

East, M. (1968b). Action in the assembly of delegates: Accreditation. *Journal of Home Economics, 60*(7) 524-525.

East, M. (1971). More about accreditation. *Journal of Home Economics, 63*(7) 531-532.

East, M. (1982). *Caroline Hunt: Philosopher for home economics*. Pennsylvania State University.

Family and Consumer Sciences Education. (2004). *FACS mission and vision statement.*. Retrieved December 19, 2004 from http://www.acteonline.org/about/division/div-fam-mission.cfm

First year's accreditation activities. (1972). Journal of Home Economics, 64(3) 4.

For the record. (1967). *Journal of Home Economics, 59*(10) 759.

For the record. (1968). *Journal of Home Economics, 60*(2) 75-76.

Foundation for Interior Design Education Research. (2005). Retrieved February 1, 2005 from http://www.fider.org/

From domesticity to modernity: What was home economics? (2001). Retrieved December 29, 2004, from Cornell University Library's Digital Initiatives, Online Exhibits: http://rmc.library.cornell.edu/homeEc/default.html

Goldsmith, E.B. (1983). An empirical analysis of the home economics research journal. *Home Economics Research Journal, 11*(3) 207-213.

Good, M.A. (2000). *Secondary school family and consumer sciences teachers' perceived importance of family and consumer sciences competencies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University.

Green, K.B. (1989). The future of home economics in higher education. *Journal of Home Economics, 81*(1) 43-49.

Griffith, R.Y. (1989). Theses and dissertations completed in home economics: 1988. *Home Economics Research Journal, 18*(1) 61-65.

Ha, M. (1992). Theses and dissertations completed in home economics: *Home Economics Research Journal, 21*(1) 75-144.

Haley, E.G., Peggram, R. S., & Ley, C.J. (1993, Winter). Enhancing program viability. *Journal of Home Economics, 85*(4) 11-17.

Hall, R.C. (1965). Accreditation program progress. *Journal of Home Economics, 57*(2) 113.

Harper, L.J. & Davis, S.L. (1986). Home Economics in higher education, 1968-1982: Analysis and trends. *Journal of Home Economics, 78*(1) 6-17.

Harris, J. (1941). Report from committee on membership credentials. Bulletin of the American Home Economics Association, 24(1) 56-57.

Helmick, S.A. (1990). Theses and dissertations completed in home economics: 1989. *Home Economics Research Journal, 19*(1) 67-71.

Hill, E.A. (1961). Report from committee to study ways to improve standards for college and university programs of home economics. *Journal of Home Economics, 53*(7) 603-604.

Hira, T.K. (1991). Theses and dissertations completed in home economics: 1990. *Home Economics Research Journal, 20*(1) 52-59.

Home Economics Archives: Research, Tradition and History (HEARTH). (2005). Ithica, NY: Cornell University. Retrieved February 1, 2005 from http://hearth.library.cornell.edu/

Horn, M.J. (1962). Report from committee on accreditation. *Journal of Home Economics, 54(7*) 602-603.

Horn, M.J. (1964a). Report from committee on accreditation. *Journal of Home Economics, 56(7*) 504.

Horn, M.J. (1964b). Accreditation: Second progress report. *Journal of Home Economics, 56*(9) 659-662.

Horn, M.J. (1965). Reaction to the AHEA accreditation proposal. *Journal of Home Economics, 57*(6) 459-460.

Horn, M.J. & Nickols, S.Y. (1982). Interdisciplinary research: Have we lost our focus? *Home Economics Research Journal, 11*(1) 9-14.

Horn, M. (1993). Proposal for the restructuring of home economics. In *The Scottsdale meeting: Positioning the profession for the 21st century.* Alexandria, VA: American Home Economics Association.

Hoskins, M. (1980). Teaching performance in home economics. *Home Economics Research Journal, 8*(5) 344-360.

Hovermale, R. (1971). Agency Member Unit Report. *Journal of Home Economics, 63*(6) 428-429.

Hultgren, F., & Wilkosz, J. (1986). Human goals and critical realities: A practical problem framework for developing home economics curriculum. *Journal of Vocational Home Economics Education, 4*, 135-154.

Hunt, C. (1958). *The life of Ellen Richards 1842-1911, anniversary edition.* Washington D.C.: American Home Economics Association.

Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS). Retrieved February 1, 2005 from http://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/

Jefferson, R.B. (1967a). At issue: Need for establishing standards for undergraduate professional education. *Journal of Home Economics, 59*(4) 253-254.

Jefferson, R.B. (1967b). Alternative proposals for establishing minimum standards for undergraduate professional education in home economics. *Journal of Home Economics, 59*(5) 367-370.

Johnson, K.K. (1995). Theses and dissertations completed in family and consumer sciences: 1994. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 24*(2) 203-211.

Johnson, J. & Fedje, C. (Eds.). (1999). *Toward a critical science approach: Family and Consumer Sciences Teacher Education Yearbook 19.* Peoria, Illinois: American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences and Glencoe McGraw Hill.

Justin, M. (1928). Report from the committee on revision of syllabus. *Bulletin of the American Home Economics Association, 11*(1) 41-42.

Kennemer, C.G. (1999). Theses and dissertations completed in family and consumer sciences: 1998. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 28*(2) 238-245.

Kennemer, C.G. (2000). An overview of theses and dissertations completed in family and consumer sciences: 1999. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 29(*2) 173-179.

Kyrk, H., Andrews, B.R., Monroe, D. & Reid, M. (1936). Tentative revision of the syllabus of home economics: Family economics. *Journal of Home Economics, 28*(3) 157-163.

Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings (1899-1908).

Lake Placid Conference on Home Economics: Proceedings of the fourth annual conference. (1902). Lake Placid, NY.

LeBleu, L.C. & Smith, F.M. (1994, June). Preprofessionals' perceptions of home economics. *Home Economics Research Journal, 22(*4) 422-440.

Lee, M.Y. (1996). Theses and dissertations completed in family and consumer sciences: 1995. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 25*(2) 196-203.

Mangel, M. (1978). Home economics defined: Historic perspectives. In M. Brown, Home economics: A definition. Washington DC: American Home Economics Association.

McGrath. E.J. & Johnson, J.T. (1968). *The changing mission of home economics: A report on home economics in the land-grant colleges and state universities.* New York: Teachers College Press.

McGrath, E.J. (1968). The imperatives of change for home economics. Journal of Home Economics, 60(7) 505-514.

McNeal, W. B. (1931). Report from the committee on revision of syllabus. *Bulletin of the American Home Economics Association, 14*(1) 22.

McNeal, W. B. (1935). Report from the committee on revision of syllabus. *Bulletin of the American Home Economics Association, 18*(1) 17.

McNeal, W. B. (1936). Report from the committee on revision of syllabus. *Bulletin of the American Home Economics Association, 19*(1) 20.

McNeal, W. B. (1940). Report from the committee on revision of syllabus. *Bulletin of the American Home Economics Association, 23*(1) 38.

Moran, J., Smith, E., Kellett, C., Collier, B., Purcell, R., Akers, A. (2004, April). Reconsidering accreditation and recognition: A proposed model for the AAFCS Council for Accreditation. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 96*(2) 73-77.

Morgan, R. (1973). What Robin Morgan said at Denver. *Journal of Home Economics, 65*(1) 13.

National Center of Educational Statistics (NCES). Retrieved February 1, 2005 from http://nces.ed.gov/

National standards for family and consumer sciences education. (1998). Retrieved December 30, 2004 from http://ideanet.doe.state.in.us/octe/facs/natlstandards.htm

Neuendorf, K.A. (2002). The content analysis guidebook. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Nickols, S. Y. (2003). Human eco-system theory: A tool for working with families. *Journal of Family and Consumer Sciences, 95*(2) 15-18.

Oliva, P. (2001). *Developing the curriculum, 5th ed*. New York: Longman.

O'Toole, L. (1961). Home economics in higher education – implications for curriculum. *Journal of Home Economics, 53*(5) 345-348.

Ownbey, S.F. (1997). Theses and dissertations completed in family and consumer sciences: 1996. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 26*(2) 207-214.

Ownbey, S.F. (1998). Theses and dissertations completed in family and consumer sciences: 1997. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 27*(2) 214-221.

Paul, P.C. (1963). Accreditation: Program, Progress, & Proposals. *Journal of Home Economics, 55*(9) 688-692.

Plihal, J., Laird, M., & Rehm, M. (1999). Critical science curriculum: A promising alternative for FCS. In J. Johnson & C. Fedje (Eds.), Family and Consumer

Sciences Teacher Education Yearbook 19: Toward a critical science approach. (pp.10-18). Peoria, Illinois: Glencoe McGraw Hill.

Professional and subject-matter sections' units. (1971). *Journal of Home Economics, 63*(6) 429.

Pullen, J.A. (2001). *Perceptions of Massachusetts family and consumer sciences education professionals regarding the importance and use of the National Standards for Family and Consumer Sciences Education in Massachusetts.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Massachusetts.

Pundt, H. (1980). *AHEA: A history of excellence.* Washington D.C.: American Home Economics Association.

Reichelt, S.A. (2001). *Family and consumer sciences education national curriculum standards: Implementation plans for reform*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Iowa State University.

Report from the committee on revision of syllabus. (1930). *Bulletin of the American Home Economics Association, 13*(1) 29, 42.

Richards, M.V. (1998). *The evolution of a profession: From home economics to family and consumer sciences*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of South Carolina.

Robertson, L.J. (1998, December). Women faculty in family and consumer sciences: influences on job satisfaction. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 27*(2) 167-193.

Robson, C. (2002). *Real world research, 2nd edition.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Schmelzer, C.D., Costello, P.S., Blalock, S.L. & Meszaros, P.S. (1989). Baccalaureate hotel, restaurant, and institutional management programs in home economics units. *Home Economics Research Journal, 18*(1) 53-60.

Shepperd, J.L. (1910). Courses in home economics as related to Department of Agriculture work. *Journal of Home Economics, 2*(4) 403-412.

Shoffner, S.M. (1985). Theses and dissertations completed in home economics 1983 and 1984. *Home Economics Research Journal, 13*(4) 409-417.

Shoffner, S.M. (1987). Theses and dissertations completed in home economics: *Home Economics Research Journal, 15*(4) 267-270.

Smith, F. (1990). Measuring students' self-perceived competence in home economics core areas. *Home Economics Research Journal, 19*(1) 17-28.

Smith, F.M. (1995). Assessment of student outcomes in home economics higher education. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 23*(4) 347-367.

Smith, T.L. (2001). An overview of the theses and dissertations completed in family and consumer sciences: 2000. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 30*(2) 271-278.

Spafford, I. (Ed.), Branegan, G., Dye, M. Harris, J.W., Hill, E.A., Lewis, D.S., Wilson, P.P & Zuill, F. (1949). *Home economics in higher education: Criteria for evaluating undergraduate programs.* Washington, DC: American Home Economics Association.

Stage, S. (1997). Ellen Richards and the social significance of the home economics movement. In S.Stage & V. Vincenti (Eds.). (1997). *Rethinking home*

economics: Women and the history of a profession (pp.17-33). Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Stage, S. & Vincenti, V. (Eds.). (1997). *Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Sweetman, M.D. (1961). To think like home economists. *Journal of Home Economics, 53*(1) 7-10.

True, V. (1962). Art in home economics. *Journal of Home Economics, 54*(10) 825-829.

Tyler, R. W. (1949). *Basic Principles of Curriculum and Instruction.* Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Tyler, R.W. (1962). Education in a world of change. *Journal of Home Economics, 54(7*) 527-536.

Vail, G.E. (1969). Meeting provisions of an accrediting program. *Journal of Home Economics, 61(*6) 440-447.

Vail, G.E. (1970). Accreditation 1970. *Journal of Home Economics, 62(*6) 416 -418.

Vail, G.E. (1973). Progress on accreditation. *Journal of Home Economics, 65(*3) 28 -29.

Vincenti, V. (2003). Revitalizing a spirit of community. President's Speech for AAFCS 2003 Convention. Washington DC

Vincenti, V. B. (1990). Home economics in higher education: communities of convenience or purpose? *Home Economics Research Journal, 19*(2) 184-193.

Wallace, S.A. (1984). Research in home economics education: past achievements, present accomplishments, future needs. *Home Economics Research Journal, 12(*3) 403-419.

Walters, J. (1976). Accreditation: What is it? How does it work? Can it help our home economics program? *Journal of Home Economics, 68*(3) 36-39.

Weber, M.J. (1993). Theses and dissertations completed in home economics: *Home Economics Research Journal, 22*(2) 180-261.

Weber, M.J. (1994). Theses and dissertations completed in home economics: 1993. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal, 23*(1) 76-83.

Weis, S., East, M., & Manning, S. (1974). Home Economics units in higher education: A decade of change. *Journal of Home Economics, 66*(5) 11-15.

Wilson, E.M. (1961). Revising a homemaking curriculum. *Journal of Home Economics, 53(*1) 11.

Wilson, M., Gross, I., Gunselman, M. & Morin, G. (1935). Tentative revision of the syllabus of home economics: The house. Journal *of Home Economics, 27*(3) 152-158.

Wood, M.W., Lindquist, R., Robinson, E.V., Staples, R., Vincent, L., Wylie, M. et al. (1935). Tentative revision of the syllabus of home economics: The Family and its relationships. *Journal of Home Economics, 27*(1) 11-16.

Women's Role Committee. (1973). The women's role committee speaks out. *Journal of Home Economics, 65*(1) 10-15.

Wyse, O.G. (1965). Will criteria for accreditation permit flexibility and experimentation? *Journal of Home Economics, 57*(4) 274.

Zuill, F. (1959). Fifty years of achievement in the American Home Economics Association. *Journal of Home Economics, 51*(7) 519-525.

Appendix A

Categories Commonly Used to Describe Content Areas within the Family and Consumer Sciences Body of Knowledge

Common title	Categories for body of knowledge	Reference
1913 Syllabus	1. Food 2. Clothing 3. Shelter 4. Institutional Management	Committee on Nomenclature and Syllabus. (1913).
1930 Revisions	1. The Family and Its Relationships 2. Family Economics 3. The House 4. Food and Nutrition 5. Textiles and Clothing	Report from the Committee on Revision of Syllabus. (1930).
1949 Blue Book	1. Foods, Nutrition, and Institutional Management 2. Textiles, Clothing, and Related Arts 3. Child Development and Family Relationships 4. Home Management, Family Economics, Housing, and Equipment 5. Home Economics Education and Extension	Spafford, I. (1949). Home Economics in Higher Education: Criteria for Evaluating Undergraduate Programs.
1959 Office of	1. Food and Nutrition 2. Clothing	Coon, B. (1962).

Common title	Categories for body of knowledge	Reference
Education Study	3. Child Development 4. Consumer Education 5. Family Relationships 6. Health, First Aid, and Home Care of the Sick 7. Home Furnishings and Equipment 8. Management of Resources	
1963 Divisions of Home Economics Study for Degree Reporting	1. Art and Interior Design 2. Child Development and Family Relations 3. Food, Nutrition, and Dietetics 4. General Home Economics 5. Home Economics Education 6. Textiles, Clothing, Science, Design, and Merchandising 7. Business 8. Communications, Journalism 9. Extension, Welfare, and Community Service 10. Housing and Equipment 11. Home Management and Family Economics 12. Institution, Hotel, Restaurant, and Management 13. Other	Harper and Davis. (1986). Home Economics in Higher Education

Common title	Categories for body of knowledge	Reference
1967 The Bird Book	1. Human Development and the Family 2. Home Management and Family Economics 3. Foods and Nutrition 4. Textiles and Clothing 5. Housing	AHEA (1967) Concepts and Generalizations
1971 Accreditation Standards	Common Body of Knowledge 1. Family in society 2. Human Growth and Development in relation to Nutrition 3. Human Development and its relation to the Family 4. Management of Human and Material Resources 5. Aesthetic Qualities in the Environment 6. Influence of Science, Technology, and Consumer Economics upon Families 7. Philosophical Base of Home Economics 8. Relation of Specialties to the Field as a Whole	AHEA. (1971). Council for Professional Development.
1989	1. Consumer and Resource	American Home

Common title	Categories for body of knowledge	Reference
Home Economic Concepts	Management 2. Housing and Living Environments 3. Individual, Child, and Family Development 4. Nutrition and Food 5. Textiles and Clothing	Economics Association. (1989). *Home economics concepts: A base for curriculum development.*
1998 National Standards for FACSE	1. Career, Community, and Family Connections 2. Consumer and Family Resources 3. Consumer Services 4. Early Childhood, Education, and Services 5. Facilities Management and Maintenance 6. Family 7. Family and Community Services 8. Food Production and Services 9. Food Science, Dietetics, and Nutrition 10. Hospitality, Tourism, and Recreation 11. Housing, Interiors, and Furnishings 12. Human Development 13. Interpersonal Relationships 14. Nutrition and Wellness 15. Parenting 16. Textiles and Apparel	Thomas, R., & Laster, J. (Eds.). (1998). *Inquiry into thinking: Family and consumer sciences teacher education Yearbook 18*; National standards for family and consumer sciences education. (1998); http://ideanet.doe.state.in.us/octe/facs/natlstandards.htm

Common title	Categories for body of knowledge	Reference
2000 Body of Knowledge	Crosscutting threads (Integrated across disciplines): 1. Basic human needs 2. Communication skills 3. Public policy 4. Critical thinking 5. Diversity 6. Global perspectives 7. Professionalism 8. Independence, dependence and interdependence of creativity thinking 9. Community development 10. Technology 11. Moral, ethical, and spiritual development Specialization threads: 1. Health 2. Food, for basic nutrition and health, and future scientific developments in creation of foods. 3. Clothing and textiles 4. Shelter 5. Economics and management 6. Relationships and social leadership	Baugher, S.Y., Anderson, C.L., Green, K.B., Nickols, S.Y., Shane, J., Jolly L. et al. (2000). Body of knowledge for family and consumer sciences.

Common title	Categories for body of knowledge	Reference
	7. Wellness	
1968 Degrees Offered	1. Home Economic Education 2. Textiles, clothing design 3. Foods, nutrition, dietetics 4. Child development, family life 5. General home economics 6. Home management / equipment / economy 7. Institutional / hotel / restaurant management 8. Home economics extension 9. Communications 10. Other	McGrath. (1968).
Research reports	1. Clothing and textiles 2. Food, nutrition, dietetics, institutional management 3. Home Economics education 4. Home management, family economics, consumer affairs, consumer economics 5. Family relations, child development, family studies 6. Child development 7. Housing, interior design, equipment	Goldsmith, E.B. (1983, March). An empirical analysis of the home economics research journal.

Common title	Categories for body of knowledge	Reference
Theses and Dissertations	1. Art and Design 2. Child Development 3. Clothing and Apparel 4. Communication 5. Consumer and Family Economics and Home Management 6. Family Relations 7. Food Science 8. Home Economics education, general 9. Human environment and Housing (formerly Housing, home furnishings, and equipment) 10. Institutional, Hotel, and Restaurant Management (formerly Institutional Management) 11. Interdisciplinary 12. International 13. Nutrition 14. Textiles 15. Miscellaneous	Smith, T.L. (2001). Kennemer, C.G. (2000, 1999). Ownbey, S.F. (1998, 1997). Lee, M.Y. (1996). Johnson, K.K. (1995). Weber, M.J. (1994, 1993). Ha, M. (1992). Hira, T.K. (1991). Helmick, S.A. (1990). Griffith, R.Y. (1989). Shoffner, S.M. (1987, 1985).
AAFCS Divisions and Sections	Professional sections: 1. Business 2. Colleges / universities / research 3. Elementary / secondary / adult education	http://www.aafcs.org/about/ members.html

Common title	Categories for body of knowledge	Reference
	4. Extension 5. Home and community 6. Human services Subject Matter Divisions: 1. Apparel and textiles 2. Family economics and resource management 3. Family relations and human development 4. Housing and environment 5. Nutrition / health / food management 6. Art and design 7. Communication 8. Education and technology 9. Internationals	
CIP Codes	1. FCS Education 2. FCS general 3. Business FCS 4. FCS Communication 5. Consumer Merchandising/Retailing Management 6. Family Resource Management Studies 7. Consumer Economics 8. Consumer Services and Advocacy	www.reeis.usda.gov CIP Codes Classification of Instructional Program Retrieved June 19, 2004

Common title	Categories for body of knowledge	Reference
	9. Family and Consumer Economics and Related Services	
	10. Foods / Nutrition / Wellness Studies	
	11. Foodservice Systems Administration / Management	
	12. Foods / Nutrition / and Related Services	
	13. Housing / Human Environments general	
	14. Facilities Planning and Management	
	15. Home Furnishings and Equipment Installers	
	16. Housing / Human Environments other	
	17. Human Development / Family Studies general	
	18. Adult Development and Aging	
	19. Family Systems	
	20. Child Development	
	21. Family and Community Services	
	22. Child Care and Support Services Management	
	23. Child Care Provider / Assistant	
	24. Human Development / Family Studies / and Related Service other	
	25. Apparel and Textiles general	

Common title	Categories for body of knowledge	Reference
	26. Apparel and Textile manufacture 27. FCS other	
HEARTH	1. Applied arts and design 2. Child care, human development and family studies 3. Clothing and textiles 4. Food and nutrition 5. Home management 6. Housekeeping and etiquette 7. Housing, furnishing, and home equipment 8. Hygiene 9. Institutional management 10. Retail and consumer studies 11. Teaching and communication	http://hearth.library.cornell.edu

Appendix B

FCS Content Categories: 28 Literature Related Categories

KEY WORDS/ CONTEXT	CATEGORY	PRESENT	ABSENT
food science, food preparation	Foods		
dietetics	Nutrition		
wellness	Health		
operations, systems, catering, restaurant	Food Service Management		
experimental, processing, development	Food Technology		
apparel	Clothing		
fabric, fibers	Textiles		
clothing design, pattern, draping	Apparel Design		
retailing, trade. buying	Merchandising		
human environment, residential environment, shelter	Housing		
interiors	Interior Design		

KEY WORDS/ CONTEXT	CATEGORY	PRESENT	ABSENT
Furniture, appliances, household technology	Equipment and Furnishings		
economic theory or consumer issues	Consumer Economics		
consumer protection, law, community resources, accessible housing, family policy	Public Policy		
financial planning, family economics, home management, decision making	Resource Management		
includes school age, adolescence, adult, life span	Human Development		
preschool, child development, infancy, toddler hood	Child Development		
marriage, parenting, relationships, family studies	Family Relations		
social agencies, helping, volunteerism, adult education,	Human Services / Extension / Community		

KEY WORDS/ CONTEXT	CATEGORY	PRESENT	ABSENT
family life education, program development	Services		
other names for FCS, foundations, professional issues	FCS History and Philosophy		
instruction, curriculum, teaching, learning, methods	Education – early childhood		
Methods, curriculum	Education - secondary		
journalism, presentation	Communication		
computer assisted design, digital, computer	Technology		
travel, tourism, lodging, hotel, resort management	Hospitality		
Art elements and principles	Applied Art or Design		
family systems, interaction, whole, systems perspective, synergistic	Integration		
cultures, customs, multicultural,	International		

KEY WORDS/ CONTEXT	CATEGORY	PRESENT	ABSENT
global			
professional, leadership, entrepreneurship, portfolio, family owned business	Other		

Appendix C

FCS Content Categories: 16 National Standards for FCS Secondary Education

KEY WORDS/ CONTEXT	CATEGORY	PRESENT	ABSENT
Work and family	Balancing Work and Family		
financial planning, estate planning, home management, decision making	Resource Management		
Consumer affairs, Certified Financial Planner	Consumer Services		
preschool, child development, infancy, toddler hood	Early Childhood		
Housekeeping, operations, planning, lodging, housing	Facilities Management		
marriage, parenting, relationships, family studies	Family		
Social agencies, extension, helping, volunteerism, programs	Family and Community Services		
operations, systems, catering, restaurant, food preparation	Food Production and Services		

KEY WORDS/ CONTEXT	CATEGORY	PRESENT	ABSENT
	Food Science, Dietetics, and Nutrition		
human environment, residential environment, shelter, interiors, furniture, equipment	Housing, Interiors, and Furnishings		
travel, lodging, hotel, resort management	Hospitality, Tourism and Recreation		
includes school age, adolescence, adult, life span	Human Development		
Human interaction	Interpersonal Relationships		
Health, emphasis on wellness	Nutrition and Wellness		
Adult-child interactions in family context, parent education	Parenting		
apparel, fabric, fibers	Textiles and Apparel		

Appendix D

Coding Form for Evaluation of Curriculum Content

16 National Standards for Secondary Programs

KEY WORDS/ CONTEXT	CATEGORY	PRESENT	ABSENT
Work and family	Balancing Work and Family		
Financial planning, family economics, home management, decision making	Resource Management		
Consumer affairs, CFP	Consumer Services		
Preschool, child development, infancy, toddler hood	Early Childhood		
Planning, operations, housekeeping, lodging, housing	Facilities Management		
	Family		
Social agencies, extension, volunteerism, programs	Family and Community Services		
operations, systems, catering, restaurant	Food Production and Services		
	Food Science, Dietetics, and Nutrition		
	Housing, Interiors, and Furnishings		
	Hospitality, Tourism and Recreation		
Includes school age, adolescence, adult, life span, individual and family	Human Development		
Human interaction	Interpersonal Relationships		
Emphasis on wellness, health	Nutrition and Wellness		
Parent education	Parenting		
Apparel, dress, fabric, fibers	Textiles and Apparel		

28 Review of Literature Categories

KEY WORDS/ CONTEXT	CATEGORY	PRESENT	ABSENT
	Foods		
dietetics	Nutrition		
Wellness, (not just a nutrition class) fitness	Health		
operations, systems, catering, restaurant	Food Service Management		
experimental, processing, development, engineering	Food Technology		
Apparel, dress	Clothing		
Fabric, fibers, science	Textiles		
Clothing design, pattern, draping	Apparel Design		
Retailing, trade, buying, fashion industry	Merchandising		
Human environment, residential environment, shelter	Housing		
interiors	Interior Design		
Furniture, appliances, household technology	Equipment and Furnishings		
Economic theory, consumer issues, consumption	Consumer Economics		
Consumer protection, law, community resources, accessible housing, family, building codes	Public Policy		
Financial planning, family economics, home management, decision making	Resource Management		
Includes school age, adolescence, adult, life span, individual and family	Human Development		
Preschool, child development, infancy, toddler hood, early childhood	Child Development		
Marriage, parenting, relationships, family studies	Family Relations		
Social agencies, volunteerism, adult education, family life education, program development, working with families	Human Services/ Extension/ Community Services		
Other names for FCS, foundations, professional issues, not career development	FCS History and Philosophy		
Instruction, curriculum, teaching, learning, methods, school	Education – early childhood		
Methods, curriculum	Education - secondary		
Journalism, presentations, family	Communication		
CAD, digital, computer	Technology		
Travel, tourism, lodging, hotel, resort management	Hospitality		
Art elements and principles	Applied Art or Design		
Family systems, interaction, whole, systems perspective, synergy, ecological	Integration		
Cultures, customs, multicultural, global	International		

Appendix E
Variety of Organizational Structures and Names of Population Schools

	Total Occurrences	Department	Division	College/Schools (Smaller unit)	Colleges/ Schools (largest unit)
Family and Consumer Sciences	19	15	2	1	1
Human Sciences	14	3			3
Health and Human Sciences					1
Human Environmental Sciences				1	1
Human Environment and Family Sciences		1			
Human Ecology		1		1	1
Human Resources				1	
Agriculture	10				1
Agriculture and Family and Consumer Sciences					1
Agricultural and Environmental Sciences					2
Agriculture, Home Economics, and Allied Programs					1
Agriculture and Human Ecology					1
Agriculture and Consumer Sciences					1
Agriculture and Applied Science					2
Family, Consumer and Agricultural Sciences			1		
Arts & Sciences	11				2
Science and Technology					1
Science					1
Applied and Natural Sciences					1
Applied Sciences					1
Applied Professional Sciences					1
Life Sciences and Technology					1
Applied Life Sciences					1
Fine and Applied Arts					1
Applied Arts					1
Education	5				3
Education, Health, and Human Sciences					1
Education and Behavioral Science					1
University College					1
Total		20	3	4	33