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ABSTRACT

A STUDY OF HOMEMAKING VALUES AND INFLUENCE
RESPONSES UTILIZING THE ECHO METHOD

by
Patricia Deyling Beals
Master of Science in Home Economics
July, 1972

This study was designed to gain some information about homemaking values and the influences that people associate with them. Since values are thought to be directors of managerial choices, investigations of values have been of interest to specialists in the field of home management.

The information for the study was obtained from a student sample and a homemaker sample, using a modified form of the ECHO* method of studying values and influences in groups. The study utilized a projective survey technique which asked respondents to give multiple answers to questions about things they could do to be a good or a bad homemaker and who would approve or disapprove. Responses were classified by members of the surveyed groups, with the interaction of the researcher, into categories which were inherent in the data.

*ECHO is not an acronym
In this study, significant differences were found to exist between the following:

1. Hierarchies of task related and human related homemaking values in the homemaker sample.
2. Students and homemakers concerning human related homemaking values.
3. Students and homemakers concerning influence responses.
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INTRODUCTION

Although home management specialists have been in general agreement that values are an inherent part of the management process, research related to values in home management has been limited due to the difficulties encountered in developing effective research methodology in this area.

The ECHO method of studying values and influences should be of interest to these specialists because of the possibilities the method offers to build new research projects and yield new information. The usual polling technique presents a statement and asks respondents to assign evaluation. In the ECHO method, which uses a projective survey technique, the researcher assigns an evaluation, such as "good" or "bad," and asks the respondent to name a behavior which carries this evaluation. In addition, the method measures the influences associated with values by asking the respondents who would approve or disapprove of the behavior named (Barthol and de Mille, 1).

In recent years, home management specialists have concerned themselves increasingly with the troublesome question of what constitutes "good" management in the home or, for that matter, whether it can be so judged by
specific standards. Determination of what homemakers themselves value in relation to home management should contribute to the clarification of this problem. In addition, an analysis of what students of home management deem important in this area of study should be of interest to home management specialists, especially those who are teachers.

Emphasis on the human aspect of home management has grown in recent years, and the work aspect has sometimes been considered important only as it relates to human consideration. Home management specialists have not always been in agreement over which aspect, if either, should have top priority. Research which indicates what homemakers and students value in relation to the two aspects should serve to clarify the issue.

Supervised field study programs have gained favor in some educational institutions. As a student and teacher of home management, the author has participated in field study programs where students have worked in homemaking problem-solving situations with homemakers who reside in government-sponsored housing projects. Observation of these programs has led the author to question whether different values and influences exist in the two groups and, if they do, whether or not these differences hamper the effectiveness of the programs.
JUSTIFICATION

Home management specialists who are concerned with the difficulties they face in clarification of concepts relating to their field should welcome the introduction of new techniques for measuring and identifying homemaking values.

If the effectiveness of field study programs involving students and homemakers has been impaired by differences in values and influences in the two groups, then the effectiveness of the programs might be increased by research which would clarify what these differences are.

HYPOTHESES

The hypotheses formulated for this study were the following:

(1) There is a significant difference between the hierarchies of task related homemaking values and human related homemaking values in the homemaker sample.

(2) There is a significant difference between the hierarchies of task related homemaking values and human related homemaking values in the student sample.

(3) There is a significant difference between the hierarchies of task related homemaking values and human related homemaking values within the total sample.

(4) There is a significant difference between homemakers and students concerning task related homemaking values.
(5) There is a significant difference between homemakers and students concerning human related homemaking values.

(6) There is a significant difference between homemakers and students concerning influence responses.

ASSUMPTIONS

It was assumed that the ECHO method for determining values and influences is an effective method of obtaining the necessary information.

LIMITATIONS

The study was limited to two samples: one sample of 22 homemakers and one sample of 20 students. Because of the limited resources in terms of large group populations, the study relied on volunteers for subjects. The sample of 22 homemakers was not considered to be representative of the homemakers in a specific housing project, nor representative of homemakers in general. The sample of 20 students was not considered to be representative of students in the home management classes on the campus where data was gathered, nor representative of students in general.

DEFINITION OF SPECIAL TERMS

In this study, specific definitions will be adopted for certain specific terms or phrases.
Category title will refer to a summary statement, or label, attached to a set of value statements or influence responses that have been grouped into one category in an ECHO classification.

Classification will refer to an ECHO technique in which responses are grouped into emergent or inherent categories rather than sorted into pre-existing categories.

Disvalue will be a specific term limited to the negative denotations of the term "value."

A government-sponsored housing project will refer to any housing project which benefits from special government services not available to privately owned and operated projects.

Hierarchy will refer to a list of category titles in their order of importance for a group of ECHO respondents, with the most important category defined as the one containing the most responses from the group members.

Homemaker will refer to any member of a family unit who takes the responsibility for managing the home. All respondents in this study were female.

Indigenous classification will refer to classification done by a team from the group or population from which a particular sample of ECHO data was taken.

Influence response will refer to any reinforcement, reinforcer, agency, or agent described by ECHO respondents in response to the questions, "Who would approve?" or "Who would disapprove?"
**Question card** will refer to a 3-inch by 5-inch card with ECHO questions printed on it, before use by a respondent.

**Value** will refer to an overt or implicit [inferred] response that attributed goodness or badness to some event or entity; a category or group of value statements, with corresponding titles.
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REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Several areas of literature relating to the study were examined. These areas included value studies in home management, interest of home economists in social related activity, changes in the philosophy of home management, and the ECHO method for determining patterns of value and influence.

VALUE STUDIES IN HOME MANAGEMENT

Examination of values that predominate throughout the world produces a wide range of attitudes about "what ought to be." In the United States, many people today have questioned those values which have traditionally been important in their society (Graves and Lyman, 17:601-08). In a dynamic society, values cannot be expected to remain static or unchanged.

The implications of these changes to those who have operated in the field of home management are many, for they have accepted the proposition that values function as the most basic underlying force in directing managerial behavior (Schlater, 40:93-98).

Home management specialists have expressed this emphasis on values in a variety of ways. The "French Lick"
committee (4:1), formed to identify and define the basic concepts of home management, proposed that "management is the conscious mediation of a consciously selected value system." Nickell and Dorsey (35) visualized identification of values as the key to motivation factors in behavior. Bishop (5:1) has defined management as "the realization of family values through the utilization of resources." Kohlmann (27) identified personal values as either means to ends or ends in themselves, in which case the value may operate as a goal. Magrabi (32) has stated that, for home management, interest in values stems from their relation to decisions. Deacon and Bratton (10) made the important point that values also provide a basis for evaluation. The purpose of management has been defined by Gross and Crandall (19) as the realization of values, goals, and standards.

McGrath (31) has expressed concern over the limited amount of research which has been done by the staffs of schools in home economics. The scarcity of trained researchers in the field of home management has been pointed out by Gross (20) and Magrabi (32). Schlater (40), in reference to her investigation of the core concepts in home management, recognized the need for research in values. Crandall (9) queried colleagues in home management about what they considered to be areas of need in management research, and more than one quarter of the 32 respondents indicated a need for research which investigated and more clearly defined values and goals.
The difficulties which have been encountered in researching values have been discussed by Magrabi (32). There has been disagreement concerning the definition of terms utilized in value studies. Personal values may be so individual that communication between researchers and respondents may have been hampered. Kohlmann (27) has suggested that individuals may have operative values that exist but cannot be named because they have not been verbalized or consciously thought out. The difficulties in interpretation of values and resistance or lack of ability to identify them have been discussed by Paolucci and O'Brien (36).

Kotzin (29) has recommended that home management researchers should rely less on findings from other disciplines. Identification of the need for research that relates directly to home management has been made by Magrabi (32) and Schlater (40).

Efforts are being made to correct this situation. Barton and Gilchrist (2) investigated the needs and interests of young homemakers living in two low-income housing projects. They determined that needs and interests of the homemakers were affected by such factors as race and age, and have suggested that homemakers be given an opportunity to help plan programs designed for them so that differing needs and interests may be met. Kohlmann and Smith (28:660) developed two inventories to assess values related to home and family life and found that, based on these inventories, the two values of family life and status existed for their
sample. They concluded that "functional personal values related to home and family life are relevant to persons working with individuals and families."

Thomas (43) has identified six societal values that are changing and discussed the great impact these changes are having on Western society. It has been suggested that home economics basically reflects a middle class set of values (Powers, 38:335-36). Gross (20) has stated that differences in cultural and class values affect home management practices. Clarification of the relationship between values and home management is needed. This relationship takes on added significance today because it is obvious that society's cultural values are changing (Crandall, 9:637-42).

INTERESTS OF HOME ECONOMISTS IN SOCIAL RELATED ACTIVITY

In recent years, there has been an increasing focus on the social related problems which exist in our society. Home economists have been involved in programs which are related to these problems, especially those which directly affect families.

McGrath (31) and Slayton (42) have challenged home economists to consider the extent to which they are addressing themselves to the social problems present in this country and maintain that this is where they are greatly needed. In discussing the major social trends which have affected home economics in recent years, Horn (23) identifies
social welfare and poverty programs as target audiences for those in the field.

Egan (13) has proposed that efforts should be made to promote the use of home economists in varied social agencies. She pointed out that homemakers need help from many areas but that home management and family economics are areas which have great contributions to make. The need for home economists in social welfare agencies has been identified by Winston (45). Youmans (47) has stated that home economists working in a team effort with social agencies often have better acceptance than case workers, because they do not control the purse strings. Needed services are often not being delivered to the disadvantaged because of a shortage of qualified personnel, according to Farmer (15), who sees the use of trained auxiliary workers as one solution to the problem.

The 59th Annual Meeting of the American Home Economics Association (AHEA) was devoted to exploring new dimensions in community programs for home economists (Egan, 12: Foreword).

Egan (13) has suggested that there is a need to relate social issues and problems to program planning in home economics education. The unique opportunity of home economics teachers in secondary schools to contribute positively to the culturally deprived student has been pointed out by Beach (3). When students and faculty who participated in a series of campus lectures, seminars, and study sessions
relating to developing intercultural understanding were asked to rank their choices for future development of social related programs, both groups ranked supervised study in an intercultural situation high on their lists (Esteros, 14: 258-61). McGrath (31) emphasized that home economists need to re-examine the curriculum in schools and include programs which prepare students to participate in activities designed to aid the urban poor. Relevant field work experiences for home economics students in such settings as settlement houses and welfare and public health agencies have been proposed by Chilman (8) to strengthen the home economics curriculum. Byrd (6:343), a participant in the 1968 AHEA Foundation study of urban family problems, stated that, "Knowledge of the factors indigenous to the current status of inner city families and their youth can be learned only through direct experience."

The effectiveness of home economists who work with the handicapped has been substantiated by Green (18). Trainee-ships in rehabilitation have been sponsored by AHEA in an effort to increase the number of trained professionals in this area (Schwab, 41:26-31).

CHANGES IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF HOME MANAGEMENT

In the last decade, there has been a conscious effort made to define more clearly the basic concepts of home management (Gross, 20:448-52). This effort was deemed necessary and desirable by professional people in the field,
who felt that clarification would promote better understanding of what their basic philosophy was, what it encompassed, and what it hoped to accomplish.

Tinsley and Sitton (44) stressed the necessity for identification and acceptance of key concepts in program planning. Schlater (40) has stated that the most intangible and least understood of the core concepts is values.

In 1959, the AHEA philosophy and objectives committee stated:

We believe that the clearest new direction for home economics is to help people identify and develop certain fundamental competencies that will be effective in personal and family living regardless of the particular circumstances of the individual family (Home Economics--New Directions, 21:8).

The competencies which the committee deemed to have special importance in management were these:

1. To establish values which give meaning to personal, family, and community living; select goals appropriate to these values
2. To make and carry out intelligent decisions regarding the use of personal, family, and community resources
3. To establish long-range goals for financial security and work toward their achievement
4. To plan consumption of goods and services--including food, clothing, and housing--in ways that will promote values and goals established by the family
5. To purchase consumer goods and services appropriate to an over-all consumption plan and wise use of economic resources
6. To perform the tasks of maintaining a home in such a way that they will contribute effectively to furthering individual and family goals (Home Economics--New Directions, 21:9).

Concentration on how the management process works and methods of planning, controlling, and evaluating have added fundamental and necessary knowledge in the field (Schlater,
40:93-98). Maloch and Deacon (33) developed a systems approach in an effort to create a more complete description of the way in which home management evolves.

It has been recognized that decision-making is the force behind management (Crandall, 9:637-42). The decision class and linkage concepts of managerial decision theory were investigated by Plonk (37), who concluded that these are important concepts and that a central, goal-directed decision sets into motion a series of satellite decisions to implement it. Plonk also found evidence that the number and quality of conscious decisions made by the individual is higher when the level of education is higher.

In general, there has been a trend to shift focus more and more from work aspects to human aspects in home management (Schlater, 40:93-98). There is also a trend toward rational and flexible standards rather than perfection (Lipppeatt and Brown, 30:50). Jeffers (25), in discussing the housekeeping ups and downs of low-income homemakers, maintained that the lack of skills is not as much of a problem as the lack of resources and motivation. Walker (45) indicated that today's conveniences have not reduced the time used for homemaking as much as might be supposed and warned that short workdays for homemakers are still a dream. In her investigation of homemakers' problems, Hunter (24) found that 60 percent of the homemakers polled thought that management of time was the hardest problem.
Changes which have occurred in the function of the family, in the physical environment of the home, and in the values predominating in Western society have had, and will continue to have, direct influence on family and home life patterns. Hook and Paolucci (22:316) have proposed that home economists approach the family from an ecological viewpoint and, in summary, suggested "a search for understanding and controlling the mutually sustaining relationships that couple man with his environment." East (11), in predicting what life may be like in the year 2000, pointed out that society has left behind the period of home production and home servicing and warned that these changes should be reflected in the choices of focus for home economics.

In reviewing the emphasis which has been placed on theory versus practice in home management, Knoll (26) has concluded that it is not a matter of elimination of one or the other but how much emphasis to place on each one. She has suggested that home management specialists should make an effort to see that the two be made to complement each other in more clearly defined and measurable ways. Home management is still in a state of some confusion regarding the specific methods of achieving its purpose, and this confusion makes progress in the field more difficult.

THE ECHO METHOD FOR DETERMINING PATTERNS OF VALUE AND INFLUENCE

The problems relating to the measurement of values have long been recognized by professionals in the behavioral
sciences. The need for relevant information about values has produced efforts to develop reliable instruments for obtaining this information.

All information relating to the ECHO method was obtained from the following sources: Project ECHO, Final Report, by Barthol and de Mille (1) and The ECHO Method and the Study of Values, by Milburn, Barthol, and de Mille (34).

From the middle of 1966 to the beginning of 1969, General Research Corporation conducted a research program known as Project ECHO. This program was sponsored primarily by the Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA), Project AGILE, Department of Defense. During this time, the project achieved the following main objectives:

1. The method was developed to a point where ECHO could give a detailed description of the value and influence pattern of a group, discriminating in detail and with confidence between different groups and subgroups in the same or different groups and subgroups in the same or different cultures.

2. The method's relevance to theory was shown.

3. ECHO was found to be reliable and concurrently valid.

4. The method was applied successfully in areas of foreign language and culture, as well as in industrial and educational settings.

5. A detailed description of the method was prepared.

6. Special elements of the ECHO method were prepared for application in Thailand (1:iii).

The ECHO method for the study of values utilizes a projective survey technique for determining group patterns of value and influence. The method has been described by Barthol and de Mille (1:iii) as:

...a way of observing, quantifying, and describing the patterns of value and influence that are felt,
verbally expressed, and often acted on in human society. Understanding these patterns helps us to understand, communicate with, and be effective in a particular group or culture.

In the ECHO method, value determination is made by asking general questions, such as questions about good and bad behavior and who would approve or disapprove of each act. Responses are classified into categories which are inherent in the data, rather than those predetermined by the investigator. This classification is carried out by members of the group being queried and/or trained researchers and staff classifiers. The use of group members in the classification process [indigenous classifiers] helps to eliminate distortion which may occur in staff classification, since indigenous classifiers can be expected to be more familiar with their own social group's values, influences, and the verbal expressions used in responses. However, staff classifiers may work more accurately and produce technically better categories. Both sets of classifiers contribute effectively to the operation, and when utilized properly, can be mutually corrective.

In the final report on the ECHO method, Barthol and de Mille (1:3) made the following suggestions for its use:

The ECHO Method is recommended for theoretical work, cultural description, and intergroup discrimination. ECHO is suggested as probably appropriate for behavior prediction, the enhancement and evaluation of training in culture-relevant fields, the construction or enhancement of informative or persuasive communications, and the development of polling questions.
The ECHO method also measures the influence that individuals associate with a specific value. By determination of forces that groups indicate would approve or disapprove of behavior, it may be possible to have a better understanding of what influences are important to the group.

For the purposes of the ECHO project, the planners decided that the concept value would incorporate "the ideas of goodness, attractiveness, interest, preference, satisfaction and their opposites," and that value would be defined as "the implicit or explicit estimate by a person, group, or organization of the merit, excellence, desirability, or worth of a behavior, principle, quality, event, or entity."

The final report of Project ECHO suggested that pre-tests on sample equivalents should be undertaken before a large scale study was prepared. The suggestion was also made that data from subsamples of 15 to 20 people were found to accurately reflect hierarchies of samples of 100 to 200 subjects. Other suggestions included the following: group administration of questions, unlimited time for administration, inclusion of 7 to 10 cards per subject, indigenous classification by nonrespondents, and interaction between indigenous and staff classifiers.

The detail supplied in the final report was deemed sufficient to allow utilization by scientifically trained investigators. The report also indicated that the analysis of the classified responses required computer support in order to be economical and timely.
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METHODOLOGY

A comparative study of the values and influence responses of students and homemakers was carried out, utilizing the projective survey technique of the ECHO method for determining values and influences in groups.

PRETESTS

According to recommendations made in the final report on Project ECHO, a pretest was conducted to familiarize the researcher with the ECHO method, and thus help to predict any problems which might arise in the study. This preliminary step also helped the researcher [R] to determine which questions would yield useful information for the study.

The pretest utilized the following questions:

What is a good thing you could do?  
Who would approve?  
What is a bad thing you could do?  
Who would disapprove?

The test was given to one sample of 10 students and one sample of 9 homemakers. Categorization was carried out by indigenous classification with the interaction of the R. No attempt was made to analyze the data by statistical methods. Results of the pretest indicated that the questions were too general to give clearcut categories relevant to the field of home management.
The questions were redesigned to read as follows:

What is a thing you could do to be a good homemaker?
Who would approve?
What is a thing you could do to be a bad homemaker?
Who would disapprove?

The redesigned questions were administered to 12 home management students in a second pretest. Categorization was carried out by indigenous classification with the interaction of the R. Results indicated that the redesigned questions would yield useful information which would be relevant to home management.

SELECTION OF THE SAMPLES

The homemaker sample consisted of 22 volunteer homemakers from the North Hollywood Apartments in North Hollywood, California. The 477-unit apartment complex is a below-market-level rental unit with special benefits under the Federal Government's 221(d)3 program. One third of the apartment residents are one-parent families and about 75 percent of the one-parent families receive aid from the Department of Social Services. The Maude Booth Family Center, operated by the Volunteers of America, is located on the premises and supplies special services to about 159 one-parent families (Flaherty, 16).

The student sample consisted of one home management class of 20 students. The class was conducted at California State University, Northridge (CSUN), Northridge, California, during the spring semester of 1972. The Department of Home
Economics at CSUN offers classes in home management as part of its regular curriculum.

COLLECTION OF DATA

The instrument used in data collection was a projective survey, based on the ECHO method for studying values and influences in groups. The gathering of the data was a two-step process. The first step was to conduct the survey itself, and the second step was to carry out indigenous classification of the responses.

Step 1

The questions "What is a thing you could do to be a good homemaker?" and "Who would approve?" were printed on pink question cards [see Appendix A]. Ten pink cards were printed for each subject [S] in the study. The questions "What is a thing you could do to be a bad homemaker?" and "Who would disapprove?" were printed on yellow question cards [see Appendix B]. Ten yellow cards were printed for each S in the study. In addition, one white card was printed for each S in the study. This white card requested the following information: age, marital status, years of education, number of children in the home, and employment status [see Appendix C].

One white card, 10 pink cards, and 10 yellow cards were assembled together in a packet envelope. One packet was made for each S. Each packet was labeled with an S.
number. Each pink card in the packet carried the S number and additional card numbers 1 through 10. Each yellow card in the packet carried the S number and additional card numbers 11 through 20. The packet envelopes for the homemaker sample were labeled S101 through S122. The packet envelopes for the student sample were labeled S201 through S220. An example of the packet and its contents appears in Appendix D.

Arrangements were made to conduct the survey of the homemaker sample at the Maude Booth Family Center. All participants in the study were volunteers who resided at the North Hollywood Apartments. The survey of the homemakers was conducted in two sessions. The first session had 17 respondents and the second session had 5 respondents.

The R assured the S's that their responses would remain anonymous. A brief introduction explaining that the study was being conducted to gain insight into values related to homemaking was given. Instructions included a simple request for the S's to answer the questions on the cards in their packets, with the qualification that each answer to the first question on each pink card be different and that each answer to the first question on each yellow card be different.

When the S's had finished answering the questions on the cards in their packets, the packets were collected by the R.

The survey of the student sample was conducted at CSUN during the regular meeting of a home management class with
an enrollment of 20 students. This survey was completed in one session.

The procedure for the survey of the student sample was the same as that used for the homemaker sample. When it was finished, the first step of data collection was complete.

**Step 2**

A team of three members was assembled from the homemaker sample [nonrespondents] to sort and tally the responses on the pink question cards. They will be referred to as Homemaker Indigenous Classifiers (HIC). The R supervised the classification and interacted with the HIC, being careful not to be involved in or influence their decisions.

The team met around a table and divided all of the pink response cards from the homemaker sample into three stacks. Each HIC sorted her cards into categories of like responses to the first question [What is a thing you could do to be a good homemaker?] on the card. When all cards had been sorted, one HIC read aloud the categories she had chosen, and each of the other two added any of her cards that fit those categories. This resulted in a single pile of cards per category. Any remaining cards which did not fit the categories chosen by the first HIC were placed in newly formed categories. When this process was finished, the team reviewed and checked each category by reading the cards again. Any cards whose category classification was questionable was discussed, and a decision was made relative
to its most accurate category placement. Some categories were split into separate categories, and other categories were combined at this time.

The team was then requested to write a label for each category. The label represented all answers in the category and made a suitable response to the question "What is a thing you could do to be a good homemaker?" Each label was then given a category number, and this number was recorded. The R found it useful to have a box drawn on each card in which to record response categories. The cards were then ready for another classification.

The above process was then repeated for the responses to the second question on the pink cards, resulting in a labeled and numbered set of response categories answering the question "Who would approve?"

The HIC were then requested to carry out classification of the yellow question cards, using the same procedure as that employed in classification of the pink question cards. This resulted in a labeled and numbered set of categories which answered the question "What is a thing you could do to be a bad homemaker?" and a labeled and numbered set of categories which answered the question "Who would disapprove?" The R reviewed the categories and no adjustments were made at this time.

A team of three students [nonrespondents] was assembled to sort and tally the responses from the student sample. They will be referred to as the Student Indigenous
Classifiers [SIC]. The procedure was the same as that used by the HIC for classification. The R reviewed the categories and no adjustments were made at this time.

When the SIC were finished, the second step of the data collection was complete. The results of the data collection steps were recorded on a schedule [see Appendix E]. This data was then transferred to computer cards for ease of analysis.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The analysis of data was carried out by utilizing computer methods to determine means and frequencies and to carry out tests for significance by chi square computations.

In addition to the computer analysis of the data, the R recorded certain observations which were considered relevant to the study.
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RESULTS AND OBSERVATIONS

After data had been recorded and transferred to computer cards, the obtained means and frequencies for the personal data requested on the white information card in the survey packet. Frequency counts were also obtained for all value category responses and for all influence category responses.

DESCRIPTION OF THE SAMPLES

The total number of homemakers in the sample was 22. Their ages ranged from 22 to 51. All of the homemakers had children in the home, with a total of 52 children for the total homemaker sample. The smallest family had one child, and the largest family had seven children. The homemakers' number of years of education ranged from 9 years to 19 years.

The total number of students in the sample was 20. Their ages ranged from 18 to 40. Not all of the students had children living in the home. The total number of children living in the home for the student sample was 30. The smallest families had no children, and the largest family had six children. The students' number of years of education ranged from 12 to 18. All students were female.
Means were determined for each sample and for both samples (i.e., for all respondents) for age, number of children in the home, and years of education. Results of this determination appear in Table 1.

Table 1

Mean Ages, Years of Education, and Number of Children of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Mean Age</th>
<th>Years of Education</th>
<th>Number of Children in the Home</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>28.76</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>25.80</td>
<td>14.95</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Frequency counts for marital status were determined for each sample and for both samples, i.e., for all respondents. Results of this determination appear in Table 2.

Table 2

Marital Status of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
While 50 percent of the students were married, with the husband living in the home, only 9 percent of the homemakers had husbands who lived at home. In the homemaker sample, 73 percent were divorced. In contrast, only 10 percent of the students were divorced.

Frequency counts for employment status were determined for each sample and for both samples, i.e., from all respondents. Results of this determination appear in Table 3.

Table 3

Employment Status of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>No. Employed Full Time</th>
<th>No. Employed Part Time</th>
<th>Number Unemployed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

None of the students and 45 percent of the homemakers were employed full time. However, there were more students than homemakers employed part time.

ANALYSIS OF VALUE RESPONSES

The category numbers and titles for the value responses that were established by the indigenous classifiers for the question "What is a thing you could do to be a good homemaker?" were the following:
1. Do a household task
2. Be considerate of the human needs of myself and others
3. Manage money well
4. Be involved constructively outside the home
5. Miscellaneous
6. To learn new things.

The category numbers and titles for the value responses expressed as disvalues that were established by the indigenous classifiers for the question "What is a thing you could do to be a bad homemaker?" were the following:

1. Fail to do a household task or not do it well
2. Be inconsiderate of the human needs of myself and others
3. Do not manage money well
4. Do not be involved constructively outside the home
5. Miscellaneous
6. Do not learn new things.

Frequency counts for each category title were determined for the value responses. The results appear in Table 4.

Table 4
Number of Value Responses of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Values Relating To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Human Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was decided that statistical analysis would be more meaningful if the number of categories were reduced. The categories relating to involvement, miscellaneous items and no responses were combined and relabeled "Other." The revised data appears in Table 5.

Table 5

Number of Value Responses of Respondents
After Combining Selected Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Values Relating To</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tasks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>347</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilizing the data in Table 5, chi square was computed to determine whether or not a significant difference existed between the responses of the two groups at the .05 level. The determination was that there was not a significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

In addition, chi square was computed to determine whether or not significant differences existed between the following:

1. Hierarchies of task related homemaking values and human related homemaking values in the homemaker sample
2. Hierarchies of task related homemaking values and human related homemaking values in the student sample
(3) Hierarchies of task related homemaking values and human related values within the total sample

(4) Homemakers and students concerning task related homemaking values

(5) Homemakers and students concerning human related homemaking values.

The results of the chi square computation indicated the following:

(1) There was a significant difference between the hierarchies of task related homemaking values and human related homemaking values in the homemaker sample.

(2) There was not a significant difference between the hierarchies of task related homemaking values and human related homemaking values in the student sample.

(3) There was not a significant difference between the hierarchies of task related values within the total sample.

(4) There was not a significant difference between homemakers and students concerning task related homemaking values.

(5) There was a significant difference between homemakers and students concerning human related homemaking values.

ANALYSIS OF INFLUENCE RESPONSES

The category titles for the influence responses [positive] that were established by the indigenous classifiers
for the question "Who would approve?" appear below.

1. Me
2. Children
3. Family
4. Husband
5. Boyfriend
6. Mother
7. Father
8. Parents
9. Society or everyone.

The category titles for the influence responses [negative] that were established by the indigenous classifiers for the question "Who would disapprove?" were the following:

1. Me
2. Children
3. Family
4. Husband
5. Boyfriend
6. Mother
7. Father
8. Parents
9. Society or everyone.

Frequency counts for each category title for the influence responses were determined. The results appear in Table 6.

It was decided that statistical analysis would be more meaningful if the number of categories were reduced. All categories relating to the family were combined, including the category of boyfriend. The decision relating to the boyfriend category was made by the R due to the indication of the S's during the classification that boyfriends were regarded as future husbands. The category of no response was combined with the category related to society or everyone and renamed "Other." The revised data appears in Table 7.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Me</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th>Boyfriend</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Parents</th>
<th>Society/Everyone</th>
<th>No Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7
Number of Influence Responses of Respondents
After Combining Selected Categories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Influences Relating To:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homemakers</td>
<td>192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Respondents</td>
<td>312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Utilizing the data in Table 7, chi square was computed to determine whether or not there was a significant difference between homemakers and students concerning influence responses. Results of this analysis indicated that there was a significant difference between homemakers and students concerning influence responses.

OBSERVATION RELATING TO THE ECHO METHOD

The R found that the most time required to complete the survey by any respondent in this study was 35 minutes. Indigenous classification required more time than the survey. The time required for classification by the SIC to sort 200 cards was one hour and 45 minutes. The HIC sorted 220 cards in two hours and 30 minutes.

Classification of influence responses appeared to be easier and take less time than classification of value responses. This was true for both teams of classifiers.
Category titles assigned to pink card value responses tended to be carried over to yellow card value responses, except that they were rephrased to represent disvalues. Category titles assigned to pink card influence responses tended to be carried over to yellow card influence responses. This method of carry-over was exhibited by both teams of classifiers.

The specific action described by the value response was not as strong a factor in classification as was the way the action was expressed. For example, the homemakers classified the response "to prepare a nutritious meal" as a task related value. However, a response relating to providing adequate nutrition was classified as "being considerate of the human needs of myself and others." Three different responses related to sewing were classified in three different ways. Sewing a dress was considered a task, sewing to save money was considered money management, and sewing pretty things for children was considered human need fulfillment.

When disagreement relating to category placement existed, the teams allowed a vote of 2 out of 3 to be the deciding factor. In the opinion of the R, there was a minimum amount of disagreement among the team members of both the HIC and the SIC relating to classification.

SUMMARY

A description of the samples was made by determining
means and frequencies for the personal data of the subjects. Frequency counts for category responses were determined and statistical analysis by computation of chi square was undertaken to test the hypotheses of the study. The observations of the R relating to the ECHO method of studying values and influences were recorded.
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SUMMARY

This study gives some insight into the values and influences that the respondents associated with homemaking. Because the samples were small, and the S's were volunteers, no predictions based on the study can be made about the general populations from which the samples were drawn.

THE SAMPLES

Although no statistical comparisons were made for personal data, certain observations appeared to the R to be of special interest.

The homemaker sample and the student sample showed fewer differences in personal characteristics than the R expected, especially relative to age and years of education. When the means for age and years of education for the two samples were compared, it was found that there was only 2.96 years difference between the means for ages and only 1.81 years difference between the means for years of education. If age and level of education are factors in homemaking values and influences, then the similarity of the two samples in the study in relation to these two characteristics could be expected to affect results.
HOMEMAKING VALUES

The study accepted the premise that the most important value category of the samples could be considered to be the one containing the most responses from subjects. Under these conditions, it appears that both the homemaker sample and the student sample rated the consideration of human needs to be the most important homemaking value. It also appears that both the homemaker sample and the student sample rated the performance of household tasks as the second most important homemaking value. The third homemaking value in the hierarchies of both groups was related to money management. The fourth homemaking value in the hierarchy of the student sample was related to involvement outside the home, and the fourth homemaking value in the hierarchy of the homemaker sample was related to learning new things.

The HIC established a category related to learning, but the SIC did not formulate such a category. It would seem to be a reasonable proposition that students value learning, but this study does not support the theory that they value learning in relation to homemaking. Yet, at the time of the study, they were enrolled in home management classes. This paradox needs further exploration.

Chi square computation was determined for analysis of the data collected in the study. Data was considered significant at the .05 level.
Computations were carried out that would yield information about the differences between the hierarchies of task related and human related homemaking values. A significant difference was found to exist between the hierarchies of task related and human related homemaking values in the homemaker sample. No significant difference was found to exist between the hierarchies of the task related and the human related homemaking values in the student sample or within the total sample.

Computations were carried out that would yield information about the difference between students and homemakers. Although the students and homemakers were both found to have human related values as the most important homemaking value, based on the number of responses, statistical analysis showed that there was a significant difference between students and homemakers concerning human related responses.

THE ECHO METHOD

It was the conclusion of the R that the ECHO method seemed to be a useful technique for studying values and influences in groups.

The major disadvantage of the method seemed to be the difficulty faced by researchers in obtaining large populations for studies. This has often been true in research projects, but the problem presented further complications when group administration was part of the procedure.
One of the biggest advantages of the method, in the opinion of the R, was its flexibility. The opportunity to change the questions with ease to suit the study was considered to be an important feature of the method.

Based on the experiences encountered in this study, the R would strongly recommend the use of pretests and the interaction of the researcher with the indigenous classifiers. Access to the books published by the developers of ECHO, which gave a complete and detailed description of the method, was of great value.

The R concluded that this study indicated that the ECHO method for studying values and influences could be a useful tool in future research projects, not only for the field of home management but also for the larger field of home economics.

HYPOTHESES

Based on the findings of this study, hypotheses numbers (1), (5), and (6) were accepted.

(1) There is a significant difference between the hierarchies of task related homemaking values and human related homemaking values in the homemaker sample.

(5) There is a significant difference between homemakers and students concerning human related values.

(6) There is a significant difference between homemakers and students concerning influence responses.
Based on the findings of this study, hypotheses numbers (2), (3), and (4) were rejected.

(2) There is not a significant difference between the hierarchies of task related homemaking values and human related homemaking values in the student sample.

(3) There is not a significant difference between the hierarchies of task related homemaking values and human related homemaking values within the total sample.

(4) There is not a significant difference between homemakers and students concerning task related homemaking values.
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IMPLICATIONS

Since home management specialists have been in general agreement that values are important to the management process, research which will yield relevant information about values should be of interest to them.

The methodological difficulties that researchers have encountered in value studies have been documented. Based on the observations made by the author in this study, the ECHO method has been found to have probable usefulness for determination of values and influences.

Relatively few attempts have been made to determine what students and homemakers value in relation to homemaking. This study has yielded some information about the homemaking values of a specific sample of students and a specific sample of homemakers. Since the samples were small, and cannot be said to be representative of the general population from which they were drawn, the findings have limited application to other populations.

The study indicated that the homemaking values of students probably need to be further examined. In this study, homemakers formulated a separate category of homemaking values related to learning new things, but the students did not. Why did this happen? Was the design of the
research faulty? Would the testing of another sample yield the same results? Have the teachers of these students failed to stimulate their interests in learning new things relating to homemaking? If the findings indicated simply that the students did not value the learning of new things related to homemaking, then why was this so? These questions have occurred to the author, who felt that they needed further investigation.

Indications related to whether or not those in the field should place more emphasis on task related or human related aspects of home management was beyond the scope of this study, but information about the hierarchies of values related to the two aspects should be of interest.

Some individuals who have been involved in social related field work have recommended that home economists need to expand their activities in this area. If this expansion is to take place, then educational programs for home economists will need to reflect this area of focus in their curricula. Information which might have implications for the planning of curricula have been reported in this study.

The study has yielded some information about homemaking values and the influences related to these values. The author felt that the need for further investigation of these relationships was indicated.

This study has been found to have implications for the fields of research, education, and social related programs.
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APPENDIX A

PINK QUESTION CARD

WHAT IS A THING YOU COULD DO TO BE A GOOD HOMEMAKER?

WHO WOULD APPROVE?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>QUESTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

YELLOW QUESTION CARD

WHAT IS A THING YOU COULD DO TO BE A BAD HOMEMAKER?

WHO WOULD DISAPPROVE?

CATEGORY

1.

QUESTION

2.
APPENDIX C

INFORMATION CARD

1. AGE_____
2. MARITAL STATUS – CHECK ONE
   ______1. MARRIED, HUSBAND IN HOME
   ______2. MARRIED, HUSBAND NOT IN HOME
   ______3. DIVORCED
   ______4. SINGLE
3. YEARS OF EDUCATION________
4. NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE HOME________
5. EMPLOYMENT – CHECK ONE
   ______1. FULL TIME
   ______2. PART TIME
   ______3. UNEMPLOYED
APPENDIX D

SURVEY PACKET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S101</th>
<th>WHAT IS A THING YOU COULD DO TO BE A BAD HOMEMAKER?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S102</td>
<td>WHAT IS A THING YOU COULD DO TO BE A GOOD HOMEMAKER?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. AGE
2. MARITAL STATUS - CHECK ONE
   1. MARRIED, HUSBAND IN HOME
   2. MARRIED, HUSBAND NOT IN HOME
   3. DIVORCED
   4. SINGLE
3. YEARS OF EDUCATION
4. NUMBER OF CHILDREN IN THE HOME
5. EMPLOYMENT - CHECK ONE
   1. FULL TIME
   2. PART TIME
   3. UNEMPLOYED
APPENDIX E

SCHEDULE FOR DATA
KEY FOR SCHEDULE

Rows - 1 through 22 represent data from the homemaker sample
24 through 43 represent data from the student sample

Columns - 1 through 3 represent subject number
4 and 5 represent age
6 represents marital status
   1. Married, husband in home
   2. Married, husband not in home
   3. Divorced
   4. Single
7 and 8 represent years of education
9 represents the number of children in the home
10 represents employment status
   1. Full time
   2. Part time
   3. Unemployed
11 through 20 represent category responses to the question, "What is a thing you could do to be a good homemaker?"
   1. Do a household task
   2. Be considerate of the human needs of myself and others
   3. Manage money well
   4. Be involved constructively outside the home
   5. Miscellaneous
   6. To learn new things
21 through 30 represent category responses to the question, "What is a thing you could do to be a bad homemaker?"
   1. Fail to do a household task or not do it well
   2. Be inconsiderate of the human needs of myself and others
   3. Do not manage money well
   4. Do not be involved constructively outside the home
   5. Miscellaneous
   6. Do not learn new things
31 through 40 represent category responses to the question, "Who would approve?"
   1. Me
   2. Children
   3. Family
   4. Husband
   5. Boyfriend
6. Mother
7. Father
8. Parents
9. Society or everyone

41 through 50 represent responses to the question, "Who would disapprove?"

1. Me
2. Children
3. Family
4. Husband
5. Boyfriend
6. Mother
7. Father
8. Parents
9. Society or everyone