

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1968

Family Life Education in the High Schools of Utah

Chad B. Howells
Utah State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Howells, Chad B., "Family Life Education in the High Schools of Utah" (1968). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2238.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2238>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION IN THE
HIGH SCHOOLS OF UTAH

by

Chad B. Howells

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Family and Child Development

Approved:

Major Professor

Committee Member

Committee Member

Dean of Graduate Studies

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1968

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

During the fall of 1967, the Family and Child Development Department gave their approval for this study to be made under the direction of Dr. C. Jay Skidmore. I would like to express my sincere appreciation to Dr. Skidmore for his help and encouragement.

I would also like to thank the other members of my Graduate Committee: Dr. Jay D. Schvaneveldt for his critical review of this thesis and his technical advice on the construction of the thesis; Dr. Don C. Carter, Head of the Department of Family and Child Development; and Dr. John D. Haas of the Education Department for his help in working with the secondary education institutions of the state.

The financial assistance received from the G.I. Education Benefits bill and also from my graduate assistantship with the Department of Family and Child Development was greatly appreciated. Without these, this study would not have been possible.

Finally, I extend my gratitude to my wife and family for their patience and support on this study. I especially thank my wife for her typing and untiring assistance in helping tabulate and analyze the data.

Chad B. Howells

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Introduction to the Problem	1
Focus on the Problem	4
Purpose of the Study	5
Statement of the Problem	5
Definition of Family Life Education	6
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
Historical Background	7
Studies on Family Life Education	8
Summary of Studies	14
METHODOLOGY	16
The Sample and Collection of the Data	16
The Instruments	17
Analysis	19
FINDINGS	21
Response	21
Administrative Provisions for Family Life Education Courses	21
The school	21
Introduction of course	22
Type of course	26
Course title	26
School department	28
Course offering	30
Enrollment	31
Structural provisions	32
Comparison with other studies	33
The Teacher of Family Life Education	34
Personal characteristics	34
Professional preparation	36
Teaching experience	40
Appraisal of course	40
Comparison with other studies	41

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

	Page
Subject and Topic Areas in Family Life Education Courses	43
Children	44
Personality development	45
Marriage and marriage problems	45
Dating and courtship	46
Family and society	47
Sex education	48
Family relationships	48
Sex in society	49
Teachers' feeling of adequacy	50
Comparison with other studies	54
Teaching Aids in Family Life Education Courses	54
Resource periodicals	54
Textbooks	56
Resource persons	56
Films	58
Comparison with other studies	58
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	60
Purpose and Problem	60
Methodology	61
Summary of Findings	62
Conclusions	64
Recommendations	67
LITERATURE CITED	70
APPENDIX	73
VITA	84

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Distribution of replies by states and kind of sex instruction given	9
2. Enrollment in all Utah high schools and high schools with family life education	22
3. Principals' estimate of year family life course first offered	23
4. Teachers' estimate of year family life course first offered	23
5. Initiation of course by principal	24
6. Initiation of course by present teacher	24
7. Principals' rating of various groups' attitudes toward family life course	25
8. Teachers' rating of various groups' attitudes toward family life course	25
9. Number of weeks family life material is offered	27
10. Compulsory or elective courses by grade	27
11. Principals' preference of compulsory or elective courses	27
12. Title of course by type of course	28
13. School department of course	29
14. Principals' preference of department of course	29
15. Grades in which course is offered	30
16. Sex composition of courses in responding schools	31
17. Division of courses by sex	31
18. Teachers' enrollment in family life classes by sex of students	32
19. Teachers' estimate of students having some family life education prior to graduation	33

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
20. Comparison of administrative provisions for four states	34
21. Sex of family life teachers	35
22. Age distribution of teachers	35
23. Undergraduate major of teachers	37
24. Teachers' highest professional degree	37
25. Number of graduate hours in selected areas	38
26. Number of undergraduate and graduate hours in marriage and family	39
27. Number of teachers that felt need for more preparation in family life education	39
28. Teaching experience in high school and family life education	40
29. Comparison of characteristics of Utah teachers with those of other studies	42
30. Time devoted to the eight subject areas	44
31. Number of hours devoted to "children"	45
32. Number of hours devoted to "personality development"	46
33. Number of hours devoted to "marriage and marriage problems"	46
34. Number of hours devoted to "dating and courtship"	47
35. Number of hours devoted to "family and society"	47
36. Number of hours devoted to "sex education"	48
37. Number of hours devoted to "family relationships"	49
38. Number of hours devoted to "sex in society"	49
39. Teachers' feeling of adequacy in teaching eight major areas	51
40. Teachers' feeling of adequacy in teaching eight major areas (simplified)	52

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

Table	Page
41. Comparison of ranking of feelings of adequacy and teaching time in eight areas	53
42. Comparison of ranking of feelings of adequacy and the "no response" given on each of the eight areas	53
43. Comparison between Utah and Florida of time devoted to eight subject areas	55
44. Use of resource periodicals for family life information	56
45. Text used in family life course	57
46. Resource persons employed in family life classes	58

ABSTRACT

Family Life Education in the
High Schools of Utah

by

Chad B. Howells, Master of Science

Utah State University, 1968

Major Professor: Dr. C. Jay Skidmore
Department: Family and Child Development

A descriptive study was made of the administrative provisions, teaching qualifications and characteristics, subjects and topics being taught, and resources used in teaching family life education in the high schools of Utah.

"Some" family life education was being taught in 98 per cent of the high schools. Of these schools, 82 per cent were teaching it as a unit in a regular class varying widely from Home and Family Living to Livestock Management.

Home Economics classes came closest to teaching family life education as it was defined in this study; however, these classes were made up almost entirely of girl students.

The training received by most family life teachers was not explicitly in family life education, resulting in a segmentalized exposure regarding the whole of family life education. Only 30.7 per cent of the family life teachers were using a family life textbook.

(92 pages)

INTRODUCTION

Introduction to the Problem

In 1957 with the launching of the Sputnik, many of the leaders of the United States panicked, feeling that all educational stress should be towards the physical and technological sciences. Foremost among these was probably Vice Admiral H. G. Rickover, who, when he was asked to appear before the 1962 Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives made such statements as:

It is only through basic education that you are able to help children to develop alert and informed minds. Life-adjustment training will never do it.

Our schoolmen claim their life adjustment training will develop good character traits. They often alibi poor scholastic achievements by saying that our schools do better in character training. The sad fact is, however, that we have more juvenile delinquency and more adult crime and that both have risen in the past decades when the progressives held full sway over our schools. . . . You learn intellectual self-discipline through basic education, not through life-adjustment training.

Require of our teachers better subject mastery, and jettison "look-say," "reading-readiness," and the whole nonsense of progressivism and life adjustment. (Rickover, 1962, pp. 45, 46, and 56)

Other critics also expressed their views concerning family life education. The text of their message is expressed in a 4 per cent proportional sampling of 16,000 school administrators. Forty-four per cent of these administrators opposed assuming more responsibility for preparing students for marriage, home, and family living. Some of the negative statements that were made were:

I agree that many of our young people need this instruction, but I deplore the growing trend to add to our schools responsibilities that belong to the home.

Perhaps we have spread ourselves too thin already.

The academic program suffers when social instruction is added. (The Nations Schools, 1960, p. 80)

After the feelings of panic subsided, many people began to realize that with complete stress on the physical sciences, they were in danger of creating a giant physically, but an infant socially, morally, and emotionally. Because of this realization, there has been more recent stress put upon the social and behavioral sciences. This balance between the physical, social, and behavioral sciences is the first of three controversies affecting family life education.

The second controversy is whether or not family life education should be included in secondary schools, or even colleges, as a part of this stress toward social and behavioral sciences. There are pros and cons on this subject also. However, the general trend of feeling among social scientists is that it should be included. Bonar communicates this general feeling in his statement:

Accrediting associations and institutions of higher education must assume responsibility in preventing the collapse of the family unit in the long range general welfare of our nation and our culture. Their leadership is needed to encourage secondary schools to make drastic curriculum changes and graduation requirements that will include preparation for maintaining and strengthening the family unit. (Bonar, 1960, p. 420)

Jewson has stressed a new type of education as follows:

Today there is much concern over the many existing symptoms of individual and family instability, such as the high divorce rate, pre-marital pregnancy, teenage VD, school dropouts, juvenile delinquency, and early marriage.

Education has a real role to play in combating and preventing breakdown in family relations. Studies suggest that students who take courses in marriage and family living are more willing to face their problems of

sex, courtship, and marriage; more often postpone or break off going steady; are more apt to terminate unpromising engagements; attempt to appraise their love feelings in terms of adequacy for marriage; and postpone marriage until they are prepared to assume the roles and responsibilities to make a successful marriage. (Jewson, 1963, p. 89)

In the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth (1960, p. 12), the crucial need was emphasized for family life education and it was recommended " . . . that family life courses, including preparation for marriage and parenthood, be instituted as an integral and major part of public education from elementary school through high school."

If family life education is taught, the third controversy is how, by whom, and under which department should it be taught. Some educators feel that it is adequate to blend family life education in with other subject matter. Kirkendall (1949), Behlmer (1959), and others feel that a more effective program would be to offer, in addition, a separate and specialized course where only family life education materials would be taught.

According to a study of school administrators and school board members (Johnson and Schutt, 1966) in the state of Maryland, it was found that the area of most concern for a sex and family life education program was the qualification and preparation of the teacher. There is much concern over the plight in which many schools find themselves by not having a qualified teacher. In consequence, they hand the teaching of this program over to the first teacher who volunteers to teach it (Iseman, 1968). Family life education is no easy subject matter to teach, so proper background and training are necessary (Kirkendall, 1949). As Broderick (1964, p. 102) so fittingly pointed out: "Young people increasingly bring more heterosexual experience and sophistication to family life classes than is assumed by most textbooks and course outlines."

Focus on the Problem

In 1961 the Utah State Legislative Council passed the House Joint Resolution #23 which reads as follows:

A Joint Resolution relating to the writing of a state course of study by the state board of education dealing with the sociological problems of family life which will help prepare students for successful marriage.

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah:

WHEREAS, broken homes and the high rate of divorce in the state of Utah are the concern of the Legislature and the citizens of Utah; and

WHEREAS, it appears that our use of marriage counseling comes at a time when it is too late to change habits and attitudes of those being counseled; and

WHEREAS, young people of the state should be more adequately prepared for the responsibilities of married life prior to their entering such relationship;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Legislature of the State of Utah that the state board of education be urged to establish a state course of study which places greater emphasis on the sociological problems of family life and which prepare students more successfully for the responsibilities found in married life. (Report to Utah State Legislative Council, 1966, p. 2)

In a report from the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, a reply was made concerning the above-mentioned House Joint Resolution #23. The author would like to quote several passages from this reply.

Since each adolescent is consciously preparing himself for adulthood, guidance in school is extremely important. The student needs also to have the opportunity to acquire specific knowledge and skill that will make healthful, comfortable and pleasant home life.

The role of the school in this training is carried out through offerings in several areas of the secondary curriculum. These offerings include help in making decisions, developing values, establishing standards and promotion and perfection of skills necessary to be successful family members. The subject matter areas which contribute significantly to the objectives, as set forth in this report, are homemaking (home economics), business, health education, agriculture, industrial arts, language arts, science, and social science. (Report to Utah State Legislative Council, 1966, p. 3)

The report then goes into an analysis of the contributions made by each of the above-mentioned subject matter areas in the secondary curriculum to the various objectives of family life education. The report is then summarized:

An analysis of the secondary curriculum with respect to family life education seems to indicate that much can and is being done through the various curricular offerings. We believe that the schools can best contribute to family life education through this integrated approach.

While much is being done, we recognize the fact that the schools, along with other agencies responsible for successful family living, can and must do more in this important area. (Report to Utah State Legislative Council, 1966, p. 23)

Purpose of the Study

This study was an attempt to objectively find out how much "is being done through the various curricular offerings" in the integrated approach being used in the state of Utah. There has been some research undertaken in family life education in other states; however, research is lacking in Utah which would make results comparable to what has been done in other regions of our nation.

Statement of the Problem

This was basically a descriptive study under which four broad questions¹ were framed for investigation:

1. What administrative provisions are made for family life education courses?
2. What characteristics and qualifications do teachers of family life education courses have?

¹These questions were adopted and modified from questions used by Alan E. Bayer (1963, p. 4) in a study at Florida State University.

3. What subjects and topics are commonly taught in family life education courses?

4. What resources are utilized in family life education courses?

Definition of Family Life Education

For the purposes of this study, "family life education" was defined as *any form of education that would teach attitudes, feelings, or facts in such areas as: (a) personal adjustment in preparing for marriage and family life; (b) sex education; (c) one's place in his parental family; (d) dating and courtship; (e) marriage; (f) love and interpersonal relationships; (g) parenthood; and (h) any phase of living in families.*

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Historical Background

Family life education in some form or another has been in existence on the educational scene for quite some time. Force reviewed some of its earlier development in these words:

Between 1918, when "worthy home membership" was recognized as one of the seven cardinal principals of education, and 1930, when at the White House Conference "The Children's Charter" challenged the public schools to accept their responsibility for teaching and training youth for successful parenthood and homemaking, the hardworking home economics personnel in the high schools carried the Family Life Education program alone and unaided. . . . In the late 1930's the family was rediscovered. Came a tidal wave of interpretation and promotion. Professional and lay groups through organizations and publications, some academically responsible and some not, sought to sell to the public and the schools the need for doing something that would curb the rising divorce rate, decrease the incidence of juvenile delinquency, and halt the general disintegration of family life. A new area of study thus opened up. . . . The bandwagon became pretty crowded as interest in family and youth conservation soared. . . . A body of subject matter and a philosophy accompanied by recommended teaching techniques filtered through from the college level to the attention of high school persons who were interested in making a possible contribution to the "cause." . . . A handful of principals and teachers began to organize and develop materials and techniques for use with the teenager. The home economics people, already overloaded with demands, found it impossible to stretch time and resources much further. What to do?

Most schools did nothing. A few, very few, enterprising schoolmen, inadvertently protected by the fact that the public's interests and efforts were absorbed by the war effort, took forward steps to meet the growing problem. Curriculum changes were made. In most cases the changes were slight. A short unit tucked in the English course, another in Social Studies, another in Physical Education and Health classes--all represented efforts to deal briefly, if timidly, with the more dramatic and usually negative aspects of family living--divorce, delinquency, disintegration of the family. In most of the classrooms of the country, however, business went on as usual. (Force, 1950, p. 156)

In the 1940's and 50's, family life programs continued to progress somewhat with some schools adventuring forth and introducing full semester courses in family life education. One of the earliest of these was offered in 1941 at Tom Rivers High School, Tom Rivers, New Jersey (Force, 1962).

In the 1960's, in spite of the big controversy over education and probably a result of the recommendations of the 1960 White House Conference on Children and Youth, a family life education "boom" has commenced. Many schools have responded to the demand for more family life classes and many new semester or full year courses have been introduced to supplement the already existing units being taught in various curricular areas.

Studies on Family Life Education

As long as family life education has been in the schools there have been educators who have been concerned with the quantity and quality of courses in this area; especially, since since this seems to be an area that is normally followed with a great amount of parental and community concern.

In 1920, Edison (1922) surveyed all the high schools throughout the United States to determine the status of sex education.¹ Of the 6,488 reporting schools, 20 per cent indicated that some sex education was being offered in their schools. Following are some of the findings particularly concerning the states that are of interest to this study (Table 1).

¹In this study, sex education is considered an integral part of family life education; therefore, several of the studies cited will be concerning sex education.

Table 1. Distribution of replies by states and kind of sex instruction given

State	Total replies	Emergency sex education ^a	Integrated sex education ^b	No sex education	Total no. of high schools
Florida	28	7	1	20	61
Indiana	363	65	46	252	709
Penn.	587	105	86	396	298
Utah	21	4	17	0	47

Source: Edison, 1922, p. 10.

^aSpecial lectures, pamphlets, exhibits, etc.

^bIncidentally in the subject of the regular curriculum.

Of the four schools, Utah had the highest percentage of integrated sex education in its schools. According to this survey, Utah was the only state in the United States that had sex education being taught in all of its replying high schools.

Brown (1936) made a study throughout the country in 1935 to determine the status of what might be termed family life education. From the 25 states from which reports were given, there were 11,532 public high schools in operation. Of these, 6,370 or 55.2 per cent were offering a course in social or home relations. At that time, the majority of the courses were one year in length and were on required status whenever possible.

In 1954, questionnaires were sent to 469 principals in the California schools by Landis and Kidd (1956, p. 135). For this study, they defined family life as "personality development, emotional and social maturity, dating, courtship, mate selection, adjustment in marriage and parenthood." From a 61 per cent return, 24.1 per cent offered nothing

and 75.9 per cent taught family living in a unit or semester course in either the social studies, home economics, or in other departments. Of the family life classes taught, 37 per cent were on an elective basis, while 63 per cent were compulsory.

Landis (1965) did a follow-up study in 1964 to distinguish the trends over a 10-year period. In the 1964 study, 590 schools were studied with a 54.4 per cent return. Thirty-three per cent offered no courses while 67 per cent offered at least one course or unit in family living. Thirty-six per cent were offered in the social studies department, 58 per cent were in the home economics department and 6 per cent were in other departments. Thirty-nine schools had discontinued the family living courses since 1954. In 1964, 67 per cent were taught on an elective basis while 33 per cent were compulsory. Note a trend toward an overall decrease in family life classes being offered with far less in the social studies department and more in the home economics department. The trend is also toward more elective and fewer compulsory classes.

Kenkel (1957) surveyed 940 high school superintendents in the state of Iowa and received a 30 per cent response. Thirty-three per cent of the responding schools offered no family life education. A full course was offered by 11 per cent of the schools and 54 per cent offered family life education as a part of another course. The average class enrollment was 14 girls and nine boys. The main reason given by the 33 per cent not offering family life education was the lack of qualified teachers.

Miller (1956) sent a questionnaire to 73 high schools in Tennessee and received a reply from 40 schools (54.8 per cent). Only six schools

were offering any kind of a course as preparation for marriage or family living. Enrollment was voluntary and an average of three boys and 122 girls were taking the course where one was offered.

Bradley (1958) made another southern study in Louisiana as quoted by Hitchcock and de Lissovoy:

Bradley (1958) wrote that 69 percent of the schools offered family life education in the home economics department. She stated that although 75 percent of the principals favored family life education, only 45 percent believed the school board would be positive, and only 42 percent thought the community would favor this instruction. (Hitchcock and de Lissovoy, 1966, p. 478)

In 1958, 182 schools in Illinois (16 per cent of the high schools outside the city of Chicago) were surveyed by Rosenstiel and Smith (1963). Of the 55 per cent return (100 schools), 40 per cent had at least one course in family living. Forty-four per cent of the family living courses were incorporated into another course. Four-fifths of the instructors of family living classes had majored in home economics.

According to Bayer, an intensive study of family life education in the public high schools of Pennsylvania was done by Glatthorn in 1958. Glatthorn surveyed all of the principals to determine the teachers of family life education. From 81 per cent of the principals, he obtained the names of 156 teachers, 91 per cent of which (143) replied to a questionnaire sent to them.

An analysis of returns indicated that 71 per cent of the courses were a school year in length, and that 49 per cent met five periods a week. Two-thirds of the courses were available only to twelfth grade students and slightly more than one-half (52 per cent) were elective rather than required.

The broad area of "marriage" and specific topics within this area received the most emphasis (17 periods). The area of "sex education" received the least attention (4.8 periods).

Most (53 per cent) of the teachers were men; median age 39.9; and 78 per cent were married. The teachers had

taught family living for a median of 3.75 years. The majority of these teachers taught family life education in a home economics course, with 95 per cent of the family life education courses found to be taught in home economics, social studies, health education, or guidance courses. Over 90 per cent of the teachers believed that all students should take the course, that the course should be expanded, and that the course had been of great help to most of the students. (Bayer, 1963, pp. 10-11)

During the year 1961-62, another study was conducted in Pennsylvania by Hitchcock and de Lissvoy (1966). Of the 647 public and private schools surveyed, 69 per cent indicated they had some kind of instruction given in family life. The instruction was elective in 42.1 per cent of the schools and compulsory in 57.9 per cent of them. Family life education was taught as a unit of another course in 55 per cent of the schools, the majority of which were in the area of home economics. Eighty-three schools (18.6 per cent) offered courses entitled "family living."

In 1960, the North Carolina high schools were the focus of Sperry and Thompson (1961). They contacted 838 schools and 611 principals responded to a part of the questionnaire on family life education. Seventy-seven per cent reported that no family life education class was offered, while 22 per cent reported that there was and that the majority were offered through the home economics department.

Whitehurst's (1961) Indiana study was carried out in two stages. A preliminary part of the study was made by Dager and Harper (1959) in which they surveyed all of the principals in Indiana to determine the teachers that were teaching family life education. They surveyed 1,086 teachers and received a response from 801 of these. Only 547 teachers made up a usable sample. The majority (60.5 per cent) of the family life teachers were teaching home economics. Around 80 per cent of the

547 teachers stated that they had had training in family life education. The majority of those trained were either in home economics (66 per cent), health and physical education (10 per cent), or sociology (10 per cent). There was a three-to-one ratio of girls to boys and 26 per cent of the courses were compulsory. The majority of the courses were of the unit variety with a median length of time of nine weeks.

Dager, Harper, and Whitehurst made an assumption from Whitehurst's study concerning teacher preparation which follows:

We must assume, therefore, that the training received in most cases was not explicitly in family life education but in some related area, which area probably provided the teachers with only segmentalized exposure regarding the whole of family life education which presumably results in limited competence. (Dager, Harper, and Whitehurst, 1962, p. 367)

Grover (1966) surveyed 87 white teachers in 1962-63 who were, presumably, teaching a home economics class entitled "family living." He received a response from 59 of them and found that there were seven major topics that were taught by 54 of the 59. These were: Family as a Social Unit, Consumer Education, Dating and Courtship, Psychology of Personality, Family Relationships, Marriage, and Child Care and Development. Sex Education, an eighth topic, was taught to some extent in more than half of the courses. Clergymen were the most commonly used resource person by these teachers. All but one of the teachers reported using newspapers and popular magazines as supplementary reading.

In 1962-63, an intensive study was made in the Florida high schools by Bayer (1963). Bayer surveyed the records of the Florida State Department of Education to determine the teachers of family life courses. A questionnaire was sent to 173 possible family life education teachers

and a response of 143 (82.7 per cent) was received. Ninety-three reported that they taught a family life course (53 full courses and 40 unit courses). Eighty-five per cent of the full courses and 46 per cent of the unit courses were taught through the home economics department. One-half of the reported courses had been introduced into the curriculum since 1955. Home economics was the undergraduate major of 66.3 per cent of the family life teachers. Only two-thirds of the full course teachers and one-third of the unit course teachers used a regularly assigned family life textbook.

In the preliminary part of the Indiana study, Dager and Harper defined family life education as follows:

Family life education is the teaching of dating and courtship; implications of early marriage; love and romance; preparation for marriage; implications of being husband-father, wife-mother; sex education; and marital adjustment as related to the personal and social responsibilities of a family. (Dager and Harper, 1959, p. 386)

This same definition was used by Bayer in the Florida study.

Summary of Studies

The above studies can be summarized by the following generalizations by Bayer:

1. In most states the majority of the family life courses that are offered are unit courses which devote only a part of the semester to family life topics.
2. The greatest percentage of family life courses are offered in home economics and social studies.
3. More girls than boys are enrolled in high school family life courses.
4. Most family life courses are elective rather than required.
5. Most of the family life teachers are women, practically all are married, and many have had college preparation in home economics. (Bayer, 1963, p. 12)

The investigator would also like to make the following generalizations concerning the above studies (particularly those made by Whitehurst (1961) and Kenkel (1957):

1. The training received by most family life teachers was not explicitly in family life education but in some related area resulting in a segmentalized exposure regarding the whole of family life education and thus resulting in a limited competence of these teachers.

2. Because of the lack of qualified teachers, family life education was not being offered in many schools where it would otherwise be taught.

METHODOLOGY

The Sample and Collection of the Data

The collection of the data consisted of two phases. First a telephone survey was made of all high school principals in the state of Utah to: (a) determine the teachers in each of their schools that taught a unit (or perchance a semester or a year's course) in an area classified as family life education, and (b) to get their cooperation and support on this study.

In the second phase, a packet containing two types of questionnaires was mailed to each school. One was a short one-page questionnaire for the principal to obtain his ideas and feelings concerning family life education. The second questionnaire was for each of the 525 teachers indicated by the principal as possibly teaching family life education. Each teacher questionnaire, when completed, was to be sealed in an individual envelope and returned to the principal's office. These, along with the principal's questionnaire, were to be returned in a stamped, self-addressed packet to Utah State University.

The teacher sample was obtained through the principals. The principal was given the definition of family life education and then asked which teachers would fall into this category. The researcher would suggest some possibilities if they weren't mentioned. The possibilities mentioned were Home Economics, Health or Physical Education, Psychology, Sociology, Social Studies, American Problems, and Biology. For this study, then, considerable importance was placed on how aware the

principal was of the subject matter being taught in each class and who was teaching it.

The Instruments

The questionnaire for the principal was developed to gather some basic information concerning the administrative provisions of each school, along with some of the principal's own personal feelings on family life education.

The teacher questionnaire was a modified version of the questionnaire used by Bayer (1963) in his Florida State study. Bayer's questionnaire used items taken from Glatthorn's (1960) Pennsylvania study and Whitehurst's (1961) Indiana study so that a comparison of the findings could be made. Bayer modified several of the items from the questionnaires of each of these studies because of inherent problems in the wording and the division of topic items. The Glatthorn study subdivided seven topic areas into 62 subtopic areas, on each of which the teachers were to estimate the amount of teaching time spent. The Whitehurst study had eleven topic areas, each divided into two to nine subtopic areas. Teachers were asked to estimate the approximate number of class periods spent on each major topic area and to indicate the approximate percentage of these class periods spent on each subtopic included under the major topic heading. Both of these questionnaires were long and complicated and required a great number of computations on the part of the teachers. Bayer attempted to simplify and cut down on the teacher time required to fill out the questionnaire. Examples were given of the subtopics taught under each major topic, but no estimate was required of the time spent on each subtopic.

The eight major topic areas and their subtopics, used by Bayer, were the result of a synthesis of the items on the Glatthorn and Whitehurst questionnaires and an examination of the table of content groupings of the following five family life textbooks:

- Blood, Robert O., Jr. 1957. *Anticipating Your Marriage*. Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press.
- Fishbein, Morris, and Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy. 1957. *Modern Marriage and Family Living*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1957.
- Kirkpatrick, Clifford. 1955. *The Family as Process and Institution*. New York: Ronald Press.
- Landis, Judson T., and Mary G. Landis. 1950. *Personal Adjustment, Marriage and Family Living*. New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Landis, Paul. 1960. *Making the Most of Marriage*. Revised. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Bayer's first drafts of the questionnaire were read by his examining committee: Professor Howard Borsuk, Professor Meyer F. Nimkoff, and Professor F. Ivan Nye. Improvements on clarity and thoroughness were made from their suggestions. Bayer then gave the draft to the department head in the Social Studies Department in the Florida State Department of Education and to the department supervisor of home economics in the same department. Two ninth grade family life teachers in the Bay County school system of Florida were also given the questionnaire for comment and criticism. The latter four individuals made further suggestions which were incorporated in the final draft of the questionnaire.

For this study, Bayer's teacher questionnaire was used almost as it stood because it was felt by the researcher that it was an excellent questionnaire and would fit the needs of this study. However, a few

modifications were made in the wording to fit the researcher's tastes and another question was added to Part II to fit the design of this study. The additional question was added to test the teacher's feelings of adequacy in teaching family life education.

A rough draft of the principal and teacher questionnaires was presented to the researcher's head professor, Dr. C. Jay Skidmore and his department head, Dr. Don C. Carter and to the other members of his examining committee, Dr. John D. Haas and Dr. Jay D. Schvaneveldt. Some minor changes were made from their suggestions which improved the preciseness of the questionnaire. These improved drafts were then presented to two of the local high schools' principals and teachers to distinguish any weaknesses that might exist. The order of two questions in Part I, question 1 of the teacher questionnaire was changed to add to the clarity of the questions.

These questionnaires were adopted to facilitate a comparison of Utah's program with the programs in Florida, Indiana, and Pennsylvania in the areas of (a) administrative provisions, (b) teacher qualification and characteristics, (c) subjects and topics being taught, and (d) resources used in teaching family life education in the high schools. These three states were chosen because there were data available for comparison in the above-mentioned areas.

Analysis

The data were tabulated on tabulation sheets for analysis and then placed on tables for viewing. Since this was a descriptive study, the figures were transferred into percentages for comparison with studies from Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Florida. As the above three states were

compared in the Florida study by Bayer, his general format was followed as far as the presentation and comparison of the data, with Utah being added as the fourth state.

FINDINGS

Response

All of the 84 high schools (grade 10-12) in the state of Utah were surveyed for this study. All 84 principals were contacted by telephone and then sent a principal-questionnaire along with the number of indicated teacher-questionnaires for his school. The principals indicated 525 teachers as possible family life education teachers, either teaching a unit, semester, or full year's course.

A response was received from 71 (84.5 per cent) of the schools either in the form of a principal's questionnaire, a teacher's questionnaire, or both. There were 52 (63.4 per cent of the principals that responded and 293 (55.8 per cent) of the teachers. Seventy-five (25.6 per cent) of the teachers indicated that they did not teach family life education in any form. Of the 218 (74.4 per cent) that did, 174 (50.4 per cent) taught it in a unit course, 17 (5.8 per cent) taught it in a semester course, and 27 (9.2 per cent) taught it in a full year's course. Seventy of the 71 reporting schools offered some type of family life education program.

Administrative Provisions for Family Life Education Courses

The school

The mean enrollment of all Utah high schools was 776 while the mean enrollment of the 71 reporting schools was 831 and the 70 schools offering family life education was 841 students. The reporting high schools for

this study were predominantly the larger schools in the state. The one reporting school that didn't offer family life education had an enrollment of only 147 students. It can be noted from Table 2 that a very high percentage (98.6 per cent) of the reporting schools are offering some type of family life education.

Table 2. Enrollment in all Utah high schools and high schools with family life education

High school enrollment	No. of Utah high schools	No. of reporting high schools	No. of reporting high schools with some F.L.E.	% of reporting high schools with some F.L.E.
Under 100	3	3	3	100.0
100-500	39	31	30	96.8
500-1,000	16	13	13	100.0
1,000-1,500	11	9	9	100.0
1,500-2,000	7	7	7	100.0
2,000-3,000	8	8	8	100.0
Total	84	71	70	98.6

Introduction of course

From the data of this study (see Tables 3 and 4), it would appear that family life education was a recent innovation in the state of Utah. The teachers estimated that 90.7 per cent of the family life education classes were offered since 1950 and 66.0 per cent since 1960. The principals estimated that 64.7 per cent of the family life education courses were introduced since 1960. An inconsistency can be noted between this

Table 3. Principals' estimate of year family life course first offered

Year	Number	Percent
Before 1940	0	0.0
1940-1944	0	0.0
1945-1949	0	0.0
1950-1954	2	11.8
1955-1959	4	23.5
1960-1964	8	47.1
Since 1965	3	17.6
Total	17	100.0
Total response	17	32.7
No response	35	67.3
Over-all total	52	100.0

Table 4. Teachers' estimate of year family life course first offered

Year	Number	Percent
Before 1940	3	3.1
1940-1944	2	2.1
1945-1949	4	4.1
1950-1954	8	8.2
1955-1959	16	16.5
1960-1964	28	28.9
Since 1965	36	37.1
Total	97	100.0
Total response	97	44.5
No response	60	27.5
Don't know	61	28.0
Over-all total	218	100.0

data and the data from the 1922 Edison study when it was indicated that sex education was being taught in all of the Utah high schools.

Another indication of the newness of the family life courses was the high percentage (42.7) of the teachers that had initiated the courses they were teaching (Table 6). The principals (Table 5) also indicated having initiated 13.5 per cent of the family life courses in their schools. If the courses were long established, fewer of the teachers and principals would have initiated the family life courses with which they were concerned.

Table 5. Initiation of course by principal

Initiate course	Number	Percent
Yes	7	13.5
No	30	57.7
No response	15	28.8
Total	52	100.0

Table 6. Initiation of course by present teacher

Initiate course	Total	Percent
Yes	93	42.7
No	121	55.5
No response	4	1.8
Total	218	100.0

One of the great concerns to the person introducing a course is the attitude of the people affected by it. Tables 7 and 8 show that the

Table 7. Principals' rating of various groups' attitudes toward family life course

Rating	Groups							
	Students		Parents		Community		Administration	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Mostly favorable	39	75.0	35	67.2	33	63.5	43	82.6
Somewhat favorable	10	19.2	14	27.0	12	23.0	6	11.6
Apathetic	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	7.7	0	0.0
Somewhat unfavorable	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mostly unfavorable	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No response	3	5.8	3	5.8	3	5.8	3	5.8
Total	52	100.0	52	100.0	52	100.0	52	100.0

Table 8. Teachers' rating of various groups' attitudes toward family life course

Rating	Groups							
	Students		Parents		Community		Administration	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Mostly favorable	171	78.5	145	66.5	129	59.2	165	75.7
Somewhat favorable	19	8.7	27	12.4	25	11.5	16	7.3
Apathetic	2	.9	6	2.7	18	8.2	6	2.8
Somewhat unfavorable	0	0.0	1	.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
Mostly unfavorable	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
No response	26	11.9	39	17.9	46	21.1	31	14.2
Total	218	100.0	218	100.0	218	100.0	218	100.0

principals and teachers tend to rate the attitudes of the four groups fairly high. The principals rated the attitudes of the parents, community, and the administration higher than did the teachers. The teachers gave the students a higher rating as well as a lower rating.

Type of course

Of 158 responding teachers, about 60 per cent taught less than six weeks of family life throughout the whole year (see Table 9). There were also clusterings around 18 and 36 weeks for the semester and full year's courses respectively.

The big majority (88.7 per cent) of family life classes were taught five days per week. The other 11.3 per cent were quite evenly spread from one through four days per week.

Three-fourths of the family life classes were elective while the other fourth was compulsory. In the tenth grade the majority of courses (54.6 per cent) were compulsory, while they were elective in the eleventh grade with 76.3 per cent and the twelfth grade with 84.6 per cent. Approximately 80.8 per cent of the principals preferred the courses taught on an elective basis (Tables 10 and 11).

Course title

Twenty-two different titles were mentioned by the 215 teachers. Seven were used as full course titles and 20 were used as unit courses. Over 50 per cent of the titles used were in the areas of Home and Family Living and Health and Physical Education (Table 12). Of the 26.5 per cent in Home and Family Living classes, over half were taught as full courses. Over three-fourths of the full courses carry the same title (Home and Family Living). Of the unit courses, almost one-third carry

Table 9. Number of weeks family life material is offered

Number of weeks	Total	Percent (N = 158)
1- 2	31	19.6
3- 4	46	29.1
5- 6	17	10.7
7- 8	6	3.8
9-10	14	8.9
11-12	4	2.5
13-14	1	.7
15-16	4	2.5
17-18	21	13.3
19-20	4	2.5
21-22	1	.7
36	9	5.7
Total	158	100.0

Table 10. Compulsory or elective courses by grade

High school grade	Compulsory		Elective	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
10	48	54.6	40	45.4
11	42	23.7	135	76.3
12	39	15.4	214	84.6
Total: Courses	129		389	
Percent	24.9		75.1	

Table 11. Principals' preference of compulsory or elective courses

Choice	Total	Percent
Compulsory	7	13.4
Elective	42	80.8
No response	3	5.8
Total	52	100.0

the same title (Health and Physical Education). Twelve of the titles were only used once with three as full courses and 11 as unit courses.

Table 12. Title of course by type of course

Name or title used	Full course		Unit course		Total	Percent
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent		
Home and Family Living	29	76.3	28	15.8	57	26.5
Health and Physical Ed.	1	2.6	52	29.8	53	24.6
American Problems			22	12.4	22	10.2
Psychology	2	5.3	20	11.3	22	10.2
Sociology			14	7.9	14	6.5
Biology	2	5.3	10	5.6	12	5.5
Homemaking	1	2.6	9	5.0	10	4.6
Physiology			8	4.5	8	3.7
Social Studies			3	1.6	3	1.3
Child Development	2	5.3			2	.9
Others	1 ^a	2.6	11 ^b	6.6	12	6.0
Total	38	100.0	177	100.0	215	100.0

^aBoys Home Economics was mentioned once as a full course.

^bEach of the following was mentioned once as a unit course: Advanced Foods, Consumer Economics, Consumer Health, Effective Learning, Guidance, Home Management, Human Relations, Livestock Management, Personality Development, Social Relations, and Special Education.

School department

Home Economics was the department mentioned most (30.8 per cent) under which family life education was taught. Health and Physical Education came a close second with 22.0 per cent (Table 13). Where family life education was taught differed considerably from where the principals preferred it taught (Table 14). The big majority (65.4 per cent) of the principals preferred it taught in the Home Economics department with

Table 13. School department of course

Department	Total	Percent
Home Economics	67	30.8
Health & Physical Ed.	48	22.0
Psychology	19	8.7
Sociology	8	3.7
Social Studies	24	11.0
Other ^a	19	8.7
No response	33	15.1
Total	218	100.0

^aOthers listed were: Physiology with seven responses; Biology with five responses; and Special Education, Life Science, Guidance, Business, Agriculture Education, American Problems, and Effective Learning all with one response each.

Table 14. Principals' preference of department of course

Department	Total	Percent
Home Economics	34	65.4
Health & Physical Ed.	2	3.8
Psychology	1	1.9
Sociology	3	5.8
Social Studies	4	7.7
Other	0	0.0
No response	8	15.4
Total	52	100.0

the second ranking department receiving only 7.7 per cent of the principals' preference.

Course offering

Thirty-eight (54.3 per cent) of the 70 responding schools offered family life education to all three grades (Table 15). This was not consistent with some of the other states where "twelfth only" received the predominant rating. As can be noted, eleventh and twelfth received the second rating with 28.6 per cent and twelfth only was third with 11.4 per cent.

Table 15. Grades in which course is offered

Grade	Number of schools	Percent
10th only	1	1.4
11th only	0	0.0
12th only	8	11.4
10th and 11th	0	0.0
11th and 12th	20	28.6
10th and 12th	2	2.9
10th, 11th, and 12th	38	54.3
No comment	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

The big majority (75.7 per cent) of the family life classes in Utah were offered to both sexes (Table 16). Those offered to girls only (20.2 per cent) significantly outnumbered those offered to boys only (2.9 per cent).

Of the 218 responding teachers, 107 (49.1 per cent) reported that they never divided the sexes during their family life classes (Table 17).

The 82 (37.6 per cent) that were completely divided were the classes that were taught to girls or boys only.

Table 16. Sex composition of courses in responding schools

Sex	Number of schools	Percent
Boys only	2	2.9
Girls only	14	20.0
Both sexes	53	75.7
No comment	1	1.4
Total	70	100.0

Table 17. Division of courses by sex

Division	Total	Percent
Never divided	107	49.1
Completely divided	82	37.6
Divided for certain topics	5	2.3
No response	24	11.0
Total	218	100.0

Enrollment

The family life teachers had a mean of 37.1 male students and 43.1 female students in their classes. It should be noted that many teachers teach more than one family life class, so these figures wouldn't be typical of each particular class. The largest number of students enrolled for both girls and boys fell in the 11-30 range (Table 18). Of the 218 reporting teachers, 10.2 per cent indicated their enrollment as being more than usual, 13.3 per cent reported less than usual, 62.3

per cent reported about the same as usual, and 14.2 per cent gave no response. This tended to indicate a slight decrease in enrollment.

Table 18. Teachers' enrollment in family life classes by sex of students

Number of students	Boys		Girls	
	No. of teachers	Percent	No. of teachers	Percent
1-10	22	10.0	21	9.6
11-30	41	18.8	56	25.7
31-50	25	11.5	42	19.3
51-70	15	6.9	27	12.4
71-100	19	8.7	21	9.6
101-Over	7	3.2	25	11.5
No response	89	40.8	26	11.9
Total	218	100.0	218	100.0
Mean		37.1		43.1

Table 19 shows the teachers' estimate of the percentage of students having family life education prior to their graduation from high school. Seventy-seven (35.3 per cent) of the 218 teachers estimated that 70 per cent or more of the students leave high school having had some kind of family life education.

Structural provisions

The majority (65.1 per cent) of the family life teachers indicated that they did not have a written syllabus to use in teaching the family life course. Only 21.6 per cent said they did have a syllabus and 13.3 per cent gave no response.

Concerning counseling facilities designed specifically to aid students in the problems of dating, courtship, marriage, and family life:

29.4 per cent indicated that there were such facilities offered in their schools and 29.0 indicated that there were not. No response was given by 21.6 per cent of the teachers. Of the 218 responding teachers, 42.7 per cent did some counseling on their own as the occasion arose. Counseling was not done by 37.6 per cent of the teachers, and 19.7 per cent did not respond.

Table 19. Teachers' estimate of students having some family life education prior to graduation

Percent of students	Number	Percentage
Less than 10%	10	4.6
10% to 20%	18	8.3
20% to 30%	17	7.8
30% to 40%	16	7.3
40% to 50%	22	10.1
50% to 60%	19	8.7
60% to 70%	8	3.7
70% or more	77	35.3
No response	31	14.2
Total	218	100.0

Comparison with other studies

A four-state comparison concerning selected administrative provisions for family life education is shown in Table 20. The four states compared were Indiana, Pennsylvania, Florida, and Utah. Fewer full courses were offered in Utah than in Indiana, but significantly fewer were offered in Utah than in Pennsylvania and Florida. A very high per cent (90.7) of the Utah schools had family life classes since 1950, as compared to Florida with 66.3 per cent and Indiana with 59.7 per cent. An inconsistency appeared here, for in the study referred to earlier by

Edison (1922), Utah was the only state in the United States with sex education being offered in all of its high schools. Either the courses were stopped and then started again, the program had been revamped and new courses introduced, or the data were just not comparable. Utah also had the lowest per cent of schools (1.4) not offering family life education. Again, this sounds like an inconsistency with the per cent of courses offered since 1950. Utah also had the lowest per cent of family life classes offered in the Home Economics department, although the Home Economics department offered the most classes within the state. Concerning whether the family life class was elective, Utah ranked higher with 75.1 per cent than Indiana (73.9 per cent) and Pennsylvania (51.8 per cent) and lower than Florida (78.3 per cent). Again, on the per cent of courses offered to both sexes, Utah (75.7 per cent) fell between Pennsylvania (75.4 per cent) and Florida (78.3 per cent).

Table 20. Comparison of administrative provisions for four states^a

Percent	Indiana	Pennsylvania	Florida	Utah
Full courses	15.2	71.0	57.6	15.0
Offered since 1950	59.7	--	66.3	90.7
Not offering family life education	32.7	69.8	75.5	1.4
In home economics	65.5	40.5	68.5	30.8
Elective	73.9	51.8	89.1	75.1
Offered to both sexes	--	75.4	78.3	75.7

^aThe comparative figures from Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Florida came from Bayer, 1963, p. 38.

The Teacher of Family Life Education

Personal characteristics

As shown in Table 21, the majority (52.7 per cent) of family life

teachers in Utah were men. The mean age of the family life teacher was 37 years old, although the biggest grouping (21.2 per cent) fell between 23 and 27 years of age (Table 22). Of the 218 family life teachers, 177 (81.2 per cent) were married, 23 (10.6 per cent) were single, 8 (3.7 per cent) were widowed, and 8 (3.7 per cent) were divorced. For those that were married, the mean number of years married was 14.2 years. The mean number of children per married teacher was 3.3 children.

Table 21. Sex of family life teachers

Sex	Number	Percent
Male	115	52.7
Female	102	46.8
No response	1	.5
Total	218	100.0

Table 22. Age distribution of teachers

Age (years) ^a	Number	Percent
22 or less	1	.5
23-27	46	21.1
28-32	41	18.8
33-37	35	16.0
38-42	24	11.0
43-47	15	6.9
48-52	17	7.8
53-57	17	7.8
58-62	10	4.6
63-67	2	.9
No response	10	4.6
Total	218	100.0

^aMean = 37 years old. Median = 34 years old.

Professional preparation

Home Economics was the undergraduate major of 28.9 per cent of the family life education teachers. It was followed with Physical Education which included 20.3 per cent of the teachers (Table 23). There were 36 other majors mentioned, none having more than 6.6 per cent of the teachers. The Bachelor's degree was the highest degree held by 74.8 per cent of the teachers (Table 24) and the Master's degree was the highest held by 15.5 per cent. The other degrees or certificates held were in addition to a Bachelor's or a Master's degree.

Many teachers had taken a number of graduate hours without having a graduate degree. Table 25 indicates the number of graduate hours in six selected areas. The two areas in which the most graduate hours were had by family life education teachers were Home Economics and Health and Physical Education. The two areas in which these teachers had the least number of graduate hours were Sociology and Guidance with 17.6 and 15.8 per cent, respectively, having five or less graduate hours. Psychology was the area in which most of the teachers had taken some graduate hours. Of the 218 responding teachers, 216 (99.1) per cent had some graduate training in psychology. The area with the fewest teachers taking graduate hours was biology with a total of 150 (68.8 per cent teachers).

One hundred and twenty-seven (58.3 per cent) of the family life teachers had some undergraduate work in marriage and the family (Table 26). Almost three-fifths of these had less than 10 hours of course work. Only 40 (18.4 per cent) of the 218 family life teachers had graduate work in marriage and the family. Only 27.5 per cent of those 40 had more than 10 graduate hours in the area. The undergraduate mean

Table 23. Undergraduate major of teachers

Undergraduate major	Number	Percent
Home Economics	74	28.9
Physical Education	52	20.3
Health	17	6.6
History	16	6.2
Psychology	12	4.7
Political Science	10	3.9
Sociology	8	3.1
Biology	5	1.9
Speech	5	1.9
Social Science	4	1.6
Social Studies	4	1.6
Art	4	1.6
English	4	1.6
Botany	3	1.2
Biological Science	3	1.2
Economics	3	1.2
Math	3	1.2
Others ^a	26	10.1
No response	3	1.2
Total	256	100.0

^aOther majors mentioned once or twice were General Science, Law, Nursing Education, Special Education, Secondary Education, Music, Physiology, Geography, Driver's Education, Vocational Education, Industrial Arts, Agricultural Education, Latin, Dramatic Arts, Physics, German, Language Arts, Wild Life Management, Animal Science, Zoology, and Business.

Table 24. Teachers' highest professional degree

Highest degree	Number	Percent
Bachelor's degree	169	74.8
Master's degree	35	15.5
Doctor's degree	3	1.3
Other ^a	11	4.9
No response	8	3.5
Total	226	100.0

^aOthers mentioned were Administrator's Certificate, Professional Counseling Certificate, and Vocational Homemaking Certificate.

Table 25. Number of graduate hours in selected areas

Number of hours	Psychology		Home Economics		Health & Physical Ed.		Sociology		Guidance		Biology	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
1-5	30	13.9	18	10.5	17	8.9	32	17.6	27	15.8	11	7.3
6-10	32	14.8	7	4.1	20	10.4	19	10.5	18	10.6	16	10.7
11-15	23	10.7	10	5.9	9	4.7	14	7.7	6	3.5	4	2.7
16-20	10	4.6	5	2.9	10	5.2	3	1.7	4	2.3	2	1.3
21-25	3	1.4	4	2.3	5	2.6	3	1.7	5	2.9	3	2.0
26 or more	11	5.1	20	11.7	24	12.5	3	1.7	4	2.3	7	4.7
No response	107	49.5	107	62.6	107	55.7	107	59.1	107	62.6	107	71.3
Total	216	100.0	171	100.0	192	100.0	181	100.0	171	100.0	150	100.0

for the 127 teachers was 13.8 hours and the graduate mean for the 40 teachers was 9.6 hours. Table 27 indicates the number and percentage of teachers that felt a need for more preparation in family life education. Those feeling the need for more preparation made up 69.7 per cent of the family life teachers.

Table 26. Number of undergraduate and graduate hours in marriage and family

Number of hours	Undergraduate		Graduate	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1-5	33	25.9	19	47.5
6-10	43	33.9	10	25.0
11-15	19	14.9	4	10.0
16-20	10	7.9	2	5.0
21-25	7	5.5	0	0.0
26-30	4	3.2	4	10.0
31 or more	11	8.7	1	2.5
Total	127	100.0	40	100.0

Table 27. Number of teachers that felt need for more preparation in family life education

Need of preparation	Number	Percent
Yes	152	69.7
No	47	21.6
No response	19	8.7
Total	218	100.0

A large majority of the family life teachers belong to at least one professional organization. The majority of these belong to the National Education Association or the Utah Education Association with 63.3 and

74.8 per cent, respectively. These, along with others mentioned, were mainly teacher organizations. Probably the nearest organizations directly concerned with family living would be the home economics associations. The American Home Economics Association had 15.1 per cent of the 218 family life teachers claim membership; while the Utah Home Economics Association had only 7.3 per cent belonging to it.

Teaching experience

The family life education teachers had a mean of 8.1 years experience teaching in the high schools and 5.1 years teaching in the family life class. Table 28 indicates a comparison of the teaching experience in the high school and in the family life class. One hundred and seven (49.1 per cent) of the 218 family life teachers had five or less years experience teaching in the high schools and 123 (56.4 per cent) had five or less years experience teaching family life education.

Table 28. Teaching experience in high school and family life education

Number years teaching experience	High school		Family life education	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
5 or less	107	49.1	123	56.4
6-10	49	22.5	38	17.4
11-15	30	13.8	12	5.5
16-20	12	5.5	8	3.7
21-25	8	3.6	5	2.3
26 or more	9	4.1	2	.9
No response	3	1.4	30	13.8
Total	218	100.0	218	100.0

Appraisal of course

The teachers' rating of the reaction of students, parents, community,

and administration to the family life course was included along with the principals' on page 25 under "Administrative Provisions for Family Life Education Courses." The majority (64.6 per cent) of the 164 commenting teachers felt no changes were necessary in their family life courses. Of the ones that felt that changes should be made, 8.5 per cent felt they would change the name of the course, 3.0 per cent felt they would change the credit value of the course, 1.8 per cent felt they would reduce the number of periods offered, 29.3 per cent felt they would modify the course content, and 1.2 per cent felt they would drop the course completely. The other changes mentioned most were to make the course co-educational, develop a one-semester course strictly on family life education, make the course required for seniors, develop a longer course, update the material, develop a student outline, and put more stress on sex attitudes instead of anatomy and perversion.

Comparison with other studies

A comparison of the four states on teacher characteristics is found in Table 29. The median age for Utah family life teachers (34.0 years) was considerably lower than for Indiana (37.9 years), Pennsylvania (39.9 years), and Florida (38.3 years) teachers.

The per cent of married teachers in Utah was substantially higher than in Indiana and Florida and somewhat higher than in Pennsylvania. In Utah, 81.2 per cent of the family life teachers were married compared to 63.8 per cent for Indiana, 78.1 per cent for Pennsylvania, and 69.6 per cent for Florida. Utah and Pennsylvania (52.7 and 53.1 per cent, respectively) had a higher per cent of male teachers than did Indiana and Florida (32.6 and 19.6 per cent, respectively). This is probably

due to the number of home economics majors teachers teaching family life education in the four states. Indiana (60.5 per cent) and Florida (66.3 per cent) had considerably more home economics majors than did Utah (28.9 per cent). If figures were available from Pennsylvania, they would probably have been closer to the Utah figure because of the higher percent of male teachers which these two states had. Utah had the lowest percentage of teachers with some course work in family life education and the lowest percentage holding master's degrees. Utah (8.1 years) had the lowest mean years of teaching experience in the high schools (Indiana with 9.5 years and Florida with 10.9 years). Concerning mean years teaching experience teaching in family life education, Utah made a better showing with 5.1 years while Indiana had 5.5 years and Florida had 4.9 years teaching experience.

Table 29. Comparison of characteristics of Utah teachers with those of other studies^a

	Indiana	Pennsylvania	Florida	Utah
Median age	37.9	39.9	38.3	34.0
Percent married	63.8	78.1	69.6	81.2
Percent male	32.6	53.1	19.6	52.7
Percent home economics majors	60.5	--	66.3	28.9
Percent having some course work in family life education	80.0	--	73.9	63.3
Percent holding master's degree	--	45.9	31.5	15.5
Mean years high school teaching experience	9.5	--	10.9	8.1
Mean years teaching experience in family life education	5.5	--	4.9	5.1

^aThe comparative figures from Indiana, Pennsylvania, and Florida came from Bayer, 1963, p. 55.

Subject and Topic Areas in Family Life

Education Courses

The teachers were asked to indicate the number of hours they spent teaching in each of eight family life areas. The eight areas given in the questionnaire and the subtopics in each area were as follows:

1. Family and society (includes functions of the family, organization of the family, the family in other cultures, the modern American family, and family disorganization).
2. Family relationships (includes grandparents in the home, the adopted child, parent-child relationships, role of the father, role of the mother, and brother-sister relationships).
3. Personality development (includes emotions, influence of heredity, patterns of behavior, psychological drives and needs, cultural influence on personality, and habit formation).
4. Sex education (includes anatomy and physiology of sex, nocturnal emissions, menstruation, preventing conception, and controlling the sex drive).
5. Sex in society (includes prostitution, morality of sexual behavior, unmarried mothers, abortion, extramarital relations, and venereal disease).
6. Dating and courtship (includes getting along with peers, how to begin dating, etiquette of dating, going steady, engagement, nature of love, petting and necking, choosing a mate, and readiness for marriage).
7. Marriage and marriage problems (includes legal aspects of marriage, the wedding, the honeymoon, mixed religious marriage, predicting marital success, spiritual aspects of marriage, adjustment in marriage, in-laws, and working wives).

8. Children (includes child-rearing practices, effect of children on marital relationship, child care, and child development).

Of the eight subject areas, children and personality development received the most amount of time being spent on them with 18.7 and 15.5 per cent, respectively; and family relationships and sex in society received the least amount of time with 9.4 and 6.5 per cent, respectively (Table 30). The first four areas (children, personality development, marriage and marriage problems, and dating and courtship) received 61.3 per cent of the teaching time. The last four areas received 38.7 per cent of the teaching time.

Table 30. Time devoted to the eight subject areas

Area	Mean hours	Percent of total time
Children	14.8	18.7
Personality development	12.2	15.5
Marriage and marriage problems	11.4	14.4
Dating and courtship	10.0	12.7
Family and society	9.3	11.8
Sex education	8.7	11.0
Family relationships	7.4	9.4
Sex in society	5.1	6.5

Children

The area of "children" had a mean of 14.8 hours taught. Of the 218 family life teachers, 20.6 per cent taught more than 15 hours in the area of children (Table 31). The two full courses of Child Development referred to in Table 12 would have been almost entirely devoted to the child development area, and the 29 full courses entitled Home and Family Living would have a great amount of time devoted to child development.

Table 31. Number of hours devoted to "children"

Number of hours ^a	<u>Number</u>	Percent
1-5	62	28.5
6-10	17	7.8
11-15	10	4.6
16-20	11	5.0
21-25	4	1.8
26-30	15	6.9
31 or more	15	6.9
No response	84	38.5
Total	218	100.0

^aMean hours taught = 14.8.

Personality development

The area of "personality development" ranked second of the eight selected areas with a mean of 12.2 hours taught (Table 32). There were 16.5 per cent of the family life teachers that taught more than 15 hours of personality development. There weren't nearly as many teachers who gave no response to the area of personality development (46) as there were the area of children (84). This would probably indicate that there were more teachers teaching in the area of personality development than in the area of children.

Marriage and marriage problems

Table 33 indicates the number of hours devoted to "marriage and marriage problems." This area had a mean of 11.4 hours taught, which gave it the rank of third in the eight selected areas. There were 11.5 per cent of the family life teachers that taught more than 15 hours in the area of marriage and marriage problems. There were 78 teachers that did not respond to this question.

Table 32. Number of hours devoted to "personality development"

Number of hours ^a	Number	Percent
1-5	56	25.7
6-10	54	24.8
11-15	26	11.9
16-20	18	8.3
21-25	5	2.3
26-30	9	4.1
31 or more	4	1.8
No response	46	21.1
Total	218	100.0

^aMean hours taught = 12.2.

Table 33. Number of hours devoted to "marriage and marriage problems"

Number of hours ^a	Number	Percent
1-5	70	32.1
6-10	29	13.3
11-15	16	7.3
16-20	11	5.0
21-25	5	2.3
26-30	3	1.4
31 or more	6	2.8
No response	78	35.8
Total	218	100.0

^aMean hours taught = 11.4.

Dating and courtship

Dating and courtship ranked fourth with a mean of 10.0 hours taught and all but 60 teachers teaching something in the area (Table 34). There were 13.3 per cent of the teachers that taught more than 15 hours. A little over one-third of the teachers taught only one to five hours of dating and courtship.

Table 34. Number of hours devoted to "dating and courtship"

Number of hours ^a	Number	Percent
1-5	78	35.8
6-10	32	14.7
11-15	19	8.7
16-20	13	6.0
21-25	7	3.2
26-30	7	3.2
31 or more	2	.9
No response	60	27.5
Total	218	100.0

^aMean hours taught = 10.0.

Family and society

There were 86 teachers that did not respond to the question for "family and society," which was the high for the eight areas (Table 35). For those who did, there was a mean of 9.3 hours taught. There were 4.1 per cent of the teachers that taught more than 15 hours in the area of family and society.

Table 35. Number of hours devoted to "family and society"

Number of hours ^a	Number	Percent
1-5	77	35.3
6-10	35	16.1
11-15	11	5.0
16-20	4	1.8
21-25	0	0.0
26-30	2	.9
31 or more	3	1.4
No response	86	39.5
Total	218	100.0

^aMean hours taught = 9.3.

Sex education

Table 36 illustrates the number of hours devoted to "sex education." There was a mean of 8.7 hours taught by the family life teachers. There were 35.8 per cent of the teachers that didn't respond to this question. Of the 218 teachers, 5.5 per cent taught more than 15 hours in sex education. Sex education would probably have been ranked lower had it not been for the high number of unit courses taught in health and physical education as shown in Table 12.

Table 36. Number of hours devoted to "sex education"

Number of hours ^a	Number	Percent
1-5	70	32.1
6-10	39	17.9
11-15	19	8.7
16-20	6	2.7
21-25	0	0.0
26-30	1	.5
31 or more	5	2.3
No response	78	35.8
Total	218	100.0

^aMean hours taught = 8.7.

Family relationships

The number of hours devoted to "family relationships" is indicated in Table 37. There was a mean of 7.4 hours taught in this area, giving it the rank of seventh. There were 5.1 per cent of the family life teachers that taught more than 15 hours in this area. A "no response" was given by 70 of the 218 teachers.

Table 37. Number of hours devoted to "family relationships"

Number of hours ^a	Number	Percent
1-5	93	42.6
6-10	34	15.6
11-15	10	4.6
16-20	8	3.7
21-25	0	0.0
26-30	2	.9
31 or more	1	.5
No response	70	32.1
Total	218	100.0

^aMean hours taught = 7.4.

Sex in society

The area that had the least amount of time spent teaching it was "sex in society" with a mean of only 5.1 hours taught. There were also only 2.8 per cent of the family life teachers that taught more than 15 hours in the subject matter area. There were 72 teachers that did not respond to the question (Table 38).

Table 38. Number of hours devoted to "sex in society"

Number of hours ^a	Number	Percent
1-5	114	52.3
6-10	22	10.1
11-15	4	1.8
16-20	3	1.4
21-25	2	.9
26-30	1	.5
31 or more	0	0.0
No response	72	33.0
Total	218	100.0

^aMean hours taught = 5.1.

Teachers' feeling of adequacy

Table 39 indicates the teachers' feeling of adequacy in teaching the eight major areas. Breaking the information on the table down further by totaling the upper four levels under most adequate and the lower four levels under least adequate (Table 40), a rank order of teachers' feeling of adequacy was established. The following is that ranking from most adequate to least adequate: (a) personality development with 60.5 per cent of the teachers rating it in the first four levels; (b) dating and courtship with 54.6 per cent; (c) family relationships with 50.0 per cent; (d) marriage and marriage problems with 43.2 per cent; (e) family and society with 38.1 per cent; (f) sex education with 36.3 per cent; (g) children with 34.4 per cent; and (h) sex in society with 28.9 per cent of the teachers rating it in the first four levels of adequacy. This ranking was then compared to the ranking of the eight areas according to the mean hours spent teaching the areas. Table 41 shows this comparison. A positive correlation of 0.31 was obtained between the teachers' feeling of adequacy and the mean number of hours spent teaching the eight areas. It is interesting to note that the area of "children," which ranked first in amount of time spent teaching, should rank seventh in feeling of adequacy; and family relations, which ranked seventh in amount of time, would rank third in the feeling of adequacy.

Another interesting comparison is between the teachers' feeling of adequacy and the number of "no response" replies given on each of the eight areas. A "no response," when asked how many hours were spent teaching that particular area, would indicate to the researcher that no time was being spent on that subject. These were ranked from the lowest

Table 39. Teachers' feeling of adequacy in teaching eight major areas

Feeling of adequacy	Major areas															
	Family and society		Family relations		Personality development		Sex education		Sex in society		Dating & courtship		Marriage and marriage problems		Children	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
	<u>Most adequate</u>															
1	26	11.9	24	11.0	56	25.7	35	16.1	4	1.8	23	10.6	15	6.9	25	11.5
2	18	8.3	37	17.0	26	11.9	13	6.0	19	8.7	31	14.2	27	12.4	19	8.7
3	23	10.6	22	10.1	30	13.8	17	7.8	23	10.6	33	15.1	26	11.9	13	5.9
4	16	7.3	26	11.9	20	9.1	14	6.4	17	7.8	32	14.7	24	11.0	18	8.3
	<u>Least adequate</u>															
5	19	8.7	21	9.6	13	6.0	19	8.7	19	8.7	20	9.2	30	13.8	25	11.5
6	22	10.1	15	6.9	15	6.9	19	8.7	25	11.5	21	9.6	18	8.3	32	14.7
7	20	9.1	26	11.9	5	2.3	21	9.6	29	13.3	9	4.1	18	8.3	14	6.4
8	27	12.4	1	.5	9	4.1	36	16.5	36	16.5	3	1.4	13	5.9	24	11.0
	<u>No response</u>															
	47	21.6	46	21.1	44	20.2	44	20.2	46	21.1	46	21.1	47	21.5	48	22.0
Total	218	100.0	218	100.0	218	100.0	218	100.0	218	100.0	218	100.0	218	100.0	218	100.0

Table 40. Teachers' feeling of adequacy in teaching eight major areas (simplified)

Feeling of adequacy	Major areas															
	Family and society		Family relations		Personality development		Sex education		Sex in society		Dating & courtship		Marriage and marriage problems		Children	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Most adequate	83	38.1	109	50.0	132	60.5	79	36.3	63	28.9	119	54.6	92	43.2	75	34.4
Least adequate	88	40.3	63	28.9	42	19.3	95	43.5	109	50.0	53	24.3	79	36.3	95	43.6

number of "no response" to the highest number and a comparison was made to the ranking of the feelings of adequacy. This ranking and the comparison are shown in Table 42. A positive correlation of .69 was obtained.

Table 41. Comparison of ranking of feelings of adequacy and teaching time in eight areas^a

Area	Feeling of adequacy	Mean teaching time
Personality development	1	2
Dating and courtship	2	4
Family relations	3	7
Marriage and marriage problems	4	3
Family and society	5	5
Sex education	6	6
Children	7	1
Sex in society	8	8

^aSpearman rank correlation coefficient = 0.31.

Table 42. Comparison of ranking of feelings of adequacy and the "no response" given on each of the eight areas^a

Area	Feeling of adequacy	No response
Personality development	1	1
Dating and courtship	2	2
Family relations	3	3
Marriage and marriage problems	4	5
Family and society	5	8
Sex education	6	6
Children	7	7
Sex in society	8	4

^aSpearman rank correlation coefficient = 0.69

Comparison with other studies

The topic areas used in the Pennsylvania and Indiana studies were not the same as those used in the Florida and Utah studies; therefore, a direct comparison was not possible. Bayer gave some generalizations concerning the Pennsylvania and Indiana studies which will be used as a comparison.

Glatthorn found that the broad area of "Marriage" received the most attention by Pennsylvania family life educators (17.0 periods) and the broad area of "sex education" received the least attention (4.8 periods).

In Indiana, Whitehurst found that the greatest percentage of total class time is devoted to "Dating" and "Courtship and Engagement" (24.2 per cent), the second greatest percentage to "Marriage" and "Marriage Problems" (18.2 per cent) and the least to "Sex Education" (5.7 per cent), "Broken Homes" (4.5 per cent) and "Sex in Society" (4.3 per cent). (Bayer, 1963, p. 69)

Table 43 gives a comparison between Utah and Florida of the time spent on each of the subject areas. The two high areas for Utah are Children and Personality Development with 18.7 and 15.5 per cent, respectively. These areas rank fourth and third in Florida with 16.1 and 16.5 per cent, respectively. The two lows for Utah were Family Relationships and Sex in Society with 9.4 and 6.5 per cent, respectively. Family Relationships and Sex in Society rank fifth and eighth in Florida with 12.5 and 5.0 per cent, respectively.

Teaching Aids in Family Life

Education Courses

Resource periodicals

About 45 per cent of the family life teachers indicated that they used at least one resource periodical from which they regularly

extracted family life information. The resource materials were categorized into the following five areas:

1. Newspapers and news magazines (local newspapers, *Time*, *Newsweek*, *U.S. News and World Report*, and *The Nation*).
2. Home and women's magazines (*Good Housekeeping*, *McCall's*, *Ladies' Home Journal*, *Co-Ed*, *Redbook*, *Woman's Home Companion*, and *Parents' Magazine*).
3. General magazines (*Look*, *Post*, *Life*, and *Readers Digest*).
4. Professional journals (*Journal of Home Economics*, *Forecast for Home Economists*, *Marriage and Family Living*, and *American Journal of Sociology*).
5. Government pamphlets.

Table 43. Comparison between Utah and Florida of time devoted to eight subject areas

Area	Florida ^a		Utah	
	Mean hours	Percent of total time	Mean hours	Percent of total time
Children	11.3	16.1	14.8	18.7
Personality development	11.6	16.5	12.2	15.5
Marriage and marriage problems	12.0	17.2	11.4	14.4
Dating and courtship	11.7	16.8	10.0	12.7
Family and society	7.4	10.6	9.3	11.8
Sex education	3.7	5.2	8.7	11.0
Family relationships	8.8	12.5	7.4	9.4
Sex in society	3.5	5.0	5.1	6.5

^aFlorida data obtained from Bayer (1963, p. 70).

The most frequently mentioned resource for family life information was professional journals, with 55.5 per cent of the family life teachers using one or more journals (Table 44). The second most used resource

was home and women's magazines with 35.3 per cent. Of the 218 family life teachers 4.6 per cent said they used no resource materials and 50.5 per cent gave no response. There were 16.5 per cent of the family life teachers that indicated that they knew of no family life information available to them. Sixty-one per cent indicated they would like more available resource information.

Table 44. Use of resource periodicals for family life information

Type of periodical	Total (N = 218)	Percent
Newspapers and news magazines	22	10.1
Home and women's magazines	77	35.3
General magazines	58	26.6
Professional journals	121	55.5
Government pamphlets	3	1.4
None	10	4.6
No response	110	50.5

Textbooks

Of the 218 family life teachers, only 30.7 per cent used a family life textbook and 58.3 per cent used none. Eleven per cent gave no response. Table 45 gives the titles and authors of the family life texts used. The family life text most used was *Personal Adjustment, Marriage, and Family Living*, by Judson T. and Mary G. Landis. It was used by 29.9 per cent of the teachers. The next most-used text was *Psychology*, by T. L. Engle, with only 6.7 per cent of the teachers using it. There were 46 other textbooks used by the family life teachers.

Resource persons

There were 67.4 per cent of the family life teachers that reported

Table 45. Text used in family life course

Title and author(s)	Number	Percent
<i>Personal Adjustment, Marriage, and Family Living</i> (Judson T. Landis and Mary G. Landis)	40	29.9
<i>Psychology</i> (T. L. Engle)	9	6.7
<i>Threshold to Adult Living</i> (Hazel Thompson Craig)	7	5.3
<i>Modern Health</i> (James H. Otto, Cloyd J. Julian, and J. Edward Tether)	7	5.3
<i>Sociology</i> (Paul H. Landis)	5	3.8
<i>Your Marriage and Family Living</i> (Paul H. Landis)	4	3.0
<i>The Developing Child</i> (Holly E. Brisbane)	4	3.0
<i>When You Marry</i> (Evelyn Duvall and Reuben Hill)	3	2.2
<i>Family Living</i> (Evelyn Duvall)	3	2.2
<i>Modern Sex Education</i> (Julian and Jackson)	3	2.2
<i>Human Physiology</i> (Morrison, Cornett, Tether and Gratz)	3	2.2
<i>Building Your Life</i> (Judson T. Landis and Mary G. Landis)	3	2.2
<i>Management for Better Living</i> (Mary Catharine Starr)	3	2.2
<i>Homes With Character</i> (Hazel Thompson Craig and Ola Day Rush)	3	2.2
<i>New Road to Health</i> (Byrd, Jones, Landis, and Morgan)	2	1.5
<i>Problems of Democracy</i> (William Dunwiddie and Horace Kidger)	2	1.5
Others used once	33	24.6
Total	134	100.0

they used some resource persons in the family life class. This information is shown in Table 46. The school nurse was used by the most teachers (44.2 per cent). The school counselor and physician followed close behind with 38.1 and 35.9 per cent, respectively. All resource persons were used by 25 or more of the teachers, except the school psychologist, who was only used by 15 of the teachers.

Table 46. Resource persons employed in family life classes

Resource person	Number	Percent (N = 181)
School nurse	80	44.2
Clergyman	25	13.8
Physician	65	35.9
Lawyer	31	17.1
School counselor	69	38.1
School psychologist	15	8.3
School social worker	29	16.0
Other	73	40.3
None	34	18.8
Total response	181	83.0
No comment	37	17.0
Total	218	100.0

Films

Films were used by only 84 (38.5 per cent) of the teachers. These 84 teachers used an average of 4.3 films per year. The largest group of films used by the majority of teachers were concerning childbirth or reproduction. The next largest group was concerning love and marriage.

Comparison with other studies

Again, the teaching aids were not directly comparable except between

the Florida and Utah studies. In Pennsylvania, it was found that the area of "Marriage" used the greatest number of teaching aids and the area of "Sex Education" used the least number of aids. In Florida, the resource periodical used most was newspapers and news magazines, with 42.4 per cent of the teachers using them; however, in Utah the periodicals used most were the professional journals with 55.5 per cent of the teachers using them. A family life text was used by 38 per cent of the Indiana teachers, 54 per cent of the Florida teachers, and 30.7 per cent of the Utah teachers. In both Florida and Utah, the text most used was *Personal Adjustment, Marriage, and Family Living* (Judson T. and Mary G. Landis), with 36.7 per cent of the Florida teachers and 29.9 per cent of the Utah teachers using it. In Florida, the resource person used most was the clergyman, with 58.7 per cent of the teachers using this source. In Utah, the most-used person was the school nurse, with 44.2 per cent of the teachers using this source. In Utah, the clergyman was used by only 13.8 per cent of the teachers. Utah is predominantly of the Latter-day Saint faith and their clergymen are laymen without formal training. This would probably account for the small amount of use of the clergyman as a resource person in Utah.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Purpose and Problem

The present study was an attempt to determine the status of family life education in the high schools of Utah. It was spurred on by a report from the Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction to the 1961 Utah State Legislative Council concerning the House Joint Resolution No. 23. The following is a part of that resolution by the State Legislative Council:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, By the Legislature of the State of Utah that the state board of education be urged to establish a state course of study which places greater emphasis on the sociological problems of family life and which prepares students more successfully for the responsibilities found in married life. (Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1966, p. 2)

A part of the concluding statement of the report reads as follows:

An analysis of the secondary curriculum with respect to family life education seems to indicate that much can and is being done through the various curricular offerings. We believe that the schools can best contribute to family life education through this integrated approach. While much is being done, we recognize the fact that the schools, along with other agencies responsible for successful family living, can and must do more in this important area. (Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1966, p. 23)

This study was an attempt to objectively find out how much "is being done through the various curricular offerings" in the integrated approach being used in the state of Utah. The study was patterned after one by Bayer (1963) in the state of Florida, so that a comparison of findings could be made.

This was basically a descriptive study under which four broad questions were framed for investigation:

1. What administrative provisions are made for family life education courses?
2. What characteristics and qualifications do teachers of family life education courses have?
3. What subjects and topics are commonly taught in family life education courses?
4. What resources are utilized in family life education courses?

For the purpose of this study, "family life education" was defined as any form of education that would teach attitudes, feelings, or facts in such areas as: (a) personal adjustment in preparing for marriage and family life; (b) sex education; (c) one's place in his parental family; (d) dating and courtship; (e) marriage; (f) love and interpersonal relationships; (g) parenthood; and (h) any phase of living in families.

Methodology

The principals were first contacted by telephone to determine the number of family life education teachers and to get the principal's commitment to support the study. A one-page principal questionnaire was then sent, along with a six-page teacher questionnaire. When these were completed, they were returned to Utah State University. The teacher's questionnaire was a modified version of the questionnaire used by Bayer (1963) in his Florida State study. This was used to facilitate a comparison of Utah's program with those of Florida, Indiana, and Pennsylvania.

Summary of Findings

A response was received from 71 of the 84 schools, and family life education was taught in 70 of these 71 schools. There were 52 principals and 293 teachers that responded, and 218 of the 293 teachers taught family life courses.

Following are the central findings from the returns, classified under the four broad questions which were framed for investigation:

1. There were a wide variety of administrative provisions that emerged from an analysis of the data.

a. There were 98.6 per cent of the reporting high schools that offered some family life education. The mean enrollment of those offering family life was 841 compared to 776 for all the Utah high schools. Family life education was offered, then, primarily in the larger high schools.

b. There were 90.7 per cent of the courses that were offered since 1950. The principals and teachers rated the attitudes of the students, parents, community, and administration as quite high.

c. The majority (82.3 per cent) of the courses were on a unit basis taught five days a week and elective rather than compulsory.

d. Almost one-third of the courses were taught in the Home Economics department and one-fourth were taught in the Health and Physical Education department.

e. The majority of the courses were offered to tenth, eleventh, and twelfth grade students of both sexes.

f. The majority of teachers used no written syllabus in teaching family life education.

2. The following are some of the teachers' personal and professional characteristics:

a. A little over half of the family life teachers in Utah were men.

b. The median age of the teachers was 34 years and the majority were married.

c. The majority of the teachers were either home economics (28.9 per cent) or physical education (20.3 per cent) majors.

d. There were 15.5 per cent of the teachers with master's degrees.

e. Only 40 of the teachers had had some graduate hours in marriage and the family.

f. The majority of the teachers felt a need for more preparation in family life education.

g. The teachers had a mean of 8.1 years experience teaching in the high school and 5.1 years teaching family life.

3. The following are some of the findings concerning the eight subject areas:

a. Children and personality development were the two areas that received the most mean hours by the teachers.

b. Family relationships and sex in society were the two areas that received the least number of mean hours by the teachers.

c. Personality development and dating and courtship were the two areas the teachers felt most adequate in teaching.

d. Children and sex in society were the two areas the teachers felt least adequate in teaching.

e. There was a positive correlation between the number of hours spent teaching in each of the eight major areas and how adequate the teachers felt in teaching the areas.

f. There was a positive correlation between the feeling of adequacy and the number of "no response" replies given on each of the eight areas.

4. Some of the findings concerning teaching aids used by Utah family life teachers are:

a. About 45 per cent of the family life teachers used at least one resource periodical.

b. Professional journals were the most frequently used resource periodical for family life information.

c. Only 30.7 per cent of the family life teachers used a family life textbook, and 58.3 per cent used none.

d. The text used by the majority of the teachers was *Personal Adjustment, Marriage, and Family Living*, by Landis and Landis.

e. The school nurse was the most commonly used resource person.

f. Films were used by only 38.5 per cent of the teachers.

Conclusions

The conclusions of this study are made concerning the areas of administrative provisions, teacher characteristics and qualifications, subject and topic areas, and resources used.

With 82.3 per cent of the courses taught on a unit basis and 60 per cent of the family life teachers teaching less than six weeks of family life during the year, it can be concluded that there really isn't very much family life material being covered during this period and that what is being taught is being covered rather sparsely. Though the study indicated that family life education is being taught in 98.6 per cent of the high schools in Utah, this is no indication of how much coverage or the quality of that coverage.

From the rating of the attitudes of the various groups by the teachers and principals, it would appear that the attitudes of these groups toward the family life course are mostly favorable. This concurs with a statement by Johnson on a Gallup poll on attitudes toward sex education:

A Gallup poll of May 1965 indicated that 69 per cent of adults in the country as opposed to 22 per cent "approve of schools giving courses in sex education"; and nearly half of that 69 per cent approving sex education would also approve discussion of birth control. (Johnson, 1966, p. 68)

The undergraduate majors of the teachers teaching family life (Table 23) varied all the way from Art to Zoology. It seems as if they allowed or assigned "anyone" who would, to teach regardless of their background and training. The training received by most family life teachers was not explicitly in family life education, but in some related area resulting in a segmentalized exposure regarding the whole of family life education and thus resulting in a limited competence of these teachers.

In examining three tables on a comparative basis, one finds Home and Family Living and Health and Physical Education being the two titles

most commonly used (Table 12), Home Economics and Health and Physical Education departments carrying the large majority of family life classes being taught (Table 13), and the large majority of family life teachers majored either in Home Economics or Physical Education (Table 23). From this three-way comparison, it is concluded that 86.8 per cent of the full courses and 45.6 per cent of the unit courses that fall into these two areas would have a large influence on what is taught in the family life classes throughout the state. This heavy Home Economics influence would probably account for the high number of hours being spent in the children area, and yet it still is rated seventh as an area in which they feel adequate to teach (Table 40). Health and Physical Education should have an effect on the two areas of sex education and sex in society. It is assumed by the investigator that Health and Physical Education have had their effects on these two areas, scoring as high as they did on either the amount of time taught or the feeling of adequacy.

The positive correlations obtained between the feelings of adequacy of the teacher and both the number of hours taught and the number of "no response" replies would tend to indicate that teachers don't get involved in areas where they feel inadequate and that if they do it is only on a superficial basis.

On a comparison with the other three states (Table 29), Utah had the smallest per cent of home economics teachers, the smallest per cent of teachers that had had some course work in family life education, and the smallest per cent of teachers with a master's degree. This would seem to indicate that Utah is lagging in the training of its family life teachers, at least when compared with other states.

With only 30.7 per cent of the teachers using a family life textbook, 16.5 per cent of the family life teachers indicating that they knew of no family life information available to them, 61 per cent indicating they would like more available resource information, no resource persons being used by 35.8 per cent of the teachers, and films being used by only 38.5 per cent, one wonders about the amount and the quality of the family life education being taught. This type of teaching situation would not be tolerated in any other field of teaching, and it should not be tolerated in this field either.

The Home Economics classes came the closest to teaching what has been defined as family life education and most of the full courses are found in this area. The majority of the films, resource information and speakers, and family life textbooks are used in the Home Economics classes. However, the Home Economics classes in Utah are made up almost entirely of girl students. Since in our modern culture the role has changed to place more importance upon equalitarianism and involvement of the husband and father in the functions of the home and in child rearing, he should equally be prepared for this role as the woman. And again, even the Home Economics teacher is not trained explicitly in family life education and thus is receiving a segmentalized exposure regarding the whole of family life education and is therefore not fully qualified nor competent to teach in the area.

Recommendations

From the findings and conclusions of this study, the investigator would like to make the following recommendations:

1. An attempt should be made to establish more and better full course programs in family life education. It is only with a full course program and a fully qualified and trained teacher that this many-faceted and delicate class can be taught adequately.

2. Since attitudes are basically positive toward family life education and since family life education should be more than just a school effort, an attempt should be made to integrate church and community efforts with those of the schools. This could possibly be done by having a family life coordinator and citizens advisory committee, made up of experts in different areas of family life, to coordinate and advise any organizations or agencies that are attempting programs to supplement the school's program. This group could also be of great help to the teacher in the school.

3. Parent education programs should be inaugurated to run concurrently with those of the schools to help stimulate parent and child discussion of the subject matter covered. These could be handled by the teacher or by a college or university in the area.

4. Better teacher training programs should be established to better prepare the teachers with the multidisciplinary background and training necessary to initiate and teach an effective family life program. Some of the ideas of people such as Kirkendall and Handwork (1950), Landis (1957), Iseman (1968), Oaks (1963), Bezant (1965), and others would be helpful in accomplishing this goal.

5. Better and more effective teaching aids should be developed and made available to those teaching family life education. Many of the teachers in this study indicated a need for this. This material could be collected and made available by a family life specialist through the

extension service or by professional people associated with some of the institutions of higher learning.

6. The proper high school department should establish the type of program that will appeal to the boys as well as the girls. Most of the full courses in the state were under the Home Economics department, and boys tend to shy away from classes associated with Home Economics because these are classes that "only girls take." If family life education could be in a department of its own or included in the Social Science or the Sociology department, it would help overcome this problem and would reach the boys as well as the girls.

7. All in all, the investigator would agree with the recommendations of the 1961 Utah State Legislative Council that the state board of education establish a state course of study in this area. The investigator would disagree with the statement that "much is being done" and would advocate that much needs to be done. The investigator would therefore recommend that the state not allow just "anyone" to teach this vital and important subject, but that the state certify teachers with a multidisciplinary background to teach family life education.

LITERATURE CITED

- Bayer, Alan E. 1963. A survey of family life education courses in the public high schools of Florida. Unpublished MS thesis. Florida State University, Tallahassee, Florida. 104 p.
- Behlmer, Reuben H. 1959. Family life education in a large high school. *Marriage and Family Living* 21(3):284-286.
- Bezant, Rozelle K. 1965. Marriage and family living in the homemaking curriculum. *Journal of Home Economics* 57(1):11-16.
- Blood, Robert O., Jr. 1957. *Anticipating your marriage*. Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press. 482 p.
- Bonar, Hugh S. 1960. The education of half of our population. *Journal of Home Economics* 52(6):418-420.
- Broderick, Carlfred B. 1964. Family life education versus reality. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 26(1):102-103.
- Brown, Eleanor F. 1936. High school courses in social and home relations. *Journal of Home Economics* 28(3):145-147.
- Dager, Edward Z., and Glenn Harper. 1959. Family life education in Indiana public high schools: A preliminary report. *Marriage and Family Living* 21(3):385-388.
- Dager, Edward Z., Glenn Harper, and Robert N. Whitehurst. 1962. Family life education in public high schools: A survey report on Indiana. *Marriage and Family Living* 24(4):365-370.
- Edison, Newell W. 1922. *Status of sex education in high schools*. U.S. Public Health Bulletin 14. 12 p.
- Fishbein, Morris, and Ruby Jo Reeves Kennedy. 1955. *Modern marriage and family living*. New York: Ronald Press. 545 p.
- Force, Elizabeth S. 1950. High school education for family living. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science--Toward Family Stability* 272:156-162.
- Glatthorn, Allan Adale. 1960. Family life education in the public high schools of Pennsylvania. Unpublished EdD dissertation, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. (Original not seen; referred to in Bayer, 1963.)
- Grover, David A. 1966. Family living courses in South Carolina. *Journal of Home Economics* 58(4):286-288.

- Hitchcock, Mary Ellen, and Vladimir de Lissovoy. 1966. Family life education in Pennsylvania high schools. *Journal of Home Economics* 58(6):477-479.
- Iseman, Marjorie F. 1968. Sex education. *McCall's* 95(4):36-118.
- It's those parents again--creating more responsibility for schools. 1960. *The Nations Schools* 66(2):72-80.
- Jewson, Ruth H. 1963. Family living classes for today's adolescents. *The Teachers College Journal* 35(3):88-91.
- Johnson, Warren R., and Margaret Schutt. 1966. Sex education attitudes of school administrators and school board members. *The Journal of School Health* 36(2):64-68.
- Kenkel, William F. 1957. A survey of family life education in Iowa high schools. *Marriage and Family Living* 19(4):379-381.
- Kirkendall, Lester A. 1949. Principles basic to education for marriage and family life in the high school. *Marriage and Family Living* 11:131-135.
- Kirkendall, Lester A., and Esther Handwork. 1950. Preparation of teachers for education in marriage and family living. *Marriage and Family Living* 12:7-9.
- Kirkpatrick, Clifford. 1955. *The family as process and institution*. New York: Ronald Press. 651 p.
- Landis, Judson T. 1957. The challenge of marriage and family life education. *Marriage and Family Living* 19(3):247-252.
- Landis, Judson T. 1965. High school student marriage, school policy, and family life education in California. *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 27(2):271-276.
- Landis, Judson T., and Mary G. Landis. 1950. *Personal adjustment, marriage, and family living*. New York: Prentice-Hall. 392 p.
- Landis, Judson T., and K. C. Kidd. 1956. Attitudes and policies concerning marriages among high school students. *Marriage and Family Living* 18:128-136.
- Landis, Paul. 1960. *Making the most of marriage*. Revised. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts. 542 p.
- Miller, Haskell M. 1956. Family life education in school and colleges, with special reference to Tennessee. *Journal of Educational Sociology* 30(4):173-180.
- Oaks, Don. 1963. The principal views the family life program. *Marriage and Family Living* 25(1):108-109.

- Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction. 1966. *Family life education*. Report to the Utah State Legislative Council. Salt Lake City, Utah. 30 p.
- Rickover, Hyman G. 1962. *Education for all children*. Hearing before the Committee on Appropriations, 87th Congress, 2nd Session. U. S. Government Printing Office. 333 p.
- Rosenstiel, Edith E., and Harold B. Smith. 1963. The growth of family life education in Illinois. *Marriage and Family Living* 25(1):109-111.
- Sperry, Irwin V., and Ruth Thompson. 1961. Marriage among high school students. *Bulletin National Association of Secondary School Principals* 45(268):100-106.
- White House Conference on Children and Youth. 1960. *Recommendations--Composite report of forum findings*. U. S. Government Printing Office. 85 p.
- Whitehurst, Robert N. 1961. A survey of family life education in Indiana high schools. Unpublished MS thesis. Purdue University, Lafayette, Indiana. NP.

APPENDIX

April 22, 1968

Dear Principal:

I appreciated talking with you on the telephone and your willingness to cooperate with us on this study of family life education in the Utah high schools.

As I mentioned, for this study family life education will be defined as: any form of education that would teach attitudes, feelings, or facts in such areas as (1) personal adjustment in preparing for marriage and family life; (2) sex education; (3) one's place in his parental family; (4) dating and courtship; (5) marriage; (6) love and interpersonal relationships; (7) parenthood; and (8) any phase of living in families.

Enclosed you will find (1) the principal questionnaire to get your feelings and recommendations, and (2) the teacher questionnaires to be distributed to the teachers concerned with this area. A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience in returning the completed questionnaires.

To stimulate promptness and to express our gratitude to the schools who have the questionnaires completed and returned to us by the end of the second week after the stamped mailing date, we wish to present to five (5) of these schools a one-year's free subscription to The Family Coordinator to be placed in their school's library as a reference for the family life education teachers. The five schools will be drawn randomly from the schools that have completed and returned their questionnaires at the end of the two-week period.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Chad B. Howells,
Graduate Student

FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION SURVEY
(Principal Questionnaire)

Department of Family and Child Development

Utah State University

1. Name of high school _____
2. Number of students (Grades 10-12) _____
3. Do you have a full semester or full year's course taught in family life education in your school? Yes(). No().
4. If yes, did you help initiate it? Yes(). No().
5. What year was this course first offered? _____
6. If you had (or have) a full semester's course taught in family life education, under which of the following departments would you prefer to include it? (If more than one, indicate 1st and 2nd choice.)
 - Home economics
 - Health and safety, physical education
 - Psychology
 - Sociology
 - Social studies
 - Other (specify) _____
7. Would you prefer it taught as: a compulsory course.
 an elective course.
8. As far as you know, what are the reactions to the family life course by the following groups? (Please check)

GROUPS	Mostly Favorable	Somewhat Favorable	Apathetic	Somewhat Unfavorable	Mostly Unfavorable
Students					
Parents					
Community					
Administration					

9. In your opinion, what are the difficulties involved in the teaching or the offering of family life education in your school? _____

Use reverse side for any other comments. THANK YOU!

April 22, 1968

Dear Teacher:

In talking with your principal, he has indicated that perhaps you are teaching subject matter in a unit, semester, or year's course in the area of family life education.

This is a descriptive study of all of the high schools in the state to determine what is being taught in this area. For this study, family life education is being defined as: any form of education that would teach attitudes, feelings, or facts in such areas as (1) personal adjustment in preparing for marriage and family life; (2) sex education; (3) one's place in his parental family; (4) dating and courtship; (5) marriage; (6) love and interpersonal relationships; (7) parenthood; and (8) any phase of living in families.

Would you please fill out the attached twenty-minute questionnaire concerning the classes you teach.

To stimulate promptness and to express our gratitude to the schools who have the questionnaires completed and returned to us by the end of the second week after the stamped mailing date, we wish to present to five (5) of these schools a one-year's free subscription to The Family Coordinator to be placed in their school's library as a reference for the family life education teachers. The five schools will be drawn randomly from the schools that have completed and returned their questionnaires at the end of the two-week period.

After completing the questionnaire, would you please seal it in the envelope and return it to the principal's office.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Chad B. Howells
Graduate Student

4. What professional degrees do you hold? _____

5. Indicate the number of hours (semester ____ or quarter ____) at the graduate level which you have taken in the following fields:

Psychology: _____. Sociology: _____.
 Home economics: _____. Guidance: _____.
 Health, physical education: _____. Biology: _____.

6. Indicate the number of undergraduate and graduate hours you have taken in the specific field of marriage and the family:

Undergraduate: _____. Graduate: _____.

7. To which professional organizations do you belong?

8. If married, how many years have you been married? _____ years.

How many children do you have? _____ children.

9. Did you help initiate the family life course you are teaching?

Yes(). No().

10. What is the total number of boys and girls in your present family

life classes? ____ boys. ____ girls. This number is:

more than(), fewer than(), about the same as(), usual.

If you teach family life subject matter in more than one course, please respond to the remainder of this questionnaire in terms of the most comprehensive single course you teach. (The following questions contain references to "course," in which case, it may mean a "unit" of a course or a full course, whichever applies.)

11. What year was this course first offered? _____

12. Is there a written syllabus for the family life course you teach?

(Yes(). No().

13. How many periods per week does the class meet?

1 _____, 2 _____, 3 _____, 4 _____, 5 _____.

14. This family life course is in the following high school department area:

- Home economics
 Health and safety, physical education
 Psychology
 Sociology
 Social studies
 Other (specify) _____

15. This course is: (Please check)

High school grade	Compulsory for		Elective for	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
10th grade				
11th grade				
12th grade				

16. Are courses divided by sex?

- Never divided.
 Completely divided.
 Divided for certain topics.

17. As far as you know, what are the reactions to the family life course by the following groups? (Please check)

GROUPS	Mostly Favorable	Somewhat Favorable	Apathetic	Somewhat Unfavorable	Mostly Unfavorable
Students					
Parents					
Community					
Administration					

18. Do you use a family life textbook for the course? Yes(). No().

Title of textbook: _____ . Author: _____ .

Other texts, pamphlets, etc. _____

19. If films are used regularly, please list the film titles:

20. Do you use any of the following resource persons as speakers in your classroom (check all those you use):

School nurse _____ Clergyman _____ Physician _____
 Lawyer _____ School counselor _____ School psychologist _____
 School social worker _____ Other (specify) _____
 None _____

21. Are there established counseling facilities available in the school which are specifically designed to aid students in the problems of dating, courtship, marriage, and family life? Yes(). No().
 Do you, personally, do any school student counseling in this area? Yes(). No().

22. Please list the resource periodicals from which you regularly draw out family life information:

() To my knowledge, there are none available to me as "Family Life Information."

() I would like more available resource information.

23. What percentage of all students that graduated from your high school last year do you estimate as having some family life education in a high school course?

_____ less than 10% _____ 10% to 20% _____ 20% to 30%

_____ 30% to 40% _____ 40% to 50% _____ 50% to 60%

_____ 60% to 70% _____ 70% or more

PART II Course, Content, Family Life Education

1. Listed below are major areas which might be covered in a course of this type. Indicate after each area the total number of class hours which you ordinarily devote to this area. Examples of topics that may be included in the major area are given in the parentheses.
- A. FAMILY AND SOCIETY: _____ hours.
(Includes: Functions of the family, organization of the family, the family in other cultures, the modern American family, family disorganization)
- B. FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS: _____ hours.
(Includes: Grandparents in the home, the adopted child, parent-child relationships, role of father, role of mother, brother-sister relationships)
- C. PERSONALITY DEVELOPMENT: _____ hours.
(Includes: Emotions, influence of heredity, patterns of behavior, psychological drives and needs, cultural influence on personality, habit formation)
- D. SEX EDUCATION: _____ hours.
(Includes: Anatomy and physiology of sex, nocturnal emissions, menstruation, preventing conception, controlling the sex drive)
- E. SEX IN SOCIETY: _____ hours.
(Includes: Prostitution, morality of sexual behavior, unmarried mothers, abortion, extramarital relations, venereal disease)
- F. DATING AND COURTSHIP: _____ hours.
(Includes: Getting along with peers, how to begin dating, etiquette of dating, going steady, engagement, nature of love, petting and necking, choosing a mate, readiness for marriage)
- G. MARRIAGE AND MARRIAGE PROBLEMS: _____ hours.
(Includes: Legal aspects of marriage, the honeymoon, mixed religious marriage, predicting marital success, spiritual aspects of marriage, adjustment in marriage, in-laws, working wives)
- H. CHILDREN: _____ hours.
(Includes: Child rearing practices, effect of children on marital relationship, child care, child development)
- I. Other areas not listed above: _____
- _____
- _____
- _____

2. Would you please rate the above areas in the order that you, as a teacher, feel adequate in teaching. (From 1, for the most adequate, to 8, for the least adequate.)

- | | |
|----------------------------------|---|
| A. Family and society _____ | E. Sex in society _____ |
| B. Family relationships _____ | F. Dating and courtship _____ |
| C. Personality development _____ | G. Marriage and marriage problems _____ |
| D. Sex education _____ | H. Children _____ |

PART III

1. As a teacher, do you feel a personal need for more college preparation in family life education? Yes(). No().

(Please comment): _____

2. There recently has been some criticism of certain phases of family life education. As a result of such conditions, which of the following changes are you planning to make? (Check all of those which apply):

_____ Change name of course _____ Modify course content
 _____ Change credit value of course _____ Drop course completely
 _____ Reduce the number of periods _____ Make no changes at all

3. What changes, if any, do you think ought to be made in the family life program?

We welcome any comments you wish to make about any aspect of family life education or of this questionnaire. Please use the other side of this form for your comments or attach additional sheets if needed.

THANK YOU!

May 21, 1968

Dear Principal:

It has been some time now since I talked with you on the telephone concerning the study of family life education in the Utah high schools. An attempt has been made to survey by questionnaire all of the high school principals and all of the teachers teaching anything in this area.

We are happy to report a fair return within the first two weeks after the questionnaires were sent out.

The results of this study will be used for further study of family life education in Utah and the development of new and better ways of teaching in this area. I am sure you as a principal realize the great need for improvement of the training and background of family life education teachers.

We realize that this is a busy time of the year as you are finishing up the school year and the summer vacation is coming upon us but we do need your help in returning the principal and teacher questionnaires in the stamped, self-addressed packet that was sent to your school. It would be appreciated if you would follow through on this as soon as possible.

If these have been sent within the past few days, please disregard this letter and accept our thanks.

Sincerely,

Chad B. Howells
Graduate Student

VITA

Chad B. Howells

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: Family Life Education in the High Schools of Utah

Major Field: Family and Child Development

Biographical Information:

Personal Data: Born at Myton, Utah, July 19, 1938, son of Clyde B. and Alice Hancock Howells; married Sharon Smith Howells January 27, 1965; two children--Corvil and Sharalee.

Education: Graduated from elementary school in Provo, Utah; graduated from Lincoln High School in Orem, Utah in 1956; received the Bachelor of Science degree from Brigham Young University, with a major in Child Development and Family Relations, in 1966; completed requirements for the Master of Science degree, specializing in Family Relations, at Utah State University, in 1968.

Professional Experience: September, 1968 to present, instructor of Family Life, Weber State College; 1966-67, teacher, Department of Seminaries and Institutes, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, Afton, Wyoming and Tucson, Arizona.