

# Curriculum Orientations of Home Economics Teacher Educators

## 가정과 교사교육자들의 가정과 교육과정 관점

류 상 회  
중앙대학교 가정교육과

Ryu, Sang-Hee  
Dept. of Home Economics Education, Chung-Ang University

---

### Abstract

본 연구는 가정과 교사교육자(전국 국·사립 대학의 가정교육과에 재직하고 있는 교수)들의 교육과정 관점을 조사함으로써 실천적 비판 중심 가정과 교육과정 개발을 위한 기초자료와 교사교육자들을 위한 세미나 프로그램 개발을 위한 유용한 자료를 제공하고자 한다.

본 연구의 결과는 다음과 같다.

- (1) 가정과 교사교육자들은 하나의 두드러진 교육과정 관점을 선호하지는 않았지만 인지과정중심 교육과정에 가장 높은 선호도를 보였다.
- (2) 석사과정에서 가정학 세부영역을 전공한 교사교육자는 가정교육학을 전공한 교사교육자보다 학문중심 교육과정과 기술중심 교육과정을 가정과 교육을 위한 적절한 관점으로 인식하였다.
- (3) 박사과정에서 가정교육학을 전공한 교사교육자는 가정학 세부영역을 전공한 교사교육자보다 개인중심 교육과정을 가정과 교육을 위한 적절한 관점으로 인식하였다.
- (4) 가정교육학 관련 교과목을 가르치는 교사교육자는 가정학 세부영역 관련 교과목을 가르치는 교사교육자보다 기술중심 교육과정을 가정과 교육을 위한 적절한 관점으로 인식하였다.

주제어 : 가정과교사교육자, 교육과정관점(학문중심, 기술중심, 인지과정중심, 개인중심, 사회재건중심)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Change and reform of curriculum orientations are current important issues for the improvement of education both in Korea and other developing

or developed countries. Curriculum orientations are based on historical developments, social and political concerns, educational theories, and philosophical views. Home economics education professionals have begun to examine different curriculum orientations that will best benefit individuals and society.

How is curriculum development defined? According to Doll (1996), curriculum development refers not only to improving the curriculum

---

Corresponding author : Ryu, Sang-Hee  
Tel : 019-393-4771  
E-mail : ryush1000@hanmail.net

structure and the curriculum documents but also to stimulating learning on the part of all persons who are concerned with the curriculum. Curriculum development as the means for bringing about improvement is a process of transforming values, ideas, and aspirations about education into programs. The literature on effective change or curriculum development suggests that it is important to consider participants in curriculum development. The reason is that participants' viewpoints, interests, beliefs, and personality characteristics are reflected in the decision making process of curriculum development. Ahrens (1956) insisted that changes in approaches, content, and methods take place only when there are changes in the thinking of those who are concerned. Therefore, we can conclude that the curriculum development process is conducted by human beings and the curriculum change is possible through people's change.

Korean home economics education now is trying revolutionary curriculum reform based on a theoretical framework which will guide home economics curriculum decisions. Until the sixth curriculum, the home economics profession suffered and was ignored because of a) the lack of a basic philosophy and conceptual framework for home economics learning, and b) the images of home economics as learning only basic skills like cooking and sewing. Because of the threat to the existence of home economics education, the home economics profession recommends the practical problem-based curriculum as the direction for home economics curriculum development (Yoo, 1992; Lee, 1992; Chae, 1995). In spite of changing philosophical orientations to the curriculum, the home economics profession has not examined the educational philosophy or beliefs of its members that may influence curriculum

development. For home economics curriculum development and curriculum change, home economics professionals must consider where they have been, where they are now, and what they should do for the future.

The purpose of this study is to identify the current personal and professional characteristics, and curriculum orientation profiles of home economics teacher educators. The purpose will be accomplished through the following research questions:

1. What are the personal and professional characteristics of home economics teacher educators?
2. What are the predominant curriculum orientations of home economics teacher educators?
3. Do the curriculum orientations of home economics teacher educators differ on their personal and professional characteristics?

Teacher educators' beliefs are also very important because the values and beliefs of teachers educators who could be on the curriculum committee are reflected in curriculum decisions (Richardson, Anders, Tidwell, & Lloyd, 1991). Much research has been done on the problems and the necessity of changing the home economics curriculum. However, no research was found related to the curriculum orientation of home economics teacher educators. This study is significant in that, firstly, information about curriculum orientation held by home economics teacher educators will be provided for home economics curriculum development. The findings in this study could help home economics teacher educators gain a better understanding about their beliefs related to curriculum and could show how their beliefs affect the development of home economics education.

## II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Education today has a variety of conflicting conceptions of the goals, content, and organization of curriculum. Eisner and Vallance (1974) realized that a problem in curriculum development efforts has been a lack of clarification of value perspectives. So, they grouped five basic curriculum orientations from many different curriculum orientations having different conceptions of the goals, content, and values: academic rationalism, technical, cognitive process, personal relevance (self-actualization), and social reconstruction (critical consciousness). Each orientation could answer the questions in the curriculum field: "what can and should be taught to whom, when, and how? The way the questions are answered is influenced largely by the assumptions through which they are approached in the first place" (Eisner & Vallance, 1974, pp. 2-3).

### 1. Academic Rationalism Orientation

Academic rationalism is concerned with the intellectual growth of the students by studying subject matter most worthy of study. However, all disciplines cannot be handled in a school because of extremely large amounts of knowledge. Academic rationalists argue that the basic field of study which includes more general and powerful paradigms of human understanding should be taught. From this orientation, Eisner (1985) recommended that the school's curriculum should emphasize the classic disciplines that provide concepts, issues, and problems that humans face. In other words, the curriculum "should help students acquire the techniques necessary for reading what able thinkers have said about such concepts, issues, and problems" (p.66). Hutchins

(1953), one of the chief proponents of academic rationalism, argues that this orientation provides students "a basic liberal education, a form of education that enables students to ask basic questions about life, truth, justice, and knowledge and to read the works of individuals who have provided powerful and lasting answers to such questions" (p. 67).

### 2. Technical Orientation

Traditionally, the technical orientation has been used for teaching in schools. This orientation emphasizes the development of a set of systematic and predefined techniques where curriculum planning is essentially a technical undertaking (Cunningham, 1992). The curriculum, the course to be run, is a document which is organized by measurable goals and behavioral objectives. Teachers formulate objectives for subject areas, and use them as criteria to determine whether students have achieved these objectives and as the evidence of educational effectiveness. This orientation fosters skills and attitudes required to maintain the existing social, political and economic structures. Emphasis is on achieving the right answer and product (Wilkosz, 1985). Therefore, this orientation is purpose oriented; schools "should have meaningful goals, and it should be possible to determine the extent to which they have been achieved" (Eisner, 1985, p. 80).

### 3. Cognitive Process Orientation

The cognitive process orientation emphasizes the development of students' cognitive skills through helping students learn how to learn and providing them with the opportunities to use their intellectual faculties. The assumptions

in this orientation are that "cognitive processes can be cultivated, that educational objectives should be derived from levels of cognitive functioning, and that test items should be designed to assess the levels of cognitive achievement that students have reached" (Eisner, 1985, p. 64). The curriculum focuses on process (how of education) rather than content (what of education). This orientation assumes "general transfer." Thus, it does not aim the simple dissemination of a body of knowledge, but the development of intellectual power. Although the subject matter is less important in building a curriculum, it is instrumental in the development of intellectual abilities. In this orientation, teachers help students learn the ability to infer, to speculate, and to solve problems because schools can not teach all knowledge or information that students will need in the future. Therefore, the curriculum would be problem-centered.

#### 4. Personal Relevance Orientation

The personal relevance orientation emphasizes personal fulfillment and helps students as individuals discover and develop their unique identities. Thus, this orientation is student centered and growth oriented. It focuses on content (what of education) unlike the cognitive process or technical orientation. The curriculum, as providing a consummatory experience for each individual student, is designed by the sympathetic interaction of teachers and students (teacher-pupil planning). The task of the school is to provide a resource-rich environment so that the child will find what he/she needs in order to grow (Eisner, 1985). The role of teacher is to provide educational situations in which each student's interests can be stimulated through providing guidance and

structure for learning without coercion and introducing new materials and ideas. The student plays an important role in choosing what he/she will study and in generating his/her own educational goals. Therefore, the major focus in this orientation is on the educational development of the individual learner (Eisner & Vallance, 1974; Eisner, 1985).

#### 5. Social Reconstruction Orientation

The social reconstruction orientation is to help students develop levels of critical consciousness in regard to real problems of society and do something about them to build a new and healthy society. The school or classroom with this orientation serves as an agency of social change and as an intermediary between what is and what might be, and between the real and the ideal. Curriculum is viewed as the means by which students learn to deal with social issues and "an active force having direct impact on the whole fabric of its human and social context" (Eisner & Vallance, 1974, p.135). The goal of education resides in the society and the analysis of the society provides the base for the curriculum.

Eisner and Vallance (1974) attempted to categorize these five major orientations for dealing with problems of the goals, content, and organization of any curriculum. Each orientation has specific implications of educational virtue. In practice, however, it is unlikely that any school is encountered in a pure form; but one of the five orientations dominates. Most of the curriculum is characterized by one or more of these five orientations in different degrees. According to Eisner (1985), the five orientations could function "as tools for the analysis of existing

school programs and as foundations for a sharpening of discourse about the planning of new programs" (p.85).

Brown (1978) identified different perspectives of curriculum paralleled to Eisner's perspectives; technical, self-actualization (personal relevance), and critical consciousness (social reconstruction). She suggested that critical consciousness orientation is appropriate for home economics curriculum, because it focuses on the betterment of society and the perennial practical problems of individuals and families. Both the cognitive process orientation and academic rationalism orientation have elements advocated by Brown for home economics education. Both these orientations are concerned with process; that is, developing students' cognitive skills is needed to learn and develop their intellectual power so as to solve problems in the future, and particularly the ethical and moral issues faced by families and workers.

### III. METHODOLOGY

#### 1. Population and Sample

The target population for this study is 83 home economics teacher educators working in the departments of home economics education in national and private universities. The lists including names and institutional addresses were provided by the directory of professors. A booklet including a cover letter and instrument was mailed to all home economics teacher educators. A stamped and self-addressed return envelope was provided. Forty-six (55.4%) home economics teacher educators responded. Follow-up phone calls to control for non-response error were not made because pushing for responses could be thought as impolite in the

Korean society. Thus, the findings of this study may have some limitation to be generalized back to the population because of low responding rate.

#### 2. Instrumentation

The instrument used to collect data was Individual Curriculum Orientation Profile (ICOP) (Babin, 1979; revised by Cunningham, 1992) translated to the Korean language. Babin(1979) designed an ICOP instrument with 57 items to discover educators' ways of thinking towards the content, goals and organization of the curriculum. He used the instrument to identify educators' particular curricular thrusts and to facilitate discussion about curriculum orientation. In 1991, Carlson adapted and developed Babin's instrument to determine factors that influence the change toward a critical consciousness orientation of Nebraska home economics teachers. Babin's instrument was critiqued by two teacher educators and the researcher. For the clarity of a questionnaire, some statements were restated to reflect only one orientation per statement. The final version included 55 statements (11 statements for each orientation). The respondent either agreed or disagreed with each statement by checking the appropriate column. The scores ranged from zero (not agreeing with any statements) to eleven (agreeing with all statements). In 1992, Cunningham reviewed Babin's (1979) original instrument and Carlson's (1991) revision. The instrument for her study was made by revising Carlson's instrument. Cunningham's instrument used by this study consisted of 45 items that used a six point Likert-type scale. Nine items reflect each of the five curriculum orientations: academic rationalism; technical; cognitive process; personal relevance; social reconstruction. The respondents were asked to

circle the appropriate number to indicate their response to each item: 1=Strongly Disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Mildly Disagree, 4=Mildly Agree, 5=Agree, and 6=Strongly Agree. In order to determine teacher educators' perception of curriculum orientation, means were computed by adding scores for each of the five orientations and dividing by 9 (for the 9 statements included in each curriculum orientation). Scores for each orientation range 1 to 6. Consequently, respondents received scores for each of the five orientations.

The construct and content validity of Cunningham's (1992) instrument was to established by six curriculum experts in the United States and Canada. Because the instrument used in this study were translated into the Korean language, to ensure of translation validity two Korean students who are enrolled in the graduate program in the Linguistics Department and one home economics teacher educator examined the Korean statements to determine if they precisely reflect the content and implications of the original English. After revising unclear words and sentences, the questionnaires of the two language versions were tested by two Korean home economics educators. The results were the same regardless of translation. Cronbach's alpha coefficient calculated to determine the reliability (internal consistency) of the instrument is .90.

### 3. Data Analysis

SPSS<sup>x</sup> computer program was used to analyze data. Descriptive statistics including frequencies, means, and standard deviations were used to describe personal and professional characteristics of home economics teacher educators, and the focus of their curriculum orientation. ANOVA was used to

answer questions 3. To run ANOVA, dummy coding was done for teacher educators' major (home economics education major and other specialized majors), and courses which teacher educators teach (home economics education and other specialized areas). For all significance tests, the alpha level was set at .05.

## IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Characteristics of Home Economics (HE) Teacher Educators

The age distribution of home economics teacher educators ranged from 35 to 65 years old, with the mean age of 49.28. They were in the 31-40 (n=9, 19.6%), 41-50 (n=18, 39.1%) and 51 and over (n=19, 41.3%) age range. The major for bachelor's degree of teacher educators is as follows: 30.4%(n=14) majored in home economics; 21.7%(n=10) in home economics education; 17.4%(n=8) in textiles and clothing; 15.2%(n=7) in food and nutrition; and 13.0%(n=6) in family resource management. In master's degree 23.9%(n=11) majored in food and nutrition as well as textiles and clothing; 19.6%(n=9) majored in family resource management; 15.2%(n=7) majored in home economics education; and 10.9%(n=5) majored in home economics. The majority of teacher educators majored in home economics specializations other than home economics education in doctoral degree: textiles and clothing (n=11, 26.8%), food and nutrition (n=10, 24.4%), family resource management (n=6, 14.6%), or human development (n=5, 12.2%). Only 9.8%(n=4) of them majored in home economics education. The teacher educators graduated from master's program in a college of home economics (n=32, 69.6%) or a college of education (n=13, 28.3%).

Only one teacher educator(2.1%) graduated from master's program in a college of home economics in the United States. The type of college from which home economics teacher educators graduated with doctoral degrees is a college of home economics (n=36, 87.8%), a college of education (n=2, 4.9%), and a college of home education in the United States (n=3, 7.3%). Most of the teacher educators reported that they taught courses related to textiles and clothing (n=13, 28.3%), food and nutrition (n=11, 23.9%), or family resource management (n=11, 23.9%). The number of teacher educators who taught courses related to home economics education was 7 (15.2%).

Considering that the subjects of this study were home economics teacher educators in the departments of home economics education, the low percent holding home economics education degrees needs to be investigated. There are two reasons. First, there are only two universities having a doctoral program in home economics education in Korea. Furthermore, the doctoral programs were only established recently. Second, home economics education departments have not hired those who majored in home economics education. The findings also indicate the curriculum of home economics education departments is mainly composed of courses related to specialized fields.

## 2. Curriculum Orientations of Home Economics Teacher Educators

Table 1 indicates means for each curriculum orientation perceived by home economics teacher educators. Teacher educators received the highest mean score (4.90) in cognitive process orientation but the lowest mean score

(4.30) in social reconstruction orientation. The technical orientation was the second highest mean score (4.61) for teacher educators followed by the personal relevance (4.53), and academic rationalism (4.40).

Table 1. Curriculum Orientation Perceived by HE Teacher Educators

Curriculum Orientations	M	SD
Academic Rationalism	4.40	.47
Technical	4.61	.71
Cognitive Process	4.90	.50
Personal Relevance	4.53	.57
Social Reconstruction	4.30	.51

Scores for each of five orientations were calculated for home economics teacher educators. Home economics teacher educators perceived predominantly one of the five orientations. The predominant type of curriculum orientation perceived by home economics teacher educators is shown in Table 2. Half (50%) of teacher educators indicated the highest mean score in cognitive process orientation, while 21.74% showed the highest mean score in technical orientation. It is surprising that educational beliefs of home economics teacher educators are moving toward a cognitive process orientation. The reason is that they recognize the crisis of home economics education oriented to academic rationalism or technology. Similarly, Wyatt (1994) found that both teacher educators and state supervisors gave the highest mean scores in cognitive process curriculum orientation.

Table 2. Predominant Types of Curriculum Orientation Perceived by HE Teacher Educators

Curriculum Orientation	n	%
Academic Rationalism	0	.00
Technical	10	21.74
Cognitive Process	23	50.00
Personal Relevance	7	15.22
Social Reconstruction	1	1.27
Academic Rationalism and Cognitive Process	1	1.27
Technical and Cognitive Process	1	1.27
Cognitive Process and Personal Relevance	3	6.52
Total	46	100.0

### 3. Differences in the Curriculum Orientations by Personal and Professional Characteristics

From the summary of results from one-way

ANOVAs for home economics teacher educators, the findings show that significant variables for contributing to different curriculum orientations were also the personal characteristic of age; and professional characteristics including their master's degree major, doctoral degree major, college type for master's degree, college type for doctoral degree, and courses which they teach (Table 3).

**Age** One-way ANOVA indicated a significant difference between age and personal relevance orientation ( $F=3.93$ ,  $p=.04$ ) at the .05 alpha level (Table 4). Home economics teacher educators who were in 31 to 40 age range (middle age group) revealed the highest mean score in personal relevance orientation (4.91); the 51 and over age range revealed the lowest mean score (4.38). Thus, middle age home economics teacher educators agreed at a higher level that personal relevance is the curriculum approach they thought best than older home economics teacher educators.

Table 3. Summary of Results from ANOVA on Curriculum Orientations by Personal and Professional Characteristics of HE Teacher Educators

Source of Variance	Curriculum Orientations									
	Academic Rationalism		Technical		Cognitive Process		Personal Relevance		Social Reconstruction	
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p
Personal Characteristics										
Age	1.36	.27	.95	.39	.56	.58	3.93	.04	.08	.92
Marital Status	.59	.45	1.36	.25	.07	.80	3.22	.07	2.49	.12
Professional Characteristics										
Educational Level	.04	.84	.00	.95	1.57	.22	.30	.59	.57	.46
Major in Bachelor's Degree	.05	.95	.59	.45	.40	.53	.39	.54	1.13	.30
Major in Master's Degree	3.60	.05	7.04	.01	.98	.33	.69	.41	.05	.82
Major in Doctoral Degree	1.62	.21	9.55	.00	.63	.43	4.22	.05	.89	.35
College Type in Bachelor's Degree	.09	.76	.86	.36	.89	.35	.83	.37	.34	.56
College Type in Master's Degree	9.54	.00	18.86	.00	2.37	.08	.28	.76	.17	.85
College Type in Doctoral Degree	1.03	.37	9.12	.00	.06	.94	1.94	.16	.58	.57
Teaching Years	.62	.69	1.38	.25	.54	.74	2.02	.10	.45	.81
University Type	.99	.33	1.27	.27	.02	.89	.05	.83	.62	.44
Student Numbers	1.32	.28	1.60	.21	.64	.60	.95	.43	1.55	.22
Course Type Taught	2.83	.10	7.47	.01	.06	.80	1.53	.22	.02	.89
Number of Curriculum Development Projects	1.09	.36	.75	.53	.43	.73	1.09	.37	.53	.67



Table 4. ANOVA on Personal Relevance Orientation by Age

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	p
<u>Personal Relevance</u>					
Age	2	1.76	.88	3.93	.04
Error	42	12.65	.30		
Total	44	58.12			

Major in Master's Degree As shown in Table 5, teacher educators' major in their master's degree was significantly related to the academic rationalism orientation ( $F=3.60$ ,  $p=.05$ ) and technical orientation ( $F=7.04$ ,  $p=.01$ ). Home economics teacher educators who majored in home economics education for their master's degree indicated lower mean scores on both academic rationalism and technical orientation than teacher educators who majored in other specialized home economics majors.

Table 5. ANOVA on Academic Rationalism and Technical Orientations by Major in Master's Degree

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	p
<u>Academic Rationalism</u>					
Major in Master's Degree	1	.76	.76	3.60	.05
Error	43	9.06	.21		
Total	44	90.74			
<u>Technical</u>					
Major in Master's Degree	1	3.11	3.11	7.04	.01
Error	44	19.43	.44		
Total	45	22.54			

Major in Doctoral Degree Major in doctoral degree was related to the technical orientation ( $F=9.55$ ,  $p=.00$ ) and personal relevance orientation ( $F=4.22$ ,  $p=.05$ ) for home economics teacher educators (Table 6). The mean score (3.64) of

teacher educators who majored in home economics education was lower than the mean score (4.72) of teacher educators who majored in other specialized areas in technical orientation. Whereas, in personal relevance orientation, teacher educators who majored in home economics education (5.06) indicated higher mean score than teacher educators who majored in other specialized areas (4.47). Thus, it is surmised that teacher educators who majored in home economics education in doctoral degree were more likely to perceive personal relevance as being more relevant to home economics curriculum than teacher educators who majored in other areas.

Table 6. ANOVA on Technical and Personal Relevance Orientations by Major in Doctoral Degree

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	p
<u>Technical</u>					
Major in Doctoral Degree	1	4.22	4.23	9.55	.00
Error	39	17.26	.44		
Total	40	21.48			
<u>Personal Relevance</u>					
Major in Doctoral Degree	1	1.23	1.23	4.22	.05
Error	39	11.38	.29		
Total	40	12.61			

College Type for Master's Degree One-way ANOVA indicated a significant difference between college type in master's degree and academic rationalism orientation ( $F=9.54$ ,  $p=.00$ ), and between college type in master's degree and technical orientation ( $F=18.86$ ,  $p=.00$ ) at the .001 alpha level (Table 7). Home economics teacher educators who earned master's degrees from a college of education or college of home economics in the United States had the lowest mean score in both academic rationalism and

technical orientation.

For both academic rationalism and technical orientation, a Tukey test of pairwise comparisons indicated a significant difference between both a college of education and a college of home economics in Korea and a college of education or a college of home economics in the United States. Home economics teacher educators who graduated from a college of education or a college of home economics in the United States were significantly less academic rationalism and technical oriented than teachers who graduated from a college of education or a college of home economics in Korea.

Table 7. ANOVA on Academic Rationalism and Technical Orientations by College Type in Master's Degree

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	p
<u>Academic Rationalism</u>					
College Type in Master's Degree	2	3.06	1.53	9.54	.00
Error	42	6.75	.16		
Total	44	9.81			
<u>Technical</u>					
College Type in Master's Degree	2	10.53	5.26	18.86	.00
Error	43	12.01	.28		
Total	45	22.54			

College Type in Doctoral Degree College type in doctoral degree was statistically significant for technical orientation ( $F=9.12$ ,  $p=.00$ ) (Table 8). Home economics teacher educators who received doctoral degree from a college of education or a college of home economics in the United States had the lowest mean score in technical orientation. A Tukey test of pairwise comparisons indicated a

significant difference between both technical orientation scores of home economics teacher educators graduating with degrees from a college of education (4.72) and a college of home economics (4.73) in Korea and a college of education or a college of home economics in the United States (3.15).

Table 8. ANOVA on Technical Orientation by College Type in Doctoral Degree

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	p
<u>Technical</u>					
College Type in Doctoral Degree	2	6.96	3.48	9.12	.00
Error	38	14.52	.38		
Total	40	21.48			

Course Type Taught As shown in Table 9, one-way ANOVA indicated a significant difference between course type taught and technical orientation ( $F=7.47$ ,  $p=.01$ ). The mean score of home economics teacher educators who taught courses related to home economics education was higher (4.73) than the mean score of teacher educators who taught courses related to other specialized areas (3.98) in technical orientation. Thus, the type of courses that teacher educators teach was statistically

Table 9 : ANOVA on Technical Orientation by Course Type Taught

Source	DF	SS	MS	F	p
<u>Technical</u>					
Course Type Taught	1	3.27	3.27	7.47	.01
Error	44	19.27	.44		
Total	45	22.54			

significant for technical orientation.

## V. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Education should be changed and reformed for the twenty-first century, and home economics education should be reconceptualized for strengthening the field of study. Now, home economics educators are trying revolutionary reform of home economics curriculum by moving toward a critical science-based approach. These assertions are motivating educators to reexamine their beliefs and plan and prepare for this reconceptualization and implementation. The purpose in this study is to identify beliefs about curriculum orientation of home economics teacher educators for the development of home economics curriculum and the change of their curriculum orientation.

Home economics teacher educators (50%) agreed with the cognitive processes as their predominant curriculum orientation for home economics education. The second predominant type with which home economics teacher educators agreed most was technical orientation (21.74%). While home economics teacher educators do not hold one strong curriculum orientation, the cognitive process curriculum orientation is the strongest. They indicated agreement with the cognitive process orientation which is congruent with the proposed problem oriented home economics curriculum approach. Home economics teacher educators' age, major, college type, and courses which they teach are significantly related to their curriculum orientation. Teacher educators who majored in specialized areas for their masters degree and graduated from a college of education or a college of home economics in Korea are more

academic rationalism and technical oriented. Teacher educators who are young and majored in home economics education for their doctoral degree are more personal relevance oriented.

This study has implications for home economics teacher educators, administrators, and curriculum committee who are responsible for guiding, supervising, or facilitating professional development of home economics teachers, and plan and develop home economics curriculum. The study also has implications and recommendations for change of home economics curriculum.

First, since home economics teacher educators agree with cognitive process and personal relevance orientations as appropriate home economics curriculum approaches, with a preference to cognitive process orientation, resource materials such as curriculum guide will be needed to support these orientations in home economics education programs and classrooms.

Second, knowing the results of this study will help teacher educators and administrators to better understand their in-service education needs.

Third, to overcome a crisis confronting home economics education, some home economics teacher educators have insisted that home economics curriculum should be changed toward a practical problem-based approach. However, teacher educators perceive social reconstruction orientation as their least preferred curriculum approach. If home economics teacher educators do not support new curriculum approaches such as practical problem-based approach, it is hard to change educators' curriculum orientations and teaching practices as well as home economics curriculum approach. Considering that teacher educators influence the development of home economics curriculum and are responsible for pre-service and in-service education, it is urgent to reeducate home economics teacher

educators through workshops and conferences for in-service teacher educators.

Fourth, teacher educators who majored in home economics education for their master and doctoral degree perceived personal relevance as being more relevant for home economics curriculum approach, and academic rationalism and technical orientation as being less appropriate for home economics curriculum approach. Thus, home economics education departments need to hire professors who majored in home economics education to teach courses related to home economics education such as home economics curriculum, home economics teaching strategies, evaluation in home economics education, and so on.

Fifth, in future study, multiple regression needs to be used to determine variables that explain the variance in curriculum orientation, and to validate teacher educators curriculum orientation their curriculum orientation needs to be discovered through long in-depth interviews.

**Key words** : home economics teacher educator, curriculum orientation (academic rationalism, technical, cognitive process, personal relevance, social reconstruction)

## REFERENCES

- Ahrens, M. (1956). Parents and staff cooperate in system-wide improvement. *Educational Leadership*, 11, 337-342.
- Babin, P. (1979). A curriculum orientation profile. *Education Canada*, 19(3), 38-43.
- Brown, M. (1978). *A conceptual scheme and decision-rules for the selection and organization of home economics curriculum content*. Madison, WI: Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction.
- Carlson, S. (1991). *Secondary home economics teacher change toward a critical consciousness orientation*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln.
- Cunningham, R. (1992). *Curriculum orientation of Nebraska home economics teacher*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Doll, R. C. (1996). *Curriculum improvement: Decision making and process*. Newton, Mass: Allyn and Bacon.
- Eisner, E. W. (1985). Five basic orientations to the curriculum. In E. W. Eisner, *The education imagination: On the design and evaluation of school programs* (2nd ed.) (pp. 61-68). New York: Macmillan.
- Eisner, E. W., & Vallance, E. (1974). *Conflicting conceptions of curriculum*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan.
- Hutchins, R. M. (1953). *The conflicts in education in a democratic society* Harper, New York.
- Lee, Y. S. (1992). *The future direction of home economics higher education*. Paper presented at the 4th Korean Home Economics Education Association Meeting.
- Richardson, V., Anders, P., Tidwell, D., & Lloyd, C. (1991). The relationship between teachers' beliefs and practices in reading comprehension instruction. *American Educational Research Journal*, 28(3), 559-586.
- Wilkosz, J. R. (1985). New movements in curriculum theory and practice. *What's New in Home Economics*, 19(4), 4.
- Wyatt, M. J. (1994). *Curriculum orientations of home economics leaders and characteristics of recommended home economics curriculum documents*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus.

Yoo, T. M. (1992). *The international comparison of home economics curriculum*. Paper presented

at the 4th Korean Home Economics Education Association Meeting.