

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA
FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION TEACHERS' ASSESSMENT
OF THE ADEQUACY OF THEIR TRAINING

by



JACQUELINE COLLEEN EVENSON

A THESIS
SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH
IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE
OF MASTER OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF SECONDARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

SPRING, 1973

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to determine the training needed for teaching family life education and, on the basis of these needs, to provide guidelines for training family life teachers.

A questionnaire was constructed, pretested, then finalized and mailed to each teacher. Those teachers who returned the questionnaire included 33 teachers currently teaching and four teachers being prepared to teach family life classes.

Eighty-six percent of the teachers had four or more years of university training. Their major areas of study were social studies and physical education. In addition to these specified teaching specialties, many teachers indicated they had a strong background in social science courses.

The teachers were asked to assess their counseling adequacy in handling situations involving premarital pregnancy, death of a parent, homosexuality, guilt feelings over sexual behavior and a sexually molested child. Teachers did not rate themselves as highly adequate. However, 92 percent of them had counseled students in the past year and 73 percent felt that training in counseling would be helpful in teaching family life education.

Because family life classes often deal with sensitive topics, teachers were asked to assess their effectiveness in handling the issues of abortion, contraception, moral standards, religious views on sex, and sex education. Experienced teachers and male teachers felt more competent in handling religious views on sex, whereas female teachers

and public school teachers felt more competent in handling abortion and contraception.

The Criteria for Teacher Training of the National Council on Family Relations (NCFR) were used to obtain self-ratings of the teachers' formal training. These ratings indicated that teachers have only minimal training in family life education prior to teaching family life courses. Seventy-three percent indicated an inadequate preparation in family life content and 76 percent indicated a need for specific teaching skills, observation and practice teaching related to family life education. Forty-eight percent of the teachers felt they needed more training in all NCFR areas and 45 percent indicated that extensive training was needed in family resources, group processes, the use of methods and materials, and family interaction. A desire for more training in family life subjects was indicated by 95 percent of the teachers. In-service education helped to remedy some of the deficient areas. However, the majority of teachers desired more training, indicating that in-service education alone was not adequate training for family life teachers.

It was concluded that training was essential for future family life teachers. On the basis of the information received, a set of guidelines has been proposed for training of family life teachers. Courses presently offered at the University of Alberta which would fulfil the criteria suggested by the guidelines are indicated.

Briefly, the proposed high priority guidelines for training family life teachers are:

1. The study of human development from birth to death.

2. A study of sexual roles, needs, identities and behaviors in the personal and social functioning of a human being's sexuality.
3. Training in biological sciences (nutrition, genetics, physiology and human reproduction).
4. Background knowledge in family interaction and relationships during each stage of the life cycle.
5. Experiences in group processes and communication skills to promote individual growth.
6. An introductory course, plus experiences, in individual and group counseling.
7. A course in methods and materials in family life education.
8. The opportunity for students to practice teach in family life education.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to acknowledge her indebtedness to the many individuals who contributed to the completion of the study. First of all she wishes to thank her committee chairman, Dr. A. Harvey, not only for her constructive advice, but also for her support and encouragement. A special thank-you to committee members Dr. D. Kieren and A. W. E. Eriksson for their interest and suggestions.

My appreciation is extended to the family life authorities and teachers who were involved in the development of the questionnaire.

I am indebted to the Edmonton Public and Separate School Boards for allowing their teachers to participate in the study, to the co-ordinators of the Perspectives for Living and Christian Family Life Programs for their help in contacting family life teachers, and to the family life teachers who so graciously used their time to complete the questionnaire.

Grateful thanks are extended to Colin Park for assistance with the computer and to Annamarie Thornberry for her time and effort in typing.

Finally, the writer expresses her appreciation to her husband Len for his support and interest.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
CHAPTER I. THE NATURE OF THE STUDY	1
Introduction	1
Background to the Problem	2
The Need for the Study	3
The Purpose of the Study	5
Definition of Terms	6
Summary	7
CHAPTER II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	8
Overview	8
Developments in Family Life Education Programs	8
Importance of Training for Family Life Teachers	14
Training Suggested by Family Life Authorities	19
Teacher Training Criteria	23
Criteria of the National Council on Family Relations	23
Research Based on NCFR Criteria	25
Carrera Guidelines	28
Importance and Use of Teaching Methods in Family Life Classes	30
Future Family Life Educator	32
Summary	33
CHAPTER III. DESIGN OF THE STUDY	35
Overview	35
Rationale for the Method of Data Collection	35
Identifying the Sample	36

	Page
Design of the Questionnaire	37
Instrumentation	37
Sources of Questionnaire Items	37
Panel of Authorities Consulted	39
Revision of the Questionnaire	39
Questionnaire Format	40
Questionnaire Pretest	40
Validity of the Instrument	40
Reliability of the Instrument	41
Delimitations of the Study	41
Collection of Data	42
Distribution of the Questionnaire	42
Follow-up Procedures	42
Analysis of the Data	43
Treatment of the Data	43
Student's t test	43
Summary	45
CHAPTER IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS	46
Introduction	46
Questionnaire Returns	46
Background Information	47
Self-Assessed Training in NCFR Criteria	50
Topics Studied in Family Life Classes	55
Self-Ratings of Teaching Skills	57
Teaching Methods and Materials Used in Family Life Classes	64
Teacher Training Strengths and Weaknesses	65

	Page
Teacher Training Suggestions	73
Summary	75
CHAPTER V. TEACHER TRAINING GUIDELINES AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS	78
Introduction	78
Training Guidelines	80
Research Implications	88
Summary	89
BIBLIOGRAPHY	90
APPENDIX	95

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Items Rated as Essential in Training Sex Educators According to (A) Knowledge, (B) Skills, and (C) Experience	29
Table 2. Classification of Questionnaire Items According to Study Objectives	38
Table 3. Family Life Teachers Surveyed by Questionnaire	46
Table 4. Major Field of Study for Public and Separate School Family Life Teachers	49
Table 5. Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Adequacy of Formal Training Between Public and Separate Teachers	51
Table 6. Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Adequacy of Formal Training Between Those Offering and Those Invited to Teach	53
Table 7. Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Adequacy of Formal Training Between Those With More Experience and Those With Less Experience	54
Table 8. Comparison of the Percentage of Time Students Spend Studying Family Life Subject Areas and the Teachers' Preparation Score in Each Area	56
Table 9. Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Effectiveness in Handling Issues Between Those With More Experience and Those With Less Experience	57
Table 10. Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Effectiveness in Handling Issues Between Male and Female Teachers	58
Table 11. Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Effectiveness in Handling Issues Between Public and Separate Teachers	59
Table 12. Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Adequacy in Counseling Situations Between Those With More Experience and Those With Less Experience	62
Table 13. Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Adequacy in Counseling Situations Between Those Invited to Teach and Those Offering to Teach	63
Table 14. Most Valuable Techniques Used in Teaching Family Life Classes	65

	Page
Table 15. Self-Assessed Training Deficiencies of Present Family Life Teachers	66
Table 16. Extensive Training Needed by Teachers	68
Table 17. Techniques or Areas Which Teachers Feel Should be Well Developed in Teacher Training Programs	69
Table 18. Areas Where In-Service Training Was the Teachers' Major Source of Information	71
Table 19. Areas Where Teacher Preparation Was the Teachers' Major Source of Information	72
Table 20. Teachers' Views on Criteria for Selecting a Family Life Teacher	74

CHAPTER I

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY

Introduction

Parents more than ever before realize that influences on their children come from many areas outside the home. They are looking to the schools for help in the task of preparing young people for the future. Family life education, including sex information, has become one focus of this education for the future. Schools are only one of many institutions and agencies which influence children. However, a 1965 survey pointed out only three percent of the Winnipeg school population was reached by these other groups (Guest, 1968). It is only the school that receives all children for a specific period of time, and the school must accept the responsibility for the total education of the individual including a child's sex and family interests (Manley, 1964).

Support from parents, teachers, students and administrators has encouraged school boards to initiate and implement family life programs in their schools as quickly as possible. Grendal and Green (1971) observed that even when much controversy has surrounded the introduction of family life education into the schools, as was the case in Kansas, school programs have continued to expand rapidly. The spread of family life education programs in Canadian schools was shown by a 1971 Vanier Institute survey which found that grade 7 to 12 students would be reached by a family life program in 29 percent of the responding Canadian schools. Of these programs 52 percent had been implemented since 1965 (Vanier Institute, 1971).

Background to the Problem

Although most people agree that family life education is worthwhile and that schools should share in the responsibility of educating youth in this area, there are many who question the level of training of teachers who are or will be teaching family life and sex education in the schools (Manley, 1964; Simon & Gagnon, 1967; Kerckhoff, 1964; Christianson, 1958; Avery, 1964; Malfetti & Rubin, 1967; Reiss, 1968; Luckey, 1967; Johnson, 1968). This doubt is intensified by perusal of literature indicating teachers are either inadequately trained or have no training in the family life subject matter.

Many Canadian universities offer courses covering a variety of aspects in the family life and sex education area. However, no specific teacher training program exists at the undergraduate level for the purpose of preparing family life teachers. At the Master of Education level only the University of Alberta, through the School of Household Economics' Family Studies Division, offers an interdisciplinary degree that may be designated as a family life education speciality provided the faculty feels the candidate has competency in this area.

Since the possibilities for teacher training in family life education in Canada are quite limited, do opportunities exist elsewhere? Unfortunately, not really! Programs in other countries provide only a slight improvement. In 1967 only eight percent of universities or colleges in the United States offered courses intended to prepare teachers to teach family life education and only three percent of the remainder were planning to initiate programs (Malfetti & Rubin, 1967). The rapid introduction of family life programs into the schools and the shortage of trained family life education teachers has led to self-

designated family life teachers. These teachers are often inadequately prepared to teach in the family life subject area although well-qualified in related fields such as health, sociology, biology, home economics, social studies and other subject areas (Somerville, 1972; Malfetti & Rubin, 1967; Luckey, 1967; Kerckhoff, 1964). At present, much of the training of family life teachers in Canada has been provided by individual school boards through a variety of in-service training sessions. Even so, existing family life programs find that obtaining qualified staff has been a major problem.

When schools accept the responsibility of providing family life education for students, they become involved in the problem of providing qualified teachers for the task. This aspect has been crucial to the development of family life programs, and until it has been solved teachers will be trained superficially and often poorly.

The Need for the Study

Individuals involved with the school family life programs in Edmonton had emphasized the need for establishing a university level teacher preparation program in the family life subject area. Since other schools in the province had not implemented family life programs at the time of the study, the focus of this study has been on the programs in Edmonton.

At present, the designated family life educators in Edmonton have had teacher training education in a variety of academic disciplines. The schools involved in family life programs have utilized in-service education to correct deficiencies in family life subject matter caused by lack of a teacher training program in family life education at the university level.

In-service education was developed in the early twentieth century. Its major purpose was the correction of deficits in the education and pre-training of teachers. The most obvious defect was inadequate command of the subject matter to be taught and the teaching skills necessary to transfer this subject matter (Rickey, 1957). Today the major role of in-service is to provide instructional improvement for professional staff members. This improvement has been largely limited to improving teaching capabilities by continuing education in current teaching methods, research findings and school policies (Harris, 1969). The role of in-service education in the family life area has been one of supplying knowledge of the subject and instruction in teaching skills. While in-service education has been a valuable tool for providing continuing education in the ever-changing field of family life education, it cannot provide the depth and breadth of subject matter training needed to properly teach family life education.

In-service education at the beginning of a family life program will provide relevant information for all teachers. However, with time, teachers trained by the in-service method are lost to the program by transfer to other schools, conflicts in class scheduling or retirement. Teachers brought in as replacements often have no family life training and therefore must learn basic content material and teaching methods from the in-service program. At the same time the program must continue providing professional growth for the continuing teachers. This dual role of training new teachers and upgrading present teachers places great pressure on an in-service program. Two separate in-service programs ideally are necessary to meet the needs of the teachers. But this is not practical even for large schools and is totally impractical

for small schools. The duplication of training efforts by each school board appears redundant when universities already possess the major facilities necessary for training family life teachers. A university program would provide core content information and methods training. Universities presently offer a variety of relevant family life courses for students. If selected carefully these courses would provide a good background in family life subjects. However, although one can obtain a specialty degree in many teaching disciplines, one cannot become a specialist in family life education as such.

In Edmonton in-service education provides a major portion of the training in subject matter and teaching skills for family life teachers. This in-service education has been, and still is, serving a vital function in the expansion of family life programs in Edmonton schools.

How long can the Alberta Department of Education rely upon individual school boards to provide teacher training in content and methods for family life teachers? If this method continues to be the only one used for training family life teachers, hopes for a long range fully developed family life program in Alberta schools will be dim. Therefore, this investigator, as well as many others involved in the family life field, feels a teacher training specialty in family life education is necessary at the university level.

The Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to determine the preparation needed for teaching family life education. Information obtained from the survey will be used to formulate a set of guidelines to assist in the design of programs for the training of junior and senior high school

family life educators in Alberta at the university level. These guidelines will also benefit students contemplating teaching careers in family life education by providing a description of the professional preparation needed, as well as supplying information for those in other teaching disciplines who wish to participate in family life programs.

Definition of Terms

The terms family life education, sex education and sex information used in the text of this report are defined as follows:

Family life education is a developmental process which includes not only the teaching of facts but also the development of attitudes and values which are conducive to personal fulfillment, healthy interpersonal relationships, and successful family life. It deals with the physical, emotional, social and moral aspects of human sexuality honestly and explicitly, at the "teachable moments" which come as children grow toward adulthood. It promotes healthy concepts of masculinity and femininity and of the relationships between boys and girls, husbands and wives, parents and children. With its emphasis on responsible behavior it is an integral part of education for human values (Guest, 1968:1).

Sex information is factual information on the biological and physical aspects of sex. Sex education is concerned with the physical aspects of sex although often the sociological and psychological aspects are included.

Summary

The rapidity with which family life programs have been started in the schools has created a demand for trained teachers. Such teachers are in short supply because few universities offer programs to train family life educators.

Although in-service education has been used in Edmonton, those

involved with the program feel that this has not been an adequate training method and feel that a need exists for a teacher preparation program in family life education at the university level.

The purpose of this study was to obtain information from teachers of family life education which will aid in the formulation of guidelines for preparation in a teacher speciality of family life education.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Overview

This chapter will be a review of the literature pertaining to teacher preparation in family life education. The developments in family life programs and the importance of training for family life teachers are discussed. Suggestions for training, including methods and materials deemed important by authorities in the field, are summarized. Finally, the future family life educator will be examined.

Developments in Family Life Education Programs

Teaching of family life and sex education in the schools of North America is not a recent development. Inclusion of sex instruction in the high school curriculum was discussed by the National Education Association (NEA) of the United States as early as 1892 (Carrera, 1971). The emphasis was on the eradication of venereal diseases which were rampant at that time.

One of the concerns then was the qualification of individuals selected to teach sex education. In 1912 the first resolution relating to the special training of sex educators was passed by the NEA. This was followed in 1914 by a more lengthy NEA resolution which recommended that institutions preparing teachers focus on subjects that would help the teacher instruct in the field of morals as well as in the area of sex hygiene (Carrera, 1971; American Social Hygiene Association, 1938).

Special training and selection of sex education teachers has been

recommended since the twenties (Beach, 1943; Cleveland Public Library, 1944; Stokes, 1945). Dr. Stokes (1945), a strong supporter of sex education in the schools as well as for specialized training for teachers, commented, "After all, how shall the blind lead the blind (p. 195)". Unfortunately, teacher preparation institutions of the day did not heed these recommendations, and workshops and in-service training sessions were the method used to train sex education teachers from the 1920's into the 1950's.

Interest in sex information rose during the social and economic upheavals of World War II when the public became disturbed with increased promiscuity among young people and the rise of venereal disease in Britain and the United States (Richards, 1966). The same concern led to the first sex education programs in Canadian schools. Only five percent of existing family life programs were implemented before 1945 (Vanier Institute, 1971).

One of the first family life programs began in London, Ontario in 1942. Starting informally as a result of requests by female students for information from the school nurse, the course for girls was expanded into other Ontario schools. Later, similar programs were requested by boys and were integrated into the school program. After preparatory workshops the health and physical education teachers provided the leadership, while the school nurse and other medical professionals served as consultants. Dr. Douglas Cram, who was instrumental in the development of the program, indicated that its emphasis was on physical aspects and provision of information with some class time used for discussion to enable better student understanding. Dr. Cram felt the program needed much improvement but, despite his professional opinion,

the program was hailed by a journalist as "one of the most enlightened systems of sex education in Ontario schools if not in Canadian schools (Guest, 1968:5)".

Guest indicated that by the summer of 1968 a teacher preparation program would exist in Manitoba but at this writing no such program has been offered (Guest, 1968).

In 1964, at the request of a local school board, the Canadian Education Association surveyed all ten provincial departments of education as well as 55 urban school boards to determine the status of sex education in Canadian schools. Data was obtained by a mail-back questionnaire listing six physical and seven social or moral aspects encompassed by sex education. Respondents were to indicate what aspects were taught and at what grade level. Other information concerning sex education was also included in the questionnaire.

The survey indicated that in 1964 no department of education in Canada had a curriculum designed for treating sex education as a separate subject. Each province maintained full responsibility for the inclusion of sex education materials in its school curriculum. Respondents from six of the provinces indicated sex information would be taught in regular classes. British Columbia, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and Newfoundland have no provisions for the inclusion of sex information in the curriculum (Canadian Education Association, 1964).

Many provinces suggested that family life and sex education were included in other courses. Biology or science courses were mentioned by Ontario, Saskatchewan and Quebec. Alberta mentioned the following selective courses: health, personal development, psychology, sociology and home economics (Canadian Education Association, 1964).

Major reasons given for not having a sex education program were: (1) no authorization was given by departments of education, (2) the area was a parental responsibility, and (3) teaching personnel were unqualified. The report mentioned the need for capable personnel to teach family living at all grade levels. Further explanation of the report stated that teachers were not academically competent and that teachers were often reluctant to discuss questions relating to sex. While the need for capable teachers was mentioned briefly, the report provided no suggestions toward the attainment of this goal (Canadian Education Association, 1964).

The province of Saskatchewan reported that an optional course in family life education had existed for grades 11 and 12 since 1950 but that only about 60 or 70 schools made use of the option. Only teachers with a background in adolescent psychology could teach the course. The researcher did not request information on the topics included in the option (Canadian Education Association, 1964).

Canada had no central organization which focused on the family until 1965 when the Vanier Institute of the Family was founded. The Institute has been concerned with promoting better family living for all Canadians. Family life education in the schools has been only one of its main interests. One of the early tasks undertaken was a survey of family life education in Canadian schools. Begun in 1967 and published in 1971, the survey has provided the first comprehensive information on the state of family life education in Canada (Somerville, 1972). The survey was meant to reach all Canadian schools. However, many of the elementary level schools were omitted as they often do not include family life classes. The sample covered those schools which began at a lower

grade and extended to grade 7 and those with grade 7 or higher. Data was gathered by a mail-back questionnaire of which 4,475 were returned, a response rate of 38 percent. The schools represented all regions of Canada, urban and rural and a wide range of sizes, large and small.

Elkin's definition for the activities carried out under the name of family life education in the survey was:

Any activity by any group or medium aimed at imparting information concerning family relationships and providing the opportunity for people to approach their present and future family relationships with greater understanding (Vanier Institute, 1971:Foreword).

Such a broad definition could be liberally interpreted by the respondent to include courses which in fact do not comply with the definition, thus casting some doubt on the reliability of the research findings. In addition, the study was addressed to administrators rather than the teachers, meaning that the answers are only as reliable as the administrators' involvement with the family life program. In terms of teacher training, the administrator may or may not have been well informed about the training of the teachers and their feelings as to its adequacy. For accuracy, such information should have been solicited directly from the teachers. For the most part, however, other general information from this study appears to be reliable.

Of the 4,475 schools which responded to the Vanier survey, 29 percent indicated that they had a family life program. Fifty-two percent of these were implemented after 1965 and 19 percent between 1960 and 1965. The rapid growth of family life classes within the school has been accompanied by many growing problems; a major one concerns teachers. The survey indicated that 44 percent were currently teaching family life education courses because they happened to teach related courses or because they were assigned to teach family life courses.

Since many Canadian family life teachers do not choose to teach family life classes, many programs may be unsuccessful as most family life authorities agree that the success of a family life program often rests on the interest, knowledge and willingness of the teacher. Canadian teachers come from these related fields: health and physical education--29 percent; guidance and counseling--22 percent; home economics--13 percent (Vanier Institute, 1971). Studies in the United States suggest that most teachers come from the home economics field, e.g. in Indiana public schools, 60 percent of the family life teachers majored in home economics, 11 percent in health or physical education, ten percent in sociology, and six percent in social studies, guidance, biology and psychology (Dager, Harper & Whitehurst, 1962).

In the schools offering family life classes in Canada, 42 percent had no family life training and 31 percent indicated the teacher's training was questionable. Pertinent training was indicated by only 27 percent. Of these, 40 percent received the training as part of their professional education, 25 percent through in-service training sessions and 32 percent through both methods (Vanier Institute, 1971).

These figures indicate that in-service plays an important part in training teachers for family life throughout Canada, not only in Edmonton.

One of the major problems faced by schools with family life programs is the lack of qualified staff. The Vanier survey indicated 56 percent of the schools felt this was a serious problem and 80 percent of the schools which did not have a family life program indicated it was also a problem (Vanier Institute, 1971).

Importance of Training for Family Life Teachers

Considerable agreement exists that the teacher is the most important variable influencing the effectiveness of instruction in a given course. This is especially true in the area of human sexuality (Juhasz, 1970; Simon & Gagnon, 1967; Fohlin, 1971; Harper & Harper, 1957; Manley, 1964; Luckey, 1967; Szasz, 1970). As Vanderwerf (1958) stated, "Effective teaching is the function of the total person and the function of the person's preparation (p. 3)".

There are many who feel that family life and sex education should be integrated into all school subject areas (Szasz, 1970; Luckey, 1967). For this to happen, all teachers would have to be broadly trained in human growth and development, interpersonal, sexual and family relations (Luckey, 1967). Fohlin (1971) notes that while this may be ideal, at present teachers do not have a sound base in human development, and sexuality has been completely neglected during teacher training. Such training is necessary! Despite 16 years under a highly developed compulsory sex education program where information is integrated into a variety of existing courses, Hoymen (1971) points out that about 33 percent of Swedish children receive little or no sex education. The problem in Sweden is inadequately trained teachers, who are directing the type of sex education received by their students. When taught as a separate course, family life education can cover sequentially all areas designated as basic.

Laycock (1967) made the assumption that all teachers will increasingly have training in the general family living area. This is not yet true. Today it is difficult to locate family life teachers with training. Many teachers feel inadequately prepared for the task as evidenced by various studies in the United States in which teachers evaluated their teacher preparation in the family life field. A Washington State study of 902 teachers who were in some way involved in family life education indicated 70 percent of the teachers felt their training inadequate for their given task and 84 percent expressed a desire for further training (Baker & Darcy, 1970). Bayer and Nye (1964) in a Florida study of 136 family life teachers indicated about five percent had more than 15 hours, undergraduate or graduate, in marriage and family courses. They concluded that 95 percent of the Florida family life teachers are untrained or only partially trained to do the job they are attempting in the classroom.

As the educational process continues to change in the direction of more student involvement, the teacher will be used more as a resource source and as a stimulator (Somerville, 1972). Emphasis on resource knowledge will increase as this role is taken on by family life teachers. This changing role will increase the need for knowledge and training.

Seely (1969) conducted a survey in Alberta to determine opinions toward sex education in the schools. The sample consisted of 24 randomly selected schools. Homeroom teachers, homeroom students and students' parents were selected by random numbers to complete a questionnaire constructed for the purpose of the survey. The sample within a given school had the provision for a maximum of 31 respondents.

Over 70 percent of the questionnaires were returned and the final sample was 217 students, 134 teachers and 210 parents. Eighty-five percent of the parents and 91 percent of the students favored sex education in the schools. The results of the survey also indicated that 86 percent of the teachers favored sex education in the schools. But when asked if they would teach sex education, only 26 percent felt qualified. This feeling of inadequate preparation must be remedied if schools are to have qualified teachers in the family life area.

The sample of parents and students were asked who they thought was the best source of sex information. The answers included: mother, father, doctor, school nurse, books, minister, priest, school counselor, specialist in sex education, gym teacher, movies, friends, school teachers, youth leaders and others. Ninety-three percent of the parents rated the doctor highest; next with 92 percent was the specialist in sex education. Students favored the specialist in sex education by 94 percent and the doctor by 80 percent. Only 38 percent of the students, 40 percent of the parents and 44 percent of the teachers felt that general classroom teachers should be the major source of sex information. The implication was that specialized training was needed when preparing to teach family life and sex education. Not only must confidence be placed in the teacher, but he must feel adequately prepared to teach family life classes.

Family life teachers in Edmonton and other parts of Canada are initially trained in related fields. As the need for family life teachers arises in the schools, these individuals are recruited into the field by principals, co-ordinators, personal interest, free space in the timetable coinciding with the family life time slot (Kerckhoff,

1964). Therefore, many teachers have no specific training in family life education. At present, Edmonton family life teachers attend in-service training sessions to attain competency in the subject area.

Herald (1972) stated that "comprehensive programs for family life teachers have been developed in Canada, particularly at the University of Guelph (p. 20)". The Family Studies Program there offers related family courses but omits the two most vital ingredients of a teacher preparation program--a teaching methods course and student teaching experience in family life education.

Herald suggests that exposure to family life methods and materials in other family courses is sufficient and that the Ontario College of Education would be expected to provide further methods and practice teaching in family life education. However, the Ontario College of Education does not have a Family Life Specialty (University of Toronto, 1972-73).

Many Canadian universities offer courses covering a variety of family life and sex education subjects. However, none provides a specialist program for training family life teachers, although several Canadian universities offer a family studies major. This major combined with the option for obtaining teacher certification would produce a qualified family life teacher.

The Alberta Department of Education favors the integration of family life education into appropriate areas of the present school curriculum. The Department of Education provides outlines of some areas where content can be integrated by the regular classroom teacher. It feels that most units in the family life area can and should be taught by the regular classroom teacher. Some units may be taught by a teacher with specialized preparation in family life education, assisted by resource persons (Family Life Education: A Point of View, 1969).

Actual training for family life and sex education teachers take many forms such as university courses, workshops, conferences, institutes and in-service meetings.

Because of the small number of teachers receiving training at the university level in family life education, workshops have been used to provide specialized education (Manley, 1964; Luckey, 1968; Somerville, 1972). According to Schulz, Calderwood and Shimmel (1968), a workshop should provide a family life teacher with the following information: (1) factual content on sexuality based on the concerns of today's youth, (2) opportunities to understand the importance of knowing one's own feelings about sexuality, and (3) methods and materials to enable the teacher to communicate their sex and family life knowledge to their students. The quality of workshops varies and unfortunately not all workshops provide pertinent sex and family life information.

While there has been some expansion of graduate programs in family life education at the Masters and Doctorate education level as in the case of Brigham Young University, University of Connecticut, Purdue University and Oklahoma State University, it is not enough to meet the demand for well trained family life teachers.

In-service training of family life teachers presently has progressed further and faster than academic preparation and some authorities suggest it is the most promising mode of teacher preparation at the present time (Broderick & Bernard, 1969).

Whatever the training mode, the need for competent teachers is crucial to existing programs today as well as to the development of future family life programs.

Training Suggested by Family Life Authorities

Individuals considered authorities in the field of family life have distinguished themselves professionally through research, by publications, and in the activities of various groups, e.g., the Sex Education Information Council of the United States and the National Council on Family Relations. These family life authorities agree that if family life education is to be successful, teachers must be adequately trained. Unfortunately, they do not agree in their ideas of what constitutes proper training for family life education.

Dr. Lester Kirkendall in 1950 emphasized that adequate teacher preparation was the most important problem facing the implementation and continuance of school sex education programs. He felt that a sex educator must be competent in two major areas: (1) personal, and (2) experiential and academic. He considered the personal area to be more important and the most difficult to develop. Important personal qualities are: interest and liking of people, emotional maturity, sense of good judgment, healthy home and family life, sense of humor and an understanding of life (1950). The experiential and academic qualities include a background of general study wherein sex is related to a sociological, psychological and biological framework, providing the basis upon which interrelationships and other aspects of family living can be formed. Also of considerable value and importance are: knowledge of law and religious doctrines affecting families, counseling procedures, teaching techniques, opportunities to develop discussion leadership in developing attitudes and handling sensitive topics, as well as a positive attitude toward sex and sex education (Kirkendall & Handwerk, 1950;

Kirkendall, 1950).

Dr. Sylvia Sacks (1965) suggested that a family life educator must possess individual counseling skills as students frequently consult this person for personal guidance. A family life educator must be non-judgmental, warm, appreciative of young people, understanding his own views and limitations, possess academic preparation in physiology, religion, sociology, law and behavior sciences. Eighty percent of American family life teachers claim they do some counseling as well as teaching (Kerckhoff, 1964).

Ira Reiss (1968) felt strongly that qualifications for a family life teacher should be the same as for teachers in other fields. A teacher must know the subject matter of the course if he is to communicate clearly and he must understand his own emotions and sexual attitudes if he is to properly handle sex topics.

The Vanier Institute of the Family organized the National Consultation on Family Life Education, held in Banff, Alberta in September, 1969. This meeting assembled government agencies and organization leaders from all over Canada to talk about family life education. The views on "Who should teach family life education?" encompassed personality attributes as well as academic qualifications. Suggestions offered for academic preparation were: one year or longer at the university level, university credit six week summer course; courses at teacher training institutions including psychology, anatomy, psychiatry, physiology, sociology, history of sexuality, personal development, child development, emotional conditioning; and in-service training. Skills are needed in the methodology of group dynamics as well as a body of knowledge in human and social development, community

organization and resources. They concluded that, "Kind hearts and coronets are not enough to work in this field . . . we are intervening in the lives of people and family life educators must keep in mind the mental health aspects of their programs (Force, 1970a:26-27)".

Szasz (1970) found it strange that parents do not consider that a child's sex role is molded by teachers, since the influence of the school on the child depends to a high degree on the teachers. Keller (1972) reiterated this and added that all teachers should re-examine their own sexual feelings, attitudes and sex information because all these aspects affect the students they teach.

Rubin and Kirkendall (1968) mentioned that the attitudes of the sex educator will determine the content, purpose and method of guidance used in handling sexual topics. Brody (1950) felt that effective family life teaching depends as much on the teacher's emotional preparedness to handle the subject as on the intellectual capacity to teach and impart knowledge.

Calderone (1967) agreed that family life teachers need to be broadly trained but felt strongly that the attitude of the teacher is a crucial factor in his success. She further commented that the most academically qualified person will fail if he cannot communicate this knowledge with an open, honest attitude and be comfortable while discussing family life topics. Academic and personal qualifications are difficult to separate when discussing

family life educators.

Essentially, family life authorities agree that training in family life content is important for family life teachers. However, most authorities have difficulty in deciding if academic content should have priority over the teachers' feelings regarding sensitive topics. Usually more importance is placed on feelings.

However, this researcher suggests that the most realistic approach for training family life teachers is to ensure that they have the same qualifications as teachers in other fields. This means ensuring that they know the subject matter which they are teaching. Reiss (1968) regards this to be of foremost importance. Once knowledge of the subject has been attained, attention can be focused on developing the teachers' feelings regarding family life education.

Although controversy over the content of teacher training exists, most authorities agree that certain background training is necessary. The training areas agreed upon are child development, psychology, sociology, biology, philosophy and knowledge of methods and materials for teaching (Schoel, 1966; Manley, 1967; Laycock, 1967; Schulz, 1968; Calderone, 1967; Sacks, 1965; Force, 1970b; Kirkendall & Handwerk, 1950).

Teacher Training Criteria

Criteria of the National Council on Family Relations

The State of Michigan in 1968 established recommendations for the certification and training of family life teachers. The Michigan Department of Education was concerned that in the absence of standards many programs were being taught by persons with unequal qualifications (Recommendations for Certification, Competence and Knowledge, 1971). State concerns, the awareness of the short supply of qualified teachers and the influx of self-designated family life and sex educators all contributed to the establishment in 1968 of a National Council on Family Relations (NCFR) Committee to establish teaching criteria.

The Committee Standards and Certification for Family Life Educators sought "to ensure that whatever departments were involved in offering courses and units, the teachers would have a multi-faceted professional preparation (Somerville, 1972:299)". The criteria developed for teacher education are guidelines for training junior and senior high school family life teachers. The criteria mention basic areas where preparation has been needed rather than courses. (1) The Family: Family patterns in a variety of historical, social and cultural settings. The family in transition. The family interaction with other social institutions. (2) Family Interaction: Dyadic relationships during the family life cycle. The family as a group. Its role, status and power interaction between spouses, siblings and generations. Its role in time of crisis. (3) Marriage Preparation:

A functional course which helps students become aware of their attitudes toward marriage and family life. (4) Human Development from Birth to Senescence: Data which clarify the needs and influences at each stage from childhood, adolescence, through the aging years. Mental health theory. Child-rearing practice and guidance. (5) Biological Sciences: Human nutrition, physiology and reproduction. (6) Sexuality: Male and female sexual identity and the relationship of sexual needs and behaviors to personal and social capacities. (7) Management of Family Resources: The family as a consuming unit. The impact of time, money and space on family and personal growth. (8) Group Processes: Experiences which would create individual awareness of how he is affected by the group and how he affects others within the group. A chance for the individual to clarify his own attitudes and values. (9) Teaching Methods and Materials in Family Life Education. (10) Practice Teaching in Family Life and Sex Education. (11) Field Experiences: Direct observations of a variety of family situations. Work with family serving agencies such as clinics, nursery schools, day care centers, courts and helping hands projects. (12) Individual and Family Counseling: Introduction and knowledge so that the individual can recognize behavior that requires referral to professional counselors. (13) Research: Acknowledgment of the contributions of various disciplines toward understanding the family. (14) Survey of Basic Laws which Regard Marriage and Family Matters. (15) Community: Appreciation of community organization with a design toward effective work with communities (Somerville, 1970).

The vast scale of the above criteria indicates the challenge required to train teachers in the area of family life education. Such a program would be demanding and difficult; however, professional

improvement is vital and many of the above topics should be studied by present-day and future teachers of family life education. The criteria will be used as a reference point in the present study on teacher preparation.

Research Based on NCFR Criteria

Fohlin (1971), in an in-depth review of the literature on "The Selection and Training of Family Life Education Teachers", noted that one can synthesize a profile of an ideal family life teacher from the various lists of desired characteristics set forth by authorities in the field. There is, however, no consensus regarding teacher preparation. Each writer has definite opinions regarding the training a family life teacher should possess. Few appear to have asked teachers for their opinions.

Wilson (1972) gathered information from 200 Ontario high school teachers who were interested in learning more about family life education. Respondents were from various fields: Home economics (48 percent), health (34 percent), guidance (18 percent), and others. They were asked to indicate strong and weak preparation areas by ranking themselves according to the Criteria for Family Life Education Teachers. Regions of least proficiency were related to procedure and methodology-- individual and group counseling, group processes, field experiences, practice teaching, research, and methods and materials in family life education. The areas of most proficiency were content oriented-- knowledge of biological sciences, family interaction, human development, consumer and family finance, family relations, and human sexuality. Wilson felt this was not surprising, as the Ontario education system relative to family life education provides some academic studies but

has no provisions for procedure or methodology.

Using three areas selected from the NCFR Criteria for Teacher Education, Adams (1972) studied experienced and inexperienced teachers. The sample was a non-random self-selected group of women enrolled in a course in family life education. Eighteen were experienced teachers with 7.4 years mean teaching experience. Their average age was 34. Twenty-one were inexperienced, with a mean age of 22 years. Thirty-three of the 39 teachers had a degree in home economics.

In the areas of sex knowledge, counseling adequacy and competency in handling family life issues, there was no measurable difference between the experienced and inexperienced groups. This finding reinforced the belief that specialized training of teachers is important for family life education. The questionnaire asked the teacher to indicate only her perceived degree of competency or adequacy. No attempt was made to determine actual job performance. Adams observed that if cognitive responses were the only issues involved, the teacher's competency and adequacy perceptions would reflect their knowledge of the issues. But in family life education many topics are emotionally laden and require the teacher to deal with affect. Since both groups indicated a high degree of inadequacy in counseling, training in counseling methods would be a valuable asset in the preparation of family life teachers.

Family life education involves discussion of many sensitive topics, of which sex has been a prime example. Many experts are convinced that teachers need the opportunity to explore and be aware of their own feelings and attitudes before they can be effective in handling sensitive family life topics (Manley, 1969; Chilman, 1969; Luckey, 1968; Schulz, 1968; Simon & Gagnon, 1967). Harper and Harper (1957) go further

and state that most teachers need sex counseling or psychotherapy to achieve the personal feeling of freedom necessary to handle sex discussions.

A six week family life institute with emphasis on sex education was the approach of the University of Connecticut to in-service training at the graduate level. This institute was held the summer of 1967 and was designed to include only professional persons presently involved in some kind of sex education program. Areas focused on were: (1) philosophy of family life education including attitudes and values, (2) development of sexuality from birth onward, (3) the relation of educational needs to the development of the child, (4) adolescent concerns, (5) methods and materials of sex education, and (6) practical programs and resources available in the sex education field (Luckey, 1968). Outstanding individuals in all fields participated.

Sensitivity training was included because of the controversial nature of sex education plus the concern that an effective sex education teacher must be aware of his own and others' feelings. The object of the sensitivity group was to promote self-insight and to enable each individual to understand others along with the dynamics of interaction. All institute participants were members of a small group of eight or ten people under the supervision of a trainer. These groups met for three-hour periods a minimum of three times each week. Individual members had access to private counseling sessions if they so desired.

Eighty percent of the 67 participants completed an "open-ended" anonymous questionnaire evaluating the scope of the institute. Sensitivity-group experience was judged to have been the most meaningful experience by the greatest number of participants. In contrast to

Luckey's finding, Carrera (1970) reports that only 25 percent of a jury of experts felt sensitivity training was essential preparation for a sex educator but 60 percent indicated it would be a useful experience.

Carrera Guidelines

Carrera (1970), using the collective judgment of a jury of 48 experts in the family life field, prepared a set of guidelines for possible direction in the designing of programs for preparation of senior high school sex educators. The jury rated a list of 58 preparation topics as essential, useful or unnecessary in training sex educators. Preparation items rated as essential are arranged in Table 1 according to: (A) knowledge content, (B) professional skills, and (C) professional experience.

From the jury's ratings, Carrera developed the following preparation guidelines for senior high school educators: (1) considerable knowledge of male and female anatomy with emphasis on human reproduction; (2) in-depth understanding of psychosexual and psychosocial behavior regarding adolescence; (3) experiences which provide understanding of cultural processes, attitudes and values related to sexual expression; (4) study and experience necessary for communicating sexual materials such as sex terminology, teaching techniques and curriculum aids, research findings and evaluation methods; (5) opportunities to develop professional skills which promote meaningful group interaction; (6) prior teaching experience in any area. Reacting to other questions concerning teachers, the panel indicated that a sex educator's performance was not related to age, sex, religion, marital status or experience as a parent (Carrera, 1970).

Table 1

Items Rated as Essential in Training Sex Educators
According to (A) Knowledge, (B) Skills and (C) Experience (N = 48)

	Essential f
(A) Knowledge Preparation Items	
1. Language of Sexuality	43
2. Methods and Materials in Sex Education	43
3. Community Resources and Agencies Related to Family Living and Sex Education	33
4. Communication Theory and Process	31
5. Research Concerning Sexual Behavior, e.g. Kinsey, Masters and Johnson	27
6. Methods of Evaluation in Sex Education	26
(B) Skill Preparation Items	
1. Leading Discussion-Group Dynamics	44
2. Use of Techniques and Curriculum Aids	39
3. Dealing with Community and Parental Groups	35
4. Curriculum Development	26
5. Individual Counseling Techniques	24
(C) Experience Preparation Items	
1. Prior Teaching (in any subject area)	26
a. one-two years	18
b. three-five years	5
c. five years or more	3
2. Supervised Teacher Training Practicum in Sex Education	21

(Carrera, 1970)

Importance and Use of Teaching Methods in Family Life Classes

Brody (1950) wrote that two premises must be accepted if one were to teach a family life course: (1) the student needs to acquire factual information, (2) active group participation is necessary if this information is to be integrated with behavior. Carrera (1970) found that content, methods and materials were rated highest, thereby supporting Brody.

Participants in a professional institute conducted to train sex educators rated discussion groups highly because they provided an opportunity to explore ideas presented by institute speakers (Luckey, 1968). Discussion groups within the high school classroom would provide a similar opportunity for students.

The literature reveals that a variety of methods and materials are employed in family life classes and it appears that family life teachers encourage their students to become actively involved in the subject matter as well as the learning process.

Allen and King (1970) reported that films and group discussions were the most prevalent teaching aids used in family life courses in 510 United States secondary schools. These techniques were used by 71 percent of the teachers.

Based upon vast experience, Schulz and Williams (1968) suggest effective teaching aids and techniques that lend themselves most readily to the presentation of family life and sex education. Techniques recommended were: case studies, literature, sound tapes, films, film-strips, role playing, class discussion, small group discussion, guest speakers, lectures, and the question box.

Somerville (1972) observed that there are many ways that students can acquire information, broaden their experience and clarify values besides lecturing. Suggested are 42 alternatives or supplements to lecturing, including discussion groups, case methods, role playing, films, records, tapes, literature, debates, interviews, observations, resource persons, field trips and surveys. Szasz (1970) noted that special educational techniques are needed to help teachers recognize "the teachable moment" in sex education and suggested small group discussions, demonstration periods and role playing.

While teaching methods and materials are important, some authorities are also stressing the importance of the teacher's ability to relate or communicate with students (Kirkendall, 1950; Sacks, 1965; Manley, 1967; Broderick & Bernard, 1969). These same individuals propose that training can improve interpersonal skills, motivation for personal growth and develop inner security. Meaningful communication and relationship building is hindered if the teacher has not resolved or coped with his anxieties and fears involving sensitive family life topics, particularly when students sense these anxieties (Kirkendall & Calderwood, 1965; Malfetti & Rubin, 1968).

After visiting many family life or sex education classes in United States schools, Iseman (1969) expressed disgust at the poor teaching and the lack of sensitivity to student needs. She suggests that closed circuit television courses with lectures by authorities in the family life field be used to provide teachers with relevant and factual information. This method would provide some informed teachers until training facilities expand and more teachers are trained.

Malfetti and Rubin (1967) proposed that teachers establish a knowledge background in human development, sexuality, family planning,

psychosexual development, sources of sexual outlet, moral issues and sexuality by reading. No formal courses would be needed. The only requirement would be to pass a knowledge test. Passing this test would insure an element of factual competency and allow the teacher to develop other skills needed for teaching by going to workshops and in-service sessions. Also suggested was an internship for prospective or new family life teachers with supervision by an experienced teacher.

Future Family Life Educator

Will the family life educator of the future be different from today's teacher? Kerckhoff and Hancock (1971), using a Delphi-type panel of 52 experts in the field of family life education, explored this concept. They found the panel focused on seven specific areas of future family life training: (1) interdisciplinary training with a family life education specialty, (2) work experiences through field work and/or practicums, (3) skills in group dynamics including sensitivity training, (4) more emphasis on sex education, (5) integration of counseling and classroom approaches to teaching, (6) special focus on drugs, alcohol and smoking, (7) understanding of alternative life styles and family forms. The authors felt the panel had been unduly influenced by the NCFR Teacher Preparation Criteria since the Delphi panel members expressed many of the same concepts. Whatever the influence, the majority opinion was that the future family life teacher will need more training.

Summary

The need for specialized training in family life education was recognized early in the development of the field. However, it was not until the early 1960's that family life programs expanded in Canada. This expansion caused a crucial shortage of qualified family life teachers. Since only a minimum of university and other training facilities were available, the shortage has persisted to the present.

The ambiguity in the minds of family life professionals as to whether personal characteristics or professional competence is more important remains. If one assumes that selected family life teachers have the necessary personal qualities, then professional competence in family life subjects becomes more important. Family life authorities agree that training is essential but cannot agree on specific training. Some training suggestions are: a background in physiology, psychology, sociology, child development and anatomy. Sacks, among others, suggests that a background in counseling would be valuable since many students will approach the family life teacher for advice. Some authorities feel the attitude of the teacher will determine the content and method of handling sexual topics and therefore teachers must be emotionally prepared to handle sensitive topics as well as academically prepared.

Teachers have indicated that they do not feel adequately trained in family life subjects. In-service teacher preparation has become the means by which more family life information is imparted to teachers. At present no Canadian university provides a specialized program for training family life teachers although several universities offer a family studies major and the option of obtaining teacher certification after the family degree.

The shortage of teachers has created many self-designated family life teachers. The inequality of their training prompted the National Council on Family Relations to formulate a set of Criteria for Teacher Education. The criteria include a variety of general family topics and experiences which would provide all teachers with a broad view of family life education.

Although training facilities are limited in family life education, present teachers must be further trained and predictions are that future family life teachers will need more training than is presently available.

CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY

Overview

This chapter details the rationale behind the method of collecting data, the sample, the method of instrumentation and the reliability of the instrument. Data collection procedures and analysis of the data are described. Delimitations of the study are defined.

Rationale for the Method of Data Collection

A study by Walsh to determine the accuracy of various methods of collecting data--questionnaire, interview and personal data blank--was conducted on a random sample of 270 male undergraduates at the University of Iowa. Three control groups were used, plus three study groups. One group provided information by interview, one by questionnaire and one by personal data blank. Personal data blank, although similar to a questionnaire, asked only for verifiable information, such as age, marital status and education obtained. An experimental group corresponding to each of the control groups was given financial incentives to distort their reports. The data from all groups were then compared with the student records. The results gave equal credence to research results obtained by any of these techniques. The findings were confirmed by Walsh in a followup study at another university (Walsh, 1967, 1968).

These studies provided impetus for utilizing the questionnaire method to collect data, even though some data would be subjective in nature. The interview method was considered for this study but rejected

since the investigator had attended in-service training sessions and visited family life classes and felt that the teachers should be given the opportunity to remain anonymous.

Identifying the Sample

A major task before embarking on the study was to identify family life teachers. In the United States home economics teachers are usually trained in family life subjects and have therefore become involved in teaching the subject. In Alberta there has been some overlap of the family life subject matter into the new Home Economics Modern Living Curriculum, and it seemed possible that home economics teachers in Edmonton would view themselves as family life teachers. However, this turned out not to be the case, as these teachers at this time feel themselves inadequately prepared to handle the subject. Prior to 1970 there was no Family Studies Program in the School of Household Economics at the University of Alberta, accounting for the lack of preparation of teachers in this area. One would assume that with the implementation of a Family Studies Program subsequent home economics teachers will be better trained in this area and will become involved in the teaching of family life education.

At present the only designated family life teachers in Edmonton schools are those teaching Christian Family Life Classes in the Separate School System and Perspectives for Living Classes in the Public School System. Lists of these teachers were obtained from each system for the 1972-73 school year. A total of 47 teachers were identified. Of these, 38 were presently teaching a structured course in family life education and nine were receiving in-service training to prepare them for teaching future classes. Those surveyed were teachers involved in teaching

Christian Family Life, specified teachers taking training to become future Christian Family Life Teachers, Perspectives for Living Teachers and teachers of modified Perspectives for Living Courses who instruct in special education schools and modify the program for students with special needs.

Design of the Questionnaire

Instrumentation

The study proposed to provide opportunities for teachers to evaluate their present training and to obtain information which would facilitate the formation of guidelines for teacher preparation in family life education. Existing questionnaires did not include sufficient items to collect the necessary information; therefore, a new one had to be designed. Question types were styled after Parten (1950) and Oppenheim (1966). A sample of the questionnaire is included in Appendix A.

Sources of questionnaire items

Literature on training needs for family life teachers was reviewed, a variety of research instruments were studied and teaching methods books were consulted before the first form of the questionnaire was constructed.

Table 2 indicates the objectives developed for the study and the questionnaire items designed to obtain data for each.

The criteria areas of the National Council on Family Relations Teacher Education were used as a baseline for collecting information. The area of practice teaching was excluded since Edmonton family life teachers are recruited from other disciplines and have no experience in practice teaching in family life education.

Table 2
Classification of Questionnaire Items
According to Study Objectives

Objective	Question
1. To obtain background information on Edmonton family life teachers	Part I: A, M; Part II: A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N
2. To obtain self ratings of teaching area standards using the National Council on Family Relations Teacher Education Criteria	Part I: G
3. To determine what areas are studied in Edmonton family life classes	Part I: I
4. To obtain self ratings of specific teaching skills	Part I: J, K, L, N
5. To determine what teaching methods and materials teachers use in the classroom and where these skills or techniques were learned	Part I: D, E, H2, H3
6. To acquire information about the state of preparation of current family life teachers	Part I: H4
7. To secure practical suggestions from present teachers which would provide direction for future family life preparation	Part I: F, H, B1, B2, C
8. To formulate guidelines for teacher preparation for family life educators	all questions

Teaching Home Economics by Hall and Paolucci (1970) and Choosing Techniques for Teaching and Learning by Spitze (1970) were found to be particularly useful references for teaching techniques used in the questionnaire.

Panel of authorities consulted

The first draft of the questionnaire was informally pretested by six graduate students and checked for clarity of questions before being sent to a panel of five specialists in family life education who had consented to check the questionnaire for inclusiveness. The members were: Dr. J. Joel Moss, Chairman of the Child Development and Family Relations Department at Brigham Young University; Dr. Richard Kerckhoff, Department of Child Development and Family Life, Purdue University; Dr. Margaret Arcus, Chairman, Division of Family Sciences, University of British Columbia; Mr. Don Wilson, Family Life Consultant, Sheridan College of Applied Arts and Technology, Oakville, Ontario; and Mrs. Lillian Tyler, Family Life Co-ordinator, Family Life Education Council, Calgary, Alberta.

Supportive comments were received from the panel regarding the need for such a study on teacher preparation.

Revision of the questionnaire

Following suggestions of the panel, the questionnaire was revised. Family life topics were grouped according to the National Council on Family Relations Criteria for Teacher Preparation to facilitate future comparisons of data. The number of items was reduced by focusing more sharply on teaching techniques used, training needed in family life education, counseling adequacy, effectiveness in handling family life issues, and academic preparation in family life content areas.

Questionnaire format

The format was left substantially open-ended to facilitate obtaining information based on the experience of the teacher. The closed format was used for questions which would be compared with other studies but, as far as possible, when the closed format was used an answer category such as "other" was included to facilitate comments.

Questionnaire pretest

A group of 13 teachers interested in family life education pretested the questionnaire. Four had previously taught family life classes in Edmonton but were no longer teaching; two were from the public school system and two from the separate school system. Three teachers had taught family life outside Edmonton. Six of the group were fourth year education students who had completed their practice teaching and who had taken two or more courses in family life subjects.

On the basis of the pretest, minor changes were made in the questionnaire to clarify wording of items and instructions.

The co-ordinators of the family life programs in both the public and separate school systems had been consulted prior to drawing up the questionnaire and their final comments were requested prior to collection of the data.

Validity of the instrument

The questionnaire was designed to determine the training needs of family life teachers. Because opinions were solicited from present teachers, the only measure suitable for judging the validity of the instrument was content.

The literature was surveyed to obtain current information on training needs for family life teachers. Objectives for the study were

used to direct construction of the questionnaire. The questionnaire was then informally pretested by six graduate students prior to being evaluated by a panel of five family life authorities who all had experience in the field of family life teacher training. They checked the questionnaire for inclusiveness based on the objectives of the study. According to their suggestions, alterations were made. Then the questionnaire was pretested by a sample of 13 teachers and the contents verified by the co-ordinators of the family life programs before the data was collected.

Reliability of the instrument

No formal measures were taken to establish reliability of responses to the items. However, care was taken to make each item as easily understood as possible with pretesting. By reducing ambiguity of wording, likelihood of respondents interpreting items differently from one time to another would be as low as possible. Therefore, if repeated measures of the attitudes had been taken, the subjects would interpret items the same way each time.

Delimitations of the study

The study was delimited by the following factors:

1. The sample of teachers was drawn only from the Edmonton Public and Separate (Catholic) School Systems.
2. Only teachers currently teaching family life education during the 1972 to 1973 school year and specified future teachers were included.
3. The study was confined to determining the preparation needs of family life teachers and formulating guidelines for future teacher training in family life.

4. It was assumed that teachers presently involved in family life classes had the personal qualities important for teaching this subject.
5. The teacher's training was self-rated in various family life areas.

Collection of Data

Distribution of the questionnaire

The majority of separate school teachers received the questionnaire at a family life in-service meeting on November 14, 1972. The respondents were given the opportunity to ask questions about the survey; on their own time they then completed the questionnaire and returned it by mail. The rest of the separate school teachers and those of the public school system received their questionnaires by mail, along with letters from the co-ordinator and from the investigator and her chairman explaining the study. All received an addressed, stamped return envelope. Shortly after mailing the questionnaire the investigator had an opportunity to answer questions at a public school in-service session. Although the sequence of the teacher's contact with the investigator and the questionnaire differed slightly, it was felt that the results would not be affected.

Follow-up procedures

The teachers sampled were given the option of identifying themselves on the questionnaire or remaining anonymous. Many did sign their names. Therefore, follow-up reminders to those who did not return the questionnaire consisted of contacting all who did not sign their names. A phone reminder was given one week after receipt of the questionnaire. Because several questionnaires had not been received two months after

distribution, a second questionnaire was mailed, followed two weeks later by a phoned reminder.

Analysis of the Data

Treatment of the data

Free response questions were coded. All information obtained from the questionnaire was transferred to computer data sheets, then typed onto computer cards. Internal accuracy checks were made in transferring data. Frequency counts and percentages were obtained to indicate the distribution of responses of the total sample to each item. As well, frequency counts and percentage distributions were obtained for Catholic respondents and public school respondents on each item.

Student's t test

Student's t, a statistical test for small samples, was used to determine whether or not the relationship of means between group x and group y was statistically significant (Phillips, 1966).

A total of 24 variables was selected to provide information regarding the teacher's background knowledge in family life subjects, perceived counseling adequacy and perceived effectiveness in handling issues.

Good background knowledge has been valuable in teaching family life education. The NCFR Criteria areas were used as variables in assessing the self-ratings of the teachers of their background knowledge. These variables were:

1. Family
2. Family interaction
3. Marriage preparation

4. Human development
5. Biological sciences
6. Human sexuality
7. Family resources
8. Group process
9. Teaching methods and materials
10. Field experiences
11. Counseling
12. Research
13. Laws
14. Community

Students may approach the family life teacher for advice. Therefore, a self-assessed measure of perceived counseling adequacy was obtained for five specific situations. These situations, used as variables, were:

1. Sexually molested child
2. Death of parent
3. Guilt feelings over one's sexual behavior
4. Homosexuality
5. Premarital pregnancy

Sensitive issues often arise in family life classes. The teachers assessed themselves on their perceived effectiveness in dealing with the following issues, which were used as variables:

1. Abortion
2. Contraception
3. Moral standards
4. Religious views on sex
5. Sex education

Variable mean scores were compared using four groups:

1. Public School teachers versus Separate School teachers
2. Male teachers versus female teachers
3. Teachers who offered to teach versus teachers invited to teach
4. Teachers with more than five years' teaching experience versus teachers with less than five years' teaching experience

Differences significant at the .05 level of significance will be reported.

Summary

Based on a study by Walsh (1968) indicating that equal credence can be given to research results regardless of whether the data was obtained by interview, personal data sheet or questionnaire, the questionnaire method was selected for use in this study.

The sample for the study was identified as all Edmonton teachers involved in teaching a structured family life course or specified teachers preparing to become family life teachers.

A questionnaire was designed, pretested, then revised. Data were collected by mailed questionnaire and the results analyzed by descriptive statistical techniques. Variables on background knowledge, perceived counseling adequacy and sensitive issues were selected and analyzed. Student's t test was used on the variables to test for significant differences in response that might be attributed to school board, sex, conditions under which teachers began teaching family life classes or the amount of previous teaching experience.

CHAPTER IV
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

Introduction

The results of the study will be reported according to the specified areas outlined in the objectives of the study. In the order reported, the areas are: background information, teachers self-assessed training in NCFR Criteria, topics studied in family life classes, teacher self-ratings of teaching skills, teaching methods and materials used in family life classes, teacher training strengths and weaknesses and teacher training suggestions. A summary of the major findings will conclude this chapter.

Questionnaire Returns

Teachers surveyed included 25 separate school Christian Family Life teachers or designated in-service teachers and 21 public school Perspectives for Living and modified special education Perspectives for Living teachers. Three questionnaires were returned blank with comments

Table 3
Family Life Teachers Surveyed by Questionnaire

System	Teachers	Mailed	Returned
Separate School	Christian Family Life	17	15
	Christian Family Life taking in-service training	9	4
Public School	Perspectives for Living	18	15
	Modified Perspectives for Living	3	3
	Total	47	37

to the effect that the writers did not consider themselves family life teachers and therefore were unable to complete the questionnaire. Excluding these, 79 percent of the questionnaires were returned.

Background Information

The family life teachers in Edmonton for the most part are young, married and male.

Fifty-six percent of the sample are male, much greater than the 29 percent found by Baker and Darcy (1970) and 27 percent found by Wilson (1972).

Forty-nine percent of the sample were 20 to 29 years of age and 35 percent were 30 to 39 years. In Wilson's survey 47 percent were 20 to 29 (1972).

Ninety-five percent were married versus 70 percent in the Wilson (1972) survey.

The teachers were asked whether they offered to teach, were invited to teach or were pressured to teach family life classes.

Fifty-seven percent of the teachers became involved by offering to teach, 38 percent were invited to teach by their principal or family life supervisor and five percent felt they were pressured into teaching family life. Since the majority of teachers offered to teach, one may assume Edmonton family life teachers were interested in the family life subject area.

In comparison, the Vanier survey indicated that only 13 percent of teachers were involved because of interest, whereas 42 percent were involved because they taught in related fields (Vanier Institute, 1971).

Ten teachers in the sample indicated their school had only one family life teacher; 13 had two teachers; ten, three teachers; two, more

than three teachers; and two indicated that their school presently had no teacher in the subject area.

Seventy-nine percent of the classes were offered in junior high schools, 16 percent in senior highs and five percent in special education schools.

The separate school course was taught only in junior high schools, accounting for the heavy concentration at that level. The need for more family life classes in high school is evident when these figures are compared with those of the Vanier survey, which found that in Canada 45 percent of family life classes are taught at the junior high level and 51 percent at the senior high level (Vanier Institute, 1971).

At the junior high level there were an equal number of male and female teachers. But of the six teachers in the high schools, five were male. Should this trend persist, Edmonton senior high family life classes could become male dominated. Such a domination would not be beneficial, as family life programs involve both sexes and therefore both sexes should be actively involved in teaching the subject.

Over 70 percent of the teachers graduated from university within the last five years. Thirty-two teachers have more than four years of university training. Of these, seven have five years' training, five have six years' and two teachers have seven years of training. This seemed to indicate that a great many of the family life teachers were interested in professional improvement and were probably well qualified in their major disciplines. Only five teachers had three years or less of university training.

Out of the total sample, only four teachers had less than two years' teaching experience, 17 had two to five years', 11 had six to ten years' and five had more than 11 years of experience.

In contrast to total teaching experience, 20 teachers of the sample were teaching family life for the first year. Nine teachers were in their second year, four teachers were in their third year, and four teachers were being trained for future teaching of family life classes.

Edmonton family life teachers, then, were experienced teachers, although the majority had been teaching family life classes for only one year. This could be explained by the fact that the Edmonton programs are only in their third year of existence. With the yearly expansion of programs, new teachers have been recruited each year to meet the increased needs.

As indicated in Table 4, family life teachers in Edmonton have been recruited from a variety of disciplines.

Table 4
Major Field of Study
for Public and Separate School Family Life Teachers (N = 37)

Subject	Public	Separate	Percent
Social studies	6	6	32.4
Social sciences	5	4	24.3
Physical education	6	1	18.9
Other		5	13.5
Home economics	1	1	5.4
Science		2	5.4

All teachers with a background in social science had a second specialty in addition to their degree in sociology or psychology. Other specialties included biological sciences, music, philosophy, religion, theology, mathematics and physics.

The major categories of the "other" group were industrial arts, mathematics, English, French and early childhood education.

Only two of the teachers had a background in home economics. In the studies of Allen and King (1970) and Wilson (1972), the majority of teachers came from this field.

When one compares the Edmonton group with other studies, several differences emerge. Wilson (1972) found home economics to be the major in 48 percent; health, 34 percent; and other, 18 percent. In the Vanier report 29 percent had a health/physical education background; 22 percent, guidance and counseling; and 13 percent, home economics (1971).

Seventy-two percent of the teachers in the study of Allen and King (1970) were home economists.

Teachers were asked to indicate if they had taken any university courses that aided them in teaching family life. Fifty-five percent had done so. They listed 50 specific courses. This was an average of two-and-one-half courses per teacher. The courses included 21 in sociology, 20 in educational psychology, six in counseling and seven in family studies. Comments from the teachers indicated that courses felt to be useful were counseling, psychology, sociology, genetics, human growth and development, sex education and any courses offering aid in teaching. From this, one can conclude that a broad background in the social sciences was very useful in the teaching of family life.

Self-Assessed Training in NCFR Criteria

The criteria proposed by the National Council on Family Relations for teacher education in the family life education field were used as a basis for obtaining information on present teacher preparation. Teachers were asked to assess their formal training in 14 subjects, using a code of one to three in which three indicated well prepared; two, fairly well prepared; and one, little or no preparation.

The overall mean score for the 14 subject areas was 1.6, indicating that the teachers themselves felt they were only minimally prepared in all family subjects. Mean scores are included in Table 5. Wilson (1972)

Table 5
Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Adequacy of Formal Training
Between Public and Separate Teachers^a (N = 37)

Criteria Areas	Public Mean	Separate Mean	Total Mean
Human Development	2.1	1.8	2.0
Marriage Preparation	1.8	2.1	2.0
Biological Sciences	2.1	1.6*	1.9
Human Sexuality	1.9	1.8	1.9
The Family	1.9	1.6	1.8
Teaching Methods and Materials	1.9	1.7	1.8
Family Interaction	1.8	1.5	1.7
Research	1.6	1.5	1.6
Group Process	1.7	1.4	1.6
Counseling	1.6	1.4	1.5
Community	1.4	1.6	1.5
Family Resources	1.4	1.6	1.5
Field Experiences	1.3	1.5	1.4
Laws	1.4	1.4	1.4

*Significant at the .05 level

^aAdequacy ratings are: (1) Little or no preparation, (2) Fairly well prepared, and (3) Well prepared.

found that teachers had more preparation in areas requiring knowledge of a topic than in areas requiring practical experience. The latter included counseling, group processes, field experiences and the use of methods and materials in family life. In an effort to determine if the same held for Edmonton teachers, the criteria were separated into two

groups: family life knowledge and skills or experience. The family life knowledge items were family, family interaction, marriage preparation, human development, biological sciences, human sexuality, family resources, research, family laws and community knowledge. The mean score in this area was 1.8. The skills or experiences were group process, field experiences, counseling and methods and materials. Here the mean score was 1.6. The difference in the two means was not statistically significant.

The only significant area of difference between the public and separate school teachers was that of biological sciences, which included a background in nutrition, genetics, physiology and reproduction. The mean score for public teachers was 2.1 and for separate teachers, 1.6 and was significant at the .05 level ($t(35) = 1.85$, one-tailed test).

Females had a 2.2 mean score in biological sciences, compared to 1.5 for males, which was statistically significant at the .01 level ($t(35) = -2.67$, one tailed-test).

Table 6 indicates that teachers who offered to teach family life classes had a higher self-assessed formal preparation mean score in nearly all subjects. But only the scores in biological sciences ($t(32) = 1.69$, one-tailed test) and human development ($t(32) = 1.67$, one-tailed test) were statistically significant at the .05 level.

This finding suggested that teachers who offer to teach family life have accumulated more background information in the area of human development, probably before offering to teach this subject. One tended to assume that without this background knowledge these teachers would not have volunteered to teach family life. Perhaps the teachers who volunteer felt that a background in biological sciences and human

Table 6

Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Adequacy of Formal Training
Between Those Offering to Teach and Those Invited to Teach^a

Criteria	Offered to Teach (N = 18)	Invited to Teach (N = 12)
1. Family	1.9	1.5
2. Family Interaction	1.7	1.4
3. Marriage Preparation	1.9	1.8
4. Human Development	2.2	1.7*
5. Biological Sciences	2.0	1.4*
6. Human Sexuality	2.0	1.7
7. Family Resources	1.5	1.3
8. Group Processes	1.6	1.5
9. Teaching Methods	2.0	1.6
10. Field Experiences	1.4	1.4
11. Counseling	1.6	1.3
12. Research	1.8	1.3
13. Laws	1.5	1.3
14. Community	1.4	1.3

*Significant at the .05 level

^aRatings are: (1) Little or no preparation, (2) Fairly well prepared, and (3) Well prepared.

development was the most desirable in teaching family life education.

Table 7 provides mean scores of teachers' self-assessed adequacy of formal training on the various criteria for those with less than and those with more than five years' teaching experience. Experienced teachers scored higher in all but one area, which may suggest that they had more training. Even so, their mean score of 1.9 was only in the higher limit of the self-assessed category of little or no preparation.

The mean scores of experienced teachers in marriage preparation,

Table 7

Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Adequacy of Formal Training
Between Those with More Experience
and Those with Less Experience

Criteria	Less Experience Mean (N = 17)	More Experience Mean (N = 16)
1. Family	1.6	2.0
2. Family Interaction	1.5	1.8
3. Marriage Preparation	1.6	2.3**
4. Human Development	1.9	2.0
5. Biological Sciences	1.8	1.9
6. Human Sexuality	1.8	1.9
7. Family Resources	1.2	1.8
8. Group Processes	1.4	1.7
9. Teaching Methods	1.9	1.8
10. Field Experiences	1.3	1.6
11. Counseling	1.3	1.8*
12. Research	1.4	1.8
13. Laws	1.3	1.6
14. Community	1.3	1.8*

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

counseling and community resources were statistically significant when compared with less experienced teachers. This indicated that the more experienced teachers had more formal training in these subjects.

A note of caution must be used in interpreting these figures, as the sample was small, non-random and was based on self-ratings of training. The mean scores in all areas indicated that more training was necessary. The ideal would be mean scores of 3 in all areas.

Topics Studied in Family Life Classes

Family life teachers indicated the amount of time their students spent studying specific family life areas. Since family life programs in Edmonton are flexible, to be able to cater to the needs of the students, Table 8 has been constructed to indicate the amount of time spent by students in the different subject areas.

Christian Family Life students spent more time studying family interaction, biological sciences and human development, whereas Perspectives for Living students spent more time studying communication and values (included in the "other" category), human development and human sexuality. In the Vanier survey, it was found that 78 percent of schools included sex education; 75 percent, dating or boy-girl relationships; and 71 percent parent-child or intergenerational relationships (1971).

Although many of the topics studied could have been included in existing categories, many teachers chose to place them in the "other" group. Included here were community resources, peer groups, pressures, morals, family problems, value systems, developing a trust relationship in the classroom, how the Church affects the family, the family and the elderly, values and communication, youth and the law, self-awareness, physical and emotional handicaps, drug dependency, parenthood as a responsible decision, and family planning.

The investigator had assumed that the amount of training a teacher had in a topic would be reflected in the amount of time the students spent studying that topic. This did not turn out to be so.

Table 8 shows the teacher preparation score and the amount of time students spent studying in a subject area. Separate schools spent more

Table 8
Comparison of the Percentage of Time Students Spend Studying
Family Life Subject Areas and the Teacher's Preparation Score in Each Area^a (N = 37)

Subject Area	Public				Separate	
	16-25%		26-45%		16-25%	
	%	Teacher Preparation Mean	%	Teacher Preparation Mean	%	Teacher Preparation Mean
1. Family	18	1.9		1.9	27	1.6
2. Family Interaction	20	1.8		1.8	16	1.5
3. Marriage Preparation	13	1.8	3	1.8	15	2.0
4. Human Development	19	2.1	8	2.1	30	1.8
5. Biological Sciences	24	2.0		2.0	30	1.6**
6. Human Sexuality	26	1.9	8	1.9	11	1.8
7. Family Resources	8	1.4		1.4	19	1.5
8. Other	6		16	5	15	3

**Significant at the .01 level

^aRatings are: (1) Little or no preparation, (2) Fairly well prepared, and (3) Well prepared.

time on family interaction, biological sciences and human development. However, their preparation scores in these areas were not significantly higher than in areas in which students spent less time. The same was true for public teachers in the areas of human sexuality, human development and marriage preparation.

Self-Ratings of Teaching Skills

Teachers were asked to indicate how effective they considered themselves to be in handling the issues of abortion, contraception, moral standards, religious views on sex and sex education when they came up in class. Various comparisons were then made.

Table 9 indicates that more experienced teachers considered themselves effective in handling issues related to religious views on sex.

Table 9

Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Effectiveness
in Handling Issues Between Those with More Experience
and Those with Less Experience^a

Issues	Less Experience (N = 17)	More Experience (N = 16)
1. Abortion	2.3	2.0
2. Contraception	2.4	2.2
3. Moral Standards	2.2	2.4
4. Religious Views on Sex	1.8	2.3*
5. Sex Education	2.4	2.4

*Significant at the .05 level

^aRatings are: (1) Not very effective, (2) Moderately effective, and (3) Very effective.

This was statistically significant at the .05 level ($t(35) = -2.25$, one-tailed test). Adams (1972), in a comparison of self-ratings of inexperienced and experienced teachers, also found the latter more effective in their handling of this topic. One may hypothesize that as teachers gain experience they become more effective in handling religious views on sex. However, another factor may be the background in religion or theology, as indicated by two experienced teachers, was higher than for inexperienced teachers.

Teachers who offered to teach family life had higher mean scores in their effectiveness in dealing with these topics, but not at a statistically significant level.

As might be expected, female teachers perceived themselves to be more effective in handling issues of abortion and contraception. Table 10 indicates that these issues were statistically significant at the .05 level: abortion ($t(35) = -1.69$), contraception ($t(35) = -1.96$),

Table 10

Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Effectiveness
in Handling Issues Between Male and Female Teachers^a

Issues	Male (N = 21)	Female (N = 16)
1. Abortion	1.8	2.0*
2. Contraception	2.1	2.6*
3. Moral Standards	2.2	2.3
4. Religious Views on Sex	2.1	1.8*
5. Sex Education	2.4	2.4

*Significant at the .05 level

^aRatings are: (1) Not very effective, (2) Moderately effective, and (3) Very effective.

religious views on sex ($t(35) = 1.63$). One surmises that since both issues involve females more directly, the ability of female teachers to deal effectively with them is related to their knowledge and understanding of the issue. In addition, females had a higher mean score on biological sciences, indicating they had more formal training in nutrition, genetics, physiology and reproduction. This too undoubtedly aided in the handling of abortion and contraception.

On the other hand, Table 10 shows that males perceived themselves better able to handle religious views on sex. The teachers who had training in religion and theology were all males.

Table 11 compares the mean score of separate teachers versus public teachers in their assessment of ability to handle issues. Although it

Table 11

Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Effectiveness
in Handling Issues Between Public and Separate Teachers^a

Issues	Public (N = 18)	Separate (N = 19)
1. Abortion	2.6	1.8**
2. Contraception	2.7	1.9**
3. Moral Standards	2.6	2.0*
4. Religious Views on Sex	2.0	2.0
5. Sex Education	2.6	2.2*

*Significant at the .05 level

**Significant at the .01 level

^aRatings are: (1) Not very effective, (2) Moderately effective, and (3) Very effective.

had been assumed that the religious orientation of the separate system would enable their teachers to better handle religious views on sex, this did not turn out to be the case. The mean scores for this item were identical. The mean scores of public teachers in the areas of handling issues of abortion, contraception, moral standards and sex education were higher than the mean scores of Catholic teachers. These mean scores were statistically significant: abortion ($t(35) = 3.87$, one-tailed test), contraception ($t(35) = 4.29$, one-tailed test), moral standards ($t(35) = 1.97$, one-tailed test), and sex education ($t(35) = 2.64$, one-tailed test).

One may suggest that because the Catholic Church has very specific views on abortion and contraception the teachers in the separate system may find it difficult to handle these issues if their views should differ from those of their Church, whereas the separate teachers also had a lower mean score in the area of biological sciences, significant at .05 ($t(35) = 1.85$, one-tailed test) level than public teachers. Poor academic knowledge would also affect handling of abortion, contraception and sex education.

The study results indicated that family life teachers in the public system perceive themselves more effective in handling sensitive topics. Since public teachers are not bound to any one set of beliefs as are the separate teachers, the public teachers have more freedom to express their own views. This may explain why they perceive themselves better able to handle sensitive topics.

Caution must be used when interpreting these results as all scores have been self-assessed and there has been no check on how these issues were actually handled in the classroom.

Over 73 percent of the teachers indicated that training in

individual or group counseling techniques would be helpful. Only one person responded negatively. Twenty-two percent answered "possibly". Ninety-two percent of the teachers were involved in counseling students, compared with 80 percent in Kerckhoff's study (1964). Twenty-two teachers had counseled one to ten students; eight teachers, 11 to 30; and two teachers had counseled 31 to 60 students. Only two teachers of the group had counseled over 60 students during a year. Despite the fact that most teachers were involved in counseling activities, few had any training in this area.

Like it or not, family life teachers are approached by their students for advice on many matters. Therefore, training in methods and techniques of counseling should form an important part of the preparation of family life teachers.

Since teachers often cannot handle counseling situations competently, it was important to know if they felt they could refer cases to a trained counselor. Ninety-five percent indicated they could refer cases; the other five percent said they could not. Although this small percentage felt they could not refer cases, all schools offering family life classes have provisions for counseling referrals. This suggested that these teachers did not have confidence in the counselor or that they were not aware of the referral service.

As the sample contained no inexperienced teachers, groups for comparison purposes were adjusted to compare teachers with more than five years' teaching experience with those having less experience. In the area of handling a sexually molested child (counseling the parents), death of a student's parent(s), guilt feelings over one's sexual behavior, homosexuality and premarital pregnancy, the mean scores for perceived counseling adequacy showed no significant difference between

more and less experienced groups. Adams (1972) found the same in his study.

The self-assessed scores, shown in Table 12, of teachers with less experience were higher in areas dealing with a sexually molested child, guilt feelings over one's sexual behavior, homosexuality and premarital pregnancy, whereas the more experience teachers felt themselves more capable to handle the situation caused by the death of a parent.

Table 12
Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Adequacy
of Counseling Situations
Between Those with More Experience
and Those with Less Experience^a

Situations	More Experience (N = 16)	Less Experience (N = 17)
1. Sexually molested child (counsel with family)	1.4	1.6
2. Death of a student's parent or parents	2.1	1.9
3. Guilt feelings over one's sexual behavior	2.1	2.5
4. Homosexuality	1.6	1.9
5. Premarital pregnancy	2.2	2.5

^aRatings are: (1) Little adequacy, (2) Fair degree of adequacy, and (3) High degree of adequacy.

Table 13 compares responses to each of the counseling situations of teachers who offered to teach with those who were invited to teach family life classes. All teachers assessed their perceived counseling adequacy on the basis of (1) little adequacy, (2) fair degree of adequacy, and (3) high degree of adequacy. The teachers who offered to teach had higher mean scores on all items than those who were invited

Table 13

Comparison of Teachers' Self-Assessed Adequacy
in Counseling Situations Between Those Invited to Teach
and Those Offering to Teach

Situations	Invited to Teach (N = 12)	Offered to Teach (N = 18)
1. Sexually molested child (counsel with family)	1.4	1.6*
2. Death of a student's parent or parents	1.8	2.1*
3. Guilt feelings over one's sexual behavior	2.4	2.5
4. Homosexuality	1.5	1.9
5. Premarital pregnancy	2.1	2.4*

*Significant at the .05 level

to teach. Teachers who offered to teach perceived themselves significantly more capable of counseling with parents involving a sexually molested child ($t(35) = 1.59$), death of a student's parent or parents ($t(35) = 1.99$) and handling premarital pregnancy ($t(35) = 1.90$). The differences between the two groups were significant at the .05 level.

Because of this difference, one tended to think that teachers who offered to teach may have had some counseling background or other background knowledge prior to offering to teach family life classes. One may also suggest that those who were invited to teach were asked in such a manner that they did not feel free to say "no" despite feelings of inadequacy.

Results indicated that all teachers needed more counseling training and experience.

No significant differences were found between public and separate teachers, males and females or more experience and less experienced

teachers in the self-ratings of counseling competency.

Teaching Methods and Materials Used in Family Life Classes

Edmonton family life teachers were in agreement on the most important teaching techniques used in the classroom. Ranked in order in Table 14 as the most important techniques are:

1. Discussion to stimulate thinking, valuing and understanding
2. Visual materials
3. Discussion techniques to gather ideas, such as buzz groups and brainstorming
4. Dramatization, such as role playing, skits and pantomimes
5. Resource people.

An average of 11 teaching techniques was used by each teacher.

Teacher preparation programs were responsible for developing an average of five skills per teacher, in-service training developed an average of six skills and other experiences were important for an average of six skills. Many teachers indicated that their teaching techniques were developed from a combination of all three categories. Only 35 percent of the total sample felt that teacher preparation programs provided techniques that were the most useful in teaching family life. Forty-six percent thought that in-service training provided the most important techniques, while 45 percent credited other experiences. The overlap of percentages indicates the ambiguity of clearly defined areas of training.

Teachers with less than five years' experience had acquired an average of ten skills compared with an average of 14 acquired by those with more than five years' experience. Of these skills, only four were

Table 14
Most Valuable Techniques
Used in Teaching Family Life Classes (N = 33)

Technique	Separate 15	Public 18	Total 33	%
1. Discussion to stimulate thinking	13	16	29	88
2. Visual materials	13	14	27	82
3. Discussion to gather ideas	8	14	22	67
4. Dramatization	7	8	15	45
5. Resource people	8	6	14	43
6. Audio materials	5	7	12	36
7. Simulation games	4	6	10	30
8. Field trips	4	5	9	27
9. Literature	2	7	9	27
10. Lecture	4	1	5	15
11. Case studies	1	2	3	9
12. Independent study	1	1	2	6
13. Observation	1	1	2	6
14. Individual conferences		1	1	3
15. Individual learning packages	1		1	3

developed in teacher preparation courses and six were developed from other personal experience.

Teacher Training Strengths and Weaknesses

The teachers were asked, "What three things should your preparation for this job have included but did not include?".

Responses were coded according to four areas: (1) academic preparation; (2) teaching skills: observation and practice teaching; (3) communication, counseling and group process skills; and

(4) miscellaneous.

Teaching involves knowledge and the ability to transfer this knowledge to students. Table 15 shows the analysis of training deficiencies for these teachers.

Table 15
Self-Assessed Training Deficiencies
of Present Family Life Teachers (N = 33)

Training Areas	Public	Separate	Total	%
1. Academic or content preparation	9	15	24	73
2. Teaching skills: observation and practice teaching	15	10	25	76
3. Communication: counseling and group process skills	5	7	12	36
4. Miscellaneous	7	8	15	45

Seventy-six percent indicated a need for more family life teaching techniques. A prominent area where the training was rated deficient was in the use of methods and materials to transfer knowledge. Some of the deficiencies itemized were:

"Observation and practice teaching in the subject area."

"How to effectively present material in sensitive areas such as sexuality."

"Methods class (knowledge of how to teach family life education) and knowledge and practice in a variety of teaching techniques."

"More practical application of theory and skills to communicate values and attitudes into behavior changes."

"In-service in various techniques--role playing, how to conduct good discussions, evaluation and class management."

Seventy-three percent indicated that academic content was lacking in their preparation. Some recommendations made were:

"More background information in course content."

"Better understanding of the psychological makeup of adolescents."

"Training in sociology, biology and psychology."

"More background and training in family communications and interpersonal relationships."

"Developmental approach to education in sexuality."

"Curriculum building and instruction prior to commencing classes."

Thirty-six percent of the teachers mentioned that skills in communication, counseling and group processes would help them in teaching family life courses. Mentioned were:

"Methods to encourage teacher-student communication."

"More in communication theory and exercise."

"Counseling techniques."

"Practice in group process."

Forty-five percent of the teachers used the miscellaneous category to bring up suggested training to help them in their jobs. Suggested were: field experiences under the supervision of a social worker and other related family life personnel; knowledge prior to school opening that the teacher was to teach family life; knowledge of what the community expects a family life class to accomplish; and training in learning how to work with parents.

The NCFR teacher training criteria were used as a basis for teachers to specify if they needed (1) no further training, (2) some further training, or (3) extensive further training.

Only seven percent indicated that no further training was needed.

The major areas these teachers felt competent in were biological sciences, laws, family resources, human development and marriage preparation.

Forty-eight percent felt they need some training in all subject areas. Rated slightly higher than others were field experience, human sexuality, counseling and research.

Forty-five percent indicated they needed extensive training. The most crucial areas were family resources for 42 percent, group processes for 36 percent, and the use of methods and materials in family life education for 33 percent.

Table 16 provides a complete breakdown of areas in which extensive training is needed.

Table 16
Extensive Training Needed by Teachers

Criteria Areas	Public (N = 18)	Separate (N = 19)	Total	%
1. Family Resources	6	8	14	42
2. Group Processes	5	7	12	36
3. Using Methods and Materials in Family Life Education	5	6	11	33
4. Family Interaction	3	7	10	30
5. Community	4	5	9	27
6. Counseling	3	5	8	24
7. Laws	4	4	8	24
8. Human Sexuality	2	5	7	21
9. Biological Sciences	2	4	6	18
10. Family	2	4	6	18
11. Field Experiences	2	4	6	18
12. Marriage Preparation	2	4	6	18
13. Human Development	1	4	5	15
14. Research	0	4	4	12

Each teacher identified an average of 2.7 techniques or experiences which should be well developed in teacher preparation programs. These areas are indicated in Table 17. The major areas indicated were

Table 17
Techniques or Areas Which Teachers Feel Should be Well Developed
in Teacher Training Programs (N = 33)

Training Areas	Public	Separate	Total	%
1. Group processes skills	9	1	10	30
2. Communication skills	3	6	9	27
3. Family interaction content	2	6	8	24
4. Using teaching methods and materials	8	0	8	24
5. Discussion techniques	3	4	7	21
6. Overall knowledge content in family life education	3	4	7	21
7. Other	1	5	6	18
8. Sensitivity and awareness to students' needs	2	4	6	18
9. Human sexuality	1	4	5	15
10. Counseling	2	3	5	15
11. Family content	1	3	4	12
12. In-service and continuing education in family life education	0	4	4	12
13. Dramatization: role playing	2	2	4	12
14. Field experiences	2	1	3	9
15. Human development	1	2	3	9
16. Values and valuing framework in family life education	0	3	3	9
17. Community resources	1	1	2	6
18. Marriage preparation	0	1	1	3

group process skills, communication skills, family interaction, the use of methods and materials, discussion techniques and overall knowledge content in family life subjects.

Indicative of the need for techniques and skills necessary to impart knowledge was the fact that four of the six areas mentioned were related to this facet of training.

It was noted that 21 percent of the teachers mentioned a need for preparation in the overall knowledge background of family life subjects. Obviously these teachers felt that they did not have enough knowledge to teach this subject. More training was needed in all criteria areas and in family interaction as both family life programs encourage improving family interaction.

The area classified "other" included items such as how to plan and arrange for parent involvement, acceptance of one's own sexuality, more teacher preparation time and university training at the expense of the school board.

Areas not selected for teacher development were biological sciences, laws and community. Why these three areas were not chosen for development in teacher preparation courses was not known. However, one may suggest that teachers felt these areas were either of less importance than others or that they felt they could be developed through other teaching efforts.

Teachers were asked to list areas in which in-service training had been the major source of information. Nine teachers indicated that in-service had not provided any major source of information. The remainder identified two areas in which in-service had been their major information source. Table 18 shows that the most prominent area was the use of methods and materials in family life classes. This was followed by group process and by human sexuality content. Both the public and separate systems have focused on these areas with their in-service training.

Over 70 percent of the teachers had attended weekend retreats or

Table 18
Areas Where In-Service Training Was the Teachers'
Major Source of Information

In-Service Information	Public (N = 14)	Separate (N = 14)	Total
1. Using Teaching Methods and Materials in Family Life Classes	8	8	16
2. Group Processes	9	5	14
3. Human Sexuality Content	6	7	13
4. Community Resources	2	2	4
5. Field Experiences		4	4
6. Family Interaction		3	3
7. Family Resources	1	1	2
8. Human Development	2		2
9. Other	1	1	2

in-service sessions of two days' duration. Thirty-five percent had attended a weekend communication seminar.

Even after teaching family life classes for up to three years, Edmonton family life teachers indicated that a major weakness in their training was lack of preparation in the content of family life education. Fortunately, these teachers were aware of this deficit and were spending considerable free time utilizing upgrading opportunities offered through in-service education.

Eight teachers indicated that teacher preparation courses had not provided any major source of information to help them in their teaching of family life classes. Since 19 teachers indicated that teacher preparation courses in university had provided the major source of their background for teaching family life, it was probable that the eight teachers who did not find university preparation had provided any

major source of information were recruited from other disciplines, for which there would have been no courses relevant to family life.

Table 19 indicates that family life content and human development were two areas where teacher preparation had been the teachers' major source of information.

Table 19
Areas Where Teacher Preparation
Was the Teachers' Major Source of Information

Criteria Areas	Public (N = 17)	Separate (N = 12)	Total
1. Family Content	8	6	14
2. Human Development	7	7	14
3. Human Sexuality	6	3	9
4. Marriage Preparation	6	2	8
5. Biological Sciences	4	3	7
6. Family Interaction	3	4	7
7. Counseling	3	1	4
8. Research	2	2	4
9. Family Resources	1	2	3
10. Community	1	1	2
11. Group Processes	2		2
12. Laws	2		2
13. Other	1	1	2

Teachers indicated that background information from subjects related to family life had been helpful in their teaching of family life classes. Teachers recruited from related areas such as health and physical education and home economics would already have a broader base of useful information for teaching family life classes than teachers recruited from non-related areas.

Teacher Training Suggestions

The importance of the teacher in family life classes will be considered briefly, since academic knowledge alone does not make a good family life teacher.

That family life teachers should be screened was the consensus of 95 percent of the teachers.

On what basis do these teachers feel future family life teachers should be screened? Ninety-two percent indicated that the ability to communicate with young people was most important. Eighty-seven percent noted the importance of personality characteristics such as warmth, sensitiveness and approachability. Professional competence in family life education was listed by 70 percent. Nineteen percent suggested other criteria: basic belief in humanity, possession of high moral values, ability to command true respect, and experience working with young people.

The majority felt that selection of the family life teacher should be based on the interest and desire of the teacher to teach the subject. Fifty-one percent felt that teachers should volunteer, not be chosen by invitation.

Thirty-five percent felt that teachers should be selected on the basis of written references and/or recommendations by other teachers, principals or parents, and then be interviewed by the co-ordinator of the family life program.

Thirty-five percent suggested miscellaneous criteria: teacher selected by the students; a mature, married person, open-minded and respected by students; sensitive to student needs; the first year should be a trial period for each teacher, following which he may or may not

decide to continue; family life teachers should have a lighter teaching load than other staff; and the teacher with the least amount of work should be given the job of teaching family life education. Table 20 lists the teachers' views on criteria for selecting a family life teacher.

Table 20
Teachers' Views on Criteria
for Selecting a Family Life Teacher (N = 37)

Criteria	Public	Separate	Total	%
1. Interest, desire or volunteered to teach	11	8	19	51
2. References and interviews	8	5	13	35
3. Miscellaneous suggestions	7	6	13	35
4. Ability to communicate	4	6	10	27
5. In-service training	5	4	9	24
6. Professional competence	4	5	9	24
7. Personality characteristics	3	5	8	22
8. Experience	2	1	3	8

The need for more training was made quite evident by the answers to the question, "Do you desire further training in the family life areas?". More training was desired by 100 percent of the separate school teachers and by 80 percent of the public school teachers. Written comments by ten percent of the teachers indicated a willingness to attain more training. Only two teachers indicated they wished no further training.

Summary

Family life teachers in Edmonton have the following characteristics: 56 percent are male, 47 percent are in the 20 to 29 year age group and 95 percent are married. Seventy-nine percent of family life classes are offered at the junior high level, indicating a major need for more expansion at the senior high level. Over 73 percent of the schools involve more than one teacher in family life education classes.

Over 70 percent of the teachers graduated from university in the last five years and 86 percent had four or more years of university training. The major areas of training are social studies, social sciences and physical education.

Only a minimum of training was indicated by teachers on the National Council on Family Relations Teacher Education Criteria areas (family, family interaction, marriage preparation, human development, biological sciences, human sexuality, family resources, group processes, using methods and materials in family life education, field experiences, counseling, research, laws and community).

Teachers were asked to indicate how effective they perceived themselves in handling issues of abortion, contraception, moral standards, religious views on sex and sex education. Experienced teachers and male teachers felt more competent in handling religious views on sex. Female teachers and public teachers felt more competent in handling abortion and contraception.

Only those teachers who offered to teach indicated counseling adequacy in handling death of a student's parents, counsel with family concerning a sexually molested child and premarital pregnancy. More counseling experience is indicated for family life teachers, especially

when 92 percent have indicated they had counseled students in the past year. Seventy-three percent of the teachers felt counseling training would be helpful in their job.

The five most useful teaching techniques were: discussion to stimulate thinking, discussion to gather ideas, visual materials, dramatization and use of resource people. Teachers indicated 46 percent of these techniques were learned in in-service training. The more experienced teachers had developed four more skills per teacher than had teachers with less than five years' teaching experience.

Teachers did not feel adequately prepared to teach family life classes. Seventy-three percent felt they should have had more academic training, and 76 percent indicated a need for instruction in teaching skills, observation of family life classes and practice teaching before they began teaching family life classes. Thirty-six percent of the teachers indicated that skills in communication, counseling and group process would have been helpful.

Teachers were asked to indicate the areas in which they needed further training. Forty-eight percent indicated they needed training in all NCFR Criteria areas, whereas 45 percent of the teachers indicated extensive training was needed in the following areas: family resources, group processes, the use of methods and materials in family life classes and family interaction. The desire for more training in family life subjects was indicated by 95 percent of the teachers.

In-service and teacher preparation had provided some major sources of information for the teachers.

Since the teacher has been so vital in the success of a family life program, the present teachers indicated that future family life teachers

should be screened on the following bases: ability to relate to students, possession of personality characteristics such as warmth and approachability and possession of professional competence.

CHAPTER V

TEACHER TRAINING GUIDELINES AND RESEARCH IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

With the rapid expansion of family life courses, the need for qualified teachers has become essential. In Alberta this need should be met by the Faculty of Education of the University of Alberta, as it has the major responsibility for the training of qualified teachers. In view of the present financial crisis facing the University of Alberta, it is highly unlikely that any new training programs will be established. Therefore, a set of teacher training guidelines has been proposed for the preparation of Bachelor of Education students to teach family life education which can be partially provided within the framework of existing University courses.

The National Council on Family Relations has prepared a comprehensive list of suggested Criteria for teacher training that provide a general view of family life content. These Criteria are as relevant to Edmonton teachers as to American teachers in providing a basic training guide. Since the Criteria were used as a baseline for evaluating present teacher preparation, they will now be utilized to formulate guidelines for the training of family life teachers in Alberta.

Because 76 percent of the family life teachers in Edmonton indicated they were inadequately trained in teaching skills, observation and practice teaching in family life education, and 73 percent felt they were inadequately trained in family life content, it becomes vitally important to implement training in these areas. These deficiencies existed mainly prior to commencement of family life teaching and, in

part, have been remedied by in-service training. With proper training, however, the newly prepared teacher should not be deficient in these areas.

Since the study areas in family life education cover a broad range of subjects, the probability of a teacher becoming competent in all family life areas is not a reasonable expectation of an undergraduate student. However, it would be reasonable to expect that prior to leaving university the student will have obtained a basic amount of knowledge in areas studied in family life classes. Therefore, high priority guidelines are those which provide students with basic knowledge and experiences, whereas low priorities are additions to the basic high priority guidelines.

Priority guidelines have been developed from Table 8, page 56. The table shows that students spend more time studying communication, values listed as "other", human development, human sexuality, family interaction and biological sciences than other areas. Other guidelines are derived from Table 17, page 69, which shows the areas that teachers feel should be well developed during teacher preparation. These include group process skills, communication skills, discussion techniques, family interaction content and the use of methods and materials in family life classes.

Since 94 percent of the teachers already are counseling students, training in this area would be valuable.

All training guidelines will include a brief subject area description followed by relevant guideline courses listed in the current University of Alberta Calendar.

Training Guidelines

Guideline 1

The study of human development from birth to death, including personality theory, human needs and influences during each stage of the life cycle.

Relevant courses are:

Family 343. Child Development. A study of the physical and personality development of children in the family context.

Family 347. The Adolescent, His Family, His World. A study of the adolescent as a family member, developmental changes during adolescence and ways of coping with resulting problems.

Educational Psychology 269. Introduction to Educational Psychology. Maturation and development theory and process.

Educational Psychology 271. Introduction to Educational Psychology. Learning theory and process.

Educational Psychology 469. Human Development and Educational Processes.

Educational Psychology 471. Learning and Instruction. A study of the relationship of learning process to instructional learning.

Educational Psychology 515. Theories of Personality.

Psychology 212. General and Developmental Psychology. A survey of problems, methods and principles in various fields of psychology, with particular emphasis on child, adolescent and adult development and behavior.

Psychology 283. Psychology of the Person. An introduction to theories and research in personality, concepts of normal and abnormal behavior and therapies and processes of human change.

Psychology 260. Basic Psychological Processes. A study of the principles

and development of perception, motivation, learning and thinking and their relationship to the psychological functioning of the individual.

Psychology 383. Personality. An introductory survey including representative theoretical point of view and research relevant to the study of personality.

Sociology 342. Socialization. A study of sociocultural influences on the development of the self, from infancy through old age.

Guideline 2

A study of sexual roles, needs, identities and behaviors in the personal and social functioning of a human being's sexuality.

Relevant courses are:

Family 541. A seminar course on human sexuality and sex education in family life education.

Health Education 397 and 399. Family Life Education for Secondary Schools.

Guideline 3

Training in biological sciences, including background information on nutrition, genetics, physiology and human reproduction.

Relevant courses are:

Foods and Nutrition 325. Nutrition. A study of carbohydrates, fats and proteins and the role which minerals and vitamins play in metabolism; food sources and requirements of man at various stages of the life cycle.

Foods and Nutrition 327. Nutrition. A study of minerals and vitamins and their chemical and physiological roles in metabolism; a

description of food sources and nutrient requirements throughout the life cycle of man.

Physiology 260. Elementary Physiology. A survey of mammalian and human physiology.

Physiology 361. Introductory Physiology. A study of mammalian and human physiology and laboratory experience with live tissues to supplement the lectures.

Biology 297. Heredity. A study of the transmission of hereditary characteristics, Mendelian inheritance and its cytological basis, microbial genetics, cytoplasmic inheritance, linkage and genetic mapping, DNA as genetic material, gene action and the genetic code.

Guideline 4

Background knowledge in family interaction and the study of family relationships during each stage of the life cycle.

Relevant courses are:

Family 241. Family Development. An introduction to the study of the family, covering dynamics of family interaction over the life cycle.

Family 441. The Family in Crisis. An analytical consideration of family adjustment to crisis events such as divorce, unemployment and inadequate income.

Health Education 397. Family Life Education for Secondary Schools I.

Health Education 399. Family Life Education for Secondary Schools II.

A study of family life education with an emphasis on the understanding of self and relationships with family members.

Sociology 477. Social Psychology of Marriage. An analysis of marital interaction over the life cycle including marital authority,

stability and sexual interaction.

Sociology 478. Family Structure and Interaction. A social psychological analysis of parenthood, socialization processes, family interaction and organization over the life cycle.

Sociology 367. Values and Belief Systems. A study of the origins, developments and social consequences of systems of beliefs and values.

Guideline 5

Experiences in group processes and communication skills to promote individual growth as well as the development of discussion abilities which will provide an enriching learning experience.

Relevant courses are:

Family 359. Presentation and Communication. An introduction to the principles of communication and their application to interpersonal, group and mass audience situations relevant to home economics.

Educational Psychology 421. Personal and Social Dynamics in Education. A growth experience utilizing communication skills and problem solving processes to understand personal and social aspects in education.

Educational Psychology 521. Interpersonal Relations in Education. Provided is a self growth opportunity in a group experience.

Sociology 341. Social Psychology. An introduction to the study of individual and group behavior observed in social processes.

Sociology 542. Small Group Behavior. A sociological study of group interaction.

Guideline 6

An introductory course, plus experiences, in individual and group counseling.

Relevant courses are:

Educational Psychology 411. Introduction to Guidance. Including problem solving processes, communication skills and small group interaction.

Educational Psychology 512. Seminar and Practicum in Individual Counseling.

Educational Psychology 518. Seminar and Practicum in Group Counseling.

Educational Psychology 520. Seminar and Practicum in School Psychology.

Educational Psychology 524. Individual Diagnosis in School Psychology.

Guideline 7

A course in methods and materials in family life education, including comparative curriculums, classroom procedures, evaluation, experience in family life techniques, opportunity to observe teaching styles and familiarity with key issues involved in family life education.

A relevant course is:

Family 543. Seminar: Family Life Education in Home, School and Community. This is an issues course in family life education.

Needed, but presently nonexistent, is a course which would include comparative curriculums and curriculum development, classroom procedures, evaluations in family life education, the use of family life materials to promote learning, dramatization and use of resource people.

Guideline 8

The opportunity for students to practice teach in family life education with an experienced family life teacher.

At present there is no student teaching practicum in family life education.

Guidelines of lower priority are those areas which provide further background knowledge and experience in areas not specified in family life classes. Training in many of these guidelines may be accomplished through independent study in University courses such as:

Family 559 and 560. Independent Study I and II. A laboratory or library research course on family topics.

Educational Psychology 499. Directed Individual Study in Educational Psychology.

Psychology 498 and 499. Individual Study I and II. Topics of interest in Psychology.

Sociology 503 and 504. Conference Course in Sociology.

Guideline 9

Experiences involving direct observation of a variety of families and supervised field work with families.

A relevant course is:

Family 445. Practicum in Family Services. Providing an assessment of the various techniques employed in working with families, their theoretical bases and their effectiveness. Actual experience in working with family members is provided.

Guideline 10

A course designed to provide family insight through the interpretation of interdisciplinary family research.

Relevant courses are:

Family 443. The application of scientific methods to the study of family relationships including theory development.

Sociology 570. Seminar in the Family.

Guideline 11

A study of community organization with a view to effective work with communities.

Relevant courses are:

Interdepartmental 516. Learning in the Community. An examination of how and what people learn in a community through mass media, institutions and organizations, traditions and customs. The value of information and knowledge in the development of a community will be explored and assessed.

Sociology 453. The Urban Community. An examination of the urban community from the ecological, social, psychological and social organizational perspectives and their interrelationships.

Guideline 12

The study of laws regarding marriage and the family in various provinces.

Guideline 13

A functional course in marriage preparation in which attitudes toward marriage and the family are explored.

A relevant course is:

Family 346. Courtship and Marriage. The study of the sociological, psychological and personal factors entering into the selection of a mate, the development of a relationship and the problems of marital adjustment.

Guideline 14

Knowledge in the use of family resources such as time, energy, space and money.

Two relevant courses are:

Family 340. Management of Family Resources. A study of the principles of management, as applied to the use of family resources.

Family 440. Consumer Problems. An analysis of the problems faced by the family as a consumer, within the framework of the economic, sociological, psychological and legal factors which create these problems. Also provided is knowledge of the sources of information and aid for the consumer.

Guideline 15

The study of family patterns in the context of historical, social and cultural settings and the family as it exists in Canadian society.

Several courses can be used:

Family 455. The Family in Transition. An introduction to the study of the family through the issues which surround the family and marriage in contemporary society. Reference to research studies and to historical data provides the basis of the course.

Family 447. The Family in Contemporary Society. An interdisciplinary study of the family in modern Western society, with consideration of the nature of the relationship between the family and business,

the family and medicine, the family and law, and the family and education.

Sociology 371. The Family. A study of the structure and function of the family system, historically and cross-culturally.

Sociology 471. Comparative Family Systems. An institutional analysis of family systems in a variety of societies.

Sociology 472. Canadian Society. A study of the composition of the Canadian population, the value hierarchy, the nature and relationships of the major institutions and the structure of Canadian society.

Research Implications

Background knowledge in family life subjects was indicated by present teachers to be an important aspect of training needed to teach family life classes. As properly trained teachers are only one method of improving the quality of family life education, it would seem pertinent that future studies be implemented to evaluate the effectiveness of present family life programs.

Controlled research is needed to compare family life programs. How are goals for these family life programs determined? Do family life programs meet their goals? For example, if the family life goal was the improvement of family communication, an instrument should be developed to measure communication prior to beginning the class and some time after the class had ended.

The development of a pre and post test instrument would be valuable to determine the knowledge of students taking subjects such as health, home economics and social studies which overlap in family life content. The purpose of this would be to evaluate the amount of family life

information reaching students in schools which have no integrated or structured family life programs. This information would be helpful in planning family life programs, as well as for further exploration of the adequacy of general classroom teachers in handling family life subject matter.

One approach to family life education in Alberta has been to deliberately integrate family life subject matter into existing courses such as health, home economics and social studies. Since duplication of family life materials is evident in the curriculum study guides, research is needed to determine if in fact family life information is reaching students in schools which indicate they have an integrated family life program.

Evaluation by students of the effectiveness of family life teachers in handling issues such as abortion, contraception and moral standards would enable teachers to improve their present teaching capabilities.

Personality attributes of the teacher have a major impact on how family life knowledge is transmitted. Therefore, research to identify the personality attributes of family life teachers rated highly by students is needed. What are the characteristics which enable this teacher to communicate effectively with students?

While there are other areas where research is indicated, the above mentioned are ones of special interest to this investigator.

Summary

The first part of this chapter proposed guidelines for training family life teachers and listed relevant University courses for each guideline. The second part of the chapter suggested areas for further research in the quest toward improving the quality of family life education.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, Wesley J. Prior teaching experience as a criterion in the selection of family life teachers--An asset or a liability? Unpublished manuscript. University of Alberta, 1972.
- Allen, Alice A., and K. F. King. Family relations courses: taught in high schools in the United States. Journal of Home Economics, 1970, 62(1), 19-22.
- American Social Hygiene Association. Some high points in the history of sex education in the United States. Journal of Social Hygiene, 1938, 24, 584-585.
- Avery, Curtis, and Margie R. Lee. Family life education: its philosophy and purpose. The Family Coordinator, 1964, 13, 27-37.
- Baker, Luther, and James B. Darcy. Survey of family life and sex education programs in Washington secondary schools and development of guidelines for statewide coordinated program. The Family Coordinator, 1970, 19, 228-310.
- Bayer, Alan, and F. Ivan Nye. Family life education in Florida public schools. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1964, 26, 182-187.
- Beach, Ruth E. Should sex education be taught in the high schools? Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1943, 14, 153-154.
- Broderick, Carlfred B., and Jessie Bernard (Eds.). Individual, sex and society. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.
- Brody, David. Techniques in family life education. Marriage and Family Living, 1950, 12, 139-141.
- Canadian Education Association. The present status of sex education in Canadian schools. Report No. 2/1964-65. Toronto, Ontario, September 1964.
- Calderone, Mary. Panel discussion: third session. In Virginia Hilu (Ed.), Sex education and the schools. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.
- Carrera, Michael. Guidelines (Chapter IV) in Guidelines for the preparation of high school teachers of sex education. 1970. (mimeographed reprint).
- Carrera, Michael. Preparation of a sex educator: a historical overview. The Family Coordinator, 1971, 20, 99-107.

- Chilman, Catherine. Some social and psychological aspects of sex education. In Carlfred B. Broderick and Jessie Bernard (Eds.), Individual, sex and society. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.
- Christensen, G. A. An analysis of related issues in family life education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Michigan State University, 1958.
- Cleveland Public Library. Sex education workshop. School and Society, 1944, 60, 294-295.
- Dager, Edward, Glenn Harper, and Robert Whitehurst. Family life education in public schools: a survey report on Indiana. Marriage and Family Living, 1962, 24, 365-370.
- Family life education: a point of view. Curriculum Branch, Department of Education, Province of Alberta, 1969.
- Fohlin, Mary Bercovitz. Selection and training of teachers for family life education programs. The Family Coordinator, 1971, 20, 231-241.
- Force, Elizabeth (Ed.). A kaleidoscope report of a national consultation on family life education. The Vanier Institute of the Family, June 1970.
- Force, Elizabeth S. Family life education 1970: a regional survey. The Family Coordinator, 1970, 19, 295-300.
- Guest, Harry H. Developments in family life and sex education in Canada. Ottawa: Canadian Health Education Specialists Society, February 1968.
- Gendel, Evalyn, and Pauline Green. Sex education controversy: a boost to new and better programs. Journal of School Health, 1971, 41, 24-28.
- Hall, Olive, and Beatrice Paolucci. Teaching home economics. New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1970.
- Harper, Robert A., and Francis Harper. Are sex educators afraid of sex? Marriage and Family Living, 1957, 19, 240-244.
- Harris, Ben M., Wailand Bessent, and Kenneth E. McIntyre. In-service education: a guide to better practice. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.
- Herold, Edward S. The family studies programme at the University of Guelph. Canadian Home Economics Journal, October 1972, 18-20.
- Hoyman, Howard, and Annelis S. Hoyman. Sweden's experiment in human sexuality and sex education. Journal of School Health, 1971, 41, 172-184.

- Iseman, Marjorie. Sex education. McCall's Magazine, 1968, 95, 36-37.
- Johnson, Warren. Human sexual behavior and sex education. 2nd edition. Philadelphia: Lea and Febiger, 1968.
- Juhasz, Anne. Characteristics essential to teachers in sex education. Journal of School Health, 1970, 40, 17-18.
- Keller, D. E. How and who of sex education. American Biology Teacher, 1972, 34, 285-286.
- Kerckhoff, Richard K. Family life education in America. In H. T. Christensen (Ed.), Handbook of marriage and the family. Chicago: Rand McNally and Co., 1964.
- Kerckhoff, Richard K., and Terry Hancock. The family life educator of the future. The Family Coordinator, 1971, 20, 315-325.
- Kirkendall, Lester A. Sex education as human relations. New York: Inor Publishing Co., Inc., 1950.
- Kirkendall, Lester A., and Deryck Calderwood. The family, the school, and peer groups: sources of information about sex. Journal of School Health, 1965, 35, 290-297.
- Kirkendall, Lester A., and Esther Handwerk. Preparation of teachers for marriage and family living. Marriage and Family Living, 1950, 12, 7-8.
- Laycock, S. R. Family living and sex education: a guide for parents and youth leaders. Toronto: Baxter Publishing Co., 1967.
- Luckey, Eleanore B. Family life ed and/or sex ed. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1967, 29, 377-380.
- Luckey, Eleanore B. Sex education and an in-service training program. The Family Coordinator, 1968, 17, 89-94.
- Malfetti, James L., and Arline M. Rubin. Sex education: who is teaching the teachers? Teachers College Record, 1967, 213-222.
- Manley, Helen. Sex education, where, when and how should it be taught? Journal of Health, Physical Education and Recreation, 1964, 35, 21-24.
- Manley, Helen. Starting a program of sex education. In Carlfred B. Broderick and Jessie Bernard (Eds.), Individual, sex and society. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1969.
- Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire design and attitude measurement. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966.
- Parten, Mildred. Surveys, polls and samples. New York: Harper and Bros., 1950. Chapter 4.

- Phillips, Bernard. Social research strategy and tactics. New York: Macmillan, 1966. Chapter 16.
- Recommendations for certification, competence and knowledge, from Second report of the Governor's Task Force on university and family life. In Dianne K. Kieren (Ed.), Readings on family life education in North America. Edmonton: Division of Family Studies, 1971.
- Reiss, Ira L. Sex education in the public schools: problem or solution? Phi Delta Kappan, 1968, 50, 52-56.
- Richards, Francis. Sex education in the schools: the doctors' role. Canadian Medical Association Journal, 1966, 95, 124-125.
- Richey, Herman. Growth of modern conception of in-service education. In Nelson B. Henry (Ed.), In-service education for teachers, supervisors, and administrators. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.
- Rubin, Isadore, and Lester A. Kirkendall (Eds.). Sex in adolescent years: new directions in guiding and teaching youth. New York: Association Press, 1968.
- Sacks, Sylvia R. Sex education with teenagers: approach and experience of a family life educator in a marriage council. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 1965, 27, 193-199.
- Schoel, Doris R. The school nurse: her role in sex education. Journal of School Health, 1966, 36, 7-8.
- Schulz, Esther, Deryck Calderwood, and Gilbert Shimmel. A need in sex education teacher preparation. SIECUS Newsletter, 1968, 1, 1-2.
- Schulz, Esther, and Sally Williams. Family life and sex education: curriculum and instruction. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1968.
- Seeley, Craighton. Opinions on sex education in Alberta. Unpublished M.Ed. thesis. University of Alberta, 1969.
- Simon, William, and John H. Gagnon. The pedagogy of sex. Saturday Review, 1967, 91, 74-76.
- Somerville, Rose M. Introduction to family life and sex education. New York: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1972.
- Somerville, Rose M. Family life and sex education: proposed criteria for teacher education. The Family Coordinator, 1970, 19, 183-185.
- Spitze, Hazel Taylor. Choosing techniques for teaching and learning. Washington, D.C.: Home Economics Education Association, National Education Association, 1970.

- Stokes, John H. Sex education and the schools. Journal of Social Hygiene, 1945, 31, 195.
- Szasz, George. Sex education and the teacher. Journal of School Health, 1970, 40, 150-155.
- University of Alberta. Calendar of 72/73: The University of Alberta. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press, 1972.
- University of Toronto. College of Education Calendar, 1972-1973. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972.
- Vander Werf, Lester S. How to evaluate teachers and teaching. New York: Rinehart and Co., 1958.
- Vanier Institute of the Family. Report on family life education survey. Part II. Family life education in the schools. Ottawa: Vanier Institute, 1971.
- Walsh, W. Bruce. Validity of self-report. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1967, 14, 18-23.
- Walsh, W. Bruce. Validity of self-report. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 1968, 15, 180-186.
- Wilson, Don. Report on Ontario teachers' family life education training needs. The Family Life Educator, 1972, 3, 1-2.

APPENDIX

FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION SURVEY

University of Alberta

The purpose of this study is to assess the current teacher preparation in Alberta for Family Life Educators. Your information will be valuable in the formation of guidelines for future teacher preparation in this area. All information received will be confidential.

DIRECTIONS: Please answer the following questions as fully as possible. Special directions precede some of the items. Check only the items that describe your situation.

I. FAMILY LIFE BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. How did you become involved in teaching Family Life Classes?

- ☐ 1. I offered to teach
- ☐ 2. I was invited to teach
- ☐ 3. I was pressured to teach

B. 1. Should prospective teachers wishing to become Family Life Teachers be screened?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No

2. If yes, on what basis? Please check those items which you feel apply.

- ☐ 1. Ability to communicate with young people
 - ☐ 2. Personality characteristics (such as warm, sensitive, approachable)
 - ☐ 3. Professional competence
 - ☐ 4. Other (please specify) _____
- _____
- _____

C. How do you feel a Family Life Teacher should be selected?

I. FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION BACKGROUND INFORMATION

D. DIRECTIONS: Listed are many teaching techniques used in the classroom. If you have used any of these techniques, please circle the letter in the column or columns that indicate where you received experience or training. Circle only those techniques in which you have experience or training. The columns are:

- A - Teacher preparation
- B - In-service teacher training
- C - Other experience
- D - No response

- | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| A | B | C | D | 1. Audio materials--tapes and records |
| A | B | C | D | 2. Discussion to stimulate thinking, valuing and understanding |
| A | B | C | D | 3. Discussion techniques to gather ideas such as buzz groups and brainstorming |
| A | B | C | D | 4. Dramatization such as role playing, skits and pantomimes |
| A | B | C | D | 5. Field trips |
| A | B | C | D | 6. Independent study |
| A | B | C | D | 7. Individual learning packages |
| A | B | C | D | 8. Lecture |
| A | B | C | D | 9. Observation |
| A | B | C | D | 10. Individual conferences |
| A | B | C | D | 11. Case studies |
| A | B | C | D | 12. Simulation games |
| A | B | C | D | 13. Resource people |
| A | B | C | D | 14. Visual materials--films, TV, posters, etc. |
| A | B | C | D | 15. Literature--from editorials to poetry |

E. Which five techniques (listed in the previous question) have been most valuable in teaching Family Life Classes.

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

I. FAMILY LIFE BACKGROUND INFORMATION

F. What three things should your preparation for this job have included but did not include?

1.

2.

3.

G. DIRECTIONS: Please indicate any formal preparation you have received in each of the following areas. Please circle the appropriate number using this code:

1 - Little or no preparation

2 - Fairly well prepared

3 - Well prepared

1 2 3

1. The Family: A study of the family in a variety of settings and as an institution in Canadian society.

1 2 3

2. Family Interaction: A study of family relationships during each stage of the life cycle.

1 2 3

3. Marriage Preparation: A functional course in which attitudes toward marriage and the family are explored.

1 2 3

4. Human Development from Birth to Death: Including personality theory, human needs, and influences during each stage of the life cycle.

1 2 3

5. Biological Sciences: Background on nutrition, genetics, physiology, and reproduction in man.

1 2 3

6. Human Sexuality: A study of sexual roles, needs, identities, and behaviors in personal and social functioning.

1 2 3

7. Family Resources: The use of time, energy, space, and money within the family.

1 2 3

8. Group Process: Utilizing group experiences to promote individual growth.

1 2 3

9. Using teaching methods and materials in Family Life Education which encourage communication between teacher, student and peers.

1 2 3

10. Field Experiences: Providing related family life field experiences.

1 2 3

11. Counseling: Individual and family counseling on an informal basis with the ability to recognize behaviors needing referral to professional counselors.

I. FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- G. 1 2 3 12. Research: Use of research findings to understand the family.
- 1 2 3 13. Laws: A study of laws regarding marriage and the family.
- 1 2 3 14. Community: A study of community structure and awareness of available resources.
- 1 2 3 15. Other (please specify) _____
- _____
- _____

H. 1. Please indicate your desire for further training by placing the subject area numbers in question G in the following categories:

- 1 - No further training needed
 2 - Need for some training
 3 - Need for extensive training

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

H. 2. Could you identify three items (from question G) where in-service training has been your major source of information.

a.

b.

c.

H. 3. Could you identify three items (from question G) where teacher preparation has been your major source of information. If many items apply, please indicate the most useful items.

a.

b.

c.

I. FAMILY LIFE EDUCATION BACKGROUND INFORMATION

H. 4. Please identify three experiences or techniques that you feel should be well developed in teacher training for Family Life Teachers.

- a.
- b.
- c.

I. How much time on the average do your students spend studying each of the following Family Life areas. Please refer to question G for a brief description of each area.

- ____ % 1. The Family in a Variety of Settings
- ____ % 2. Family Interaction
- ____ % 3. Marriage Preparation
- ____ % 4. Human Development
- ____ % 5. Biological Sciences: nutrition, physiology and reproduction
- ____ % 6. Human Sexuality
- ____ % 7. Family Resources
- ____ % 8. Other (please specify) _____

J. Do you feel that in your role as a Family Life Teacher, training in individual and/or group counseling techniques would be/is helpful?

- ____ 1. Yes
- ____ 2. No
- ____ 3. Possibly
- ____ 4. No comment

K. How many students have approached you individually for advice, opinions, and/or suggestions involving their school or home lives during this school term?

- ____ 1. None
- ____ 2. (State number of different students)

L. How would you perceive your counseling adequacy if a student approached you about one of these personal problems? Please respond by following this code:

- 1 - Little adequacy
- 2 - Fair degree of adequacy
- 3 - High degree of adequacy

- ____ 1. A sexually molested child (counsel with family)
- ____ 2. Death of a student's parent or parents
- ____ 3. Guilt feelings over one's sexual behavior
- ____ 4. Homosexuality
- ____ 5. Premarital pregnancy

I. FAMILY LIFE BACKGROUND INFORMATION

103

M. Can you refer difficult problems to a school counselor?

_____ 1. Yes

_____ 2. No

N. How effective do you feel in handling these issues should they arise in class? Please respond by the following code:

1 - Not very effective

2 - Moderately effective

3 - Very effective

_____ 1. Abortion

_____ 2. Contraception

_____ 3. Moral standards

_____ 4. Religious views on sex

_____ 5. Sex education

II. GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. Which of the following courses do you teach this year?

_____ 1. Christian Family Life

_____ 2. Perspectives for Living

_____ 3. Modified Perspectives Class

_____ 4. None

B. How many Family Life Teachers are there in your school (including yourself)? Please circle.

1 2 3 4

C. At what level do you teach?

_____ 1. Junior High

_____ 2. Senior High

D. Number of complete years of College or University training. (Please circle.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

E. How long has it been since you graduated from University?

_____ 1. 5 years or less

_____ 2. Over 5 years

F. What was your major specialization at University?

_____ 1. Home Economics

_____ 2. Physical Education

_____ 3. Social Studies

_____ 4. Other (please specify) _____

G. Have you taken any University courses that would aid you in teaching Family Life Classes?

_____ 1. No

_____ 2. Yes (please specify) _____

II. GENERAL BACKGROUND INFORMATION

H. Have you participated in any non-credit seminars or workshops 2-3 days in length which have helped you in teaching Family Life Education?

- ☐ 1. No
☐ 2. Yes (please specify) _____

I. Number of years of full-time teaching you have completed (including this year):

- ☐ 1. Less than 2 years
☐ 2. 2-5 years
☐ 3. 6-10 years
☐ 4. 11-15 years
☐ 5. 16 years or more

J. How long have you taught a course in Family Life Education (including this year)?

- ☐ 1. None
☐ 2. 1 year
☐ 3. 2 years
☐ 4. 3 years or more

K. Do you desire further training in Family Life areas?

- ☐ 1. Yes
☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Comments: _____

L. Sex:

- ☐ 1. Male
☐ 2. Female

M. Age:

- ☐ 1. 20-29
☐ 2. 30-39
☐ 3. 40 or over

N. Marital status:

- ☐ 1. Single
☐ 2. Married
☐ 3. Widowed
☐ 4. Divorced/Separated
☐ 5. Other

Please add any general comments you might wish to make here.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH!

If you wish a resumé of the results of this study, please return this sheet to me with your name and address.

MAIL TO: Mrs. Jacqueline Evenson
13639 - 100 Avenue
Edmonton

RESUME REQUESTED BY:

YOUR NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

**END OF
REEL**