

5-1-2014

Home Economics Programs Within Higher Education: A Typology

Sara Holtzman

Southern Illinois University Carbondale, holtzmans@siu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://opensiuc.lib.siu.edu/theses>

Recommended Citation

Holtzman, Sara, "Home Economics Programs Within Higher Education: A Typology" (2014). *Theses*. Paper 1401.

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at OpenSIUC. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses by an authorized administrator of OpenSIUC. For more information, please contact opensiuc@lib.siu.edu.

HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITHIN HIGHER EDUCATION:
A TYPOLOGY

by
Sara Holtzman
B.S. University of Wisconsin - Whitewater, 2012

A Thesis
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment for the Requirements for
Master's of Science in Education

Department of Educational Administration and Higher Education
in the Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale
May 2014

THESIS APPROVAL

HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITHIN HIGHER EDUCATION:
A TYPOLOGY

By

Sara Marie Holtzman

A Thesis Submitted in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of
Master's of Science in Education
in the field of Higher Education

Approved by:

Dr. Patrick Dilley, Chair

Dr. Saran Donahoo

Dr. Walter Wendler

Graduate School
Southern Illinois University Carbondale

March 28, 2014

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Sara Holtzman, for the Master's of Science in Education degree in Higher Education, presented on March 28, 2014, at Southern Illinois University.

TITLE: HOME ECONOMICS PROGRAMS WITHIN HIGHER EDUCATION: ATYPOLOGY

MAJOR PROFESSOR: Dr. Patrick Dilley

Home economics programs through the 1920s served varied purposes within higher education. This typology addresses three types of home economics programs – teaching, extension, and academia- through the lens of characteristics, curricula, and examples. Reviewing historical events that lead into the differentiation of home economics programs throughout the United States offers unique insights into the reasons for the development of each type. This typology offers a different point of view in considering what home economics programs entailed, and defines the field as an intentional and academic program of study for the women of higher education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CHAPTER</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
ABSTRACT.....	i
CHAPTERS	
CHAPTER 1 – Introduction.....	5
CHAPTER 2 – Literature Review	7
CHAPTER 3 – Type I: Teaching.....	12
CHAPTER 4 – Type II: Extension	25
CHAPTER 5 – Type III: Academia.....	29
CHAPTER 6 - Conclusion.....	38
REFERENCES.....	40
VITA	43

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The 1920s was an era of intense advancement through American society (Buhle, 1983). A number of key historical events brought about pieces that allowed for the development of women within both home and academic communities. Each historical event solidified and influenced America in the 1920s, as well as home economics programs. Although the establishment of home economics was earlier in America's history, the 1920s was a time of focus and movement propelled by the ending of World War I, the ratification of the Nineteenth Amendment, the passing of the Smith-Hughes Act, the progressive social movement, and the establishment of both the Women's Bureau within the Department of Labor, and the Bureau of Home Economics (Buhle, 1983). Each event advanced home economics within colleges and universities across the country.

Home economics provided the opportunity for women in the United States to satisfy various niches within society, creating three of what I deem as types of home economics programs. Institutions of higher learning presented educational opportunities for women by providing general curriculum, area specific curriculum, graduate study opportunities, or a mixture of all three. Offering curriculum in various forms allowed each institution to provide different outputs of educated women, some teachers, some educators working with extension programs, and some academically prepared to join the workforce. Each focus - teaching, extension, and academia - functioned with different curriculum, career opportunities, and institutions. In this paper I identify each type of home economics program and within each of the three types establishes the characteristics, examples, and curricula involved. In a focused dissection of home economics in higher education between 1920 and 1926, incorporating the

historical context in which the division of education formed, I present the origins of what is known today as “family and consumer sciences”.

CHAPTER 2

LITERITURE REVIEW- FOUNDATIONS OF HOME ECONOMICS

September 19, 1899, was the date of the creation of home economics at the Lake Placid Conference in Morningside, New York (American Home Economics Association, 1901). Within this conference, affluent members of the time had come together to “[take] united action on the part of those most interested in home science, or household economics” (American Home Economics Association, 1901, p. 3). Attendees of the meeting were each trustees of the Lake Placid Club and began home economics movements by “sending out invitations to a conference on this important sociologic problem to be held at their clubhouse September 19 to 25” (American Home Economics Association, 1901, p. 3). As outlined in the Lake Placid Conference Proceedings, published in 1901 by the American Home Economics Association, the recipients of these invitations included:

Mrs. Mary Hinman Abel, Professor W. O. Atwater, Mrs. Helen Campbell, Miss E. O. Conro, Mrs. Emma P. Ewing, Miss A. M. Homans, Mrs. Mary Morton Kehew, Miss Helen Kinne, Miss Marion Talbot, and Mr. Melvil Dewey.

The range of backgrounds of individuals in attendance spoke to the diverse group willing to discuss matters of women’s education in the form of home economics. Both married and unmarried women, in addition to a man passionate about the subject, brought various perspectives to a range of ideas discussed in the proceedings. Dewey maintained strong ties to the University of the State of New York, in which his involvement in home economics was relevant to women’s education. Dewey believed that “there is no more important question before the American people than home science” (American Home Economics Association, 1901, p. 4). His stance aligned fairly closely with the goal of the conference and this initial home

economics foundation, to bring about social change and understanding of home economics through the pre-existing organizations (American Home Economics Association, 1901).

The conference attendees established the goals and initial development of home economics necessary to continue the development of the field. The goals outlined in the conference lead to the 1902 definition of home economics. Vincenti's (1977) chronology of the development of home economics identifies the definition of home economics as:

Home Economics in its most comprehensive sense is a study of the laws, conditions, principles, and ideals which are concerned on the hand with man's immediate physical environment and on the other with his nature as a social being, and is the study specially of the relation between these two factors. (p. 322)

The definition itself aided the development of the academic field as other pre-existing organizations allowed for the introduction of women's education some 20 years later (Vincenti, 1997).

Not until the 1920s did major changes began to occur in the field. In 1920, the American Association of Land-Grant Colleges added a department of home economics, a large shift in the definition and goals of home economics began from housework to benefitting the home and family, and parent education classes for both men and women were added to home economics education (Vicenti, 1997). By 1924, the American Home Economics Association creates a Home Economics and Business focus, blending the gap between consumers and producers, and the active support for the parent education movement in home economics (Grant, 1997). It was not until 1925 that lobbyists successfully pushed the Land-Grant College Association to recognize home economics curriculum; in 1926, food corporations began employing home economists to create newspaper and journal submissions, and the American Drug Association

required all new dietitians to complete a four-year degree with a focus of foods and nutrition (Tomes, 1997). Each of these events marked rather significant points in the establishment of home economics in the 1920s, and each influenced the way home economics was presented in terms of higher education.

Outside of the early to mid-1920s there were two major events that helped shape home economics education. In 1914, the Smith-Lever Act was passed, followed in 1917 by the Smith-Hughes Act was passed. The Smith-Lever Act was extremely significant legislation that created the Agriculture Extension Service, and therefore, jobs for women in home economics programs, as well as opportunities for women in rural communities to participate in home economics education within their homes (Vincenti, 1997). Extension services became a huge part of home economics education and thus, forced what I see as the third type of home economics in higher education. The goals, curriculum, places of learning and jobs pertaining to extension services varied greatly, and receives significant attention in the Extension section.

The Smith-Hughes Act of 1917 established the federal support vocational education. Although members of home economics departments did not have much of any say in the acts drafting and passing, this change in funding expanded the possibilities of home economics within the United States. The Act began when Congress assembled a committee to inspect the current value of vocational training, which included two women, Agnes Nestor and Florence Marshall. Ironically, Nestor and Marshall fought against the inclusion of home economics, as they did not want to pigeonhole opportunities available to young women. Instead of pushing for home economics, Nestor and Marshall fought for education for wage labor that would ultimately prepare women for paid employment (Apple, 1997). On the other side of the argument were Senator Carroll Page, Senator Hoke Smith and Congressman Dudley Mays Hughes, all

supporting rural communities, who had witnessed the need for home economics education in Land-Grant Colleges and for the education of rural women. They argued for the inclusion of home economics in the curriculum of Land-Grant institutions (Apple, 1997). The result of the feud was a compromise in which home economics education for girls received funding as well as the training of teachers of home economics as well as agriculture.

The Smith-Hughes Act cemented the vocational training of home economics majors in terms of cooks, housemaids, dietitians, institutional managers, and household decorators, in addition to high school educators and administrators (Apple, 1997). The Smith-Hughes Act led to the growth of home economics programs on college campuses, but the growth was focused and started to work against the goals of home economics. Nestor and Marshall worried that men would simply push women into home economics and unfortunately this rang true. Women interested in scientific research were pushed into home economics; which offered a less prestigious careers (Apple, 1997). This is the foundation of yet another branch of home economics: academia. Home economics programs began to focus more on teacher training and administrative roles, while some institutions remained heavy in the use of scientific research education (Weigley, 1974). Some institutions attempted to continue on with both, and others offered very little in terms of home economics.

This breakdown began the specialization of various home economics departments across the country in the early 1920s, and solidifies the breakdown of the three types of home economics program. The challenge to claim three types, of home economics programs is that more often than not the scientific research portion of home economics education prepared students for both a specific job market, along with qualifying them to teach home economics subjects (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). The easiest way to rationalize this murky

division is to apply today's doctorate programs to home economics of the 1920s. Today, specializations in each area of graduate study exist for those seeking a doctorate degree, but there are also advanced degrees in education. Once one has obtained a specific education in the form of a terminal degree, he/she is eligible and deemed qualified to teach, to seek employment relevant to their specific degree, or one could acquire a degree in teaching to simply teach.

CHAPTER 3

TYPE I: TEACHING

Characteristics

After the establishment of the Smith-Hughes Act teaching became the focus of many home economics programs, especially those within Land-Grant Colleges (John, 1925). The newly recognized home economics programs for students in elementary and high schools required teachers to fill the classrooms, and home economics programs were available to respond quickly and effectively. A 1924 study by the Bureau of Vocational Information reported that the teaching profession provided the bulk of the graduates from home economics departments. In 1924, 1,200 women were teachers in home economics at colleges and universities, 400 in normal schools, and 5,000 in public high schools or vocational schools (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). Public high schools and vocational schools held just over four times more home economics teachers than colleges and universities, those women destined to teach the teachers.

All women entering home economics programs were encouraged to find the value in a generalized home economics degree (Weigley, 1974). Stepping away from any specialization was thought to strengthening the shift away from women gaining skills and techniques in the field, focusing more on the needs of real life (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924, p. 364). This new focus encompassed interests in public health, living conditions, social aspects of the home, and the economics of purchasing. Parents and women studying home economics urged for curriculum to be established involving child welfare. This push was yet another way in which the programs became less centered on science and research, and focused on the roles of motherhood and parenting (Grant, 1997).

Curricula

The standard curriculum for home economics included four main foci. The first focus included food preparation, planning, and nutrition. The second was the study and design of textiles, including dressmaking, sewing, and millinery; the third was household management: planning, furnishing, and upkeep of the home. The final focus, general home economics, was comprised of education courses and pedagogy. After building a solid foundation in the basic home economics curriculum, it was then appropriate for the program to start building specializations (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). An example of specification as cited in the 1924 Bureau of Vocational Information report explained:

When the general course is strongly developed, specialization is possible. A major in foods may emphasize food preparations, planning, and choice, or nutrition in its physiological aspects; the later inevitably requires, as a basis for progress, specialization beyond the four-year course. (p. 324)

Similar to the development of the food program, the specialization focused in pedagogy also had unique requirements. Some schools further developed the home economics teacher's education added elements of educational theory and methods to their course load (Bevier, 1928).

The idea of developing teacher education rooted in science was not novel to that of home economics departments. Early normal schools and state teachers' colleges after the Civil War were set on grounding teaching in science (Thelin, 2004). One of the largest private normal schools was Alfred Holbrook's National Normal University, an institution focused on the preparation of future teachers that "took great interest in curricular development and pedagogy as a science" (Thelin, 2004, p. 84). Both men and women founded normal schools and state

teacher's colleges. Some institutions were coeducational, but each focused on the development of pedagogy, which home economics borrowed to strengthen their curriculum (Bevier, 1928).

Although various institutions were developing within different areas of the country the Midwest was one area in which a specific set of curriculum for teachers and housewives was defined. From the early 1830s through the 1850s, no standard curriculum for home economics instructors existed; teachers were simply without training, creating a shortage of quality programs (Fritschner, 1977). The common thought process was simply that there was:

No such profession as that of a female teacher. The whole business is conducted by raw apprentices, in place of experienced workman – young girls just grown up – who adopt it for some temporary purpose. (Fritschner, 1977, p. 211)

The need for better vocational training was eminent, and the need for teachers to teach that training was great. The situation became so dire that the Commission on National Aid to Vocational Education granted grants to almost all forms of vocational education. Unfortunately, home economics was still not valued as a vocational education “as the program did not make a positive contribution to economics growth” (Fritscher, 1977, p. 211). The introduction of larger household machines and the rigorous educations needed to operate such machines did build the need for home economics and offered a reason for effective teachers in the field. At the same time young women became more apt to take jobs out of the home, there was a greater push for home economics classes; teachers keeping young women near the hearth and within happy and well maintained homes (Weigley, 1974). Catharine Beecher wrote that, “as a general rule every time a women would prefer to be a wife, mother, and housekeeper, could her ideal be fully met”, implying that only women serving as homemakers could fulfill their life's purpose (Weigley, 1974, p. 81).

From 1870 to 1920, the percentage of women employed in a nonagricultural position doubled from 6.4% to 13.3%, of which teaching was the greatest contributor to the increase. In 1920, 8.7% of women employed, and of them 652,500, were in fact teachers, a substantial increase from 1870 when only 5.8% of women employed were identified as teachers (Fritscher, 1977). Each region of the country - the Northeast, South, and West - created their own way of training of teachers, and each region met with various and differing challenges in the process (Fritscher, 1977).

In the early 1900s, the Northeast region of the United States, wealthier families rarely had the need for such an education that collegiate home economics teaching would provide. Houses employed servants to fulfill every household need while the young ladies completed other more “feminine” tasks (Fritscher, 1977). Following the more restrictive laws of immigration and the slow interest that young women had in clerical position, the pool to choose from for good servants decreased sharply (Fritscher, 1977). Young women were increasingly finding their way into the job market and away from servitude through the 1920s, and with that, these women began to refuse to take positions of lesser status. In comparing the employment statistics for young women in 1900, 1910, and 1920, the numbers are not very surprising. In 1900, most women (over 305,000) were servants, followed by teaching (over 207,000). The 1910 numbers are similar, although the gap between teachers and servant was closing: there were 310,474 servants and 306,920 teachers. In 1920, 238,357 women were employed as servants; 262,600 women were clerks; 302,108 were stenographers and typists; 425,983 women were identified as teachers; 284,836 women were saleswomen; and finally, 194,001 women were identified as being bookkeepers, cashiers, or accountants (Fritscher, 1977, p. 216). Almost half a million

women in the northeastern United States were teaching by 1920, significantly more than the number of women employed in other professions.

In an effort to bring young women back into service positions, cooking schools developed in the Northeast. These cooking schools offered a similar foundation to home economics programs, but focused on a different set of needs (Weigley, 1974). Weigley claims that, “in the East, urban cooking schools sprang up to parallel the home economics work of the land grant colleges in the West and Midwest” (1974, p. 80). The founders of the cooking schools wanted to spread the instruction for young women in terms of cleanliness, wholesome surroundings, and nutritious meals. The reality was that “slum existence of the immigrants and the poor would be intolerable” (Fritscher, 1977, p. 217). In an attempt to preserve the quality of life for the wealthy, various pamphlets were sent from the cooking schools to women in areas of lower socioeconomic status, most featuring ways and dress of how to feed, cloth, and care for their families for fewer than 15 cents per day (Fritscher, 1977). Ideally, the cooking schools looked to produce a better class of servants in terms of cooking, and to provide better head cooks in larger establishments. After building the cooking schools and opening the doors to more than women aspiring to be servants, the schools began producing teachers to supply the cooking element in other public schools.

The Midwest did not face the same challenges in developing home economics among their institutions of higher learning. The communities were far more rural and most inhabitants maintained strong ties to farming and agriculture. Unfortunately, the Midwest was facing a rapid decline in terms of the supply of white women despite the influx of immigrants in the rural areas. A great debate about supporting the agricultural education, as well as home economics education for women ensued. Those in favor of rural education were those white males with

which an innate sense of superiority for farming was born (Apple, 1977). Females were enrolled to ensure that farmers' wives would be effectively trained and remain in their rural communities. Other groups, such as the Farmer's Institute, discovered that untrained farmers began ruining the soil for crops, and something had to be done to correct the unskilled labor (Fritscher, 1977). The solution to the issue was home economics, and the Farmer's Institute began advocating for the movement of education in both agricultural arts and home economics (Fritscher, 1977).

Despite this call for education for both men and women, coeducation was already progressing in the United States. In 1872, "there were already 97 major coeducational colleges and universities in the United States" (Rudolph, 1962, p. 322). Of the 97 coeducational institutions, 67 of them were located in the Midwest, 17 in the South, and 13 in the Northeast; and by 1900, 71% of all American institutions were coeducational (Rudolph, 1962). More women were graduating from high school, and number of women enrolled in higher learning continued to increase dramatically (Rudolph, 1962, p. 324). It was this increase in women's enrollment and coeducational institutions that suggested that liberal arts programs were inherently feminine, contributing to the gendernization of education (Rudolph, 1962). Home economics was a program in which the feminine ideal was carried out and the separate spheres of education in coeducational institutions remained (Rury, 1984).

The first offering of home economics was within the Midwest at either Kansas Agricultural College or Iowa State College, the records are unclear as to which institution was actually first. The Midwest was targeted because the rural community had been identified as those in the United States as those needing the most practical and progressive knowledge in their economics environment (Fritscher, 1977). Various inner city issues- such as labor strikes, social

unrest and violence- somewhat undermined rural communities, and it was thought that the education of rural folks would allow for the troubles in the city to be solved quickly (Fritscher, 1977). The assumption was that in educating these “rough” rural community members educators would have the power to “soften, refine, and humanize rude girls and boys to lead them to respect others, and to bring out those qualities which will lead them in turn to be respected” (Fritscher, 1977, p. 221). Education was thought to make life more livable and therefore keep members of the rural communities outside of the large cities and safely within their farms.

John Anderson, President of Kansas State Agricultural College, was the first president of a land-grant institution, in 1874, to explain that he felt that women had the right to be educated as women. The boundaries between men’s work and women’s work were bold, but allowed a woman to explore education in her own sphere. Interestingly enough, the curriculum that both President Anderson of Kansas State and President Welch of Iowa State had in mind was the similar to that of the founders of the seven sister colleges, specifically the work of Mary Lyon at Mount Holyoke (Fritscher, 1977). The education was to provide the purest of women’s arts, the ability to make a home, and finally address all of the poor moral behaviors that were thought to be slowly dissolving the moral fiber of society and marriages. Anderson made it clear that in home economics education, there was not to be a relationship between higher education and the progressive emancipation of women (Fritscher, 1977, p. 222). Women were barred from other forms of study and remained separated from male students both intellectually as well as socially.

The primary reason for these ladies’ courses was indeed to prepare women for the home, but the general curriculum offers served as a foundation for creating more teachers of home economics. The initial design of the courses was founded on the northeastern cooking schools,

and on the Holyoke Plan, Mary Lyon's seminary type education (Fritschner, 1977). Mary Lyon maintained distinctly domestic views as to what educating young women should actually encompass at Mount Holyoke. Not only did she model her seminary after that of a mental institution, she thought that the women she served should not associate with one another. She controlled rigorous relationships and gave each resident amply space while living in an apartment under the stairs to signify her spinster status. Lyon also maintained particular relationships with her student in an effort to act as a motherly figure, to replace the need for parental guidance lost from home (Horowitz, 1984).

The initial classes offered at both Kansas State Agricultural College and Iowa State College were taught by Welch's wife, Mary B. Welch. Mary Welch did not have any teaching credentials, but was selected due to the cleanliness and propriety of her household. The chairmen of the board of trustees requested, "If you will tell these girls how to keep house as you keep it, Mrs. Welch, it will be all we will ask of you" (Fritschner, 1997, p. 223). Due to the lack of preparation beyond maintaining the ability to keep her house clean, Welch searched elsewhere for instruction on education. Welch utilized the cooking school textbook as a curricular guide and later, attended both Maria Parloa's Boston Cooking School and the National Training School for Cookery. As Welch's own education continued, her student's education expanded and they taught more young women the ways of pedagogy (Fritschner, 1997).

The cookery class at Iowa State began with 12 lessons (Fritschner, 1997). The first focusing on yeast and bakery women learned how to make biscuits, rolls, milk, breakfast twists, prepare yeast, and gold and silver cake. The second lesson included bread, baked macaroni and Swiss pudding. The third lesson focused on boiled eggs, omelets, and apple tarts. The fourth lesson was chicken curry, ragout beef, broiled steak, and Cassel pudding. Fancy food

preparation was the final lesson, which included fried oysters, oyster soup, escalloped oysters, and coffee. In addition to the cookery class, junior girl home economics participants studied house furnishing, care of the sick, management help, care of the children, and finally, dress (Fritschner, 1977, 223). The sophomore girls learned how to wash, iron, the basics of sewing, how to use sewing machines, and dress making. The struggle was in maintaining interest in courses for sewing and cleaning because most young woman wanted to focus on cooking. Welch dispensed with the sewing and cleaning courses, added more in-depth cooking courses in addition to housekeeping, hygiene, good breeding, and how to make a home beautiful as well as clean (Fritschner, 1977).

In addition to the courses surrounding the upkeep of the home, young women were expected to complete classical and practical classes. Music, elocution, drawing, English, literature, history, and mathematics were often focused on in women's education. Although these courses did align with that of what men at the institution were studying, there was still the segregation that kept both men and women very far apart from one another in term of education. The differentiation between the eastern schools and the Midwestern education for women was the inclusion of what is known as the Woman's Course (Fritschner, 1977). This course speaks to the reality that young women in the Midwest will be getting married, and they will face harsh realities. Their husbands will come home dirty and need fixing, the children will get sick, and clothes will need mending, meals must be prepared effectively and there will be not rest.

Part of the course, in preparation for the hard life in front of them, was a time in which women had to commit to working in a dining room, pantry, or kitchen. This was directly borrowed from the traditions of Vassar College, who implemented the practice because the young women at Vassar were not exercising enough movement in their daily lives and good help

was simply hard to find (Horowitz, 1984). The situation was similar for Kansas State and Iowa State: costs were kept low and the practical experience for real life was undeniable. The reality was that although these courses of study were in place to prepare the young women enrolled in them for the home life the education was similar to that of those expecting to continue of and become part of the extension programs or teachers. The baseline for educators was incredibly low, as demonstrated in the selection of Mrs. Welch. It was not until late that the government intervened with restriction on the development of teacher and the need for continued education within home economics before one was able to teach (Fritschner, 1977).

Home economics education in the South was also unique. Individuals in the southern United States disliked the idea of women's education, especially the liberal education of women in the North. Southerners chose to:

Fight fire with fire, thinking that it was better to build a women's college close to home that inculcated traditional religious and region values than to risk having young Southern women attend a renegade Northern college. (Thelin, 2004, p. 84)

The University of Kentucky and the University of Tennessee were the first institutions to work home economics curriculum into their educational plans (Fritschner, 1977). Students could choose from either a two-year or a four-year path in home economics, both focusing on food, handwork, nursing, laundry, and textiles (Fritschner, 1977, p. 227). The departmental goals of each institution were to keep women in the home, train women to maintain a home if servants were not an option, and to provide female students with access to teachers with scientific background from full four-year coursework (Fritschner, 1997). Matters of race complicated home economics in the South: it was initially deemed unsuitable for white women to complicate their lives with such work for slaves and servants. It was not until the focus of home economics

was put on producing “intelligent cooks” and “white women’s specialties” that home economics grew in popularity (Fritschner, 1977, p. 228).

The “white women’s specialties” of the South included the focus of expanding and validating teacher education. It was not until 1910 that home economics instructors were expected to have a more thorough knowledge of their subjects of study, this changing the expectation of educators from something all young women could do, to a more specialized staff. Teacher training was the basic four-year plan, with the addition of a science based focus, or specialty, or even continued education in the form of a Master’s degree. The designated “black land-grant colleges” offered serving, housekeeping, and basic cooking classes, suggesting only aspirations to be a servant, housekeeper, or a cook (Fritschner, 1997). This racial divide in terms of education prepared women for the roles that society had already prepared for them, a strict gender and socioeconomic stratified job. The focus was on those with opportunity to become instructors, but it is necessary to recognize that not all individuals were privileged enough to gather the basic credential for such a profession, especially as the expectation was raised in terms of continuing teacher education for college level women.

Examples

Various institutions were identified as institutions to prepare young women for educating others in home economics. I have identified a couple of examples of each institution stand out due to their variations in course offerings and educational expenses for young women and their families. Both the University of California-Berkeley and The University of Chicago offered more developed teacher education programs, complete with master level courses and specializations (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924).

The University of California-Berkeley offered specializations, as well as teaching courses for home economics. The specializations are those further programs of study specific to one area of home economics; please see type III, academia for more details. The College of Letters and Science as well as the School of Education harbored Berkeley's home economics department (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). Some of the specializations were rooted in science, but the pedagogy classes rested in education, and therefore, both areas offered home economics courses (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). The program was open to all high school graduates; four-year education was free for California residents. Women not having a high school degree were subject to examination prior to admittance, and non-residents were expected to pay \$150 with an additional \$50 fee to attain one's masters in 1924 (Bureau of Vocational Information, p. 366). Related majors offered at UC Berkeley included: household science, general household art, costume design, interior decoration, general decorative design, and textiles. The course catalog listed courses for prospective teachers, summer courses, and graduate courses in costume design, interior decoration, and nutrition and metabolism. The opportunity to take graduate level courses allowed women to move on in their specialization or teach at the higher education level (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924).

The University of Chicago was focused in the education of future home economics instructors (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). The School of Education and the Department of Household Administration housed the home economics department. Admission to the program was by either high school certificate or a thorough review. The aim of this program was to successfully train home economics teachers for elementary, secondary, and vocational schools (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). The training of heads of departments and instructors in addition to state supervisors, extension workers, and directors of

college dormitories was also focused on through the University of Chicago program. Tuition for four years was \$180, and a Master of the Arts in home economics would cost a graduate \$600 to complete (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924, p. 367). Today, the \$180 price tag for education would be roughly \$1,785.00, and the \$600 graduate school fee would be equivalent to \$8,238.00 (calculated using a 1,273% inflation rate <http://www.dollartimes.com>). Prestige came with a price tag for these young women, but the ability to teach across various levels was something of great interest to most of these women.

CHAPTER 4

TYPE II: EXTENSION

Characteristics

Extension services included a large number of careers for women enrolled in home economics programs. Not only was the criteria for one to become involved in the extension programs very different from other home economics, but the type of institution and the communities potential positions are located in are also very different than the teaching and academic branches of home economics. Two government initiatives began the extension programs across the United States, both within the Progressive Era (Babbit, 1997). President Theodore Roosevelt's Commission on Country Life illuminated the issues of rural communities, along with the survey by the United States Department of Agriculture in 1913, not only described the unfavorable living conditions of women in rural communities but also called for teachers to travel to these areas to educate these women (Babbitt, 1997). It was the result of the survey that brought "traveling teachers" into rural areas and then connected with Agricultural Colleges forming what is known today as extension programs (Babbitt, 1997). The various legislation pieces that came into history in 1918, such as the Smith-Hughes and Smith-Lever acts, influenced the possibilities for women in higher education across the country.

The Smith-Lever Act was one that granted the opportunity for extension programs to be put into place at land-grant institutions. The Act, according to the Bureau of Vocational Information, (1924) stated:

In all states with head-quarters in the state school of agriculture and agricultural experiment station, with which the state department of agriculture and the local farm bureau cooperate in strengthening extension work, the aim of the extension service is to

distribute instruction and information in regard to home economics and agriculture to the entire rural population. (p. 567)

The reality of the creation of extension programs is that they were almost a tag along benefit for women after the need for rural men to become educated in terms of agriculture was established. This pairing of agriculture and home economics breed what had been referred to as rural sociology of the 1920s. Home economics was used in such a way that a greater benefit of society was developed as rural sociology spread (Kline, 1977).

Curricula

The land-grant institutions in which the rural sociology programs were established provided an excellent environment for women to connect with the rural populations that they would be serving as members of the extension service (Babbit, 1997). Some of the positions held by women after graduating from these land-grant institutions included leaders of junior extension, home demonstration work, and girls' clubs, or specialists in nutrition, child feeding and care, health work, textiles, clothing, home furnishing, and home management (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). To fulfill such diverse jobs the graduate needed a rather broad education, encompassing most of what their counterparts in academia and other teachers would consider baseline material.

Extension programs were opportunities in which women in rural communities gain access to home economics education through various forms of education. Classes and instructors stemming from land-grant institutions spread the good word of home economics and through basic sanitation, cooking, sewing, and sanitation to women in rural communities, as their husbands and counterparts attended the institutions for an education based in agriculture.

Legislation provided home economics instructions with the tools to implore various methods of education (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924).

Women also used extensive methods for their various positions within the extension program. Demonstrations, lectures, printed materials and personal conferences were each identified and valued as techniques to connect with and educate women within rural communities (Bible, 1963). One of the major issues that had been addressed was the need for young women working in the extension programs to constantly sharpen their skills to ensure they are providing the most accurate information to other women. The process of extension produced two trends: individuals participating began relying on centralized and uniform information and personal loyalties, which weakened the community and family ties that were once part of the rural community. Both trends make sense as the information now being brought to young woman may have been contradictory to the practices of the home with which had been most familiar and unchecked (Bible, 1963).

Examples

The College of Home Economics at Cornell University was a program was a major contributor to the Cooperative Extension Services of New York. Many graduates of Cornell were capable of serving as social workers in addition to extension workers, making them valuable assets as women set out to act as “traveling teachers” (Babbitt, 1997). Flora Rose, director of the College of Home Economics at Cornell, worked with closely with extension. Rose sent extension workers to educate the public in rural communities of the most nutritious foods available. She continued to do this and add in other extension services, for example, germ warfare, and child rearing throughout the Great Depression. One report of the extension services offered in New York acknowledged the vital role of extension in teaching the public

about gardening, preparing fresh vegetables, and using the least resources possible (Babbitt, 1997). Some extension programs began to form with whatever funding could be gathered from private and government agencies (Babbitt, 1997). Despite all of the work that Rose and other home economists devoted to the extension services, the funding was too daunting, and needs far too great (Babbitt, 1997).

CHAPTER 5

TYPE III: ACADEMIA

Characteristics

An argument can be made for the continued education required of women to become teachers, especially those for college women to be bound in one category with all of academia. The intention of separating the two was to focus on the diverse options in terms of what women in higher education could achieve after graduating with specific courses of studies in home economics. Each specialization includes specific offerings, of which I have identified five: nutrition and food preparation, textiles, institutional management, childcare, and family consumption/home economics. The coursework and occupational opportunities after the completion of the degree were far more than simply educating other women, although contemporary society might not remember just how much women were actually allowed to accomplish outside of the home. Most professions stemmed from the specializations are very gendered, but it is better than the promise of simply devoting ones life to motherhood, or working in a seminary.

Most colleges and universities offered more than general home economics courses and therefore fall into programs, which provide the specificity and focused programs needed to push home economics into the academic sphere. Specific job opportunities and some graduate level programs of study separated these programs from those of normal schools or those insertions simply offering general home economics courses.

Making home economics academic. The focus of most of the specialties is not the elements of the home, but the scientific training strung throughout the curriculum. In an effort to recognize the academic nature of home economics early members of the Lake Placid

Conference, Melvil and Annie Godfrey Dewey, sought to solidify home economics place among the other subject matters within the Dewey Decimal Classification (Fields & Connell, 2004).

The purposes of home economics that this desire was founded on were those that had been initiated by early founder of home economics. The first purpose of home economics was the study of laws, conditions, principles and ideals regarding the understanding of man's physical needs and the understanding of man's social needs and the relationship between those factors. The second purpose that justified the inclusion of home economic in the Dewey Decimal Classification was the idea that home economics is an empirical science focusing upon the practical problems of house work and cooking (Fields & Connell, 2004).

The challenge in confirming such a grand entrance into academic standing within the Dewey Decimal Classification was in deciding how to classify home economics, if at all (Fields & Connell, 2004). The specializations, of home economics in which the overarching scientific foundations and regard for research were deemed far superior to and not to be classified with such common forms of the household arts. An argument suggested placing home economics within two sections of the classification system: sociology and economics, and throughout the years various changes in location, divisions, and direction arose regarding home economics' inclusion in the Dewey Decimal Classification (Fields & Connell, 2004). Each redefined home economics and reflected the various name changes of the program of study, but each reaffirmed the fact that home economics was indeed part of the larger academic conversation.

Curricula

Academia is an area in which the curriculum of home economics programs is broken down within the specific specializations (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). Each specialization demanded unique classes, ensuring that each served as defined programs of study

(Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). The following section offers insight into the opportunities available for women who had sought out degrees in one of the five specializations as well as the educational material each program demanded (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924).

Nutrition and food preparation. Nutrition and food preparation was a specialty valued only by some practicing women in home economics. Although nutrition was necessary early on in the 1920s for promoting a healthier society, some reduced the focus area to simply cooking and failed to recognize any social mobility that the profession may have offered (Rury, 1984). Some of the courses that nutrition programs focused on in addition to the general home economics sources were food preparation, planning menus, nutrition in physiological aspects of food, and cooking classes (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924).

There were various employment opportunities offered once one attained the nutrition and food preparation focus. Becoming a dietitian, a food inspector in an industry, dealer, or government department, or a demonstrator of food preparation techniques and tools were each a possibility for women with degrees in the nutrition and food prep specialization (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). Women also found employment working within home economics laboratories where research based on health and diet was a focus. Household equipment and the continued inspection of economic uses of food were huge opportunities for the employment of women outside the home (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). As time progressed, the ability to perform research was limited to women who had sought out graduate training in chemistry. Laboratories in special research organizations, food industries, and advertising industries each served as areas for women in home economics to conduct research in terms of food preparation and nutrition (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924).

Should a student have sought out additional experience within business education, another world of careers opened up for women in home economics. The possibility of directing food service in a hotel, restaurant, cafeteria, or within a tearoom became available. Dietitians trained in home economics worked closely with nurses within hospitals, emphasizing their ability to serve as nutritional coaches and educators (Nyhart, 1997).

Textiles. Textile and hygiene and art of clothing are were also a focus brought under speculation by some women in education. There were apparent restrictions as to how far an education in textiles would take a young woman in terms of career possibilities. Typically, individuals in these positions were restricted to large cities as most of the facilities needed were depended on populated areas (Rury, 1984). This did not leave many opportunities available for women in rural communities, and once again, the social mobility piece was difficult to recognize and consequently support. The price of the education was simply too much for many women to justify, given the benefits of working within the field (Rury, 1984). Some of the classes included in a specific textile focus were sewing and design, scientific study of textiles: structure, manufacture, and use, and methods of dyeing and testing fabrics. Classes in sanitation with relation to textiles required engineering training and sometimes training within interior design (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924).

In terms of positions available most of the opportunities for women with an education in textiles laid in research. The factors that establish clothing costs, materials, dyeing, and makeup of fabric were each important to society as new products and fashion were established (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). Research opportunities presented themselves within laboratories at universities, laboratories of trade associations, and laboratories associated with plants used for manufacturing fabrics, dyes, or reagents. With more advanced training and skill, women

sometimes received promotions to designers of textiles or costumes, and gained the ability operate their own dressmaking establishments.

Both sewing and cooking were looked upon as positions in which women could fill, while men were taught their elements of “manual education” (Rury, 1984). As I pointed out earlier, elements of liberal arts education allowed for a gendered understanding of education to develop. There were masculine manual courses (such as agriculture, soils, and farms), and feminine manual courses, (such as textiles), in which labor was the focus. Society did not view seamstresses and cooks as maintain very prestigious jobs, but more like how parents allow their children to bang on random pieces of metal with plastic toys while they complete the true task at hand. There was no recognition of social mobility through women’s education in both sewing and cooking, and therefore, these special areas of study received little appreciation from women of the times (Rury, 1984). Training in areas generally prepared women to be domesticated servant and cooks (Rury, 1984).

Institutional management. Institutional management was an area that served as a hybrid between teaching and vocational education. In the managerial focus, young women learned how to instruct young men in jobs and tasks for vocational training. These women were at the forefront of challenging gender roles, but safely nestled in with teachers as not to blemish their femininity. Women frequently trained men in areas of manual education for their specific and gendered work thought to be too difficult for women to complete. This training led to the industrial growth that Americans saw, and was accredited as being progressive and providing ample social mobility.

The vocational side of the institutional management piece was not only to teach young men how to complete their future jobs, but also provided women with very specialized training.

Institutional management included business training in the form of practical fieldwork that allowed women to grow in terms of their abilities and equality. The Bureau of Vocational Research (1924) recognized this focus as simply too broad to attempt to cover, for “household and institutional management is a large and growing field which offers a considerable variety of occupation and opportunity and which increasingly demands specialized training” (p. 362).

Childcare. Childcare was not a focus included in the initial plans for home economics (American Home Economics Association, 1901). It was not until Iowa State College of Home Economics collaborated with agriculture to make a strong case for the inclusion of childcare within home economics that this focus area received consideration (Grant, 1997). Iowa State proposed was the idea that if home economics were to maintain any sort of pace with the development of agriculture, the benefits that program provides childcare and well being must be a topic of discussion for both men and women in families. The belief held by supporters of the childcare curriculum would push home economics forward in terms of becoming recognized within academia and piece back together the moral fiber of the country was enough for home economists to successfully establish the focus in 1925 (Grant, 1997).

Subject matter for childcare included the study of both physical and psychological care of children, bordering on psychology and education. Social organizations devoted to child health and welfare, and various journals began to come into play as the focus began to develop in both home economics and kindergarten training schools. Positions available for women studying childcare were centered around education and facilitating parental classes and demonstrations through various extension programs (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924).

Family Consumption and Home Economics. The family consumption and home economics course work offer yet another varied group of professions for women. As other

professions created a serious change in the family structure and pulled women to work outside of the home, a large concern for the social status of American society developed. This family consumption focus allowed for the home to yet again rise to the forefront of academia (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924). In 1924, America had some 20,700,000 housewives, making the profession of homemaker one of the top areas of employment (Bureau of Vocational Information). Women as homemakers “were to develop both the skill and character in future generations necessary for continued social and economics development” (Rury, 1984, p. 26). General course preparing for extension services, and those focused on educational methods and theory, including research, were those that a focus in family consumption and home economics would provide in addition to the general home economics curriculum (Bureau of Vocational Information, 1924).

Work-related opportunities (outside of those in extension and teaching) ranged across a broad spectrum of opportunities beyond becoming a housewife. Women in this area were qualified to serve as budget officers for department stores and in banks, act as copywriters for advertising agencies, heads of home economics departments, dietitians, and demonstrators for various household products. The industries and locations that employed women changed over the years, but included charity organizations, nutritional clinics, and other specialty agencies that employed women (Babbitt, 1997). On occasion, elements of social work and journalism were worked into the curriculum, allowing women to also branch out into those fields; some of those fields included social workers, factory inspectors, managers of large schools and orphanages, marketing agents, and journalists (Babbitt, 1997).

Examples

In addition to the efforts of establishing home economics in the Dewey Decimal Classification, home economics programs struggled with women remaining in control of their educational sphere, and the restructuring of programs. For example, Berkeley continued to struggle through a restructuring of the department (Nerad, 1999). Berkeley scorned the validity of the program by simply moving the educational components of home economics to the Davis and Santa Barbra campuses of northern California. The program suffered a major setback after losing some of their more prestigious faculty members who had been in charge of establishing the curriculum of the courses in the 1950s (Nerad, 1999). Without these strong female faculty members, the curriculum went into the hands of the now male administrators.

In response to the desertion, it fell to Chancellor Clark Kerr to restore confidence in the remaining faculty and secure Berkeley's title as one of the top institutions in the United States (Nerad, 1999). In attempting to solidify Berkeley's place as one of the top institutions, Chancellor Kerr required every department to produce an expectation plan outlining both five and ten-year projections. These plans served as Kerr's model for building distinguished programs at Berkeley (Nerad, 1999). Unfortunately for the home economics department at Berkeley, Chancellor Kerr, the Committee on Educational Policy, the Academic Senate Budget Committee, the Committee on Courses, and the Chancellor's Academic Advisory Committee all deemed that, "home economics is not an area where we could ever distinguish ourselves, and we were looking for ways to distinguish ourselves" (Nerad, 1999, p. 132). Essentially, the administrators at Berkeley did not see any credible academic value in maintaining its home economics program.

In addition to the idea that home economics could never be recognized as a theme in a distinguished national institution, many administrators and faculty believed that a women's education did not have to stray past the offerings of liberal arts. Other members of the community spoke out on behalf of home economics, but decided that women would be better served if only one of the California schools offered this program (Nerad, 1999, p. 133). The shift in campuses due to lack of prestige was regarded as an attack on the 40 years' worth of work that Agnes Fray Morgan, the founder for Berkeley's home economics department, created. The outrage that brought about from home economists in the region negotiated a compromise in which some of the home economics remained in the newly-named Morgan Hall in state of the art facilities (Rossiter, 1997). To replicate Morgan after her retirement in 1954, as these changes began, administrators only sought out male candidates. They found their dean in George Briggs, who, within two years of beginning in the position, renamed the narrow offering of home economics still offered at Berkeley "nutritional sciences" in the hopes of being more gender neutral (Rossiter, 1997).

Berkeley's history offers some insights as to how much control male administrators had on home economics and how the mere title of the program could be implicated in reducing prestige at an institution and therefore, the renaming and restructuring continued. There was not enough "hard science" and research produced under home economics for Kerr to deem the program of academic quality. In addition to two major home economics programs restructuring and renaming, this inspired a call to ground the study of home economics in science and create more research opportunities in home economics (Rossiter, 1997).

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

This typology of home economics programs supports three major outcomes in terms of women's education. Teaching based programs were very different from academic passed programs, which were again very different from extension based programs. The most distinguishing factors were the types and levels of education offered, and the positions with which an individual could hold after graduating from their program.

General home economics courses offered the minimum for teacher education. The development of stricter teacher monitoring and educational expectations pushed teachers to continue on to graduate level education. Should a woman had the desire to teach at the higher education level a specialization was required, similar to that of a focused doctorate that we see today. In the 1920s, most institutions had the ability to train teachers, but some excelled, especially normal schools.

Extension based programs were unique in the types of institutions that offered these opportunities. Most of these facilities of higher education were actually land-grant institutions after legislation passed to centralize the education of both women and men in rural communities. Methods in which the education was delivered were unique to extension in the form of demonstrations, lectures, and mass mailings. The curriculum was rather general compared to that of the other two branches of home economics programs, but women's education in that capacity needed to enable graduates to address a range of issues that rural women faced.

Academic based programs were different from teaching programs in their focus in research in the curriculum versus method and theory of education. Individuals who attended the academically driven programs found themselves in one of five specific programs of study:

nutrition and food preparation, textiles, institutional management, childcare, or family consumption/home economics. These women moved on to various positions within society or within the home, but most with the hopes of bettering the ethical values of society.

It is apparent that each of these branches of home economics are unique and deserve their own credit in shaping current female education today. The ethical development and progressive nature of these programs defined part of the years that launched into women's rights (Buhle, 1983). The idea of women wanting to be treated as equals and feminist tones were bred in the face of home economics.

REFERENCES

- American Home Economics Association. (1901). *Lake Placid conference proceedings: Volumes 1-3*. Washington, DC: American Home Economics Association.
- Apple, R. D. (1997). Liberal arts or vocational training? Home economics education for girls. In S. Stage & V. B. Vincenti (Eds.), *Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession* (pp. 145-162). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Bureau of Vocational Information. (1924). *Reining fro the professions and allied occupations: Facilities available to women in the United States*. New York, NY: Bureau of Vocational Inforamtion.
- Babbit, K. R. (1997). Legitimizing nutrition education: The impact of the Great Depression. In S. Stage & V. B. Vincenti (Eds.), *Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession* (pp. 145-162). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Bevier, I. (1928). *Home economics in education*. Philadelphia, PA: J. B. Lippincott.
- Bible, B. L. (1963). Methods in home economics extension. *Journal of Cooperative Extension, 1*(2), 111-117.
- Buhle, M. J. (1983). *Women and American socialism 1870-1920*. Springfield, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Fritschner, L. M. (1977). Women's work and women's education: The case of home economics, 1970-1920. *Work and Occupations, 4*, 209-234.
- Fields, A. M., & Connell, T. H. (2004). Classification and the definition of a discipline: The Dewey decimal classification and home economics. *Libraries & Culture, 39*(3), 245-259.

- Grant, J. (1997). Modernizing mothers: Home economics and the parent education movement, 1920-1945. In S. Stage & V. B. Vincenti (Eds.), *Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession* (pp. 55-74). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Horowitz, H. L. (1984). *Alma mater: Design and experience in the women's colleges from their Nineteenth-Century beginnings to the 1930s*. Amherst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.
- Kline, R. R. (1977). Agent of modernity: Home economists and rural electrification. In S. Stage & V. B. Vincenti (Eds.), *Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession* (pp. 125-144). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Nerad, M. (1999). *The academic kitchen: A social history of gender stratification at the University of California, Berkeley*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.
- Nyhart, L. K. (1997). Home economists in the hospital, 1900-1930. In S. Stage & V. B. Vincenti (Eds.), *Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession* (pp. 125-144). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Rossiter, M. W. (1997). The men move in: home economics, 1950-1970. In S. Stage & V. B. Vincenti (Eds.), *Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession* (pp. 96-117). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Rudolph, F. (1962). *The American college and university: A history*. New York, NY: A. Knopf.
- Rury, J. L. (1984). Vocationalism for home and work: Women's education in the United States, 1880-1930. *History of Education Quarterly*, 24(1), 21-44.

- Theelin, J. R. (2004). *A history of American higher education*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Tomes, N. (1997). Spreading the germ theory: Sanitary science and home economics. In S. Stage & V. B. Vincenti (Eds.), *Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession* (pp. 96-117). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Vincenti, V. B. (1997). Chronology of events and movements which have defined and shaped home economics. In S. Stage & V. B. Vincenti (Eds.), *Rethinking home economics: Women and the history of a profession* (pp. 96-117). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Weigley, E. S. (1974). It might have been euthenics: The Lake Placid Conference and the home economics movement. *American Quarterly*, 26(1), 79-96.

VITA
Graduate School
Southern Illinois University

Sara Marie Holtzman

Holtzmannsm@gmail.com

University of Wisconsin-Whitewater
Bachelor of Science, Ecology, May 2012

Thesis Title: Home Economics Programs Within Higher Education: A Typology

Major Professor: Dr. Patrick Dilley