



**Leadership:
Reflective Human
Action**

Volume 17, Number 1



KAPPA OMICRON NU FORUM

Volume 17, Number 1

4990 Northwind Drive, Suite 140

East Lansing, MI 48823-5031

(T) 517.351.8335 • (F) 517.351.8336

www.kon.org

EDITOR

Dorothy I. Mitstifer

GUEST EDITOR

Sharon Y. Nickols
University of Georgia

EDITORIAL COMMITTEE

Bonnie Braun
University of Maryland

Rebecca Hess
*California University of
Pennsylvania*

Yvonne Gentzler
Iowa State University

Carole J. Makela
Colorado State University

Sue McGregor
*Mount Saint Vincent
University*

Kathleen Rees
*Texas A&M University-
Kingsville*

Deborah Tippet
Meredith College

Richard Tuveson
CSU-Long Beach

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

CHAIR

Barbara S. McFall
West Virginia University

FIRST VICE CHAIR

Sammy G. Garner
Appalachian State University

SECOND VICE CHAIR

Amelia Brown
East Tennessee State University

SECRETARY

Angela Radford Lewis
East Tennessee State University

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

Tracy L. Bridges
UNC - Greensboro

Dierdra M. Cody
Berea College

Anita G. Coleman
NW Missouri State University

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

Dorothy I. Mitstifer
East Lansing, Michigan

*Official Publication of Kappa
Omicron Nu, Inc., National Honor
Society. Member, Association of
College Honor Societies. Copyright
2006. ISSN: 1520-4820*

*Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM is a
refereed semi-annual publication
serving the profession of family and
consumer sciences. The opinions
expressed by authors are their own and
do not necessarily reflect the policies of
the society.*

Contents

Leadership: Reflective Human Action

State of the Society Message	3
	<i>Sarah M. Shoffner</i>
Guest Editor's Message	7
	<i>Sharon Y. Nickols</i>
Helen A. Strow: A Journey to the World and Back	11
	<i>Nancy B. Leidenfrost, CFCS</i> <i>G.A. (Jenny) Schroeder, Ph.D., CFCS</i>
Jessie Harris: An Accomplished Leader in Home Economics	25
	<i>Francille M. Firebaugh</i> <i>Lois E. Dickey</i>
Mollie and Russell Smart: Family-Work Partnership Pioneers	33
	<i>Laura S. Smart</i>
Alberta Hill: Living the Mission Locally, Nationally, and Internationally	53
	<i>Anupama Pasricha</i> <i>Virginia B. Vincenti, CFCS</i>
A Symbol of Generativity: Margaret Edsel Fitch, National and International Leader	69
	<i>Lynda Harriman, Ph.D.</i>
Leaders Building Apparel Design Programs Within the Home Economics During the 20th Century	81
	<i>Diana Saiki</i>
Editor's Message	91
	<i>Dorothy I. Miltstifer</i>



State of the Society Message

Sarah M. Shoffner

December 31, 2005

On behalf of the Board of Directors of Kappa Omicron Nu, it is an honor to report on the state of our society. My remarks focus on the initiatives that are moving KON forward and that are helping us empower leaders through scholarship, research, and leadership development.

The first initiative to highlight is the Undergraduate Research Community for the Human Sciences (URC). The URC continues to promote undergraduate research, and to date there are 29 participating institutions. Evidence of progress within this initiative is demonstrated by the third undergraduate research conference in conjunction with the 2005 KON Leadership Conclave.

A related initiative is the Undergraduate Research Journal for the Human Sciences. This journal was organized during the First Undergraduate Research Conference at the Kappa Omicron Nu Conclave in 2001. The Journal is open to all undergraduate students that wish to publish in the human sciences. Four volumes are posted on the KON web site.

The Kids and Careers in Human Sciences program, initiated in 2003, continues to provide program opportunities for chapters. It was developed to give college students and professionals the resources necessary to provide “hands-on” family and consumer sciences experiences to 9-12 year olds. The program is intended to make a contribution to understanding of the human sciences by showing children that human sciences careers address the needs of people in today’s world. It shows children that they can use HS knowledge to improve their lives and that HS careers can be fun and satisfying.

Your KON Board continues to develop ways to support the needs of the membership. The Carver Policy Governance Board Leadership Model provides a framework for us to focus on the owners/members and direct resources appropriately. As a result of these efforts, several things are available:

1. Following Conclave the Web site and electronic resources were enhanced, according to feedback from Conclave participants, to meet needs of chapters for program support and management tools. We now have the following on-line resources: newsletter, chapter adviser and president handbooks, chapter handbook,

Sarah M. Shoffner was Chair, KON Board of Directors, 2004-2005



forms, archives of the *Dialogue* and *Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM*, and more. A new *About Us* section was developed to communicate to our own members and the public.

2. Program initiatives support the integration of academic and co-curricular goals (Kids and Careers in Human Sciences, the Undergraduate Research Community, Required Program choices).
3. The Graduate Program Showcase, sponsored by the Coordinating Council of Honor Societies and hosted by Kappa Omicron Nu, provides a comprehensive list of human sciences-related graduate programs available at universities and colleges in the United States.
4. Resources for leadership development – More than a dozen ready-to-use programs focus on ethics, leadership, and professionalism.
5. Resources for professionals—Monographs and books distributed by KON, newly digitized “Heritage of Home Economics,” archived manuscripts, and two online courses.
6. And finally, our recognition and award system is alive and well—KON awarded more than \$100,000 during the biennium. Our 2003-2005 awards included:
 - ◆ 100 grants for chapters for the scholars program
 - ◆ 2 fellowships for Master’s students
 - ◆ 4 doctoral fellowships
 - ◆ 2 New Initiatives Research Grants
 - ◆ 4 Undergraduate Paolucci Grants
 - ◆ 9 Graduate Paolucci Grants
 - ◆ 14 Adviser Fellowships
 - ◆ 32 Conclave Scholarships
 - ◆ URC Undergraduate Research Conference Awards to 8 students representing 6 institutions.

The Eighth KON Leadership Conclave and Undergraduate Research Conference was held in Chicago, August 4-7, 2005. The theme of the Conference was “Integrating Academic & Co-Curricular Goals.” Track I involved chapter delegates, members, and advisers, and Track II involved undergraduate researchers and faculty undergraduate research coordinators. Sessions focused on public speaking, diversity, chapter success stories, application of Reflective Human Action principles to chapter leadership, A Matter of Ethics, chapter planning, and delegate and adviser forums following the business meeting to identify priorities for KON. Eight undergraduate researchers from six institutions presented their research.

Liabilities and Fund Balances

<i>Year End</i>	<i>General Fund</i>	<i>Designated Funds</i>	<i>Net Assets</i>
6/30/05	\$106,160	\$464,039	\$570,199

Kappa Omicron Nu is enriched by the expertise of a large number of members who volunteer or who are elected for a variety of positions. Board members whose terms expired in 2004: Barbara A. Woods, Angela Rushman; in 2005: Sarah M. Shoffner, Erika C. Barnhart, Renee Santos, Catherine Schon.

In concluding this report, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to serve as chair of the KON Board. It is a highlight of my investment in KON and the profession. It is my hope that you will invest yourself in the honor society. It is a reflection of who you are and what you can accomplish. Membership goes far beyond a notation on your resume—to new dimensions as a life long learner. Remember the motto: “Leaders for Life.”

Your honor society is on the move, defining the future of our profession. My challenge to you is to make a real connection and be part of that future. I'll be your cheerleader! Thank you.



Guest Editor's Message

Sharon Y. Nickols

Legacy: “Something that has come from an ancestor or predecessor or the past” (Webster’s College Dictionary, 2003). Synonyms for legacy are inheritance and bequest. In 1995, *Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM* Editor Dorothy Mitstifer invited an advisory group to consider new themes for future issues of *KON FORUM*. One of those selected was “Legacies for the Future.” The purpose was to provide a record of the contributions of leaders who helped shape the field of family and consumer sciences so that their experiences and insights could help inform the future. We hoped to receive manuscripts about leaders in a variety of professional practice settings and all subject matter areas. The legacies of our predecessors have helped shape the intellectual heritage of the profession. The characteristics for leadership—such as visionary thinking, tenacity, and organizational and communications skills—that they modeled for colleagues and students have provided inspiration for future generations of leaders.

One of the objectives of the theme “Legacies for the Future” was to inspire professionals to make contributions to the field.”

Although we conceived of this objective broadly, there has been a more specific outcome in terms of prompting many authors to scrutinize documents, interview colleagues, reflect on memories, and write manuscripts about mentors and colleagues they knew, individuals who have shaped a field of specialization, and, in the case of one of our authors, her parents, who also were her professional mentors. This is the fourth issue of the “Legacies for the Future” theme in *Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM*. The previous issues were published as Volume 9, Number 2; Volume 10, Number 1; and Volume 11, Number 2.

Three threads of commonality are woven among the experiences of the people featured in the articles in this issue:

- ◆ **context**, both in terms of the context in which the featured leaders developed their interest in and practiced their profession through home economics and their incorporation of context as they developed curricula and programs reinforcing the integrative, holistic nature of home economics;
- ◆ **relationships**, with colleagues, with spouses, with students that were filled with respect, fun, adventure, support, and courage;
- ◆ **international awareness and experiences**, as the venue for using their education and providing leadership for the profession.

Sharon Y. Nickols is Janette M. Barber Distinguished Professor, Department of Housing and Consumer Economics, University of Georgia.



Barbara Miller Solomon states in the introduction to her book *In the Company of Educated Women* that “women have been the protagonists in a drama in which their own desires and efforts, as well as conditions beyond their control, contributed to a momentum for change (Solomon, 1985, p. xvii). Today, when women make up more than half of undergraduate students enrolled in U.S. colleges and universities, and they approach or exceed half of those enrolled in graduate programs and professional schools, we forget that just a century ago very few women attended post-secondary education. Newcomer (as cited in Solomon, 1985, p. 64) calculated that only 2.8 percent of women ages 18-to-21 attended college in 1900. By 1920, this number was 7.6 percent and by 1930 it was 10.5 percent. Many of the home economics leaders whose lives are chronicled in this issue received their college education during these years when only one in ten (or fewer) women in their peer group were enrolled in higher education programs.

Solomon (1985) noted that students’ interest in home economics contributed to its growth as an academic discipline during the early twentieth century. The development of the curriculum to reflect scientific, social, economic, and domestic dimensions expanded the traditional liberal arts education. The work of Anna Cooley and Harriet Goldstein in developing programs of apparel design in the first decade of home economics illustrates the integration of courses in economics, science, history, art, and management in creating this new academic program and career. Their philosophy was later adopted by Elizabeth Tarpley. All three women expressed their integrative understanding of fashion within the context of home economics in their articles for the *Journal of Home Economics*, books and in AHEA leadership roles.

Home economics became an important source of female employment, observes Solomon (1985), as graduates entered the labor force as high school teachers, urban social workers, and college professors. Although critics have suggested that home economics restricted women’s educational and career choices (See Stage, 1997), Solomon states, “The accomplishments of students and faculty in this field should not be denigrated; nor should students’ choices be summarily criticized without a full appreciation of their reasons, both vocational and societal, for choosing home economics” (1985, p. 87). The articles in this issue illustrate the importance of understanding the historical and contextual situations, and the influence of significant individuals, in helping to determine academic and career paths.

For example, the county home demonstration agent who organized the 4-H club that Margaret Fitch joined and her high school teachers, as well as Margaret's older siblings, encouraged her home economics activities which led to selecting home economics as her major. A shortage of county agents allowed her to be employed in Extension despite not meeting the criteria of having three years teaching experience and being at least 25 years of age. Jessie Harris could accept the request of the publisher to become the author of her high school textbook *Everyday Foods* because the simultaneous opportunity to join the faculty of the University of Tennessee freed her of the restriction prohibiting any connection with a publisher on the part of employees of the Texas Department of Education. Russell Smart, realizing that there were few opportunities to have a career as an architect during the Great Depression, took the advice of his psychology professors and pursued graduate study in child development.

Examination of their personal characteristics reveals the influence of formative experiences on the ability of the subjects of these articles to both adapt to changing circumstances and hold on to valued beliefs and ethical principles. For example, Alberta Hill's experiences living in a variety of locations and being employed in different institutional structures, including the military, prepared her for both her administrative role and her engagement in international activities. Likewise, the variety of educational institutions attended by Helen Strow and her experience in U.S. academic positions, in Europe with the Red Cross, and at the United States Department of Agriculture, provided the foundation for her leadership of international programs for the American Home Economics Association, an assignment she carried out with the collaboration of Jessie Harris, who provided leadership in developing Home Science programs in India. The international teaching and leadership of all the individuals featured in this issue carried on the legacies of other U.S. leaders documented in *The International Heritage of Home Economics in the United States* (O'Toole, 1988).

It is important to note that most of the accomplishments by these leaders occurred prior to the enactment of federal statutes prohibiting discrimination against women in higher education. It was not until 1972 that Congress expanded Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited discrimination in employment, to include all educational institutions; amended the Equal Pay Act of 1963 to cover executive, administrative, and professional employment; and enacted Title IX of the Education



Amendments to prohibit sex discrimination in all federally assisted education programs (Chamberlain, 2001). Whatever challenges they faced because of gender, these leaders forged on using a variety of tactics from “badgering” campus decision makers, arguing vehemently for resources and continuity of programs, or avoiding certain encounters.

As stated earlier, two synonyms for legacy are inheritance and bequest. These words imply the transfer of something valuable to a beneficiary. We are the beneficiaries of the legacy created by the subjects of these articles. The bequests of our foremothers and forefathers in shaping the curriculum, developing the programs, providing the leadership, and nurturing the next generation of professionals is an inheritance we celebrate.

References

- Chamberlain, M. (2001). Women and leadership in higher education. In C.B. Costello & A.J. Stone (Eds.), *The American Woman, 2001-2002, Getting to the Top*. (pp. 63-86). New York: W.W. Norton & Company.
- Merriam-Webster, Incorporated. (2003). *Webster's College Dictionary*. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc.
- O'Toole, L. (Ed.) (1988). *The International Heritage of Home Economics in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association.
- Solomon, B. M. (1985). *In the Company of Educated Women*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stage, S. (1997). Introduction, home economics: What's in a name? In S. Stage & V.B. Vincenti (Eds.), *Rethinking Home Economics: Women and the History of a Profession*. (pp. 1-13). Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Helen A. Strow: A Journey to the World and Back

Nancy B. Leidenfrost, CFCS
G.A. (Jenny) Schroeder, Ph.D., CFCS

Helen A. Strow

Birth: July 28, 1904
Death: February 8, 1999
Education: 1925 – B.S. – Ohio State University, home economics
1931 – M.S. – Ohio State University, textiles and clothing



Helen Strow served as an Extension educator in the U.S. Government and in the private sector both at home and on the international level for a 60-year period. This article documents her leadership initiatives and her professional contributions. Her advocacy for international partnerships in our profession remains her legacy to us today.

“The only continent she hasn’t been to is Antarctica, and that’s only because there’s no home economics program there” (Cota, 1994). This quote from Helen Strow’s nephew, Robert Strow, succinctly describes the stage upon which Helen successfully performed many leadership roles in more than 40 countries across six decades of her professional life. Although Helen’s professional journey took her to many parts of the world, a consistent pattern emerged—she always returned to her roots, Ohio and Wood County.

Helen’s professional career began with teaching high school home economics in Ohio, moving next to Extension Specialist in Ohio and Michigan. When World War II emerged, she served as an American Red Cross Club Director in England and Germany. After the war, she returned briefly to Henry County (Ohio), serving as the County Extension Home Economics Agent before accepting a six-month assignment with the Marshall Plan in Germany. Following this assignment, she returned to Ohio as a Home Economics Supervisor with the Ohio Extension Service.

In 1956, after four years at the state level, she joined the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) as International Extension Specialist. This role would take her to every continent except Antarctica. Her passports, found among her belongings, document her worldwide travel.

Retiring after 18 years with USDA, Helen changed her professional agenda by working part time for the American Home

Nancy B. Leidenfrost, CFCS; USDA, National Extension Program Leader, Retired

G.A. (Jenny) Schroeder, Ph.D., CFCS; Coordinator, Academic Advising (Retired), University College and College of Human Ecology, The Ohio State University



Economics Association (AHEA) headquarters in Washington, D.C. on international projects and activities. Following thirteen years of service to AHEA, she once again returned to Columbus, Ohio; her activities included visiting her family in Weston and volunteering with UNICEF, the International Home Economics Service, Inc. (IHES) (of which she was a co-founder in 1974), American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS), Ohio Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (OAFCS), and College of Human Ecology and Extension activities.

Helen's impact on the profession and on the well-being of families, children, and communities worldwide is impressive. Her legacy of helping people improve and enrich daily living is an inspiration for many. She served as a mentor, and as one colleague commented, she "still often out paces those many years her junior with a vision and drive that gets things done" (Cota, 1994).

Helen lived a full and busy life contributing in selfless ways to the lives of people around the world during her 94 years. She was born July 28, 1904 to Raymond M. and Elsie (Murphy) Strow in Milton Center, Wood County, Ohio. She died February 8, 1999 in Riverside Hospital in Columbus. A nephew and his wife, a niece, eight great nephews and nieces, and several great-great nephews and nieces survive her.

Student Years

After high school graduation in 1921 from the former Milton High School, she enrolled in The Ohio State University, graduating in 1925 with a B.S. Degree in Home Economics. In 1931, she graduated with a M.S. Degree in Textiles and Clothing from Ohio State. From 1949-1970, a span of 21 years, she continued to enroll in graduate course work at Cornell, Columbia Teacher's College, University of Maryland, George Washington University, and John Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies. This graduate work added to her expertise in areas such as interior design, Extension methods and evaluation, anthropology, and Spanish. While an undergraduate, Helen lived in a boarding house on Neil Avenue and in Oxley Hall, the first women's dormitory at Ohio State. After graduation a group of ten friends started a Round Robin letter that circulated to the total group once a year.

Another memory of her undergraduate days was receiving a weekly letter from her mother, sometimes including community news, the number of babies her physician father delivered in the

week, and a dollar bill! Helen saved these letters and in retirement years in Columbus placed them in an album for her family.

Helen's family was important to her, and in her travels she decided to investigate her Mother's Irish heritage. After a bus trip she took through Ireland, she described with humor her naiveté when she learned the Murphy name was a common name in nearly every town where the bus stopped.

Early Professional Years

Following four years of teaching high school home economics, she served for one year as an Acting Home Economics Extension Specialist for Ohio Extension Service. Next she moved to the position of Home Economics Extension Specialist at Michigan State University for another year. Then from 1933-41 she served in the Michigan Upper Peninsula as Home Economics Extension Supervisor for 15 counties. Helen viewed this extremely rural setting as good training for later jobs. In her words, "It's for young people really. You have to enjoy ice and snow." (Cota, 1994).

American Red Cross Work

Again she returned to Ohio and this time served as Ohio Extension Home Economics Supervisor for one year before joining the American Red Cross in 1943 as a club director in Weymouth and Southampton, England. When World War II ended in Europe, and American occupation took place, she was transferred to Germany to serve as club director first in Giessen and next at Bamberg. Helen described the location with these words, "We were not far from the line. At this time, Germany was divided into four parts—French, English, American, and Russian controlled" (Cota, 1994). The Red Cross clubs served as gathering places for enlisted men to spend their free time.

Found among Helen's keepsakes was a green three-ring notebook marked Red Cross Work in Europe. The contents told many details about life as a club director. The Weymouth report, dated July 1945, gave attendance for several activities of the club since its opening January 29, 1944. These details included club activities such as 120 dances attended by approximately 22,735 people, 70 movies attended by about 10,905 people, sports equipment loaned to service men, and games most popular were ping-pong, billiards, checkers, and bingo. Club staff members often were called on to help the servicemen make phone calls home and send cables to loved ones.



The pictures included several groups of Red Cross workers in uniform and a picture of the Mauritania, the troop ship Helen took to her duty post. Other items in her notebook were letters, notes, activities, thank-you notes to the club director and staff, a soldier's poem, instructions on how to wear the uniform of the American Red Cross, and a copy of a newsletter entitled *Over Here*, January 1, 1945. Helen donated her uniform to the Ohio Historical Museum. A brochure with pictures of staff at Whispering Pines, the new location of the Bamberg club, described Helen as club director with these words:

Helen may be tiny but she has enough pep and energy for at least two people. She is the one who is responsible for the colorful, cheerful, gay, and homelike atmosphere that one finds when entering "Whispering Pines" (Strow, Notebook).

The Marshall Plan

After the war Helen again returned to Ohio, this time to serve as Home Economics Extension Supervisor and then for one year as County Extension Home Economist in Henry County. Her Extension work in Henry County was interrupted within the year with a request to serve as a consultant in Germany. In her words:

After the end of World War II, the Marshall Plan included a program providing assistance in Agriculture and Home Economics Extension to rural families. Upon request of the U.S. State Department, I went to Germany on a six-month assignment to share with German Home Economists some of the U.S. methods [for] teaching women. While in Germany, an extension of my time was requested and [the assignment] became ten months (Strow, Collection).

Upon completion of this consultancy, she returned again to the Ohio Extension Service serving as a supervisor on the State staff from 1952-56.

United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) - 1956-1974

In 1956 when she transferred to the Federal Extension Service, she was serving as president of the Ohio Association of Home Economics (OHEA). She described her USDA position this way:

There I joined . . . five agriculturalists who were working with Extension participants from other countries . . . brought here for short time training. At first visitors were from Europe and then emphasis shifted to Latin America and Asia. Still later, as new nations emerged in Africa, large numbers came from Africa. Our function was to plan their [educational] programs along with representatives of other services in the Department, provide orientation to Extension Service in the U.S., and evaluate

(assess) programs, and send Extension professionals on two year assignments to countries that request this service. We also briefed Americans being sent overseas by the Agency for International Development (USAID) (Strow, Collection).

During a given year 1,600 internationals would visit the Extension International Research Training Division.

Prior to and during Helen's employment in the International Extension Research and Training Division, Extension received major annual funding grants from USAID, which were used to employ U.S. staff, to conduct conferences for international scholars, and to develop educational materials for international use. "Training the trainer" concept was the distinguishing characteristic of Helen's Extension work. She believed in the effectiveness of this method and used it with many professional groups around the world.

Her early professional work experiences impacted her commitment to international work because she believed ". . . Extension offered great opportunities for improving the life of isolated rural, farm families" (Leidenfrost, 1998). She explained her concept of service and practice philosophy this way: "My understanding of the Extension philosophy and my field of study (home economics) and the need of families gave rise to my interests" (Leidenfrost, 1998). She also shared the lasting impact early experiences had on her career path:

I thought the concepts and philosophy of the Cooperative Extension Service had application beyond the U.S. borders As an Extension professional I liked teaching skills to build confidence [and providing] . . . a support role while helping individuals to assume decision making and to take leadership action. I believe in the principles that [a] dedicated Extension professional practices." (Leidenfrost, 1998)

Helen considered the position of Extension specialist as her first "real" job internationally. In 1960 through a USAID grant, "I was sent out to the Philippines to plan and conduct workshops for Extension workers in the Far East." She reviewed her preparation for this assignment: "They arranged that I visit Laos, Cambodia, Thailand, and Taiwan to observe the Home Economics Extension programs. It was excellent preparation for the workshop. In addition to these countries, Indonesia, Malaysia, and Japan sent delegates to the workshop" (Strow, Collection).

She rarely overlooked an opportunity to observe Home Economics Extension programs in other countries. As she began the return trip from the Philippines, she made observation stops in India, Iran, Jordan, Turkey, and Israel. "In all countries



American Home Economics Extension people (professionals) were working, which made it easier to visit homes in villages” (Strow, Collection).

“We taught very simple things” (Cota, 1994). Examples of these simple things included how to make a bamboo sink and a cotton mattress. Helen summarized her experiences: “Village women are fantastic. They are responsible for feeding their families and for agricultural fieldwork. In Africa, the women do 80 percent of the field work.” She noted that, even though there was “greater restrictions on women’s freedom in Muslim countries,” there was similarity in what she taught women in Asia, Africa, and South America (Cota, 1994).

Requests for simple written instructions for making home improvements, teaching methods, and gardening came to the USDA office. Her words describe this type of request: “It was difficult teaching women from homes where the kitchen was outdoors and the cooking was in one pot over three stones on the ground” (Cota, 1994).

“Sun Dry Your Fruits and Vegetables” was the first small bulletin prepared. It was soon translated into Spanish and French and later into Korean, Turkish, Arabic, Chinese, and other languages. The Federal Extension Service, in collaboration with USAID, produced a number of Extension Bulletins on methodology for use by Extension and village workers. They included: “Showing How—The Demonstration Method,” “Seeing is Believing—How to Conduct Convincing Result Demonstrations,” “Helping Hands—Giving Volunteer Leaders a Place in the Extension Program,” The “Farm and Home Visits,” “Educational Campaigns,” “Educational Tours,” and the “Extension Village Worker” bulletins.

Collaboration with USAID in publications extended beyond Extension methodology to home economics subject matter areas in 1962-65, and a “How to...” series called the Sanitation Series included the following subjects: “Prepare and Serve Safe Meals,” “Caring for Baby,” and “Making Soap.” The purpose of the Series was to aid Extension and village workers in many countries. In 1964, a Home Improvement Series was published, including “Low Cost Beds Made at Home,” “Making a Cotton Mattress,” and “Soak Pit with Dishwashing Table.” In 1961 Helen Strow and Sue Taylor Murray published “Ways to Better Rural Living—Home Economics Extension Around the World,” which documented, in pictures by subject, the methodology used to deliver programs. A book produced by specialists in each

field entitled “Homemaking Handbook” included chapters on gardening, chicken raising, feeding the family, and others (Strow, Collection).

In the mid 70s, USDA support toward International Extension waned and USAID funding declined with the philosophy that countries would be initiating their own Extension Services. This situation resulted in USAID mission home economists, Washington-based home economists with international service experience and interest from government, private foundations (Rockefeller), and higher education to form the International Home Economics Service (IHES) in 1974. Helen was one of the founding members. The mission of IHES is to strengthen formal and non-formal programs in less developed countries through program development and dissemination of knowledge that enables women to fully participate in development in their countries.

During her tenure as Extension specialist 1956-74, Helen collaborated with other organizations. On two different occasions, the FAO of the United Nations requested Helen’s expertise. In 1962 she accepted a six month assignment in Nigeria “. . . to evaluate the home economics program and make recommendations for the future” (Strow, Collection). She made observations in all three of the regions that comprised Nigeria at that time, spending the most time in the Western Region working on Community Development. The focus was on programs for women and she “helped them develop a training program for school leavers” (Strow, Collection).

In 1965, FAO sent Helen to Egypt to teach one semester in the small Home Economics Department at Cairo University. This included teaching Extension methods “and supervising seniors in field work. This consisted of one day a week in a village teaching village women and girls under the age of twelve” (Strow, Collection). Following the semester, she worked with the Ministry of Agriculture to help five graduates of Cairo University Home Economics Department start work in villages with women and girls.

In 1968, the Ministry of Agriculture in Malaysia asked for her help with a training program for young women who had graduated from the Agricultural School. This assignment lasted six weeks. On her return from Malaysia, she visited Thailand. In 1971 she was an observer for USAID at the FAO workshop on Better Family Living in the Philippines. During her return trip from the Philippines she observed Indonesia’s Home Economics Extension program.

Helen represented AHEA for a month in Turkey in 1973. She conducted a survey for the AHEA family planning project. This



included interviewing officials and many village women. In 1974 and 1975 she conducted similar surveys in Pakistan, Bangladesh, Kenya, and Ghana. At the request of the Dean of Home Economics at Oklahoma State University in the early 70s, she planned and accompanied two Home Economics Extension Program observation teams to observe how people live in Mexican villages (Strow, Collection).

Indeed, Helen was a world traveler! Although her resume included working and participating in professional meetings in 42 countries, her slide collection (found in more than 28 metal boxes) included pictures from 87 countries.

American Home Economics Association (AHEA)

Upon retirement from USDA, Helen worked as a part time employee of the American Home Economics Association from 1976-1989. During that time she carried out AHEA responsibilities to the International Section and raised funds for international workshops (Strow, Collection).

The Inter American Commission for Women funded two workshops. The regional workshop in Honduras focused on nutrition. In Jamaica, Extension workers participated in a workshop on “Making and Using Visuals to Teach Nutrition.”

Twelve countries representing Latin America and the Caribbean participated in the workshop on “Income Generation for Rural Women” funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). An in-depth two-week workshop for 18 Latin American countries, held in Bogota, Columbia, was funded by the United Nations Voluntary Fund for Women Decade (1976-85).

Family planning was the topic of two workshops in Cameroon—one in English and another in French. Approximately 35 home economics supervisors attended each workshop funded by the United Nations Family Planning Association (UNFPA).

The Hewlett Foundations provided \$70,000 for each of three years to re-activate the AHEA Family Planning Project. Participants from fifteen countries of Africa and the Caribbean received training in two-week workshops on population, family planning, and proposal writing. UKFPA, UNICEF, and AHEA Population Education Committee provided the funding for this workshop.

While working part-time at AHEA, Helen sensed a waning interest in families around the world, even as the importance of interdependence increased. She read about the AID Development Education programs for which funding was available and

asked Dr. Wanda Montgomery to work with her to obtain Biden Pell AID Grants. “Global Connections” was the program that resulted from this collaboration. A four-year training program for middle and high school home economics teachers and their students was implemented.

Three grants of \$5,000 from Church World Service were granted through the leadership of Jessie Taylor at the National Council of Churches, USA to assist with other international programs. During Helen’s time at AHEA, she represented the association at a number of international meetings, e.g., World Food Day (WFD) committee. She served three years on the WFD advisory committee. In her words, “During this time, the World Food Day Chair requested that Wanda Montgomery and I use materials printed in other countries to prepare a teaching kit for teachers. The kit was extremely popular with teachers, and in three years Mrs. Young, WFD Chair, requested another kit, which we provided.”

In 1993-94, Helen served on the AHEA and OHEA Task Forces for the 1994 UN International Year of the Family (IYF). She prepared and distributed a resource kit on activities related to children around the world.

Another project during her retirement years was collecting historical materials on the overseas services of American and Canadian Home Economists. She described this project: “These materials are being stored in the library at Michigan State University where they will be available to students and others seeking information about contributions of home economists in Asia, Africa, Latin America, and the Caribbean. Mary Andrews had a special library event and recognized Helen who was present for the recognition of her contribution to the library. She also contributed her own reports to this collection.” Another collection, her African village cooking utensils, was contributed to the Ohio African American Museum.

Helen was a member of three professional honor societies, Omicron Nu, Phi Upsilon Omicron, and Extension Epsilon Sigma Phi. In 1964, she received the USDA Superior Service Award. She was honored by AHEA as one of 100 Leaders Award (1984) and awarded the Distinguished Service Award (1994). Two Helen Strow Workshops were held in her honor for the International Year of the Family, 1993-94. In addition, Helen received the International Service Award from Extension Epsilon Sigma Phi.

The College of Human Ecology at Ohio State recognized Helen with the establishment of the Helen Strow International Programs Fund and the Helen Strow International Service Award given to



Ohio State graduates world wide at the IFHE Congress meeting in Bangkok in 1996. She received two awards from the College of Human Ecology Alumni Society, the International Service Award in 1993 and the Certificate of Achievement in 1966.

Helen was an active member of the Ohio and District of Columbia state associations affiliated with AHEA, and these groups recognized her many contributions. From the District of Columbia Home Economics Association she was awarded the International Leadership Award in 1984, Home Economist of the Year Award in 1980, and Outstanding Achievement Award in 1972.

The AAFCS Helen Strow International Fellowship was established in 1992 and initiated at the June 17-18, 1988 International Section Pre-Annual Meeting Conference on the Georgetown University Campus. In 1993, the first recipient, Mbula Mbole from Kenya received the Fellowship. She graduated from State University of New York at Oneonta with a B.S. in Human Ecology. From the College of Human Ecology at Ohio State she received an M.S. in 1998. The AAFCS endowment provides for a fellowship for a student to obtain a degree in home economics. Helen requested that preference be given to a student from a developing country where it was impossible to obtain a degree in home economics.

During the International Year of the Family (IYF) in 1994, the Ohio Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (OAFCS) established a travelship in her honor. This travelship grants \$1500 every four years for a member to participate in the IFHE Congress for the first time.

Helen's legacy lives on in the daily life of countless professionals, families, and communities she touched. Her friends and colleagues highlighted her legacy in their own words. Some of these comments were written in 1993 for her nomination for the AHEA Distinguished Service Award.

In reality, Helen has never "retired." She continues to inspire and to lead through her commitment to the global dimensions of our profession. Always alert to the need for us to hone our professional skills, Helen has been a tireless advocate for international awareness, development education, human rights, and the advancement of women, all with an eye toward empowering families, however they may be defined or constituted around the world.

*Nancy L. Granovsky
Texas A & M Extension
President, IFHE, 1996-2000*

Helen was a mentor, an inspiration, and a friend. She encouraged me in all my international work: at the United Nations; at IFHE; in the International Division of AAFCS; and the International Home Economics Service. Her help is sorely missed.

Ruth Norman
IFHE Representative to the UN
Former Chair, AAFCS Liaison Committee to the UN

During her years at AHEA (now AAFCS) she led the international endeavors. She had a vision for home economics in developing countries, in particular. She worked tirelessly to draft proposals for funding and to find people for assignments. She was recognized throughout many parts of the world as the home economist in the USA who cared about the welfare of families.

Francille M. Firebaugh
Vice Provost for International Affairs,
Emeritus, The Ohio State University
Former Dean, College of Human Ecology, Cornell University

It was often a delight at international meetings to see home economists, now leaders in their own countries, run to greet and hug Helen. They recalled her assistance over the years, giving them factual knowledge, support, encouragement, and countless hours of efforts to help them get to a meeting, or a workshop, receive a scholarship, office nomination, be accepted at a university, start their professional organization, be hosted when they arrive in a new culture, receive follow-up materials and encouragement when they return home, and many other efforts. Such efforts may seem simple in most U.S. professional circles. But doing them long and successfully across many political boundaries, languages, and cultures and in demanding and unpredictable physical climates, transportation [modes], [and] living and working conditions in remote, developing country sites requires stamina and diplomacy as well as competence. To pioneer professional development in this variety of conditions with grace, sensitivity, and effectiveness takes a very special person. Helen Strow has been that person for over fifty years.

Marian L. Davis, Ph.D.
Faculty member, College of Human Sciences
Florida State University

To see Helen in a meeting or friendly conversation with persons from other countries is proof that to these persons she is certainly a Distinguished Home Economist. Her ability to work wisely and judiciously is based on her knowledge of and sensitivity to the cultures, educational structures, governmental agencies, and the political situations in many countries.

Alberta D. Hill, Ph.D.
Dean Emeritus, Washington State University
Past President, AHEA
IFHE, V.P. for the Americas Region, 1994-1998



Her knowledge and insight are always available—tirelessly, endlessly, and to the benefit of us all.

*Juanita Mendenhall
President, IFHE/U.S., 1999-2004*

Helen Strow is a visionary and a long-range planner. She sees possibilities where few exist and potential . . . [that] others tend to overlook. She has the ability to coordinate and implement international projects that respond to the needs of home economists in other countries. She is dedicated to working in a global society and thinking globally.

*Janett A. Gibbs
University of Georgia,
Extension Specialist, Retired*

Two important things stand out in my many memories of sharing with Helen in a variety of cross-cultural international experiences. The first was her interest in the villages of developing countries. Always she would ask, “Did you (or they, or she) get to visit any village homes?” Never mind the Universities, the temples, the mosques, the cities, etc.—it was visiting the village home where families were nurtured that qualified you as a knowledgeable traveler. The second memory is of the number of friends from the U.S. and the world who were invited to enjoy Helen’s lovely Washington, D.C. apartment. Helen truly shared her home with the world and brought the world to her home during the 27 plus years she lived there.

*Wanda Montgomery
Past Director, AHEA Global Connections
Past President, IHES Board*

Everyone who knows and works with Helen has been inspired by her unshakeable commitment and spirited will for international partnership in our profession.

*Nancy B. Leidenfrost
USDA, National Extension Program Leader, Retired
IFHE Development Committee, Chair 1996-2000*

Helen Strow was an international treasure! Indeed, we in Ohio were fortunate to have her return to her home state. However, this move did not slow her pace. She continued to plan, think, and give ideas for the international focus of the home economics profession. Truly, she was a Home Economist of the World because she saw no boundaries, just families, children, and communities striving to improve daily living.

*G.A. (Jenny) Schroeder, Ph.D., CFCS
Coordinator, Academic Advising
University College, Ohio State
Past Chair, AAFCS International Division*

It was a rewarding task to organize and describe the outstanding contributions Helen Strow made in her 94 years of life. It is impossible to access the impact and influence she had worldwide on the profession and on family life. Perhaps the words from the Royal Bank of Canada newsletter offer a viable perspective.

History is made up of the living issue of the day in which it is made. Its laboratory is the world we move about in (What use, 1977, p. 3). By telling us what our forefathers did, history inspires us in two directions: to respect their achievements great in their day and to strive to equal their resourcefulness and courage (p. 12).

We respect Helen's achievements around the world. She was a very energetic person, often developing and searching for new ideas and appropriate printed material, financial resources, and knowledgeable people. She continues to influence our lives as we strive to meet the unknown challenges in the future. Her legacy—sensitivity to cultural differences, ability to help people solve daily living problems with programs that would survive and grow over time, and a genuine and sincere interest in others reflected her ability to listen—is a wonderful gift to family, friends, and professional colleagues.

References

- Cota, K. N. (1944, Nov. 26). Home economics work has kept Helen Strow on the move. *Sentinel-Tribune*, Wood County's Daily Newspaper.
- Leidenfrost, N. B. (1998). Reflection and Implication from Extension's History 1914-1998" at IFHE American Regional Conference - An Exchange Between the Caribbean, South, Central and North America. Mayaguez: University of Puerto Rico.
- Strow, Helen. Red Cross work in Europe notebook.
- Strow, Helen. Collection of professional and personal papers and resume.
- What Use is History? (1977, March). *The Royal Bank of Canada Monthly Letter*, 58 (3). Montreal, Quebec.



Jessie Harris: An Accomplished Leader in Home Economics

Francille M. Firebaugh and Lois E. Dickey

Jessie W. Harris

Birth: July 11, 1888, Washington, Georgia
Death: February 2, 1972, Little Rock, Arkansas
Education: 1908—University of Tennessee, Knoxville, B.A.
1912—Columbia University, B.S.
1924—Columbia University, M.S.



Jessie W. Harris—a leader with vision, confidence, and presence—not by dint of stature, but through a no-nonsense approach and the perspicacity of her “command.” Joining the University of Tennessee (UT) at Knoxville faculty in 1926, Miss Harris became the Director of the School of Home Economics the next year. In 1947, she was named Vice Dean of the College of Agriculture and Home Economics, and in 1957 she became the first Dean of the newly formed College of Home Economics, serving in that capacity for one year before her retirement. During UT’s bicentennial, the College published an informal history, *Through the Arch* describing Miss Harris as having “expanded upon the foundations in place, stressed postgraduate work and a sense of collegiality between faculty and students, but there was never a question about who was in charge—of the curriculum, the faculty, the careers of graduates, and all things appertaining thereunto” (*Arch*, p. 15).

Before coming to UT Miss Harris taught Latin three years at the San Marcos Bible Academy; served as Chair, Department of Home Economics, Sam Houston State Teachers College; State Demonstration Agent, Texas A & M; Associate Professor of Home Economics, University of Nebraska; and State Director of Home Economics, Texas Department of Education. These experiences, especially those involving administration, served her well as she aggressively led home economics at UT during a period of extensive change. Miss Harris wrote: “In every part of this program, we must eagerly meet the future, recognizing change and cultivating a liking for giving up the past and accepting the future” (Harris, 1960, p. 89). Many faculty hired early in her tenure as Dean remained at the College until their retirement, contributing stability to the program, and probably creating some challenges in making changes.

Francille M. Firebaugh is Professor Emeritus and Senior Consultant to the Provost, Cornell University

Lois E. Dickey is Professor Emeritus, Ohio State University



Personal recollections of Miss Harris

While chronicling Miss Harris' leadership and accomplishments, we want to relate some personal memories of her. Her close friend and colleague, Ida Anders, wrote about her youth as the daughter of Jessie Wooten and William Mercer Harris who was a Baptist minister: "Rumor has it that in her grade-school days she organized her five brothers and sisters and loaded them into a borrowed spring wagon which she drove around to make parish calls on the members of her father's church, with his full approval . . . it was Jessie who organized the trip, borrowed the spring wagon, made the schedule of calls, and drove the horse!" (Anders & Davison, 1959, p. 52).

Miss Harris and Miss Anders traveled extensively and shared their experiences with the faculty and students in many ways, one of which was The Chalet, a house they had built in Gatlinburg, Tennessee. Designed based on their travels in Switzerland, The Chalet was a warm, welcoming refuge from the "work world." A weekend house party or Saturday lunch at The Chalet were events to anticipate and enjoy.

As a graduate student in 1955-56, Dr. Firebaugh recalls Miss Harris' daily entrance into the Home Economics Building. Parking her Cadillac in the driveway at the rear of the building, she would call out as she came through the door—"Myra!" Dr. Myra Bishop was Chair of the Department of Home Management with an office at the end of the short hallway. A short conversation between long-time colleagues and friends started their day.

As a faculty member in the 1950s, Dr. Dickey remembers that faculty members were admonished to work hard. Only their best was acceptable and collegiality was important, for they were members of "the team." The monthly faculty meeting was preceded by tea in the cozy wood paneled multipurpose room—and it was a proper tea with silver service, simple but delicious refreshments, and congenial conversation. A weekly tea-time was also available for further interaction with colleagues. Another special event was the traditional fall weekend house party. A lovely site in one of the mountain resorts was chosen, plans developed to transport faculty as soon as Saturday morning classes were over; all enjoyed a weekend of fun, good food, and relaxation. A common tribute from those who began their college teaching under Miss Harris was appreciation for her ideals of professionalism, collegiality, high standards of work, and the "team approach" which she instilled by her example.

Author

Miss Harris was offered a contract to co-author a high school text, *Everyday Foods*, while she was State Director of Home Economics in the Texas Department of Education, but employee policy prohibited any connection with a publisher. She reported: “I was in a quandary, I either had to resign my position or surrender my freedom and give up the publication of this book. I took a long drive alone to think it over. When I returned... home, still undecided, I found a telegram sticking under the door . . . from Dean Hoskins offering me the position . . . at the University of Tennessee. I immediately sent two telegrams accepting both offers, feeling that Providence had provided the way. These were the best decisions I ever made” (Addicks, 1964, p. 15). The first edition of *Everyday Foods* was published in 1927 with Elizabeth Lacey as co-author; the book continued through a fifth edition in 1949, also with Elizabeth Lacey Speer. Miss Harris also co-authored a junior high school textbook, *Everyday Living*, with Miss Anders and Miss Mildred Tate, and authored a number of professional articles.

Academic program development, research, and extension

Miss Harris’ commitment to increasing the depth and quality of the programs associated with the Department was evidenced by her efforts to attract strong faculty to the University, her interest in providing curricular experiences to enliven content for students, her work to improve the teaching and research facilities and equipment, and her willingness and skill in cooperating with other campus units.

In reviewing Miss Harris’ tenure at UT, one is struck by her leadership and effective involvement in foreseeing and meeting the many challenges of the time—the depression, war, and recovery. Two colleagues of Miss Harris described her attributes: “One of her greatest skills is her ability to think ahead of the crowd, yet not so far ahead that those with minds less flexible cannot keep up Her ability to select and develop people, to delegate . . . authority and responsibility while carrying her own full load, may be the secret to her success” (Anders & Davison, 1959, p. 52). Corroboration of such a description can be found in each area of study that received her close attention and support.

In the 1930s, the Child Development program benefited from “. . . one of the first separate buildings in the nation designed as a Nursery School, and the first of its kind on a University Campus” (Arch, p. 15). Dr. Ella Day headed the program and



designed the separate nursery school building with special facilities for observation of the children.

Also during the 1930s, Miss Harris envisioned a strong crafts program that became an asset both to the University and the State, increasing the quality of traditional crafts. Miss Harris aggressively pursued this vision by persuading Miss Marin Heard to lead the craft program in extension and classroom instruction. From its modest beginning in a single room on “The Hill” (UT), to the renovation of an historic building to become The Craft House, to the cooperative project with the Pi Beta Phi Sorority for summer residential workshops, the Craft program gained national and international recognition.

In the early 1940s, the Nutrition program under Dr. Florence MacLeod and Miss Ruth Huenemann introduced the Master’s Degree in Nutrition with a public health focus, the second such program in the nation. As a Community Nutrition program, it continued to receive federal funding over the years.

Other areas of study benefited from Miss Harris’ vision, including the Home Economics Education program. Off-campus teaching centers to make student teaching more realistic were established in the early 1940s and students lived and worked in the school community (Arch, p. 22). In 1949, a doctorate in Home Economics Education was approved—the first doctoral offering in home economics at UT. The home economics curriculum at the University was further enhanced with the establishment of a Department of Home Demonstration Methods, a joint venture with Agricultural Extension.

The Department of Home Management in cooperation with the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) offered an innovative program in which students gained off-campus experience working with TVA home economists. The program was similar to a cooperative program in Institution Management, begun in 1933, with students alternating quarters between on-campus study and off-campus work in schools and hospitals (Arch p. 17).

The Textiles and Clothing program developed in accordance with Miss Anders’ vision of study in the field to encompass the scientific, historic, and artistic aspects (Arch, p. 15). Textile research was enhanced with an air-conditioned laboratory in which cooperative research with the Physics Department was conducted on cotton fibers.

During Miss Harris’ tenure, research became a more prominent expectation of faculty endeavors. Dr. Florence MacLeod was

named Assistant Director of the Experiment Station in charge of home economics research. Graduate study increased during this period as well. In 1947, Home Economics, granted more Master's degrees than any other unit on campus (Arch).

Facilities

The Home Economics Building, new when Miss Harris arrived at UT, is reputed to be the first building constructed at a state university for the exclusive use of home economics (Arch); additions were erected in 1937 and 1959. She “had badgered architects until the building represented the very best facilities which could be planned and paid for” (Arch, p. 31). The building was named for Miss Harris in 1964 (Forum, 1964).

Roles in WWII

Miss Harris was an invited participant in a National Institute on Education and the War in Washington, DC, in 1942. Among the 16 program recommendations, one of particular note advocated more programs served by “practical courses in home economics, with increased emphasis on home care of the sick, nutrition, child care, cooking, sewing, and home management, designed to assist home living under war conditions.” She summarized her report of the Institute: “Today’s crisis is home economics’ priceless opportunity to serve the nation and, through that service, to achieve rich professional growth” (Harris, 1942, p. 533).

Miss Harris served as Chief of the Community Nutrition Division of the USDA’s Food Distribution Administration in 1943 and 1944. Her role was to facilitate the development of nutritious recipes and the formulation of nutrition recommendations that could be accommodated within the constraints of rationing and shortages of food products.

Professional leadership positions

Miss Harris was active in the American Home Economics Association (AHEA), having served on the Executive Committee, chair of the Committee on Committees, chair of the Committee on Credentials, and President from 1942-1944. While serving as AHEA President, Miss Harris lead the movement for establishment of Future Homemakers of America clubs in high schools throughout the nation (Brown, 1982). At the conclusion of her term as President, she made wide-ranging recommendations for the organization, its membership, and related issues. Among her suggestions were



- a) develop criteria for the baccalaureate degree in home economics (many years later this was partially implemented by the program accreditation process);
- b) develop “well-organized apprentice training programs,” (a suggestion that has been supported over the years with service learning and opportunities for student internships);
- c) establish a federal Department of the American Home (an idea that does not seem to have had any traction);
- d) strengthen the consumer movement and education of consumers (a concept that came into effect in the 50s and 60s);
- e) expand state and local home economics associations (eventually state and district associations were formed); and
- f) further develop international programs (a goal achieved with the leadership of Helen Strow (Harris, 1944).

Further, Miss Harris urged the association to secure suitable headquarters. As a member of the AHEA Building Fund committee, she enthusiastically espoused the need for expanded space for AHEA and the Future Homemakers of America (then co-located with AHEA) (Harris, 1946). The campaign for \$250,000 was successful and a building was procured for the association in Washington DC's Dupont Circle through an anonymous donation in 1950 (Nelson, 1951).

Other national leadership positions included membership on the Executive Committee of the Land Grant College Association (1948-1951), and chairing the Committee on Criteria for Home Economics (Brown, 1982). After her retirement from UT, Miss Harris became acting head of the Department of Home Economics at Winthrop College, SC for a year.

International

In 1950, Miss Harris undertook an assignment in Germany with the Cultural Exchange program of the U.S. Department of State. “A major mission was to recruit nine women to come to the United States to study home economics, which she successfully carried out. She did not care for the beer and learned to order apple cider instead. She made speeches on the American family in four cities, passing out American cigarettes at each event to have a ‘friendly, home-like atmosphere” (Arch, p. 26). The next year, she was appointed on “a joint committee of the U.S. Department of Agriculture and the Land Grant College Association as a consultant on the Point IV Program in Technical Assistance in Agriculture and Home Economics for several foreign countries, among which was India” (Arch, p. 26).

The Lady Irwin College Directress in New Delhi (who was also President of the Home Science Association of India) and two officials with the U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission in India invited Miss Harris to help formulate needs in developing Indian home science in higher education. Contracts between the Government of India and the University of Tennessee extended from 1955 to 1962. Technicians from the U.S. worked in India on two-year assignments and Indian home scientists studied at the University of Tennessee for at least a year. Miss Harris' leadership in the formulation of the project and the first contract (1955-1958) was a major factor in the success of the program. "Dean Harris astutely planned, developed, and administered the eminently successful Home Science cooperative program between selected institutions of higher education in India and the University of Tennessee" (Program, 1964). Results of Miss Harris' leadership are seen in the professional commitment of the 26 Indian home science faculty who studied for their M.S. degrees in the exchange program. Most of the participants returned to India to give leadership in the home science college programs, and many of them continued their academic study for the doctoral degree.

Another international thrust under Miss Harris' leadership was the foreign study tour to extend student and faculty experiences. In 1955, Miss Heard lead a five-week craft tour of Scandinavia jointly sponsored by UT and Pi Beta Phi sorority; twenty four students participated. In 1956, Miss Anders led a six-week "Fashion and Fabric Tour" in Europe, visiting couture houses, textile manufacturers, museums, and cultural events; twenty-two students and faculty participated (Arch, p. 29). The success and impact of these tours prompted further international study tours.

Conclusion

Informal descriptions of some of the very strong and effective deans of home economics during the years of growth in the field included the term "war horse." Indeed, Miss Harris was one such leader whose determination and clarity of vision helped vigorously move aside obstacles to program development and the expansion of facilities. The effects of her leadership roles at UT were demonstrated in her transforming a struggling young program to one with recognized national and international stature. We are both honored to have known her as graduate students, and in the case of Dr. Dickey, as a faculty member in the later years of her tenure. Miss Harris made things happen!



References

- Addicks, P. R. I. (1964). "The 'First Lady' of home economics," *Tennessee Alumnus*, Winter, 15-17.
- Anders, I., & Davison, E. (1959). "Jessie W. Harris, former AHEA president, retires," *Journal of Home Economics*, 51(1), 51-52.
- Brown, I. (1982). "Jessie Wooten Harris," *Home economics education: Seventy significant leaders*. Yearbook 2. Teacher Education Section, American Home Economics Association, 20-24.
- "Dean Jessie W. Harris, her life and her legacy," (1991). *Review*, College of Human Ecology, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 10(2), 1-2.
- Harris, J. W. (1942). "Highlights of the national institute on education and the war, August 28-31, 1942," *Journal of Home Economics*, 34(8), 531-533.
- Harris, J. W. (1944). "The AHEA: Today and tomorrow," *Journal of Home Economics*, 36(7), 394-396.
- Harris, J. W. (1946). "A home for home economics," *Journal of Home Economics*, 38(7), 413-414.
- Harris, J. W. (1960). "Panorama of home economics," *Journal of Home Economics*, 52(2), 87-89.
- Home Economics Alumnae Forum*, October 31, 1964. "Naming of the Jessie W. Harris home economics building." The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Nelson, M. T. (1951). "The house at twentieth and Q." *Journal of Home Economics*, 43(9), 706-709.
- Through the Arch, home economics to human ecology, 1897-1994*, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- The University of Tennessee UT-India Home Science Program 1955-1962*, No date. (University of Tennessee College of Home Economics in cooperation with the Home Science Association of India, the Ministry of Education of India, and the U.S. Technical Cooperation Mission).

Mollie and Russell Smart: Family-Work Partnership Pioneers

Laura S. Smart

Mollie S. Smart

Birth: April 11, 1916, Chatham, Ontario
Education: 1936–University of Toronto, B.A., Psychology
1941–University of Michigan, M.A., Child Development
1969–University of Delhi, Ph.D., Educational Psychology

Russell C. Smart

Birth: March 25, 1913, Greenfield, Massachusetts
Married: August 9, 1939
Death: January 13, 1996, San Diego, California
Education: 1934 – Dartmouth College, A.B., Psychology
1939 – University of Minnesota Ph.D., Child Welfare



Mollie and Russell Smart's partnership included more than 50 years of marriage and many joint publications, including a best-selling college textbook on child development. Their books, written over more than 40 years, emphasized the developing child in the context of the family, and later books included as well a focus on culture. The Smarts were ahead of their time in their enactment of gender roles, both professionally and at home. The themes of their partnership developed in this article are: partners at work and at home, application of scientific knowledge to living, low boundaries between work and home, and multiculturalism.

Mollie and Russell Smart were partners both at home and at work, lecturing and writing together in the field of child development and family relationships. Their trade books, written for parents, and their textbooks for high school and college students placed child development in the context of family system, beginning in the 1940s when Freudian theory had a strong grip on popular view of child development. Their best-selling book was *Children: Development and Relationships* (1967, 1973, 1977, 1982). Based upon the theories of Erikson and Piaget, it also emphasized the importance of physical development, social relationships, and cultural context. *Children* sold well not only in the United States but also in Canada and New Zealand and India. This textbook is the Smarts' best-known legacy to the field.

Their students, colleagues, and children recall a more personal legacy of Mollie and Russell Smart, whose partnership flowed

Laura S. Smart is Chair, Family, Consumer and Nutrition Sciences, Northern Illinois University.



easily between home and office; research and theory on child development and family relationships were easily applied at home as they raised their three daughters, and just as easily home economics-based kitchen, housing, and clothing design were applied in daily living.

This article is based upon interviews with Mollie Smart in July and August 1998, upon personal communications with her, and upon recollections provided by others who knew Russell Smart. Four themes of their relationship will be developed following brief biographical sketches of Mollie and Rus before they met and a description of the location that brought them together.

Biographical Sketches

Mollie Starr Stevens

Mollie was born in Chatham, Ontario, in 1916 and also grew up there. Most of her family lived in the area, with a few living in Western Canada and the United States. Her relatives had moved between Canada and the United States many times since the earliest recorded arrival of an ancestor from England to the Colonies in 1701.

Mollie went to the University of Toronto after graduating from Grade 13 at the age of 16. In Canada, college preparatory students go to high school for five years rather than four, as they do in the United States. The normal age for high school graduation in Canada, therefore, is 19 rather than 18. This was true also in the 1930s.

As a student in the honor psychology program at Toronto, Mollie studied what the psychology professors thought their students needed to know: philosophy, anthropology, biology, neurology, English, French, German, and all existing fields of psychology. Her psychology and anthropology classes were small; four to eight students would sit around the desk of the professor, who led discussion on the assigned readings. At Toronto, Mollie also had opportunities to compete in intra- and extramural swimming. Women's athletics were important in Canada; she later found that such was not the case in the United States at that time.

When in high school, Mollie worked with children during her summers, teaching swimming and softball between duties as a lifeguard at a playground in her hometown, Chatham. The summer following her first year at Toronto, at age 17, she was supervisor of all counselors (male and female) at the three

playgrounds in Chatham. Following her graduation from the University of Toronto at age 20, Mollie went to the Merrill-Palmer Institute in Detroit to begin graduate studies in child development.

Russell Cook Smart

Rus came from a conservative Republican family of old New England stock. An ancestor, John Smart, had come from England to New Hampshire in 1639. Rus was born in Greenfield, Massachusetts in 1913 and moved as a young boy to Troy, New York, where he grew up.

Rus finished high school at 16, but because his parents thought him too young to go to college, he attended Deerfield Academy in Massachusetts for a year. The headmaster of Deerfield and his wife, Mr. and Mrs. Boynton, were partners in teaching and Rus's first model of an academic couple.

After a year at Deerfield Academy, Rus started at Dartmouth College, where he studied architecture and psychology. For two summers when he was in college, Rus worked under the direction of Ernest (Lank) Osborne at a camp in upstate New York run by Teacher's College, Columbia University. It was there that Rus obtained skills, which he would later apply at the Merrill-Palmer Camp.

Although he really wanted to be an architect, there were few opportunities in that profession during the Great Depression. Rus's psychology professors encouraged him to continue his studies in their field. A desire to try a different environment from New England led him to apply to the University of Iowa and the University of Minnesota, both of which offered him assistantships. He chose Minnesota's doctoral program in Child Welfare (now Child Development). Rus's adviser was Florence Goodenough, known for the Goodenough Draw-A-Man Test, which was used to test young children's intelligence. Rus's first publication was with Goodenough (Goodenough & Smart, 1935).

The University of Minnesota and Merrill-Palmer in Detroit were two of the six child development institutions, which had been funded by the Laura Spelman Rockefeller fund, established by Mrs. Rockefeller's estate for the purpose of founding and strengthening centers for studying and teaching child development. The Merrill-Palmer Institute hired Rus when he was almost finished with his doctorate. Lawrence K. Frank, who was the Executive of the Rockefeller Fund, coordinated the child development programs of the six Rockefeller Fund institutions.



Frank was the originator and catalyst of ideas about research and teaching on child development and family relations in the context of communities and the world.

At Merrill-Palmer Institute

In September 1936, Mollie went to Merrill-Palmer as a graduate student. She was invited to stay on as a counselor at Merrill-Palmer Camp the following summer and to remain at the Institute the next year as a staff member. In June 1937, Rus had just arrived to become a counselor at the Camp, preparing for his first job as a staff member.

This remarkable institution of higher learning set the stage for the Smarts' life-long partnership that included the four themes which will be developed in the following sections of this article: partners at work and a home, application of scientific knowledge to living, low boundaries between work and home, and multiculturalism. Before examining each of these themes, I will briefly describe their life at Merrill-Palmer.

There were students from almost every state and from many countries at Merrill-Palmer Institute in Detroit. There were no lectures; students spent many hours in preparation for discussions. These discussions included two or more teachers, learning from each other and amazingly from the students. Famous scholars, such as Margaret Mead, came to speak to the students and show them their work. Eminent professors listened to young faculty and indicated to students as well that the latter were valuable contributors. Collegiality was manifested also in that faculty knew the names of all students. There were no exams and no grades assigned. Cooperation rather than competition was the norm for Merrill-Palmer faculty as well as students and children.

Even though Mollie had experienced non-competition as a student at Merrill-Palmer, the application of the concept to children's activities and play was new to her. Her experience as a playground supervisor in her hometown had been in facilitating competition in boys' and girls' sports. Rus's experience working at Lank Osborne's camp had shown Rus that school-age children could play and learn with little or no competition. The methods Rus had learned from Lank Osborne were congruent with the Merrill-Palmer model and provided enhancement to it.

The conceptual framework presented at Merrill-Palmer would later come to be known as systemic or ecological: child development was seen as occurring within various systems, including

the family, peer group, neighborhood, and culture. The list of topics for research, teaching, and service at Merrill-Palmer in this era included: longitudinal research on mental and physical growth of children, children's view of religion, marriage and family counseling, counseling families on nutrition and growth, providing students with supervised experience in community organizations (especially settlement houses and nursery schools), teaching child development to medical and nursing students, expanding student's and faculty's world view through foreign visitors and contact with ethnic groups in Detroit, and lecture-discussions on controversial issues such as discrimination against women and Negroes (as they were called then).

To further broaden their appreciation of different cultures, students and faculty went out to dinner together once a month to a different "foreign" restaurant. Although today this sampling of what we call ethnic food is firmly ingrained in American culture, such openness to other cultures was less common in the 1930s. The "melting pot" ideology, that immigrants should become American and give up their foreign ways, still held sway in the culture of the times. Inspired by Larry Frank, the view at Merrill-Palmer was that cultural differences should be understood and respected. Eating at ethnic restaurants may seem to be an insignificant accomplishment today, but ethnic foods that are mainstream today were unknown to many members of the dominant culture then. Mollie, for example, had never eaten Italian or Chinese food prior to going to Merrill-Palmer. At Merrill-Palmer, students from other countries cooked meals typical of their own countries and families and explained the meals to the other students and faculty.

A laboratory for graduate students and a demonstration of a camp run on child development principles, the Merrill-Palmer Camp promoted cooperation between children rather than competition, including of families, and taught the importance of nutrition and physical development. There were only 40 children at the Camp and almost half as many staff. Children had many choices of activities and skills development but competed with only their own records.

The counselors worked long hours at camp but had a great time in their brief leisure. They rode horses, danced, swam, and canoed, always as a group. Interaction among the counselors resembled the practice of mate selection at that time: youth began heterosexual interaction by group dating and progressed to pairing off. Rus and Mollie did not pair off for over a year, although they saw each other frequently in both professional and



recreational roles. At first, they dated each other and others. During the fall of their second year on the staff they became engaged and were married the following summer, after camp, on August 9, 1939.

Mollie and Russell Smart

In 1942, when their first daughter Susan was born, Mollie stayed home and Rus continue to work at Merrill-Palmer. Although he loved working there, it did not pay well. Rus resigned from Merrill-Palmer in 1944 and took a job as an industrial psychologist that paid twice as much. However, the job took him away to Chicago and Buffalo for five days out of every week, a separation which Mollie and Rus both hated. When Rus was offered jobs at Michigan State University and Cornell University in early 1945, they chose Cornell. The Smart family, which now included Susan, age 2, and Ellen, age 6 weeks, moved to Ithaca, where Rus became a member of the faculty in the Department of Child Development and Family Relationships in the College of Home Economics. Laura was born in 1948.

Recruited by Olga Brucher, Dean of the College of Home Economics at University of Rhode Island, Rus and his family moved to Kingston in 1953. Rus became Chair of the Department of Child Development and Family Relationships. Dr. Brucher promised Mollie that as soon as she was ready, she would be able to take a tenure-track position in the Department. When Mollie was ready about ten years later, however, the new dean and new university president had no knowledge of the agreement. So Mollie remained part-time and focused more of her energy upon textbook writing. Mollie eventually became full professor, but that was after Rus had stepped down as department chair. After 40 years in Rhode Island, Mollie and Rus moved to San Diego in 1994.

Partnership with Four Themes

Throughout their lives as wife and husband, colleagues, and co-parents, Mollie and Rus frequently referred to the Merrill-Palmer years as the setting which sparked and nurtured their relationship, enhanced their democratic view of relationships, showed them how to apply scientific knowledge to living, inspired low boundaries between work and home, and fostered their interest in learning and teaching about child development in diverse cultures. These themes cannot be completely separated from each other.

Both Mollie and Rus had experiences in their families of origin that brought them to adulthood with gender role expectations that were ahead of their time. Their compatibility in this area meant that they fell into their roles easily and without much negotiation or discussion—heated or otherwise. They were the proverbial fish that did not know they were swimming in water.

For the first five years of life, Mollie was the only child in a large extended family, surrounded by attentive relatives and blessed with loving, young parents. When her sister was born, her mother asked her father if he had wanted a boy. He replied, “No, I want another girl.” He was the major source of Mollie’s slowness in understanding the feminist movement; Mollie’s childhood was free of gender discrimination.

Mollie participated in competitive sports while she was growing up—the norm for Canadian (but not American) girls in the 1920s and 1930s. As a teenager, she taught swimming and softball to girls and boys. When she was chosen at age 17 to supervise all staff, male and female, at the three playgrounds in her hometown of Chatham, Ontario, Mollie’s concept of women’s proper role as leader was affirmed.

Rus also had experiences growing up that led him to views that many years later would be known as non-sexist. As a child, Rus had a particularly close relationship with his mother and older sister, who taught him to knit and do needlepoint. When he was an adult, he regarded these skills as both practical and artistic. He taught Mollie and their daughters to knit and also assisted them in sewing projects. Rus did not rely on pre-made patterns for his sweaters and needlepoint chair seat covers; he designed his own elaborate patterns. When he was bedridden at the end of his life, he designed and began to knit a sweater for himself.

Partners at Work and at Home

Judged by the standards of the twenty-first century, the Smarts’ gender role behavior may not seem remarkable. Rus held the tenured position, and Mollie worked part time for a number of years. In this way, their behavior was related to the cultural assumptions of the time. But Mollie never stopped working professionally, she simply worked as much as was comfortable when her daughters were small, teaching college courses, writing a regular column for *Parents’ Magazine*, and writing books. At various points in her career, Rus (unasked) provided support to Mollie so that she could complete important projects, such as her Master’s degree and doctorate.



Rus provided companionship and instrumental support to Mollie early in their marriage as she completed her Master's degree. Merrill-Palmer did not grant degrees, but its credit was transferable to other universities. Mollie decided to finish her M.A. at the University of Michigan, under the direction of Willard Olson, known for his concept "The Whole Child." Olson gave challenging seminars and directed her thesis on children's views of religion. She had four hours of class every Saturday morning in Ann Arbor, a 40-mile trip, long before the first superhighway had been built in the U.S. To provide companionship and make her life easier, Rus drove her to Ann Arbor every week. In addition, she went to a night class in Detroit. Because Rus had finished his Ph.D. just before they were married, he understood the pressures of having a job while doing graduate work.

When they moved to Cornell in 1945, the job offer to Rus did not include Mollie. However, when almost anybody in the Department was sick or went away, Mollie covered the class or taught the course. The full-time faculty treated Mollie as an equal. Because she did not want a full-time job at that time, she did not feel at all deprived. She also wrote materials on child development for the Home Economics Extension part of their Department. Susan, and later Ellen and Laura, went to the department nursery school, which operated on the same principles of childcare and education that Rus and Mollie had learned at Merrill-Palmer. The Smarts had on-site daycare for their children in the 1940s and early 1950s. When each daughter in turn attended the nursery school, her parents could see her on the playground while working in their office. Laura was even in what we today would call all-day infant care for children aged 6 to 9 months. She was the "home management house baby" at the Department's home management house, where students learned first hand how to run a household. (Usually, the students would care for a foster baby.) Laura was cared for in turn by each of the students (and thrived on all the attention in spite of, or perhaps because of, the multitude of devoted caretakers).

Throughout their careers, many people wondered how Mollie and Rus worked together without apparent professional jealousy. The simple answer, according to Mollie, is that Rus did not have an overdeveloped ego-investment in his own career. Nor was Mollie focused upon her own ego. They both believed in what they taught and wrote and lived lives congruent with their values.

Rus never cared to increase his status beyond Chair of Child Development and Family Relations. The university president

once offered Rus the opportunity to be chairman of the Psychology Department, but Rus declined. Rus was committed to his own field, within the College of Home Economics. He enjoyed his colleagues (overwhelmingly female), and they liked working in his Department. His own gender, and that of his colleagues, was not an issue for Rus. Rus once told Mollie that the secret of his success with female colleagues was that he treated them as if they were the most important persons in the world.

Speaking partners. Rus and Mollie did a lot of professional speaking together, in a style that reflected their Merrill-Palmer classroom experience. When preparing for the speech, they first outlined the points they wanted to make and decided who would start speaking. Once they were at the speaking engagement, they talked in turn, often interrupting each other to illustrate a point the other had made or to explain something that did not seem clear. They encouraged audiences to interrupt with questions and comments. Audiences felt that they were part of a conversation rather than passive recipients of a lecture.

Consulting partners. In Rhode Island, they consulted for the state Parent-Teacher's Association for many years, training parents as leaders of parent discussion groups on child development and guidance. They also worked in numerous sites across the U.S. as Head Start consultants when that program was being set up in 1965.

Writing partners. Although Mollie spent more of her career as a writer and Rus spent more of his as a professor and department chair, Mollie and Rus wrote together professionally. Mollie's writing career and their joint career began when they were at Merrill-Palmer. A man who was editing a series of books written by experts on pastimes approached the director, Edna N. White. (Sam Sneed, a famous golfer at the time wrote one of these books.) The editor wanted to commission a book on the parenting of infants. Dr. White decided that Mollie Stevens and Lois Schulz should write the book, with their royalties going to Merrill-Palmer.

When the book (Schulz & Smart, 1941) won a *Parents' Magazine* prize, Mollie went to New York to accept the award. At the luncheon where the prizewinners were honored, an editor from Scribner's asked Mollie if she would write a book for parents for Scribner's to publish. The editor was willing for Rus to be co-author. They spent the next summer writing *It's a Wise Parent* (1944, 1950), while Susan napped in her carriage. Each of them would write a chapter and the other one would edit it, or as Rus



said, “run it through the typewriter again.” This book was reviewed in *The Christian Century* (It’s a Wise Parent, 1944) and in the New York *Herald Tribune Weekly Book Reviews* (Family Joys, 1945), in which the book was referred to “as useful a little book as a contemporary young parent is likely to get” (p. 22).

The Smarts’ first book led to an invitation from Houghton Mifflin to write a high school text on child development, *Living and Learning with Children* (Smart & Smart, 1949, 1956, 1961). For this book, they created a neighborhood of families with children aged from infancy through early adolescence. Each chapter began with a short play about some of the characters. By the time of the last edition, Mollie and Rus had written a companion volume on family relationships, *Living in Families* (Smart and Smart, 1958, 1965).

Mollie’s book, *Babe in a House* (Smart, 1950) was reviewed in the *American Journal of Public Health* (Babe, October, 1950), and the *Journal of Home Economics* (Pillar, 1950). The short review recommended the books to parents. Pillar in her more lengthy review noted that the father’s role with a new baby and siblings’ reactions were both discussed, and the “author makes a plea for the baby’s side and gives helpful interpretations of the infant’s feelings” (p. 666).

Meanwhile, Mollie began writing a monthly column for *Parents’ Magazine* in the late 1940s, which continued until the late 1960s when the magazine changed from relying on experts to using professional writers. She also wrote occasional articles for *Parents’*.

Publishers continued to offer to publish their books. In the 1950s they started on college textbooks, which were more work and not as much fun to write as high school books. However, the work involved in writing the college texts kept them abreast of the field. Rus did the main writing of a college textbook on family relations (Smart & Smart, 1953) while Mollie did the main work on the high school books.

Children: Development and Relationships, was their best-known college text with four editions between 1967 and 1982. The second edition sold over 100,000 copies, and copies of the 1982 edition are still in print, available for sale at booksellers on the Internet. The book’s companion volume was a book of readings intended to supplement the textbook. At first, they shared the writing of *Children* equally, but by the time of the second edition was in process Rus was busier as a department chair and Mollie did more of the writing. For the last two editions of

Children, Laura was grown up and a real colleague in the field. She contributed a chapter on adolescence to the last two editions (1977 and 1982). The last two editions were also available as four paperback volumes that included the text chapters and accompanying readings and were entitled: *Infants: Development and Relationships* (Smart & Smart, 1973b; 1978a), *Preschool Children: Development and Relationships* (Smart & Smart, 1973d, 1978b), *Schoolage Children: Development and Relationships* (Smart & Smart, 1973e, 1978c), and *Adolescents: Development and Relationships* (Smart & Smart, 1973a) (Smart, Smart, & Smart, 1978).

Children (1967) was reviewed in the *Journal of Home Economics* (Madera, 1967) and *Choice* (Children, 1967). Based on Piaget and Erikson, the book was recommended by Madera as “making both theories meaningful in describing human development” (p. 494). The unsigned review in *Choice* panned the book for having no direct reference to Freud. The reviewer of the 1972 edition (Nunn, 1974) was more savvy, in that she recognized that “the approach is interdisciplinary—to study the child as a physical and psychological being living in a family that is part of a culture [and is based upon] psychology, sociology, nutrition, genetics, and anthropology—and deals with challenges facing a wide range and broad sample of children and families” (p. 54).

Mollie’s next book was published with Laura in 1976, *Families: Developing Relationships*. Rus declined their offer to be involved as a co-author. In writing this book, Mollie clearly carried on the Merrill-Palmer tradition of valuing the beginning colleague’s contributions. With her new Master’s degree in Human Development and Family Studies from Penn State, Laura was the “expert” on the latest research on the family; Mollie contributed her expertise on child development and on textbook writing. Laura and Mollie divided the chapters between them and each wrote a first draft for half of them and a second draft for the other half. They met regularly, when each had finished a chapter, to edit and critique each other’s work. Mollie and Laura actually wrote the last chapter together, sentence-by-sentence. Rus was sure that they would have inter-generational conflicts, but they never had any that they could not easily discuss to an agreeable conclusion.

Rus did editing, bibliographies, and typing for Mollie and Laura. Rus enjoyed shocking male colleagues by telling them that he was his wife and daughter’s “secretary.” Laura’s husband did some of the photography that appeared in the text. *Families* received very positive reviews in the *Journal of Marriage and*



the Family (Schvaneveldt, 1976), the *Journal of Home Economics* (Oyer, 1977), and the *Family Coordinator* (Walters, 1976). Walters praised Mollie and Russell Smart as “two of the best child development text writers in the nation” and opined that “the Smarts have always reflected an unusual ability in relating research to the real issues of life” (p. 311). The second edition (Smart, L. S. & Smart, M. S.) was published in 1980.

Mollie and Rus’s last publication (1990) was about dual career couples in academia. By the beginning of the 1990s, academia was beginning to accept the reality of husbands and wives who seek employment on the same campus.

Partners at home. Neither Rus nor Mollie knew much about housekeeping and cooking when they got married; they both assumed that they would share the work at home. This assumption, and its enactment in 1939, was at least 40 years ahead of its time. The year they had been engaged, they had already done a considerable amount of entertaining at small dinners in the recreation house of Merrill-Palmer. The day after their honeymoon, Rus realized that Mollie was not a “morning person” and needed coffee to waken her and that he was better suited to kitchen chores than she was that early in the day. From that day on until he became too ill, Rus made breakfast every day, and Mollie did the rest of the cooking. Years later, inspired by a discussion with a daughter and son-in-law regarding the young couple’s decision to divide their housekeeping more equitably than they had at first, Rus made a list of all the chores that he did and that Mollie did and decided that he should pick up some of Mollie’s tasks. In addition, beginning in retirement, he also prepared afternoon tea. Rus always contributed when Mollie or one of the daughters needed help with a project, whether it was putting on a party or cutting out a dress.

When they moved to Cornell in 1945, Rus went to Ithaca first to get their house set up. He consulted Ella Cushman (in another department of the College of Home Economics) on kitchen design and learned to incorporate a table on wheels, which he made. Ella gave him much more information and introduced him to the pamphlets that the College of Home Economics published to help homemakers. Rus used information about work-saving kitchen designs developed at Cornell (Beyer, 1952) when he designed kitchens for homes in Ithaca and Rhode Island.

Rus was knowledgeable in regard to all the arts, but especially architecture and interior design. Mollie was always content to let him choose furnishings, although he did consult her. He fixed

things, did a lot of carpentry and building, and made the curtains and bedspreads. He eventually made suits and coats. Because they worked in colleges of home economics, he always had able consultants to turn to for advice on sewing, arranging and choosing kitchens, and even designing and building houses. When the University of Rhode Island built a new nursery school in the late 1950s, Rus's design became the basis for the architect's plans.

Rus pursued activities that interested him without worrying what other people would think about him. His self-assurance combined with interest in the arts, and, of course in child development and family relationships, allowed him to create the kind of life he wanted. Congruity between his work and home life was a natural outcome of his personality and interests.

Application of Scientific Knowledge to Living

Early in their relationship, Mollie and Rus were excited and inspired by all that they were learning at Merrill-Palmer, which was a model environment for a seamless interface between work and home. Their colleagues there were like an extended family, tutoring them, babysitting, having them for dinner, and sending their students to observe the Smart's children. Mollie and Rus realized that they could put their knowledge about children and family relationships to work in their own lives. Although they both had academic roots in psychology, they believed that the difference between child development and child psychology was that the former discipline includes the child as a total organism itself embedded in layers of systems. The field also involved the practical application of knowledge. Students learn about children not only from books but also from the child development laboratory, the home, and all other contexts.

Mollie and Rus practiced what they taught. Mollie once told me that her role as mother had taught her the most of any of her roles and was the most satisfying. Dinner table conversations often included discussions of how theory and research tied into whatever else was being discussed. Although their children were living examples of what they taught, Mollie and Rus did not make their children feel like guinea pigs. However, when they needed their children to be guinea pigs, the girls were willing. In 1953, when the family was on a cross-country trip, with Mollie and Rus earning the way by giving workshops at universities, they stayed for two weeks at the University of Montana. Their daughters were 10, 8, and 4. Mollie and Rus explained to them that people would be watching the children's behavior and they should try to be good examples and get along with each



other. The older sisters reminded Laura of the importance of good behavior. They were as good as gold for two weeks and mightily impressed the audience.

Many people at the time thought that psychologists' children were badly adjusted or even spoiled brats because psychologists applied narrow theories to them or did not apply their knowledge. An example of this among Mollie and Rus's acquaintances was a psychologist who let his preschool and schoolage children eat all the chocolate they wanted because he was applying Davis's research. Davis (1928) had found that newly weaned infants, when offered a variety of food, chose a balanced diet. As child developmentalists, Mollie and Rus knew about nutrition, growth, and health as well as family relationships. As home economists they knew how to organize a home that provided the resources needed for growth in these areas.

Low Work-Family Boundaries

The application of scientific knowledge to living, and the collegial relationships that they had as junior staff with their mentors and then later as mentors with their own students and junior staff, led to low work-family boundaries. What was taught and learned was relevant to life.

At Cornell, graduate students and some undergraduates came to their house for conversation and parties. The students babysat, often for free, and even volunteered for weekends to let Rus and Mollie go to Syracuse and New York. Nursery school and home felt continuous to their children, as work and home did to Mollie. Much of what Mollie and Rus learned in their work was relevant to home and vice versa. For the students, going to the Smart home was like entering a living laboratory. They could see that their teachers put into practice what was taught in the classroom. Sparked by what they saw at the Smart home, students brought up theoretical points, which were then freely discussed. One student in particular would engage Rus and Mollie in heated discussions about the relative merits of parental fostering of intelligence versus creativity. This student sometimes stayed until 2 a.m. to attempt to win his case, either with Rus or Mollie or sometimes with another student after the hosts had retired.

The work environment also loaned itself to family life. As noted earlier, at Cornell Mollie and Rus could look out the window on the playground and see one of their daughters on the nursery school playground. When they were at nursery school, the Smart children knew that their parents were nearby. School and home were continuous in a pleasant way.

Multiculturalism

The fourth theme had its roots in Mollie's Canadian-American heritage. Mollie's relatives and ancestors have moved back and forth across the Canadian-American border for almost three centuries. Many of them have seen the national border as irrelevant and have felt that they belonged in both countries. Although Mollie became a U.S. citizen, she made trips at least yearly to Ontario to visit her family and friends and made sure that her husband and children belonged in Ontario as well as the U.S. Although to Mollie the cultural differences between (English) Canada and the U.S. were relatively mild, her experiences in two countries gave her a foundation for what is now called multiculturalism. Rus's blue-blood New England background would not have predicted his interest in other cultures, but his move to graduate school in the Midwest was an early indication of his willingness to explore the world.

Merrill-Palmer whetted Mollie and Rus's lifelong interest in other cultures. They wanted to expand their lives in the direction of experiencing diverse cultures and working with a larger sample of the country's and world's universities. They traveled a great deal with their children in the United States and Canada, sometimes camping, taking brief jobs at other universities in order to earn their way. In 1959 Rus got a Fulbright to India, at the college of Home Science, University of Baroda, where Rus taught and did research (Smart, 1962b). They went around the world by ship, traveling for three months in Europe on the way to India and visiting several Asian countries on their way home. All five Smarts eventually became crazy about India, where there was so much to explore and learn. Their hosts and hostesses were eager to teach them, guide them, and arrange wonderful experiences for them.

In 1966, Rus and Mollie both got Fulbrights to India, his for teaching and hers for research. Laura delayed her entrance to college for a year in order to be Mollie's "domestic engineer" and research assistant. Rus, Laura, and Mollie lived in a house at Lady Irwin College in New Delhi, another outstanding College of Home Science. At 17, Laura as domestic engineer interviewed, hired, supervised the cook, planned menus, and supervised the *dhobi* (washerman) and sweeper. As research assistant, she accompanied Mollie to her research sites and helped to administer the questionnaires.

Mollie's original goal for her research was simply to publish it (Smart, 1970; Smart and Smart, 1970). However, by becoming a doctoral student and maintaining a two-year residency in India,



she would be eligible to pursue a Ph.D. The Fulbright director guided her toward a department and adviser at the University of Delhi, made translations and copies for her, and paid for a Hindi-speaking assistant. Because Rus did not want to be away from Mollie for a year, they supervised students in the University of Wisconsin College-Year-In-India program, which would allow them both to stay in India for another year. Laura went back to the U.S. for college, and Ellen, their second daughter who by this time had learned to speak fluent Hindi and had spent a year in India with the Wisconsin program, joined them in India to assist in the supervision of the University of Wisconsin Students. Mollie had plenty of time to write her dissertation.

Although Merrill-Palmer started Rus and Mollie toward a systems theory and cross-cultural point of view, India gave both perspectives a big boost. In India, the point of reference for understanding human development is not the individual but the larger family system. Whereas in Western psychology a child is thought of as an individual, in India a child or an adult is seen first and foremost as a member of a large system.

To many Americans, Indian culture may appear to be monolithic. However, India's population consists of many ethnic groups. Mollie tells the story of a small boy at a party in Baroda, which is in the state of Gujarat. The boy conversed with guests in four languages: Gjjrati, Marathi, Hindi, and English. The three Indian languages that he spoke are just a fraction of the many languages spoken in India. It was obvious to Mollie and Rus that to live in India is to live in a multi-ethnic society.

In 1971-72, Rus and Mollie went to Massey University in New Zealand as research Fulbrights and also to brief stints at universities in Australia, Hong Kong, and Great Britain. Although different from India culturally, demographically, geographically, and economically, New Zealand was just as lovable and so much easier for the Smarts to understand. Clem Hill, head of their department was a model administrator, full of ideas, witty, supportive, and a facilitator. They were surprised when he told them to just do what they wanted and then realized that it was his style to set people free to be themselves. They published five articles from the research they did that year (Smart & Smart, 1973e, 1975; Smart, R. C. & Smart M. S., 1975, 1976; Smart, Gordon, & Smart, 1972). In 1974-75 they spent a year teaching at Guelph University in Ontario. In 1979, Clem Hill invited Mollie and Rus to return for two years to New Zealand as department members at Massey University. Because Mollie was on chemotherapy for breast cancer, they curtailed

their visit to several months. Two publications resulted from this trip (Smart, Smart, & Goodman, 1988; Smart & Smart, 1980).

Their experience in India, New Zealand, and other countries gave the Smarts a cross-cultural perspective that found its way into their textbooks, teaching, and research. They also worked with international students, particularly those from India, at the University of Rhode Island, helping them to adjust to life in the U.S. Cultural issues were also a part of the American domestic scene in the 1960s. The Civil rights movement was part of the impetus for President Johnson's Great Society programs, which included Head Start. As Head Start consultants, Mollie and Rus worked toward the goal of educational opportunities for economically disadvantaged U.S. children.

Rus and Mollie went to India again on their way home from New Zealand in 1972 and also in 1988, when Ellen was there as a Fulbright scholar. They stayed with her in Jaipur and made visits to Colleges of Home Science in Jaipur and Udaipur. Even though they were retired, the faculty and students treated them with the respect and warmth due to elder professors, especially those whose books they had used.

Although they did not know it when they were in India, Rus had begun his final illness. He was more quiet than usual and did not want to go anywhere or do anything, not like the enthusiastic traveler of earlier days. He lived six more years before dying of prostate cancer. Two years before he died, Mollie and Rus moved to San Diego to live with Ellen, curator of the South Asian art in a museum in that city. Like a good South Asian daughter, she wanted to be with them and care for them. Now Ellen and Mollie live happily together in Ridgefield, Washington. It took them both a long time to recover from the almost two-year period when Rus was in bed and very ill. Mollie does not like to recall those times, but she often enjoys thinking about all that went before.

In 1999, Mollie traveled to India with Ellen, where Susan and Laura met them, for one last family trip to India. Mollie and Laura both lectured at the Department of Human Development and Family Relations, College of Home Science, University of Baroda, which had been their host 40 years earlier. Mollie lectured also at Lady Irwin College, where students were still familiar with the text *Children*.

Conclusion

Rus and Mollie Smart were a professional and domestic team. They are best known nationally and internationally for their textbooks, which described the physical, social, and cognitive



development of children in the context of family, community, and culture. Students and colleagues remember them also as role models of the practical application of knowledge from their field to daily living. The Smarts began their marriage with the awareness that what they were learning and teaching about child development and family relationships (and more broadly, home economics) could be applied in their lives and demonstrated to others. They carried on this plan throughout their lives without self-consciousness. In addition, they saw themselves as equal partners before the term had been invented. In these ways, they were work-family partnership pioneers. Both of them felt gratified because each helped the other professionally; each enhanced the other's career by being part of it. During the Post-World War II period, Mollie was able to create a career for herself at her own pace, with huge amounts of loving support from not only Rus but from colleagues and graduate students.

Mollie's application of knowledge was an element in her choice of Rus as a marriage partner. At Merrill-Palmer she had taken a course on marriage and the family that helped her to recognize Rus as the kind of partner she wanted. Prior to the course, she had believed that romantic love was the key to happiness. Her father, for example, when well into his eighties would still look at her mother and sigh, "When you find the right one, you're ready." Mollie actually followed her father's advice, but was guided by what she had learned in the course to look at her own needs realistically and to listen to her head as well as her heart.

Future of Family and Consumer Sciences

According to Mollie, the study of family and consumer sciences is more relevant today than it ever was. Many or most parents don't have time to teach their children skills in the home in the way that it was possible to do 30 or more years ago. Furthermore, because of the growing complexity of the world, young people need more insight and more techniques to prepare them for making and maintaining a home, bringing up their own children, and managing their own relationships. Mollie would like to see family and consumer sciences integrated into the curriculum from preschool through college. It is important that young people be encouraged to enter the field and to have the opportunities for a good education in undergraduate and graduate school. These are the people who will provide the education and leadership for teachers in the school system.

Mollie noted that family and consumer scientists know that for children to develop optimally, they must have adequate nutrition,

clothing, housing, communities, affection, and stimulation. Family and consumer scientists know how to make these resources available to children and their families. Because of their interdisciplinary approach to studying the contexts in which individuals develop, family and consumer scientists are those who are the best prepared to teach and do research in this area.

References

- Babe in a house by Mollie Stevens Smart (1950, October). *American Journal of Public Health*, 40, 1329.
- Beyer, G. H. (Ed.) (1952). *The Cornell kitchen: Product design through research*. Ithaca: Cornell University.
- Children: Development and relationships by Mollie S. Smart and Russell C. Smart (1967, October). *Choice*. 917.
- Davis, C. M. (1928). Self-selection of diet by newly weaned infants. *American Journal of Diseases of Children*, 36, 651-679.
- Family joys. (1945, January 21). *New York Herald Tribune Weekly Book Reviews*, p. 22.
- Goodenough, F. L. & Smart, R. C. (1935). Inter-relationship of motor abilities in young children. *Child Development*, 6(2), 141-153.
- It's a wise parent by Mollie Stevens Smart and Russell Cook Smart. (1944, November 6), *Christian Century*, 61, p. 1419.
- Madera, K. (1967). Review of children: Development and relationships by Mollie S. Smart and Russell C. Smart. *Journal of Home Economics*, 59, 494.
- Nunn, H. R. (1974). Review of children: Development and relationships (2nd ed.) by Mollie S. Smart and Russell C. Smart. *Journal of Home Economics*, 66, 58.
- Oyer, E. J. (1977). Review of families: Developing relationships by Mollie Stevens Smart and Laura S. Smart. *Journal of Home Economics*, 69, 50.
- Pillar, E. L. (1950). Review of babe in a house by Mollie Stevens Smart. *Journal of Home Economics*, 42, 666.
- Schulz, L. & Smart, M. S. (1941). *Understanding your baby*. New York: Sun Dial Press.
- Schvaneveldt, J. D. (1978). Review of families: Developing relationships by Mollie Stevens Smart and Laura S. Smart. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 40, 198-199.
- Smart, L.S. & Smart, M. S. (1980). *Families: Developing relationships*. 2nd ed. New York: Macmillan.
- Smart, M. S. (1950). *Babe in a house*. New York: Scribner's.
- Smart, M. S. (1970). Self-esteem and social-personal orientation in preadolescence and adolescence related to parental behavior. *C.I.E. Studies in Education and Psychology*, Publication No. 69. Central Institute of Education, Delhi, 84 pp.
- Smart, M.S., Gordon, A. & Smart, R. C. (1972) Values reflected in children's drawings. *New Zealand Psychologist*, 1(1), 4-12.
- Smart, M.S. & Smart, L. S. (1976). *Families: Developing relationships*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smart, M.S. & Smart, R. C. (1944, 1950). *It's a wise parent*. New York: Scribner's.
- Smart, M.S. & Smart, R. C. (1949, 1956, 1961). *Living and learning with children*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Smart, M.S. & Smart, R. C. (1958, 1965). *Living in families*. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.
- Smart, M.S. & Smart, R. C. (1953). *An introduction to family relationships*. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders.



- Smart, M. S. & Smart, R. C. (1967, 1972, 1977, 1982). *Children: Development and relationships*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smart, M. S. & Smart, R. C. (1970). Self esteem and social-personal orientation of Indian 12- and 18-year-olds. *Psychological Reports*, 27, 107-115.
- Smart, M. S. & Smart, R. C. (1973a). *Adolescents: Development and relationships*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smart, M. S. & Smart, R. C. (1973b; 1978a). *Infants: Development and relationships*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smart, M.S. & Smart, R. C. (1973c). New Zealand preadolescents' parent-peer orientation and parent perceptions compared with English and American. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 35, 142-148.
- Smart, M. S. & Smart, R. C. (1973d; 1978b). *Preschool children: Development and relationships*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smart, M. S. & Smart, R. C. (1973e; 1978c). *Schoolage children: Development and relationships*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smart, M.S. & Smart, R.C. (1975). Recalled, present, and predicted satisfactions in stages of the family life cycle in New Zealand. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 37, 408-415.
- Smart, M. S. & Smart, R. C. (1990, January-February). Paired prospects: Dual-career couples on campus. *Academe*, 76(1), 33-37.
- Smart, M. S., Smart R. C. & Goodman, M. S. (1988). Assessing recovery in abused women: Data from the United States and New Zealand. *Violence, Aggression and Terrorism*, 2(4) 373-390.
- Smart, M. S., Smart, R. C., & Smart, L. S. (1978). *Adolescents: Development and relationships*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smart, R. C. (1962b). Height and weight of preschool children in the Chetan Balwadi. *Indian Journal of Pediatrics*, 29(69), 33-36.
- Smart, R. C. & Smart, M. S. (Eds.) (1972, 1977). *Readings in child development and relationships*. New York: Macmillan.
- Smart, R. C. & Smart, M. S. (1975). Group values shown in preadolescents' drawings in five English-speaking countries. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 97, 23-37.
- Smart, R. C. & Smart, M. S. (1976). Preadolescents' perceptions of parents' and their relations to a test of responses to moral dilemmas. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 4, 297-308.
- Smart, R. C. & Smart, M. S. (1980). Complexity of preadolescents' social play and games. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 15(1), 81-92.
- Walters, J. (1976). Review of *Families: Developing relationships* by M. S. Smart and L. S. Smart. *Family Coordinator*, 25, 311-312.

Additional Articles (not referenced)

- Smart, M. S. (1979). Issues in infancy: Providing for the good life. *Education*, 28(8), 206.
- Smart, R. C. (1962a). Certain administrative procedures in nursery schools in land-grant institutions. *Journal of Home Economics*, 34(5), 380-383.
- Smart, R. C. (1965). The changing composition of "intelligence": A replication of a factor analysis. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 107, 111-116.
- Smart, R. C. & Smart, M. S. (1963). Kraus-Weber scores and personality adjustment of nursery school children. *Research Quarterly of the American Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation*, 34(2), 199-205.
- Smart, R. C. (1957). Dating patterns. *Journal of Home Economics*, 49(10), 800-801.
- Taylor, R. & Smart, M. S. (1973). Depression and recovery at nine weeks of age. *Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry*, 12, 506-510.

Alberta Hill: Living the Mission Locally, Nationally, and Internationally

Anupama Pasricha
Virginia B. Vincenti

Alberta Hill

Birth: October 25, 1918
Education: 1939 - B.S., University of Idaho
1947 - M.A., Columbia University
1959 - Ed.D., University of Illinois



Alberta Hill is recognized for her contributions to curriculum development and teaching methods locally, nationally, and internationally during her more than 60 years of dedicated service to humanity through her work in family and consumer sciences. As an octogenarian she continues to be actively involved in work that demonstrates her commitment to the mission of profession. In 1993 the American Home Economics Association (AHEA) recognized Dr. Alberta Hill with a Distinguished Service Award for her achievements as a teacher, teacher educator, program specialist, administrator, and international program consultant. She has devoted her indefatigable efforts to develop other professionals unassumingly. Her international perspective of collaborating with professionals around the world and her contribution to teacher education in St. Lucia are very apt in today's global environment. She was instrumental in setting up of the International Federation of Home Economics' U.S. chapter. Her various leadership roles include Dean, College of Home Economics, Washington State University; Head, Department of Home Economics Education, Iowa State University; President of AHEA; positions in many professional organizations; and international consultant. She continues to preach involvement and is involved herself in activities that promote home economics education and the well-being of people.

Introduction

Although some professionals apply their profession's mission only to their paid work, others internalize their professional mission so that it pervades their lives beyond their career. Dr. Alberta Hill exemplifies the latter. She has lived the mission of home economics throughout her forty-nine-year career in various professional positions and leadership roles in numerous organi-

Anupama Pasricha is Assistant Professor, Department of Family, Consumer, and Nutritional Sciences, The College of St. Catherine

Virginia B. Vincenti, Ph.D., CFCS is 2003-2004 President, American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences Professor, Department of Family and Consumer Sciences University of Wyoming



zations. Now, almost twenty years after retirement, she is still highly involved in fulfilling the profession's mission of integrating knowledge and applying it to daily life to improve the well-being of individuals and families.

Dr. Hill is still a well-known leader and respected professional in the states where she was employed. She also is well known and respected nationally through her work in the US Office of Education and in professional organizations. Internationally she is known through her work in the International Federation of Home Economics (IFHE) and the International Home Economics Services, Inc. (IHES), a NGO supporting home economics programming around the world (Andrews, 2005). She is highly regarded for her expertise in home economics curriculum development, teaching methods, and for her ability to work with people. Because of her commitment to collaboration with professionals around the globe, she has developed a network of colleagues and friends from many countries. Her soft-spoken, humble manner has contributed to her effectiveness as a leader and mentor to many students and professionals.

In view of these significant achievements, the recording of Dr. Hill's background, her professional development, and her experiences is believed to be useful and therefore was undertaken as a course project at Iowa State University. This paper, further developed from the course project, is organized under six themes: her beginnings, professional leadership, personal leadership, international legacy, community work, and discussion and implications.

Under the aegis of oral history methodology, personal interviews were conducted with Dr. Alberta Hill, Dr. Carolyn Blount, Ms. Susan Webber, Dr. Ruth Norman, and Ms. Vivian Baglien. This research seeks to understand the legacy of Dr. Alberta Hill and to share the attributes of Dr. Hill to inspire us all to live our professional commitment to the mission of the profession. Dr. Blount is a professor at a Seattle area community college and one of the volunteer consultants and instructors at Sir Arthur Lewis Community College in St. Lucia where Dr. Hill also served. Ms. Webber is a teacher and past president of the Washington State American Association of Family and Consumer Sciences (AAFCS) affiliate (WAAFCS), and Dr. Norman, the Director, United Nations Liaison Committee at US chapter of IFHE (IFHE-US), has worked with Dr. Hill on several international projects including the one in St. Lucia. Vivian Bagelien is a teacher and Family Career and Community Leaders of America (FCCLA) advisor for Auburn High School, an online

educator at Green River Community College, both in Auburn, WA, and a graduate student at Iowa State Leadership Academy.

Her Beginnings

Alberta Hill was born on October 25, 1918, in rural farming area near Payette, Idaho close to the Idaho-Oregon border. At the age of 18 months her parents moved to Oregon, and at the age of six her family moved back to Idaho near Emmett, where she attended a one-room/one teacher country school for her first eight grades. As in many one-room schools, students were encouraged to be helpers. Alberta's teacher gave her increasing responsibilities as she grew older. For example, Alberta helped make assignment copies and helped the younger children in the school. As a young girl, she was also involved in 4-H.

Later, Alberta attended the only high school in the county. Because there was no bus from her home to the school in Emmett eight miles away, she lived in town and worked for her room and board. Her responsibilities as a boarder included laundry, housecleaning, meal preparation, and supervising small children. She says this was a very good learning experience for her, not only in terms of development of homemaking abilities but also in learning the interpersonal skills of dealing with others from the mother in the family.

Although Alberta was originally not interested in home economics as a career due to its focus on sewing, she developed an interest when a new, comprehensive program in Vocational Homemaking was introduced into the high school curriculum in her senior year. An excellent teacher at the high school influenced her decision to major in home economics education at the University of Idaho in Moscow.

While in college (1935-1939), Ms. Hill had numerous opportunities to develop her leadership skills, in part because she lived in a cooperative dormitory throughout her college years. As a freshman and sophomore, she lived in a small group where all shared in planning, preparing meals, and getting mattresses cleaned to rid them of bedbugs. In her junior and senior years, she lived in a group of 100 students and was elected house manager. In this role, she was responsible for meal planning, food purchasing, bookkeeping, and work schedules. Also while in college Ms. Hill was active in a church youth group, Home Economics Club, and Phi Upsilon Omicron, a home economics honor society.

After graduation, Ms. Hill taught four years in high schools in Hailey and Preston, Idaho. During this time the U.S. had



entered World War II. The Army's need for extra personnel prompted Ms. Hill in June 1943 to join the Women's Army Corps (WACS). After basic training, she was sent to cooks and bakers school and later was assigned as a baker to the WAC Company in Ft. Benning, GA. Following this assignment, she was transferred to a Regimental Intelligence Office as a clerk. In spite of these stereotypic positions, the army provided opportunities for one-to-one interaction with socio-economically and educationally diverse people. Her upbringing had taught her to accept everyone, which probably helped her with such interactions. In 1946 after leaving the service, she taught briefly in high school before going to Columbia University in New York, where she completed her master's degree in Home and Family Life Education in 1947.

Professional Leadership

Soon after receiving her degree, she obtained employment at North Dakota State University as an assistant professor in Home Economics Education. However, after one rewarding year, her commitment to development of a four-year program in Southern Idaho prompted her to apply for an open faculty position at Idaho State University in Pocatello. This role gave her a chance to develop courses for a new home economics program for juniors and seniors. Until then, the institution had been a two-year "Southern Branch" of the University of Idaho. Her work included facilitating in-service education for home economics teachers. She credited the experienced high school teachers for teaching her a lot while she worked in this role (Hill, A., personal communication, October 16, 2003).

After four years in this position, her academic acumen motivated her to pursue a doctoral degree at the University of Illinois, where she served as half-time instructor in the College of Education (1952-54) while completing coursework for the doctoral program. Before finishing her degree, she took an assistant professor position at the University of Connecticut and used summers to complete her Ed.D. in 1959. From 1959-1965 she worked as Home Economics Program Specialist in US Office of Education in Washington D.C. under Edna P. Amidon, Director of Vocational Home Economics. In this position, Dr. Hill expanded her professional network. She had special responsibility for thirteen Western states and traveled throughout to work with state supervisors, teacher education institutions, teacher educators, and cooperating teachers guiding student teachers. According to Dr. Hill, one of her most important roles was to "pass on" the successful practices she had learned from those in other states (A. D. Hill, personal communication,

January 19, 2005). She also worked on a project that resulted in publication of *Concepts and Generalizations: Their Place in High School Home Economics Curriculum Development* (1967) by the U.S. Office of Education, which was widely used and commonly known as “the bird book” (A. D. Hill, personal communication, June 16, 2005). During AHEA’s 61st convention, Dr. Hill presented a paper, *The Business of Teacher Education: Teaching Teachers*. In it, she gave suggestions to enhance home economics teacher education: more and early real-professional opportunities to prospective teachers; more emphasis on learning and learners; more constructive supervision; broadening recruitment by adding groups like teacher’s aides, mature experienced homemakers, persons with background in business, and ex-home economics teachers; and preparing teaching assistants and teaching aides (Hill, 1970).

With such diverse experience and a doctoral degree, but no formal administrative preparation as was common then, she obtained her first administrative leadership position. From 1965 to 1969, she lived the mission of the profession as Professor and Head of the Department of Home Economics Education at Iowa State University (ISU). During that period, there was unrest on the campus due to the Vietnam War, Civil Rights Movement, and assassination of Martin Luther King. In her administrative role, she encouraged faculty to focus on revision of the department’s curriculum. Because of fragmentation and course proliferation, she recommended reorganization of courses, including new combinations of content together with that from related disciplines. In this scenario, she recognized that team teaching would be necessary until new instructors were prepared. She also recommended more flexible policies and procedures for assigning credit hours to learning; more independent studies, field studies, participation in seminar groups; and considerably more study of families for all home economics students (Greenwood, 1968, 140-142). According to Dr. Hill, this was a period of great challenge for her.

From Iowa Dr. Hill moved to Washington State University (WSU) at Pullman, where she chose to settle for the rest of her life. At WSU, she was Professor of Vocational Education in the College of Education for six years before becoming Dean of the College of Home Economics (1975-1983). Although she was administering a much broader college, she remained active in Home Economics Education during her deanship.

During her tenure as Dean, her colleagues elected her American Home Economics Association (AHEA) President-Elect across



the U.S. She also chaired the cross-organizational Home Economics Vocational Coalition that published a widely disseminated statement on home economics education, and she testified before the U.S. Senate Appropriation Subcommittee on Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare in the spring of 1979 (Hill et al., 1979). She argued that demonstrated growth and effectiveness of current secondary home economics programs and the new mandates of the 1976 amendments to the Vocational Education Act warranted more funding for secondary home economics programs at a time when federal support had been decreasing (“Hill Testifies On,” 1979). Dr. Hill believed AHEA’s effort helped maintain support for home economics education (A. D. Hill, personal communication, June 16, 2005).

Dr. Alberta Hill presided over AHEA during a challenging time (1979-1980). It was a time of self-examination for the profession and Association. The Association published Helen Pundt’s book, *A History of Excellence* (1980), on its own history (“Participants Hear Congressmen,” 1980). The Association work on societal issues continued to get significant attention (Pundt, 1980), but its membership had dropped to 46,000 (1979 Membership Report, 1979) from a high of 50,000, contributing to a deficit budget and restructuring of its governance. Some higher education units had changed their names to Human Ecology. Home economists were studying and debating Brown and Paolucci’s paper, *Home Economics: A Definition* (1979), commissioned by AHEA’s Future Development Committee, which also prepared discussion guides to encourage members to examine important professional questions.

In 1982, toward the end of her deanship at WSU, the university was experiencing economic stress. Dr. Hill faced a challenge to the status of the college when the university administration proposed that home economics merge with agriculture. As a seasoned leader, she prepared and presented two oral and several written statements to communicate the philosophy of home economics and the history and achievements of the College of Home Economics that supported its remaining a separate college.

Dr. Hill’s ideas for college reorganization to consolidate home economics units to strengthen the quality of instruction, research, and service were discussed (Hill et al., 1982). She argued that the planned merger in a time of economic exigency was a rash decision likely to do irreparable damage to a valuable unit (Swan, R., September 17, 1982) that had historically been under-funded because its programs were understood to be women’s programs, whose students came to the college just to

become better homemakers. She identified the loss of the College as both a family and women's issue. Dorothy Z. Price, then Chair, Department of Child and Family Studies, and Cecilia Banks, then Director of the Office of Programs for Women agreed that it was a women's issue. In the *Northwest Women's Report*, ("Regents vote," 1982), Dr. Hill made another plea, maintaining that the "merger of the colleges will result in irrevocable damage to the stature and reputation of the colleges of home economics nationwide. . . . If we do away with [the] home economics structure [college] at this time, we will have nothing to build on and we will never get it back" (p. 3). In a meeting of WSU administrators and Board of Regents, Dr. Hill argued, "we (the public) do not give credit to professions that are of service to people, as opposed to those that can be measured in dollars and cents. It is much more difficult to judge the effectiveness of a home economist versus an increase in bushels of wheat" (unpublished minutes of the regents meeting, September 21, 1982). Despite her best efforts, the Colleges of Home Economics and College of Agriculture were merged in 1983.

However, after the Regents approved the merger, she adopted a positive attitude. She wrote, "[W]e have committed ourselves to be creative, cooperative, and extremely assertive in trying to develop a structure that will enhance and not diminish the programs in home economics. . . . We have a history of working with people in the College of Agriculture in research and extension and [I] see no reason why we can't work with them in instruction" (Efforts Begin, 1982). At the same time, she held to the position that home economics could only be strong if all its departments were within one unit and remained an integrated and complete program. In spite of this, she believed that the profession of home economics as a whole would perceive this merger as a step backward and the faculty would have to work harder to maintain the stature of a professional program on the WSU campus (Efforts Begin, 1982). Following the merger, all the home economics departments remained in the merged college, but they lacked effective coordination. At that point Dr. Hill became a part-time professor and finally retired in 1986.

In 1988, the School of Home Economics at the University of Idaho, her *alma mater*, named her the Margaret Ritchie Distinguished Speaker. Alberta Hill entitled her presentation, "Where Tradition in Home Economics Meets the Future" in which she explained that she was not advocating adherence to tradition, but the importance of learning lessons from former generations to prevent making the same mistakes. She challenged the alums in university positions to let go of out-dated methods and use



experience and research to keep abreast of changes in society and employment so that curricula can prepare graduates well for the 21st century. She urged those working in other settings to cooperate with university decision makers and provide advice (p. 3), while simultaneously acknowledging gender bias in society including gender stereotyping of the profession even though it has always included men. She challenged the audience, saying, “Home economics will continue to be largely female for some time, but we will continue to move toward greater balance as we [society] inch along in achieving true equality of sexes in homes and work places. This will not happen by wooing more men into the profession, but by attracting able women who are willing to prove they can perform as equals with men. We cannot be just NAGs, i.e. Nice Average Girls” (p. 3).

In referring to the nature of home economics, she continued, “The emphasis of the profession on improvement of home and family life and its integrated nature have remained its strength and been the source of its greater problems and controversies” (1988, April, p. 4). Home and family life never had much status because they have been considered women’s responsibility and the value of such work has not been quantified in the GNP. Even though a variety of specific family problems have received media attention, they have gotten few community or national resources to address them except as “cures” for separate problems. Home economics offers the missing dimension by recognizing and addressing the complex interactions of factors affecting individual and family well-being (Hill, April, 1988).

She added, the integration of knowledge is difficult to understand and more difficult upon which to develop consensus. Some programs are attempting to integrate knowledge by requiring a series of discipline- and specialization-based courses, but Dr. Hill argued, such a curriculum does not ensure that students understand how to apply such knowledge to practical problems. Others are approaching integration through a core curriculum structured around the study of (a) current societal issues, (b) roles of home economics content in solving current problems, and (c) problem solving skills. Such core courses often are taught as seminars involving team interaction of students from different specializations as required in professional work. Although she saw this as an exciting idea, she worried that if they are not done well, students would neither accept the adequacy of their background for interdisciplinary/inter-specialized work nor accept the ethical responsibility to use their interdisciplinary preparation to make contributions within their specialized professional roles that demonstrate this broader, integrative approach (p. 4). The

increasing specialization within the profession and scarcity of faculty with advanced degrees in home economics at that time led to hiring from other fields and disciplines. Without adequate orientation to the integrative nature of home economics, specialized faculty have continued work in their own specializations in their teaching and research. This lack of understanding of the purposes, scope, and mission of home economics has prompted secondary and higher education unit administrators to restructure home economics programs for political and budgetary reasons that have fragmented the profession by encouraging specializations to align with their root disciplines (Hill, 1988, April). Dr. Hill closed her address by saying that if the profession completely disintegrates, it will be reinvented with a similar philosophy under another name because the mission and work of the profession is so essential that it will live on.

Personal Leadership style

Dr. Hill's associates reiterated attributes that make her successful. Her leadership style is not flamboyant but dependable and steady. Dr. Carolyn Blount, who has been a co-presenter with Dr. Hill at several professional meetings and otherwise worked with her for about forty years through professional organizations, stated that Washington State colleagues admire Dr. Hill most for her involvement and commitment to the profession. According to Dr. Blount¹, Dr. Hill has incredible energy and reaches out to others to share opportunities and mentor them. She is trustworthy and dependable with excellent interpersonal skills (C. Blount, personal communication, November 11, 2004). Dr. Blount, herself, greatly admires Alberta Hill as a person, professional, and mentor to her because of her knowledge, wisdom, energy, concern for others, and sense of humor. She said Dr. Hill had given others opportunities to be leaders and educators. In her case, Dr. Hill encouraged her to join IFHE and to get involved. Dr. Hill has an irrefutably nice manner of talking others into accepting opportunities and has a wonderfully inspiring sense of humor. Dr. Blount also pointed to Dr. Hill's professionalism in not gossiping; in fact, according to Dr. Blount, she has never heard her criticize anyone loudly and always has communicated her critique in very subtle statements. An interesting story about the humbleness and selfless character of Dr. Hill is that when she turned 80, she wanted the state association to honor her by giving a coin to help fund someone from St. Lucia to attend the national AAFCS meeting in Seattle in 1999. Dr. Blount successfully coordinated this birthday gift for her (C. Blount, personal communication, August 1, 2004).



In another interview, Ms. Susan Webber, who was her student at WSU, also comments on Dr. Hill's humbleness, her concern for others, and interpersonal skills such as remembering details about individuals. Ms. Webber considers Dr. Hill a person who can be trusted and depended upon. She thinks of Dr. Hill as a mentor to many because of her knowledge and experience. Ms. Webber also noted how easy she is to get along with and how much fun she is to be with (S. Webber, personal communication, August 1, 2004).

Ms. Vivian Baglien, an educator in Washington State, who knows Dr. Alberta Hill primarily as past Dean of the College of Home Economics at WSU, said of her, "She is a professional that cannot be easily matched. Family and consumer sciences teachers in Washington State revere her dedication to our profession. I have always admired her sheer tenacity to continue to contribute on a professional level when she easily could have slipped into [disengaged] retirement. She continues to attend various professional meetings at [the] state and national level[s]. She . . . just keeps on going and going! If we can attract more professionals at her level, our profession will continue to grow and flourish" (V. Baglien, personal communication, December 1, 2003, & November 30, 2004).

In 1993 the American Home Economics Association (AHEA) recognized Dr. Alberta Hill's contributions to the profession with a Distinguished Service Award for her achievements as a teacher, teacher educator, program specialist, administrator, and international program consultant (Distinguished Service Award Recipients, 1993, pp. 52, 53, 56). This is the highest award bestowed upon members of the Association.

Alberta Hill credited her success to the supervisors she had in all the institutions where she was employed. She acknowledged Edna Amidon, Director, Vocational Home Economics, U.S. office of Education; P. Roy Brammell, Dean, College of Education, Connecticut; Helen LeBaron (Hilton), Dean of the College of Home Economics at ISU; and Marianne Andrews, Director, Home and Family life Education, Office of the Washington State Superintendent of Public Instruction. She does not believe that we need to have a single, long-term role model, but that we can learn from many. She also believes, "One person cannot bring change, but it is the team work which helps us achieve the desired objectives" (A. D. Hill, personal communication, October 16, 2003). She credited her various supervisors for teaching her the importance of teamwork (A. D. Hill, personal communication, June 16, 2005). She also credits her father's inspirational teach-

ings for involvement in so many altruistic activities. She remembers his saying, “You are no better than anyone else and no one is any better than you,” implying that all are equal and should have equal opportunity for freedom and fair treatment.

International Legacy

Dr. Hill’s interest in supporting people around the world was sparked by her family that read and talked about international news and equality. Because she was already oriented toward international issues, it was easy for her to get professionally involved. Gradually she increased her involvement by working with international exchange students, teaching international students, and becoming an active member of the IFHE. Dr. Hill’s active involvement with IFHE started in 1968. The federation meetings, which aim to encourage sharing of ideas and philosophies, have been a great platform for her to become acquainted with professionals from different countries. In 1981 and again in 1983 she had the opportunity to teach and learn from faculty members in teacher education colleges through a USAID-Washington State University program in eastern Indonesia. Field visits to adult education programs and individual homes in Indonesia provided background to make the instruction practical and acceptable within the culture.

Another opportunity for international work arose in 1987 when Helen Strow, then IHES President, requested help for home economics programs in St. Lucia, in the Caribbean. Dr. Hill and Dr. Ruth Norman, then a board member of IHES and IFHE’s representative to the UN², got involved in a project that led to several years of Dr. Hill’s involvement as one of the first volunteer consultants to both the Ministry of Education and teachers at Sir Arthur Lewis Community College in St. Lucia (Highlights of 25, 1998). The community college had received a grant for a training program for primary and secondary home economics teachers from eight Caribbean island states who had little or no college level home economics course work. During her five school terms in St. Lucia, Dr. Hill taught some of the courses, helped develop curriculum for the program, worked with the St. Lucia Home Economics Association, and advised students interested in further education. This work got her involved in the Caribbean Association of Home Economists (CAHE) that subsequently led to her participation in a number of the CAHE biennial meetings and a fund raising project to strengthen home economics programs in the Caribbean through the IHES. “Beginning in 1996, these teachers began to attend IFHE Council meetings and Congresses, eventually submitting papers and receiving international recognition for their work. [This



was] a great tribute to the work which began with Dr. Hill” (R. Norman, personal communication, November 29, 2005).

Dr. Hill’s involvement with the IFHE has been long standing. When IFHE met in Minneapolis in 1988, she and Carolyn Blount conducted a pre-congress workshop for international participants on home economics in post secondary education (Hill, 1988, Fall). They shared the existing post-secondary programs in two universities and four or five community colleges with professionals from other countries (A. D. Hill, personal communication, June 16, 2005). She tirelessly participates in international associations and projects, including setting up IFHE-United States (IFHE-US) in 1996, for which she chairs the Nominating Committee, 2002-2008. Her education and the diversity of her experiences as dean, committee member in various organizations, advocate, and colleague to diverse people prepared her well to serve personally and professionally wherever she chose.

Her approach to international work is first to get to know the culture and people by listening and observing. She attempts to acquaint herself with possible problems with language, organizational structure of the educational institutions, and the background of the teachers with whom she is working. The most important thing she believes is to understand what people are accustomed to and then use a suitable method of teaching. In addition to getting acquainted with the culture of a particular institution, she believes it is better to adjust to other cultures rather than trying to make the locals change. This approach has helped her learn to appreciate different methods of teaching, ethical standards of other cultures, family lifestyles, and ways of being hospitable to people (A. D. Hill, personal communication, May 30, 2003).

Dr. Hill shared her thoughts on international work at the 1987 AHEA convention that had the theme, “Gateway to Global Home Economics”. She contended that home economists needed a well-articulated and widely communicated statement of the philosophy and purposes to guide their international involvement; more aggressive communication of the expertise that home economists can offer international agencies and groups; and greater concern for the status of women internationally. In addition, she urged the profession to broaden its public policy concerns to include Congressional support for worldwide programs, and a well qualified, paid AHEA staff to provide leadership, information, and coordination to international efforts (Shipman, 1987).

Dr. Hill’s philosophy and experience prompted her to urge us to broaden our views by learning about history, government, and

social standards around the world. To her the essence of successful international work is working cooperatively with people in other countries, focusing on project goals, content, and problems with professional organizations playing an important role in achieving such collaboration.

Because becoming a good international professional takes time and continued effort and because ethnocentrism is difficult to unlearn after it has become entrenched in a person's values, she believes international education should begin early in children's education. International education, including courses on social, cultural, economic conditions, and problems of other countries should be an integral part of education at all levels. She urges colleagues of all ages to be active members of the international community (A. D. Hill, personal communication, May 30, 2003). To this end, when she chaired the Scholarship and Exchange Program Committee of AHEA's International Section, the committee developed a directory of information about overseas assignments for university faculty; opportunities for students, secondary and Extension educators; fellowships; and personal exchange programs (Section program initiated, 1987).

Community Work

Dr. Hill continues to serve on different community, national, and international boards. Her experience prompted her to urge her colleagues to prepare themselves to achieve effective teamwork by learning that boards and board/executive relationships vary with respect to size, mission, budget, and geographical service areas of the board (Hill, 1999).

Dr. Hill has successfully used her professional skills for community work and volunteerism that have been an integral part of her life. Being an active member of United Church of Moscow, Idaho since 1970, she has served as Board of Director's chair and as President of the Ecumenical Campus Ministry Boards at both the University of Idaho and WSU, and member of the Board of Northwest Regional Christian Churches. She has served the Council of Aging & Human Services, Whitman County, WA as a member of its Board of Directors for three terms and for the past few years as its President. Dr. Hill also has supported two children through Child Reach (formerly Foster Parent Plan) and has corresponded with them. Over the past 42 years she has supported many children in eight countries.

She is especially concerned with fair treatment of people who need advocacy, such as the mentally challenged and politically oppressed, on whose behalf she writes letters through her



association with Amnesty International (AI). AI helps her gain more understanding of world problems and provides an opportunity for her to advocate through its Letter Writing Program for those who have been inhumanely treated and have lost their freedom. Each month she writes a letter in support of a person AI has identified as being held unjustly and sends a copy to the embassy in DC of the country of the detainee.

Discussion and Implications

Dr. Alberta Hill is a model leader for our profession. Her leadership qualities worth emulating are concern for others, humility, persistence, sense of humor, team spirit, knowledge and wisdom, ability to reach out, exemplary interpersonal skills, dependability, steadiness, and selfless dedication to the profession and its mission. Positive attitude is another important attribute that we need to learn from her. If we can nurture even some of these qualities within ourselves and in those lives we touch, we will be providing empowered leaders who can contribute to the profession.

Her passion for sharing with, learning from, and teaching people around the world demonstrates her belief that learning is an exchange process between individuals. Therefore, we should learn from each other and pass it on to others. We can walk the path she has created to be open to change and find the best way to use the change for the benefit of the profession and society. Her background and preparation is strong evidence of how an individual is shaped by upbringing at home and mentoring during her education and career development. From her past, we have a wonderful example of parenting practices that prepare individuals for respecting diversity. We should also seize all the opportunities that come our way to experience and learn new things just as she has. Dr. Alberta Hill's long-standing involvement with international organizations has contributed immensely to the home economics teaching programs in other countries. Her contribution throughout her active involvement with academic, professional, and community organizations is a model of active leadership. Dr. Hill has a message for all practicing professionals in the field of family and consumer sciences. In an interdependent world, it is critical that we learn to collaborate across the country and around the world. Active participation in professional organizations is one of the easiest ways to create such collaboration and involvement internationally. Moreover, professionals today can gain great insights about fragmentation of the profession from studying the past in order to make informed decisions for the benefit of the profession and the well-

being of society. She feels strongly that to make an impact we need to decide what we want to do in life, stick to it, and support the organizations that empower us through our collaborative work with fellow professionals. She urges us to use serial reciprocity to pass on what we have learned from educational programs, associations, and mentors to younger professionals (Hill, A., personal communication, February 14, 2005).

References

- 1979 Membership Report. (1979, Winter). *Journal of Home Economics*, 71(4), p. 52. (Available from AAFCS Collection, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, 2B Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY).
- 1993 Distinguished Service Award Recipients. (1993, Fall). *Journal of Home Economics*, pp. 52-53, 56.
- Andrews, M. P. Home Page. *International Home Economics Services, Inc.* (2005). Retrieved on July 6, 2005 from <http://www.msu.edu/~mandrews/>.
- Concepts and generalizations: Their place in high school home economics curriculum development* (1967) Washington, DC: American Home Economics Association.
- Brown, M. M., & Paolucci, B. (1979). *Home economics: A definition*. Washington, DC: American Home Economics Association.
- Efforts begin to detail merger (1982, September 24). *Bulletin/Calendar*, 9(1). (Available from Manuscripts, Archives and special Collections, Washington State University, Pullman).
- Greenwood, B. B. (1968). Academic women in home economics at land-grant institutions. (Doctoral dissertation, Florida State University, 1968). *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 30(02), 730.
- Highlights of 25 years of service to international home economics. (1998). *International Home Economics Services, Inc.*, p. 2. (Available from the International Home Economics Services, Inc. P.O. Box 81 Howey-in-the-Hills, FL 34737)
- Hill, A. D. (1970, June). *The business of teacher education- Teaching teachers*. Paper presented at the 61st Annual Meeting of American Home Economics Association, Cleveland, Ohio (Obtained from Dr. Alberta Hill).
- Hill, A. D., Shear, T., Bell, C. G., Cross, A. A., Carter, E. A., & Horning, L. N. (1979, Winter). Vocational home economics education: A statement by the Vocational Education Coalition. *Journal of Home Economics*, 12-16. (Available from AAFCS Collection, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, 2B Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY)
- Hill, A. D. (1988, April). "Where tradition in home economics meets the future". Margaret Ritchie Lecture at University of Idaho. (Obtained from Dr. Alberta Hill)
- Hill, A. D. (1988, Fall). Pre-congress workshop held in northwest. *International Update*. (Available from AAFCS Collection, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, 2B Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY).
- Hill, A. D. (1999, June). About boards: A personal point of view. *The Not-For-Profit CEO Monthly Letter*, 6(8), 6. (Available from C3 Publications, 3495 NW Thurman, Portland, OR).
- Hill, A., Mitchell, M., Friend, S., Bradish, D., Trout, B., Price, D., et al. (1982, January 27). Ideas for reorganization to consolidate home economics units to strengthen the quality of instruction, research and service in the college of home economics at Washington State University. Draft prepared for discussion to dean and chairman of college of Home Economics, WSU. (Available from Manuscripts, Archives and special Collections, Washington State University, Pullman).



- Hill testifies on consumer homemaking. (1979, May). *AHEA Action*. 1-4. (Available from AAFCS Collection, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, 2B Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY).
- Minutes of the Washington State Board of Regents meeting. (September 21, 1982). (Available from Manuscripts, Archives and special Collections, Washington State University, Pullman).
- Participants hear congressman and receive warning on vocational education. (May, 1980). *AHEA Action*. 1. (Available from Manuscripts, Archives and special Collections, Washington State University, Pullman).
- Pundt, H. (1980). *AHEA: A history of excellence*. Washington, D.C.: American Home Economics Association
- Regents vote to merge WSU college of home economics. (1982, September-October). *Northwest Women Report*, 3. (Available from Manuscripts, Archives and special Collections, Washington State University, Pullman).
- Section program initiated. (1987, Fall). *International Update*. (Available from AAFCS Collection, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, 2B Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY).
- Shipman, J. (1987, Fall). Global gateways reviewed. *International Update*. (Available from AAFCS Collection, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, 2B Carl A. Kroch Library, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY).
- Swan, R. (1982, September 17). Merger plan called discriminatory. *Daily Evergreen*. (Available from Manuscripts, Archives and special Collections, Washington State University, Pullman).

Authors' Note:

This research began as a course project in FCEDS 504x Intellectual Foundations of Family and Consumer Sciences Leadership, taught online by Drs. Virginia Vincenti and Lorna Browne for the Iowa State Family and Consumer Sciences Education Leadership Academy. It involved archival research and an oral history methodology using published and unpublished print materials obtained from AAFCS, IFHE, WSU, and from Dr. Alberta Hill herself.

(Footnotes)

¹ Dr. Carolyn Blount is current international Chair of the IFHE Development Fund Committee and someone with whom Dr. Hill has worked on several projects such as the WAAFCS twinning project with St. Lucia' home economists and one to increase AAFCS members' participation in IFHE.

² IFHE is a NGO of the UN.

A Symbol of Generativity: Margaret Edsel Fitch, National and International Leader

Lynda Harriman

Margaret Edsel Fitch

Birth: December 16, 1919
Education: 1942 - B.S., Oklahoma A & M University (now Oklahoma State University)
1960 - M.S., Oklahoma State University



Margaret Edsel Fitch's legacy is building bridges and systems nationally and internationally to involve people to affect change and work toward a better future for themselves and others. Margaret modeled this behavior by staying connected to her professional organizations and her career field.

Margaret Edsel Fitch, a local, state, national, and international leader, is an eternal optimist who approaches the future and change with a can-do attitude. She is recognized for her genuine interest in and concern for people of all stations in life. As a leader she is most recognized for having confidence in others' abilities and inspiring that confidence in them. Other enduring traits are her innate ability to understand varied perspectives and her quiet diplomacy. Without doubt, Margaret Edsel Fitch is one of the professional giants of our time.

Professional Challenges

According to Margaret, the issues addressed by our profession are widely recognized throughout society as being critical. Yet many do not look to family and consumer sciences professionals for expertise. Margaret believes that a concerted effort to aggressively market our profession and report what our professionals have done and can do is long overdue. She also contends that working more closely with decision makers, locally and at the state and federal level, is absolutely critical to gaining their support. In addition, knowing our legislators is essential to helping them shape policy. Contact with them must be made on a regular basis. As professionals, she urges everyone to also work through their clientele to reach decision makers. "Our power base," she says, "includes our students and our clientele. Many times they are the parents or children of the power brokers." "Our programs," she says, "need to be so essential and needed that those who benefit will not only support us but also demand our services be adequately funded" (M. Fitch, personal communication, July 8, 1998).

Dr. Lynda Harriman is Faculty Emeritus, Department of Family and Consumer Sciences, Oklahoma State University.



Margaret views the specialization of fields in our profession as a real strength. Yet she is concerned that, in the process of strengthening fields of specialization, the integration of the profession has been compromised. “In many instances today, we are splintered among specialized occupations and professional associations working toward similar goals but without an appreciation for the strengths each specialization brings to an issue. Unification of professionals within specialized fields working for a common purpose is critical to strengthening the position of each and the profession as a whole.” It is Margaret’s hope that we will find a way to rekindle the integrative nature of the profession for the benefit of all.

Margaret’s commitment to international outreach remains strong. Internationally there remain many challenges for the profession. “We in industrialized countries need to continue to provide leadership and educational opportunities in developing countries” (personal communication, July 29, 1998). Our challenge, according to Margaret, is to find ways to provide education to help professionals in other countries to upgrade their knowledge and technical skills. This kind of outreach can strengthen the profession. It can also provide opportunities for twenty-first century professionals, who will work in a global economy.

Formative years

Her roots were modest. She was the fifth child of eight, born to Alphe and Dora Edsel in Seiling, Oklahoma. Her father was an oil wholesale dealer, her mother a homemaker. Margaret’s oldest sister, fifteen years her senior, was her second grade teacher. This sister lived at home and influenced many of the decisions Margaret made while a youth. Yet Margaret was closer to, and more able to confide in, another older sister who was to become a nurse. Her mother, who only completed the eighth grade, stressed the importance of education and wanted all of her children to attend college. Six of the eight did obtain college degrees.

While in the seventh grade, Margaret recalls that the county home demonstration agent, Ola Armstrong, came to her school to organize a 4-H club. Margaret wanted to join and did. Her older brother encouraged their mother to let Margaret do whatever she could and would do in 4-H club work. Her 4-H club experiences began to shape Margaret’s later career choice. Some of her early memories of 4-H camp were taking live chickens to camp and learning to dress them. There was no refrigeration at camp, so the youth helped dress the chickens and the cook prepared them for the camp participants. Extension specialists would come to the

camp and provide educational demonstrations for the youth. Margaret also remembers attending 4-H Roundup, the state 4-H conference, at Oklahoma A & M five different years. Here she gained experience giving speeches and demonstrations and modeling a state reserve grand champion wool dress and coat that she had constructed. The garments were sent to National 4-H Congress for further competition.

Her home demonstration agent during her high school years was Zella King. Lodema Shephard and Eunice Ballinger were Margaret's high school home economics teachers. They all promoted her 4-H work. Her teachers did so by allowing her to complete her 4-H clothing projects as class projects. Along with her 4-H club experiences, these three individuals influenced her and directed her interest in home economics. Before she finished high school, Margaret had already decided that she wanted a career in Cooperative Extension.

When it came time to select a college, there was no question regarding where she would attend. Her parents preferred that she attend a local state college. Oklahoma A & M was the only place Margaret would consider. Her 4-H experiences made her feel at home on the A & M campus. While attending Oklahoma A & M she remained active in 4-H through the collegiate 4-H club. Her freshman year she attended the National 4-H Congress in Chicago, participated in radio programs on 4-H, and assisted with state 4-H Round Up. During her college years, Margaret held offices and committee assignments in the Home Economics Club. She was also a member of Aggiettes, the pep club, her church youth group, and Delta Zeta sorority.

Career Experiences

Margaret never wavered from her goal of an Extension career. Emma Chandler, Oklahoma's first Cooperative Extension State Leader of Home Economics and one of Margaret's college instructors supported her goal. Upon graduation from Oklahoma A & M, however, she became a vocational home economics teacher at Waynoka, Oklahoma. At the time, entry-level Extension agents were required to have completed 3 years of teaching experience and be at least twenty-five years of age. However, seven months into that school year, in 1943, Extension had a shortage of agents and suspended the requirement for new hires. Margaret was contacted, and before the end of the school year she found herself in Boise City as a home demonstration agent. She spent eighteen months there, doing considerable work in the area of food preservation, due to the food shortages brought on by World War II.



Her first position was not always easy. She often found that her ideas were criticized or not taken seriously by her male county director; she assumed this was because of her youth. Sometimes he would tell the secretary not to do Margaret's work. Because she had a good working relationship with the secretary, that did not become a major issue.

Margaret and other women in Extension also faced sexual harassment. Traveling alone to meetings with certain male co-workers and administrators often presented challenges to women. Women had to learn to avoid being alone with certain individuals wherever possible. This was never an issue that Margaret or her female colleagues felt comfortable broaching with their district administrators.

She left Boise City and moved to El Reno, Oklahoma in 1945, where she spent the next 25 years of her career. Food preservation continued to be a priority need until the end of the war. Margaret recalls giving a food preservation demonstration the night that peace was declared. Her demonstration was not disrupted by the announcement, because there was no television then. None of the participants knew about the peace announcement until they returned home that evening. Later many of the participants recalled that they would always remember where they were the night peace was announced.

The people of Canadian County take credit for rearing Margaret. She acknowledges that they probably did. Margaret's work in Canadian county found her teaching youth and adults. During her tenure there the 4-H program grew from approximately 300 to over 900. Five years out of ten, Canadian county youth, whom she coached, placed first in the State 4-H Meat Identification and Quality event (Wittkopp, 1970). They were also competitive nationally, taking third place at the American Royal in Kansas City in 1955 (Daily Oklahoman, Oct. 16, 1955).

In Canadian County, there were nine Extension Homemaker clubs when she arrived and fifty when she left, with a membership of nearly 600. This adult Extension program strengthened the 4-H programs because parents who belonged to Extension Homemakers encouraged their children to be in 4-H. Margaret's philosophy was that club members should lead their own clubs and that her role was to develop leaders. Home visits were an important part of her non-formal teaching. One family credited her with saving their marriage. Another homemaker told her that she feared going to the doctor until Margaret taught a lesson on health.

In spite of her many successes, Margaret also faced disappointment and discouragement while in Canadian County. Her hard work in developing and nurturing a growing program garnered only a satisfactory on her annual evaluations from her county director.

Professional challenges were also a fact of life in Canadian County, a bedroom community to Oklahoma City. The education level and income level in this county was higher than that of many Oklahoma counties at the time. In fact Canadian County was number one agriculturally during part of her tenure there. Because of this she was unable to secure federal funding to develop and implement an Expanded Food and Nutrition Education program. In addition, the employment of women was fairly high; she was challenged to find ways to reach families with education. She started some of the first lunch-and-learn programs for working women at their work sites.

Margaret was also charged with establishing the first Extension program advisory committee in Canadian County. The committee was to represent the demographics of the county. She included businessmen, lawyers, clergy and other professionals on the committee, which not only served in an advisory capacity but also participated in presenting and supporting programs. The support of the clergy and the school superintendent was particularly important the year she decided to conduct what could have been a controversial program on sex education.

Over her career in Canadian County from 1945 to 1970, some eight to ten Extension assistants were oriented to Extension under Margaret's tutelage. All but two went on to have successful Extension careers. The other two got married.

Margaret herself married in 1952. Her marriage resulted in another example of her being a pathfinder for women of her generation. At the time, home demonstration agents who married were to give thirty days notice and resign. She approached her district home economist, Zella King, and indicated that she was planning to marry in three months, and wished to continue working for at least a year. The district home economist advised Margaret not to formally give a date of resignation. Consequently, Margaret continued working with no termination date stipulated by administration, effectively breaking this glass ceiling for her self and for other women in the Oklahoma Extension system. New hires still had to be single, but marriage was no longer an employment issue for women already working.

Throughout her career in County Extension work, women also faced salary inequities and were overlooked for administrative positions, regardless of qualifications and experience. Later when



she held a state level administrative position, Margaret tried to recruit women into county administrative positions. She often found that they were unwilling or lacked the confidence needed to take an administrative position. She continually tried to encourage those with the potential to apply for administrative posts.

The Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service administration pursued Margaret for state Extension positions various times. On one occasion her services were requested to serve as Oklahoma's associate state 4-H leader. Margaret preferred to stay in El Reno where her husband was also employed. She considers her county experience as the most rewarding part of her career, because she could visibly see the outcomes of her teaching.

After her husband passed away in 1966, Margaret looked at other employment opportunities differently. The Extension state leader of the Texas Extension System, Florence Lowe, tried to convince her to take employment there. In addition she had opportunities with commercial companies. At one point, she approached the Dean of the College of Home Economics at Oklahoma State, Dr. Lela O'Toole, who shared information about an opening at the University of Arizona for the Extension Home Economics Program Leader and recommended her for the position. George Hull was Extension Director in Arizona at the time. He had formerly served as Associate State 4-H Program Leader in Oklahoma. Margaret held him in high esteem. In November of 1970 Margaret moved to Tucson, Arizona to take this position.

Margaret considers her experience in Tucson as her finest career experience. While there, she initiated county advisory committees as part of the program planning process. She also promoted interdisciplinary programming among Extension faculty. She helped establish the first state advisory committee, and helped to bring in extramural funds for programs. Because of the large distances between counties in Arizona, Margaret encouraged distance education before it was fashionable. Specialists sometimes mailed program materials and conducted lessons by telephone where necessary.

Margaret spent five years in Arizona. She found the cultural diversity of citizens within the state to be one of most interesting aspects of her work there. The Extension staff was also ethnically diverse. Some worked exclusively on the Hopi and Navajo Reservations in conducting nutrition education programs.

In November 1975, Margaret moved to Hawaii as the assistant director for home economics, 4-H, and community resource development. The Extension Homemaker organization there was

made up of women with great leadership skills. Major Extension programs emphasized food safety, because of the high rate of food poisoning in the state. Few Extension specialists were on staff. That did not stop Margaret from providing programs to meet the needs of the people. Money management was an important need. She was able to bring Josephine Lawyer, a former national program leader, to Hawaii for a short-term assignment to provide money management education. She also secured the services of Virginia nutrition specialist, Dr. Ann Hertzler, who was on sabbatical. Dr. Hertzler developed and taught a nutrition curriculum on diet and food safety.

After being in Hawaii only one year, Margaret was given the added responsibilities of the position of Acting Associate Director for Hawaii Cooperative Extension. She held that position for five years and 3 months, until her retirement in January 1981. In that role she had administrative responsibilities for the entire system. As an administrator, Margaret was sensitized to cultural differences and learned to work across cultures. Her positive outlook and fair approach to problems helped neutralize many situations.

However, being female, Caucasian, and in an acting position, her efforts were often undermined. In addition, county professionals were unionized, whereas administrators were not. The county professionals often were more concerned with keeping in line with their union than following directions from administration. In Hawaii, County Extension Directors were generally male and Japanese or Chinese. Because there were only a few counties in the state, each island being a county, she worked directly with and through County Directors. She perceived that because she was a woman in a temporary position, her program suggestions were often ignored. She frequently felt defeated and discouraged as she tried to move programs forward. If an Extension Home Economist did not want to do something and her county director said she did not have to do it, nothing happened. In spite of these barriers, Margaret perceived her greatest challenge while in Hawaii was to maintain the integrity of the Extension budget, so Extension funds were used for Extension purposes.

State and National Leadership

Margaret's leadership abilities were recognized early in her career. In 1957 she was named El Reno Business & Professional Women's club businesswoman of the year. The following year the National Home Demonstration Agents Association presented her the national distinguished service award. Margaret was also



elected to membership of the El Reno Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors, the first woman to be granted this opportunity. Within Extension she served as Oklahoma Association of Extension Home Economists President. In 1969, she held the national office of secretary with the National Association of Extension Home Economists.

Her professional peers again acknowledged her leadership qualities when they elected her president of the Oklahoma Home Economics Association in 1967. Then she served as chairman of the state presidents' unit for the American Home Economics Association. In 1974, she became president of the 55,000 member American Home Economics Association. A high priority during her year as president was membership involvement. In a news release prepared by Arizona State University (1974), she was quoted as saying, ". . . with over 55,000 members, you sometimes have problems building a strong central structure. A greater response to membership is essential to national unity, which can contribute to each state's ability to assume significant responsibilities."

During her term as AHEA president, Margaret was one of a group of seven national leaders challenged to rethink the purpose of the profession and outline future directions for home economics, as had occurred in 1959, in a document titled "New Directions." Significant changes were occurring in the larger society, and looming questions were arising about the continuing need for existence of home economics in some institutions of higher education (McGrath, 1968, p. 505-510). The women's movement and the fact that increasing numbers of women were entering and staying in the workplace, were among trends giving rise to questions relating to the purpose and directions of home economics both within and outside the field. In addition, questions were being raised about the emphasis the profession placed on skills training, as opposed to applying the social and natural sciences to issues relating to the home and family (Blackwell, 1962, p. 447-450). *New Directions II* defined home economics as:

The study of the reciprocal relations of family to its natural and man-made environments, the effect of these singly or in unison as they shape the internal functioning of families, and the interplays between the family and other social institutions and the physical environment.

Bivens, Fitch, Newkirk, Paolucci, Riggs, St. Marie, and Vaughn, (1975) p. 26-27.

This definition, served to refocus the profession back to its basic mission, which had not changed. It further served as a challenge to professionals to stay future oriented. The missions of many

higher education units today read much like this 1975 definition. In 1984, the American Association of Home Economics named 75 leaders who had made significant contributions to the Association and to the profession. Not surprisingly, Margaret Fitch's name was among them (Keeler-Battles, 1989, p. 67).

International Leadership

In 1981, Margaret took a short-term international assignment with the United Nations to Qatar, on the Persian Gulf. She was one of a team of four home economists, another American, one from England, and one from Egypt. They were sent to the University of Qatar to do a feasibility study for the University regarding the establishment of a masters degree program in home economics and a dietetics program for women. Due to the lack of job opportunities for women in Qatar, the team did not recommend that the school add a masters degree program. Nor did the team recommend the establishment of the dietetics program, because women in Qatar were not allowed to work anywhere that men were employed. Consequently, dietetic interns would be unable to work in hospitals where men were employed.

Although the Qatar assignment was her first official international assignment, Margaret had always had an interest in other cultures. As a youth her family took several vacations to Mexico. She used to think she would want to work there. She also credits Dean Lela O'Toole with her becoming more involved internationally. In the late 1960s she was invited by Dean O'Toole to attend her first International Federation for Home Economics (IFHE) Congress (in England). Dean O'Toole, a member of the IFHE Board of Directors continued to encourage her involvement and attendance at future IFHE Council meetings. By the time she retired Margaret had participated in at least ten International Federation of Home Economics International Council meetings and International Congresses all over the world. She also served on the Federation's executive committee for four years between 1974 and 1978.

In 1982 she took a United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) assignment to Tonga in the South Pacific to assess the program and staffing needs of the Cooperative Extension service there. The country had just been struck by a hurricane, which devastated most of the islands. There was a shortage of food and an immediate need for planting gardens. Of the major needs identified by Margaret and her team members, was that of securing additional education for the Extension staff in Tonga. Many of them had no college education.



A grant secured from the United Nations Women in Development program by the International Federation of Home Economics then took Margaret, as part of an international team to Togo, West Africa in 1983. The grant provided funds for a West African Conference on Technology, where the team introduced newer food production and preparation technologies to women and taught them to be trainers of trainers. In Togo, as well as other West African countries, women were the producers of food, yet new tools coming into the country were given first to men. Women were left using older tools and methods. Women came from all West African countries to be introduced to newer technologies.

From Togo, Margaret and five of the team went on to Nigeria where they were invited to review Extension Home Economics programs in rural areas. A number of income producing projects were reviewed. Some women, she remembers made clothing and hats, which they sold in their own shops. The Nigerian Extension Service used a leader training approach similar to the way Extension programs were conducted in the United States. The team offered suggestions for improving the outreach programs.

Margaret's international work kept her integrally involved with the International Federation of Home Economics. She became a member of the Executive Committee and then served as Vice President of the Americas Region. Her leadership and dedication were formally recognized when she was nominated and elected president-elect of the International Federation of Home Economics in 1979 and served as president from 1980-84. She was the first United States citizen to hold this office. An achievement of her time in office included expanding committee opportunities beyond those serving on the board. Committees were asked to meet once a year when the board met. This was an attempt to increase involvement among the membership. She also worked toward development of regions within the Federation, in order to increase member participation (O'Toole & Fitch, 1988, p. 187-188). Learning to work across cultures with those who have different customs was a major challenge of her leadership role.

Margaret continues to actively participate in the International Federation of Home Economics and promotes international involvement among professionals. Such involvement, she believes, is important to increasing understandings across cultures as we move rapidly into a global community. In recognition of Margaret's leadership and desire to assist those in developing nations, the International Federation of Home Economics established the Fitch Fund. This fund supports programs in developing countries (Dollar, 1992, p. 208).

Even in retirement, Margaret has continued to serve her profession and her alma mater. In turn, her contributions continue to be recognized and honored. Oklahoma State University bestowed upon her the coveted Henry G. Bennett Distinguished Service award in 1986. In 1990 she received the Oklahoma State University Women's Council Outstanding Alumna Award. In 1991 Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Epsilon Sigma Phi honor society recognized her with their Friend of Extension Award. In that same year, she was also initiated into the Oklahoma State University Alumni Association Hall of Fame.

Her Legacy

Margaret's legacy as an educator is her commitment to others and to helping them succeed and build confidence in their ability to reach their goals. Throughout her career, her sincere interest in and concern for the well being of others, endeared her to them, and gave them confidence to succeed. When the Canadian County Commissioners designated one week in September, 1996 as Margaret Fitch Week, a ceremony in her honor brought nearly a hundred local people to the event, many giving testimony to her important influence on their lives.

Much change has occurred in the profession and in the professional organizations she led throughout her career and into her retirement years. Margaret has watched as Extension continues to evolve and change. She can always be counted on to remain positive, hopeful, and supportive. She stays involved and she encourages others to do the same.

Margaret believes that the support and encouragement she received throughout her career made possible the many opportunities that she experienced. She believes that she owes much to her profession and that returning something is important. It is her opinion that just doing a good job in one's career is not enough (M. Fitch, personal communication, July 8, 1998). "We should pass on what has been given to us and encourage and support others, including young professionals. There are people at all stages of life that need encouragement to reach their potential." Those who know Margaret know that she practices what she preaches. She is always there to provide a word of encouragement.

From a rural Oklahoma school setting to an Extension career to national/international leadership in several countries, Margaret Edsel Fitch has been a role model inspiring others to give freely of their time and talents to help others improve their quality of life.



References

- Arizona State University. (1974). News Release.
- Bivens, G., Fitch, M., Newkirk, G., Paolucci, B., Riggs, E., St. Marie, S., & Vaughn, G. (1975). Home economics-new directions II. *Journal of Home Economics*, 67(3), 26-27.
- Blackwell, G. (1962). The place of home economics in American society. *Journal of Home Economics*, 54(6), 447-450.
- Dollar, D. O. (1992). *A history of the Oklahoma State University Alumni Association*. OSU Centennial History Series, Stillwater, Oklahoma. Oklahoma State University.
- Keeler-Battles, L. (1989). *A history of the Oklahoma State University College of Home Economics*. OSU Centennial History Series. Stillwater, OK: Oklahoma State University.
- McGrath, E.J. (1968). The Imperatives of Change for Home Economics. *Journal of Home Economics*, 60(7), 505-510.
- O'Toole, I., & Fitch, M. (1988). Economics and the contribution of home economists in the United States. In L. O'Toole (Ed.), *The International Heritage of Home Economics in the United States* (pp. 185-199). Washington, D.C: American Home Economics Association.
- Wittkopp, P. (1970, March). Meat judging is rewarding. *The Oklahoma Farmer-Stockman*, 83,(3) 28-29.
- Young Stockmen Find Royal Competition Tough. (1955, October 16). *The Daily Oklahoman*, p. A16.

Leaders Building Apparel Design Programs Within the Home Economics During the 20th Century

Diana Saiki

This paper discusses the useful contextual approach to teaching apparel design, which initially developed from the perception that apparel is an important component of the social changes related to the family including technology, fashion, changes in roles between men and women, and changes from home sewing to purchased garments. As the field of apparel matured, it became increasingly defined, developing specializations within professional practice and scholarship, yet maintaining consideration of context. Highlighted are leaders throughout the 20th century who contributed to the development of apparel within home economics programs, including Anna M. Cooley, Harriet Goldstein, and Elizabeth Tarpley.

This article presents three pioneers who helped develop apparel design education within home economics programs. The article was inspired from a larger study where apparel industry professionals were interviewed about their professional careers (Saiki, 2002). A design instructor within a home economics program interviewed for the larger study discussed a contextual approach to apparel design where the student must be aware of different subjects beyond technical skills. She emphasized how important this approach was to the success of her students. She described teaching design from this contextual point of view to stay in touch with the customer.

Parents wanted a garment that was easy to put on their child and safe for their child to wear. I used to take them to classes with children and students played with children. I allowed the children to draw what they wanted. I used to tell my students that they needed to observe the movements and the behavior of the children. They also had to analyze the drawings by children. We also went to the museum for children. (H.A. personal communication, 2001)

This contextual approach to apparel was also discussed among notable apparel industry professionals interviewed for the larger project. After reading about the start of apparel design programs within home economics, this approach to apparel design was found throughout the 20th century within home economics programs. It is a natural approach to apparel design due to early

Dr. Diana Saiki is Assistant Professor in Department of Family and Consumer Sciences at Ball State University. She teaches classes in fashion merchandising and history of costume. Her research focuses on history of costume, innovation theory, and industry professionals.



ideas that apparel was an important part of individual and family development within the greater social environment.

Through biographies, this perception is shown over the course of the 20th century from the point of view of people working in higher education, who first broadened the idea of the field from a technical focus on sewing to a broader, more conceptually rich understanding with connections to other fields as well as deeper understanding of the specialties within the field of apparel design. Individuals from different time periods throughout the 20th century are highlighted.



Photograph of Anna M. Cooley. Courtesy of Teachers College, Columbia University.

Anna M. Cooley

Anna M. Cooley was born in 1874. She earned a bachelor's degree at Columbia University (*Who Was Who*, 1976) and eventually became a professor of domestic arts in 1904 at the Teachers College at Columbia University (Ohles, Ohles, & Ramsay, 1997). She was a founding and life-long member of American Home Economics Association (Baldwin, 1949).

Ms. Cooley felt that there were two kinds of domestic art teachers, those who teach sewing technically and those who give the subject a rich thought-content. She encouraged teachers to follow the latter method and to demonstrate relations of domestic arts to other subjects (Cooley, 1909). She argued that this contextual approach enabled a woman to be a better consumer, producer, and homemaker in any community. Among her accomplishments, Ms. Cooley developed curriculum for domestic arts. She focused on development of domestic arts at all levels of education, from elementary school through postsecondary school. At the high school level she encouraged a holistic approach to domestic arts, which included apparel design. The curriculum for a designer attending a domestic arts school included practical courses in technical skills, such as construction of underwear, shirtwaists, lingerie gowns, and lined gowns. These courses required mastery of hand sewing, machine sewing, and pattern making. Courses that fostered a broader view, also known as "allied subjects," included art, industrial history, economics, art history, and chemistry. Community-focused subjects addressed important issues of the time such as relationships with employers, sweatshop problems, and charity organizations. According to Cooley, these were subjects related to being an effective homemaker (Cooley, 1909; 1910; 1911).

Her ideas regarding curriculum of domestic arts in high schools were applied to the new college programs in home economics. She noted in 1911 that programs in home economics at the

college level were only about 20 years old, and she had the foresight to envision that eventually the field of domestic arts would mature to the point that doctorates would be earned. Professor Cooley responded to new freedoms for women during the time period. A leader of women's reform during the twentieth century, Mary Fraser noted that Professor Cooley:

“. . . saw no reason why a woman should not run her household on scientific and artistic principles. She argued that . . . just as a man needs education in his world, a woman who wanted to be trained to run her household scientifically and artistically needed educated teachers to introduce the necessary subjects into the school curriculum . . . ” (Madden, 1995, p. 24).

Within the domestic arts category at the college level, Ms. Cooley recommended courses related to the economics of apparel, such as costs of materials and construction. These subjects included ethics of shopping and sweatshop labor. She discussed possibilities related to apparel from the sociological point-of-view, including apparel as it relates to the family, the homemaker, and the “home spirit.” She also recommended that the student take courses about the house, the location of the home within the community, home economy, and psychological-oriented courses such as how individual meaning changes depending on the home environment. She discussed the artistic side of household arts, including the art of apparel design. She suggested additional courses including evolution of dress and further exploration of the practical work in materials, textiles, and garment construction (Cooley, 1911).

Ms. Cooley authored many articles published in the *Journal of Home Economics* and *Bulletin of American Home Economics*. She published nine books. The books associated with apparel included *Occupations for Little Fingers: A Manual for Grade Teachers* (1913), *Mothers, and Settlement Workers* (1905), *Shelter and Apparel: A Textbook of the Household Arts* (1913), *Apparel and Health: An Elementary Textbook of Home Making* (1916), *Household Arts for Home and School, Vols. I and II* (1929), and *Domestic Art in Women's Education* (1911). Her books ranged from technical skills to broader topics relating apparel and the social environment, such as health and shelter. Even in a technical book about sewing titled *Occupation for Little Fingers*, Cooley with Elizabeth Sage (1913) noted that handwork is part of the context as it developed from a need for food, shelter, and clothing (p. vii). She was a leader in professional organizations: American Home Economics Association, American Women's Association, and Education Association (*Who Was Who*, 1976).



Harriet Goldstein

Harriet Goldstein was born in Trufaut, Michigan in 1883. Ms. Goldstein was educated at the Chicago Art Institute, Chicago Art Academy, University of Minnesota, Northwestern Conservatory, and New York School of Fine and Applied Arts (*Who's Who in America*, 1928). She started teaching in 1910 at the University of Minnesota. Her sister, Vetta Goldstein, was hired as an instructor at the University of Minnesota in 1914, and the two worked together to promote the notion of “art in everyday life.” Harriet Goldstein wrote about apparel design in particular. Harriet Goldstein became the leader of the arts division in the home economics program, retiring from the University of Minnesota in 1949 (*Strategic plan*, 2002).



Photograph of Harriet Goldstein. Courtesy of University of Minnesota Archives.

Ms. Goldstein helped define apparel design within home economics. She emphasized the need to enhance beauty in the home environment. She noted that apparel was part of beauty and it should be “sought in everything we do, and in everything we select” (p. 1). She emphasized that dress should emphasize an individual’s personality, wardrobe, health, values, and economic situation. She discussed appropriate principles in dress design, such as proportions and color (Goldstein & Goldstein, 1925).

Whereas Ms. Cooley, who was focused on contextual courses to develop the different aspects related to the family and social environment in which design was studied, Ms. Goldstein focused on the use of contextual courses to increase the students’ abilities as designers. In 1936 she wrote, “It is not merely a matter of knowing how to sketch and make designs. There must be a rich background in psychology, economics, textile information, and many others if one is to do more than superficial work” (Goldstein, 1936a, p. 22). She identified eight professions within apparel design, including stylist, buyer, homemaker as a consumer, fashion illustrator, fashion designer, dressmaker, home dressmaker, and teacher. She encouraged students to find a niche within the field and to take classes to support his or her understanding of that specialty within apparel design and the related contextual topics (Goldstein, 1936b).

In an influential talk at an American Home Economics Association yearly conference, Ms. Goldstein (1944) connected apparel design to other programs in home economics through art. Art, according to Ms. Goldstein, includes economics, science, and management. She stated that apparel design students “can be lead to understand the apparel problems of other types of people, and, we hope, to become an effective influence in a

broader field” (1944, p. 549). She also made a connection among all the home economics programs noting that art is found in each program. For example, the restaurant manager must be aware of the environment and food presentation (Goldstein, 1944). Ms. Goldstein also emphasized the importance of art for the political environment of the time. Art was very important to mental health, especially during the 1940s when America was involved in WWII. With such associations, Ms. Goldstein was at the forefront of the arts and crafts movement where relationships between aesthetics and lifestyles were emphasized (*Strategic plan*, 2002).

Ms. Goldstein published articles in *The Journal of Home Economics*. She wrote a book titled *Art in Everyday Life* (1925). She was also an honorary member of Phi Upsilon Omicron and Omicron Nu (*Who’s Who in America*, 1928). Harriet Goldstein and her sister started the Goldstein collection while teaching at the University of Minnesota. Their collection was representative of their philosophy that art objects, including apparel, textiles, and furniture, are “integral to the learning and life experience.” By 1973 their collection became core pieces of the Goldstein Gallery. Three decades later, the museum houses 17,000 objects with an outstanding collection of designer garments. The museum is still important today and is used for research and exhibitions about design, addressing historical and social issues related to apparel design (*Strategic plan*, 2002).

Elizabeth Tarpley

Mrs. Elizabeth Tarpley was born in 1898. She graduated with a bachelor’s degree from Peabody College in Nashville, Tennessee in 1920. She earned her masters of arts in 1927 at Columbia College. Mrs. Tarpley traveled often as a faculty member, specializing in Indian dress and adornment. She was the head of the division of textiles and apparel department from 1942 to 1961 at the University of Texas at Austin (In Memoriam, n.d.).

As a pioneer of the textiles and apparel field, Ms. Tarpley was the chairperson of the apparel and textiles committee in the American Home Economics Association during the early 1950s. Ms. Tarpley worked at a time when apparel design educators made contributions about fabric testing and labeling standards (Heggstad, 2005a). Ms. Tarpley recognized technical skills within the context of the whole educational experience. She wrote, “Courses in clothing construction can make a unique contribution toward an individual’s ability ‘to acquire and use the skills and habits involved in critical and constructive



Elizabeth Tarpley - Photograph is courtesy of the University of Texas Office of Public Affairs and The Center for American History at the University of Texas at Austin.



thinking,' which is one of the purposes of higher education" (Rathbone & Tarpley, 1952, p. 101). Ms. Tarpley introduced to home economic professionals strategies to develop an individual's ability to think critically while learning apparel construction. The student-focused strategy had students approach learning at their individual level and goals (Rathbone & Tarpley, 1952).

Unlike Ms. Cooley and Ms. Goldstein, Ms. Tarpley chose to focus her book on the sole two topics named in the titled *Fabrics and Dress* (1931). She described dress within the context of art, economics, and hygiene, and she allowed for practical considerations, including construction and clothing care. She stressed selection and clothing care, rather than construction, describing this emphasis as "keeping with present tendencies" (Rathbone & Tarpley, 1931).

In the 1950s, Ms. Tarpley was the chairperson of the apparel and textiles committee in the American Home Economics Association. She participated in a planning committee to further define the specialties in the field. The committee saw clothing programs in college as a means to develop individuals who recognize individual worth and dependence on each other as family units and as a whole society. They noted that "clothing has traditionally been one of the primary needs of the individual and the family; throughout history it has served as a means of protection and adornment. In addition, "production, distribution, and consumption of clothing and textiles have directly affected national and international relations" (Apparel, 1956, p. 635). This committee discussed deepening knowledge in the field in response to new technologies and a changing society, defining areas within the specialty that still exist today, including merchandising, promotion, fashion design, history, and textiles.

The committee called for thinking about apparel and textiles in a broader sense as part of human development. In order to achieve this "broader sense," the committee suggested additional goals that paralleled curriculum goals of predecessors, but were broader socially. Goals for apparel design programs, for example, included pursuing further understanding of fashion in society and understanding of social forces at work in the global apparel industry. Apparel in relation to the family was broadened to understanding "practices" of different social groups and closer inspection of family values related to apparel use. In addition to clothing construction, the committee suggested that apparel design programs focus on teaching topics such as apparel construction relationships to design, commercial patterns, and managerial processes (Apparel, 1956).

Mrs. Tarpley wrote the book, *Fashions and Fabric* (1962), in addition to previously mentioned *Fabrics and Dress* (1931). She was member of Omicron Nu, Pi Lambda Theta, and Kappa Delta Pi. She was also a member of the American Home Economics Association, American Association of University Professors, Texas Home Economics Association, and Texas State Teachers Association. She was chairman for four years of the textiles and apparel division of the American Home Economics Association. The Department of Home Economics at the University of Texas at Austin has an Elizabeth Tarpley endowment in her honor (In Memoriam, n.d.).

Conclusion

These women worked during the 20th century when apparel design education was at different stages of development, and their work reflected these changes. Anna Cooley lived during a time when apparel design was viewed as part of the overall goal of home economists to provide helpful information for a woman to create a positive environment for her family (Heggestad, 2005a). Harriet Goldstein in her cutting edge talks and writings worked during the next time period when home economists began to offer training for people interested in design careers and during the arts and crafts movement when design was related to lifestyles (Heggestad, 2005b; *Strategic plan*, 2002). Ms. Goldstein helped nurture ideas related to design expanding previous ideas for applying principles of art (Goldstein & Goldstein, 1925). These concepts continued through the 1950s when apparel and textile scholars began to look beyond practicalities, such as fabrics and labeling. They began to view apparel as a social object, focusing on apparel design broadly with goals to teach for the individual student and to address topics such as fashion movement, gender roles, and the reason people dress as they do (Heggestad, 2005a; Rathbone & Tarpley, 1952). These social courses were incorporated into apparel specialties further developed by pioneers, such as Elizabeth Tarpley and other leaders who were in touch with social changes of the time period, refined the apparel design program, focusing on individual style and design for particular consumers with an awareness of related contextual variables (Apparel, 1956; Agins, 1999).

Leaders in home economics helped develop a program with a contextual approach that included apparel related to impact of technology, fashion, social changes affecting women, men, and children and to the movement from home sewing to purchased garments. This contextual approach to apparel, fostered in home economics programs and rooted in the family and the changing



roles of individuals within the family and in society, gives an apparel designer a practical and a useful approach to face these and future design challenges. Heggstad (2005b) noted that designers trained as home economists tended to emphasize practical needs and concerns of families. In support of research with apparel industry professionals conducted by the author of this paper, this contextual approach is common among successful designers who are meeting needs for a variety of people (e.g. Saiki & DeLong, 2000; Saiki, 2002; Saiki & DeLong, in press). Designers with this contextual approach can successfully face challenges and understand current fashion trends, including the elderly population, larger-sized population, integration of computer technology, and changes in the economy.

Further research is encouraged to understand approaches to apparel, particularly design in home economics programs versus other programs, such as art. Also, for further documentation of the historical developments of apparel design within home economics programs, the technical aspects of design, textiles, and fashion merchandising could be explored.

References

- Agins, T. (1999). *The end of fashion*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Apparel and textiles moves forward. (1956). *The Journal of Home Economics*, 48(8), 635 - 639.
- Baldwin, K. E. (1949). *The AHEA saga*. Washington, DC: American Home Economics Association.
- Ohles, F., Ohles, S. M., & Ramsay, J. G. (1997). *Biographical dictionary of modern American educators*. Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press.
- Cooley, A. M. (1909). Selection of domestic art subject matter for secondary schools. *The Journal of Home Economics*, 1(1), 52-60.
- Cooley, A. M. (1910). Domestic art as discussed at the recent meetings of the household arts section of the national education association. *The Journal of Home Economics*, 2(4), 354-358.
- Cooley, A. M. (1911). *Domestic art in woman's education*. New York: C. Scriber's Sons.
- Goldstein, H. (1936a). Teaching costume design. *The Journal of Home Economics*, 29(1), 88-92.
- Goldstein, H. (1936b). Teaching costume design. *The Journal of Home Economics*, 29(2), 88-92.
- Goldstein, H. (1944). Art: Its place in home economics. *The Journal of Home Economics*, 36(9), 549-552.
- Goldstein, H., & Goldstein, V. (1925). *Art in everyday life*. New York: Macmillan Company.
- Heggstad, M. (2005a). *Apparel and textiles*. Retrieved February 15, 2005, from <http://hearth.library.cornell.edu/h/hearth/textiles.html>
- Heggstad, M. (2005b). *Subjects: Applied arts and design*. Retrieved February 15, 2005, from <http://hearth.library.cornell.edu/h/hearth/applied.html>
- In memorium Elizabeth Tarpley*. (n.d.). Retrieved March 21, 2005, from <http://www.utexas.edu/faculty/council/2000-2001/memorials/SCANNED/tarpley.pdf>

- Madden, B.T. (1995). *In the thick of the fray: The professional life of Mary Elizabeth Frayser*. Unpublished masters' thesis, Winthrop University, Rock Hill, SC.
- Ohles, F., Ohles, S.M., & Ramsay, J.G. (1997). *Biographical dictionary of modern american educators*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 1997.
- Rathbone, L., & Tarpley, E. (1931). *Fabrics and Dress*. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Rathbone, L., & Tarpley, E. (1952). Student and teacher co-operation in clothing construction courses. *The Journal of Home Economics*, 44(2), 101-102.
- Sage, E., & Cooley, A. M. (1913). *Occupations for little fingers*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.
- Saiki, D. (2002). *The role of women as change agents in careers related to the Minnesota apparel industry, 1950 to 1989*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Minnesota, St. Paul.
- Saiki, D., & DeLong, M.R. (2000). Minnesota manufacturing from storm coats to tricot knit underwear: B.W. Harris Manufacturing Company, Inc. and Munsingwear, Inc. *Minnesota Creates: Fashion for a Century*. The Goldstein, pp. 51-60.
- Saiki, D., & DeLong, M.R. (2006, June). Professionals relating with clients in the apparel industry. *Qualitative Market Research: An International Journal*, 9(3), 266-281.
- Strategic plan and mission statement*. (2002). Retrieved March 21 2005, from The Goldstein Museum of Design web site: <http://goldstein.che.umn.edu/strategic.html>
- Who's Who in America*. (1928). Chicago, Illinois: Marquis Who's Who, Inc.
- Who's Who of American Women, 11th edition, 1979-1980*. (1979). Wilmette, Illinois: Marquis Who's Who, Inc.
- Who Was Who among North American Authors, 1921-1939*. (1976). Detroit, Michigan: Gale Research Co.



Editor's Message

Dorothy I. Mitstifer

It occurred to me as I was editing this issue of the *Kappa Omicron Nu FORUM* that we would all do well to ponder the question: What will be the legacy of my professional life? It is true that some of us practice reflection, but the pace of today's professional life sometimes overrides our best-laid plans. This message is meant to remind you that taking time to examine your hopes, goals, desires, and expectations will make a difference in your impact—your legacy.

Legacy thinking, according to Galford and Maruca (2006), is about the day-to-day—my decisions, use of time, actions, influence, satisfactions. Although others define your legacy, you can gain perspective about yourself to see how your legacy is taking shape and how you can influence it.

Kouzes and Posner in their book, *A Leader's Legacy* (2006), tell the story of a company official who discovered that he often used the wrong tools and methods in his leadership. When he settled on the fact that every day he had the opportunity to make a small difference, he was pleasantly surprised by the improvement he was able to make. Instead of noble and grandiose accomplishments, it was the private conversation with a colleague, the time he spent listening, the quiet support of a direct report that contributed a lasting legacy.

According to Kouzes and Posner (2006), when we choose to lead every day we “reenlist in a very special relationship with others” and “choose aspirations of long-term significance over short-term measures of success” (p. 179). Because relationships grow in a climate of trust, leaders need to establish a caring connection. “Where there's a climate of trust, there's also a climate in which leaders can let go of control and grant everyone ownership of their own actions” (p. 179). For long-term significance, there must be determined “doing,” not just by the positional leader but also by all the other players.

You just never know whose life you might touch. You just never know what change you might initiate and what impact you might have. You just never know when that critical moment might come. What you do know is that you can make a difference. You can leave this world better than you found it. (Kouzes & Posner, 2006, p. 181)

***Dr. Mitstifer is
FORUM Editor
and Executive
Director of
Kappa Omicron
Nu.***



References

- Galford, R. M., & Maruca, R. F. (2006). *Your leadership legacy: Why looking toward the future will make a better leader today*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2006). *A leader's legacy*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.