TEACHING AND MANAGEMENT OF HOME ECONOMICS IN SELECTED BASIC SCHOOLS IN MUFULIRA DISTRICT, COPPERBELT PROVINCE OF ZAMBIA

THESIS
M. Ed.
Phi
2009
C.I

ANNA PHIRI

A dissertation submitted to the University of Zambia in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the award of the degree of Master of Education in Educational Administration

UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA, LUSAKA
February 2009
DECLARATION

I, Anna Phiri, declare that this dissertation is a clear testimony of my own personal effort and experience during field research. The report is being presented to this University for the first time as it has never been presented elsewhere. All published and unpublished materials used in this report have been acknowledged and adequate reference provided.

Signed: Anna Phiri

Date: 25.02.09.
Approval

The University of Zambia approves this dissertation of Anna Phiri as fulfilling part of the requirements for the award of a degree of Master of Education in Educational Administration.

SIGNATURE:

DATE

24th February 2009

24th February 2009
DEDICATION

To my children Bessy, Kalwani, Brian, Manase and Tionge who suffered the absence of a mother and father. Bessy thanks a great deal for mothering your siblings when I was away for studies. Your support and encouragement in my education and work will forever inspire me. God bless you abundantly.
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I thank my God for enabling me to complete my studies successfully. Without God’s assistance this task would not have been completed.

I was fortunate to have worked with two scholars, namely Dr Yizenge A. Chondoka then Senior Lecturer, in the Department of History of the School of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Zambia, as Principal Supervisor and Mrs. Chintu Chilele, Curriculum Development Centre, Ministry of Education, Lusaka, as Co-supervisor. To both of them, I say thank you very much for their patience and excellent guidance.

The successful completion of my studies is owed to the Mufulira College of Education Board that sponsored me to undertake graduate studies at the University of Zambia. Special thanks go to the Headteachers, Home Economics teachers, Parent - Teachers Association (PTA) Members, Pupils and Ministry of Education officials in Mufulira district. Thanks also go to former pupils of Mission schools, former Home Economics Inspectors and Senior lecturers of Mufulira, Solwezi and Kitwe Colleges of Education who accepted to be interviewed and answer questionnaires at short notice.

My gratitude goes to Ms Mercy Zulu for secretarial services rendered to me, at times on short notice. Deserving special thanks are my mother (Mrs. Idah Phiri), brothers (David, Amos and Stephan) sisters, (Agnes, Rebecca, Slyvia, Conceptor and Patricia) my husband, (Mr. T.B.Mwanza) our children, (Bessy, Ian, Brian, Manase and Tionge) my friends, Mr. and Mrs. Ham and Mrs. Metto Sichaaza Sikabanga for
their support during my studies. Last but not the least, I thank all my postgraduate colleagues for their cooperation and sharing ideas during academic discussions.

May God bless you all.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACRONYMS</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AHEA</td>
<td>American Home Economics Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDC</td>
<td>Curriculum Development Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COCE</td>
<td>Copperbelt College of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEBS</td>
<td>District Education Board Secretary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESO</td>
<td>District Education Standards Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFA</td>
<td>Education For All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOF</td>
<td>Educating Our Future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESO</td>
<td>Education Standards Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HE</td>
<td>Home Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEAZ</td>
<td>Home Economics Association of Zambia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOE</td>
<td>Ministry Of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAGE</td>
<td>Programme for the Advancement of Girl’s Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTA</td>
<td>Parent Teacher’s Association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SESO</td>
<td>Senior Education Standards Officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UPE</td>
<td>Universal Primary Education.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>United States of America.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZATEC</td>
<td>Zambia Teacher Education Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZBEC</td>
<td>Zambia Basic Education Course</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZPC</td>
<td>Zambia Primary Course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF TABLES

1: Boys and girls taking home economics in the Upper Basic Schools visited in Mufulira District ................................................................. 32

2: Responses from home economics teachers on material/ infrastructure requirements in Basic Schools ......................................................... 36

3: Home economics teachers' responses on funding of practical lessons ................................................................. 43
LIST OF FIGURES

1: Respondents Status................................................................. 27

2: Head teachers in need of revisiting the syllabus.......................... 51
# Table of Contents

Declaration........................................................................................................... ii
Dedication............................................................................................................ iv
Acknowledgements............................................................................................... v
Acronyms............................................................................................................. vii
List of Tables......................................................................................................... viii
List of Figures...................................................................................................... ix
Abstract............................................................................................................... xii

## Chapter One: Introduction to the Study............................................................ 1
  1.0 Background.................................................................................................. 1
  1.1 Study Area.................................................................................................. 3
  1.2 Statement of the Problem........................................................................... 3
  1.3 Purpose of the study.................................................................................. 4
  1.4 Objectives of the Study............................................................................. 4
  1.5 Research Questions................................................................................... 5
  1.6 Significance of the Study........................................................................... 5
  1.7 Study Limitations...................................................................................... 6
  1.8 Operational Definitions............................................................................. 6

## Chapter Two: Literature Review..................................................................... 8

## Chapter Three: Research Methodology.......................................................... 20
  3.0 Introduction................................................................................................ 20
  3.1 Research Design....................................................................................... 20
  3.2 Population.................................................................................................. 20
  3.3 Sample size and sampling procedures....................................................... 21
  3.4 Research Instruments and data collection techniques............................... 22
  3.5 Data Analysis............................................................................................ 24
  3.6 Data Interpretation.................................................................................... 24
  3.7 Limitations................................................................................................ 24
  3.8 Ethical considerations............................................................................... 25
ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study was to investigate the teaching and management of Home Economics in Basic Schools in Mufulira district. The case study design was used utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methods. A total sample of 150 respondents was selected from Mufulira, Solwezi, Kitwe and Lusaka districts. The last three districts outside the Copperbelt Province were specifically for former pupils in Mission Schools during the colonial era. Data were collected using questionnaires, semi structured interviews and Focus Group Discussions. The quantitative data collected were analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) while data from semi-structured interviews and Focus Group Discussions were analyzed qualitatively by coding and grouping similar themes together into groups using constant comparative techniques.

Ministry of Education officials, head teachers, Home Economics teachers, parents and learners recognise the importance of the subject because among other things, it imparts life long skills in learners. However, it was discovered that Home Economics as a subject had been integrated into science at Middle Basic and only taught on its own as a subject at Upper Basic school level. It was also discovered that the Examinations Council of Zambia (ECZ) through the Ministry of Education is no longer funding practical subjects including Home Economics as it used to do in the past. It stopped funding practical subjects in 1995.

However, it was revealed that the Ministry of Education did give grants for Home Economics which the schools in respective districts had to share according to their plans. The funds were inadequate and were usually sent too late to the districts and
affected schools. It was revealed that the little resources given to Home Economics teachers for upper basic pupils were ably utilized. The study revealed that among the major constraints facing the learning and teaching of Home Economics in Basic schools of Mufulira district were, lack of infrastructure, equipment, financial and material support from the Ministry of Education.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

1.0 Background

Home Economics is a field of study that focuses on factors that affect the well being of individuals and families such as parenting, nutrition and housing. It is an important subject to study because it enhances the health of individuals and families and the quality of their environment (Encyclopedia H. Vol. 9, 2001:300).

The Home Economics Movement in North America began in the mid-1800s. From 1862, Home Economics courses were offered to students in a limited number of colleges in the United States of America (USA). The real development of Home Economics as a field of study began in 1908 at the Lake Placid Conference when the American Home Economics Association was formed with Ellen Richards as the first President (Vaines, 1984). For about a century from Lake Placid Conferences, the Home Economics profession in the United States and Canada has grown big and has been very well organized.

In Africa, Home Economics originally called Domestic Science was started by people from outside the continent. They were, mainly, the wives of European missionaries whose husbands came to work in Africa. The wives of missionaries were interested in teaching European basic housecraft skills, specifically sewing and cooking to the African women in the local communities where they lived. The
beginning was not easy because not many African women were literate enough to understand what the wives of missionaries were discussing with them.

Gradually the subject was seen to be for the few literate African women in the African communities where missionaries lived. Thereafter, materials such as books for the subject came from America, Canada and Europe to be used by wives of missionaries in teaching the few African women. To the Africans, much of what was contained in Home Economics syllabus and the books that they read was in some ways conflicting with the African cultural practices with regard to the recipes and cooking methodologies. Cultural practices are some of the factors that slowed down acceptance and the spread of Home Economics in Africa.

During the colonial era Home Economics was offered only to girls and women primarily in accordance with the African culture. The new subject provided African women with skills that enabled them to manage their homes and families efficiently (Gadsden, 1993:28). Therefore, Home Economics was seen by the African society as a subject to improve the African woman in the way she cared for her family with respect to housecraft skills and food preparation in her family, consequently improving the nutritional levels of the members of the family and ultimately the whole community’s health.
1.1 Study Area

The study was carried out in Mufulira district of the Copperbelt Province of Zambia. The study focused on selected Basic schools in the district. Mufulira is one of the districts in the Province that borders the Democratic Republic of Congo (hereafter as DRC). In 2008, the district had 55 Basic schools. Of these, 31 were government Basic schools, 16 were Private Basic schools and 8 were community-run Basic schools. At the time of the field research the total population of pupils in the district was 19,640. Of this total, 4,144 pupils were in private schools; 5,125 in community schools and 10,375 were in government Basic schools. The total population of teachers in the district was 31,561.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Since the colonial era and throughout independent Zambia, Home Economics as a subject in schools had been marginalized. There was little attention and support from the Ministry of Education. There was also minimal support for Home Economics in the educational institutions offering this subject. To understand the status of Home Economics in the Zambian schools and the constraints facing the subject, this study looks at the teaching and management of Home Economics in Basic schools in the country with special emphasis on one district in the Copperbelt Province.
1.3 Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of the study was to establish the major constraints in the teaching and management of Home Economics in Basic schools in the country. More importantly, the study aimed at establishing ways of enhancing the teaching and management of Home Economics in the country.

1.4 Objectives of the Study

The following were the objectives of the study:

1. To find out the perception of Home Economics by Home Economics teachers, learners, parents and Ministry of Education officials.

2. To assess the teaching and learning materials and infrastructural status for Home Economics teaching in Basic schools in the study area.

3. To establish the material and financial support from the Ministry of Education to Home Economics teaching especially in practical lessons and demonstrations.

4. To find out how the resources from the Ministry of Education are being utilized in the learning and teaching of Home Economics.
5. To identify major constraints facing the learning and teaching of Home Economics in Basic schools in Mufulira district.

1.5 Research Questions

1. As a subject in Basic schools, how is Home Economics perceived by Home Economics teachers, learners, parents and Ministry of Education officials?

2. What are the attitudes of Home Economics teachers and learners towards Home Economics?

3. Does the Ministry of Education allocate funds for Home Economics teaching especially for practical lessons and demonstrations?

4. How are the resources from the Ministry of education being utilized by the schools where they offer Home Economics?

5. What are the constraints facing the learning and teaching of Home Economics in Basic Schools in Mufulira district?

1.6 Significance of the Study

The findings of this study were meant to positively influence the Ministry of Education officials such as standards officers, policy makers and planners, school managers and PTA members to improve their perception of the subject. The results of the study would also help home economics teachers to develop positive attitude towards the subject and enhance teaching. Lastly, the results of
the study would be useful to the specialists in Home Economics at the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) to reform the Home Economics curriculum in response to the current needs of the Zambian society and technological advancement in Home Economics. The recommendations of this study are meant to lobby funds from the Ministry of Education for Home Economics teaching in Basic schools.

1.7 Study Limitations

This study should have been extended to all the Basic schools in the Copperbelt Province but was limited to Mufulira district only due to inadequate funding from the sponsors.

1.8 Operational Definitions

Basic education: attainment of education up to level 4 (grade 7) in community school or up to grade 9 in government school.

Home Economics: is the field of study that focuses on factors that affect the well being of individuals and families such as parenting, nutrition and housing. It is important because it enhances the health of individuals and families and the quality of their environment.

Infrastructure: Desks, classrooms, buildings, roads, sewing and cooking appliances and utensils, office locks and shelves for books.
Instructional material: refers to books, chalk, pens, pencils, paper, materials for demonstration or practical lessons such as stoves, plates and dishes, sewing machines, cloths, needles and all the relevant requisites.

Perception of Home Economics: this refers to an individual's attitude, thinking and understanding of Home Economics as a subject in schools within the country.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature review for this study has been subdivided into two parts, namely international and local levels. The former focuses on Home Economics studies outside Zambia and the later deals with Home Economics studies in this country since the days of mission education.

2.1 International level

In November 1948, members of the United Nations in Article 48 declared the right to education for all people and Article 32 the members reaffirmed the right of every child without discrimination of any kind to free and compulsory primary school education (UN, 1948). The Jomtien Conference of 1990 and the Dakar Conference of 2000 also emphasized the need to provide Education for All by the year 2015. Such education required well trained human resources, provision of adequate text books and teaching aids, laboratories, workshops and equipment for learners in schools. Home Economics is one of the subjects that required such educational requisites.

The creation of the American Home Economics Association in 1899 in the United States of America initiated a long but fruitful struggle to make Home Economics an important subject to be included in all school curricular and to be undertaken by all children in schools of the new world.
Home Economics was nationally recognized as an important subject when College of Home Economics was established in 1919 at University of Cornell in the United States of America. The college played a prominent role in improving American health and hygiene practices for both rural and urban families. The college then developed their own credentials and began to earn advanced degrees in the field of Home Economics. Later, it affiliated itself to other colleges. In 1922 Cornell University awarded its first masters degree in Home Economics and 1930 it produced its first PhD in Home Economics (Schuler and Schuler, 1973). From Cornell University the subject spread to many educational institutions in the United States.

In the 1920s Home Economics materials were disseminated through the print media, publishing women's magazines and writing inexpensive pamphlets that were distributed widely. They also started using the radio in the 1920s and in the 1950s the television was used as an outreach medium (Lee and Dressell, 1963). These were ways of sensitizing the public of the importance of Home Economics as a subject in educational institutions and the American society.

The curriculum of Home Economics has greatly changed in the United States of America since its introduction at the end of the 19th century. Smith (1999) states that, Home Economics, formerly limited to solving problems of food (Nutrition and Cookery), clothing, sewing, textiles,
household equipment, house cleaning, housing, hygiene and household economics, later came to include many aspects of family relation, parental education, consumer education and institutional management. Although called by different names in many countries outside the United States such as, home science, household arts, domestic science or domestic economy, the name has not changed in the United States.

According to Smith, studies in the United States have shown that one way to help prevent eating disorders is to educate children about the importance of health eating habits during their adolescent years. That is why, home economics programs in schools are seen as indispensable by many educators (Smith, 1999).

Historically, the development of home economics in Africa, originally referred to as Domestic Science, was started by foreigners. The foreigners were wives to missionaries who had come from Britain, Canada, America, and Ireland while others were white ladies and nuns. The white ladies were interested in teaching the women basic home craft skills specifically, sewing and cooking. Since the subject did not originate in Africa, the Home Economics Movement had not initially been very forceful in Africa. It was also a subject primarily for women and girls in educational institutions partly due to cultural issues and also because of the way it was introduced on the continent: by women only and so
everybody thought it was for females only (*Journal of Home Economics* 1900-1975).

In Liberia, women were taught to take care of the home in terms of cleanliness, care for children and the clothes, surroundings, hygiene in the kitchen and proper sanitation. These were responsibilities that were taught to girls by missionaries. It was said that, those women who were more educated in domestic science were to be employed in white collar jobs as nurses, teachers and clerical workers. Literature is silent on men being included in Domestic Science in Liberia. This is also an indication that the subject was entirely tailored towards women. Men studied subjects that were leading to job opportunities for men. Grimshaw (1986) states that:

> Women are directly fitted for acting as nurses and teachers of our early childhood by the fact that they are themselves childish, frivolous and short sighted; in a word, they are big children all their life long.

Although the African women were not childish in this context, the quotation confirms African traditional views about home economics as a subject for women only to take care of the home and the family.
In Yoruba land in Nigeria missionary education was offered to both sexes at the outset. Although children of both sexes received the same instructions in reading, writing and arithmetic, they were taught vocational subjects appropriate to their sexes. Boys learned agriculture and the industrial skills and techniques necessary for the new jobs created in the colonial economy, while girls focused on domestic subjects in preparation for their future vocations as wives and mothers. It was observed in Nigeria that domestic training in mission schools, according to the earliest references concerning the curriculum of the missionaries, put much emphasis on needlework (Denzer, 1992). Later, the girls' curriculum was expanded to include, laundry, darning, mending and dressmaking and learning time for each of these subjects was two hours because they were practical subjects and needed more time.

In Yoruba land, domestic science was only taught in girls' mission schools and marriage training homes run by the mission stations. The subject received very little attention in mixed schools. In the mixed school, only needlework was taught. The cookery syllabus was criticized as being too European; as a result Nigerian staff encouraged local recipes to be used in the teaching cookery and housecraft in the specifically constructed demonstration rooms in the affected educational institutions (Denzer, 1991). Other than needlework being a home-focused subject, it became a lucrative occupation for young educated elite women as they became
dressmakers and made profits from their businesses. On the other hand, skills in cooking, baking, sewing and embroidery saw the young ladies go into commercial enterprises such as opening shops to sell baked foodstuffs in markets (Denzer, 1989). Although the real intention of teaching needlework to girls was to prepare them for future vocations as wives and mothers, the skills enabled them to earn a living as they become dressmakers. Similarly, the skills in cookery following the Nigerian syllabus which was adopted in preference to the European syllabus, the positive impact was that it benefited the young ladies to enter into commercial enterprises such as the opening of shops to sell baked foodstuffs in the markets.

In her chapter that appeared in Hansen’s work (1992), Musisi states that ‘home economics’ curriculum for girls in Uganda was from practical to theory. They were taught sewing starting with small samples. After some good experience they later began to make big garments. The curriculum included domestic science, housewifery and hygiene just as it was in England. At vocational level, the curriculum enabled women enter only a limited number of professions, such as primary school teaching nursing and home-making, which were deemed suitable to European gender role definitions. On the other hand, through learning home craft or home economics, women tended to produce more food and the surplus was sold to supplement the income in the home.
In Southern Rhodesia (Zimbabwe), when missionaries trained African girls how to sew, cook and laundry, they claimed that their primary purpose was not to prepare them to work for Europeans but create proper Christian wives for the African elite (teachers, evangelists and other emerging elite). Some trained girls entered domestic services as house maids but it was not a rule and it was not encouraged to do that. Home economics as a subject, was not in the school curriculum but only taught to girls by missionaries to make girls good future mothers in the African societies (Nilsson in Hensen, 1992). The African girls were also taught skills in home economics in Women Clubs established by wives of missionaries in the country. The Federation of African Women's Clubs (FAWC) in Zimbabwe flourished and they were the largest women's home craft organizations. These clubs were organized by European women who were the wives of the civil servants in the country. They taught African women skills such as cooking, baking, sewing, home decorating, basic hygiene and nutrition. FAWC focused its efforts almost exclusively on rural African women, unlike home craft clubs in most other African countries (Nilsson in Hensen, 1992). Although women and girls were trained in home economics they were not employed in the domestic service as maids. Europeans employed men who were taught home economics by their wives at home (on the job-training). However, in the
Post-war era many African women entered domestic service in increasing numbers although men still dominated the industry.

Writing in Hensen’s work of 1992, Sheldon states that, in Mozambique there was one teacher training school that offered new advanced courses for girls in sewing, cookery, nursing and childcare in addition to academic courses. There is evidence that men outnumbered women in domestic service work despite their not being trained in domesticity.

2.2 Local Level: Zambia

Historically, Christian missionaries pioneered education in Zambia although from 1924 when the territory came under direct British administration, the government showed great interest to promote African education. This interest was put into practice when for the first time the British government set guidelines for African education based on the government-sponsored Phelps-Stokes Report of 1924 (Mwanakatwe, 1974:68). It was through the Phelps-Stokes recommendations that domestic science (Home economics) was introduced by missionary wives and other unmarried European women in the mission stations in Northern Rhodesia (Zambia) as a subject in schools for African girls and women.
During the colonial era, Home Economics was known by many different names such as home craft, housecraft, home science and finally they settled for domestic science. The subject included components such as laundry, needlework, housewifery, knitting, soap and candle making, hygiene, childcare and parenthood. The subject aim was to equip women and girls with skills that would enable them to manage their homes and families efficiently. For boys and men the missionaries introduced practical subjects like bricklaying, carpentry, arithmetic, bible knowledge and local languages (Snelson, 1974).

Furthermore, because people who pioneered this subject were ladies and taught by ladies and studied by girls and women alone, it was considered a subject for females only. Culturally, boys could not participate in this subject because traditionally what was for women could not be taken by men or boys.

Though the subject was given little attention by the government or other missionaries in the country, the Dutch Reformed Church Mission (DRCM) operating in Eastern Zambia was more fortunate than most missions. It attracted many capable women to undergo further education in Domestic Science. Girl's hostels were established at Madzimoyo, Nyanje, Merwe and Magwero where the girls were taught to cook, to make soaps and candles, pottery work, mother craft and hygiene. These households
duties were usually taught in the morning and the girls attended the station elementary (primary) school in the afternoon (Snelson, 1974).

Perhaps the most important Christian mission in connection with Domestic Science in colonial Zambia was the London Missionary Society whose subdivision (branch) established an only girls' school in the current Luapula Province. The school was started in 1915 at Mbereshi in the Province by Mable Shaw, a young schoolteacher from Midlands in the United Kingdom (UK). Mable Shaw thought the best way was to take few girls into a boarding school. It proved difficult to persuade parents to let go their daughters and only managed to get four in her first attempt. As time went by, parents came to trust Miss Shaw, and numbers increased until there were more applicants than places in the boarding school.

The success at Mbereshi was due to the fact that the education given to girls was ultimately related to the actual life of the home and the community. Class work occupied most of the morning and afternoons were devoted to Domestic Science, time when the girls lived as nearly as possible an ordinary village life of drawing water, collecting firewood and preparing their own food. Additionally, girls made their own clothes as they learnt how to sew, knit and crotchet. They did gardening but not heavy digging as it was done by paid labour. Instructions were given in mother craft and child care. It was observed that Mbereshi-trained mothers could be spotted out among village youngsters because of their
cleanliness and good health and exemplary clean homes. The women from Shaw's school became superior wives and mothers, but also made careers for themselves in teaching and nursing (Snelson, 1974). Mable Shaw's teaching of home economics yielded good results because from the initial stage, she applied both the European home economics skills and the African skills that were related to the actual life of the African home and the community.

The United Free Church of Scotland also introduced a curriculum in domestic science at Lubwa Mission in Chinsali district. Mrs MacMinn, Mrs Kaunda and Miss Masterton ran a women's school where the curriculum covered sewing, housewifery, oil and soap making, starch making and gardening as well as the normal classroom subjects (Gadsden, 1994).

Domestic science was in line with the recommendations of the 1924 Phelps-Stokes Report that stressed the need for the kind of education that would prepare people for life in the village or life within the tribal ethnic community (Carmody: 2004).

From 1964, the government followed a 7-3-2-4 formal educational system. In that system, seven years were for primary education, three years for junior secondary school, two years for senior secondary and four years for University education. In primary schools, domestic science changed the name to home craft in which learners studied cookery, laundry,
housewifery, gardening, needlework and knitting. The government provided material and financial resources for practical and demonstration lessons in the subject (MOE: 1972). Apart from material and financial support for the subject the government assisted in making sure that what the learners produced at school took part in the respective district agriculture shows which were conducted annually.
CHAPTER THREE
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction
This chapter discusses the methodology used in this study under the following headings: research design, target population, sample size, sampling procedure, research instruments, validity of instruments and data collection procedure. Additionally, the chapter discusses problems encountered during data collection, data analysis and data interpretation.

3.1 Research Design
The study employed a case study. This was necessary in order to give details of how home economics as a subject developed over a period of time in Zambia, from the colonial era to the present.

3.2 Population
The target pupil and teacher population was from Basic schools in Mufulira district. In 2008, there were 31 Basic schools in the district with 31,561 teachers and 10,375 pupils in conventional or government schools. There were 16 private schools with 49 teachers and 4,144 pupils and 8 community schools with 50 teachers and 5,121 pupils.
3.3. Sample size and Sampling Procedure

The sample for this study was as follows: 90 pupils (45 from Middle Basic, 45 from Upper Basic) from 9 selected Basic schools; 18 Parents’ Teachers Association (PTA) members; 1 District Education Board Secretary (DEBS); 4 standards officers; 9 head teachers; 18 Home Economics teachers; 3 senior lecturers from Basic Colleges of Education; 4 former pupils of colonial mission schools and 4 former inspectors of schools. The total sample of respondents in this study was 150. The sample was selected for the following reasons. Firstly, the schools selected were easily accessible as they were within the district. Secondly, the transport cost to these schools was affordable. The learners selected to participate in the interviews and questionnaires were from the following Basic schools: Mufulira, Twasekela, Kansuswa, Murundu, Chibolya Trust School (Mine), Eagle (Private), Luansobe and Misambo. From each school 10 pupils were selected using stratified sampling. The method entails the use of the natural divisions of the sampling frame in this case the grade levels were the strata. Stratified sampling was used so as to ensure that all grade levels in a school, that is grades 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9 were adequately represented in the sample. Further, purposive sampling was used to select home economics teachers, head teachers, PTA members, former inspectors of home economics, and former pupils of colonial mission schools, DEBS and standard officers. These were purposefully sampled because they were the key persons in the study.
3.4. Research Instruments and data collection techniques

The study used three instruments namely; structured questionnaires, semi-structured questionnaires and focus group discussions. A pre-test was conducted in order to assess whether or not the subjects (sample) of the final study would understand the items in the questionnaires and focus group discussion checklist. The pre-test also helped to determine the best way to test the methods to be used in analyzing the data that were collected. The pre-test was conducted at Mufulira Central Basic School, a School that was not included in the final study. Each category of respondents had a different research instruments as follows:

- The data were collected using questionnaires for school managers, home economics teachers, PTA members, former pupils in colonial mission schools and lecturers in Basic Education Colleges.
- Semi-structured questions were for the District Education Board secretary (DEBS) and standard officers.
- Archival research was also used to collect data from libraries.
- Focus Group Discussions were also used with pupils and other stakeholders.

Primary information was collected through questionnaires. Respondents completed a questionnaire by filling in the blank spaces. Interviews and Focus Group Discussions were conducted in the communities where schools are
located. Besides qualitative method, quantitative method was also employed in
data collection.

One set of questionnaires was administered to 9 head teachers (2 from urban, 2 from peri-urban, 2 from rural and 3 from Private Basic schools in Mufulira District). Another set of questionnaires was administered to 18 home economics teachers (12 from government and 6 from Private Basic School). The other questionnaires were administered to the DEBS and 3 standard officers at the District office. Four questionnaires were administered to the former inspectors of home Economics, 4 more questionnaires to former pupils of mission schools and 3 questionnaires to senior lecturers of Basic Education Colleges. The researcher read out the instructions to the respondents before the respondents filled in the questionnaire. The questionnaires were filled in during the respondents' own time although the researcher had given a time frame of 10 days in which she would collect the questionnaires. However, for rural Basic schools the researcher had to wait at each school to collect the questionnaires because of transport problems. It would have been difficult to come back to collect the questionnaires if these were left in the rural schools. In order to ensure anonymity and confidentiality, all the respondents were told not to write their names on the questionnaires.

A tape recorder was used in the collection of data during Focus Group
Discussions with the pupils. Further, in-depth interviews were conducted with
home economics teachers and headteachers, former inspectors of schools and
former pupils of colonial mission schools, so as to collect some data that were not captured in the questionnaires. More data were also collected from some old mission schools through desk research and such data supplemented data collected from the field. The response or retention rate for the questionnaires for Mufulira District was 95 per cent.

3.5 Data Analysis

Quantitative data were analyzed using computer software called Statistical Package for Social Sciences [SPSS] that assisted in generating tables of frequency and percentages. Qualitative data were analyzed by grouping [categorizing] and comparing respondents' opinions. The emerging themes were again grouped and interpreted. Content analysis was also used especially in analyzing data from the desk study.

3.6 Data Interpretation

Quantitative data were interpreted by using tables, frequencies and percentages. For qualitative data, categories and themes were considered and interpreted accordingly.

3.7 Limitations

We encountered a number of problems while collecting data. It was difficult to collect data from PTA members regarding the teaching and management of home economics in Basic schools because most of them were miners by
'profession' and did not know much about home economics in the schools where their children were learning. Additionally, it was not easy to travel in rural Basic schools as it was raining most of the time making streams/rivers in the respective areas flooded. It was also difficult to collect questionnaires from the DEBS and standard officers because of their busy schedules. The other problem was that pupils in rural and peri-urban Basic schools could not speak English, hence Focus Group Discussions were done in Bemba, the local lingua franca in the Copperbelt Province. The researcher who was not fluent in Bemba had to decode discussions into English with the help of a Research Assistant.

3.8 Ethical considerations

During the research, all the respondents were assured that the information they were giving would be treated with utmost confidentiality and was for academic purposes only. A few respondents did not mind using their names in the thesis.
CHAPTER FOUR
PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF THE FINDINGS

4.1 Presentation of the findings

The quantitative data are presented in frequencies, percentages, tables and graphs while qualitative data are summarized using narrative reports. The findings are presented and interpreted strictly in relation to the evaluation objectives.

4.2 Respondents' Gender

There were 150 respondents who participated in the study and of these 76 (50.6%) were males and 74 (49.3%) were females.

4.3 Respondents Status

There were 18 class teachers (11.5%); 9 head teachers (5.7%); 18 PTA members (11.5%); 90 pupils from Middle and Upper Basic schools (57.6%), 45 from each category; 4 (2.5%) former pupils of Mission schools in the colonial era; 4 (2.5%) former inspectors of schools; 3 (1.9%) senior lecturers; 3 (1.9%) education standards officers and 1 (0.6%) District Education Board Secretary (DEBS). The data are graphically presented below in Figure 1.

4.4 PERCEPTION OF HOME ECONOMICS BY STAKEHOLDERS

4.4.1 RESPONSES FROM FORMER PUPILS TO MISSION SCHOOLS

The study revealed that 4 (2.5%) of the former pupils in Mission schools said that home economics was called domestic science during the colonial era
when the subject was introduced in Mission schools by the wives of the missionaries or any other white women who participated in the teaching of the subject. However, from 1964 when the country attained political independence the name of the subject changed to housecraft.

FIGURE 1. RESPONDENTS STATUS

4.4.1.1 Qualification for home economics teachers during the colonial era
The study revealed that there was no standard qualification for a home economics teacher during the colonial era. Being a missionary or a white woman was enough qualification to teach the subject. This means that the ladies that taught home economics were lowly qualified. One respondent [Mrs C. Zulu], commented that:

The missionary ladies could not have been highly educated due to the nature of the subject which was female dominated and looking at the type of education offered to the African women that time.

The study also revealed that although missionary ladies were lowly qualified they saw the subject as very important and the parents also appreciated it. This was because the subject focused on the home and its environment. Later the African women who started as helpers to the white women teachers were trained to teach the subject. The qualified African women teachers had to have one of the following three academic qualifications: Standard 4, Standard 6 or Form Two.

4.4.1.2 Curriculum of home economics Taught in schools

Four (2.5%) of the former pupils in Mission schools disclosed that components in the study of home economics were fairly standard throughout Zambia. They included cookery, laundry, housewifery, needle work, hygiene, mothercraft and craft. The syllabus also included soap and candle making that were part of laundry component. The former pupils further stated that their
parents were happy with home economics as a subject because it helped the family in the home environment.

4.5 Number of boys and girls taking home economics in 9 Middle and Upper Basic Schools under study

It was discovered that in the nine schools visited in Mufulira district, at Middle Basic level, both boys and girls were studying the subject although it had been integrated in other subjects. At Upper Basic school level, the subject was also taken by both boys and girls. It is at this level that the subject was taken separately and not integrated in other subjects. (District Annual Report: 2007).

4.6. RESPONSES FROM GRADERS 5-7 PUPILS

4.6.1 Teaching of Home Economics to both boys and girls in Basic schools

Hundred percent of the pupils in Basic schools revealed that, the subject was taught to both boys and girls in their schools. However, it was clear that the pupils did not like the system of integrating home economics in other science subjects. They wanted it on its own. For example one pupil lamented:

I would have loved to learn the subject on its own so that I can learn more how to cook and sew.

The pupils further said that the subject was important because they were going to learn how to cook and sew and later in life become either chefs or tailors.
4.6.1.2 Hours allocated to home economics in schools

The grade 7 pupils that were interviewed said that two periods of 40 minutes each were allocated to home economics per week and the subject was taught theoretically. The periods per week mentioned by pupils during interviews were also confirmed to be on the School Subject time table. However, a time table at one school showed that only one period was allocated to home economics per week. The situation was different in private schools. In the two private Basic schools the schools allocated three hours per week for home management, cookery, laundry and health education and two periods were allocated for needle work practical lessons. It was also discovered that two schools, one government Basic school, Twasekela and one private Basic school, Eagle did not offer home economics. No reasons were given.

The study also disclosed that in PAGE classes under study, home economics was only taught to girls and the boys were not happy about this action. One boy in a PAGE class complained that:

Home Economics should be taught to both boys and girls. We all need the subject as it teaches hygiene, about food, sewing which we all need to survive.
4.7 RESPONSES FROM GRADES 8 AND 9 PUPILS

4.7.1 Teaching of Home Economics at Upper Basic School

The study revealed that in government Basic schools Home Economics was an optional subject and this led to a few boys and girls taking it. It was also revealed that at the beginning of grade 8 the enrolment in Home Economics was usually equal numbers of boys and girls, but as they progressed most boys left the subject. Eventually this situation made the number of girls more than that of boys in Home Economics classes. It was also discovered that in government schools, boys were forced to take Home Economics due to lack of teachers in optional subjects like Office Practice, Technical Drawing and Art. However, some boys revealed that they took Home Economics out of personal interest and not because of lack of optional subjects. At Twasekela Basic school pupils said that the subject was not taught because the Headmistress who used to teach them had retired and no one had taken over.

In two private Upper Basic schools the situation was different from government Upper Basic schools. In the private schools, the study revealed that all the grades 8 and 9 classes were taking Home Economics. However, one private Upper Basic school did not offer the subject and no reasons were given in the questionnaire.
Table 1: Boys and Girls taking Home Economics in the Upper Basic Schools visited in Mufulira District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Basic School Government</th>
<th>No. of grade 8 pupils who take Home Economics</th>
<th>No. of grade 9 pupils who take Home Economics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>girls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chibolya Basic Basic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mufulira Basic Basic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansuwa Basic Basic</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Murundu Basic Basic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luansobe Basic Basic</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twasekela Basic Basic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Basic Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mine Trust School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEES Basic</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Basic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.8 RESPONSES FROM P. T. A MEMBERS

4.8.1 Pupils who studied Home Economics

The PTA members interviewed had pupils who had done Home Economics in all the schools visited in the district. Ten (55.5%) of the PTA members agreed that the subject was liked by the pupils as it gave pupils survival skills. Eight (44.4%) of the PTA members disclosed that some pupils were not taking Home Economics seriously because it was not examinable at grade 7 level. In addition, most parents were able to name the subject (Home Economics) as Domestic Science, home craft and home economics but not very conversant with what was going on in the subject or what their children were learning in Home Economics.

4.9 RESPONSES FROM EDUCATION STANDARD OFFICERS

4.9.1 Men teaching the subject and observation of Home Economics lessons

The study revealed that the Education Standard Officers encouraged male teachers to teach Home Economics. One District Education Standards Officer (DESO) was not aware that Home Economics was offered to both male and female student teachers in Basic Teacher Education Colleges. Fieldwork also revealed that Education Standard Officers greatly appreciated the subject and looked at it as very important to the learners especially lower and Middle Basic school level because it imparted life long skills.
4.10 RESPONSES FROM THE DISTRICT EDUCATION BOARD SECRETARY (DEBS)

Field research revealed that the DEBS appreciated Home Economics as an important subject because it provided life skills to the pupils at a tender age. To this end, the DEBS, Mr Mpokosso, proudly stated that 'I always support the Mfulira Home Economics Association (HEA) in fundraising ventures for Home Economics'.

4.11 RESPONSES FROM HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

4.11.1 Importance of the subject

The Home Economics teachers stated that the subject teaches a multiple of life skills out of which livelihoods can be developed in future if well supported. They also said that it required a lot of effort to educate the parents and the public at large about the importance of Home Economics especially with regard to self-reliance in job creation for future generations. The Home Economics teachers further stated that it required political will to make parents understand the significance of Home Economics and to make it be fully recognized in the Zambian society.

4.12 RESPONSES FROM HEAD TEACHERS

4.12.1 Importance of the subject to the learners

The study revealed that headteachers in Upper Basic schools looked at the subject as important for both boys and girls because it gave life long skills to
the pupils. The headteachers also stated that they were trying to support the subject but were constrained because of minimal grants. However, the headteachers in private schools did not have any problem of funds. The schools supported the subject fully because they had enough funds raised from school fees.

4.13 RESPONSES FROM SENIOR LECTURERS IN COLLEGES

4.13.1 Time allocation for Home Economics in respective Colleges of Education
Senior lecturers at the College of Education where Home Economics teachers were trained in the district highlighted the importance of the subject to student teachers. However, senior lecturers needed more time allocated to the subject on the time table to cover enough material for the whole Basic school level and equip the student teachers with more knowledge in the subject.

4.14 MATERIAL AND INFRASTRUCTURAL SUPPORT FOR HOME ECONOMICS TEACHING IN BASIC SCHOOLS

4.14.1 Responses from former pupils in Mission Schools
On the issues of material and infrastructural support for the teaching of Home Economics, field interviews revealed that during the colonial era and from shortly after political independence of Zambia, Home Economics as a subject received much support from the two respective governments. Schools were supplied with teaching and learning materials sufficiently and quickly. Such
materials included those used in the training of teaching cookery, housecraft, housewifery, mothercraft, personal hygiene and laundry. One respondent, Mrs Mukwayaya even boasted that:

We had everything we needed in stock for example crocheting threads and needles, different types of fabric, variety of sewing threads, knitting wool (variety) and needles, various charts for various components of the subject and many more.

It was also revealed that specific and appropriate classrooms were for Home Economics. These were classrooms that were spacious and had suitable equipment for the subject. Most of the teaching and learning materials were also available in the schools that were offering Home Economics. Pupils learnt the subject with great interest.

Table 2. Responses from Home Economics teachers on material/infrastructure requirements in Basic School

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Material and Infrastructure support in Government Basic schools: Inadequate support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Material and infrastructures in private basic schools: adequate support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No responses</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.15 Responses from Home Economics teachers

Fieldwork in twelve (66.6%) schools in Mufulira district revealed that, in most government Basic schools there were inadequate infrastructure, equipment and teaching and learning materials for Home Economics. The Home Economics teachers further stated that they had to take an initiative to create rooms and use their own equipment in the teaching of the subject. It was also revealed that government Basic schools that had specific Home Economics rooms or buildings were left by the colonial government. Unfortunately, some of these few special facilities had been turned into ordinary classrooms depriving Home Economics pupils of ideal facilities for their use. In some schools where there were ideal buildings, the buildings had inadequate equipment. Either way, things were found to be difficult for Home Economics in schools in Mufulira district.

However, the situation was different in private schools. Interviews with four (22.2%) Home Economics teachers in private Basic schools revealed that they had no problems with Home Economics rooms, equipment, teaching and learning materials. They proudly commented that it was interesting to teach Home Economics in their schools because of the use of modern materials and technology available in the schools.

4.16 Responses from head teachers

The study revealed that three (33.3%) of the head teachers from government Basic schools complained of the inadequacy of the Home Economics buildings, equipment and other learning and teaching materials. Two (22.2%)
of the government Basic school head teachers said that they had created rooms for the subject but had no equipment. Field interviews with head teachers also revealed that pupils were only learning theory using few teaching and learning aids made through the teachers’ initiative. The situation was different in private schools where they had adequate Home Economics rooms with all the equipment, teaching and learning materials for the subject.

4.17 Responses from Pupils

4.17.1 Responses from grades 5-7 pupils

The study revealed that pupils in urban Middle Basic schools had Home Economics rooms but inadequate equipment. However, pupils in peri-urban schools were using rooms created by the teacher or a make-shift one with no equipment. In the rural areas of the district it was discovered that pupils were using ordinary classrooms and learning theory only. In private basic schools the pupils said that they had adequate Home Economics rooms, teaching and learning materials.

4.17.2 Responses from grades 8 and 9 pupils

The picture was very different at this level. The study revealed that in most government Upper Basic schools, infrastructure were there but lacked equipment, furniture and teaching and learning aids. The pupils disclosed that they had to carry some teaching and learning materials from home.
4.18 Responses from Education Standard Officers

The Education Standards Officers in the district confirmed the responses of pupils stated in the above paragraphs.

4.19 Responses from the District Education Board Secretary

During the interview with the District Education Board Secretary (DEBS) it was revealed that there were 38 schools in the district and not all of them had adequate infrastructure for Home Economics. He further stated that some of the Basic schools that had good Home Economics facilities, such facilities were in the urban areas and they were left by the colonial government. The DEBS concluded by tabulating problems faced by lack of proper infrastructure specific for Home Economics in schools in the district. He lamented that in other schools, classrooms and make-shift rooms were used to teach Home Economics.

4.20 Responses from senior lecturers in the Basic Education College

Mufulira College of Education is the government educational institution training teachers who are going to teach Home Economics in Basic schools. Interviews with lecturers revealed that the college had infrastructure and teaching and learning materials for Home Economics. They had all the necessary equipment though some of it was old. The college was also able to replace the old equipment with modern equipment.
4.21 FINANCIAL SUPPORT FROM MINISTRY OF EDUCATION FOR TEACHING HOME ECONOMICS PRACTICAL AND DEMONSTRATION LESSONS

4.21.1 Responses from former pupils in colonial Mission schools

The former pupils in colonial Mission schools revealed that during the colonial era, financial support to the subject came from missionaries' homeland as well as grants from the colonial government. They further revealed that other support materials like utensils for cookery, beds and beddings for home management, dolls and baby wear for mothercraft were bought by the teachers from the funds which came from missionaries' homelands and government grants. All the components of the subject were catered for in terms of practical lessons. These included cookery, laundry, home management, needlework, crafts, personal hygiene, housewifery and mothercraft. Mrs C. Zulu, a former pupil in a colonial Mission school lamented:

Nowadays the subject is not well taught in the sense that we parents do not see the practices in terms of hygiene, cooking and needlework. Girls and young ladies cannot mend an undone sleeve or hem. It's a shame.

Another one also commented:

Even if you give a lot of kitchen utensils during kitchen parties, some of our young ladies do not know how to use or clean them which is a
sheer waste of time and resources because they do not learn the subject.

The other one also boasted that:

During the colonial era and after independence, ladies who did Home Economics were recognized through their cleanliness. In fact we got married to high ranking government officials because of the skills we displayed.

It was further disclosed that from the late 1970s there was gradual decline in the financial support from the government for Home Economics practical lessons. From the 1980s funds from the government became very inadequate, pupils were asked to buy their own articles unlike the way it was when they used to give them freely. The money raised from the sales of articles was used to buy more materials for the next grade.

4.21.2 Responses from former inspectors of schools

Former Inspectors of schools revealed that funding during their tenure of office was adequate. Every aspect of the subject was catered for in terms of funds. Practical lessons were carried out in all components of home economics that is, cookery, home management, laundry, needlework, crafts, personal hygiene, housecraft and mothercraft. Teachers used to get funds from Inspectors of schools through head teachers and had to retire them at the end of each term.
Inspectors further disclosed that, money for practical examinations used to come from Examinations Council of Zambia (ECZ) through Home Economics Inspectors of schools who disbursed it through the head teachers to Home Economics teachers.

The study further revealed that from 1964 the Ministry of Education continued to support the funding of practical subjects in schools. However, support began to reduce from around the 1980's and early 1990’s when the Zambian economy started going down. In view of that, the government was no longer able to fund the education sector adequately. As a result cost sharing was introduced in schools, and that included cost sharing in Home Economics.

On observation of practical lessons and demonstrations, the study discovered that Inspectors used to check on how the equipment was stored in the store rooms and on the shelves. They also observed how the teacher carried out the demonstration lessons, use of equipment, preparedness the arrangement of the demonstration table procedure through the demonstration lesson, pupils’ activity and the end result of the practical lesson. In addition, former Inspectors of schools revealed that Weekly Focasts (Schemes of Work) and lesson plans were also looked at. They also encouragement H.E teachers to have a backyard garden to grow vegetables that they could use in Home Economics practical lessons.
Table 3. Home economics Teachers’ responses on funding of practical lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funded by PTA in government schools</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government schools: Only funded during final examinations</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequately funded in Private schools</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not teach Home Economics subject</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.21.3 Responses from Home economics teachers

The study revealed that eight of the teachers in government schools under study stated that the schools in which they taught Home Economics, support for practical lessons in the subject was being funded by the school PTA members. Although they were being funded, the resources were not adequate, not even enough to purchase teaching and learning material for the subject. Such funds were mainly only used for grade 9 Home Economics examinations at the end of the year.

The study also revealed that four of the Home Economics teachers in the government schools under study did not get funding of any kind, as a result pupils were levied K10,000 each in order to raise funds for the practical lessons. Any funds that were left were added to the amount for final practical examinations.
As stated in the above paragraphs, the situation in the private schools was different. There, practical lessons and practical final examinations were all adequately funded by the PTA together with the owners of the schools.

4.21.4 Responses from head teachers

The head teachers' responses were not different from those of the Home Economics teachers. However, for the Middle Basic classes only theory work was taught, hence, no practical lessons were carried out in such schools. As expected there was positive response in private schools meaning that in these schools practical demonstrations in Home Economics were carried out.

4.21.5 Responses from grades 8 and 9 pupils

Fieldwork revealed that grades 8 and 9 pupils learnt cookery, health education, laundry, needlework and home management. In the visited government Basic schools a few practical lessons were carried out in all the components of Home Economics and not much in laundry due to lack of laundry equipment. In the visited private Basic schools practical lessons were carried out in all components of Home Economics since they had all the equipment needed for the subject.

4.22 Equipment Used in demonstration and practical lessons

The study revealed that five (55.6%) of the government schools used their own tools in needlework practical lessons. Little equipment was found in the school and pupils had to bring their own equipment from home for practical
lessons especially in cookery and home management. The trend was common in peri-urban and rural Basic schools.

4.23 Support for the subject from PTA members

The study revealed that 10 (55.5%) of the PTA members interviewed in government schools confirmed the problem of equipment for Home Economics in schools and stated that pupils carried equipment from homes, which sometimes got broken. PTA members complained that the items that were lost or got broken were not replaced by the respective schools. The PTA members felt that it was not fair that pupils should be getting equipment from homes instead of finding equipment in schools. This was not the situation in private schools as they were funded adequately.

4.24 Funding of Home Economics practical lessons by the District

The views expressed by Education Standards Officer and the District Education Board Secretary confirmed the problems of funds for practical lessons and final examinations in Home Economics.

4.25 RESOURCE UTILISATION IN THE TEACHING AND LEARNING OF HOME ECONOMICS

Inspectors of schools said that the little money allocated to Basic schools was looked after by Home Economics organizers who channeled it to Basic school home economics teachers in the district. The money was used to buy ingredients, fabric, threads and needles for practical lessons. At the end of
each term receipts were retired to the appropriate MOE officials at the District office. The receipts from each Basic school were forwarded to the Inspector of Schools at the regional office. This was also what the Home Economics teachers and head teachers said on the utilization of the inadequate funds obtained for home economics from Ministry of Education and other sources.

However, during interviews it was disclosed by authorities in some schools that some head teachers were not happy with some teachers who only concentrated on teaching cookery and sidelined needlework. They also stated that they were not happy with teachers who also got some equipment from the Home Economics Department to go and use in their homes and getting a lot of food stuffs from what the pupils had prepared. In general, Mufulira DEBS stated that the money for Home Economics was properly utilized in his district.

4.26 CONSTRAINTS FACING THE LEARNING AND TEACHING OF HOME ECONOMICS IN BASIC SCHOOLS IN MUFULIRA DISTRICT

4.26.1 Responses from various stakeholders during fieldwork
The basic facts on the constraints facing the subject were similar whether the responses came from former pupils in colonial Mission schools, current pupils in government Basic schools, teachers of Home Economics or head teachers in these schools. Their main point was that teaching of Home Economics was not very effective because of lack of funds to purchase the necessary materials for good teaching of the subject. They also stated that by integrating
the home economics in science at Middle Basic school level, the subject has lost its original significance. It only comes up as a separate subject at Upper Basic school level.

The negative attitude of some teachers and members of the public about the subject is a serious setback for Home Economics. Some head teachers were not supporting the subject as they regarded it as an expensive subject.

4.27 Infrastructure equipment and learning materials for Home Economics

The study revealed that infrastructure, equipment, teaching and learning materials were a major problem in government Basic schools in Mufulira district. Peri-urban and rural schools were the most adversely affected in the district. It was disclosed that most of the urban Basic schools have rooms but lack furniture, equipment and the teaching and learning materials.

4.28 Teachers that teach the subject by gender

Fieldwork revealed that 45 female teachers taught Home Economics in Basic schools in the district. Field research also disclosed that teachers that taught Home Economics were trained using one of the following curricula: Zambia Primary Course (ZPC), Zambia Basic Education Course (ZBEC) and Zambia Teacher Education Course (ZATEC). One teacher, Mrs Kamanga of Chibolya Basic School lamented:

Teachers trained through ZATEC Programme are not competent enough even in other subjects. I feel the programme should be
revisited, we usually have a lot of problems in trying to make them teach effectively.

It was also revealed through the fieldwork conducted in the district that trained teachers from National in-service Training College (NISTCOL) Chalimbana and Copperbelt College of Education (COCE) taught Home Economics in Upper Basic schools.

4.28.1 Views on the teaching of the subject by male teachers

Fieldwork revealed that pupils were only taught Home Economics by female teachers. There was no male to act as a role model for the boys. One pupil had this to say:

We would have loved to be taught by a male teacher. Male teachers should copy from male nurses who have taken up the female dominated career.

4.29 Hours allocated to Home Economics in Basic schools

The study revealed that pupils in five Basic schools said that there were two periods allocated to Home Economics per week which was taught according to the teacher’s interest because of the integration. At Upper Basic school the subject was allocated three hours per week.
The senior lecturers at Mufulira College of Education said that time allocated for Home Economics per week was not adequate. The time allocated to technology study area was 3 hours contact and 1 hour research and consultation per week. The senior lecturers said that the problem was that the 3 hours were shared between Home Economics and Industrial Arts lessons. They complained about the ZATEC program being too short for Home Economics lecturers to cover the syllabus with many components. The ZATEC programme was one year college based and one year field based.

4.30 Teaching and Management of Home Economics in Mufulira Basic Schools

The District Education Board Secretary (DEBS) revealed that the subject was not adequately taught in Basic schools in the district. The DEBS stated that head teachers complained genuinely about inadequate funds for Home Economics. Even the little funds that were allocated for the subject came erratically making it difficult to plan properly. It was also revealed that the equipment for Home Economics was not adequate in schools. The DEBS concluded that due to the outlined factors the subject was not well managed and not effectively taught in Basic schools in the district.

RESPONSES FROM FORMER INSPECTORS OF SCHOOLS

4.31 Financial support to the subject and components of Home Economics where practical lesson were carried out

The former inspectors of schools revealed that in 2007, funding, equipment, teaching and learning materials were inadequate in schools making it difficult
for the teachers to teach. The study further revealed that former Inspectors of school were not for the idea of subject integration. They disclosed that they preferred the subject to be taught on its own, so that practical lessons could be carried out as it was done immediately after independence.

RESPONSES FROM HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

4.32 Home Economics teachers' views on the teaching of the subject

The study revealed that four (4) (22.2%) of the Home Economics teachers from Private schools said that, the teaching of Home Economics had been stable because of the support they were getting from their head teacher and the proprietors of the schools. The study further revealed that the Home Economics teachers in basic private schools of Mufulira district were well funded provided they gave notice to their head teacher in good time. They further disclosed that practical lessons were carried out at Middle and Upper basic levels as the syllabus demanded. Home Economics teachers in private basic schools said that even lower basic pupils were able to learn the subject theoretically and able to draw and mention nutritional value found in foods drawn.

In government schools the Home Economics teachers revealed that for the subject to be well taught and managed, the schools should have infrastructure equipment, teaching and learning materials most of all funding, for the practical lessons to be carried out.
RESPONSES FROM HEADTEACHERS

4.33 Revisiting the syllabus

Figure 2. Head Teachers in need of revisiting the syllabus

The study revealed that three (3) (33.3%) of the head teachers said that the syllabus was adequate to the teaching of the subject and that there was no need to change it. The study further revealed that six (6) (66.6%) of the head teachers said that the syllabus needed to be revisited so that it could include new technology in the subject. They urged the Home Economics Association of Zambia (HEAZ) to be organizing in-house training to help teachers keep abreast with the new technology in the subject. They further advised that HEEAZ should be networking with other associations in the region to help them get the latest information.

RESPONSES FROM PTA MEMBERS

4.34 Funding and teaching of Home Economics

On the issue of funding, PTA members said that the government should be funding the subject as it used to do after Independence because the subject brought about creativity in both boys and girls as they grew. The PTA
members further stated that the subject should have its own examination paper in order to show its importance at grade 7 level. The PTA members also pointed out that teachers should be attending workshops and prepare magazines to disseminate information on the importance of Home Economics as a subject.

RESPONSES FROM EDUCATION STANDARDS OFFICERS

4.35 To improve the teaching of the subject
The Education Standards officers stated that the teaching of the subject could only be improved if the subject was well funded. They also disclosed that the subject was expensive to properly run it in schools as it was like a family home. They concluded that Home Economics teachers needed refresher courses to keep abreast with new technology in the subject.

RESPONSES FROM DISTRICT EDUCATION BOARD SECRETARY (DEBS)

4.36 Equipment and learning materials
The DEBS revealed that to help schools in urban and peri-urban areas which had no equipment and other learning materials in the district, the Mufulira district HEAZ association held an Insaka night to raise funds. The association worked with the DEBS office who instructed head teachers to buy tickets to help the association raise funds to buy a stove for one school and other equipment for schools that had infrastructure but no equipment. The fundraising venture was held on 13th August 2007 and the money was raised
through the preparation of traditional dishes and pledges made by some education officials.

RESPONSES FROM SENIOR LECTURERS AT THE COLLEGE

4.37 Changes that should be made at tertiary Level in Home Economics

The study revealed that for the subject to be taught and learnt well, more hours should be allocated to the contact session for effective teaching and learning. The study further disclosed that the Senior Lecturers were for the idea of specialization as it used to be during the Zambia Primary Course (ZPC) and Zambia Basic Education Course (ZBEC) Programmes.

4.38 Time allocation to the subject at tertiary level

The Senior Lecturers demanded that for the subject to be well taught enough time should be allocated to Home Economics and this should not be less than 3 hours. With this time, they concluded, they could be able to adequately cover the long Home Economics syllabus. The student teachers would get skills needed to impart to the pupils in the Basic schools.
CHAPTER FIVE
DISCUSSION OF RESEARCH FINDINGS

5.1 Introduction
The teaching and management of Home Economics in Zambian Basic schools has been perceived to be very important by the general public. 87% of the respondents observed that the subject was losing value at Middle Basic level because it was integrated with other subjects like Creative and Technology Studies, Art and Design and, Physical Education. The subject had been well funded in the colonial times and after independence especially from the 1970s the funds for Home Economics dwindled and this led to the subject being abandoned in some Basic schools.

5.2 Perception of Home Economics by the Stake Holders
5.2.1 Home economics teachers
The Home Economics teachers’ perception of the subject was that it was very important. The role of Home Economics teachers was to teach and manage the subject which should have had all the necessary facilities in place. Those interviewed said:

While our role was to teach and manage Home Economics as a subject, it proved to be difficult because we did not possess the materials needed in our department for us to manage and use for teaching.
It was therefore important that the Home Economics teachers were supplied with cookery equipment like electric stoves, microwaves, electric kettle and all relevant and necessary modern equipment. Learners should also have the experience of using traditional equipment such as braziers, pestle and mortal and cooking sticks. In home management, items like laundry basins detergents and chemicals like jik, sta-soft and starch were needed. Fashion and fabrics required a variety of fabrics, various needles, threads, sewing machines and other necessary items. On the other hand, health education needed items like toiletries, mirror and dressing table, cosmetics for good grooming and other necessary materials needed for Home Economics teachers to impart the required skills in the learner. The Home Economics teachers also stated that, if Home Economics were well taught, there would have been no need for the launch of *Keep Zambia Clean and Health* campaign that was launched by His Excellency the late Republican President Dr Levy Patrick Mwanawasa on 22 June 2007. Apart from that, Home Economics teachers felt that they needed refresher courses and workshops for them to keep abreast with the new technology in their subject. Unfortunately there were no male teachers found teaching Home Economics in the district. Male teachers said “may be we teach Home Economics in science, but do not carry out any practical lessons.”

5.2.2 Learners

The study established that learners viewed the subject to be very important and that it was good that it was taught to both boys and girls including the
Programme for Advancement of Girl's Education (PAGE) in Basic schools. One grade six boy, Chisenga of Mufulira Basic school said that:

Home Economics is a very good subject because it teaches us how to cook and sew clothes and we can even become chefs and tailors in future.

Another pupil in grade seven, Mbikazi at Chibolya Basic School said that:

Madam despite the subject being taught to both boys and girls, it is not taught on its own but we do learn the subject in Creative and Technology and Science. We see it on the time table written as Home Economics but it is not taught on its own.

Pupils in government Basic schools were of the view that they should learn the subject on its own and also should be carrying out practical lessons like their counterparts in private Middle Basic schools. They said that in private Middle Basic schools, grades 5, 6 and 7 pupils were able to carry out practical lessons. This should be the same even in government Middle Basic schools.

In government Basic schools it was observed that at Upper Basic school there was a shortage of staff in optional subjects like Agriculture Science, Office practice, Technical drawing, art and wood work except in Home Economics. The pupils in Upper Basic schools said that, the lack of teachers in other optional
subjects disadvantaged them because they did not have other options to choose from. Chibuye, a boy at Kansunwa Basic School said that:

Among the optional subjects in our school, only Home Economics is available. In other schools they have at least three while in some schools there are no optional subjects.

Apart from that, pupils were asking the government to build more Home Economics rooms, to supply furniture, equipment, teaching and learning aids like books and charts for the subject.

**5.2.3 Parents**

Parents were aware of the importance of the subject to the pupils. One male parent Mr.Chaponda viewed the subject as one that brought about multiple skills if well taught and learnt. The skills that Mr.Chaponda mentioned were skills like baking, tailoring, entrepreneurship the setting up of a restaurant or tailoring shop and many more. A parent Mrs.Chewe who was once taught by the missionaries said:

I am not happy with the way they have integrated the subject with other subjects at Middle Basic School. My child, if you will not defend the subject to be taught on its own then it may be phased out one day.
Yet another parent who once taught at Mindolo Ecumenical Foundation in Kitwe, on the Copperbelt, Miss Milambo complained that:

For the subject to bring out the skills it used to bring out in the learners during our days, it should be taught as it were taught in the past, of course with some modifications here and there because times are changing.

She went on to say that in the past the subject was taught starting with theory and later practice which empowered a person throughout one's life. She further proudly exclaimed:

_Mayo (mother)! I am still practicing what I learnt a long time ago as you can see what I am doing in my restaurant._

### 5.2.4 Ministry of Education Officials

The Ministry of Education Officials at district level admitted that Home Economics was very important to the learners especially at basic school level. The District Education Board Secretary (DEBS) Mr. Mporokoso emphasized that:

Home Economics is a very important subject but lack financial support and teaching materials. That is why I do urge the district Home Economics Association (HEA) to fund raise and buy some equipment and distribute them in schools that are lacking.
The DEBS also encouraged the head teachers to support Home Economics teachers in fund raising ventures at the school and district levels. He pointed out that the fund raising ventures would help the Home Economics teachers to carry out practical lessons with their pupils.

The District Education Standards Officers (DESO) Mr. Fonseka observed that the grade nine (9) results for Home Economics were good, but was aware that they did not under take enough practical lessons. He advised that:

Without enough practice, pupils would not have enough skills to sustain themselves when they drop out of formal school.

At Provincial level, the Ministry of Education had a Senior Education Standards Officer (SESO) who coordinated all practical subjects including Home Economics. The SESO happily commented that he was pleased with the Home Economics Association of Zambia (HEAZ) which held the Annual General Conference to display what they did in Home Economics in Basic schools, Basic Education Colleges and High School Teacher Training Colleges. He concluded by saying that he was impressed with the association because it was the most active association of practical subjects in the Province. He also admitted that there were many unsolved problems associated with the teaching of Home Economics such as infrastructure, equipment and financial resources.
Officials at the Ministry of Education headquarters in Lusaka noted the importance of Home Economics as a subject. For instance, Ms Irene Malambo, former Home Economics specialist at the Curriculum Development Centre (CDC) said that, the subject was very important to our children because it cultivated creativity in them. She added that the government attached great importance to practical subjects such as Home Economics but unfortunately did not have enough resources for all educational needs.

Former Inspector of Home Economics at Ministry headquarters Mrs. Catherine N. Phiri commented that:

For the subject to survive we should do away with the traditional methods of teaching where we carry out a practical lesson and expect a group of pupils to prepare a variety of food stuffs. I feel the subject should be taught as a science where we need a few samples for learners to carry out an experiment on their own. For example, a few potatoes on which pupils to establish how much starch the potato contains.

The former Inspector went on to state that it should be assumed that children had already learnt the cooking, laundry and sewing skills at home and that what was remaining was to carry out experiments in the laboratories on the already gained skills. Mr. Mulenga, the Acting Director of Standards and Curriculum at the Ministry of Education Headquarters said that practical subjects were very important and the Ministry of Education was aware of the problems the practical
subjects were facing. The government was doing everything possible to finance the practical subjects in schools especially at Basic school level where the situation was bad.

5.2.5 Materials and infrastructure for home economics teaching in Basic schools

Home economics teachers, former students in colonial Mission schools, head teachers and former inspectors of schools said that most of the government schools in Mufulira district had inadequate infrastructure, equipment, teaching and learning materials for Home Economics. This had resulted in the subject not being well taught and managed. The ideal situation in the teaching of Home Economics involved teaching theory, demonstration lessons (practical lessons) and after the lessons pupils to practice what the teacher had demonstrated in small groups of four or five pupils. On the other hand, when the subject was only taught theoretically without practicing pupils did not gain the skills required. For example, if the teacher mentioned the procedure for making tea without showing the equipment and demonstrating how it was done practically the pupils would be at a loss because the concepts might not have been explained practically. In addition, the normal lesson would have theory, demonstration and practice. If one of these components was not done then it meant the lesson was not complete.
Home Economics lessons also required specific class rooms designed for the teaching of the subject. Good management of home economics involved keeping the room very clean, procuring equipment, stock books and other teaching and learning materials. Pupils must also be taught how to carefully handle the equipment in their respective rooms. A Home Economics classroom block had to have a cookery room and a storage room for the equipment. The cookery room should have cooking space (stoves), working space (tables or washing surface above cupboards) washing up space (sink and draining board) and storage space (cupboards, fridge and freezer). Additionally, there should be a needle work room and a store room for storing needlework equipment, a sink basin for washing hands before handling the fabric to avoid making it dirty and a dressing mirror for checking fitness of garments. Apart from that, there had to be a home management room which should have a bedroom, toilet and bathroom, living room and items that are found in those rooms. The Basic schools that were adversely affected in this context were those found in peri-urban and rural areas where they lacked ideal home economics buildings. Most of the buildings in the peri-urban and rural areas were makeshift buildings which could not be used in the rainy season because they were leaking.

5.2.6 Material and financial support from Ministry of Education

The headteachers found out that the Ministry of Education did not send funds for Home Economics specifically but that funds for the subject came from school grants which were sent to schools. The headteachers said that this was unusual
because previously Home Economics funds were sent through the provincial office and were managed by the Home Economics inspector who used to send the funds to Home Economics coordinators at district level and through the head teachers to Home Economics teachers. It was revealed by head teachers that for the final examinations of practical subjects, funds came from the Examinations Council of Zambia (ECZ). The head teacher of Mufulira Basic School Mr. Chongo said that at present, he and the PTA members had to use their initiative to fund Home Economics. At all times, the funds for Home Economics were not adequate enough to cater for all required equipment and practical lessons. Mrs. Sakala a head teacher at Chibolya Basic School said:

Although there was a pronouncement of free education, the PTA members and myself have allowed our Home Economics teacher to levy the pupils a K10, 000 specifically grades 8 and 9 in order to supplement the little resources we allocate to the department.

The head teachers said that apart from levying the pupils, Home Economics teachers had to embark on fund-raising ventures like selling fritters, ice blocks, organizing *Insaka* nights and charging pupils during civilian days, when those that did not want to wear uniform did so only after paying a small token to the school for the day in question (civilian day). The funds raised from such activities were used to restock their departments and for carrying out practical lessons.
5.2.7 Utilization of the resources from the Ministry of Education

Home Economics teachers' training and syllabus in Basic and High School Colleges and, the University of Zambia (UNZA) did involve the teaching, management and utilization of resources. Sometimes on first appointment some teachers found nothing to manage, utilize and use to teach in the new schools. Despite the challenges that they encountered, they usually tried to use the little resources in the teaching of Home Economics. Mrs. Siwale a home economics teacher at Murundu Basic School complained that:

I use some equipment from my home to supplement the little equipment in the department.

Another home economics teacher at Mufulira Central Basic School, Mrs. Amutike proudly stated that:

The little funds allocated to our department are well utilized in that we are able to fund-raise as well as use it for carrying out practical lessons. This is how we end up producing very good results at grade 9 Level.

5.2.7 Constraints in Home Economics teaching in Mufulira district

Among the constraints in the teaching of Home Economics, Focus Group Discussions revealed the following as the major challenges in the teaching of the subject: lack of appropriate Home Economics class rooms; lack of male Home
Economics teachers brought no role models for boys learning Home Economics; materials in the teaching of the subject were also inadequate, especially the modern technology. In Basic Colleges of Education the Senior Lecturers complained of inadequate time allocated for Home Economics in the institution. It was in view of the many challenges facing Home Economics that The Education Post of Saturday, November 10, 2007 gave a timely warning to the government when it stated that, "the government should provide concrete support to Home Economics departments in schools. As a result of lack of support, some Basic schools abandoned the subject."
CHAPTER SIX

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 Summary of findings from the fieldwork

The following were the major findings of this study:

1. There were 87% of all respondents who stated that Home Economics in the Basic schools in Mufulira district was not taught properly especially at Middle Basic school level.

2. The poor teaching and management of Home Economics in Basic schools was as a result of inadequate funding for the subject.

3. More important factors for the poor teaching and management of Home Economics in Basic schools was mainly due to, among other things, lack of appropriate infrastructure, equipment, teaching and learning materials and trained staff in the subject.

4. Respondents including learners and parents were not happy in the way Home Economics was taught at Middle Basic school level where the subject was integrated in other science subjects.

5. The respondents were of the opinion that at Middle Basic level, the subject should stands on its own to help the learners build up skills and strengthen their foundation in the subject for Upper and High school levels.

6. Stakeholders wanted the subject be taught theoretically at Lower Basic School, with simple practical lessons at Middle Basic School and to be intensified at Upper Basic School level by having more practical lessons.
This situation would benefit those who dropped out of formal education at grade 9 level.

7. The respondents were of the opinion that Home Economics teachers in Basic schools, especially those in rural areas should be exposed to three-months' refresher courses.

8. There were boys in Basic schools in Mufulira that took Home Economics, yet there were no male teachers teaching this subject. This had disadvantaged boys who had no male role model in this important subject.

9. All stakeholders did recognize the significance of Home Economics with regard to vocational employment, health and the wellbeing of an individual, family and the community.

6.2 Conclusion

Following the African culture and the European culture of the time, colonial teachers of Home Economics in colonial Zambia allowed only girls to study the subject. This had changed from the 1980s and therefore both boys and girls should be encouraged to study the subject in Basic schools. The subject should be looked at as vocational subject that could provide entrepreneurial skills to the learners.

As a subject that had been ‘neglected’ by the Ministry of Education for a long time, further studies are required in Home Economics. For example, studies on the impact of integrating Home Economics in Creative and Technology Studies,
Physical Education, Art and Design and Science in Middle Basic schools on students desire to study the subject at Upper Basic and High school levels. We also need studies on the effect of public negative attitudes on Home Economics on learners' choice of the subject at High school level. In other words, more studies on Home Economics are necessary for the Ministry of Education to have a bird's view of this important practical subject.

6.3 Recommendations

Based on the findings discussed above the following recommendations are presented:

- The Ministry of Education should popularize the significance of Home Economics to learners in Basic schools in the country.
- The Parent Teacher Associations in the country should explain the importance of Home Economics in schools to parents at their PTA Annual General meetings.
- The Ministry of Education should start building appropriate or tailor-made Home Economics class rooms in schools where the subject was offered. The designs for Home Economics classrooms should be specific to the needs of the subject.
- Since Home Economics was a practical subject, the Ministry of Education should provide adequate funds for practical and demonstration lessons in Basic schools.
• Knowing that Home Economics was a practical subject, the Ministry of Education should provide materials for practical lessons such as kitchen hardware and utensils for use by learners in the schools where the subject was offered.

• More time should be allocated for the teaching of Home Economics in schools where it was offered and in Colleges of Education where Home Economics teachers were being trained.

• Learners in schools where the subject was offered should be exposed to modern technology in Home Economics.

• As a way of encouraging learners in Home Economics, the products that they produced should be displayed either in the locality where the school was situated or at the local Agriculture Show for people to buy and admire. This way the public would appreciate the importance of Home Economics.

• There should be a deliberate policy by the Ministry of Education to enroll more male trainee teachers in Colleges of Education so that they become role models for male learners in Basic schools.

• The Ministry of Education should provide learning and teaching materials in schools where Home Economics was offered. This study proved that these were insufficient in Mufulira district Basic schools. This situation should be generalized to the rest of Basic schools in the whole country.
• Teachers of Home Economics needed refresher courses, workshops and seminars to update themselves with the latest technology, methodologies of food preparations and academic data in the food industry to improve the teaching of Home Economics.

• Home Economics should be a separate subject and taught as such in Middle Basic schools. It should not be taught as an "integrated science" subject as the case was in 2008.

• The current Home Economics syllabus should be amended to include the latest development in the food industry and dietary requirements in the modern society.
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UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FORMER INSPECTORS
OF SCHOOLS FOR HOME ECONOMICS

TOPIC: TEACHING AND MANAGEMENT OF HOME ECONOMICS IN
BASIC SCHOOLS OF MUFULIRA DISTRICT

1. As a home economics inspector, what aspects of learning and teaching were you looking at when inspecting a home economics lesson?

2. How was the financial support towards the subject?
   a. adequate  b. inadequate.

3. In which component of home economics were practical lessons carried out?

4. What kind of content was found in the home economics syllabus?

5. What are the similarities in the teaching and management of home economics as compared to the colonial era and after independence?

6. What are the differences in the teaching and management of home economics today as compared to yester years?
7. Give a general comment on the aspect of teaching and learning of home economics.

Thank you for your co-operation
INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR FORMER PUPILS OF MISSION SCHOOLS WHERE HOME ECONOMICS WAS TAUGHT

(A tape recorder will be used to collect data from the former pupils of mission schools where Home Economics was taught)

1. What was Home Economics called during your time?
2. What was being taught that time?
3. What kind of teachers did you have in terms of qualification?
4. What activities were carried out in the subjects that were being taught?
5. Who funded the subject?
6. How many hours / periods were allocated to the subject?
7. What is your comment on how Home Economics is being taught and managed nowadays?

Thank you for your co-operation
INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR DIRECTORS
OF FAIRVIEW AND SYLVIA CATERING TRAINING CENTRE

(A tape recorder will be used to collect data from the Directors of Fair View and Sylvia catering)

1. What are the entry requirements to train in this college?
2. What subjects do you offer in your institution?
3. What kind of problems do you face with students who did not take Home Economics at School?
4. Given the opportunity, would you change the Home Economics subject in Schools?
5. If you would want changes to Home Economics, what would you want to change?

6. What is your general comment on the subject?

Thank you for your co-operation
INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR SENIOR LECTURERS IN BASIC TEACHERS' TRAINING COLLEGES
(Mufulira, Kitwe and Solwezi).

(A tape recorder will be used to collect data from Senior Lecturers of the above named colleges.)

1. What are the entry requirements to train in this college?
2. What subjects do you offer in your institution?
3. What kind of problems do you face with students who did not take Home Economics at School?
4. Given the opportunity, would you change the Home Economics subject in Schools?
5. If you would want changes to Home Economics, what would you want to change?
6. What is your general comment on the subject?

Thank you for your co-operation
INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PARENTS TEACHERS ASSOCIATION MEMBERS (PTA)

(A tape recorder will be used to gather data from P.T.A. members)

1. Is Home Economics offered in your school?
2. What do the children learn in this subject?
3. What kind of equipment and learning aids do you have specifically for Home Economics?
4. What kind of practical lessons were being carried out?
5. Where does the money for practical lessons come from?
6. What kind of help do you give to the subject as P.T.A members?
7. How would you want the subject to be taught?
8. Give a general comment on the subject.

Thank you for your co-operation
FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION FOR GRADES 5-7 PUPILS
(BOYS AND GIRLS) IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS.

1. Do you learn Home Economics as boys and girls together in your school?
2. What activities do you do?
3. How many hours/periods a week do you learn the subject?
4. Do you like the subject?
5. How do you want the subject to be taught?
6. Give a general comment.

Thank you for your co-operation
UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR MINISTRY OF EDUCATION OFFICIALS (HEADQUARTERS)

1. What is your perception of home economics as a subject?

2. Do funds for practical subjects also cater for home economics?
   Yes
   No

3. If yes, how do you send the money to basic schools?

4. If no, why?

5. How can the teaching and management of home economic be improved?

6. Give a general comment.
Thank you for your co-operation

FOCUS GROUP DISCUSSION FOR GRADE 8 -9 PUPILS
(BOYS AND GIRLS) IN GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE SCHOOLS

1. Do you learn Home Economics as boys and girls together in your school?
2. How many boys and girls are in the Home Economics Class?
3. What components of Home Economics do you learn?
4. What kind of practical lessons do you carry out?
5. Where do you carry out your practical lessons?
6. What kind of equipment do you use?
7. What kind of buildings do you use?
8. Give a general comment on how you feel the subject should be taught?

Thank you for your co-operation
UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE DISTRICT EDUCATION BOARD SECRETARY (DEBS) OF MUFULIRA DISTRICT

TOPIC: TEACHING AND MANAGEMENT OF HOME ECONOMICS IN BASIC SCHOOLS OF MUFULIRA DISTRICT
(Answer as briefly as possible in the space provided)

1. How many schools are in your district?

2. Are there infrastructure for Home Economics in those schools?

3. Does your office fund practical subjects in your district?

4. Where does the money for practical lessons come from?

5. Do you feel Home Economics is well taught in schools? Be honest.

6. Do you feel Home Economics is well managed in schools?

7. Give a general comment on the subject.

Thank you for your co-operation
UNIVERSITY OF ZAMBIA
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL ADMINISTRATION AND POLICY STUDIES

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STANDARDS OFFICERS OF MUFULIRA DISTRICT

TOPIC: TEACHING AND MANAGEMENT OF HOME ECONOMICS IN BASIC SCHOOLS OF MUFULIRA DISTRICT

(Answer as briefly as possible in the space provided)

1. Home Economics is one of the practical subjects. How well is it taught in Middle and Upper Basic Schools?

2. Are there buildings and equipment for the subject in schools?

3. Do you encourage men to teach the subject since colleges train them?

4. Have you ever observed a Home Economics lesson in one of your Inspections?

5. How was it?

6. Does the district budget for practical subjects?

7. If not, why?

8. How can the teaching of the subject be improved?

9. Give a general comment on the subject.

Thank you for your co-operation
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SCHOOL MANAGERS

(Answer as briefly as possible in the space provided)

1. Do you have a building, equipment and other learning aids for the subject?
   (Tick in the box?)
   Yes ☐
   No ☐
   If not, why?

2. How many teachers teach the subject (by gender)?

3. Do the pupil’s carry out practicals in Home Economics?
   Yes ☐
   No ☐

4. If no to question 3, why?

5. If yes to question 3 where does the money for practical lessons come from?

6. How is the money utilized by Home Economics teachers?

7. What is the attitude of teachers towards the subject?

8. Do you think there is need to revisit the syllabus? Give reasons.

9. What is your general comment on the subject?

Thank you for your co-operation
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR HOME ECONOMICS TEACHERS

(Answer as briefly as possible in the space provided)

1. How do you see the teaching of the subject in your view (improving or losing value)? Give reasons.

2. How many girls and boys do you have in your class?

3. Which grades learn the subject and do the practical lessons?

4. What kind of practical lessons do you carry out?

5. Comment on the buildings, equipment and learning materials for the subjects?

6. Are you funded as a department for practical lessons? If yes, who funds the practical lessons?

7. If not, how do you carry out practical lessons?

Do you feel that the subject is adequately funded? Give reasons?

8. Give a general comment

Thank you for your co-operation