

1956

Methods, procedures, and purposes of home visitations

<https://hdl.handle.net/2144/23609>

"Downloaded from OpenBU. Boston University's institutional repository."

Thesis
Kaffel, F.A.
Twomey, E.
1956

BOSTON UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

Thesis

METHODS, PROCEDURES, AND PURPOSES OF HOME VISITATIONS

Submitted by

Frank Albert Kaffel

(B.Ed., Keene Teachers College, 1954)

Edmund Twomey

(B.S. in Ed., Boston University, 1954)

In Partial Fulfillment of Requirements for
the Degree of Master of Education

1956

Boston University
School of Education
Library

First Reader: Mark Murfin
Associate Professor of Education

Second Reader: B. Alice Crossley
Associate Professor of Education

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	Page
I. Introduction.....	1.
II. A Survey of Related Literature.....	5.
III. Procedure.....	32.
IV. Analysis of Data.....	35.
V. Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations.....	62.
Appendix A.....	67.
Bibliography.....	70.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Number of Teachers Answering Checklist.....	35.
2. Number of Home Visitations Attempted, Completed and Planned by Five Selected Communities.....	36.
3. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 27 Teachers in Town A.....	37.
4. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 27 Teachers in Town A.....	38.
5. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are not Made by 27 Teachers in Town A.....	39.
6. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 27 Teachers in Town A.....	40.
7. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 26 Teachers in Town B.....	41.
8. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 26 Teachers in Town B.....	42.
9. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are not Made by 26 Teachers in Town B.....	43.
10. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 26 Teachers in Town B.....	44.
11. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 30 Teachers in Town C.....	45.
12. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 30 Teachers in Town C.....	46.

Table

Page

13. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are not Made by 30 Teachers in Town C.....	47.
14. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 30 Teachers in Town C.....	48.
15. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 51 Teachers in Town D.....	49.
16. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 51 Teachers in Town D.....	50.
17. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are not Made by 51 Teachers in Town D.....	51.
18. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 51 Teachers in Town D.....	52.
19. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 147 Teachers in Town E.....	53.
20. Number and Per Cent of Responses for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 147 Teachers in Town E.....	54.
21. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are not Made by 147 Teachers in Town E.....	55.
22. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 147 Teachers in Town E.....	56.
23. Number and PerCent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 281 Teachers in Five Selected Communities.....	57.
24. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 281 Teachers in Five Selected Communities.....	58.
25. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are not Made by 281 Teachers in Five Selected Communities.....	59.

Table

Page

26. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 281 Teachers in Five Selected Communities.....	60.
--	-----

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background of the Problem.-- Home visitation by the school teacher is one of the better ways to gain an insight into community living conditions and problems which have a great influence on the schools in that community. The teacher will be able to understand the child better by going into the home because he will know the parents, the home environment, and the economic, social and moral level of the home.

Obtaining the support of the parents is of the utmost importance in this day of ever increasing criticism of the public school and its practices; therefore, visits to the pupils' homes by the teacher should also bring a better understanding between the home and school. This practice is an important contribution to better public relations.

Contemporary curriculum planning is based on a study of the community and its resources with the help of parents, lay groups, and administrative personnel so that the curriculum can be based on local needs. Home visits by the teacher should fulfill many of these curriculum needs because seeing the home will enable the teacher to understand the community and to recognize the needs in planning curriculum revision.

Home visits should also help in diagnosing the troubles

of a youngster before he may become a juvenile delinquent. The home exerts the greatest influence on the child and the teacher who has seen the home also understands some of the child's problems better.

Grinnell and Young^{1/} state:

"Activities leading to closer cooperation between home and school are today being emphasized increasingly in schools throughout the country. It is generally recognized that mutual respect and understanding between teachers and parents are fundamental to a satisfactory and effective learning situation for the child."

More knowledge of home conditions and the development of friendly relationships between teachers and parents should contribute to a better understanding of the child, resulting in improved instruction and guidance of the child.

In the last few years, with the tremendous urbanization of the country, the teacher has lost the close relationship between home and school that existed in the small community. Since this growth of the community, it has been a common thought that teachers have made less home visits until the practice has all but disappeared from the scene.

Statement of the Problem.-- Specifically this study proposes to determine by means of a status survey:

1. Reasons for visits to the home.
2. Methods of arranging meetings.

^{1/}J.E. Grinnell, Raymond Young, The School and the Community, Ronald Press Company, New York; 1955. p. 36.

3. Values derived from the home visitations.

4. Why more visits are not made.

Limitation of the Problem.-- This study will be limited to a survey of home visitation practices of elementary school teachers. The data will be gathered from the staffs of four elementary school systems and a selected group of teachers who are graduate students attending Boston University. This study is concerned only with those personal visits which the teacher makes in the home of the child.

The study is further limited by its sample in that it will survey the practices and opinions of only a small group in a limited geographical area. It is therefore an exploratory type of survey.

Source and Justification of the Problem.-- There are many misconceptions by teachers in relation to home visitations. Teachers are reluctant in visiting parents because of distortions that have been rooted in their minds by many factors. Some school teachers and school systems make planned visitations to the homes of parents. Other teachers report incidental visitations. Home visitation by the teacher on the other hand is discouraged by some school administrators. These differences of school practices and reluctant attitude on the part of others indicated to the writers that there is need for further study in the area of home visitation by the classroom teacher.

With the increasing criticism and interest in the public

schools, it seems necessary for the public and the educators to share a common understanding of the practices used in today's schools.

One of the better means of obtaining community support of the schools and its program is through visiting the home of the pupils. From these visitations, information can be obtained which will be useful in moulding the educational program to the children's needs, lives, and problems. Because it is imperative that teachers understand the community as well as the child, it will be to the advantage of the teacher to make home visitations in obtaining an insight into community living conditions.

This study seeks information concerning the status of home visitation by elementary school teachers. It is hoped that the data gained will show the extent of home visitations, the problems related to making home visitations, and some aids in planning home visitations. It is believed that the need justifies this study.

CHAPTER II

A SURVEY OF RELATED LITERATURE

1. Understanding the Child

Through Home Visitation

Teachers know that the home is an important area of living; therefore, knowledge of it is very helpful in understanding of the child in the classroom. Today the school stresses the importance of teaching the individual and knowing their many differences. One of the better ways to gain a knowledge of the home and the child's individual differences is through home visitations. "The visit of the teacher to the home, if used discriminately, is an effective type of home-school contact. This is because the home is so important an area of pupil living."^{1/}

In some communities the practice of home visits is unknown and some homes will not welcome the teacher. Kyte^{2/} has found that in some communities home visits by teachers are quite common while in others this practice has been ignored. In certain localities teachers have experienced great difficulty getting into the home while in others they are gladly welcomed.

^{1/}William c. Reavis, Paul R. Pierce, and Edward H. Stullken, The Elementary School, The university of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1931, p. 550.

^{2/}George C. Kyte, The Principal at Work, Ginn and Company, Boston, 1954, p. 437.

Rightly done, however, the practice of home visits proves very valuable in bringing home and school closer together.

Home visits enable the teacher to acquire much useful information. Bruckner^{1/} says that the home visit better acquaints the teacher with the child and his home surroundings. It will be helpful to the teacher to know the relations between the parents and their children. In trying to understand the relations between the parents and their children, Slacks^{2/} tells us to look for the following: "Do the parents require obedience from their children, or do the children do as they please? Are the children respectful to their parents? Are the parents interested in the school, or are they indifferent to it?" These are things that are of great importance to the teacher because of the bearing they have on his management and his teaching of the children.

Davis and Norris^{3/} tell us that the teacher guides the child while he is in school and in order for the teacher to do this function of guiding better, he must understand the home and receive as much help as possible from the parents.

The importance of understanding the home is stressed by

^{1/}Grace Bruckner, "Visit Their Homes," The Clearing House, (December, 1941), 16:110.

^{2/}John R. Slacks, The Rural Teacher's Work, Ginn and Company, Boston, 1938, p. 60.

^{3/}Frank G. Davis, Pearle S. Norris, Guidance Handbook for Teachers, McGraw-Hill Book Company, Boston, 1949, pp. 86-87.

^{1/}Yeager who says: "The pupil can be better understood in his home environment, especially in regard to those conditions which influence his progress.

The teachers should be acquainted with the many outside conditions which influence the child in school. Some of these influences are recorded by Bruckner^{2/} who says: "Home conditions--food, shelter, necessities, luxuries and family relationships--are very important to an understanding of that pupil the teacher is endeavoring to teach."

^{3/}Willey and Andrew also state:

"By means of the conference the teacher gains information about the child's family background, interests, recreation, and vocation. The standards of living and culture pattern in which the child lives in home and community assume great significance."

By having the interview at home the teacher is able to see many factors that come in touch with the child which would not be noticed in the classroom.

^{4/}Langdon and Stout point out that there are many factors which influence the child such as--pets in the family, the

1/William A. Yeager, School-Community Relations, The Dryden Press, New York, 1954, p. 159.

2/Op. cit., p. 110.

3/Roy D. Willey and Dean C. Andrew, Modern Methods and Techniques in Guidance, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1955, p. 460.

4/Grace Langdon and Irving W. Stout, Teacher-Parent Interviews, Prentice-Hall Company, New York, 1954, p. 269.

place where the child plays, the treasures that would be shown at home, but probably never mentioned at school. The teacher will also be able to see the toys, reading material available to the child, and his hobbies.

Home visits also enable the teacher to observe better the child's personality and emotional stability which is important in understanding the child. Bruckner^{1/} states: "The child's emotional reactions and his personality may be accounted for and more wisely directed when home conditions and problems are observed first hand."

In understanding the personality of the child Langdon and Stout^{2/} say:

"The teacher may see the child in a new light, as he acts as host with ease and aplomb, or retreats to the background in shyness and self-consciousness or puts on a show to keep the center of attention, all of which can be very revealing."

The emotional stability of the child is a direct result of the home life as Ogburn and Nimkoff^{3/} point out:

"In many fields of research, findings converge on the family as the principal social influence in the life of the individual...The moral judgements of children are largely derived from their parents. There is evidence also that parental influence does more than form judgements, it influences conduct profoundly as well."

^{1/}Op. cit., p. 110.

^{2/}Op. cit., p. 269.

^{3/}William F. Ogburn and Meyer F. Nimkoff, Sociology, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1950, p. 229.

Therefore a teacher must have an understanding of the influence the family has on every individual child, because many emotional disturbances in the classroom can be traced to the home.

^{1/}Bruckner also says: "Through calls, unusual factors often come to light, factors which might and probably do influence the child's behavior and achievement in and out of school."

^{2/}Brown tells us that home visits can be used to have a better understanding of the child so that his time can be spent wisely while he is in school.

By the method of home visits the teacher can now assimilate all information concerning the factors that influence the child and use it accordingly. Wiley and Andrew ^{3/} point out that through home visits:

"The teacher gains an understanding of the parent's philosophy of rearing children and their methods of discipline, direction, or control. He makes judgements about the parents' ability to guide the child in personality training and in the acquisition of academic skills...All information a teacher gains from the parent may aid him in diagnosing and treating the emotional problems of children."

^{4/}Kyte also says:

"The teacher assimilates information helpful to him and to the school in serving his pupils'

1/Op. cit., p. 110.

2/Robert H. Brown Jr., "Home Visitations Prove Teacher and Parent Equal Better Pupils," School Executive, (November, 1952), 72:46-47.

3/Op. cit., p. 463.

4/Op. cit., p. 438.

specific needs. He acquires knowledge about the parents, an insight into home and family conditions materially affecting the child and an understanding of the cooperation to be expected from the parents."

The above facts point out the need for the home visitation because it is a practice that can help solve the many problems the teacher will face during his day in school.

^{1/}Yeager says: "If it were possible for each teacher to see each pupil in relation to his home and community environment, better understanding of the pupil would come about."

In making home visits a question may arise as to who should take part in the conference. The parents should be the ones to decide this question, although it seems natural for all members of the family to have some part in the interview, though perhaps not in all of it. It should depend upon who they are and what they would have to offer.

In connection with the problem of who should take part in the conference Langdon and Stout^{2/} say:

"Often grandparents or some other relative can see the child in a different light than that in which the parents see him and can help greatly in adding to a teacher's understanding of the youngster.... All of a child's relationships play their part in his being what he is."

The teacher though, should speak of its being helpful to meet any who have much of a part in the child's life if the opportunity arises.

^{1/}William A. Yeager, Administration and the Teacher, Harper and Brothers Publishers, New York, 1954, p. 159.

^{2/}Op. cit., p. 264.

Finally, there may be a time when a teacher will be called in to give help on a case study by either, a child-study group, by some social agency, teacher-with-teacher interviews, or teacher-principal conferences.

If the teacher had made home visits he should be able to divulge information that would have an important bearing on the case.

In gaining information from home visits that a teacher can use in other interviews, Wiley and Andrew^{1/} say:

"For the teacher who can work with parents satisfactorily the home visit is an excellent medium for gaining information. Reports of these home visits to other teachers are helpful in case conferences or teacher-with-teacher conferences or teacher-with-administrator interviews."

2. The Use of Home Visits in Juvenile Delinquency

It has been said that the school is in a very strategic position in regards to juvenile delinquency. The school is closer to the child and his home, whereas, other social agencies do not come in touch with the child until he is in trouble.

Tappan^{2/} states:

"The most successful work in the formulation and reorientation of individuals' response patterns

^{1/}Op. cit., p. 463.

^{2/}Paul W. Tappan, Juvenile Delinquency, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1949, p. 367.

can be accomplished with children; such efforts in nursery, school, and play groups show possibilities of forestalling a child's bent toward conduct problems or delinquency when his difficulties are apprehended soon enough."

If the teacher were able to come in closer contact with the home, through a home visitation program, more understanding will arise when the teacher deals with a possible delinquent.

This is borne out by Dirksen ^{1/} who says:

"The home is the most fundamental external factor in man's social life. It gives his life stability, without which social organization is impossible... Judges estimate that the dominant factor in delinquency is the broken home in as high as ninety per cent of the cases."

Neumeyer ^{2/} continues: "A family that is broken by divorce, desertion, separation, or death, or that functions inadequately as a social unit, is handicapped in carrying on its responsibilities toward the children." Therefore, the teacher that has an understanding of the home also has an understanding of the juvenile delinquent. Tappan ^{3/} tells us that: "It is the family where the attitudes and conduct are bred out of which antisocial lives develop." The Gluecks, ^{4/} in their study, have shown that the normal pattern of the family group has

^{1/}Cletus Dirksen, Economic Factors of Delinquency, Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1948. p. 53.

^{2/}Martin H. Neumeyer, Juvenile Delinquency in Modern Society, Second Edition, D. Van Nostrand Company, New York, 1955, p. 155.

^{3/}Op. cit., p. 496

^{4/}Sheldon and Elnor Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, The Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1950, p. 89.

been more frequently disarranged among the delinquents.

The various conditions in homes that can cause delinquency are listed by Neumeyer:^{1/}

"Various objective conditions of delinquent homes have been observed, as the kinds of broken homes, the extent of criminalistic behavior in the home, housing, sanitation, poverty, parental supervision or the lack of it, uncogentiality, conflicts, and the like."

Sheldon and Elenor Glueck^{2/} also found the following conditions in the homes of delinquent children--there was a greater dearth of sanitary conditions, homes more crowded and not clean; the family was dependent on relief agencies; more parents of the delinquents were separated, divorced or had never married, or were no longer living. The parents of these delinquents were also more troubled with serious physical ailments, mental retardation, emotional disturbances, drunkenness, and criminalism.

One of the better ways to see these surroundings and note if any of the preceding conditions are present is for every teacher to make a visit to everyone of his pupils' homes. The teacher who visits the home will be able to see the parents and various cultural and social conditions which are of great importance in a home that may contain a delinquent according to the Gluecks^{3/} who say that in the homes of delinquents:

^{1/}Op. cit., p. 158.

^{2/}Op. cit., pp. 91-107.

^{3/}Ibid., p. 115.

"There was less planning of household routine and a less refined cultural atmosphere. Their families were less self-respecting than the families of the non-delinquents and less ambitious to improve their status or that of their children. Standards of conduct were likewise much poorer in the homes in which the delinquents grew up."

The knowledge thus gained through a home visit will undoubtedly help the teacher to solve a child's problem before he becomes a delinquent, therefore, the teacher could be the difference between a happy or a delinquent child.

3. The Place of Home Visits in Curriculum Planning

In the past the curriculum of a school had been set up as a collection of courses of study where the child had to learn the content or fail. The contemporary view point is that learning is a twenty-four hour process and includes what were at one time called extracurricular activities. "Studies of children's out-of-school activities offer many valuable suggestions for the improvement of the curriculum experience."^{1/}

The curriculum should be built on the developmental needs of children and persistent life situations found in the contemporary culture.

In building a contemporary curriculum Elsbree and McNally^{2/}

^{1/}J. Murray Lee and Doris May Lee, The Child and His Curriculum, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Incorporated, New York, 1950, p. 213.

^{2/}Willard S. Elsbree and Harold J. McNally, Elementary School Administration and Supervision, American Book Company, New York, 1951, p. 54.

say: "The curriculum is more than a program of learning facts and skills, it is a program of learning better how to live."

Burton and Brueckner^{1/} also say: "The immediate curriculum is developed always within the general societal aims and values."

With regards to life situations and the influence they have on curriculum planning, Lee and Lee^{2/} state: "For curriculum change it is essential that the school have an understanding of the basic needs of children and the way in which learning takes place."

It is further proven that outside factors influence the curriculum building program as stated by Burton and Brueckner^{3/} who say:

"The curriculum results from the interaction of many factors in addition to aims, content, and process. Among the other interactive factors are persons; power structures among persons; material facilities; the aim and the political, economic, and social structure of the surrounding society; the aims and the philosophies of the community."

Today curriculum planning has undergone a great change. It is "...planned in broad outline enlisting wide teacher and community participation...details determined by teacher-pupil planning."^{4/}

^{1/}William H. Burton and Leo J. Brueckner, Supervision, Appleton-Century-Crofts Incorporated, New York, 1955, p. 369.

^{2/}Op. cit., p. 190.

^{3/}Op. cit., p. 369.

^{4/}Willard S. Elsbree and Harold J. McNally, Op. cit., p. 59.

In planning the curriculum, Burton and Brueckner^{1/} also say: "Teachers and pupils actually make the curriculum in all schools, aided directly and indirectly by parents, organized lay groups and administrative personnel."

Individual differences are of utmost important in contemporary curriculum. It is problem centered and based on experiences where groups work together on problems in which the pupils are interested. Teachers, therefore, should have an understanding of the community and then, and only then, will they have an understanding of the problems a child is interested in.

If a teacher is to succeed in contemporary curriculum, the planning of it and its execution, according to the preceding facts, he must have an understanding of the community and the child's home life. The teacher will then be able to mold the educational program to the child's needs, lives, and problems.

In trying to meet the needs of the children, Lee and Lee^{2/} tell us: "To get the desired objectives in curriculum change, the school should make studies of their children's reactions, home conditions and interests."

The importance of community study is also shown by

1/Op. cit., p. 369

2/Op. cit., p. 205.

Burton and Brueckner^{1/} who say:

"A reputable curriculum program necessitates far-flung study by all staff members and by groups, based upon defined local needs. The political, economic, and social structure and aim of the surrounding society, its hopes and aspirations, its tensions and shortcomings, need to be understood. Public opinion toward education must be known."

In selecting experiences to base the school's curriculum upon, Lee and Lee^{2/} say:

"Experiences should be so selected and guided as to develop new meanings through adaption to the needs of the local community, utilization of available local resources, compensation where possible for environmental lacks, and participation in a wide variety of environmental situations.... The centering of schools in the community means that there would need to be much more analysis of the local situation, as a basis for curriculum planning."

One of the better ways to gain this knowledge and analysis of the community and the needs of the pupils is through home visitation. It does not seem possible that a teacher is fulfilling all these needs if he has not gone into the home and studied the environment carefully and objectively.

The importance of home visits in planning the curriculum is shown by Burke^{3/} who says: "It provides splendid background for gearing our instruction to the home environment of the pupil, and for making home and school education compatible."

^{1/}Op. cit., p. 570.

^{2/}Op. cit., p. 203.

^{3/}Louise Burke, "Home Visits--A Teaching Asset," The Educational Digest, (February, 1946), 37:18-19.

"The information thus gathered should be most valuable in suiting the educational program to the children's needs, lives and problems, and in planning educational programs for the improvement of community life."^{1/}

4. Public Relations

Public relations seeks to bring about a harmony of understanding between any group and the public it serves and upon whose goodwill it depends.^{2/}

With the increasing need for a broader and clearer understanding in the case of public school relations, it seems necessary for the public, the school executives, and the school staff to work cooperatively together to meet the needs of the children. This means genuine cooperation in planning and working for good schools, with the public giving as well as receiving ideas. This undoubtedly must be a two-way process and a two-way flow of ideas between school and community which provides the basis for mutual understanding and effective teamwork.

The Twenty-Eighth Yearbook^{3/} states that:

"The school administrator is not a superintendent or principal one day and a public relations agent the

^{1/}Willard S. Elsbree and Harold J. McNally, Op. cit., p. 385.

^{2/}The American Association of School Administration, Public Relations for America's Schools, Twenty-Eighth Yearbook, 1950, A Department of the National Education Association of the United States, Washington, D. C., p. 12.

^{3/}Ibid., p. 20.

next. A Teacher is not a teacher during the day and a public relations agent after school. They are educators and public relations agents all the time. Public relations is a part of the educational process itself."

^{1/}
The Twenty-Eighth Yearbook continues:

"Public relations consciousness should permeate every level of the school system. The staff at each level should be made familiar with the general objectives of the over-all program and with the special techniques and procedures applicable at each level. There is a public relations job for every member of the school system to do, a job that is an integral part of his daily work. Any staff, however large or small, which works together for a commonly-recognized end, should have no difficulty in developing an honest and intelligent program that will effectively meet its individual problems."

^{2/}
Yeager states that:

"Education as a community enterprise can be maintained only by the intelligent and active support of its citizens. Hence, the education of the adult becomes a necessary accompaniment of any educational program."

^{3/}
Menge and Faunce sum up the present status of school-community relations as follows:

"Three stages of school community relations are commonly found today. The 'let-us-alone' policy is hard to support today. Many schools are immersed in an elaborate 'we-sell-you' program. This phase has the serious disadvantage in that it is a one-way communication street. The third stage may be termed the 'we-work-together' stage."

^{1/}Op. cit., p. 167.

^{2/}Op. cit., p. 168.

^{3/}Wilmer Menge, Roland C. Faunce, Working Together for Better Schools, American Book Company, New York, 1951, pp. 15-16.

This third stage is becoming more and more prominent because it is an undisputed fact that it's only logical for a group of people to have a clear understanding of the purposes of any school program before the system can gain their support confidently. Without these affirmative attitudes, relationships tend to be random, haphazard, incidental, and relatively ineffective.

Elsbree and McNally ^{1/} stress the following goals in relation to public understanding:

- "1. To improve the quality of children's learning and growing.
2. To raise community goals and improve the quality of community living.
3. To develop understanding, enthusiasm and support for the community's program of public education."

Yauch ^{2/} states that parents generally look upon teachers as being somewhat different from normal human beings. This is naturally a carry over from their childhood experiences. If the experiences were very unpleasant, these feelings are strong. If the experiences were pleasant, these feelings are not so deeply rooted.

Hymes ^{3/} states that:

1/Op. cit., p. 375.

2/Wilber Yauch, Improving Human Relations in School Administration, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1949, p. 215.

3/James L. Hymes, Effective Home-School Relations, Prentice-Hall, New York, 1954, p. 38.

"Despite the friendly feeling for education in the abstract, many parents have unpleasant memories of their childhood school--memories which weaken their enthusiasm to work with teachers today."

Grinnell and Young ^{1/} continue:

"The average person tends to think in stereotypes created out of his own limited experiences, reinforced or distorted by portrayal of character stereotypes in radio, movies, comic strips, television, or the theater. He is prone to pass judgement and to react with stereotyped images and attitudes."

It is of utmost importance for those who work in the educational field to know what people "think" they are and do, because it is on the remolding or redirecting of these attitudes that the profession must focus a portion of its efforts.

The Twenty-Eighth Yearbook ^{2/} states that:

"The word "teacher" to far too many Americans, conjures up a composite something like this:

1. The teacher is an old maid.
2. Teachers are aloof, snobbish, unwordly.
3. Teachers are querulous, irritable, generally unsympathetic, and lacking in understanding of young people and their problems.
4. Teachers are ineffectual.
5. Teachers are paid too much and have too many vacations.
6. Teachers have no interest outside of school and schoolwork.

1/Op. cit., p. 38.

2/Op. cit., p. 157.

7. Teachers get their jobs through political, racial, or religious connections.
8. Teachers are inclined to be "bossy" in relationships with others--they carry over classroom manners into adult contacts.
9. Teachers are fussy, picayune, and trivial in their attitudes.
10. Men teachers are timid, queer, eccentric, or sissyish; a "real" man does not go into teaching."

Unfortunately, it is not a flattering picture. There's nothing to indicate the essential nobility of the profession; not much to suggest that the teacher is the molder of youth and the preserver of America's heritage.^{1/} Yet, except for the more enlightened public citizen, this great distortion is too often the consensus of public opinion as to what the teacher is. It is of little wonder that the man in the street is not too concerned with the profession's fight for a fuller and better education for all the children. Only a grave threat of a critical shortage of teachers and school buildings can arouse the people from apathy.

What better method can be practiced than parent and teacher contact to root out such stereotypes as have been described and substitute in its place images of the teacher and the school system that portray their essential importance. Home visitations are one of the most effective ways in reconditioning these attitudes and erasing these distortions

^{1/}Twenty-Eighth Yearbook, op. cit., p. 157.

from the minds of the public.

Grinnell and Young ^{1/} state:

"One of the major purposes of intervisiting between the home and school, then, is to give the teacher a more complete understanding of the child's background and to provide information regarding his out-of-school activities and interests. Also, as the teacher and parent become better acquainted, there may be an opportunity to iron out some of the misunderstandings and friction between the home and school. Cooperation between school and home in helping the pupil with various educational and personal problems will be encouraged. Then, too, it may serve to acquaint the teacher with life in the world outside the school in order that he may be better able to make educational activities and materials contribute adequately toward promoting adjustments for effective living."

"One of the most effective means of developing community support is to maintain close contact with the home of the pupils." ^{2/} This is because the parents are those who are most interested in the schools.

Unfortunately in the past, home contacts were made only when discipline problems arose or when the school had something unpleasant to discuss. This procedure naturally left a negative impression on the public because of its consequences. This undoubtedly did not help to better the relationship between the public and the school. Lately, many schools have accepted the idea of home visitations and are making it a standard practice for each teacher to visit the parents of

1/Op. cit., p. 326.

2/Ibid., p. 327.

every child in her room. Elsbree and McNally^{1/} state: "A number of schools now make it standard procedure for teachers to schedule at least two personal interviews with one or both parents of every child in her class."

Hymes^{2/} states:

"Some have half-days of schools at the start of the year; mornings are used for work with children, afternoons are available for home visits. In the course of the year, a few schools close down completely for a day or two. Occasionally, the school day is cut short to give an hour or a half-hour at the end of the day for adults to talk together."

In some schools the program provides for the teachers visiting homes during school hours when this is more convenient to the parents.

Reavis and Pierce^{3/} state:

"The school staggers the schedule and services of teachers to cover late-afternoon and evening hours, weekends, and vacation in order to visit and to cooperate more fully with the home and community agencies in insuring continuity of activities of successful living for pupils."

Some schools have for many years used the technique of home visits as a means of reaching all the parents of the children in school. There are school systems where this device has been established as a basic part of the teacher's responsibility and where home visits are required by each

1/Op. cit., p. 385.

2/Op. cit., p. 142

3/Op. cit., p. 555.

teacher to every home during the school year. The benefits of home visits have already been stated and further repetition is not needed here.

The most interesting question is why such an excellent device has not gained universal support and become standard practice everywhere. The answer to this question is that schools have not been able to overcome the various barriers and to solve the problems that make such home visits difficult to administer.

Menge and Faunce^{1/} state:

"Teachers are understandably reluctant to devote a large portion of their own time to the task, and most school systems have not been able to work out a satisfactory plan to release pupils and thus make school time available for this purpose. The barriers between school and home tend to raise vague fears about how one will be received in the home and about the proper attitudes of a parent toward a teacher."

The technique of making home visits can be developed only through successful practice. This practice has not yet become a part of the professional skills of many teachers. The barriers to home visits can be removed when school people and parents work on the problems together.

Menge and Faunce^{2/} continue:

"It is perhaps significant that the schools where the most effective program of home visitations

1/Op. cit., p. 97.

2/Ibid., pp. 96.97.

have been worked out are those where parents and teachers have had experience in planning and have enjoyed social activities together in the school. From such informal group activities can come the initial move to visit the home."

It is of the utmost importance that the teachers prepare for home visits in order to obtain best results. The policy of visiting the home of the students must be set up with professional care and all teachers who participate must be briefed to assure the success of their efforts.

^{1/}
Duff and Carr state:

"The teacher should make it a point to visit only after he has established a degree of rapport with the students at whose home he is to call. He should make his first visit an occasion when he has some significant commendations to convey to the parents."

^{2/}
Duff and Carr continue that barriers such as the following should be eliminated:

- "1. Some teachers lack personality and understanding in dealing with parents.
2. Cultural, religious, language and racial consideration must be reckoned with.
3. Many parents are suspicious of the motives of teachers and may resent what seems to them to be an intrusion."

It is the duty of every teacher to remove these barriers and strive together with the parents to form a mutual feeling of friendliness. As to the visit itself, Yeager ^{3/} states that

1/Op. cit., pp. 96-97.

2/W. L. Duff and John Carr, Basic Principles of Guidance, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1948, p. 200.

3/Op. cit., p. 159.

the following suggestions will be helpful:

- "1. The approach to home visitation should begin with the removal of all possible barriers to a satisfactory visit.
2. Before going into any home the teacher should study the child concerned, having in mind as many first-hand facts as possible.
3. The techniques of interviewing should be studied carefully.
4. The approach to the parent should always be positive. Find something good to say about each child. Matters requiring adjustments should be approached tactfully. Friendliness should characterize every visit. Offer to work together to remove any conflict if it exists.
5. Ascertain as many facts about the child in the home environment as possible health, the family, home interests, and economic conditions.
6. Since every child is an individual child, each case ought to be studied and reported as a "case study."
7. A record should be kept of all visits in terms of the purpose for which the visit is made.
8. In difficult cases the teacher will do well to work carefully with probation officers, community organizations, the family minister and physician, recreational personnel, and others who may assist in any way. Where a visiting teacher is employed, a close relationship with the classroom teacher should be developed.
9. The end result of home visitations should be to help the teacher to better understand and better deal with the pupil, for this knowledge of home life can serve as a background in the interpretation of school life."

5. Arrangements

It is safe to assume that in many situations where home visits are anticipated, it is advisable for the teacher to notify the parents in advance. Occasionally an incident may arise where it is impossible to contact parents ahead of time and it is necessary to visit a home unannounced, but as a standard practice, it is to the advantage of the teacher to make arrangements prior to the visit.

Reavis and Pierce ^{1/} state that: "Teachers have found that making an appointment in advance helps to put the parents at ease and paves the way for a cordial working relationship with them."

Arrangements may be made by telephone, letter to parents, or by sending notes home with the child. The telephone and letter to the parents is practiced most frequently.

6. Home Visits in Action

The local unit of the Minnesota Education Association advanced a plan which was made a part of their American Education Week program. The staff was so interested in the program that a 100% participation was recorded. ^{2/} This is the way the project was set up.

A letter was mailed to the parents of each pupil in their

1/Op. cit., p. 550.

2/G. I. Sholy, "Home Visits Break the Ice", School Executive, (September, 1954), 74:46.

twelve grades explaining that a teacher would like to visit them in their homes. A post card accompanied the letter which the parents were to return stating a convenient time and date for the visit.

Approximately half of these cards were returned. Once the cards were received, the teaching staff distributed the cards according to the possible needs of the parents. In some cases the parents specified a particular teacher to make the visit.

The teachers made these evening visits on their own time and provided their own transportation. These visits were arranged for a half hour period but in many situations the teachers remained for the entire evening.

Many parents called during the three-day visiting period and asked if they may be included on the visitation list. Other parents who did not ask for a home visit have since expressed their reluctance in having a teacher visit their home but after hearing about the visits from others would now welcome the opportunity. The parents who were visited have done a splendid job in spreading good will to other parents.

^{1/} Sholy states the following about what parents reported:

"I didn't know that a teacher could be so easy to visit and could discuss the things we were interested in. We talked about school affairs of course, but we also covered local problems in other fields."

"I was surprised that our teachers had such a grasp of the local situation."

1/Op. cit., p. 46.

"My children were hoping that I would not ask a teacher to come to our home, but now they're all for it."

Each teacher reported on her visit to the administration, comments on the general atmosphere, ideas discussed, and personal reaction. After the administration conferred with the staff about each visitation, they firmly believe that they now have a better understanding of the parents' problems.

The teachers then wrote to each family thanking them for the opportunity to visit them and expressed their appreciation for the interest they showed in the teachers.

^{1/}
Sholy continues:

"We believe that we have never done anything better in selling the school to the community. Most of the parents are now on familiar terms with the teachers and the good word that they spread throughout the community is becoming almost a legend. There is now a deeper feeling of comradeship among teachers--this plan has helped them feel that they each serve a definite part in the advancement of good will and community betterment. We believe that the accomplishments would have been less if the proposal had been handed down from the administration and not initiated by the teachers themselves."

^{2/}
Robert H. Brown, Jr., Superintendent of Schools in Madison, Connecticut, writes the following about home visitations:

"Purpose of home contacts

To gain a better understanding of the child

1/Op. cit., p. 46.

2/Op. cit., pp. 46-47.

so that his time spent in school would be more profitable; to increase the cooperation and understanding of the home and school; and to develop a friendly relationship between the teacher, pupil and parent.

Our visitation program was publicized to clarify its purpose to the citizens of the community--to improve the friendly feeling which already existed between parents and teachers. Parents are contacted not only when something is wrong; it is well to let them know their children are getting along satisfactorily or well in school.

The mechanics of home visits was an interesting procedure in itself. Since each teacher has a class of, on the average, twenty-seven pupils, approximately two visits every three weeks would cover the entire school population. From our previous experience, we knew that one hour was the average amount of time needed for each visit.

The teachers contacted the homes by letter or telephone, setting a convenient time for the visit. 'What can we talk about?' was the question. The obvious answer was 'the child'. A starting point could arise from the discussion of some good quality of the child. From here on the conversation upon the teacher. Teachers have been advised to remember the objectives of the program, to discuss as many things as possible which would benefit the child, and to use tact and diplomacy."

In conclusion, it appears that home visitations are of major importance in understanding the child and his problems, in fostering better public relations, and in changing and planning of contemporary curriculum.

CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

Constructing the Questionnaire.-- In this study our primary objectives were to determine the methods, values, techniques, and frequency of home visitations executed by elementary teachers in grades one through six. In order to construct an instrument to obtain the information, it was necessary to interview teachers and review available literature written by authorities in the educational field pertaining to various methods and procedures used in home interviews. After carefully analyzing the literature and the suggestions of the teachers interviewed, the following six phases were considered most pertinent:

1. Number of successful visits made to date.
2. Purpose of visit.
3. Values derived from visit.
4. Reasons for unsuccessful visits.
5. Reasons more visits are not made.
6. Methods of contact and arrangements for visit.

A questionnaire was constructed and presented to thirty teachers who were members of a graduate seminar at Boston University. Valuable suggestions for improvement were made. Particular attention was given to making it as brief and simple

as possible to answer. It was believed that a short, concise form would meet with a better response from busy teachers. Almost all answers could be expressed quickly by checking or placing a number after the proper term. The survey questionnaire was reduced to twenty-seven items and about three minutes time was required to complete the questionnaire. Suggestions for clarity and refinement were incorporated into the final form of the questionnaire as found in Appendix A.

An introductory letter which was to be sent with the questionnaire was written explaining the purpose of the study and asking for help of those to whom the questionnaires were sent.

Sample Surveyed.-- The communities chosen for the survey were selected communities. The territories or communities were placed in five categories.

1. One approximately 5,000 inhabitants.
2. One approximately 10,000 inhabitants.
3. One approximately 12,000 inhabitants.
4. One approximately 200,000 inhabitants.
5. One group of graduate students at Boston University.

The study is limited and based on 281 returns from the above territories and does not represent a random sampling of all the communities in Massachusetts.

Distributing the Questionnaire.-- A total of 410 questionnaires were distributed to elementary teachers from

grades one through six in five communities. Information from teachers was obtained by visiting principals and asking them to distribute the forms to the teachers in their building. The writers also contacted teachers personally and asked them to kindly oblige in answering the questionnaire.

The introductory letter stated that no comparison of teachers or schools would be made. It was suggested that teachers not sign their names. The teachers were asked to pass the information back to the principal in the sealed envelope upon completion.

After all of the returns were received, they were compiled and an analysis of the data was made.

CHAPTER IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

A total of 281 teachers of the elementary grades replied to the checklists sent out to five selected communities in Massachusetts. This represents a 69 per cent return, as 410 questionnaires were distributed. The divisions according to communities are represented in Table I.

Table 1. Number of Teachers Answering Checklist

Town	Teachers Responding
(1)	(2)
A	27
B	26
C	30
D	51
E	<u>147</u>
Total	281

The data presented in Table 2 shows the number of home visitations attempted, completed, and planned in the five selected communities for the school year 1955-56.

In Town A, 27 teachers attempted 120 home visits, completed 72 visits, and planned 49 visits for the remainder of the year.

In Town B, 26 teachers attempted 49 home visits, com-

pleted 36 visits, and planned 4 for the remainder of the year.

In Town C, 30 teachers attempted 90 home visits, completed 61 visits, and planned 32 for the remainder of the year.

In Town D, 51 teachers attempted 25 home visits, completed 21 visits, and planned 7 for the remainder of the year.

In Town E, 147 teachers attempted 133 home visits, completed 72 visits, and planned 95 for the remainder of the year.

Table 2. Number of Home Visitations Attempted, Completed and Planned by Five Selected Communities

Town	Visits Attempted	Visits Completed	Visits Planned
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
A.....	120	72	49
B.....	49	36	4
C.....	90	61	32
D.....	25	21	7
E.....	133	72	95
Total.	397	262	187

The questionnaire was constructed in a manner whereby each teacher could check as many responses as were applicable to him.

Table 3 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town A concerning the purpose of home visits made by them. Of 27 teachers replying to the survey, 44 responses were received on the purpose of home visitation.

1. Thirty-two per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were made for the purpose of discussing

the case with the parent.

2. Twenty-nine per cent of the responses indicated that visits were made for the purpose of visiting the family socially.

Table 3. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 27 Teachers in Town A

Purpose of Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Discuss case with parent.....	14	32
Visit family socially.....	13	29
Visit pupils (sick, etc.,)....	7	16
Talk with child and parent.....	6	14
Report progress to parents.....	4	9
Total.....	44	100

Table 4 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town A concerning the reasons for unsuccessful home visits made by them. Of 27 teachers replying to the survey, 6 responses were received on the reasons for unsuccessful home visits.

1. Fifty per cent of the responses indicated that the reason for unsuccessful home visits was because the parents were not at home.
2. Thirty-three per cent of the responses indicated

that the child was not at home.

Table 4. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 27 Teachers in Town A

Reasons for Unsuccessful Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Parents not at home.....	3	50
Child not at home.....	2	33
Admitted but not cooperative.....	1	17
Admittance refused.....	0	0
Total.....	6	100

Table 5 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town A concerning the reasons why more home visits are not made by them. Of 27 teachers replying to the survey, 52 responses were received on the reason why more home visits are not made.

1. Thirty-one per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were not required in the school system.
2. Fifteen per cent of the responses indicated that demands of other school work interfered with home visits.
3. Twelve per cent of the responses indicated that the community attitude was not favorable to home visits.

Table 5. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are not Made by 27 Teachers in Town A

Reasons More Visits are not Made	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Not required in my school system.....	16	31
Demands of other school work.....	8	15
Community attitudes not favorable.....	6	12
School policy dis- courages practice.....	4	7
It is not the duty of the teacher.....	4	7
Lack of transportation.....	3	6
Other occupation.....	3	6
Personal (family) obligations.....	3	6
Too many homes to visit.....	3	6
Poor home reception.....	2	4
Total.....	52	100

Table 6 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town A concerning the methods of contact and arranging for home visits made by them. Of 27 teachers replying to the survey, 24 responses were received on the methods of contact and arranging for home visits.

1. Thirty-eight per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were planned by telephone.

2. Thirty-eight per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were planned through regular (mutually planned) appointments.

Table 6. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 27 Teachers in Town A

Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Plan visit by telephone.....	9	38
Regular (mutually planned) appointments..	9	38
Plan visit through pupil.....	4	16
Unannounced visits.....	2	8
Total.....	24	100

Table 7 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town B concerning the purpose of home visits made by them. Of 26 teachers replying to the survey, 24 responses were received on the purpose of home visitation.

1. Twenty-nine per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were made for the purpose of visiting a sick pupil.
2. Twenty-five per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were made for the purpose of reporting progress to parents.

3. Twenty-five per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were made for the purpose of discussing a case with parents.

Table 7. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 26 Teachers in Town B

Purpose of Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Visit pupil (sick, etc.).....	7	29
Discuss case with parent.....	6	25
Talk with child and parent.....	6	25
Report progress to parents.....	3	13
Visit family socially.....	2	8
Total.....	24	100

Table 8 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town B concerning the reasons for unsuccessful home visits made by them. Of 26 teachers replying to the survey, no responses were received on the reasons for unsuccessful home visits.

Table 8. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 26 Teachers in Town B

Reasons for Unsuccessful Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Parents not at home.....	0	0
Child not at home	0	0
Admitted but not cooperative.....	0	0
Admittance refused.....	0	0
Total.....	0	0

Table 9 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town B concerning the reasons why more home visits are not made by them. Of 26 teachers replying to the survey, 44 responses were received on the reason why more home visits are not made.

1. Thirty-six per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were not required in the school system.
2. Fourteen per cent of the responses indicated that demands of other school work interfered with home visits.
3. Twelve per cent of the responses indicated that there was poor home reception.

Table 9. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are Not Made by 26 Teachers in Town B

Reasons More Visits are Not Made	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Not required in my school system.....	16	36
Demands of other school work.....	6	14
Poor home reception.....	5	12
It is not the duty of the teacher.....	4	9
Personal (family) obligations.....	4	9
Lack of transportation.....	3	7
Community attitudes not favorable.....	3	7
Too many homes to visit.....	1	2
School policy dis- courages practice.....	1	2
Total.....	44	100

Table 10 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town B concerning the methods of contact and arranging for home visits made by them. Of 26 teachers replying to the survey, 21 responses were received on the methods of contact and arranging for home visits.

1. Forty-eight per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were planned by telephone.
2. Twenty-four per cent of the responses indicated that

home visits were planned through regular (mutually planned) appointments.

Table 10. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 26 Teachers in Town B

Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Plan visit by telephone.....	10	48
Regular (mutually planned) appointments.	5	24
Plan visit through pupil.....	3	14
Unannounced visits.....	3	14
Total.....	21	100

Table 11 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town C concerning the purpose of home visits made by them. Of 30 teachers replying to the survey, 18 responses were received on the purpose of home visitation.

1. Thirty-four per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were made for the purpose of visiting a sick pupil.
2. Twenty-seven per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were made for the purpose of discussing a case with parents.
3. Twenty-seven per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were made for the purpose of talking with

the child and parent.

Table 11. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 30 Teachers in Town C

Purpose of Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Visit pupil (sick, etc.).....	6	34
Discuss case with parent.....	5	27
Talk with child and parent.....	5	27
Report progress to parents.....	1	6
Visit family socially.....	1	6
Total.....	18	100

Table 12 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town C concerning the reasons for unsuccessful home visits made by them. Of 30 teachers replying to the survey, 2 responses were received on the reasons for unsuccessful home visits.

1. One hundred per cent of the responses indicated that the reason for unsuccessful home visits was because the parents were not at home.

Table 12. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 30 Teachers in Town C

Reasons for Unsuccessful Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Parents not at home.....	2	100
Child not at home.....	0	0
Admitted but not cooperative.....	0	0
Admittance refused.....	0	0
Total.....	2	100

Table 13 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town C concerning the reasons why more home visits are not made by them. Of 30 teachers replying to the survey, 18 responses were received on the reason why more home visits are not made.

1. Twenty-two per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were not required in the school system.
2. Twenty-two per cent of the responses indicated that more home visits were not made because of lack of transportation.
3. Sixteen per cent of the responses indicated that demands of other school work interfered with home visits.

Table 13. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are Not Made by 30 Teachers in Town C

Reasons More Visits are Not Made	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Not required in my school system.....	4	22
Lack of transportation.....	4	22
Demands of other school work.....	3	16
Poor home reception.....	2	11
School policy dis- courages practice....	2	11
Too many homes to visit.....	1	6
Community attitude not favorable.....	1	6
It is not the duty of the teacher.....	1	6
Other occupation.....	0	0
Personal (family) obligations.....	0	0
Total.....	18	100

Table 14 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town C concerning the methods of contact and arranging for home visits made by them. Of 30 teachers replying to the survey, 15 responses were received on the methods of contact and arranging for home visits.

1. Fifty-three per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were planned by telephone.
2. Twenty per cent of the responses indicated that home

- , visits were planned through regular (mutually planned) appointments.
3. Twenty per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were planned through the pupil.

Table 14. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 30 Teachers in Town C

Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Plan visit by telephone.....	8	53
Regular (mutually planned) appointments.	3	20
Plan visit through pupil.....	3	20
Unannounced visits.....	1	7
Total.....	15	100

Table 15 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town D concerning the purpose of home visits made by them. Of 51 teachers replying to the survey, 28 responses were received on the purpose of home visits.

1. Thirty-five per cent of the responses indicated that visits were made for the purpose of seeing the sick child.
2. Thirty-two per cent of the responses indicated that visits were for the purpose of discussing the case with the parents.

Table 15. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 51 Teachers in Town D

Purpose of Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Visit pupil (sick, etc.).....	10	35
Discuss case with parent.....	9	32
Report progress to parent.....	3	11
Talk with child and parent.....	3	11
Visit family socially.....	3	11
Total.....	28	100

Table 16 shows the data on responses received from teachers in Town D concerning the reasons for unsuccessful visits made by them. Of 51 teachers replying to the survey, 14 responses were received on the reasons for unsuccessful visits.

1. Fifty per cent of the responses indicated that parents were not cooperative.
2. Twenty-nine per cent of the responses indicated that parents refused admittance.

Table 16. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 51 Teachers in Town D

Reasons for Unsuccessful Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Admitted but not cooperative.....	7	50
Admittance refused.....	4	29
Parents not at home.....	3	21
Child not at home.....	0	0
Total.....	14	100

Table 17 shows the data on responses received from teachers in Town D concerning the reasons why more visits are not made. Of 51 teachers replying to the survey, 82 responses were received concerning the reasons why more home visits are not made.

1. Twenty-seven per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were not required in the school system.
2. Sixteen per cent of the responses indicated that the demands of other school work interfered with home visits.
3. Fourteen per cent of the responses indicated that the community attitude was not favorable towards home visits.

Table 17. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are Not Made by 51 Teachers in Town D

Reasons More Visits are not Made	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Not required in my school system.....	22	27
It is not the duty of the teacher.....	13	16
Too many homes to visit.....	11	14
Community attitude not favorable.....	11	14
School policy dis- courages practice.....	10	12
Lack of transportation.....	6	7
Poor home reception.....	6	7
Other occupation.....	1	1
Personal (family) obligations.....	1	1
Demands of other school work.....	1	1
Total.....	82	100

Table 18 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town D concerning the methods of contact and arranging for home visits by them. Of 51 teachers replying to the survey, 13 responses were received on the method of contact and arranging for home visits.

1. Thirty-eight per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were planned by telephone.

2. Thirty-eight per cent of the responses indicated unannounced home visits.

Table 18. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 51 Teachers in Town D

Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Plan visits by telephone.....	5	38
Unannounced visits.....	5	38
Regular (Mutually planned) appointments.	3	24
Plan visit through pupil.....	0	0
Total.....	13	100

Table 19 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town E concerning the purpose of home visits made by them. Of 147 teachers replying to the survey, 70 responses were received on the purpose of home visits.

1. Twenty-nine per cent of the responses indicated that visits were made for the purpose of discussing a case with the parent and an equal percentage for the purpose of talking with the parent and the child.
2. Twenty-two per cent of the responses indicated that visits were made for the purpose of seeing the sick child.

Table 19. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 147 Teachers in Town E

Purpose of Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Discuss case with parent.....	20	29
Talk with child and parent.....	20	29
Visit pupil (sick, etc.,).....	16	22
Report progress to parent.....	14	20
Visit family socially.....	0	0
Total.....	70	100

Table 20 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town E concerning the reasons for unsuccessful visits made by them. Of 147 teachers replying to the survey, 45 responses were received on the reasons for unsuccessful visits.

1. Forty-five per cent of the responses indicated that the parents were not at home.
2. Twenty-four per cent of the responses indicated that the parents were not cooperative.

Table 20. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 147 Teachers in Town E

Reasons for Unsuccessful Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Parents not at home.....	20	45
Admitted but not cooperative.....	11	24
Admittance refused.....	10	22
Child not at home.....	4	9
Total.....	45	100

Table 21 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town E concerning the reasons why more home visits are not made. Of 147 teachers replying to the survey, 274 responses were received on the purpose of home visits.

1. Thirty-three per cent of the responses indicated that visits were not required in the school system.
2. Twelve per cent of the responses indicated that it was not the duty of the teacher to make home visits.
3. Ten per cent of the responses indicated that there were too many homes to visit.

Table 21. Number and Per cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are Not Made by 147 Teachers in Town E

Reasons More Visits are not Made	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Not required in my school system.....	90	33
It is not the duty of the teacher.....	31	12
Too many homes to visit.....	27	10
Lack of transportation.....	20	8
Poor home reception.....	20	8
School policy dis- courages practice.....	22	8
Demands of other school work.....	21	8
Community attitude not favorable.....	19	7
Personal (family) obligations.....	10	4
Other occupation.....	4	2
Total.....	274	100

Table 22 shows data on responses received from teachers in Town E concerning the methods of contact and arranging for home visits made by them. Of 147 teachers replying to the survey, 46 responses were received concerning methods of contact and arranging for home visits.

1. Fifty-four per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were planned by telephone.

2. Twenty-two per cent of the responses indicated that visits were planned through the pupil.

Table 22. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 147 Teachers in Town E

Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Plan visits by telephone.....	25	54
Plan visits through pupils.....	10	22
Unannounced visits.....	7	15
Regular (mutually planned) appointments..	4	9
Total.....	46	100

Table 23 shows data on responses received from teachers in five selected communities concerning the purpose of home visits made by them. Of 281 teachers replying to the survey, 184 responses were received on the purpose of home visits.

1. Twenty-nine per cent of the responses indicated that visits were made for the purpose of discussing the case with the parent.
2. Twenty-five per cent of the responses indicated that visits were made for the purpose of visiting the sick child.

Table 23. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Purpose of Home Visits by 281 Teachers in Five Selected Communities

Purpose of Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Discuss case with parent.....	54	29
Visit pupil (sick, etc.,).....	46	25
Talk with child and parent.....	40	22
Report progress to parent.....	25	14
Visit family socially.....	19	10
Total.....	184	100

Table 24 shows data on responses received from teachers in five selected communities concerning the reasons for unsuccessful visits made by them. Of 281 teachers replying to the survey, 67 responses were received concerning reasons for unsuccessful visits.

1. Forty-two per cent of the responses indicated that the reason for the unsuccessful visit was that the parents were not at home.
2. Twenty-eight per cent of the responses indicated that the parents were not cooperative.

Table 24. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons for Unsuccessful Home Visits by 281 Teachers in Five Selected Communities

Reasons for Unsuccessful Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Parents not at home.....	28	42
Admitted but not cooperative.....	19	28
Admittance refused.....	14	21
Child not at home.....	6	9
Total.....	67	100

Table 25 shows data on responses received from teachers in five selected communities concerning the reasons why more home visits are not made. Of 281 teachers replying to the survey, 467 responses were received.

1. Thirty-two per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were not required in the school.
2. Eleven per cent of the responses indicated that it was not the duty of the teacher to make home visits.

Table 25. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Reasons Why More Home Visits are Not Made by 281 Teachers in Five Selected Communities

Reasons More Visits are Not Made	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Not required in my school system.....	148	32
It is not the duty of the teacher.....	53	11
Lack of transportation.....	44	9
Too many homes to visit.....	43	9
Community attitude not favorable.....	40	9
School policy dis- courages practice....	39	8
Demands of other school work.....	39	8
Poor home reception.....	35	8
Personal (family) obligations.....	17	4
Other occupation.....	9	2
Total.....	467	100

Table 26 shows data on responses received from teachers in five selected communities concerning the methods of contact and arranging for home visits made by them. Of 281 teachers replying to the survey, 116 responses were received.

1. Fifty per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were planned by telephone.
2. Eighteen per cent of the responses indicated that

home visits were made by regular appointments.

Table 26. Number and Per Cent of Responses to Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits by 281 Teachers in Five Selected Communities

Methods of Contact and Arranging Home Visits	Number of Responses	Per Cent
(1)	(2)	(3)
Plan visits by telephone.....	58	50
Regular (mutually planned) appointments.	20	18
Plan visits through pupil.....	19	16
Unannounced visits.....	19	16
Total.....	116	100

The following is a list of Values Derived From Home Visits most frequently indicated by the 281 teachers who responded to the questionnaire:

1. A distinct change in children's attitude toward school.
2. A definite improvement in school work.
3. Obtain a better understanding of the children.
4. More cooperation from both child and parent.
5. Closer family and school relations.
6. Arrived at reason for child's emotional disturbance.
7. Helpful in realizing the problems the teacher has

to overcome.

8. Helpful in understanding the social background of the child.
9. Parents helped teacher establish better attitudes of child in class.
10. Have a better understanding of family problems.
11. Children appreciate interest taken in them when they're ill.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to survey present-day practices in home visitations by elementary school teachers. This survey was completed by the use of a questionnaire which was sent to 410 teachers in five communities. These communities were selected for this survey and they do not represent a random sampling.

The items selected for the checklist were decided upon after a review of the literature and revision by a seminar group of experienced elementary school teachers. They were classified in six parts:

1. Number of successful visits made to date.
2. Purpose of visit.
3. Values derived from visit.
4. Reasons for unsuccessful visits.
5. Reasons for not making more visits.
6. Methods of contact and arrangements for visits.

The questionnaire was constructed in a manner whereby each teacher could check as many responses as were applicable to him.

Findings.-- Returns were received from 281 teachers, which represents 69 per cent of the original checklists distributed.

After a complete tabulation, tables were set up to show

the responses received from the teachers surveyed in regard to home visitations.

Not many home visits were made by the teachers surveyed in this study for a number of reasons. Thirty-two per cent of the responses by these teachers showed that the main reason for the lack of home visits was because they were not required by the school system.

Eleven per cent of the responses indicated that another reason for the lack of home visits was that they were not the duty of the teacher.

Teachers in many cases find it necessary to contact parents in reference to discussing certain problems. In many instances, these interviews prove satisfactory. According to the results of this survey, it was found that 29 per cent of the responses indicated that the most practiced purpose of home contacts is to discuss a problem with the parents.

Twenty-five per cent of the responses indicated that home visits were made for the purpose of visiting the child.

There are instances whereby teachers have been unsuccessful in executing a successful home visit. Forty-two per cent of the responses showed that the main reason for unsuccessful visits was because the parent was not at home. This indicated that there is need for more advance planning preceding the home visit.

According to the results of the survey, it was found that

28 per cent of the responses indicated that the parents admitted the teacher to the home but were not cooperative. To overcome this barrier, it is advisable for the teacher to have some knowledge of techniques of interviewing.

There are many different means by which to contact parents in arranging home visits. Fifty per cent of the responses from the teachers surveyed indicated that teachers made arrangements for home visits by telephone. In making home visits, it is advisable to notify parents in advance to pave the way for a cordial working relationship. The telephone is considered to be the most practical means for arranging visits.

According to the responses received from the teachers surveyed pertaining to the values derived from home visits, the practice of home visits plays an important role in developing a better relationship between school and home. Home visitations foster a better understanding of the child because it enables the teacher to see his social, economic, and cultural environment, all of which affect the child in his school work and relationships with other people. Improvement in school work will be noticeable in some instances after a home visit because of this personal contact between the child and teacher outside of school. If home visits are made, it is probable that there will be better cooperation between the home and the school which probably did not exist before.

Of all the values listed by the teachers in this survey, the following were repeated most frequently:

1. Better understanding of the children and the home.
2. A noticeable improvement in the pupils' attitude toward school and the teacher.
3. It developed better rapport between home and school.

Conclusions and Recommendations.-- This survey shows that the practices of home visitation are not carried out to the extent that they should be and that teachers are reluctant in visiting the home. This study, however, also shows the important role that home visitations can play in the policies of a school system because of the benefits which the teachers and the school administrators will obtain from this practice.

The writers feel that the literature and findings of this study suggest that school systems should realize that home visits are of great value in the teacher's understanding of the child and his many problems, the part home visits play in fostering better public relations, and the values of home visits in planning and changing the curriculum. The administration, therefore, should consider home visitation as part of their educational policy and the teachers of the school system should be consulted so they will understand the value of this practice also.

There is a tendency for teachers to visit the homes only when certain serious problems or cases arise. It would be advantageous for the teachers to visit the home even if there isn't an immediate problem to discuss. This type of visit would

help to bring about a better understanding between the home, teacher, and school and pave the way in erasing the negative impressions which are rooted in the mind of some of the public.

Suggestions for further study

1. A questionnaire to be sent to parents to survey their attitudes toward home visits.
2. A survey of a large number of superintendents to obtain their reaction toward home visits.
3. A larger survey could be made encompassing many different communities, large and small, using the checklist in this study.
4. A survey of a number of communities in other parts of the United States.

APPENDIX A

Dear Fellow Teacher,

We are seeking information in regard to teacher visitation in the homes of school pupils.

Would you kindly fill out the following questionnaire, seal it in the envelope and return it to your principal as soon as possible. This will require about three minutes of your time!

Please do not sign your name, as we are interested only in obtaining information derived from your own experiences and it is not our intent to evaluate teachers or to compare schools by the data.

Sincerely yours,

Frank Kaffel
Edmund Twomey

Elementary Teachers

QUESTIONNAIRE

I. Number and Nature of Home Visitations, School Year '55-56

Total number of successful visits made to date	_____
Total number of attempted visits made to date	_____
Number of visits planned for remainder of year	_____

Purpose of Visit (please check)

Visit Pupils (Sick, etc.,)	_____
Discuss case with parents	_____
Report progress to parents	_____
Talk with child and parent	_____
Visit family socially	_____
Others:	_____

II. List or describe one or two values derived from home visits

- 1. _____
- 2. _____

III. Reasons for unsuccessful visits

- Parents not at home _____
- Child not at home _____
- Admittance refused _____
- Admitted but not cooperative _____
- Others: _____

IV. Reasons more visits are not made (Check the reasons which are applicable to you)

- Lack of transportation _____
- Not required in my school system _____
- Poor home reception _____
- Too many homes to visit _____
- Community attitude not favorable _____
- School policy discourages practice _____
- It is not the duty of the teacher _____
- Lack of time because of:
 - Other occupation _____
 - Personal (family) obligations _____
 - Demands of other school work _____
- Others: _____

V. Methods of Contact and arrangements for visits

- Plan visit by telephone _____
- Plan visit through pupil _____
- Unannounced visits _____
- Regular (mutually planned) appointments _____
- Others: _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Association of School Administration, Public Relations for America's Schools, Twenty-Eighth Yearbook, 1950, National Education Association, Washington, D. C.
- Brown, Robert H. Jr., "Home Visitations Prove Teacher and Parent Equal Better Pupils," School Executive, (November, 1952), 72:46-47.
- Bruckner, Grace, "Visit Their Homes," The Clearing House, (December, 1941), 16:110-111.
- Burke, Louise, "Home Visits--A Teaching Asset," The Educational Digest, (May, 1949), 37:18-19.
- Burton, William, and Leo J. Brueckner, Supervision, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Incorporated, New York, 1955.
- Davis, Frank G., and Pearle S. Norris, Guidance Handbook for Teachers, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1949.
- Dirksen, Cletus, Economic Factors of Delinquency, Bruce Publishing Company, Milwaukee, 1948.
- Duff, W. L., and John Carr, Basic Principles of Guidance, Prentice-Hall, Inc., New York, 1949.
- Elsbree, Willard S., and Harold J. McNally, Elementary School Administration, New York, 1951.
- Glueck, Sheldon, and Elenor Glueck, Unraveling Juvenile Delinquency, The Commonwealth Fund, New York, 1950.
- Grinnell, J. E., and Raymond Young, The School and the Community, Ronald Press Company, New York, 1955.
- Hymes, James L., Effective Home-School Relations, Prentice-Hall, New York, 1954.
- Langdon, Grace, and Irving W. Stout, Teacher-Parent Interviews, Prentice-Hall Incorporated, New York, 1954.
- Lee, Murray J., and Doris May Lee, The Child and His Curriculum, Appleton-Century-Crofts, Incorporated, New York, 1950.
- Neumeyer, Martin H., Juvenile Delinquency in Modern Society, D. Van Nostrand Company, New York, 1955.

- Menge, Wilmer and Roland C. Faunce, Workins Together for Better Schools, American Book Company, New York, 1951
- Ogburn, William F., and Meyer F. Nimkoff, Sociology, Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston, 1950.
- Reavis, William C., Paul R. Pierce, and Edward H. Stullken, The Elementary School, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1931.
- Reavis, William C., Paul R. Pierce, and Edward H. Stullken, Administering the Elementary School, Prentice-Hall Incorporated, New York, 1953.
- Sholy, G. I., "Home Visits Break the Ice", School Executive, (September, 1954), 74:46.
- Slacks, John R., The Rural Teacher's Work, Ginn and Company, Boston, 1938.
- Tappan, Paul W., Juvenile Delinquency, McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1949.
- Willey, Roy D., and Dean C. Andrew, Modern Methods and Techniques in Guidance, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1955.
- Yauch, Wilber, Improving Human Relations in School Administration, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1949.
- Yeager, William A., Administration and the Teacher, Harper and Brothers, New York, 1954.
- Yeager, William A., School-Community Relations, The Dryden Press, New York, 1951.