To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Loretta Ann Sparn entitled "Relationships Between Tennessee Homemakers' Employment Status, Household Size, Club Membership and Extension Contacts and Their Use of Clothing Construction Practices." I have examined the final copy of this thesis for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Agricultural Extension.

Roy R. Lessly

Roy Lessly, Major Professor

We have read this thesis
and recommend its acceptance:

Edwin E. Conley Jr.

Helen L. Rader

Accepted for the Council:

Lee Minkel

Vice Provost
and Dean of The Graduate School

STATEMENT OF PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Master's degree at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, I agree that the Library shall make it available to borrowers under rules of the Library. Brief quotations from this thesis are allowable without special permission, provided that accurate acknowledgment of the source is made.

Permission for extensive quotation from or reproduction of this thesis may be granted by my major professor, or in his absence, by the Head of Interlibrary Services when, in the opinion of either, the proposed use of the material is for scholarly purposes. Any copying or use of the material in this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature Loretta A Spann

Date 11-22-88

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN TENNESSEE HOMEMAKERS' EMPLOYMENT STATUS, HOUSEHOLD SIZE, CLUB MEMBERSHIP AND EXTENSION CONTACTS AND THEIR USE OF CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Loretta Ann Sparn

December 1988

AG-VET-MED.
Thesis
88
.S627

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author wishes to express appreciation to the many people who were instrumental in assisting her with this study. Special thanks is extended to Dr. Roy Lessly, major professor and graduate committee chairman, for his continued assistance, encouragement, guidance and support in the study and writing of this thesis. Appreciation is also given to Ms. Helen Rader and Dr. Cecil E. Carter, Jr., committee members, for their assistance.

The author is grateful to her District Supervisors, Mr. Melvin Arnett, Mr. Larry Glasgow, Ms. Pat Ganter and former supervisor Mrs. Alpha Worrell, for their continued support and encouragement during this study. Appreciation is also expressed to Dean M. Lloyd Downen and Associate Dean Mildred Clarke for providing this opportunity for graduate study. Gratitude is also expressed to The University of Tennessee at Martin Home Economics Department, especially Dr. Anne Cook, for the encouragement and the feeling of being important to their graduate program.

The author would be remiss without thanking co-workers and volunteer leaders from Bedford County for their assistance with her work in the county while the author was away at school. Thanks especially to John Teague, David Gordon and Juanita Patterson for meeting 4-H clubs and seeing that all deadlines were not missed. A special thanks is given to office secretary and friend, Kim Harvey Hamilton, who kept work going in the author's absence and who laughed with the author in good times and sympathized during the frustrations.

Acknowledgments would not be complete without expressing gratitude to friends, especially Linda Ballard, who was a co-worker at the beginning of this study but became family for five weeks out of the year. Also to friends who provided encouragement and a "home away from home" while thesis work was being completed.

Most of all the author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to her family for all the sacrifices that were made and for the emphasis that they put on education. To her sisters, Mary Margaret and Therese, for their continued love and support. To the late Harold and Mary Elizabeth Sparn, parents of the author, for their encouragement and early emphasis they placed on the value of education. To her grandmother, Mrs. Johanna Sparn, who has continually said "Education is the only thing that can never be taken away from you." Finally, thanks to Sparky for providing companionship and love to the author, for being there and being patient while writing and typing took place.

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between the use of recommended clothing construction practices by homemakers and their employment status, household size, membership in an Extension Homemaker Club, selected personal and family characteristics and contacts with Extension. Data were obtained from the 1986 clothing construction survey through telephone or face to face interviews. Five hundred and forty eight homemakers in 29 Tennessee counties were surveyed. The "n^{th}" number technique of random sampling was used to select respondents from counties EHC mailing lists, telephone directories and other available sources.

The chi square (x^2) test and the one-way analysis of variance F test was used to determine the relationships between selected independent and dependent variables. The .05 probability level was accepted as being statistically significant. Data were analyzed using the University of Tennessee Computing Center facilities.

Major findings included the following:

1. As the number of homemakers using the recommended clothing construction practices increased, so did the number of office visits made, telephone calls made, Extension clothing publications received, mass media contacts, special interest meetings attended and Extension homemaker club meetings attended increase.

2. Extension homemaker club membership was significantly related to the homemakers use of 12 of the 21 recommended clothing construction practices.

3. Employment status was not significantly related to the homemakers use of 20 of the 21 recommended clothing construction practices.

4. Homemakers' household size was not significantly related to the homemakers use of 19 of the 21 recommended clothing construction practices.

5. Homemakers' age and place of residence was not significantly related to the homemakers use of recommended practices.

6. As the number of garments made increased, the number of recommended practices used by homemakers also increased. Homemakers who sewed for quality construction, good fit, enjoyment and to save money tended to use recommended practices at a higher rate.

Implications were drawn and recommendations for further study were made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM	1
	Introduction	1
	Need for the Study	2
	Purpose and Objectives of the Study	3
	Limitations of the Study	4
	Methods and Procedures	5
	Definition of Terms	7
II.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	8
	Related Studies Regarding the Relationship of Extension Homemaker Club Membership to Recommended Practice Use	8
	Related Studies Regarding the Relationship Between Clientele's Use of Recommended Practices and Extension Contacts	11
	Related Studies Regarding the Relationship of Personal and Family Characteristics to Recommended Practice Use	14
III.	STUDY FINDINGS	18
	Relationship Between Membership in Extension Homemakers Clubs and Homemakers' Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices	19
	Relationships Between Selected Personal and Family Characteristics and Homemakers' Average Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices	26
	Relationships Between Household Size and Homemakers' Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices	31
	Relationships Between the Homemakers' Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices and Their Contacts with Extension	40
	Relationships Between Homemakers' Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices and Extension Meetings Attended	56
	Relationships Between Employment Status and Homemakers' Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices	70

CHAPTER PAGE

IV. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS. 79
Purpose and Specific Objectives. 79
Method of Investigation. 80
Method of Analysis 80
Major Findings 81
Implications and Recommendations 86
Recommendations for Further Study. 89

BIBLIOGRAPHY. 91

APPENDIX. 95

VITA. 101

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Relationship Between Membership in Extension Homemakers Clubs and Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices.	20
II.	Relationships Between Selected Personal and Family Characteristics and Homemakers Average Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices.	27
III.	Relationships Between Household Size and Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices.	32
IV.	Relationship Between the Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices and Their Contacts With Extension.	41
V.	Relationship Between Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices and Extension Meetings Attended.	57
VI.	Relationship Between Employment Status and Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices.	71

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

The Cooperative Extension Service, under the provisions of the 1914 Smith Lever Act, assists people in utilizing more fully their own resources and those available to them for solving problems and meeting changing economic and social conditions. The Agricultural Extension Service in Tennessee works with federal, state and county governmental bodies, as well as the United States Department of Agriculture and the state's land-grant colleges to solve those problems and meet those changing conditions. Through Extension agents in 95 counties of Tennessee, people are stimulated to use educational information to provide them a more satisfying life.

In the role of educators, Tennessee County Extension Agents serve a variety of clientele and use a wide range of methods in an effort to reach as many people as possible.

A group of randomly selected Tennessee homemakers were used for this study and were asked to provide information about their use of clothing construction practices. Their use of these practices was then analyzed in relation to the homemakers household size, employment status, Extension homemaker club membership, contacts with Extension and selected personal and family characteristics.

Clothing construction was selected as an area for evaluation and study because of the importance it plays in our lives. In 1983, it

was estimated that families spent 8.6 percent of their income on clothing. Clothing prices have continued to increase every year, and as the number of homemakers being employed outside the home increases, the need for clothing increases as well (6).*

In a 1985 study of West Coast home sewers, it was found that almost 34 percent of those surveyed listed economy as their primary reason for sewing. Almost 30 percent sewed for creativity, 16 percent for fashion, 8 percent for relaxation and 7 percent for gifts (12). Therefore, it is evident that clothing construction plays an economic and psychological role in the lives of families. It is important, too, for homemakers to use recommended clothing construction practices to realize the greatest value and satisfaction from the clothing dollars spent.

Because Tennessee Extension agents have the responsibility of planning and disseminating information to their clientele, they must know if recommended practices are being utilized, who among the potential homemakers are being reached, and what affect the number of Extension contacts have on their audience.

II. NEED FOR THE STUDY

With todays tight economy, changing clothing needs as well as changing clothing trends, it is becoming increasingly important for consumers to plan for their clothing needs and to construct quality garments.

---

*Numbers in parenthesis refer to alphabetically numbered references in the Bibliography.

Quality Extension programs are a major concern of every Tennessee Extension home economist. The home economist is continually evaluating programs to determine the best method of reaching their clientele and to also determine the relationship between homemakers' selected characteristics and their use of construction practices.

Extension home economists are aware that not all homemakers use all of the recommended clothing construction practices. Therefore, there is a continuing need to teach clothing construction and to encourage the adoption of recommended clothing construction practices. A study in the clothing construction area would be useful to agents in order to help them plan better programs to meet the needs of their clientele. This study would also help Extension home economists to know which teaching methods are most effective.

III. PURPOSE AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Tennessee Extension home economists are convinced of the importance of using recommended clothing construction practices to enhance the quality of garments made.

The major purpose of this study was to determine the relationship between homemakers use of recommended clothing construction practices and their household size, their employment status, their contacts with Extension, their membership in Extension homemakers clubs, and selected personal and family characteristics. Information from this study will be used by Extension home economists in future program development.

The specific objectives of this study were:

1. To determine the relationship between Extension homemaker club membership and homemakers' use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

2. To determine the relationship between selected personal and family characteristics and homemakers' average use of recommended clothing construction practices.

3. To determine the relationship between household size and homemakers' use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

4. To determine the relationship between homemakers' use of selected recommended clothing construction practices and their contacts with Extension.

5. To determine the relationship between homemakers' use of selected recommended clothing construction practices and Extension meetings attended.

6. To determine the relationship between employment status and homemakers' use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to the analysis of data available through the clothing construction survey which was conducted in the Fall of 1986. Data were secured by Extension agents and/or volunteer leaders through telephone calls or face to face interviews. Five hundred and forty-eight interviews were held in 29 of the 95 Tennessee counties. These interviews were held only in the counties which included clothing construction in their educational programs.

This study was limited in that it was concerned only with homemakers who sewed. Clothing construction practices were limited to those practices recommended by the Extension Clothing Section at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. These practices dealt with selection of fabrics, pattern alterations, preparation techniques, and construction techniques.

V. METHODS AND PROCEDURES

This section describes the methods and procedures used to obtain and analyze survey data used in this study.

Population and Sample

The population of this study included homemakers in 29 Tennessee counties who sewed. Two audiences were represented, Extension homemaker club members and non-members. Data from a total of 548 homemakers, 284 of those being Extension homemaker club members and 264 being non-members, were used in this study.

Random sampling was done on a county basis with Extension agents and volunteer leaders conducting personal interviews either by telephone or face to face. For the Extension homemaker club member, the "n^{th}" number technique was used to select 35 members, using the county mailing lists and enrollment records. In selecting the non-members, the "n^{th}" number technique was used to select 40 homemakers, using the telephone directory or other available listing of all households in the county.

Survey Instrument

The basic interview schedule used to record data from each homemaker (see appendix) was developed by Extension Clothing Specialists in the Home Economics Section at the University of Tennessee. The instrument was designed for use in personal telephone or face to face interviews.

Questions dealt primarily with clothing construction practices (selection of pattern, fabric and alterations, preparation and construction techniques including staystitching, understitching and pressing), Extension contacts over the past 12 months and general information about the homemaker and her family.

Interviews

Interviews were done in one of two ways. Of the EHC members, 39.1 percent were contacted by telephone and 60.9 percent were contacted through face to face interviews. Of the non-members, 69.7 percent were contacted by telephone and 30.3 percent through a face to face interview.

Of the clientele interviewed in the EHC group, 85 percent were from the original sample, while 15 percent were alternates. In the non-member group, 62 percent were from the original sample and 38 percent were alternates.

The interviews were conducted in the Fall of 1986.

Analysis of Data

Upon completion of the surveys, Extension agents sent their forms to the Agricultural Extension Education Section of the University of

Tennessee where data cards were punched and processed for computer analysis. Data were analyzed using computer equipment at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the survey data. Statistical tests used to determine the relationships between selected dependent and independent variables included the one-way analysis of variance F test and the chi square (x^2) test. The .05 probability level was accepted as being statistically significant.

VI. DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following are terms used in this study that may need clarifying:

1. Extension Homemaker Club Member (EHC Member). An individual enrolled in an active Extension homemaker club which meets on a regular monthly basis and is under the direction of the Agricultural Extension Service. In most previous studies, this audience was referred to as Home Demonstration Club members (HDC members).

2. Extension Contacts. Attendance at club meetings, special interest meetings, telephone calls, Extension office visits, Extension publications, workshops, mass media or home visits received or attended in a 12 month period of time.

3. Practice. A research verified and commonly accepted procedure or task which, if performed correctly and on a regular basis, will increase or help insure a desired outcome or return.

4. Employed. A homemaker who is employed outside of the home.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of this chapter was to review findings from other studies related to (1) Extension Homemaker Club membership and clothing practice use, (2) the relationship between Extension contacts and practice use, and (3) the relationship between practice use and personal and family characteristics, including employment, household size, age, and place of residence.

Limited research was available specifically related to adoption of clothing construction practices. Most studies reviewed were related to other areas of Home Economics, as well as Agriculture and farm practices. However, these studies were reviewed because of the nature of the study and its purpose.

I. RELATED STUDIES REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP OF EXTENSION HOMEMAKER CLUB MEMBERSHIP TO RECOMMENDED PRACTICE USE

The purpose of this section was to review studies regarding EHC membership as related to the use of recommended practices. Some studies included dealt with areas other than clothing, but findings appear to be relevant to the present study.

Atkinson, in her 1987 study of clothing construction practices used by Tennessee homemakers, found that homemakers who were members of a HDC used a significantly higher percentage of clothing practices

than did non-members. She found that homemakers who were HDC members selected patterns and clothing based on their needs and construction skills more frequently than did non-members. They also used all the practices relating to the fabric board end label information at a significantly higher rate than did non-members. HDC members were more likely to select fabric based on pattern recommendations, grain and garment style than did non-members. There was no significant difference between members and non-members and their alteration techniques, types of shears used or method of shrinking fabrics before cutting. HDC members used more of the interfacing practices, understitching practice, 3 of the 12 seam finishes, pressing equipment, 3 of the 6 staystitching practices and hem construction practices such as hem tape, stretch lace and bias bound finishes, than did non-members. There was no significant difference in the two groups as to zipper applications, pattern markings and the purchase of fabric or requesting of permanent care labels (2).

Stocking, in her 1975 study of nutrition practice, found that HDC members used a greater percentage of recommended nutrition practices than did other homemaker audiences (23).

It was found in the Davis study of nutrition practices used by selected groups of homemakers in Hardeman County, Tennessee, that more HDC members planned two to three days ahead than homemakers in the other groups and they used the "Food for Fitness--A Daily Food Guide" as a basis for their planning. She also found that 68 percent of HDC members followed recommended principals of meal planning as compared to less than 50 percent of county wide homemakers and less than 10 percent of the Bolivar Housing Authority group (7).

In a clothing consumer practice study done in Lauderdale County, Connell found that HDC members averaged significantly more Extension contacts than did non-members and that HDC members filed complaints with manufacturers when unsatisfied with purchases significantly more frequently than did non-members. She also found that HDC membership had no significant influence on the homemakers use of practices related to clothing inventory, clothing expense records, wardrobe planning, price comparison and sale purchases. She found that HDC members were more likely to read labels for fiber content before making purchases than were non-members. They were also more likely to make-over clothing as an up-keep method than were non-members (5).

In a study done in 1976, of HDC homemakers and public housing homemakers, Mary T. Smith found that HDC members scored considerably higher in the use of 16 recommended nutrition practices than did the public housing homemakers (20).

In a study done on Interior Design practices, Stinson indicated that HDC members were more likely to use recommended Interior Design practices than general homemakers. She also concluded that the HDC members had received more Interior Design instruction from Extension agents (22).

In a 1975 clothing consumer study, Scholossom, dealing with the 1972 clothing survey results found that 17 percent of young non HDC members kept clothing records as compared to only 9 percent of members. She also found that 15 percent of non-members kept a written inventory as compared to only 7 percent of HDC members. There was no significant

difference in the two groups concerning their use of 22 recommended clothing practices (18).

Phillips, in a study of consumer credit uses by HDC members and non-members in Anderson County, found that, on the average, HDC members had tried more of the 17 recommended consumer practices than did the non-members. She found that both HDC members and non-members had bought household items, made home improvements and purchased property through credit. HDC members made the most frequent use of credit cards (16).

II. RELATED STUDIES REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CLIENTELE'S USE OF RECOMMENDED PRACTICES AND EXTENSION CONTACTS

The purpose of this section was to review studies that dealt with Extension contacts and the use of recommended practices. Studies reviewed dealt with both Home Economics and Agriculture but were believed to be relevant to this study.

Shipman completed two different studies on the use of housing program aids to work among the disadvantaged. In one study in S.E. Oklahoma, families received help with home improvements such as building shelves, closets, refinishing furniture and selection of second hand furniture. Home visits were made to the families and evidence points to the fact that Extension influenced them to make improvements in their living conditions. In her study, done with Indians in Oklahoma, as a result of home visits, Extension helped families to improve their

living quality and helped them economically. Utility bills decreased and their pride increased (19).

In a 1967 study of selected clothing construction practices, used by members of two selected HDC's in Knox County, Hurst found that the greater the assistance by Extension agents, related to clothing construction, the higher the adoption scores (13).

In Atkinson's 1987 study, she found that homemakers who had attended one or more Extension meetings during the previous 12 months used a significantly higher number of recommended practices than those who had not attended any meetings. Also those who made one or more visits to the Extension office, made one or more telephone calls and received one or more Extension newsletters used a significantly higher number of recommended practices than those who made no visits, made no calls or received no newsletters (2).

In a study done by Speer, on characteristics which influence adoption of Interior Design practices, she reported that the number of contacts homemakers had with Extension agents did significantly influence the use of 10 of the 17 recommended Interior Design practices. The homemakers reporting the use of these 10 practices had more contacts with Extension than the homemakers who reported they did not use the practices (21).

Connell, in her clothing consumer study, reported that the Lauderdale County homemakers used Extension publications more than any other source for wardrobe planning information (5).

Boyce, in her development and testing of a seven unit money management newsletter, found no significant relationship between pre- and post-test scores of homemakers who used Extension as a source of money management information and those who did not (3).

In Donaldson's study of clothing consumer practices, she found that as the number of telephone calls to the Extension agent increased so did the percentage of homemakers using the recommended clothing practices. As the number of Extension publications received increased, the percentage of homemakers using the recommended clothing practice also increased. Their clothing consumer practices also increased as the number of Extension office visits increased. Homemakers that attended clothing meetings were using clothing consumer practices at a higher percentage than those homemakers who attended no meetings (8).

Klaeser, in her clothing construction study found that an equal percent of homemakers, in the 1972 and 1977 survey, cited Extension publications and Extension agents as helpful sources of clothing information. The homemaker most frequently mentioned "meetings" as their contact with Extension. Telephone calls, office visits, and newsletters were also listed (14).

Arnett, in a related study, focused on factors that influenced office visits and telphone calls made by farmers in Wilson County. The results indicated that farmers whose wives were HDC members had significantly more office visits than farmers whose wives were not members. Club membership of wives had no effect on the number of telephone calls made by farmers to the Extension office (1).

Gordon, in a study of feeder pig producers, found a positive relationship between Extension contacts and practice use. His study looked at the relationship between Extension contacts and the use of recommended feeder pig practices of producers in Haywood County. He found that if producers were expanding their operations they had more contacts with Extension and were using more of the recommended practices (9).

In a similar study done by Rutter, dealing with beef producers, he found a significant positive relationship between the use of 13 recommended beef production practices and the total number of contacts with Extension agents. Beef producers who followed recommended practices attended an average of 2.8 Extension meetings, 1.1 beef meetings, made .4 visits to the Extension office, made 5.5 telephone calls and received 3.5 farm visits by the Extension agent in a 12 month period (17).

III. RELATED STUDIES REGARDING THE RELATIONSHIP OF PERSONAL AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS TO RECOMMENDED PRACTICE USE

There were several studies reviewed which dealt with personal and family characteristics as they related to recommended practice use. These studies looked at employment status, household size, age and place of residence. These studies were done in all areas of Extension work, including Home Economics and Agriculture.

In Atkinson's clothing construction study, her findings indicated that 26 percent of the homemakers were employed and 74 percent were not. She found that homemakers employment status was not significantly

related to the homemakers use of recommended clothing construction practices. Employed homemakers, however, used body measurements to select patterns at a significantly higher rate. Unemployed homemakers altered patterns at a higher rate, used more of the recommended stay-stitching practices, hem practices and pressing techniques. Employment had no significant relationship to recommended interfacing, understitching, seam finishing or fabric preparation techniques. She also looked at relationships of homemakers who had children living at home as compared to those who did not. Her findings indicated a positive relationship between homemakers with children living at home and total construction practices used. Homemakers with no children were using a significantly higher percentage of total practices than were those with children. They read board end labels more frequently, considered grain, weight, feel and texture when purchasing fabric more, altered patterns more often, used recommended practices relating to staystitching, interfacing, understitching, seam and hem finishes and pressing more often than did homemakers with children at home. There was no significant difference, however, in fabric preparation and cutting by the two groups (2).

Webb's study of 1,152 HDC members indicated that 75 percent of the homemakers studied were unemployed. In her findings, a very high percentage of HDC members were using interior design recommended practices. Employment, however, appeared to have no influence on the practices used (25).

Donaldson, in her 1987 study, found that a higher percentage of unemployed homemakers, as compared to employed homemakers, were using many of the recommended clothing consumer practices (8).

Speer, in her 1979 study, found no significant difference in recommended practice use and employment status in her study of homemakers and their use of interior design practices (21).

In Hurst's study of the personal characteristics of HDC members in Knox County who sew, she concluded that the average age of workshop participants was 52 years of age, compared to 48 years for non participants. All the participants were married so marital status played no significant role (13).

Henry studied low income homemakers in Macon County to determine the influence of selected personal and family characteristics of homemakers on their participation in clothing construction workshops. She found that workshop participation was not significantly influenced by marital status, age, education level, family income, employment of the homemaker, place of residence or the number of children living at home (10).

Hobt, in her survey in the area of management, found that younger homemakers scored higher on recommended practice use. Another influencing factor was the husbands' employment. Wives of husbands who were employed full time, off the farm, scored higher on the use of budgeting and record keeping practices. Better educated, higher income and non-working women used more recommended practices. There was low practice adoption among the disadvantaged, older, less

educated homemakers who did not participate in an Extension organization (11).

Mullins surveyed the area of home management and found that Benton County homemakers indicated that changes in home redecoration ranked first in importance. More of the employed homemakers had plans for redecorating than did the non-employed homemakers. She also found that more employed homemakers planned to buy or replace furnishings for the home than non-employed homemakers. More employed homemakers also tended to have higher debts and spend above their income than did unemployed homemakers (15).

Cobb characterized homemakers in Tennessee and related certain family nurturing variables to family characteristics. She found that as the homemakers age increased, the number of positive responses tended to decrease (4).

In Stinson's interior design study, she indicated that HDC members differed significantly from general homemakers in their employment status, family income and home ownership. When comparing HDC members and non-members as related to employment, she found that a higher percentage of non-members were employed and had higher incomes. She also found that a higher percentage of HDC members owned their own homes as compared to non-members (22).

CHAPTER III

STUDY FINDINGS

Findings of this study were organized according to the major objectives of the study. Results of data analysis were summarized and presented in six tables and major findings are discussed in each section.

Section I presents study findings regarding the relationship between membership in Extension Homemaker Clubs and homemakers use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

Section II presents findings as to the relationship between selected personal and family characteristics and homemakers' average use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

Section III presents findings regarding the relationship between household size and homemakers' use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

Section IV presents study findings regarding the relationship between homemakers' use of selected recommended clothing construction practices and their contacts with Extension.

Section V presents study findings regarding the relationship between homemakers' use of selected recommended clothing construction practices and Extension meetings attended.

Section VI presents findings regarding the relationship between homemakers' employment status and their use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

I. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN MEMBERSHIP IN EXTENSION HOMEMAKERS CLUBS AND HOMEMAKERS' USE OF SELECTED RECOMMENDED CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES

The purpose of this section was to compare members and non-members of Extension Homemakers Clubs and their use of selected recommended clothing construction practices. Practices were grouped under the four major subsections: (1) selection of fabrics, (2) alterations, (3) preparation, and (4) construction. Each subsection included related clothing construction practices. Findings are presented in Table I.

Selection of Fabrics

Five variables relating to the selection of fabrics for clothing construction were discussed under this heading. These included the selection of fabrics based on fiber content, care recommendations, garment style, fabric color and texture, and whether the fabric was woven or knitted on the grain.

Data in Table I show that about 95 percent of the Extension Homemakers Club members, compared to 92 percent of non-members, considered fiber content when selecting fabrics for construction. Approximately 98 percent of the Extension Homemakers Club members, compared to about 92 percent of the non-members, considered care recommendations of fabrics before purchasing them for construction purposes.

Results indicated that almost 91 percent of the Extension Homemaker Club members, compared to 76 percent of non-members, considered if the fabric was woven or knitted on the grain while 99 percent of the members,

Table I. Relationship Between Membership in Extension Homemakers Clubs and Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices

Clothing Construction Practices	EHC Membership Status: Non-Member Number	Non-Member Percent	Member Number	Member Percent
SELECTION OF FABRICS				
Consider Fiber Content				
No	20	7.7	13	4.7
Yes	241	92.3	265	95.3
Total	261	100.0	278	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.60$ $p = .21$				
Consider Care Recommendations of Fabric				
No	20	7.6	7	2.5
Yes	242	92.4	272	97.5
Total	262	100.0	279	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 6.44$ $p = .01$				
Consider if Fabric is Woven or Knitted on Grain				
No	62	23.8	26	9.5
Yes	198	76.2	248	90.5
Total	260	100.0	274	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 18.95$ $p = .00$				
Consider Garment Style				
No	22	8.4	3	1.1
Yes	241	91.6	279	98.9
Total	263	100.0	282	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 14.95$ $p = .00$				
Consider Fabric Color and Texture				
No	14	5.4	5	1.8
Yes	247	94.6	276	98.2
Total	261	100.0	281	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 4.14$ $p = .04$				
ALTERATIONS				
Alter by Cutting Seam Allowances Larger or Smaller				
No	51	19.5	50	17.9
Yes	211	80.5	230	82.1
Total	262	100.0	280	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .14$ $p = .71$				
Alter by Slashing Patterns and Adding Extra Amount				
No	142	54.8	116	42.6
Yes	117	45.2	156	57.4
Total	259	100.0	272	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 7.40$ $p = .01$				
Alter by Folding out Extra Amount in Pattern				
No	113	44.1	100	37.2
Yes	143	55.9	169	62.8
Total	256	100.0	269	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 2.36$ $p = .12$				
Alter by Lengthening or Shortening Patterns				
No	41	15.7	17	6.0
Yes	220	84.3	266	94.0
Total	261	100.0	283	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 12.42$ $p = .00$				
PREPARATION				
Do you Shrink Fabrics?				
No	98	37.3	89	32.0
Yes	165	62.7	189	68.0
Total	263	100.0	278	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.42$ $p = .23$				

Table I (Continued)

Clothing Construction Practices	EHC Membership Status: Non-Member Number	Non-Member Percent	Member Number	Member Percent
Do You Shrink Notions?				
No	182	69.5	186	68.9
Yes	80	30.5	84	31.1
Total	262	100.0	270	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .00$ $p = .96$				
Do You Mark Construction Details?				
No	34	13.0	22	7.9
Yes	228	87.0	256	92.1
Total	262	100.0	278	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 3.20$ $p = .07$				
CONSTRUCTION				
Do You Staystitch the Neckline?				
No	50	19.1	36	12.7
Yes	212	80.9	247	87.3
Total	262	100.0	283	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 3.68$ $p = .05$				
Do You Staystitch the Shoulder Seams?				
No	108	41.5	102	36.8
Yes	152	58.5	175	63.2
Total	260	100.0	277	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.06$ $p = .30$				
Do You Use Sew-in Interfacing?				
No	80	31.3	52	18.9
Yes	176	68.7	223	81.1
Total	256	100.0	275	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 6.79$ $p = .01$				
Do You Use Fusible Interfacing?				
No	82	31.5	57	21.2
Yes	178	68.5	212	78.8
Total	260	100.0	269	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 6.79$ $p = .01$				
Do You Use Interfacing on Necklines?				
No	38	14.4	26	9.3
Yes	225	85.6	253	90.7
Total	263	100.0	279	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 2.95$ $p = .09$				
Do You Use Interfacing on Collars?				
No	19	7.2	11	3.9
Yes	244	92.8	272	96.1
Total	263	100.0	283	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 2.32$ $p = .13$				
Do You Use Interfacing on Facings?				
No	37	14.2	13	4.6
Yes	224	85.8	269	95.4
Total	261	100.0	282	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 13.72$ $p = .00$				
Do You Understitch the Necklines?				
No	32	12.1	32	11.4
Yes	232	87.9	249	88.6
Total	264	100.0	281	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 7.74$ $p = .01$				
Do You Understitch the Facings?				
No	57	21.7	34	12.3
Yes	206	78.3	242	87.7
Total	263	100.0	276	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 7.74$ $p = .01$				

as compared to almost 92 percent of the non-members, considered garment style when selecting fabrics. About 98 percent of the members, compared to 95 percent of the non-members, considered fabric color and texture before selecting fabrics.

According to the chi square (x^2) test, membership in Extension Homemaker Clubs was not significantly related to homemakers consideration of fiber content when selecting material for construction. On the other hand, there was a significant relationship between the Homemaker Club membership and selection of fabric based on care recommendations, garment style, fabric color and texture and whether it was woven or knitted on the grain. For the four practices where significance was shown, homemakers who were members of the Extension Homemaker Club used the practices at a higher percentage than non-members.

Alterations

The four variables dealing with alteration practices included altering by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller, altering by slashing patterns and adding extra amounts, altering by folding out extra amounts in patterns and altering by lengthening or shortening patterns.

Findings revealed that about 82 percent of EHC members, compared to almost 81 percent of non-members, altered by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller when making garments, while 94 percent of members altered by lengthening or shortening patterns, as compared to about 84 percent of non-members. Only about 57 percent of EHC members, and 45 percent of the non-members, altered by slashing patterns and

adding extra amounts. Almost 63 percent of members, compared to almost 60 percent of non-members, altered by folding out extra amounts in patterns.

According to the chi square (x^2) test, membership in an Extension Homemaker Club was not significantly related to the use of the alteration practices of cutting seam allowances larger or smaller or by folding out extra amounts in patterns. On the other hand, there was a significant relationship between EHC membership and the use of the alteration practices of slashing patterns and adding extra amounts and lengthening or shortening patterns. Extension Homemaker Club members tended to follow the recommended alteration practices of slashing and adding, lengthening and shortening, and folding out extra amounts at a higher percentage than did non-members and the alteration practice of cutting seam allowances larger or smaller at approximately the same rate.

Preparation

Variables in this subsection included shrinking fabrics, shrinking notions and marking construction details. Sixty-eight percent of members, compared to almost 63 percent of non-members, shrunk fabrics before using them in clothing construction. About 92 percent of members, compared to 87 percent of non-members, marked construction details, and only 31.1 percent of members, compared to 30.5 percent of non-members, shrunk notions before using them for clothing construction.

In comparing Extension Homemaker Club members and non-members, chi square (x^2) test revealed that there was not a significant relationship between club membership and the homemakers use of any of the three

preparation practices; however, EHC members used the practices at a higer percentage than did non-members.

Construction

Nine variables relating to clothing construction were dealt with in this subsection. These included practices which related to interfacings, staystitching and understitching of garments constructed.

Data in Table I show that about 87 percent of Extension Homemaker Club members, compared to almost 81 percent of non-members, staystitched the necklines when constructing garments, while only about 63 percent of members, compared to almost 59 percent of non-members, staystitched the shoulder seams. According to the chi square (x^2) test, there was a significant relationship between homemakers membership in Extension Homemaker Clubs and their use of the practice of staystiching the necklines, but not between membership and their use of staystitching the shoulder seams.

Almost 81 percent of Extension Homemaker Club members, compared to almost 69 percent of non-members, used sew-in interfacing, while almost 79 percent of members, compared to almost 69 percent of non-members, used fusible interfacing. According to the chi square (x^2) test, there was a significant relationship between membership and homemakers use of both sew-in and fusible interfacing. In both instances, Extension Homemaker Club members were using the practices more frequently than were non-members.

Almost 91 percent of EHC members, compared to almost 86 percent of non-members, used interfacing on necklines, while about 96 percent of members, compared to almost 93 percent of non-members, used interfacing

on collars. About 95 percent of members, compared to only 66 percent of non-members, used interfacing on facings. According to the chi square (x^2) test, there was a significant relationship between membership and homemakers use of interfacing on facings, but there was not a significant relationship between membership and their use of interfacing on necklines or collars. Although the relationship was not significant in all three instances, EHC members used the practices more often than non-members.

When comparing the use of practices relating to understitching, it was found that almost 89 percent of Extension Homemaker Club members understitched the necklines, as compared to almost 88 percent of non-members following this practice. Almost 88 percent of members compared to about 78 percent of non-members, understitched the facings. According to the chi square (x^2) test, there was a significant relationship between membership in Extension Homemaker Clubs and homemakers use of understitching both the necklines and the facings. In each instance, Extension Homemaker Club members were using these practices significantly more often than non-members.

Table Summary

Findings presented in Table I indicated that a higher percentage of homemakers who were members of Extension Homemaker Clubs selected fabrics based on fiber content, care recommendations, whether the fabric was woven or knitted on the grain, garment style and fabric color and texture than did homemakers who were not EHC members.

When altering patterns, a higher proportion of EHC members altered by slashing patterns and adding extra amounts, by folding out extra

amounts in patterns and by lengthening or shortening patterns. EHC members and non-members who altered by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller, did so at approximately the same rate.

Extension Homemaker Club members marked construction details, shrunk fabrics and shrunk notions at a higher rate than did non-members.

When constructing garments, EHC members staystitched the necklines and shoulder seams at a higher percentage than did non-members. Members used both sew-in and fusible interfacing at a significantly higher percentage than did non-members and also used interfacing on necklines, collars and facings more often than did non-members. Extension Homemaker Club members understitched the facings more frequently than did non-members, but they understitched the necklines at about the same rate.

According to the chi square test, homemakers' membership status was found to be significantly related to their use of 12 of the 21 recommended clothing construction practices.

II. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN SELECTED PERSONAL AND FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS AND HOMEMAKERS' AVERAGE USE OF SELECTED RECOMMENDED CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES

The purpose of Table II was to evaluate the relationships between selected personal and family characteristics and homemakers' use of selected recommended practices. Characteristics were broken down into five areas (1) age, (2) employment, (3) number of garments made in the past 12 months, (4) place of residence, and (5) reasons for sewing.

Table II. Relationships Between Selected Personal and Family Characteristics and Homemakers Average Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices

Selected Personal and Family Characteristics	Number	Mean Number of Practices Used
Age		
Under 40	157	31.0
Over 40	386	32.1
Total	543	31.8
Variance Ratio F = 2.3 p = .13		
Employed		
No	177	32.4
Yes	371	31.4
Total	548	31.8
Variance Ratio F = 2.1 p = .14		
Number of Garments Made		
0	36	27.6
1-5	184	30.2
6-15	203	32.1
16+	116	34.8
Total	539	31.7
Variance Ratio F = 15.1 p = .00		
Place of Residence		
Farm	157	32.2
Rural	158	32.2
Subdivision	157	31.3
Urban	67	31.1
Total	539	31.8
Variance Ratio F = .76 p = .51		
REASON FOR SEWING		
Sew for Good Fit		
No	69	28.4
Yes	436	32.4
Total	505	31.9
Variance Ratio F = 20.5 p = .00		
Sew for Enjoyment		
No	68	29.4
Yes	445	32.2
Total	513	31.8
Variance Ratio F = 8.7 p = .00		
Sew for Quality Construction		
No	75	26.4
Yes	424	33.0
Total	499	32.0
Variance Ratio F = 60.5 p = .00		
Sew to Save Money		
No	34	27.8
Yes	499	32.1
Total	533	31.8
Variance Ratio F = 11.9 p = .00		

There were 47 practices, relating to selection of fabrics, alterations, preparation and construction, to which homemakers were asked to respond.

Age

Homemakers who were under 40 years of age had a mean score of 31.0 practices used, while those over 40 had a mean use score of 32.1. The one-way analysis of variance F test indicated that there was not a significant relationship between the mean number of practices used and the age of homemakers. Although there was not a significant relationship, homemakers who were over 40 tended to use the recommended practices at a slightly higher rate than did those homemakers under 40.

Employment

Homemakers who were not employed outside the home had an average practice score of 32.4, while those who were employed had a mean use score of 31.4. When tested at a probability level of .05, results showed no significant relationship between homemakers' mean recommended practice use and their employment. Although there was not a significant relationship, unemployed homemakers tended to use the recommended practices at a slightly higher rate than employment homemakers.

Number of Garments Made

Homemakers surveyed who had not made any garments in the past 12 months had used an average of 27.6 practices, while those who had made from 1 to 5 garments had an average practice use of 30.2. Homemakers who had made from 6 to 15 garments had a score of 32.1 practices used, while those who made 16 or more garments had a score of 34.8. When

these scores were tested at the .05 probability level, there was a significant relationship between the average number of practices used and the number of garments made. The more garments homemakers made, the greater the number of clothing practices used.

Place of Residence

Homemakers surveyed who lived either in a rural setting or on a farm had an average practice use score of 32.2. This compared to a mean use score of 31.3 by homemakers who lived in a subdivision and 31.1 for homemakers who lived in an urban setting. A one-way analysis of variance *F* test indicated that there was not a significant relationship between homemakers' average practice use and their place of residence. Although there was not a significant relationship, homemakers who lived on a farm or in a rural setting tended to use the practices at a slightly higher rate than homemakers who lived in subdivisions or urban settings.

Reasons for Sewing

Findings presented in this subsection were further classifed into four categories: (1) sew for good fit, (2) sew for enjoyment, (3) sew for quality construction, and (4) sew to save money.

Sew for good fit. Those homemakers who said they sewed for good fit had an average practice score of 32.4, while those who did not sew for good fit had an average of 28.4 practices used. The one-way analysis of variance *F* test indicated that there was a significant relationship between the average number of practices used and whether or not a homemaker sewed for good fit. Homemakers who indicated that they sewed

for a good fit used the recommended practices at a higher rate than those who did not sew for this reason.

Sew for enjoyment. Those homemakers who sewed for enjoyment had an average practice score of 32.2, while those who did not sew for enjoyment had a mean use score of only 29.4. When tested at a probability level of .05, results showed a significant relationship between whether or not homemakers sewed for enjoyment and the average number of recommended practices used. Homemakers who sewed for enjoyment used the practices at a higher rate than did those who did not indicate enjoyment as their reason for sewing.

Sew for good quality. Homemakers surveyed who did not sew for quality construction had a mean score of only 26.4 practices used, while those who did sew for quality had an average practice use of 33.0. When the scores were tested at a .05 probability level, there was a significant relationship between the mean number of practices used and whether or not homemakers sewed for quality. Homemakers who sewed for quality used the recommended practices at a significantly higher rate than those who did not sew for quality.

Sew to save money. Homemakers who sewed to save money had a mean use score of 32.1 practices used, while homemakers who did not sew to save money had a mean use score of only 27.8 practices. The one-way analysis of variance F test indicated that there was a significant relationship between the mean number of practices used and whether or not homemakers sewed to save money. Those homemakers who sewed to save

money used the recommended practices at a higher rate than homemakers who did not sew for that reason.

Table Summary

Homemakers' age, employment status and place of residence were all found to have no relationship to the number of recommended clothing construction practices used.

Findings did indicate, however, that there was a significant relationship between mean practices used and the number of garments homemakers had made in the past 12 months. Analysis showed that homemakers who had made more garments also used more of the recommended practices.

Of the four reasons for sewing--sew for good fit, sew for quality construction, sew for enjoyment and sew to save money, all were found to be significantly related to the mean number of recommended clothing construction practices used. Homemakers who sewed for these four reasons used the practices at higher rates than did homemakers who did not sew for these reasons.

III. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN HOUSEHOLD SIZE AND HOMEMAKERS' USE OF SELECTED RECOMMENDED CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES

The purpose of this section was to compare household size and the homemakers use of selected recommended clothing construction practices. Subsections included: (1) selection of fabrics, (2) alterations, (3) preparation, and (4) construction. Each subsection includes related clothing construction practices with findings presented in Table III.

Table III. Relationships Between Household Size and Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices

Clothing Construction Practices	Household Size: One Number	One Percent	Two to Four Number	Two to Four Percent	Five or More Number	Five or More Percent
SELECTION OF FABRICS						
Consider Fiber Content						
No	6	11.5	22	5.2	4	7.7
Yes	46	88.5	400	94.8	48	92.3
Total	52	100.0	422	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 3.50$ $p = .17$						
Consider Care Recommendations of Fabrics						
No	7	13.0	18	4.3	2	3.8
Yes	47	87.0	405	95.7	50	96.2
Total	54	100.0	423	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 7.68$ $p = .02$						
Consider if Fabric is Woven or Knitted on Grain						
No	10	18.9	63	15.1	15	29.4
Yes	43	81.1	354	84.9	36	70.6
Total	53	100.0	417	100.0	51	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 6.79$ $p = .03$						
Consider Fabric Color and Texture						
No	4	7.4	13	3.1	2	3.8
Yes	50	92.6	411	96.9	50	96.2
Total	54	100.0	424	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 2.62$ $p = .27$						
Consider Garment Style						
No	4	7.4	16	3.8	5	9.6
Yes	50	92.6	410	96.2	47	90.4
Total	54	100.0	426	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 4.54$ $p = .10$						
ALTERATIONS						
Alter by Cutting Seam Allowances Larger or Smaller						
No	9	16.7	76	18.0	9	17.3
Yes	45	83.3	347	82.0	43	82.7
Total	54	100.0	423	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .06$ $p = .97$						
Alter by Slashing Patterns and Adding Extra Amount						
No	22	43.1	201	48.1	28	54.9
Yes	29	56.9	217	51.9	23	45.1
Total	51	100.0	418	100.0	51	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.44$ $p = .49$						
Alter by Folding out Extra Amount in Pattern						
No	18	35.3	173	42.0	19	37.3
Yes	33	64.7	239	58.0	32	62.7
Total	51	100.0	412	100.0	51	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.15$ $p = .56$						
Alter by Lengthening or Shortening Pattern						
No	5	9.1	39	9.2	10	19.2
Yes	50	90.9	385	90.8	42	80.8
Total	55	100.0	424	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 5.18$ $p = .08$						
PREPARATION						
Do You Shrink Fabrics?						
No	22	41.5	139	32.8	19	36.5
Yes	31	58.5	285	67.2	33	63.5
Total	53	100.0	424	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.76$ $p = .41$						

Table III (Continued)

Clothing Construction Practices	Household Size: One Number	One Percent	Two to Four Number	Two to Four Percent	Five or More Number	Five or More Percent
Do You Shrink Notions?						
No	34	65.4	283	68.0	41	78.8
Yes	18	34.6	133	32.0	11	21.2
Total	52	100.0	416	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 2.84$ $p = .24$						
Do You Mark Construction Details?						
No	7	13.2	41	9.7	7	13.5
Yes	46	86.8	382	90.3	45	86.5
Total	53	100.0	423	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.19$ $p = .55$						
CONSTRUCTION						
Do You Staystitch the Neckline?						
No	7	13.0	63	14.8	11	21.2
Yes	47	87.0	363	85.2	41	78.8
Total	54	100.0	426	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.70$ $p = .43$						
Do You Staystitch the Shoulder Seams?						
No	21	39.6	167	39.9	18	34.6
Yes	32	60.4	252	60.1	34	65.4
Total	53	100.0	419	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .54$ $p = .77$						
Do You Use Sew-In Interfacing?						
No	13	24.1	99	23.9	16	30.8
Yes	41	75.9	316	76.1	36	69.2
Total	54	100.0	415	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.20$ $p = .55$						
Do You Use Fusible Interfacing?						
No	16	33.3	110	26.4	9	17.3
Yes	32	66.7	306	73.6	43	82.7
Total	48	100.0	416	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 3.41$ $p = .18$						
Do You Use Interfacing on Necklines?						
No	8	14.5	47	11.1	6	11.8
Yes	47	85.5	376	88.9	45	88.2
Total	55	100.0	423	100.0	51	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .57$ $p = .75$						
Do You Use Interfacing on Collars?						
No	4	7.3	21	4.9	2	3.9
Yes	51	92.7	406	95.1	49	96.1
Total	55	100.0	427	100.0	51	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .72$ $p = .70$						
Do You Use Interfacing on Facings?						
No	8	14.5	37	8.7	4	7.8
Yes	47	85.5	387	91.3	47	92.2
Total	55	100.0	424	100.0	51	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 2.10$ $p = .35$						
Do You Understitch the Necklines?						
No	7	13.0	50	11.7	3	5.8
Yes	47	87.0	376	88.3	49	94.2
Total	54	100.0	426	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.82$ $p = .41$						
Do You Understitch the Facings?						
No	8	15.1	68	16.2	12	23.1
Yes	45	84.9	353	83.8	40	76.9
Total	53	100.0	421	100.0	52	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.71$ $p = .43$						

Selection of Fabrics

Five variables relating to the selection of fabric for clothing construction were discussed under this heading. These included the selection of fabric based on fiber content, care recommendations, whether or not the fabric was knitted or woven on the grain, garment style, and fabric color and texture.

Data in Table III show that almost 89 percent of homemakers who resided in single households, almost 95 percent of homemakers who resided in households of 2 to 4 and about 92 percent of homemakers who resided in households of 5 or more considered fiber content when selecting fabrics for clothing construction. Eighty-seven percent of homemakers who resided in single households, almost 96 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 2 to 4, and about 96 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 5 or more considered care recommendations of fabrics before purchasing them. About 81 percent of homemakers who lived in single households, almost 85 percent of homemakers who resided in households of 2 to 4, and almost 71 percent of homemakers who resided in households of 5 or more considered, when selecting fabrics, whether or not they were woven or knitted on the grain. Almost 93 percent of homemakers who resided in single households, almost 97 percent of homemakers in households of 2 to 4 and about 96 percent of homemakers in households of 5 or more considered fabric color and texture, while almost 93 percent of the homemakers who lived by themselves, about 96 percent who lived in households of 2 to 4, and about 90 percent who lived in households of 5 or more considered garment style before purchasing fabrics.

According to the chi square (x^2) test, household size was not found to be significantly related to the homemakers consideration of fiber content, fabric color and texture or garment style when selecting fabrics for clothing construction. On the other hand, there was a significant relationship between household size and the selection of fabric based on care recommendations and whether or not the fabric was woven or knitted on the grain. Therefore, household size did influence homemakers in their consideration of these two practices. In looking at care recommendations of fabrics, it was found that as household size increased, so did the use of this practice. In looking at whether or not fabric was selected based on it being woven or knitted on the grain, it was found that in households of 5 and over this practice was used less frequently.

Alterations

The four variables relating to alteration practices included altering by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller, slashing patterns and adding extra amounts, folding out extra amounts in patterns, and lengthening or shortening patterns.

Findings revealed that about 83 percent of homemakers who lived alone, 82 percent who lived in households of 2 to 4 and almost 83 percent who lived in households of 5 or more altered by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller. Also revealed was that about 57 percent of homemakers who lived alone, almost 52 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 2 to 4 and about 45 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 5 or more altered by slashing patterns and adding extra

amounts. It was found, too, that about 65 percent of homemakers who lived alone, 58 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 2 to 4 and about 63 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 5 or more altered by folding out extra amounts in patterns. Homemakers who altered by lengthening or shortening patterns included almost 91 percent who lived alone, almost 91 percent lived in households of 2 to 4 and almost 81 percent who lived in households of 5 or more.

According to the chi square (x^2) test, it was found that none of the alteration practices were significantly related to household size, therefore, the size of a household had no influence on whether or not homemakers used these recommended alteration practices. Although there was not a significant relationship, in all four practices homemakers who resided in households by themselves used these at a higher percentage than did homemakers whose households were larger.

Preparation

Variables in this subsection included shrinking fabrics, shrinking notions and marking construction details. In comparing household size, data revealed that there was not a significant relationship between the size of household and any of the three practices, therefore, the size of a household had no influence on homemakers use of these three practices.

Almost 59 percent of homemakers who lived alone, about 67 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 2 to 4 and almost 64 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 5 or more shrunk fabrics before constructing garments. Data revealed that only 35 percent of homemakers who lived by themselves, 32 percent of homemakers who lived

in households of 2 to 4 and about 21 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 5 or more shrunk notions before using them. Nearly 87 percent of homemakers who lived alone, about 90 percent who lived in households of 2 to 4 and about 87 percent who lived in households of 5 or more marked construction details before constructing garments.

Construction

Nine variables relating to construction of clothing were dealt with under this heading. These included construction practices dealing with interfacings, understitching and staystiching.

Data in this table revealed that 87 percent of homemakers who lived by themselves, about 85 percent who lived in households of 2 to 4 and almost 79 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 5 or more staystitched the necklines of garments. About 60 percent of homemakers who lived alone, about 60 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 2 to 4 and about 65 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 5 or more staystitched the shoulder seams of garments. Almost 76 percent of homemakers who lived alone, about 76 percent who lived in households of 2 to 4 and about 69 percent who lived in households of 5 or more used sew-in interfacing. Homemakers who used fusible interfacing included almost 67 percent of homemakers who lived by themselves, almost 74 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 2 to 4 and almost 83 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 5 or more. Almost 86 percent of homemakers who lived alone, almost 89 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 2 to 4 and about 88 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 5 or more used interfacing on the necklines of garments, while almost 93 percent who lived alone,

about 95 percent who lived in households of 2 to 4 and about 96 percent who lived in households of 5 or more used interfacing on collars when constructing them. Nearly 86 percent of homemakers who lived alone, about 91 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 2 to 4 and about 92 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 5 or more used interfacings on the facings of garments. Eighty-seven percent of homemakers who lived by themselves, about 88 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 2 to 4 and about 94 percent of homemakers who lived in households of 5 or more understitched the neckline when constructing garments, while nearly 85 percent of homemakers who lived in single households, about 84 percent who lived in households of 2 to 4 and about 77 percent who lived in households of 5 or more understitched the facings of garments.

According to the chi square (x^2) test, it was found that household size was not significantly related to the homemakers use of any of these construction practices. Therefore, household size had no influence on whether or not the homemaker followed these recommended construction practices.

Table Summary

Household size was found to be significantly related at the .05 level to the use of only 2 of the 21 selected recommended clothing construction practices. The only influence that household size had was on the homemakers selection of fabric based on care recommendations and whether or not the fabric was woven or knitted on the grain.

In looking at fabric selection for construction, it was found that as household size increased, so did the homemakers consideration of care recommendation increase. Although there was not a significant relationship, homemakers who resided in households of 2 to 4 people tended to consider fiber content, whether fabric was woven or knitted on the grain, fabric color and texture, and garment style at a higher percentage than did other homemakers.

When comparing the use of alteration practices, although there was not a significant relationship, it was found that as household size increased, the percentage of homemakers who altered by slashing patterns and adding extra amounts and altered by lengthening or shortening patterns decreased. In all four practices, homemakers who lived alone used alteration practices at a higher percentage than did other homemakers.

In looking at preparation practices, although there were no significant relationships, it was found that as household size increased, the homemakers use of shrinking notions and marking construction details decreased. It was also found that as the household size increased, the percentage of homemakers who shrunk fabrics increased.

In looking at construction practices, although there were no significant relationsips, it was found that as household size increased, so did the percentage of homemakers who used fusible interfacing, interfaced collars, interfaced facings, and understitched the neck-lines increase. It was also found that as household size increased, the percentage of homemakers who staystitched the necklines and who understitched the facings decreased.

IV. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN HOMEMAKERS' USE OF SELECTED RECOMMENDED CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES AND THEIR CONTACTS WITH EXTENSION

This section presents data (Table IV) regarding the relationship between homemakers' use of selected recommended clothing construction practices and the number and type of contacts they had with Extension over a 12-month period. The variables are grouped under four subheadings: (1) selection of fabrics and methods of Extension contacts, (2) alteration practices and methods of Extension contacts, (3) preparations and methods of Extension contacts, and (4) construction and methods of Extension contacts. The purpose of the analysis was to determine what influence homemakers use of selected recommended clothing construction practices may have had on Extension contacts.

Selection of Fabrics and Methods of Extension Contacts

Five hundred and six of the 539 homemakes surveyed considered fiber content when selecting fabrics. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.4 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, received 2.1 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. Thirty-three homemakers surveyed did not consider fiber content when selecting fabrics. On the average, these homemakers made .6 office visits, .7 telephone calls, received .6 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from .8 mass media contacts. When tested by the one-way analysis of variance F test, it was found that homemakers who used the practice of considering fiber content when purchasing fabrics had significantly more contacts

Table IV. Relationship Between Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices and Their Contacts With Extension

Clothing Construction Practices	Number of Homemakers	Mean Number of Extension Contacts: Office Visits	Telephone Calls	Extension Publications	Mass Media
SELECTION OF FABRICS					
Consider Fiber Content					
No	33	.55	.70	.61	.79
Yes	506	1.44	1.65	2.08	2.34
		F=4.96	F=4.99	F=9.28	F=8.71
		p= .03	p= .03	p= .00	p= .00
Consider Care Recommendations of Fabric					
No	27	.74	.96	.63	.74
Yes	514	1.39	1.60	2.07	2.33
		F=2.17	F=1.88	F=7.28	F=7.60
		p= .14	p= .17	p= .01	p= .01
Consider if Fabric is Woven or Knitted on the Grain					
No	88	.63	.73	.91	1.19
Yes	446	1.52	1.76	2.17	2.46
		F=12.02	F=14.31	F=16.51	F=13.95
		p= .00	p= .00	p= .00	p= .00
Consider Garment Style					
No	25	.32	.52	.48	1.04
Yes	520	1.41	1.62	2.06	2.30
		F=5.83	F=5.25	F=8.17	F=4.45
		p= .02	p= .02	p= .00	p= .04
Consider Fabric Color and Texture					
No	19	.58	.84	.74	.95
Yes	523	1.40	1.62	2.05	2.31
		F=2.50	F=1.97	F=4.32	F=4.00
		p= .11	p= .16	p= .04	p= .05
ALTERATIONS					
Alter by Cutting Seam Allowances Larger or Smaller					
No	101	1.37	1.48	2.00	2.54
Yes	441	1.39	1.62	2.01	2.19
		F= .01	F= .32	F= .00	F=1.19
		p= .93	p= .57	p= .98	p= .28
Alter by Slashing Pattern and Adding Extra Amount					
No	258	1.15	1.30	1.63	2.09
Yes	273	1.61	1.90	2.33	2.45
		F=5.77	F=9.19	F=8.90	F=2.08
		p= .02	p= .00	p=. 00	p= .15
Alter by Folding out Extra Amount in Pattern					
No	213	1.24	1.29	1.69	2.20
Yes	312	1.48	1.80	2.23	2.33
		F=1.43	F=5.90	F=4.88	F= .25
		p= .23	p= .02	p= .03	p= .62
Alter by Lengthening or Shortening Pattern					
No	58	.89	.93	1.00	1.91
Yes	486	1.44	1.67	2.14	2.31
		F=3.03	F=5.03	F=9.10	F= .92
		p= .08	p= .03	p= .00	p= .34

Table IV (Continued)

Clothing Construction Practices	Number of Homemakers	Mean Number of Extension Contacts: Office Visits	Telephone Calls	Extension Publications	Mass Media
PREPARATION					
Do You Shrink Fabrics?					
No	187	1.06	1.10	1.66	2.05
Yes	354	1.55	1.86	2.16	2.36
		F=5.76	F=12.62	F=4.03	F=1.30
		p= .02	p= .00	p= .05	p= .26
Do You Shrink Notions?					
No	368	1.15	1.38	1.72	2.07
Yes	164	1.86	2.06	2.53	2.68
		F=11.53	F=9.59	F=10.32	F=4.91
		p= .00	p= .00	p= .00	p= .03
Do You Mark Construction Details?					
No	56	.71	.95	1.14	1.59
Yes	484	1.46	1.65	2.07	2.34
		F=5.58	F=4.48	F=5.92	F=3.27
		p= .02	p= .03	p= .02	p= .07
CONSTRUCTION					
Do You Staystitch the Neckline?					
No	86	.85	1.16	1.23	1.76
Yes	459	1.48	1.66	2.16	2.36
		F=5.85	F=3.26	F=8.42	F=3.01
		p= .02	p= .07	p= .00	p= .08
Do You Staystitch the Shoulder Seams?					
No	210	1.33	1.60	1.80	2.24
Yes	327	1.44	1.61	2.15	2.28
		F= .33	F= .00	F=2.10	F= .02
		p= .56	p= .94	p= .15	p= .88
Do You Use Sew-In Interfacing?					
No	132	1.23	1.57	1.77	2.29
Yes	399	1.40	1.59	2.05	2.25
		F= .60	F= .01	F=1.07	F= .01
		p= .44	p= .91	p= .30	p= .91
Do You Use Fusible Interfacing?					
No	139	.89	.97	1.72	2.00
Yes	390	1.53	1.76	2.05	2.30
		F=8.29	F=12.17	F=1.56	F=1.16
		p= .00	p= .00	p= .21	p= .28
Do You Use Interfacing on Necklines?					
No	64	1.03	1.11	1.78	1.83
Yes	478	1.40	1.61	2.01	2.30
		F=1.51	F=2.63	F= .40	F=1.43
		p= .22	p= .11	p= .53	p= .23
Do You Use Interfacing on Collars?					
No	30	.60	1.03	.97	1.47
Yes	516	1.42	1.61	2.07	2.30
		F=3.84	F=1.69	F=4.65	F=2.27
		p= .05	p= .19	p= .03	p= .13
Do You Use Interfacing on Facings?					
No	50	.76	1.00	1.00	1.36
Yes	493	1.42	1.63	2.08	2.35
		F=4.07	F=3.25	F=7.30	F=5.16
		p= .04	p= .07	p= .01	p= .02
Do You Understitch the Necklines?					
No	64	1.10	1.14	1.70	1.47
Yes	481	1.40	1.62	2.03	2.37
		F=1.03	F=2.39	F= .81	F=5.28
		p= .31	p= .12	p= .37	p= .02
Do You Understitch the Facings?					
No	91	.96	.95	1.52	1.53
Yes	448	1.46	1.70	2.10	2.40
		F=2.88	F=7.94	F=3.40	F=6.82
		p= .05	p= .01	p= .07	p= .01

with Extension through office visits, telephone calls, Extension clothing publications and mass media than those who did not use the practice. Therefore, homemakers who used the practice of considering fiber content when selecting fabrics were more likely to make more office visits, telephone calls, receive more Extension clothing publications and use more mass media contacts for clothing information.

Five hundred and fourteen of the 541 homemakers surveyed considered care recommendations of fabrics before purchasing them. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.4 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, received 2.1 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. Twenty seven homemakers surveyed did not consider care recommendations of fabrics. On the average, these homemakers made .7 office visits, 1.0 telephone calls, received .6 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from .7 mass media contacts. The homemakers use of the selection practice of considering care recommendations of fabrics was not significantly related to the mean number of office visits and telephone calls, but it was related to the mean number of Extension publications received and mass media contacts. Therefore, telephone calls and office visits were less likely to be influenced by whether homemakers considered fabric care recommendations. Extension publications and mass media were more likely to be influenced by homemakers use of this practice.

Four hundred and forty-six of the 534 homemakers surveyed considered whether the fabric was woven or knitted on the grain when purchasing

fabrics. On the average, these homemakers made 1.5 office visits, 1.8 telephone calls, received 2.2 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.5 mass media contacts. Eighty-eight homemakers surveyed indicated they did not consider if the fabric was woven or knitted on the grain. These homemakers, on the average, made .6 office visits, .7 telephone calls, received .9 Extension publications and received clothing information from 1.2 mass media contacts. The one-way analysis of variance F test indicated that the homemakers consideration of whether fabrics were woven or knitted on the grain was significantly related to the mean number of office visits, telephone calls, Extension publications and mass media. Therefore, homemakers who used the practice of considering whether fabrics were woven or knitted on the grain were more likely to make more office visits, telephone calls, receive more Extension publications and use mass media for clothing information.

Five hundred and twenty of the 545 homemakers surveyed considered garment style when selecting fabrics. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.4 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, received 2.1 Extension clothing publications and received information from 2.3 mass media contacts. The 25 homemakers who did not consider garment style averaged .3 office visits, .5 telephone calls, .5 Extension clothing publications and 1.0 mass media contacts for clothing information. When tested at the .05 probability level, results showed that homemakers who considered garment style when selecting fabrics had significantly more contacts with Extension through telephone calls, office visits,

Extension publications and mass media than those who did not use the practice. Therefore, homemakers who considered garment style when selecting fabrics were more likely to make Extension contacts.

When selecting fabrics, 523 of the 542 homemakes surveyed indicated that they considered fabric color and texture. On the average, these homemakers made 1.4 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, received 2.1 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. Nineteen homemakers indicated they did not consider the color and texture of fabrics. They, on the average, made .6 office visits, .8 telephone calls, received .7 Extension clothing publications and obtained clothing information from 1.0 mass media contacts. When the F test was used, it found that the homemakers who used the practice of considering fabric color and texture when selecting fabrics had significantly more contacts with Extension through Extension publications and mass media than those who did not use the practice. It also found that the homemakers use of this practice did not have a significant relationship to contacts with Extension through visits and telephone calls. Therefore, office visits and telephone calls were less likely to be influenced by the homemakers consideration of color and texture of fabrics, but the number of publications and mass media contacts were more likely to be influenced by the homemakers use of this recommended practice.

Alteration Practices and Methods of Extension Contacts

Of the 542 homemakers surveyed, 441 indicated they altered patterns by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller. On the average, these

homemakers made 1.4 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, received 2.0 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.2 mass media contacts. The 101 homemakers who did not alter by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller averaged 1.4 office visits, 1.5 telephone calls, 2.0 Extension clothing publications received and 2.5 mass media contacts. According to the one-way analysis of variance F test, it was found that the homemakers use of the alteration practice of cutting seam allowances larger or smaller was not significantly related to the mean number of all four contact methods. Therefore, homemakers use of this alteration practice of cutting seam allowances larger or smaller did not tend to influence the four contact methods.

Two hundred and seventy-three of the 531 homemakers surveyed, who altered by slashing patterns and adding extra amounts, on the average, made 1.6 office visits, 1.9 telephone calls, received 2.3 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.5 mass media contacts. The 258 homemakers who did not alter by slashing and adding, on the average, made 1.2 office visits, made 1.3 telephone calls, received 1.6 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.1 mass media contacts. When the F test was used it found that the homemakers use of the alteration practice of slashing patterns and adding extra amounts did not have a significant relationship on contacts through mass media, while the use of the practice did have a significant relationship on contact through office visits, telephone calls and Extension publications. Therefore,

homemakers who used this alteration practice were more likely to make more office visits, telephone calls and receive more Extension publications.

When altering patterns, 312 of the 525 homemakers surveyed altered by folding out extra amounts in patterns. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.5 office visits, 1.8 telephone calls, received 2.2 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. On the other hand, the 213 homemakers who did not alter by folding out extra amounts in patterns averaged 1.2 office visits, 1.3 telephone calls, received 1.7 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.2 mass media contacts. According to the one-way analysis of variance $\underline{F}$ test, the homemakers use of this alteration practice was not significantly related to the number of office visits and mass media, while the use of the practice was significantly related to the number of telephone calls and Extension clothing publications received. Therefore, the homemakers use of this alteration practice did influence the number of telephone calls and Extension publications.

Four hundred and eighty-six of the 544 homemakers surveyed indicated they altered by lengthening or shortening patterns. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.4 office visits, 1.7 telephone calls, received 2.1 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. Fifty-eight homemakers indicated they did not use this alteration method. They, on the average, made .9 office visits, .9 telephone calls, received 1.0 Extension clothing

publications and received clothing information from 1.9 mass media contacts. According to the one-way analysis of variance F test the homemakers use of this alteration practice was not significantly related to the number of office visits and mass media, while the use of the practice was significantly related to the number of telephone calls and Extension publications received. Therefore, homemakers who used the alteration practice of lengthening and shortening patterns were less likely to influence office visits and mass media, but more likely to influence telephone calls and Extension publications.

Preparation and Methods of Extension Contacts

Homemakers who shrunk fabrics tended to have, on the average, more contacts with Extension. Of the 541 homemakers surveyed, 354 indicated they shrunk fabrics before sewing. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.6 office visits, 1.9 telephone calls, received 2.2 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.4 mass media contacts. On the other hand, 187 homemakers said they did not shrink fabrics. These homemakers averaged 1.1 office visits, 1.1 telephone calls, 1.7 Extension publications and received clothing information from 2.1 mass media contacts. According to the F test, it found that the homemakers use of the practice of shrinking fabrics was not significantly related to the number of mass media contacts, while the homemakers use of this practice was significantly related to the number of office visits, telephone calls and Extension publications received. Therefore, homemakers who used this recommended practice made more office visits, telephone calls, and received more Extension publications.

Another recommended construction practice included shrinking notions. Of the 532 homemakers surveyed, only 164 indicated they followed this practice. On the average, these homemakers made 1.9 office visits, 2.1 telephone calls, received 2.5 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.7 mass media contacts. On the other hand, 368 homemakers indicated they did not shrink notions. On the average, they made 1.2 office visits, 1.4 telephone calls, received 1.7 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.1 mass media contacts. According to the F test it was found that homemakers who used the practice of shrinking notions had significantly more contacts with Extension through office visits, telephone calls, mass media and Extension publications than those who did not use this practice. Therefore, homemakers who used the practice of shrinking notions were more likely to make more office visits, telephone calls, receive more Extension publications and use more mass media for clothing information.

Four hundred and eighty-four of the 540 homemakers surveyed indicated they marked construction details in their sewing preparations. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.5 office visits, 1.7 telephone calls, received 2.1 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. Fifty-six homemakers who said they did not mark construction details averaged .7 office visits, 1.0 telephone calls, 1.1 Extension clothing publications, and 1.6 mass media contacts for clothing information. According to the F test it was found that the homemakers use of the preparation practice of marking

construction details was not significantly related to the mean number of mass media contacts, while the use of the practice was significantly related to the mean number of office visits made, telephone calls made and Extension publications received. Therefore, homemakers who followed the recommended practice of marking construction details were more likely to make more office visits, telephone calls and receive more Extension publications.

Construction and Methods of Extension Contacts

Of the 545 homemakers surveyed, 459 indicated they staystitched necklines when constructing garments. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.5 office visits, 1.7 telephone calls, received 2.7 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. Eighty-six homemakers said they did not follow this practice. They, on the average, made .9 office visits, 1.2 telephone calls, received 1.2 Extension publications and received clothing information from 1.7 mass media contacts. According to the one-way analysis of variance F test, it found that the homemakers use of the construction practice of staystitching necklines did not have a significant relationship on contacts through telephone calls and mass media, while the use of the practice did have a significant relationship on contacts through office visits and Extension publications received. Therefore, homemakers who used this staystitching practice were less likely to make telephone calls and use mass media and more likely to make office visits and use clothing publications for clothing information.

Three hundred and twenty-seven of the 537 homemakers surveyed indicated they staystitched the shoulder seams when constructing garments. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.4 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, received 2.2 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 of mass media contacts. Two hundred and ten homemakers surveyed did not follow this recommended practice. These homemakers averaged 1.3 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, 1.8 Extension publications and 2.2 mass media contacts for clothing information. According to the F test it found that homemakers use of the practice of staystitching shoulder seams was not significantly related to any of the four contact methods. Therefore, homemakers who used this construction practice were less likely to influence the four contact methods.

Three hundred and ninety-nine of the 531 homemakers surveyed indicated that they used sew-in interfacing. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.4 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, received 2.1 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. One hundred and thirty-two homemakers indicated they did not use sew-in interfacing. They, on the average, made 1.2 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, received 1.8 Extension publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. The homemakers use of the construction practice of using sew-in interfacing was not significantly related to any of the four contact methods. Therefore, homemakers who used sew-in interfacing were less likely to influence the four contact methods.

When constructing garments, 390 of the 529 homemakers surveyed indicated they used fusible interfacing. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.5 office visits, 1.8 telephone calls, received 2.1 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. One hundred and thirty-nine homemakers did not use fusible interfacing. They, on the average, made .9 office visits, 1.0 telephone calls, received 1.7 Extension publications and received clothing information from 2.0 mass media contacts. When the *F* test was used in each case, it found that the homemakers use of fusible interfacing was significantly related to the mean number of office visits and telephone calls made. It also found that there was not a significant relationship on their use of this practice and the mean number of Extension publications received and mass media contacts. Therefore, the homemakers use of this practice was more likely to influence number of telephone calls and office visits and less likely to influence the number of Extension publications and mass media sources.

Of the 542 homemakers surveyed, 478 indicated that they used interfacing on necklines when constructing garments. On the average, these homemakers made 1.4 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, received 2.0 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. On the other hand, 64 homemakers said they did not use interfacing on the necklines. On the average, these homemakers made 1.0 office visits, 1.1 telephone calls, received 1.8 Extension publications and received clothing information from 1.8 mass

media contacts. The one-way analysis of variance F test indicated that the homemakers use of the construction practice of using interfacing on necklines was not significantly related to the mean number of any of the four contact methods. Therefore, contact methods were not influenced by whether homemakers used interfacing on the necklines when constructing garments.

Whether or not homemakers used interfacing on collars was asked to 546 homemakers. Five hundred and sixteen indicated that they followed this recommended practice and that they averaged 1.4 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, 2.1 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.3 mass media contacts. Only 30 homemakers did not use interfacing on collars. These homemakers, on the average, made .6 office visits, 1.0 telephone calls, received 1.0 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 1.5 mass media contacts. When the F test was used it was found that the homemakers use of the preparation practice of using interfacing on collars was significantly related to the mean number of office visits and Extension publications, while there was not a significant relationship on the use of this practice and the mean number of telephone calls and mass media contacts. Therefore, the number of office visits and Extension publications were more likely to be influenced by the homemakers use of this practice, and the number of telephone calls and mass media contacts were less likely to be influenced by their use of this practice.

Four hundred and ninety-three of the 543 homemakers surveyed indicated that they used interfacing on facings. On the average, these homemakers made 1.4 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, received 2.1 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.4 mass media contacts. Fifty homemakers did not use interfacing on facings. These homemakers, on the average, made .8 office visits, 1.0 telephone calls, received 1.0 Extension publications and received clothing information from 1.4 mass media contacts. The homemakers use of the preparation practice of using interfacing on facings was not significantly related to the mean number of telephone calls made, while the use of this practice was significantly related to the mean number of office visits, Extension publications and mass media contacts. Therefore, homemakers who used the practice of using interfacings on facings were more likely to make more office visits, receive more Extension publications and use more mass media contacts.

Five hundred and forty-five homemakers were surveyed as to whether or not they understitched the necklines when constructing garments. Four hundred and eighty-one of these homemakers indicated they followed this recommended practice. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.4 office visits, 1.6 telephone calls, received 2.0 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.4 mass media contacts. On the other hand, 64 homemakers said they did not understitch the necklines. These homemakers, on the average, made 1.1 office visits, 1.1 telephone calls, received 1.7 Extension publications and received clothing information from 1.5 mass media contacts. When the

F test was used, it found that the homemakers use of the construction practice of understitching necklines was not significantly related to the mean number of office visits, telephone calls and Extension publications, but it was significantly related to the number of mass media contacts used. Therefore, the use of the practice had no influence on the number of office visits, telephone calls and Extension publications, but it did have an influence on the number of mass media contacts.

Four hundred and forty-eight of the 539 homemakers surveyed said they understitched the facings on garments they constructed. On the average, these homemakers made 1.5 office visits, 1.7 telephone calls, received 2.1 Extension clothing publications and received clothing information from 2.4 mass media contacts. Ninety-one homemakers who did not follow this practice averaged 1.0 office visits, 1.0 telephone calls, received 1.5 Extension publications and received clothing information from 1.5 mass media contacts. When tested at a probability level of .05 results indicated that the homemakers use of the construction practice of understitching the facings of garments was significantly related to the mean number of office visits, telephone calls and mass media, while the practice use was not significantly related to the mean number of Extension publications received. Therefore, homemakers use of this understitching practice was less likely to influence the number of Extension publications and more likely to influence the number of office visits, telephone calls and mass media.

Table Summary

Findings reported in Table IV indicated a positive relationship among the use of 17 of the 21 practices and the number of Extension contacts made in a 12 month period.

Twelve of the 21 practices influenced office visits, 11 influenced telephone calls, 14 influenced Extension clothing publications received and 9 influenced mass media contacts. Homemakers who used more recommended clothing construction practices averaged more contacts with Extension.

V. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN HOMEMAKERS' USE OF SELECTED RECOMMENDED CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES AND EXTENSION MEETINGS ATTENDED

The purpose of Table V was to show the relationships between homemakers use of selected recommended clothing construction practices and the number of Extension meetings attended over a 12 month period. The variables are grouped under four subheadings: (1) selection of fabrics and Extension meetings attended, (2) alteration practices and Extension meetings attended, (3) preparation practices and Extension meetings attended, and (4) construction practices and Extension meetings attended. The purpose of the analysis of this data was to determine what influence homemakers use of selected clothing construction practices may have had on Extension meetings attended.

Table V. Relationship Between Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices and Extension Meetings Attended

Clothing Construction Practices	Number Homemakers	Mean Number of Extension Contacts: Special Interest Meetings	Mean Number of Extension Contacts: EHC Meetings
SELECTION OF FABRICS			
Consider Fiber Content			
No	33	.48	.91
Yes	506	1.11	2.25
		F=3.17	F=6.80
		p= .08	p= .01
Consider Care Recommendation of Fabric			
No	27	.70	1.04
Yes	514	1.01	2.21
		F= .96	F=4.26
		p= .33	p= .04
Consider if Fabric is Woven or Knitted on Grain			
No	88	.50	1.13
Yes	446	1.18	2.35
		F=8.95	F=13.72
		p= .00	p= .00
Consider Garment Style			
No	25	.60	.72
Yes	520	1.09	2.23
		F=1.49	F=6.67
		p= .22	p= .01
Consider Fabric Color and Texture			
No	19	.89	1.11
Yes	523	1.09	2.21
		F= .18	F=2.69
		p= .67	p= .10
ALTERATIONS			
Alter by Cutting Seam Allowances Larger or Smaller?			
No	101	.90	2.10
Yes	441	1.12	2.18
		F=1.05	F= .06
		p= .31	p= .80
Alter by Slashing Pattern and Adding Extra Amount?			
No	258	.81	2.01
Yes	273	1.29	2.30
		F=8.23	F=1.37
		p= .00	p= .24
Alter by Folding out Extra Amount in Pattern?			
No	213	.84	2.10
Yes	312	1.23	2.21
		F=5.13	F= .18
		p= .02	p= .67
Alter by Lengthening or Shortening Pattern?			
No	58	.47	1.47
Yes	486	1.16	2.25
		F=6.48	F=3.87
		p= .01	p= .05

Table V (Continued)

Clothing Construction Practices	Number Homemakers	Mean Number of Extension Contacts: Special Interest Meetings	Mean Number of Extension Contacts: EHC Meetings
PREPARATION			
Do You Shrink Fabrics?			
No	187	.78	2.12
Yes	354	1.24	2.16
		F=6.67	F= .02
		p= .01	p= .88
Do You Shrink Notions?			
No	368	.80	1.96
Yes	164	1.66	2.48
		F=22.47	F=3.65
		p= .00	p= .06
Do You Mark Construction Details?			
No	56	.32	1.11
Yes	484	1.15	2.26
		F=9.08	F=8.19
		p= .00	p= .00
CONSTRUCTION			
Do You Staystitch the Neckline?			
No	86	.38	1.45
Yes	459	1.22	2.31
		F=13.15	F=6.49
		p= .00	p= .01
Do You Staystitch the Shoulder Seams?			
No	210	.77	1.95
Yes	327	1.32	2.36
		F=9.87	F=2.60
		p= .00	p= .11
Do You Use Sew-In Interfacing?			
No	132	.70	1.68
Yes	399	1.20	2.35
		F=6.24	F=5.38
		p= .01	p= .02
Do You Use Fusible Interfacing?			
No	139	.76	1.81
Yes	390	1.14	2.27
		F=4.06	F=2.63
		p= .04	p= .11
Do You Use Interfacing on the Neckline?			
No	64	.58	1.33
Yes	478	1.12	2.26
		F=4.42	F=6.01
		p= .04	p= .01
Do You Use Interfacing on Collars?			
No	30	.30	1.23
Yes	516	1.13	2.23
		F=5.00	F=3.38
		p= .03	p= .07
Do You Use Interfacing on Facings?			
No	50	.28	.76
Yes	493	1.15	2.30
		F=9.11	F=13.32
		p= .00	p= .00
Do You Understitch the Necklines?			
No	64	.69	1.56
Yes	481	1.12	2.24
		F=2.72	F=3.14
		p= .10	p= .08
Do You Understitch the Facings?			
No	91	.56	1.44
Yes	448	1.17	2.33
		F=7.45	F=7.19
		p= .01	p= .01

Selection of Fabrics and Extension Meetings Attended

Five hundred and six of the 539 homemakers surveyed considered fiber content when selecting fabrics. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.1 special interest meetings and 2.3 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. On the other hand, 33 homemakers did not consider fiber content. They, on the average, attended only .5 special interest meetings and .9 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. When tested by the one-way analysis of variance *F* test, it found that homemakers use of the practice of considering fiber content when selecting fabrics was significantly related to the number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings that homemakers attended, while the use of the practice was not significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings attended. Therefore, homemakers who considered fiber content when selecting fabrics tended to attend more Extension Homemaker Club meetings than did homemakers who did not use this practice.

Five hundred and fourteen of the 541 homemakers surveyed considered care recommendations of fabrics. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.0 special interest meetings and 2.2 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. This compared to 27 homemakers who did not consider care recommendations of fabrics, who averaged attendance at .7 special interest meetings and 1.0 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the *F* test, the homemakers use of the practice of considering fabric care recommendations when selecting fabrics was significantly related to the number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings homemakers attended, while the use of the practice was not significantly related to the

the average number of special interest meetings attended. Therefore, the homemakers practice of considering fabric care recommendations was less likely to influence attendance at special interest meetings and more likely to influence attendance at Extension Homemaker Club meetings.

Four hundred and forty-six of the 534 homemakers surveyed considered whether the fabric was woven or knitted on the grain when purchasing fabrics. On the average, these homemakers attended 1.2 special interest meetings and 2.4 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Eighty-eight homemakers surveyed indicated that they did not consider if fabric was woven or knitted on the grain. These homemakers, on the average, attended only .5 special interest meetings and 1.1 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the F test, there was a significant relationship between the homemakers use of the recommended practice and attendance at special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Therefore, homemakers who considered if fabrics were woven or knitted on the grain tended to attend more special interest meetings as well as Extension Homemaker Club meetings than homemakers who did not use this recommended practice.

Five hundred and twenty of the 545 homemakers surveyed considered garment style when selecting fabrics. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.1 special interest meetings and 2.2 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. On the other hand, 25 homemakers surveyed indicated they did not consider garment style. They, on the average, attended only .6 special interest meetings and .7 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. When tested by the one-way analysis of variance F test, homemakers use

of the selection practice of considering garment style when selecting fabrics was significantly related to the number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings that homemakers attended, while the use of the practice was not significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings that homemakers attended. Therefore, the homemakers practice of considering garment style was less likely to influence attendance at special interest meetings and more likely to influence attendance at Extension Homemaker Club meetings.

When selecting fabrics, 523 of the 542 homemakers surveyed indicated that they considered fabric color and texture. On the average, these homemakers attended 1.1 special interest meetings and 2.2 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Nineteen homemakers indicated that they did not consider fabric color and texture when selecting fabrics. They, on the average, attended .9 special interest meetings and 1.1 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the F test, homemakers use of the recommended practice of considering color and texture of fabrics was not significantly related to the homemakers attendance at special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Therefore, the homemakers practice of considering color and texture of fabrics was not influenced by either type of meeting attendance.

Alteration Practices and Extension Meetings Attended

Of the 542 homemakers surveyed, 441 indicated they altered patterns by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller. On the average, these homemakers attended 1.1 special interest meetings and 2.2 Extension

Homemaker Club meetings. The 101 homemakers who did not alter by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller averaged attendance at .9 special interest meetings and 2.1 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the one-way analysis of variance F test, the homemakers use of the alteration practice was not significantly related to the number of special interest meetings or Extension Homemaker Club meetings that homemakers attended. Therefore, the homemakers use of this practice had no influence on the homemakers attendance at either type of meeting.

Two hundred and seventy-three of the 531 homemakers surveyed, who altered by slashing patterns and adding extra amounts, attended on the average,1.3 special interest meetings and 2.3 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. The 258 homemakers who did not alter by slashing and adding extra amounts attended, on the average, .8 special interest meetings and 2.0 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. When tested by the one-way analysis of variance F test, the homemakers use of this alteration practice was significantly related to the number of special interest meetings attended. On the other hand, the use of this practice was not significantly related to the number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings that homemakers attended. Therefore, homemakes who altered garments by slashing patterns and adding extra amounts were less likely to influence attendance at Extension Homemaker club meetings and more likely to influence attendance at special interest meetings.

When altering patterns, 312 of the 525 homemakers surveyed altered by folding out extra amounts in patterns. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.2 special interest meetings and 2.2 Extension

Homemaker Club meetings. On the other hand, the 213 homemakers who did not alter by folding out extra amounts in patterns averaged attending .8 special interest meetings and 2.1 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the F test, homemakers use of the alteration practice of folding out extra amounts in patterns was significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings that homemakers attended. The use of this practice was not significantly related to the number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings attended. Therefore, the homemakers use of this recommended practice was more likely to influence the number of special interest meetings attended but less likely to influence the number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings attended by homemakers.

Four hundred and eighty-six of the 544 homemakers surveyed indicated they altered by lengthening or shortening patterns. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.2 special interest meetings and 2.3 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Fifty-eight homemakers indicated they did not use this alteration practice. They, on the average, attended only .5 special interest meetings and 1.5 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. When tested by the one-way analysis of variance F test, it found that the homemakers who used the alteration practice of lengthening or shortening patterns had attended significantly more special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Therefore, the use of the practice of lengthening or shortening patterns when altering tended to influence attendance at Extension meetings.

Preparation Practices and Extension Meetings Attended

Of the 541 homemakers surveyed, 354 indicated they shrunk fabrics before sewing. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.2 special interest meetings and 2.2 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. On the other hand, 187 homemakers indicated they did not shrink fabrics. These homemakers averaged attending .8 special interest meetings and 2.1 Extension Homemaker club meetings. According to the *F* test, it found that the homemakers use of this preparation practice was significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings attended by homemakers, while the practice use was not related to the mean number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings that homemakers attended. Therefore, homemakers who used this recommended practice more often also attended more special interest meetings.

Another recommended preparation practice included shrinking notions. Of the 532 homemakers surveyed, only 164 indicated they followed this practice. On the average, they attended 1.7 special interest meetings and 2.5 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. On the other hand, 368 homemakers indicated they did not shrink notions. They, on the average, attended .8 special interest meetings and 2.0 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the one-way analysis of variance *F* test, it found that the homemakers use of the practice of shrinking notions was significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings that homemakers attended, but it was not related to the mean number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings attended by

homemakers. Therefore, the homemakers practice of shrinking fabrics was less likely to influence attendance at Extension Homemaker Club meetings and more likely to influence attendance at special interest meetings.

Four hundred and eighty-four of the 540 homemakers surveyed indicated they marked construction details in their sewing preparations. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.2 special interest meetings and 2.3 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Fifty-six homemakers who did not use this recommended practice averaged attendance at .3 special interest meetings and 1.1 Extension Homemaker club meetings. According to the F test, the homemakers use of the preparation practice of marking construction details was significantly related to the mean number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings and special interest meetings attended by the homemakers. Therefore, homemakers who marked construction details when preparing garments were more likely to attend more special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings than homemakers who did not use this practice.

Construction Practices and Extension Meetings Attended

Of the 545 homemakers surveyed, 459 indicated they staystitched the necklines when constructing garments. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.2 special interest meetings and 2.3 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Eighty-six homemakers did not follow this recommended practice. They, on the average, attended only .4 special interest meetings and 1.5 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According

to the F test, it found that the homemakers who used the construction practice of staystitching necklines had attended significantly more special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Therefore, the homemakers practice of staystitching necklines was likely to influence attendance at special interest meetings as well as Extension Homemaker Club meetings.

Three hundred and twenty-seven of the 537 homemakers surveyed indicated they staystitched the shoulder seams when constructing garments. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.3 special interest meetings and 2.4 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Two hundred and ten homemakers surveyed did not follow this practice. They averaged attendance at .8 special interest meetings and 2.0 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the F test, the homemakers use of the practice of staystitching shoulder seams was significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings that homemakers attended, while the use of the practice was not signifcantly related to the mean number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings that homemakers attended. Therefore, the homemakers use of this practice was less likely to influence attendance at Extension Homemaker Club meetings and more likely to influence attendance at special interest meetings.

Three hundred and ninety-nine of the 531 homemakers surveyed indicated that they used sew-in interfacing in garments. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.2 special interest meetings and 2.4 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. On the other hand, 132 homemakers did not use sew-in interfacing. They, on the average, attended .7

special interest meetings and 1.7 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the one-way analysis of variance F test, the homemakers use of the construction practice of using sew-in interfacing was significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings attended by homemakers. Therefore, the homemakers practice of using sew-in interfacing was likely to influence attendance at special interest and Extension Homemaker Club meetings.

When constructing garments, 390 of the 529 homemakers surveyed said they used fusible interfacing. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.1 special interest meetings and 2.3 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. One hundred and thirty-nine homemakers indicated they did not use fusible interfacing. On the average, they attended .8 special interest meetings and 1.8 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. When the F test was used it found that the homemakers use of the construction practice of using fusible interfacing was significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings that homemakers attended, while the use of the practice was not significantly related to the number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings homemakers attended. Therefore, the homemakers use of this practice was more likely to influence attendance at special interest meetings and less likely to influence attendance at Extension Homemaker Club meetings.

Of the 542 homemakers surveyed, 478 indicated that they used interfacing on necklines when constructing garments. On the average, these homemakers attended 1.1 special interest meetings and 2.3

Extension Homemaker Club meetings. On the other hand, 64 did not use interfacing on the necklines. These homemakers averaged attendance at .6 special interest meetings and 1.3 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the F test, the homemakers use of the construction practice of using interfacing on necklines was significantly related to the mean number of both Extension Homemaker Club meetings and special interest meetings attended by homemakers. Therefore, the homemakers use of this practice was likely to influence attendance at special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings.

Whether or not homemakers used interfacing on collars was asked to 546 homemakers. Five hundred and sixteen indicated that they followed this recommended practice. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.1 special interest meetings and 2.2 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Only 30 homemakers said they did not use interfacing on collars. They attended, on the average, .3 special interest meetings and 1.2 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the one-way analysis of variance F test, the homemakers use of the construction practice of using interfacing on collars was significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings attended, while the use of the practice was not related to the number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings attended. Therefore, the homemakers practice of using interfacing on collars was likely to influence attendance at special interest meetings, but not at Extension Homemaker Club meetings.

Of the 543 homemakers surveyed, 493 indicated that they used interfacing on facings when constructing garments. These homemakers,

on the average, attended 1.2 special interest meetings and 2.3 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Fifty homemakers did not use interfacing on facings. They, on the average, attended only .3 special interest meetings and .8 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. When tested by the one-way analysis of variance F test, the homemakers use of the construction practice of using interfacing on facings was significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings that homemakers attended. Therefore, homemakers who used interfacing on facings tended to attend more special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings than homemakers who did not use interfacing on facings when constructing garments.

Four hundred and eighty-one of the 545 homemakers surveyed indicated that they understitched the necklines when constructing garments. These homemakers, on the average, attended 1.1 special interest meetings and 2.2 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. On the other hand, 64 homemakers did not understitch the necklines. These homemakers averaged attendance at .7 special interest meetings and 1.6 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the F test, the homemakers use of the construction practice of understitching necklines was not significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings that homemakers attended. Therefore, the homemakers practice of understitching necklines had no influence on attendance at special interest meetings or Extension Homemaker Club meetings.

Of the 539 homemakers surveyed, 448 indicated that they understitched the facings when constructing garments. On the average, they

attended 1.2 special interest meetings and 2.3 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Ninety-one homemakers indicated that they did not use understitching on the facings of garments. These homemakers, on the average, attended only .6 special interest meetings and 1.4 Extension Homemaker Club meetings. According to the one-way analysis of variance *F* test, the homemakers use of the construction practice of understitching facings on garments was significantly related to the mean number of special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings attended by homemakers. Therefore, the homemakers practice of understitching facings was likely to influence attendance at both special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings.

Table Summary

Findings reported in Table V indicated a positive relationship among the use of 18 of the 21 selected recommended practices and the number of Extension meetings attended in a 12 month period.

Fifteen of the 21 practices influenced attendance at special interest meetings and 11 of the 21 influenced attendance at Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Homemakers who used more recommended clothing construction practices tended to attend more Extension meetings.

VI. RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN EMPLOYMENT STATUS AND HOMEMAKERS' USE OF SELECTED RECOMMENDED CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES

The purpose of this section was to compare employed and unemployed homemakers as to their use of selected recommended clothing construction practices. Practices were grouped under four major subsections: (1)

Table VI Relationship Between Employment Status and Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices

Clothing Construction Practices	Employment Status: Employed Number	Employed Percent	Unemployed Number	Unemployed Percent
SELECTION OF FABRICS				
Consider Fiber Content				
No	10	5.7	23	6.3
Yes	165	94.3	341	93.7
Total	175	100.0	364	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .01$ $p = .93$				
Consider Care Recommendation of Fabric				
No	6	3.4	21	5.7
Yes	169	96.6	345	94.3
Total	175	100.0	366	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .88$ $p = .35$				
Consider if Fabric is Woven or Knitted on the Grain				
No	24	13.6	64	17.9
Yes	152	86.4	294	82.1
Total	176	100.0	358	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.25$ $p = .26$				
Consider Garment Style				
No	6	3.4	19	5.2
Yes	171	96.6	349	94.8
Total	177	100.0	368	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .50$ $p = .48$				
Consider Fabric Color and Texture				
No	5	2.9	14	3.8
Yes	170	97.1	353	96.2
Total	175	100.0	367	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .10$ $p = .75$				
ALTERATIONS				
Alter by Cutting Seam allowances Larger or Smaller				
No	31	17.6	70	19.1
Yes	145	82.4	296	80.9
Total	176	100.0	366	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .09$ $p = .76$				
Alter by Slashing Pattern and Adding Extra Amounts				
No	82	48.0	176	48.9
Yes	89	52.0	184	51.1
Total	171	100.0	360	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .01$ $p = .91$				
Alter by Folding out Extra Amount in Patterns				
No	69	40.4	144	40.7
Yes	102	59.6	210	59.3
Total	171	100.0	354	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .01$ $p = 1.0$				
Alter by Lengthening or Shortening Patterns				
No	19	10.9	39	10.5
Yes	155	89.1	331	89.5
Total	174	100.0	370	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .00$ $p = 1.0$				
PREPARATION				
Do You Shrink Fabrics?				
No	58	33.1	129	35.2
Yes	117	66.9	237	64.8
Total	175	100.0	366	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .15$ $p = .70$				
Do You Shrink Notions?				
No	110	63.2	258	72.1
Yes	64	36.8	100	27.9
Total	174	100.0	358	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 3.90$ $p = .04$				

Table VI (Continued)

Clothing Construction Practices	Employment Status: Employed Number	Employed Percent	Unemployed Number	Unemployed Percent
Do You Mark Construction Details?				
No	16	9.2	40	10.9
Yes	157	90.8	327	89.1
Total	173	100.0	367	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .19$ $p = .66$				
CONSTRUCTION				
Do You Staystitch the Neckline?				
No	20	11.4	66	17.8
Yes	155	88.6	304	82.2
Total	175	100.0	370	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 3.21$ $p = .07$				
Do You Staystitch the Shoulder Seams?				
No	58	33.3	152	41.9
Yes	116	66.7	211	58.1
Total	174	100.0	363	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 3.25$ $p = .07$				
Do You Use Sew-In Interfacing?				
No	50	28.9	82	22.9
Yes	123	71.1	276	77.1
Total	173	100.0	358	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.94$ $p = .16$				
Do You Use Fusible Interfacing?				
No	40	23.0	99	27.9
Yes	134	77.0	256	72.1
Total	174	100.0	355	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = 1.20$ $p = .27$				
Do You Use Interfacing on Necklines?				
No	18	10.3	46	12.5
Yes	157	89.7	321	87.5
Total	175	100.0	367	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .38$ $p = .54$				
Do You Use Interfacing on Collars?				
No	8	4.5	22	5.9
Yes	168	95.5	348	94.1
Total	176	100.0	370	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .22$ $p = .64$				
Do You Use Interfacing on Facings?				
No	15	8.6	35	9.5
Yes	159	91.4	334	90.5
Total	174	100.0	369	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .03$ $p = .87$				
Do You Understitch the Necklines?				
No	20	11.3	44	12.0
Yes	157	88.7	324	88.0
Total	177	100.0	368	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .01$ $p = .94$				
Do You Understitch the Facings?				
No	29	16.5	62	17.1
Yes	147	83.5	301	82.9
Total	176	100.0	363	100.0
Chi square test $x^2 = .00$ $p = .96$				

selection of fabrics, (2) alterations, (3) preparation, and (4) construction. Each subsection includes related clothing construction practices with findings presented in Table VI.

Selection of Fabrics

Five variables relating directly to pattern selection were included under this heading. They were the selection of fabrics based on fiber content, whether or not fabric was woven or knitted on the grain, care recommendations, garment style, and fabric color and texture.

Findings indicated that 93.7 percent of the unemployed homemakers compared to 94.3 percent of the employed homemakers considered fiber content when selecting fabrics for construction, while 94.3 percent of the unemployed homemakers compared to 96.6 percent of the employed homemakers, considered care recommendations when purchasing fabrics. Of the homemakers who considered if fabric was woven or knitted on the grain, 82.1 percent were unemployed and 96.4 percent were employed. Approximately 96.6 percent of the employed homemakers considered garment style when selecting fabrics, as compared to 94.8 percent of the homemakers who were unemployed. Of the homemakers who consider fabric color and texture, 97.1 percent were employed, compared to 96.2 percent who were not employed.

According to the chi square (x^2) test, there was no significant relationship between employment status and the use of the five practices. Also revealed was that the employed and unemployed homemakers considered fiber content, garment style and fabric color and texture when selecting fabrics for construction at about the same rate.

Alterations

Under this heading, recommended practices relating to alterations included altering by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller, altering by slashing patterns and adding extra amounts, altering by folding out extra amount in patterns and altering by lengthening or shortening patterns.

Data revealed that 82.4 percent of the homemakers who were employed, compared to 80.9 percent of homemakers who were unemployed, altered by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller, while 52 percent of the employed homemakers, compared to 51.1 percent of the homemakers who were unemployed, altered by slashing patterns and adding extra amounts. The practice of altering by folding out extra amounts in patterns was used by 59.6 percent of the employed homemakers, compared to 59.3 percent of the unemployed homemakers and 89.1 percent of the employed homemakers, compared to 89.5 percent of the unemployed homemakers, altered by lengthening or shortening fabrics.

According to the chi square (x^2) test, there was no significant relationship between employment status and the use of any of these recommended alteration practices. Homemakers, regardless of employment, used these practices at about the same rate.

Preparation

Recommended practices in this subsection included shrinking fabrics, shrinking notions and marking construction details before actually constructing garments.

Results indicated that 66.9 percent of the employed homemakers, compared to 64.8 percent of the unemployed homemakers, shrunk fabrics, 36.8 percent of the employed homemakers, compared to 27.9 percent of the unemployed homemakers, shrunk notions, and 90.8 percent of the employed homemakers, compared to 89.1 percent of the unemployed homemakers marked construction details before constructing garments.

According to the chi square (x^2) test, there was not a significant relationship between homemakers' employment status and whether or not they shrunk fabrics or marked construction details, but there was a significant relationship between homemakers' employment status and the practice of shrinking notions. Employed homemakers were found to shrink fabrics and notions at a higher rate than homemakers who were not employed, but they marked construction details at about the same rate.

Construction

Variables relating to this subsection dealt with nine recommended construction procedures including staystitching, understitching and interfacing garments.

Data in this table showed that 88.6 percent of employed homemakers, compared to 82.2 percent of unemployed homemakers, staystitched the necklines, while 66.7 percent of employed homemakers, compared to 58.1 percent of unemployed homemakers staystitched the shoulder seams of garments. Seventy-seven percent of homemakers who were employed, compared to 72.1 percent of unemployed homemakers used fusible interfacing, while 71.1 percent of employed homemakers, compared to 77.1

percent of unemployed homemakers used sew in interfacing. Data also revealed that 89.7 percent of employed homemakers, compared to 87.5 percent of unemployed homemakers, used interfacing on necklines of clothing. Ninety-five point five percent of employed homemakers, compared to 94.1 percent of unemployed homemakers, used interfacing on collars, and 91.4 percent of employed homemakers, compared to 90.5 percent of unemployed homemakers, used interfacing on facings. Homemakers who used understitching practices included 88.7 percent of employed homemakers, compared to 88 percent of unemployed homemakers who understitched necklines and 83.5 percent of employed homemakers, compared to 82.9 percent of unemployed homemakers who understitched the facings of garments.

When tested at a .05 probability level, the use of these practices was not found to be significantly related to the homemakers' employment status. Homemakers who were employed staystitched the necklines and shoulder seams, used fusible interfacing and used interfacing on necklines at a higher rate than homemakers who were unemployed. Employed and unemployed homemakers understitched the facings and necklines, and used interfacing on facings and collars at about the same rate. Unemployed homemakers used sew-in interfacing at a higher rate than employed homemakers.

Table Summary

Findings presented in Table VI indicated that homemakers who were employed considered fiber content of fabrics, garment style and fabric color and texture when selecting fabrics at about the same rate as

homemakers who were unemployed. Homemakers who were employed were more likely to consider care recommendations of fabric when purchasing them and whether the fabric was woven or knitted on the grain than those who were unemployed. There was no significant relationship, however, between employment status and these selection of fabric practices.

Homemakers, employed and unemployed, altered garments by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller, by slashing patterns and adding extra amounts, by folding out extra amounts in patterns and by lengthening or shortening patterns at about the same rate. Again, there was no significant relationship between employment status and homemakers use of these selected recommended practices.

Findings showed that employed and unemployed homemakers marked construction details at about the same rate, while employed homemakers shrunk notions and fabrics at a higher rate than homemakers who were unemployed. It was found that there was not a significant relationship between employment status and whether or not homemakers shrunk fabrics or marked construction details, but there was a significant relationship between employment status and whether or not homemakers shrunk notions.

In looking at the construction practices of using sew-in interfacing, homemakers who were unemployed used this practice at a higher rate than homemakers who were employed. Homemakers, employed and unemployed, understitched the facings and necklines, and used interfacing on facings and collars at about the same rate. Homemakers who were employed stay-stitched the necklines and shoulder seams, used interfacings on necklines, and used fusible interfacing at a higher rate than homemakers

who were unemployed. Homemakers employment status was not found to be significantly related to these construction practices.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS AND IMPLICATIONS

I. PURPOSE AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIVES

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to determine the relationships between homemakers use of recommended clothing construction practices and their household size, employment status, contacts with Extension, membership in an Extension Homemaker Club and their selected personal and family characteristics.

Specific Objectives

The specific objectives of the study were:

1. To determine the relationship between Extension Homemaker Club membership and homemakers use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

2. To determine the relationship between selected personal and family characteristics and homemakers average use of recommended clothing construction practices.

3. To determine the relationship between household size and homemakers use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

4. To determine the relationship between homemakers use of selected recommended clothing construction practices and their contacts with Extension.

5. To determine the relationship between homemakers use of selected recommended clothing construction practices and Extension meetings attended.

6. To determine the relationship between employment status and homemakers use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

II. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

The population for this study included homemakers who sewed and lived in 29 of the 95 Tennessee counties. Two audiences, Extension Homemaker Club members and non-members, were represented with 548 total homemakers surveyed.

The sample consisted of randomly selected homemakers in each county participating. The "n^{th}" number technique of random sampling was used to select respondents from either telephone directories, counties mailing lists, or enrollment records. The Extension home economist or volunteer leaders interviewed the homemakers either by telephone or face to face.

III. METHOD OF ANALYSIS

The completed county surveys were forwarded to the State Extension Education office for computer processing. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize the survey data. Statistical tests used to determine the strengths of relationships between variables, as well as the significance levels, included one-way analysis of variance $\underline{F}$ test and the chi square (x^2) test. The .05 probability level was accepted as being statistically significant.

IV. MAJOR FINDINGS

Relationships Between Membership in Extension Homemaker Clubs and Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices

1. Extension Homemaker Club membership was not significantly related to the homemakers use of the practice of considering fiber content when selecting fabrics, however, EHC members did tend to use this practice more frequently than non-members.

2. Extension Homemaker Club members were more likely to select fabrics based on garment style, fabric color and texture and whether it was woven or knitted on the grain than non-members. Extension Homemaker Club membership was significantly related to the homemakers use of these practices.

3. Extension Homemaker Club membership was not significantly related to the homemakers use of the practice of altering patterns by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller or by folding out extra amounts in patterns. Of the homemakers who were making pattern alterations, EHC members made alterations by slashing patterns and adding extra amounts and by lengthening or shortening patterns at a significantly higher rate than did non-members.

4. Extension Homemaker Club membership was not significantly related to homemakers use of the clothing preparation practice of shrinking fabrics, shrinking notions or marking construction details when preparing garments for construction.

5. Of the five practices related to the use of interfacing, Extension Homemaker Club members used sew-in interfacing, fusible interfacing and used interfacing on facings at a significantly higher rate than non-members.

6. Extension Homemaker Club members used both of the practices related to understitching at a significantly higher rate than non-members.

7. Extension Homemaker Club membership was significantly related to the use of 12 of the 21 clothing construction practices.

Relationships Between Selected Personal and Family Characteristics and Homemakers Average Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices

1. Homemakers age was not significantly related to the homemakers use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

2. Homemakers employment status was not significantly related to the homemakers use of selected recommended clothing construction practices.

3. As the number of garments made by homemakers increased, so did the mean number of practices used increased. The number of garments that homemakers made significantly related to their use of recommended clothing construction practices.

4. Homemakers place of residence was not significantly related to the homemakers use of selected recommended practices.

5. The number of recommended clothing construction practices used by homemakers was significantly related to the four reasons indicated for sewing. There was a significant relationship between the number of

practices homemakers used and whether they sewed for good fit, enjoyment, quality construction and to save money.

Relationship Between Household Size and Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices

1. The homemakers household size was not significantly related to whether or not they considered fiber content, fabric color and texture or garment style when selecting fabrics.

2. Household size was significantly related to two of the five selection practices. The homemakers household size was significantly related to whether they considered care recommendations of fabrics and whether fabric was woven or knitted on the grain.

3. The homemakers household size was not significantly related to any of the four alteration practices. Household size had no influence on whether homemakers altered by cutting seam allowances larger or smaller, by slashing patterns and adding extra amounts, by folding out extra amounts in patterns or by lengthening or shortening patterns.

4. Household size was not significantly related to the homemakers use of preparation practices. The household size did not influence homemakers in their use of practices of shrinking fabrics, notions or marking construction details.

5. Household size was not significantly related to any of the nine practices related to the construction of garments.

6. The size of the homemakers household was significantly related to only 2 of the 21 clothing construction practices.

Relationships Between Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices and Their Contacts With Extension

1. Homemakers use of 12 of the 21 clothing construction practices was significantly related to the mean number of office visits made to the Extension office. Homemakers who indicated that they used all 21 of the practices averaged more office visits than homemakers who did not use the practices.

2. Homemakers use of 11 of the 21 clothing construction practices was significantly related to the mean number of telephone calls made to the Extension office. Homemakers who indicated that they used all 21 of the practices averaged more telephone calls than did homemakers who did not use the practices.

3. Homemakers use of 14 of the 21 clothing construction practices was significantly related to the mean number of Extension clothing publications received by homemakers. Homemakers who indicated that they used all 21 of the practices received more publications than did homemakers who did not use the practices.

4. Homemakers use of 9 of the 21 clothing construction practices was significantly related to the mean number of mass media contacts used for clothing information. Homemakers who indicated that they used 19 of the practices tended to use more mass media contacts for clothing information than homemakers who did not use the practices.

5. Homemakers who used more recommended clothing construction practices tended to have more contacts with Extension.

Relationships Between Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices and Extension Meetings Attended

1. The homemakers use of 15 of the 21 clothing construction practices was significantly related to the number of special interest meetings that homemakers attended.

2. The homemakers use of 11 of the 21 clothing construction practices was significantly related to the number of Extension Homemaker Club meetings that homemakers attended.

3. Homemakers who indicated that they used all 21 of the clothing construction practices tended to attend more special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings than homemakers who did not use the practices.

Relationships Between Employment Status and Homemakers Use of Selected Recommended Clothing Construction Practices

1. Employment status of homemakers was not significantly related to homemakers use of the five fabric selection practices. Employed homemakers were more likely than those unemployed to consider if fabrics were woven or knitted on the grain, however, both groups considered fiber content, care recommendations of fabrics, garment style and fabric color and texture at about the same rate.

2. Employment status was not significantly related to any of the four alteration practices. All practices were used by both employed and unemployed homemakers at about the same rate.

3. Of the three practices relating to preparation techniques, unemployed homemakers shrunk notions at a significantly higher rate than those who were employed. Use of the other practices showed no relationship to employment status.

4. Employment status of homemakers was not significantly related to any of the nine construction practices. Employed homemakers were more likely than those unemployed to staystitch necklines and shoulder seams and use fusible interfacing. Unemployed homemakers used sew-in interfacing at a higher rate. Both groups used interfacings on necklines, collars and facings and understitched the necklines and facings at about the same rate.

V. IMPLICATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Extension Homemaker Club membership was significantly related to homemakers use of 12 of the 21 clothing construction practices. In each case EHC members tended to use the practice more frequently than did non-members. This would seem to imply that EHC membership had a positive influence on homemakers adoption of recommended practices.

Extension should continue to develop programs to reach Extension Homemaker Club members as well as non-members. They could use contact methods such as newsletters, workshops, mass media and special interest meetings to reach more clientele. EHC members tended to be older and unemployed, therefore, agents should work to increase their contacts with employed and younger homemakers.

The number of garments made and the reasons for sewing were two characteristics which were significantly related to the homemakers adoption of recommended practices. As the number of garments made increased so did the number of practices used. That could imply that homemakers who sewed more often would also use more recommended practices. Homemakers who sewed for good fit, quality construction, enjoyment and to save money also used practices at a higher rate. This could imply that homemakers who sewed for these reasons would use recommended practices in order to achieve better quality garments, better fit and to have longer lasting garments which would save them more money. Extension should continue to reach homemakers who sew a large number of garments. Special programs should be provided to include new sewing techniques, advanced skills and quality construction details.

Homemakers age and place of residence was not significantly related to the number of practices used. Homemakers who lived on farms, in rural settings, in subdivisions and in urban settings all used the practices at approximately the same rate. Therefore, Extension should continue to reach all audiences regardless of geographic areas.

Homemakers who were over 40 and under 40 years of age used the recommended practices at approximately the same rate. Therefore, Extension should attempt to plan and provide educational information for all audiences regardless of age.

Study findings indicated that the homemakers household size was not significantly related to their use of 19 of the 21 recommended

clothing construction practices. Homemakers who lived in single households tended to use the alteration practices more often and the selection and construction practices less often than other homemakers. Homemakers who lived in households of two to four tended to use the selection and preparation practices more often than other homemakers and those who lived in households of five or more tended to use the construction practices more often and the preparation practices less often than other homemakers.

This could imply that homemakers who lived in larger households had less time for alteration and preparation practices while single household homemakers may have had more time for these practices. Therefore, in order to stay in tune with busy lifestyles, Extension should provide more programs to teach time saving techniques.

Findings of this study indicated that as homemakers use of recommended clothing construction practices increased, so did the number of contacts with Extension. This could imply that clothing construction practices use had a positive influence on Extension contacts. There was not a big difference in the total number of practices used and the type of contact made. Of the 21 selected clothing construction practices, 12 significantly influenced the number of office visits homemakers made, 11 influenced the number of telephone calls made to the Extension office, 14 influenced the number of Extension clothing publications received for clothing information, 9 influenced the number of mass media contacts used, 14 influenced attendance at special interest meetings and 11 influenced attendance at Extension Homemaker Club meetings.

This could imply that homemakers who made contacts with Extension had gained useful information that they put to use. It is recommended that Extension continue to use a variety of contacts to contact clientele including mass media, office visits, telephone calls, publications, special interest meetings and Extension Homemaker Club meetings. Extension agents should keep abreast of new clothing information and technology and should encourage homemakers to use the Extension office for clothing information. Extension agents should make an effort to publicize the Extension Service and make the homemakers aware of the services available to them.

The employment status of homemakers was not significantly related to their use of 20 of the 21 recommended clothing construction practices. Both employed and unemployed homemakers tended to use the practices at about the same rate. As the number of employed homemakers increase, Extension may want to emphasize the construction of ready to wear garments, new sewing equipment and machines, new fabrics and time saving techniques. Extension should continue to work to reach both the employed and unemployed homemaker. By scheduling meetings at night and weekends, employed homemakers could be more involved in Extension educational opportunities. Programs at the work site could also be utilized to reach more working homemakers.

VI. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER STUDY

1. Future studies should be conducted using equal numbers of employed and unemployed homemakers in order to make a better comparison of their uses of recommended clothing construction practices.

2. Studies in the future should look at the influence other methods of contacts with Extension, such as clothing workshops, newsletters and home visits, have on practice use.

3. With changing trends, employment status, household size, etc., comparisons should be made between the homemakers of 1986 and the homemakers of future years.

4. Future studies should be conducted using a non-Extension Homemaker Club audience to determine the number of Extension contacts and the frequency of use of recommended clothing construction practices.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arnett, Melvin. "Influence of Selected Factors on Number of Office Visits and Telephone Calls Made to the Wilson County Extension Office, Lebanon, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1973.

2. Atkinson, Berniece. "Relationship Between Selected Personal and Family Characteristics of Tennessee Homemakers and Their Use of Clothing Construction Practices." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1987.

3. Boyce, Phyliss R. "Development and Testing of a Seven Unit Series of Extension Money Management Newsletters with Selected Home Demonstration Club Members and Non-Members in Clay County, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1981.

4. Cobb, Virginia. "A Partial Analysis of the 1975-1976 Tennessee Extension Family Life Survey." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1976.

5. Connell, Jane H. "Relaitonships Between Contacts Lauderdale County, Tennessee Homemakers Had With Extension and Their Use of Recommended Clothing Practices." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1984.

6. Courtless, Joan C. "Recent Trends in Clothing and Textiles." Family Economics Review. Number 2, 1984.

7. Davis, Emma. "Nutrition Practices Adapted by Selected Groups of Hardeman County, Tennessee Homemakers." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1969.

8. Donaldson, Jackie. "Relationships Between Tennessee Homemakers Employment Status, the Number and Types of Contacts Made With Extension Agents and Their Use of Clothing Consumer Practices." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1987.

9. Gordon, Michael. "Relationships Between Number of Contacts Haywood County, Tennessee Feeder Pig Producers Had With the Agricultural Extension Service and the Management of Their Feeder Pig Operation." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1977.

10. Henry, Madeline. "Relationship Between Participation in a Clothing Construction Workshop and Selected Characteristics and Sewing Skills of Low-Income Homemakers in Macon County, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1972.

11. Hobt, Ann Sims. "Relationship Between Union County, Tennessee Homemakers Practice Adoption Scores on Budgeting and Record Keeping Practices and Selected Personal and Family Characteristics." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1971.

12. Holmes, Christina L. "West Coast Sewers Made 23 Percent More Apparel in '85." Sew Business. Volume 125, Number 3, March, 1986.

13. Hurst, Janice. "Some Selected Clothing Construction Practices of Two Selected Home Demonstration Club Member Groups In Knox County, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1967.

14. Klaeser, Susan. "A Comparative Summary of Selected Data From 1972-1977 Tennessee Extension Clothing Practice Checklist Surveys and Amounts of Tennessee Extension Supervisory District I Staff Time Spent and Clientele Contacts Made by Counties in Fiscal Year 1972 and FY 1975." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1978.

15. Mullins, Wileva. "A Comparison of Recommended Home Management Practices of Two Selected Homemaker Groups in Benton County, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1970.

16. Phillips, Marjorie. "Factors Influencing Use of Consumer Credit by Selected Anderson County, Tennessee, Home Demonstration Club Members and Non-Members." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1976.

17. Rutter, Floyd. "Relationship Between Characteristics of Beef Producers, Their Production Operations and Their Use of Management Practices and the Number of Contacts They Had With Extension." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1979.

18. Schlosshan, Sue. "The Influence of the 1972 Statewide Extension Clothing Practice Survey on Amounts of Staff Time Planned and Expended and Clientele Contacts With Selected Audiences and Teaching Methods, Fiscal Years 1972 and 1974." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1975.

19. Shipman, Jean. "Help for Housing Problems." Extension Service Review. U.S.D.A., January, 1971.

20. Smith, Mary Theresa. "A Comparison of the Characteristics of Giles County, Tennessee, Home Demonstration Homemakers and Public Housing Homemakers and Their Use of Recommended Nutrition Practices." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1976.

21. Speer, Julia. "Relationship Between Selected Tennessee Homemakers Personal and Family Characteristics, Number of Extension Contacts and Use of Recommended Interior Design Practices." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1979.

22. Stinson, Roberta. "Use of Interior Design Practices by Tennessee Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1980.

23. Stocking, Helen. "Influence of Selected Variables Upon Levels of Nutrition Practice Use by Various Extension Homemaker Audiences in Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1975.

24. Troelstrup, Arch W. Consumer Problems. New York: McGraw Hill Book Company, Inc., 1952.

25. Webb, Betty. "Relationship Between Selected Characteristics of Home Demonstration Club Members and Employment and Number of Contacts They Had With Extension Agents in Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1979.

APPENDIX

AEE INFO-27

The Agricultural Extension Service
University of Tennessee

1986 Clothing Construction Survey
(See Instructions on Last Page)

Card no. 1 (1)

County Name _____

Respondent no. (2) (3) (4)

Co. Temis no. (5) (6) (7)

Respondent's telephone number _____

Hello! I'm _____ a volunteer leader, calling for the University of Tennessee Agricultural Extension Office in _____ County. We're doing a Clothing Construction Survey in our County. Your information will help us understand more about the home sewing being done in the County.

PART I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Most of the following questions can be answered with yes or no.

			Sews	
			no	yes
(8)	1. Do you sew?	circle one	1	2

			Who sew for?	
			no	yes
(9)	(a) Self?	circle one	1	2
(10)	(b) School age children?	"	1	2
(11)	(c) Teens?	"	1	2
(12)	(d) Elderly?	"	1	2
(13)	(e) Handicapped/disabled?	"	1	2

NOTE: If the answer is no to either of the above questions this interview should be terminated or the Consumer Survey should be used with this homemaker.

			Reasons for sewing	
			no	yes
(14)	(a) To get a good fit?	circle one	1	2
(15)	(b) Because you enjoy it?	"	1	2
(16)	(c) To get quality construction?	"	1	2
(17)	(d) To save money?	"	1	2

			Skill level of sewing		
			Beginner	Average	Advanced
(18)	4. Do you consider your sewing skill level to be beginner, average or advanced?	circle one	1	2	3

			Approximate number of garments completed			
			None	1-5	6-15	over 15
(19)	5. Approximately how many garments have you completed for yourself or family members in the last 12 months?	circle one	0	1	2	3

			Saved money by sewing	
			no	yes
(20)	6. Have you saved money by sewing for yourself or family members during the last 12 months?	circle one	1	2

			Estimated dollars saved			
			None	1-50	51-100	Over 100
(21)	7. Please estimate the number of dollars saved by sewing in the last 12 months?	circle one	0	1	2	3

PART II: SELECTION OF PATTERNS, FABRICS AND PATTERN ALTERATIONS

The following questions can be answered with never, rarely, sometimes or nearly always.

	1. When you select fabrics for clothing for yourself, and/or family members, how frequently do you consider the following?		Points considered when selecting fabric			
			Never	Rarely	Some-Times	Nearly Always
(22)	(a) Fiber content?	circle one	1	2	3	4
(23)	(b) Care recommendations?	"	1	2	3	4
(24)	(c) Pattern recommendations?	"	1	2	3	4
(25)	(d) Fabric woven or knitted on grain?	"	1	2	3	4
(26)	(e) Fabric color and texture?	"	1	2	3	4
(27)	(f) Garment style?	"	1	2	3	4

	2. How frequently do you use the following procedures when you alter patterns:		Procedures used for altering patterns			
			Never	Rarely	Some-Times	Nearly Always
(28)	(a) Alter by cutting seam allowance larger or smaller?	circle one	1	2	3	4
(29)	(b) Alter by slashing pattern and adding extra amount?	"	1	2	3	4
(30)	(c) Alter by folding out extra amount in pattern?	"	1	2	3	4
(31)	(d) Lengthen or shorten patterns?	"	1	2	3	4

PART III: PREPARATION AND CONSTRUCTION TECHNIQUES

	1. In preparation before sewing, how frequently do you do the following:		Preparation steps			
			Never	Rarely	Some-Times	Nearly Always
(32)	(a) Shrink fabric?	circle one	1	2	3	4
(33)	(b) Shrink notions?	"	1	2	3	4
(34)	(c) Cut garment with regular shears?	"	1	2	3	4
(35)	(d) Cut garment with pinking shears?	"	1	2	3	4
(36)	(e) Mark construction details?	"	1	2	3	4

	2. How frequently do you staystitch the following areas:		Staystitches the following areas			
			Never	Rarely	Some-Times	Nearly Always
(37)	(a) Neckline?	circle one	1	2	3	4
(38)	(b) Shoulder seam?	"	1	2	3	4
(39)	(c) Armscye?	"	1	2	3	4
(40)	(d) Waistline?	"	1	2	3	4

	3. How frequently do you use the following types of interfacing:		Type of interfacing used			
			Never	Rarely	Some-Times	Nearly Always
(41)	(a) Sew-in?	circle one	1	2	3	4
(42)	(b) Fusible?	"	1	2	3	4

			Areas in garment where interfacing is used			
	4. How frequently do you use interfacing in the following garment sections:		Never	Rarely	Some-Times	Nearly Always
(43)	(a) Neckline?	circle one	1	2	3	4
(44)	(b) Collars?	"	1	2	3	4
(45)	(c) Cuffs?	"	1	2	3	4
(46)	(d) Facings?	"	1	2	3	4
(47)	(e) Waistbands?	"	1	2	3	4
(48)	(f) Belts?	"	1	2	3	4

			Understitches following areas			
	5. How frequently do you understitch the following garment areas:		Never	Rarely	Some-Times	Nearly Always
(49)	(a) Neckline?	circle one	1	2	3	4
(50)	(b) Collars?	"	1	2	3	4
(51)	(c) Facings?	"	1	2	3	4
(52)	(d) Pockets?	"	1	2	3	4

			Seam finishes used			
	6. How frequently do you use the following seam finishes:		Never	Rarely	Some-Times	Nearly Always
(53)	(a) Pinked?	circle one	1	2	3	4
(54)	(b) Pinked and stitched ?	"	1	2	3	4
(55)	(c) Turned under and stitched ?	"	1	2	3	4
(56)	(d) Machine overcast?	"	1	2	3	4
(57)	(e) French?	"	1	2	3	4
(58)	(f) Hong King or bias bound?	"	1	2	3	4
(59)	(g) Serged?	"	1	2	3	4

			Hem finishes used			
	7. How frequently do you use the following hem finishes:		Never	Rarely	Some-Times	Nearly Always
(60)	(a) Hem tape?	circle one	1	2	3	4
(61)	(b) Stretch lace ?	"	1	2	3	4
(62)	(c) Pinking?	"	1	2	3	4
(63)	(d) Clean finishing ?	"	1	2	3	4
(64)	(e) Hong Kong or bias bound ?	"	1	2	3	4
(65)	(f) Zig zagging ?	"	1	2	3	4
(66)	(g) Serged ?	"	1	2	3	4

			Techniques used to press when sewing			
	8. How frequently do you use the following techniques in pressing when constructing garments :		Never	Rarely	Some-Times	Nearly Always
(67)	(a) Press as you sew?	circle one	1	2	3	4
(68)	(b) Use special equipment to press seams and darts?	"	1	2	3	4
(69)	(c) Use a press cloth to prevent shine?	"	1	2	3	4

Card no. 2 (1)

Respondent no. (2) (3) (4)

Co. Temis no. (5) (6) (7)

PART IV. EXTENSION CONTACTS

The next few questions deal with the number of contacts you have had over the past 12 months with the County Extension Home Economics agent. This information will help us evaluate the effectiveness of our program.

Methods of Obtaining Information From Extension				Number of times clothing construction information received in past 12 months								
(8)	1.	Regular EH Club Meetings?	circle one	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & over
(9)	2.	Visits to Extension office?	"	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & over
(10)	3.	Telephone calls to Extension office?	"	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & over
(11)	4.	Circular letter or newsletter prepared by agent?	"	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & over
(12)	5.	Extension publications?	"	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & over
(13)	6.	Mass Media (news articles, radio, TV)?	"	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & over
(14)	7.	Special Interest meetings?	"	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & over
(15)	8.	Clothing Construction workshops?	"	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & over
(16)	9.	Clothing Leader lessons?	"	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 & over

PART V. INFORMATION ABOUT HOMEMAKER AND FAMILY

Now we are approaching the end of this interview. The information you gave me is very helpful. These last few questions deal with information about you and your family. This information is needed to see how responses differ by personal and family characteristics.

1. Regarding your place of residence, do you live on a farm, in a rural non-farm area, a subdivision, or an urban area?

		Place of residence			
		Farm	Rural non-farm	Sub-division	Urban
(17)	circle one	1	2	3	4

2. Including yourself, how many people currently live in your household?

		Number of persons living in household							
(18)	circle one	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

3. Are you single or married?

		Marital status	
		Single	Married
(19)	circle one	1	2

4. How many children living with you are from 5 through 18 years of age?

		Number of children living in household							
(20)	circle one	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. Are you presently employed, unemployed, retired, or full time homemaker?

		Employment status			
		Employed	Unemployed	Retired	Full-time Homemaker
(21)	circle one	1	2	3	4

6. On your last birthday were you under 40 years of age?

		Age of respondent	
		Under 40	40-over
(22)	circle one	1	2

			No. persons who provide family income							
(23)	7. How many persons in your household provide income for the family?	circle one	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

			EHCM	
			No	Yes
(24)	8. Are you presently a member of a Extension Homemakers Club?	circle one	1	2

(NOTE: After checking to make sure you have recorded a response to each question, thank the respondent and conclude the interview.

Interviewer should complete the following questions after concluding the interview.

			Telephone	Face-to-Face
(25)	1. Was the interview completed by telephone or face-to-face?	circle one	1	2

			Who was Interviewed?	
			Person originally selected was interviewed	Person interviewed was an alternate
(26)	2. Was the person interviewed the first selected in the sample or was this person an alternate?	circle one	1	2

			Number of Calls Made to Complete Interview			
			One	Two	Three	Over three
(27)	3. How many times did you (interviewer) call this respondent to complete the interview?	circle one	1	2	3	4

1. Date Due: December, 1986

2. Disposition: Mail completed survey forms to Associate District Supervisor

3. Counties included: All, which include construction in their educational program

4. Survey population: General population and Extension Homemaker Club Members

5. Sample size: Thirty (30) Extension Homemaker Club members and forty (40) General population (i.e. randomly selected non-member of EHC)

6. Sampling:

   A. For Extension Homemaker Club members: Use the Nth number techniques to randomly select 35 EHCM - five of them should be designated as alternates

   B. For General Population: Use a telephone directory or the other available listing of all households in the county to randomly select (use Nth number) forty (40) general homemakers who are not EHCM

   C. Agents and/or volunteers may conduct the interview.

VITA

Loretta Ann Sparn, daughter of the late Mary Elizabeth and Harold Sparn, was born in Hamilton County, Tennessee on October 20, 1956. She grew up in Chattanooga and attended private and public schools. She graduated from East Ridge High School in 1974. She entered The University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, majoring in Home Economics Education, and received a Bachelor of Science degree in May of 1978.

She was employed in March, 1979 as Assistant Extension Agent in Obion County, Tennessee, responsible for the 4-H Home Economics program. In 1984 she transferred to Bedford County, Tennessee in the same position. She was promoted to Associate Extension Agent in 1986.

She is a member of Tennessee Association of Extension 4-H Workers, National Association of Extension 4-H Agents, Tennessee Association of Extension Home Economist and Gamma Sigma Delta, the National Honorary Agriculture Society.