To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Roberta E. Stinson entitled "Use of Interior Design Practices by Tennessee Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers." I recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Agricultural Extension.

Cecil E. Carter, Jr., Major Professor

We have read this thesis and recommend its acceptance:

Accepted for the Council:

Vice Chancellor
Graduate Studies and Research

Ag-VetMed
Thesis
80
.S855
cop. 2

USE OF INTERIOR DESIGN PRACTICES BY TENNESSEE HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS AND GENERAL HOMEMAKERS

A Thesis

Presented for the

Master of Science

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Roberta E. Stinson

March 1980

1413786

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation and gratitude to the following who contributed, so willingly, to her program of graduate study and the preparation of this thesis.

To Dr. Cecil Carter, Jr., major professor, for his guidance, inspiration, and encouragement during the course of graduate study and for his advice and constructive criticisms in the preparation of this manuscript.

To Dr. Webster Pendergrass, Vice President of Agriculture, Institute of Agriculture, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, retired; to Dr. Robert S. Dotson, Professor and Head, Agricultural Extension Education; to the District IV Supervisors; and to the Macon County Agricultural Extension Committee for granting leave for the purpose of graduate study.

To her husband, David, and her parents, Mr. and Mrs. Claude Edmonds, for their patience, encouragement and assistance during graduate study.

ABSTRACT

The major purpose of this study was to compare general homemakers and home demonstration club members in Tennessee as to their personal characteristics, family characteristics, use of recommended interior design practices, mass media sources used to obtain interior design information, sources of instruction received on interior design and requests made for additional training on interior design. Data were obtained through personal interviews by County Extension Agents with 1,197 home demonstration club members and 376 general homemakers in 67 Tennessee counties. The Nth number technique was used in each county to select individuals to be included in the survey. Data were analyzed by The University of Tennessee Computing Center. Percentages were used to compare the two study groups. The Chi Square test was used to determine levels of significance achieved by observed differences. Differences which achieved the .05 level were accepted as being significantly different.

Data analysis indicated that the home demonstration club members differed significantly from the general homemakers in that the former tended to be older, to own their own home, were not employed outside the home, had a lower estimated family income, were more likely to be using the recommended interior design practices, were more likely to be using mass media sources to obtain interior design information, were more likely to have received instruction on interior design from Extension Agents and from commercial concerns and they also were

significantly more interested than the general homemakers in receiving additional information on interior design subjects.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I.	BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM	1
	Introduction	1
	Need for the Study	3
	Purposes and Objectives of the Study	3
	Limitations of the Study	4
	Definition of Terms	4
II.	METHODS AND PROCEDURES	6
	Study Organization	6
	Population and Sample Studied	6
	Methods of Securing Data	7
	Analysis of Data	7
III.	REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	9
	Age and Extension Contacts	9
	Marital Status	11
	Education	13
	Family Characteristics	13
	The Influence of These Characteristics on Interior Design Practices	15
	Information Used	16
IV.	STUDY FINDINGS	20
	Personal Characteristics of Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers	20
	General Family Characteristics of Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers	23
	Comparison of Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers as to Their Interior Design Practices	25
	Mass Information Sources Used By Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers	34
	Comparison of Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers as to Interior Design Instruction	39
	Comparison of Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers and Their Source of Interest in Interior Design	42

CHAPTER PAGE

V. SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS 46

Objectives 46
Method of Investigation 46
Methods of Analysis 47
Major Findings 47

BIBLIOGRAPHY 50

APPENDIX 54

VITA 59

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
I.	Personal Characteristics of Home Demonstration Club Members Compared to Those of General Homemakers	21
II.	Family Characteristics of Home Demonstration Club Members Compared to Those of General Homemakers	24
III.	Use of Recommended Interior Design Practices by Home Demonstration Club Members Compared to Those of General Homemakers	26
IV.	Mass Media Sources of Interior Design Information by Home Demonstration Club Members Compared to Those of General Homemakers	35
V.	Sources of Interior Design Instructions by Home Demonstration Club Members Compared to Those of General Homemakers	40
VI.	Additional Interior Design Training Requested by Home Demonstration Club Members Compared to Those of General Homemakers	43

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM

I. INTRODUCTION

Cooperative Extension Service, in the State of Tennessee, assists people to utilize more fully their own resources and those available to them in solving current problems and in meeting changing economic and social conditions. The Agricultural Extension Service works with the federal, state and county governmental bodies, as well as, the United States Department of Agriculture and the state land-grant college, which in Tennessee, is The University of Tennessee. Through Extension agents in ninety-five counties of Tennessee, people are stimulated to use educational information to give them a more satisfying family and community life.

The role of the Extension Agents is two-fold in that he not only disseminates useful and practical information relating to agriculture, but also helps rural people make practical application of such knowledge to farm and home situations. The teaching methods employed by the Extension Agents directly influence the effectiveness of his efforts. Because of supervising agencies and of Extension clientele, it can be sometimes difficult to give an account of work effectiveness. Yet, an understanding of the capabilities and limitations of available teaching methods is essential to their intelligent selection and efficient use to plan programs, which can be better utilized by individuals.

To serve more than one audience and to employ a wide variety of methods, to reach as many people as possible, are principles used by Extension Agents. Major concentration, in this study, is the comparison of general homemakers and home demonstration club members concerning their use of interior design practices. The general homemaker, in this study, pertains to an individual having the primary responsibility for establishing and maintaining the home environment in the family. The general homemaker is not enrolled in an active home demonstration club. The home demonstration club member is an individual enrolled in an active home demonstration club, under the direction of the Cooperative Extension Service. The Cooperative Extension Service works directly with home demonstration club members through monthly club meetings, special interest groups, media and family contact or personal contact. Extension may have contact with general homemakers through special interest groups, media, and family contacts through 4-H clubs. It would be helpful for program purposes to know the characteristics of home demonstration club members as compared to general homemakers in Tennessee.

Interior design is an area which is often underestimated in terms of the positive influence it has on every phase of family living. The study of interior design was selected because of its overall effect on the life-style and comfort of families in Tennessee. Through the use of recommended practices and improvements in the home a more pleasant and convenient home environment can be obtained. Extension Agents have a desire to know if recommended practices are being utilized by general homemakers as compared to home demonstration club members.

Extension has a desire to know if the personal and family characteristics, sources of interior design information, and instruction in interior design differs among general homemakers and home demonstration club members.

II. NEED FOR THE STUDY

The quality of Extension Programs is a major concern of every Tennessee Extension Home Economist. Information regarding how to improve Extension programs to more effectively reach both home demonstration club members, as well as, general homemakers. It is suspected that the potential homemaking clientele having the greatest need of Extension's expertise is too often the clientele most difficult to reach. Home demonstration club members may take full advantage of every opportunity to use the many services Extension offers while general homemakers may be totally unaware of Extension's problem-solving methods.

Extension home economists must know what factors influence general homemakers, as well as, home demonstration club members to use the services Extension offers. This information should help Tennessee agents to improve their educational programs so that a greater number of homemakers may receive even more benefit from the Extension Program.

III. PURPOSES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

Tennessee Agriculture Extension Agents are convinced of the importance of using recommended interior design practices to enhance

quality of life in more homes. The purpose of this study was to compare home demonstration club members with general homemakers to determine their differences and the possible influence of the Extension program upon differences observed.

The specific objectives of this study were: To compare home demonstration club members with general homemakers as to: Their personal and family characteristics; their use of recommended interior design practices; their sources of interior design information; their felt needs for instruction in interior design.

IV. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study was limited to the analysis of data available in the Interior Design survey conducted, Fall, 1976. The data were secured by Extension agents through personal interviews with 1,197 home demonstration club members and 376 general homemakers in 67 Tennessee counties. Analysis of data was limited to variables regarding the personal and family characteristics, use of interior design practices, mass information sources used and type of Extension instruction received. Interior design practices selected for study were those established by the Extension Home Economics Department at The University of Tennessee, Knoxville. These seventeen practices had to do with planning selection, buying, maintenance, renovation, construction, and care of furnishings.

V. DEFINITION OF TERMS

In order that the writer and reader have a common understanding of terms used in this study certain terms are defined as follows:

Extension Contact. The number of general Extension meetings attended, number of Extension interior design meetings attended, number of office visits and telephone calls made to the county Extension office, and the number of home visits received by the homemaker in a 12 month period of time.

Home Demonstration Club Member (HDC). An individual enrolled in an active home demonstration club under the direction of the Cooperative Extension Service.

Homemaker. An individual having the primary responsibility for establishing and maintaining the home environment in the family context.

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.

CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

I. STUDY ORGANIZATION

The study was divided into four areas for analysis and reporting. The first area consisted of the comparison of home demonstration club members and general homemakers as to their personal and family characteristics. The second area consisted of the comparison of home demonstration club members and general homemakers and their use of recommended interior design practices. The third area consisted of a comparison of home demonstration club members and general homemakers as to their sources of interior design information. The fourth and final area consisted of a comparison of general homemakers and home demonstration club members as to their felt needs for instruction in interior design.

II. POPULATION AND SAMPLE STUDIED

The population of the study included homemakers from two audiences. HDC (Home Demonstration Club) members and general homemakers. Data from a total of 1,197 home demonstration club members and 376 general homemakers from 67 Tennessee counties were used in the study.

Random sampling was done on a county basis with Extension agents conducting personal interviews with approximately 20 homemakers per county. The Nth number technique of random sampling was used. Names

of potential survey homemakers were obtained from Extension mailing lists of home demonstration club members and of general homemakers in each county.

III. METHODS OF SECURING DATA

A committee composed of Interior Design specialists and Extension Education specialist initially developed the 1977 Interior Design survey. Interview schedules were given to Extension agents in all 95 Tennessee counties in the Fall of 1976. Using the Nth number sampling technique previously mentioned, Extension agents primarily responsible for home economics programs in the counties scheduled interviews with homemakers. In personal interviews, homemakers were asked certain lead questions about their use of interior design practices. Through their responses and by personal observation during home visits the Extension agents recorded what they felt best represented the true situation. The time period allocated for completing all county surveys was October, 1976 to January, 1977.

IV. ANALYSIS OF DATA

Upon collecting the data, the counties sent their surveys to the State Extension Office where computer data cards were punched for statistical analysis, by The University of Tennessee Computer Center.

The Chi square (χ^2) test was used to determine the significance of observed differences in home demonstration club members and general homemakers. Differences which achieved the .05 level were accepted as

being statistically significant. All computations were made by The University of Tennessee Computing Center.

CHAPTER III

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Available literature was reviewed relative to homemakers age, marital status, education, family characteristics and the influence of these same characteristics on the use of Interior Design Practices. A vast amount of literature could be found relative to the technical nature of interior design, but the information was not considered particularly useful for this study. The primary concern of this study was to discover what types of individuals are being served by Extension and whether contacts with Extension bring about a desired level of practice adoption. The criteria for recommended practices were already established.

Little information was available concerning Extension contacts in the area of interior design. Most of the material was relevant to other areas of home economics and farm operation. However, because of the nature of the study and its purposes both other areas of home economics and farm related material was found to be beneficial in establishing Extensions influence on the quality of family living.

I. AGE AND EXTENSION CONTACTS

Caplivitz's study of 464 New York low-income families found that families headed by persons between 30 and 39 years of age had most frequently taken out loans. Carson, in her study of 100 Knoxville

petitioners in 1968, reported that 40 percent were less than 31 years old; almost as many were between the age of 31 and 40; and only one-fourth were over 40 (2:17).

Hamdorf stated there was a significant relationship between age and the use of loans. It has been estimated by some finance counselors that about three-fourths of all young families make installment payments for goods they have purchased (10:354).

Henry's study was confined to 100 low-income homemakers in Macon County Tennessee. She attempted to discover which, if any, personal or family characteristics influenced participation in clothing construction workshops. Her study with these low-income homemakers revealed that the factors of age, marital status, education level, family income, husband's occupation, homemaker employment status, home ownership, place of residence and number of children had no appreciable influence on participation in clothing workshops. The only factor of significant influence was the homemaker's type of employment. One could, however, conclude that the low-income status of the homemakers could in itself be a factor (12:23).

Hurst studied the characteristics of HDC members in Knox County Tennessee who sew. Her purpose was to determine what characteristics were possessed by homemakers who attended workshops as opposed to those who did not attend. She concluded that the average of workshop participants was 52 years as compared with 48 years of age for non-participants. All homemakers studied were married. Majorities of homemakers bought furniture and household goods on credit. The top

ranking credit purchases of high income respondents was furniture. Concerning the length of loan, longer terms (2 or more years) were obtained by all interviewers using credit at banks on furniture and household appliances. More high income homemakers had longer terms than low income on all items. Low income homemakers used the revolving charge for purchases of bedspreads as compared to high income (14:10).

II. MARITAL STATUS

In Carson's study of 100 bankruptcy petitioners, 73 percent were married at the time of the court hearing. Single persons comprised 5 percent of the sample while 22 percent were divorced, separated, or widowed. In Hamdorf's study 24 of the 30 petitioners were married, and all of those included in the study were married (3:20).

Hatcher's study of Home Demonstration Club members in Madison County Tennessee indicated 82 percent of 70 respondents were married. Her findings showed that about one-third of the respondents owned credit cards and 61 percent used loans (11:67).

In 1974, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board (FHLBB) amended its rules for member institutions to protect women from discrimination in home mortgage loans. These new rules require FHLBB member institutions to consider the combined income of both husband and wife in the extension of mortgage and credit and require that loan applicants be evaluated for credit worthiness regardless of sex (5:13).

Shultz and Riggs describe a West Virginia situation in which a majority of people enrolled in adult education programs are 50 years of age or older. Did this mean that young homemakers had no interest in the programs being offered? Apparently, the problem of enrollment centered around baby-sitting problems and lack of transportation rather than lack of interest. Shultz and Riggs surveyed young West Virginia homemakers to find out just what types of programs they would prefer and what modes of contact would better enable them to participate. Of the young homemakers, 21-35 years old: 94 percent were married and most had children. Twenty-five percent of those with children were employed away from home. Their program subject preferences in order were: (1) food shopping, (2) interior decorating, and (3) elementary clothing construction. The suburban homemakers in particular were interested in receiving interior design information. A similar study of Colorado homemakers in 1965 showed them to also be interested in subjects related to home surroundings, home remodeling, buying and building, as well as, furniture restoration (20:33).

Hobt also surveyed in the area of management and found in her work with Union County Tennessee that younger homemakers with young husbands scored higher on practice use. Another influencing factor was the status of the husband's employment. Wives of husbands employed full-time off the farm scored higher on the use of practices related to budgeting and record-keeping. The data indicated a strong tendency for high practice adoption by homemakers who were better educated, had higher income, were not employed and were making house payments. There were

higher budgeting practice use by younger homemakers. There was low practice adoption among the disadvantaged, older, less educated homemakers who did not participate in Extension organization (13:81).

III. EDUCATION

Neas study of consumer use of credit showed Tennessee homemakers had bought household items on credit and had used credit or loans to purchase real property. Homemakers had made home improvements by the use of credit or loans. A high proportion of homemakers using loans felt that buying items without money, record keeping, and convenience were the main advantage of credit. Homemakers felt that overuse of credit was the greatest disadvantage of using credit. Neas found that those factors influencing the use of creit included age, marital status, place of residence, number of children, and husband's income. Those not related, were the number of years homemakers had been in home demonstration clubs and their educational level (17:14).

IV. FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS

Mullins surveyed in the area of management and found in her work with Benton County Tennessee that changes in home redecoration ranked first in importance with all homemakers included in this study. More of the employed homemakers had plans for redecorating than did the nonemployed homemakers. More employed homemakers, than nonemployed members had new homes which could be one reason for fewer nonemployed members planning to build. Mullins found that more employed homemakers

planned to replace or buy new furnishings for the home than nonemployed homemakers. More employed homemakers tend to have higher debts and spend above their income more often than nonemployed homemakers (16:29).

Phillips studied factors influencing the use of consumer credit. She found that both general homemakers and home demonstration club members had bought household items, made home improvements and purchased real property through the use of credit. Home demonstration club members made the most frequent use of credit cards as compared to other family members. One-third of the general homemakers use credit cards as compared to other family members. The top ranking credit purchases of the home demonstration club members were household items. General homemakers had also made major purchases of household items (18:23).

Cobb characterized homemakers in Tennessee and related certain family nurturing variables to family characteristics. Nurturing variables had to do with families interaction and communication, self esteem and family rules. She found that wives with more high school education had significantly more positive responses. Also homemakers from part-time farms had significantly more positive responses. As the homemakers age increased the number of positive responses tended to decrease (4:19).

Stocking's study was to determine the use of recommended nutrition practices by selected Extension Audiences, homemakers receiving food stamps, home demonstration club members and young homemakers. She found that whether or not the homemaker had purchased a refrigerator was not significantly related to the number of nutrition practices used

by any homemaker audience. Almost all of those interviewed had a refrigerator. Having a freezer in the home was related to the number of nutrition practices used by food stamp recipients and home demonstration club members. Those with a freezer used more practices (22:49).

V. THE INFLUENCE OF THESE CHARACTERISTICS ON INTERIOR DESIGN PRACTICES

In the area of home economics, Klasser compared clothing surveys from two time periods using a homemaking audience from District I counties in Tennessee. After comparing their levels of practice use she concluded that homemakers in the second survey audience used a greater number of clothing practices and more often listed Extension as a helpful source of clothing information. Where there was less agent time spent and fewer contacts the practices in certain subject related areas were correspondingly weak (15:34).

Shipman did two different studies on the use of housing program aides to work among the disadvantaged. In one study S. E. Oklahoma families received help with building functional units such as shelves and closets and were taught skills in refinishing, making draperies and selecting second-hand furniture. Home visits were made to these families and evidence points up the fact that Extension visits influenced families to make improvements in their living conditions (21:16).

Shipman's second study dealt with housing work among the Indians at Ponca Indian Reservation in Oklahoma. As a result of home visits, Extension Program aides helped families to improve their quality of

living and also brought economic benefits to the community. Most of the work was through teaching basic housing maintenance. As a result, utility bills decreased and community pride increased. Shipman attributes more comfortable, livable housing with a reduction in neighborhood vandalism; evidence again that Extension plays a vital role in the life of people (21:16).

Gordon's study concerned the relationship between Extension contacts and the use of feeder pig production practices among Haywood County Tennessee producers. Particularly if the producers were expanding their operations they had more contacts with Extension and more contacts in turn influenced the use of recommended practices. Larger producers also had a greater number of contacts and used more practices (9:79).

VI. INFORMATION USED

Fisher studied a group of young homemakers that would rather receive programs by news letters, magazines or pamphlets so that no travel would be involved. Their preferences for getting information through group methods included "belonging to a club," "enrolling in an adult education class" or "attending a workshop." In any case, they wanted group meeting specifically designed for young homemakers and wanted them held in their own communities. They expressed the desire for evening meetings in spring or fall seasons so that husbands could tend to baby-sitting chores while the homemakers attended the meeting. Fisher also devoted her study to young homemakers in Oregon. In 1967, she secured the names of young women married during their

Junior or Senior year of high school and attempted to involve them in Extension home economics through home visits as the first stage of involvement. Through this means she was able to contact 136 teenage homemakers the first six months. The names of other young homemakers were secured through the help of many agencies. The young women ultimately began attending group meetings, and workshops and received information by newsletters. Occasional meetings grew into monthly meetings and a newspaper column was developed and directed to the specific needs of young families. As a follow-up to the study, an evaluation was done in 1970 in which 330 young homemakers responded to a questionnaire. Two-thirds of the respondents said they had made phone calls to the Extension office requesting information. Three-fourths asked for bulletins, three-fourths used the newsletter information and one-fourth had attended meetings or workshops. The two most frequent reasons named by those not attending meetings were "too busy" and "didn't want to attend alone." Lack of interest was named only six times out of 330 responses. This is clearly more evidence that young homemakers can be reached with effort, new methods and programs especially designed for young homemakers (6:10).

Arnett kept records of in-coming phone calls and office visits by adult male farmers in Wilson County Tennessee for a three-year period. He recorded only those calls or visits by clientele seeking agricultural information. A total of 203 contacts were listed. He found that age, race or full vs part-time farm operation had no significant influence on the number of office visits. Educational level, however, was a

significant factor in the number of visits made. Also, related was the unemployment status of the wife and her membership in a home demonstration club organization. It is interesting to note that those farmers with wives who were home demonstration club members and were not employed made more visits to the Extension office. The farmer's own club or group affiliation had no influence. In the other part of Arnett's study he found that none of the personal and family characteristics were related to the number of phone calls made seeking agricultural information (1:17).

Floeter described the effective use of telephoning in her "Dial Access" article. "Dial Access" is a different approach to passing home economics information by telephone involving the use of 322 different tapes on home and garden topics. The caller desiring information on tomatoes for canning or freezing dials a tape library service at the University of Wisconsin. Evaluation of the effectiveness of the method is built into the program. A survey of 218 users of the program showed that the system had the greatest appeal to an audience that Extension had not previously been reaching. These people didn't usually attend Extension meetings and had not previously phoned the home economics agent or the Horticulture agent. Sixty-eight percent got the information they needed and an overwhelming 94 percent shared the information, again pointing up Extension's impact (7:23).

In-coming telephone calls by homemakers seeking home economics information were kept track of by Forrest. After a month of recorded calls she did a follow-up interview with the callers. Questions were

based on established criteria regarding whether the homemakers (1) had applied information they had received, (2) had shared this information with others, and (3) had retained the information. There were 108 calls with another 152 people receiving the "shared" information for a total of 260 contacts. Of the 152 callers, all were women and 92 percent were married. Over half said the phone was their only contact with Extension. More callers were in the age group 31 - 40 years of age than any other single group though the age spread was 21 - 26 years. Callers represented the typical husband-wife-children family nucleus. Most questions were food related but 10-20 percent of the calls dealt with other homemaking problems, such as, carpet selection. Nearly all were knowledge and skill questions. Concerning whether or not the telephone could be considered a useful and effective tool for passing information, the response was overwhelmingly in favor of it (8:15).

CHAPTER IV

STUDY FINDINGS

This chapter on study findings was organized into four major sections according to the specific objectives of the study. Data pertaining to each objective of the study were presented in a table.

Section I presents data comparing home demonstration club members with general homemakers as to their personal and family characteristics.

Section II presents data comparing home demonstration club members with general homemakers as to their use of recommended interior design practices. An attempt is made to establish a relationship between home demonstration club members characteristics and practice use as compared to general homemakers.

Section III presents data comparing home demonstration club members with general homemakers as to their sources of interior design information. The purpose of this section was to compare both groups to determine a relationship between the use of sources of information.

Section IV presents data comparing home demonstration club members with general homemakers as to their felt needs for instruction in interior design.

I. PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS AND GENERAL HOMEMAKERS

Findings regarding three variables that compare the personal characteristics of home demonstration club members and general homemakers are presented in Table I.

TABLE I

PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS COMPARED TO THOSE OF GENERAL HOMEMAKERS

	Home Demonstration Club Members		General Homemakers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Age		$\chi^2 = 64.3$ P = 0.001		
20-29	92	7.7	70	18.6
30-39	227	19.0	85	22.6
40-49	179	15.0	78	20.8
50-59	265	22.1	62	16.5
60-Over	434	36.2	81	21.5
Total	1197	100.0	376	100.0
Marital Status		$\chi^2 = 1.8$ P = 0.40		
Single	30	2.5	18	4.8
Widowed or Divorced	183	15.3	42	11.2
Married Spouse Not Living at home	59	4.9	45	12.0
Married Spouse Living at home	925	77.3	271	72.0
Total	1197	100.0	376	100.0
Educational Level		$\chi^2 = 1.8$ P = 0.401		
Under 8 grades	31	2.7	14	3.8
8-11 grades	204	17.7	58	15.7
12-or More grades	917	79.6	297	80.5
Total	1152	100.0	369	100.0

Age Group

In comparing groups of homemakers, 7.7 percent of home demonstration club members were in the age range of 20-29 as compared to 18.6 percent of the general homemakers. The age range of 50-59 years of age included 22.1 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 16.5 percent general homemakers. The age range of 60-over included 36.3 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 21.5 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test the ages of home demonstration club members differed significantly from that of the general homemakers in Tennessee. Home demonstration club members tended to be older than the general homemakers.

Marital Status of Respondent

Nearly 5 percent of the home demonstration club members were married with the spouse not living at home, compared to 12 percent of the general homemakers. Homemakers who were married with the spouse living at home, about 78 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 72 percent general homemakers were married with the spouse living at home. According to the χ^2 test the marital status of the homemaker was not significantly different from the marital status of the general homemakers.

Educational Level

About 80 percent of the home demonstration club members compared to 80.5 percent of the general homemakers had completed high school. According to the χ^2 test the educational achievement of home demonstration club members and general homemakers did not differ significantly.

II. GENERAL FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS AND GENERAL HOMEMAKERS

Home demonstration club members and general homemakers are compared as to their family characteristics in Table II. These groups are compared as to their family income, employment status and home ownership.

Homemakers Employed Outside the Home

Twenty-five percent of home demonstration club members were employed outside the home as compared to 53.6 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test general homemakers differed significantly from home demonstration club members as to employment status. A significantly larger percent of the general homemakers as compared to home demonstration club members were employed outside the home.

Family Income

The data showed that 14.2 percent of home demonstration club members had a family income of less than five thousand dollars as compared to 8.9 percent of the general homemakers. General homemakers with a family income from ten thousand or more were 64.3 percent as compared to 56.2 percent of home demonstration club members. According to the χ^2 test family income of the general homemakers differed significantly from that of the home demonstration club members. General homemakers tended to have a higher income than the home demonstration club members.

TABLE II

FAMILY CHARACTERISTICS OF HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS COMPARED TO THOSE OF GENERAL HOMEMAKERS

	Home Demonstration Club Members		General Homemakers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Homemakers Employed Outside the Home		$\chi^2 = 102.2$ P = 0.001		
No	864	75.0	167	46.4
Yes	288	25.0	193	53.6
Total	1152	100.0	360	100.0
Family Income		$\chi^2 = 6.6$ P = 0.03		
Less than $5,000	119	14.2	22	8.9
$5,000-$10,000	249	29.6	66	26.8
$10,000 or more	472	56.2	158	64.3
Total	840	100.0	246	100.0
Do You Own Your Own Home?		$\chi^2 = 7.3$ P = 0.001		
No	107	9.3	53	14.4
Yes	1046	90.7	314	85.6
Total	1153	100.0	367	100.0

Do You Own Your Own Home?

Home demonstration club members that did own their own home were 90.7 percent as compared to 85.6 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test general homemakers differed significantly from home demonstration club members as to home ownership. A higher percentage of home demonstration club members owned their own homes than general homemakers.

III. COMPARISON OF HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS AND GENERAL HOMEMAKERS AS TO THEIR INTERIOR DESIGN PRACTICES

Table III compares the use of recommended practices by general homemakers and home demonstration club members.

Had a Written Long-Range Plan for Home Furnishings

Eighty percent of general homemakers did not have a written long range plan for home furnishings, as compared to 81.9 percent home demonstration club members. According to the χ^2 test general homemakers and home demonstration club members do not differ significantly as to the use of this practice.

Considered Needs and Interests of Family Members in Making Plans

Home demonstration club members that did consider the needs and interests of family members in making a plan were 69.8 percent as compared to 67.5 percent of the general homemakers. According to χ^2 test general homemakers were not significantly different from the home demonstration club members in their use of this practice.

TABLE III

USE OF RECOMMENDED INTERIOR DESIGN PRACTICES BY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS COMPARED TO THOSE OF GENERAL HOMEMAKERS

	Home Demonstration Club Members		General Homemakers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Had a Written Long-Range Plan for Home Furnishings		$\chi^2 = 0.56$ P = 0.46		
Yes	209	18.1	73	20.0
No	947	81.9	292	80.0
Total	1156	100.0	365	100.0
Considered Needs and Interests of Family Members in Making Plans		$\chi^2 = 0.52$ P = 0.47		
Yes	769	69.8	233	67.5
No	333	30.2	112	32.5
Total	1102	100.0	345	100.0
Made an Inventory of Furnishings on Hand & Condition as a Basis for Planning		$\chi^2 = 0.00$ P = 0.93		
Yes	512	46.5	162	47.0
No	589	53.5	183	53.0
Total	1101	100.0	345	100.0
Determined from Inventory Which Furnishings Should be Bought or Reconditioned First, Second, etc. (Priorities)		$\chi^2 = 1.12$ P = 0.29		
Yes	578	53.0	172	49.6
No	512	47.0	175	50.4
Total	1090	100.0	347	100.0

TABLE III (cont'd)

	Home Demonstration Club Members		General Homemakers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
In Planning, Considered the Atmosphere the Home Would Express (e.g. Formal, Informal Cheerful, Quite, Restful)		$\chi^2 = 4.11$ P = 0.04		
Yes	935	83.7	275	78.8
No	182	16.3	74	21.2
Total	1117	100.0	349	100.0
Considered How Each Room Would be Used & Planned for Furnishings Accordingly		$\chi^2 = 4.14$ P = 0.04		
Yes	942	84.3	279	79.5
No	175	15.7	72	20.5
Total	1117	100.0	351	100.0
Decided on Furniture Budget in Planning Process		$\chi^2 = 9.28$ P = 0.001		
Yes	673	61.3	178	51.9
No	424	38.7	165	48.1
Total	1097	100.0	343	100.0
Followed Plan When Purchasing or Constructing Home Furnishings		$\chi^2 = 5.10$ P = 0.02		
Yes	642	59.2	176	52.1
No	442	40.8	162	47.9
Total	1084	100.0	338	100.0
Considered Construction Details of Each Home Furnishings Item Before Purchasing		$\chi^2 = 0.09$ P = 0.76		
Yes	962	83.9	305	84.7
No	185	16.1	55	15.3
Total	1147	100.0	360	100.0

TABLE III (cont'd)

	Home Demonstration Club Members		General Homemakers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Considered Suitability for Intended Purpose of Each Home Furnishing Item Before Purchasing		$\chi^2 = 0.09$ P = 0.76		
Yes	1023	88.6	321	89.4
No	131	11.4	38	10.6
Total	1154	100.0	359	100.0
Considered Care of Each Furnishing Item Before Purchasing		$\chi^2 = 0.00$ P = 0.96		
Yes	1034	88.8	323	88.7
No	130	11.2	41	11.3
Total	1164	100.0	364	100.0
Used Recommended Consumer Buying Practices		$\chi^2 = 1.71$ P = 0.19		
Yes	802	71.7	243	67.9
No	317	28.3	115	32.1
Total	1119	100.0	358	100.0
Knew How to Decide When Money Could be Saved by Either Purchasing or Making a Home Furnishing Item		$\chi^2 = 3.41$ P = 0.06		
Yes	936	81.6	278	77.0
No	211	18.4	83	23.0
Total	1147	100.0	361	100.0
Understood Principles of Art Elements of Design as a Sound Basis for Selecting & Using Home Furnishings Furnishings		$\chi^2 = 5.79$ P = 0.02		
Yes	754	67.6	216	60.5
No	361	32.4	141	39.5
Total	1115	100.0	357	100.0

TABLE III (cont'd)

	Home Demonstration Club Members		General Homemakers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Repaired and/or Reconditioned Home Furnishings as Needed		$\chi^2 = 4.92$ P = 0.02		
Yes	988	84.9	292	79.8
No	176	15.1	74	20.2
Total	1164	100.0	366	100.0
Provided Proper Care for Home Furnishings as Needed		$\chi^2 = 1.83$ P = 0.18		
Yes	1041	89.4	317	86.6
No	124	10.6	49	13.4
Total	1165	100.0	366	100.0
Sought Professional Advice & Assistance in the Area of Interior Design When Appropriate		$\chi^2 = 2.39$ P = 0.30		
Yes	482	42.1	148	40.8
No	662	57.9	215	59.2
Total	1144	100.0	363	100.0

Made An Inventory of Furnishings on Hand and Their Condition As a Basis for Planning

Forty-seven percent of the general homemakers had made an inventory of furnishings on hand and their condition as a basis for planning compared to 46.5 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test the observed differences are not significant at the .05 level. Home demonstration club members did not differ significantly from the general homemakers in their use of this practice.

Determined From Inventory Which Furnishings Should be Bought or Reconditioned First, Second, and So On (Priorities)

Fifty-three percent of home demonstration club members determined from inventory which furnishings should be bought or reconditioned as compared to 49.6 percent of general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test this is not a significant difference.

In Planning, Considered the Atmosphere the Home Would Express (e.g. Formal, Informal, Cheerful, Quiet, Restful

In planning about 84 percent of the home demonstration club members considered the atmosphere the home would express as compared to 78.8 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test this difference is significant at the .04 level. A significantly higher percentage of the home demonstration club member than the general homemakers were using this practice.

Considered How Each Room Would be Used and Planned for Furnishings Accordingly

Home demonstration club members who considered how each room would be used and planned for furnishings accordingly were 84.3 percent compared

to 79.5 percent of general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test the observed differences were significant at the .04 level. General homemakers and home demonstration club members did not differ significantly in their use of this recommended interior design practice.

Decided on Furniture Budget in Planning Process

The proportion of home demonstration club members who decided on a furniture budget in the planning process was 61.3 percent compared to 51.9 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test this observed difference in the use of this practice by the home demonstration club members and general homemakers was significant at the .001 level.

Followed Plan When Purchasing or Constructing Home Furnishings

The proportion of home demonstration club members who did follow a plan when purchasing or constructing home furnishings was 59.2 percent compared to 52.1 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test this was a significant difference. A significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers were following a plan when purchasing or constructing home furnishings.

Considered Construction Details of Each Home Furnishings Item Before Purchasing

The proportion of general homemakers who considered construction details of each home furnishings item before purchasing was 84.7

compared to 83.9 percent of the home demonstration club members. According to the χ^2 test these observed differences were not significant. Home demonstration club members did not differ significantly from the general homemakers in their use of this recommended practice.

Considered Suitability For Intended Purpose of Each Home Furnishing Item

The proportion of general homemakers who considered the suitability for intended purpose of each home furnishing item was 89.4 percent compared to 88.6 percent of the home demonstration club members. According to the χ^2 test this observed difference was not significant. Home demonstration club members and general homemakers did not differ significantly in their use of this practice.

Considered Care of Each Furnishing Item Before Purchasing

The proportion of general homemakers who considered care of each home furnishing item before purchasing was 88.7 compared to 88.8 percent of the home demonstration club members. According to the χ^2 test this difference is not significant at the .05 level. The two audiences did not differ significantly in their use of this practice.

Used Recommended Consumer Buying Practices

The proportion of home demonstration club members who use buying practices was 71.7 percent compared to 67.9 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test this observed difference was not significant. Therefore, home demonstration club members and general homemakers did not differ in their use of this practice.

Knew How to Decide When Money Could Be Saved by Either Purchasing or Making a Home Furnishing Item

The proportion of home demonstration club members who knew how to decide when money could be saved by either purchasing or making a home furnishing item was 81.6 percent compared to 77 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test this observed difference was not significant. Therefore, home demonstration club members and general homemakers did not differ significantly in their use of this practice.

Understand Principles of Art Elements of Design As A Sound Basis For Selecting and Using Home Furnishings

The proportion of home demonstration club members who understood principles of art elements of design as a sound basis for selecting and using home furnishings was 67.6 percent compared to 60.5 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test this was a significant difference. A significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers were using this practice.

Repaired and/or Reconditioned Home Furnishings as Needed

The proportion of home demonstration club members who repaired or reconditioned home furnishings as needed was 84.9 percent compared to 79.8 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test this was a significant difference. A significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers were using this practice.

Provided Proper Care for Home Furnishings as Needed

The proportion of home demonstration club members who provided proper care for home furnishings as needed was 89.4 percent compared to 86.6 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers did not differ significantly as to their use of this practice.

Sought Professional Advise and Assistance in the Area of Interior Design When Appropriate

The proportion of general homemakers who did not seek professional advice and assistance in the area of interior design was 59.2 percent compared to 57.9 percent of home demonstration club members who did not seek professional advice. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members did not differ significantly from the general homemakers in their use of this practice.

IV. MASS INFORMATION SOURCES USED BY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS AND GENERAL HOMEMAKERS

The variables in Table IV compares home demonstration club members and general homemakers as to their use of mass media sources to obtain information about interior design.

Radio

Radio was not used as a source of information last year by 65.6 percent of the home demonstration club members compared to 69.1 percent of the general homemakers. Almost 16 percent of the home demonstration club members compared to about 13 percent of the general homemakers

TABLE IV

MASS MEDIA SOURCES OF INTERIOR DESIGN INFORMATION BY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS COMPARED TO THOSE OF GENERAL HOMEMAKERS

	Home Demonstration Club Members		General Homemakers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Radio		$\chi^2 = 2.39$ P = 0.30		
Source Not Used Last Year	784	65.6	260	69.1
Sources but Not Particularly Helpful	225	18.8	69	18.4
Sources Which Were Particularly Helpful	186	15.6	47	12.5
Total	1195	100.0	376	100.0
Television		$\chi^2 = 7.95$ P = 0.02		
Sources Not Used Last Year	418	34.9	159	42.3
Sources but Not Particularly Helpful	384	32.2	117	31.1
Sources Which Were Particularly Helpful	394	32.9	100	26.6
Total	1196	100.0	376	100.0
Newspaper		$\chi^2 = 26.5$ P = 0.001		
Sources Not Used Last Year	391	32.7	173	46.1
Sources but Not Particularly Helpful	382	31.9	113	30.2
Sources Which Were Particularly Helpful	423	35.4	89	23.7
Total	1196	100.0	375	100.0
Magazine		$\chi^2 = 16.0$ P = 0.001		
Sources Not Used Last Year	153	12.8	79	21.0
Sources but Not Particularly Helpful	254	21.1	79	21.0
Sources Which Were Particularly Helpful	790	66.0	218	58.0
Total	1197	100.0	376	100.0

TABLE IV (cont'd)

	Home Demonstration Club Members		General Homemakers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Book		$\chi^2 = 21.5$ P = 0.001		
Sources Not Used Last Year	427	35.7	183	48.8
Sources but Not Particularly Helpful	242	20.2	67	17.9
Sources Which Were Particularly Helpful	528	44.1	125	33.3
Total	1197	100.0	375	100.0
Other		$\chi^2 = 8.65$ P = 0.01		
Sources Not Used Last Year	980	= 82.3	330	88.5
Sources but Not Particularly Helpful	32	2.7	4	1.0
Sources Which Were Particularly Helpful	178	15.0	39	10.5
Total	11190	100.0	373	100.0

reported that radio was a helpful source of information regarding interior design. When tested by the χ^2 test these observed differences were not significant. Therefore, home demonstration club members did not differ significantly from the general homemakers regarding their use of radio as a source of interior design information.

Television

Television was not used as a source of information last year by 34.9 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 42.3 percent of general homemakers. Television was a source of information which was particularly helpful to 32.9 percent home demonstration club members as compared to 26.6 percent of general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers differed significantly in their use of television as a source of interior design information.

Newspaper

Newspaper was a source not used last year by 46.1 percent of the general homemakers and 32.7 percent of the home demonstration club members. Newspaper was particularly helpful to 35.4 percent of the home demonstration club members and 23.7 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers differed significantly in their use of newspapers as a source of interior design information.

Magazine

Magazines were a particularly helpful information source to 66 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 58 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers differed significantly in their use of magazines as a source of interior design information. A significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers used magazines.

Books

Books were a source not used last year by 35.7 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 48.8 percent of the general homemakers. Books which were sources that were particularly helpful last year were used by 44.1 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 33.3 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers differed significantly in their use of books as a source of interior design information. A significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than the general homemakers used books.

Other

Other sources of information not used last year by 82.3 percent home demonstration club members as compared to 88.5 percent general homemakers. Other sources of information were particularly helpful to 15.0 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared

to 10.5 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers differed significantly in their use of other sources of information. A significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers used other sources of information.

V. COMPARISON OF HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS AND GENERAL HOMEMAKERS AS TO INTERIOR DESIGN INSTRUCTION

The variables in Table V compares general homemakers and home demonstration club members as to their different sources of instruction they received last year about interior design.

Extension Agent

Extension agents were a particularly helpful source of instruction to 70.4 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 47.1 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers differed significantly in their use of Extension agents as a source of instruction they received last year. A significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers used Extension agents as a source of instruction in interior design last year.

Home Demonstration Leader Conducted Meetings

Home demonstration club leader was a particularly helpful source of instruction to 62.5 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 13.8 percent of the general homemakers. According to the

TABLE V

SOURCES OF INTERIOR DESIGN INSTRUCTIONS BY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS COMPARED TO THOSE OF GENERAL HOMEMAKERS

	Home Demonstration Club Members		General Homemakers	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Extension Agent		$\chi^2 = 87.3$ P = 0.001		
Sources Not Used Last Year	244	20.4	167	44.4
Sources but Not Particularly Helpful	110	9.2	32	8.5
Sources Which Were Particularly Helpful	842	70.4	177	47.1
Total	1196	100.0	376	100.0
Home Demonstration Leader Conducted Meetings		$\chi^2 = 419.9$ P = 0.001		
Sources Not Used Last Year	268	22.4	303	80.6
Sources but Not Particularly Helpful	181	15.1	21	5.6
Sources Which Were Particularly Helpful	747	62.5	52	13.8
Total	1196	100.0	376	100.0
Home Economics Teacher		$\chi^2 = 0.23$ P = 0.89		
Sources Not Used Last Year	1038	87.3	326	86.7
Sources but Not Particularly Helpful	53	4.5	19	5.1
Sources Which Were Particularly Helpful	98	8.2	31	8.2
Total	1189	100.0	376	100.0
Classes Through Technical Institutes or Commercial Concerns		$\chi^2 = 7.83$ P = 0.01		
Sources Not Used Last Year	1066	89.4	354	94.1
Sources but Not Particularly Helpful	39	3.2	8	2.2
Sources Which Were Particularly Helpful	88	7.4	14	3.7
Total	1193	100.0	376	100.0
Other		$\chi^2 = 2.18$ P = 0.34		
Sources Not Used Last Year	1130	95.0	357	96.0
Sources but Not Particularly Helpful	13	1.1	1	0.2
Sources Which Were Particularly Helpful	46	3.9	14	3.8
Total	1189	100.0	372	100.0

χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers differed significantly in their use of home demonstration club leaders as a source of instruction in interior design last year. A significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers used home demonstration club leaders as a source of instruction last year.

Home Economics Teacher

Home economics teachers were not a source of instruction used last year by 87.3 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 86.7 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers did not differ significantly as to their use of this practice.

Classes Through Technical Institutes or Commercial Concerns

Sources of classes of instruction through technical or commercial concerns were not used last year by 89.4 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 94.1 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers differed significantly in their use of instruction through classes of technical institutes or commerical concerns. A significantly higher proportion of the general homemakers than the home demonstration club members used classes through technical institutes or commercial concerns as a source of instruction last year.

Other

Other sources of instruction were not used last year by 95 percent of the home demonstration club members as compared to 96 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members differ significantly as to their use of this practice.

VI. COMPARISON OF HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS AND GENERAL HOMEMAKERS AND THEIR SOURCE OF INTEREST IN INTERIOR DESIGN

The variables in Table VI compares home demonstration club members and general homemakers as to their source of instruction they would be interested in receiving in the future.

Planning for Furnishings

Home demonstration club members who would like to receive instruction in planning for furnishings were 49.7 percent compared to 42.8 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test the observed differences were at the .04 level. General homemakers and home demonstration club members did not differ significantly in their use of this recommended interior design practice.

Furniture Buying

General homemakers who would like to receive instruction in furniture buying were 35.5 percent as compared to 39.8 percent of the home demonstration club members. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers did not differ significantly as to their use of this practice.

Furniture Use (Arrangement, Color Schemes, etc)

Home demonstration club members who would like to receive instruction on furniture use were 66.4 percent as compared to 62.3 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test home demonstration club members and general homemakers did not differ significantly as to their use of this practice.

Furniture Repair/Reconditioning

Home demonstration club members who would like to receive instruction on furniture repair or reconditioning are 62.4 percent as compared to 52.1 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test this observed difference in the use of this practice by home demonstration club members and general homemakers was significant at the .001 level.

Furniture Construction

Home demonstration club members that would like to receive instruction in furniture construction are 33.6 percent as compared to 24.8 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test this observed difference in the use of this practice by home demonstration club members and general homemakers was significant at the .001 level.

Furniture Care

Home demonstration club members who would like to receive instruction on furniture care were 60.5 percent as compared to 45.8 percent of the general homemakers. According to the χ^2 test this

observed difference in the use of this practice by home demonstration club members and general homemakers was significant at the .001 level.

Other

General homemakers who would like to receive instruction in other areas were 92.6 percent as compared to 82.3 percent of the home demonstration club members. According to the χ^2 test this observed difference in the use of this practice by home demonstration club members and general homemakers was significant at the .001 level.

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS

I. OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of the study were to compare home demonstration club members with general homemakers as to:

1. Their personal and family characteristics.
2. Their use of recommended interior design practices.
3. Their sources of interior design information.
4. Their felt needs for instruction in interior design.

The study was undertaken in an effort to better understand what factors influence home demonstration club members and general homemakers to use recommended interior design practices. By having this information Extension agents can plan better programs and methods of serving the homemaking audience.

II. METHOD OF INVESTIGATION

Data for the study were obtained through personal interviews with approximately twenty (20) randomly selected (i.e., Nth number technique) homemakers in each of 67 Tennessee counties. Interview schedules were developed and used to record information about each homemaker and her use of interior design practices. Data from a total of 1,197 home demonstration club members and 376 general homemakers were used to achieve objectives of the study.

III. METHODS OF ANALYSIS

The completed interview schedules were coded and recorded on data processing cards for computation by The University of Tennessee Computing Center. Information was tabulated by frequency counts. The Chi square (χ^2 test) was used to determine the significance of observed difference in home demonstration club members and general homemakers. Differences which achieved the .05 level were accepted as being statistically signifcant.

IV. MAJOR FINDINGS

Major findings are summarized under subtopics pertaining to each study objective.

Personal Characteristics of General Homemakers and Home Demonstration Club Members

Home demonstration club members and general homemakers were compared as to age, marital status and education. Analysis of the data indicated that home demonstration club members and general homemakers differed significantly as to their ages. Home demonstration club members tended to be older than the general homemakers. Home demonstration club members did not differ significantly from general homemakers in either marital status or educational level achieved.

Family Characteristics of General Homemakers and Home Demonstration Club Members

General homemakers and home demonstration club members were compared as to their employment outside the home, family income and

home ownership. Analysis of the data indicated that home demonstration club members differed significantly from the general homemakers on each of these family characteristics. A significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers owned their own home. On the other hand, a higher proportion of the general homemakers than of the home demonstration club members were employed outside the home and thus tended to have a higher family income.

Use of Recommended Interior Design Practices by Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers

Home demonstration club members were compared with general homemakers as to the use of 17 recommended interior design practices. Analysis of data showed that home demonstration club members did not differ significantly from general homemakers in their use of 11 of the recommended practices. A higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers were classified as users of the remaining six recommended interior design practices.

Use of Mass Media as Sources of Information About Interior Design by Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers

General homemakers and home demonstration club members were compared as to their self-reported use of radio, television, newspapers, magazines and books as a source of interior design information. Analysis of the data indicated that a significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers were using television, newspaper, magazines and books to obtain interior design

information. The home demonstration club members and general homemakers did not differ significantly in their use of radio as a source of information.

Sources of Interior Design Instructions Received by Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers

General homemakers and home demonstration club members were compared as to their use of four sources of instruction in interior design. Analysis of the data indicated that a significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers receive helpful instruction during the previous 12 months from Extension agents, home demonstration club leaders and technical institutes and/or commercial concerns. The two groups did not differ significantly in terms of instructions received from home economic teachers.

Additional Training on Interior Design Requested by Home Demonstration Club Members and General Homemakers

General homemakers and home demonstration club members were compared as to requests made for additional training on six specific interior design subjects. A significantly higher proportion of the home demonstration club members than of the general homemakers requested additional training in four of the six subjects. The two groups did not differ significantly in their requests for additional training on two of the subjects.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Arnette, Melvin Haskel. "Influence of Selected Factors on numbers 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. Caplovitz, David. The Poor Pay More. New York. The Free Press of Grencoe, 1963.

3. Carson, Ann Lea. "Selected Characteristics of 100 Personal Bankruptcy Petitions in Knoxville, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1968.

4. Cobb, Virginia Clark. Master's Thesis. "A partial analysis of the 1975-76 Tennessee Extension Family Life Survey." The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, December, 1976.

5. "Federal Home Loan Bank Board Prohibits Sex Discrimination in Home Lending." United States Department of Agriculture Research Service, Family Economics Review, ARS-NE-36, Spring, 1975.

6. Fisher, Ermina. "Young Homemakers Eager for Help." Extension Service Review. USDA, April, 1971, pp. 10-11.

7. Floeter, Jan. "Dial Access." Extension Service Review. July, August, 1977, pp. 22-23.

8. Forrest, Lavern B. "Should We Still Teach by Phone?" Extension Service Review. USDA, January, 1977, pp. 14-15.

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

10. Hamdorf, Kent G. "A Comparison of the Characteristics and Financial Problems of Persons Completing and Persons Not Completing the Wage Earner's Plan in Knoxville, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1968.

11. Hatcher, Ester. "Consumer Credit Practices of Selected Home Demonstration Club Members of Madison County, Tennessee." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1970.

12. Henry, Madeline Lenore. "Relationships 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, 1972.

13. Hobt, Ann Simms. "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.

14. Hurst, Janice Joreka. "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.

15. Klasser, Susan M. "A Comparative Summary of Selected Data from 1972 and 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 Fiscal Year 1975." Unpublished Master's Thesis, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1976.

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

17. Neas, Ethel Josephine. Master's Thesis. "Factors Influencing Blount County, Tennessee Home Demonstration Club Members' use of Consumer Credit." The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, December, 1972.

18. Phillips, Marjorie Wattenbarger. Master's Thesis. "Factors Influencing use of Consumer Credit By Selected Anderson County, Tennessee Home Demonstration Club Members and Nonmembers." The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, August, 1976.

19. Plummer, J. T. "Life Style Patterns and Commercial Bank Card Usage." Journal of Home Economics, The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, 1968.

20. Scultz, John and Riggs, Sue. "Reaching Young Homemakers." Journal of Extension. Spring, 1972, pp. 33-38, Volume X, Number 1.

21. Shipman, Jean A. "Help for Housing Problems." Extension Service Review. USDA, January, 1971.

22. Stocking, Helen Roberts. Master's Thesis. "Influence of Selected Variables upon Levels of Nutrition Practice used By Various Extension Homemakers Audiences in Tennessee." The University of Tennessee, Knoxville, June, 1975.

APPENDIX

AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE
THE UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE
KNOXVILLE, TENNESSEE

1977 Tennessee Interior Design Survey

(1) (2) (3) County TEMIS Code Number for FY 1977. Date _____

(4) (5) Audience (as in TEMIS): 22 = Home Demonstration Club Members; 23 = General Homemakers, and 17 = Other.

A. GENERAL INFORMATION

(8) 1. Age Group: 1 = 20-29; 2 = 30-39; 3 = 40-49; 4 = 50-59; 5 = 60 and over.

(9) 2. Marital status of respondent: 1 = single; 2 = widowed or divorced; 3 = married, spouse not living at home; 4 = married, spouse living at home.

(10) 3. Homemakers' educational level.) = No response; 1 = 0-7; 2 = 8-11; 3 = 12 or more.

(11) 4. Is homemaker employed outside the home? 0 = No response; 1 = No; 2 = Yes.

(12) 5. Optional: Family Income? 0 = No response; 1 = Less than $5,000; 2 = $5,000-$10,000; 3 = $10,000 or more.

(13) 6. Do you own your own home? 0 = No response; 1 = No; 2 = Yes.

(14) (15) 7. Actual number family members under 21 living at home?

(16) (17) 8. Actual number over 21?

(18) 9. Do you plan to move to another location during the next five years? 0 = No response; 1 = No; 2 = Yes.

(19) 10. Do you plan to remodel during the next five years? 0 = No response; 1 = No; 2 = Yes.

(20) 11. Do you plan to build during the next five years? 0 = No response; 1 = No; 2 = Yes.

TAEE 416c3a
Revised 1/7/77

RECOMMENDED PRACTICES (see explanatory Guide Sheet and Lead Questions, 416c3b & c) 1 = No; 2 = Yes; 0 = No response.

___ (21) 1. Had a written long-range plan for home furnishings.

___ (22) 2. Considered needs and interests of family members in making plan.

___ (23) 3. Made an inventory of furnishings on hand and their condition as a basis for planning.

___ (24) 4. Determined from inventory which furnishings should be bought or reconditioned first, second, and so on (priorities).

___ (25) 5. In planning, considered the atmosphere the home would express (e.g. formal, informal, cheerful, quite, restful).

___ (26) 6. Considered how each room would be used and planned for furnishings accordingly.

___ (27) 7. Decided on furniture budget in planning process.

___ (28) 8. Followed plan when purchasing or constructing home furnishings.

___ (29) 9. Considered construction details of each home furnishing item before purchasing.

___ (30) 10. Considered suitability for intended purpose of each home furnishing item before purchasing.

___ (31) 11. Considered care of each home furnishing item before purchasing.

___ (32) 12. Used recommended consumer buying practices.

___ (33) 13. Knew how to decide when money could be saved by either purchasing or making a home furnishing item.

___ (34) 14. Understood principles of art and elements of design as a sound basis for selecting and using home furnishings.

___ (35) 15. Repaired and/or reconditioned home furnishings as needed.

___ (36) 16. Provided proper care for home furnishings as needed.

___ (37) 17. Sought professional advice and assistance in the area of interior design when appropriate.

TAEE 416c3a
Revised 1/7/77

C. SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Sources of interior design information received last year? 1 = Source not used last year; 2 = Sources but not particularly helpful; 3 = Sources which were particularly helpful.

____ (38) Radio

____ (39) Television

____ (40) Newspaper

____ (41) Magazine

____ (42) Book

____ (43) Other (Please specify) _____

Sources in interior design instruction received last year? 1 = Source not used last year; 2 = Sources but not particularly helpful; 3 = Sources which were particularly helpful.

____ (44) Extension Agent

____ (45) Home Demonstration leader conducted meetings

____ (46) Home Economics teacher

____ (47) Classes through Technical Institutes or commercial concerns.

____ (48) Other (Please specify) _____

D. FUTURE ASSISTANCE NEEDED

1. What do you consider to be your major problem in interior design?

_____

2. Would you be interested in receiving instruction in any of the following areas? (0 = No response; 1 = No; 2 = Yes.)

____ (49) Planning for furnishings

____ (50) Furniture buying

____ (51) Furniture use (arrangement, color schemes, etc.)

____ (52) Furniture repair/reconditioning

____ (53) Furniture construction

____ (54) Furniture care

____ (55) Other (Please specify) _____

E. CONTACTS WITH AGENTS

Number of contacts with Extension Agents last 12 months? (TO THE EXTENSION AGENT: The purpose of the following questions is to provide information needed to help identify methods and approaches of greatest use to county personnel.)

____ ____ (56) (57) 1. Actual number of Extension meetings attended?

____ ____ (58) (59) 2. Actual number of Extension meetings dealing with interior design?

____ ____ (60) (61) 3. Actual number of visits to County Extension Office?

____ ____ (62) (63) 4. Actual number of telephone calls made to County Extension Office?

____ ____ (64) (65) 5. Actual number home visits received from agents?

VITA

Roberta Eileen Stinson, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Claude Edmonds, was born in Rockwood, Tennessee on February 9, 1949. She lived in Crossville, Tennessee attending public schools in the Cumberland County School System and was graduated from high school in 1967. She entered Tennessee Technological University in Cookeville, majoring in Home Economics in June, 1969.

She was employed in September, 1972 as Home Economics Extension Agent in Macon County Tennessee where her responsibilities were in both the areas of Special Program in Foods For Youth and 4-H Club Work. She later worked in both the areas of Adult Home Economics and 4-H Club work.

She was a member of Association of Extension Home Economics and the Association of Extension 4-H Workers.

She married David Keith Stinson in 1976 and they have one child, Shawnasea Forrest.