

August 24, 1967

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a thesis written by Janice Joreka Hurst entitled "Some Selected Clothing Construction Practices of Two Selected Home Demonstration Club Member Groups in Knox County, Tennessee." I recommend that it be accepted for nine quarter hours of credit in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science, with a major in Agricultural Extension.


Major Professor

We have read this thesis and
recommend its acceptance:



Claire Gilbert



Barbara Darden

Accepted for the Council:



Vice President for
Graduate Studies and Research

SOME SELECTED CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES OF TWO SELECTED HOME
DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBER GROUPS IN KNOX COUNTY, TENNESSEE

A Thesis
Presented to
the Graduate Council of
The University of Tennessee

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

by
Janice Joreka Hurst
December 1967

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express her sincere appreciation to her major professor, Dr. Robert S. Dotson, for his guidance, assistance and encouragement in the writing of this thesis. Gratitude is also expressed to Dr. Claire Gilbert and Professor Rowena Dowlen.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. Vernon W. Darter, Director, Agricultural Extension Service, The University of Tennessee, for granting study leave for the purpose of graduate study.

Thanks also are due to the Knox County Extension Home Agents and to the home demonstration club members interviewed for their splendid cooperation.

Finally, the author is most grateful to her family and friends for their encouragement and understanding throughout the study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
The Study Area.	2
Clothing Situation.	4
Purpose of the Study.	6
Definitions of Terms.	6
II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.	8
Research Related to Characteristics of Home	
Demonstration Club Members.	8
Research Related to Practice Adoption	11
Research Related to Factors Influencing Practice	
Adoption.	12
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE.	16
Population.	16
The Samples	16
Interview Schedule.	17
Rating Explanation.	17
Data Analysis	19
IV. FINDINGS OF THE STUDY	20
Characteristics	20
Enjoyment of sewing	20
Marital status.	22
Age of homemaker.	22

CHAPTER

PAGE

IV. (continued)

Size of family.	22
Ages of children.	26
Gross family income	29
Occupations of head of household and respondent	29
Type of clothing construction training.	32
Source of clothing construction assistance in previous year.	32
Sources of information received the previous year	36
Practice Adoption	38
Garments constructed.	38
Practice adoption score	40
Clothing construction practice rating	42
Buying practices.	44
Preliminary steps	44
Construction practices.	44
Factors Influencing Practice Adoption	45
Age of homemaker in relation to practice adoption score	46
Size of family in relation to practice adoption score	46
Gross family income in relation to practice adoption score	49
Employment of homemaker in relation to practice adoption score.	49

CHAPTER

PAGE

IV. (continued)	
Source of assistance in relation to practice	
adoption score.	52
Sources of information in relation to practice	
adoption scores	52
Types of training in clothing construction in	
relation to practice adoption scores.	56
Benefits of sewing.	59
Complaints with regard to sewing.	62
Homemakers' reasons for not accepting recommended	
practices	62
V. SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS.	66
Summary of Findings	68
Implications.	71
Recommendations	71
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	72
APPENDIXES.	75
Appendix A. Interview Schedule	76
Appendix B. Rating Scale of Practice Adoption.	84

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Numbers and Percents of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, According to Their Enjoyment of Sewing	21
II. Numbers and Percents of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, According to Marital Status.	23
III. Ages of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Percents, and Average Ages	24
IV. Family Sizes of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Percents and Averages.	25
V. Ages of Daughters in Families of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Percents.	27
VI. Ages of Sons in Families of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Percents.	28
VII. Total 1966 Gross Family Income of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and	

TABLE

PAGE

Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Percents, and Median Incomes.	30
VIII. Occupations of Husbands of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Percents.	31
IX. Employment Outside the Home of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Percents.	33
X. Types of Training in Clothing Construction Received by All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Percents.	34
XI. Sources of Clothing Construction Assistance Received During Previous Year by All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Percents.	35
XII. Sources of Information in Clothing Construction Received During the Previous Year by All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Percents.	37
XIII. Percents of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, Constructing Garments During the Year Prior to the	

TABLE

PAGE

Survey, by Kinds and Average Numbers of Garments Constructed.	39
XIV. Practice Adoption Scores of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Percents.	41
XV. Average Clothing Construction Practice Adoption Ratings and Total Average Ratings for All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants	43
XVI. Ages in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Average Scores	47
XVII. Size of Family in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Average Scores	48
XVIII. Incomes in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Average Scores.	50
XIX. Employment Outside the Home in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Average Scores.	51

TABLE

PAGE

XX.	Sources of Clothing Construction Assistance Used During the Previous Year in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Average Scores	53
XXI.	Numbers of Different Sources of Assistance in Clothing Construction Used the Previous Year in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers, Percents and Average Scores.	54
XXII.	Sources of Clothing Construction Information Used the Previous Year in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Average Scores.	55
XXIII.	Numbers of Different Sources of Clothing Construction Information Used the Previous Year in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers, Percents and Average Scores.	57

TABLE

PAGE

XXIV.	Types of Training in Clothing Construction in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers and Average Scores. . . .	58
XXV.	Numbers of Different Types of Training in Clothing Construction in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, by Numbers, Percents and Average Scores	60
XXVI.	Benefits of Sewing Mentioned by All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, According to Numbers and Percents.	61
XXVII.	Complaints with Regard to Sewing Mentioned by All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, According to Numbers and Percents,	63
XXVIII.	Numbers and Percents of All Knox County Home Demonstration Club Members Interviewed, Participants and Nonparticipants, Rating Various Reasons Why Homemakers Did Not Adopt Recommended Clothing Construction Practices: First, Second or Third Ranking	64

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. THE STUDY AREA

To set the stage for the present study, a word concerning the county and its people would seem in order. Knox County is a highly urbanized county with little distinction between rural and urban areas. Both are densely populated and have a comparable level of living. Therefore, the homemakers' problems are quite similar and the home economics program would appear to be equally applicable to both rural and urban home demonstration club members.

Knox County, located in East Tennessee (see Figure 1), had a population of 250,523 persons in 1960 (15:29).^{*} Knoxville, the county seat, is a major shopping center for Knox and surrounding counties.

The median educational level in 1960 for persons 25 or more years old was tenth grade in rural areas and twelfth grade in urban areas. About one-third of the adult population had some college training; yet, at the same time, one-third had less than a high school education (15:217).

Approximately 55 percent of the rural families and 60 percent of the urban families had incomes over \$4,000 which provided an

^{*}Numbers in parentheses refer to numbered references in the bibliography; those after the colon are page numbers.

opportunity for some discretionary spending. However, almost 12 percent had incomes under \$3,000 (15:241).

The level of living in Knox County was slightly higher than the national average. According to the 1960 Census, more than 80 percent of the homes had one or more bathrooms and 86 percent had hot and cold running water. Although nearly one-fourth of the families did not own laundry equipment, more than 50 percent did have automatic laundry equipment available, and laundromats were located in both rural and urban areas.

Transportation and communication facilities were considered adequate (15:161). Nearly 80 percent of the homes had telephones. Suburban, and even some rural areas, had bus service to Knoxville. Most roads were blacktopped and more than 75 percent of the labor force was traveling to work by personal auto or car pool. Since more than 50 percent of the families who had a car were one-car families, many homemakers had to depend on other club members for transportation to local and county home demonstration club meetings.

According to the 1960 Census, approximately 35 percent of the population was of school age and 20 percent was retired or near retirement. The largest adult population group was in the 35-45 year age group. These also were the ages at which the most county women were working since more than 60 percent of the female work force was drawn from this age group.

Also according to the 1960 Census, approximately 80 percent of those in the labor force were "white collar" workers. A random sample

of the 1965 home demonstration club members revealed that 20 percent worked away from home. Of those members working away from home, 60 percent were employed full-time and 40 percent part-time.

There were 38 home demonstration clubs in Knox County in 1966 with a total of 1,007 members. According to information provided by the home agent in an interview in the spring of 1967, there was a history of strong leadership in the home demonstration club program. Intensive leadership training was provided for both organizational and project leaders in 1966. The leaders were assuming responsibility for monthly club meetings and were conducting workshops and special interest classes for women working away from home, young homemakers, teenagers, and senior citizens. In addition, approximately 3,500 women were regularly reached by the home demonstration club leaders on a person-to-person basis.

II. CLOTHING SITUATION

To identify the homemakers' educational needs in the clothing work area, the Knox County home agents conducted a clothing practice survey in April, 1966, using the Tennessee Clothing Practice Checklist, Extension Training and Studies Form 416c2. Based on the survey, information was gathered in an effort to find the extent to which homemakers were using 21 selected recommended clothing practices.

Fifty-one homemakers were randomly selected and interviewed from the list of home demonstration club members who had constructed garments the previous year. Based on the findings, only 42 percent of

the Knox County home demonstration club members constructed clothing that year. Those interviewed constructed a total of 844 garments in 1966.

An analysis of the survey data disclosed that an average of 79 percent of the homemakers interviewed were using at least parts of the 21 recommended practices included in the checklist.

Relatively large majorities (75-98 percent) of the homemakers were using practices with respect to: (1) considering both body type and measurements when deciding what size pattern to use; (2) deciding where and how much patterns should be altered; (3) using appropriate methods when altering patterns; (4) straightening fabric before cutting; (5) staystitching; (6) using appropriate interfacings in recommended areas; (7) making darts; (8) finishing unnotched edges of facings; (9) pressing; (10) understitching; and, (11) reading hang tags and/or labels.

At the same time, 57 percent were found to have marked curved areas and special construction details; 67 percent had trimmed seams correctly; 55 percent had used recommended practices in setting in sleeves; and 59 percent had put hems in properly. In addition, the responses given showed that only 39 percent had used all the recommended pieces of pressing equipment.

Prior to the study, workshops had been held periodically for home demonstration club members interested in learning more about the construction of garments. It had been assumed that members who attended workshops would know and use more recommended clothing construction

practices than those who had not attended. The present study was designed to find out whether this assumption might be true or not.

III. PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The major purposes of this study were to collect basic benchmark clothing construction data for use in Knox County Extension program planning and to discover any differences that might exist in practice adoption between home demonstration club members who had attended a clothing workshop and those who had not attended a clothing workshop.

Answers to the following specific questions were sought:

1. How did those who attended Extension clothing construction workshops differ characteristically from others?
2. Which of the recommended clothing construction practices were the respondents using?
3. What factors influenced club members to adopt or reject the recommended practices?

IV. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

A participant is defined as a home demonstration club member who participated in one or more Extension clothing workshops and completed at least one garment in conjunction with a workshop. Participants may have participated in one or more of four workshops conducted in Knox County within the three years previous to the study. The workshops were on tailoring, fitting, basic construction and professional finishing.

Based on previous studies, it was hypothesized that the participants were likely to have the characteristics of innovators and would tend to be among the early adopter of recommended clothing construction practices.

Nonparticipants are those who attended none of the clothing workshops. It was hypothesized that they had none of the characteristics of innovators and were not likely to be among the first to adopt recommended practices.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The major purpose of the Cooperative Extension Service as stated in the Smith-Lever Act, is ". . . to aid in diffusing among the people of the United States useful and practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics, and to encourage the application of the same" (12:55).

The "Scope Report" (13:10), made by the 1957 Extension Sub-Committee on Scope and Responsibility, lists family living among the nine major areas of Extension program emphasis. The report suggested that homemakers continue to need certain of the basic homemaking skills, one of these skill areas being that of clothing construction.

This chapter considers available literature related to characteristics of home demonstration club women, their adoption of recommended clothing construction practices, and some factors known to influence the adoption or rejection of such practices.

I. RESEARCH RELATED TO CHARACTERISTICS OF HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS

A Federal Extension Service (F.E.S.) study made in 1957 (14:1) identified home demonstration club members and gave highlights of some general characteristics of these women nationally. Club members were reported to be different in some respects from women who did not belong

to home demonstration clubs. Higher percentages lived on farms and had more formal education, they had a higher average age, and they had some different interests than others. Among the members themselves there were differences, but general characteristics were given as follows:

1. Six out of 10 were under 50 years of age.
2. Eight out of 10 were not employed away from home.
3. Almost one-third had net incomes below \$1,500 (1956), the majority of those 50 years of age and older reported less than \$1,500 family income.
4. One-half of the total group had received some training in home economics.
5. Leadership in home demonstration clubs was highest among members 30-59 years of age.

In the clothing phase of a 1957 North Carolina study (4:27) concerning characteristics of home demonstration members, it was found that 78 percent of the members did some sewing. The problems stated by the members related to buying, planning, and construction. Thirty-one percent recognized a problem in construction and 24 percent in fitting, and all those recognizing one or both problems expressed a need for information.

Fessenden (5:11) reported on a 1959 national study of problems home demonstration club members encountered with clothing. Ranking high among the problems identified was that of getting a satisfactory fit with regard to both ready-made and constructed clothing. Home demonstration club members also wanted assistance in properly altering patterns.

Hillman (3:17) stated that there was little evidence that the majority of 300 families studied acquired clothing based on an organized plan. There was little indication that they had wardrobes that would not wear out all at once and force families to purchase clothing at inconvenient times. Items were usually bought when the need arose.

Hillman (3:18) also found that relatively few of the garments worn by families were made in the home. The homemakers constructed few new garments; and, when they did sew, they were less likely to make clothes for their children and their husbands than for themselves. Fifty-six percent indicated that they did not know enough about garment construction and proper fitting to get a finished appearance in homemade clothes. The amount of time involved in the making of garments influenced home sewing since many homemakers assisted husbands with farm tasks in addition to carrying out their housekeeping responsibilities. Significant is the fact that only 18 percent of the homemakers had ever attended an organized class in clothing construction. The majority stated that any techniques they used were learned from mothers, close friends, or relatives. All homemakers indicated that they had to make at least some alterations on many garments purchased. The sources of information used by these homemakers were, according to frequency of mention: magazines, 73 percent; newspapers, 65 percent; friends, 37 percent; radio, 33 percent; sales people, 30 percent; home demonstration clubs, 19 percent; bulletins, 8 percent; and circular advertising, 6 percent.

II. RESEARCH RELATED TO PRACTICE ADOPTION

Rogers (9:69) classified as "innovators" the people who have a tendency to be the first to try and adopt new ideas. He describes "innovators" as people who differ from the majority in that they have more education, are younger, participate in more formal ways, and have higher social status. They tend to become aware of innovations and reach adoption decisions more quickly. Others are persons (noninnovators) who are not among the first to try out and adopt new ideas.

Lionberger (8:104) stated that the speed with which adoption of recommended practices takes place is partly dependent upon the practice itself. Generally speaking, the more complex the practice, the more slowly it will be adopted; while the more compatible the practice is with existing methods used, the more likely that it will be adopted.

Beal and Rogers (1:630) recognized the rapid advances of science and technology and the implications for homemaking and the problems of how to diffuse these ideas and practices and homemakers, both innovators and noninnovators. They implied (1:634) that mass media seem to be very effective in informing homemakers that a new practice exists, but are less effective in persuading homemakers to try such a practice. Homemakers are not influenced as much by outside sources when approaching the adoption stage as they are by the results of their own trial.

The Tennessee Extension Clothing Specialists report in the Project V Plan of Work for 1967 (11:10) that homemakers who learned

new construction techniques in workshops or training meetings tended to construct garments of a higher quality as a result of their use of recommended practices. However, many families especially the economically deprived, tend not to realize their inadequacies in knowledge, skills and abilities. Consequently, they often fail to take advantage of the many Extension-related opportunities for improvement available to them.

The conclusion of an evaluation of a 1952 Regional workshop for Extension Clothing Specialists (7:162) was that those planning Extension clothing programs must be constantly sensitive to changes in social customs, to changes in consumer demands, and to new developments on the market. This involves the constant need to sharpen tools for collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and dispensing information.

Educational efforts should be modified as adoption progresses, explained Lionberger (8:12). In the beginning, much effort is necessary to obtain the first few adoptions. Consequently, the advocate of change may work for a while without seeing many results. However, when successful, changes begin to take place and results tend to snowball with subsequent adoption occurring with little or no additional expenditure of energy.

III. RESEARCH RELATED TO FACTORS INFLUENCING PRACTICE ADOPTION

Practice adoption is influenced by the aspirations and capabilities of the person involved (6:8). Aspirations are usually reflected in goals, values and means of achievement. Capabilities

include general knowledge and skills which may be related to age, formal education, socio-economic status and social contacts.

Research findings (6:3) show that people adopt new ideas or practices at different times. The acceptance of a new idea involves a sequence of thoughts and actions. The stages in the adoption process include: awareness, interest, evaluation, trial and adoption. At the "awareness" and "interest" stages, mass media and group contacts are important. At the "evaluation" and "trial" stages, agricultural agencies, neighbors and friends are most important.

Wilson and Gallup (16:24) reported that the extent to which homemakers made contacts with members of the Extension staff largely determines the adoption of recommended practices. Also, Extension workers' selection of teaching methods may stimulate motivation and increase opportunity for people to make contact with Extension personnel.

Wilson and Gallup (16:22) further contend that certain factors influence the adoption of practices which others do not. They note that age is not an important factor in practice adoption or Extension teaching. Women over 50 years of age adopt as many practices as a result of Extension teaching as women of 30 years and younger. However, previous educational training and socio-economic status do make a difference. Women with more home economics training and with higher statuses tend to adopt more recommended practices.

Research in Tennessee (2:19) showed that when homemakers' scores for adoption of homemaking practices were studied in terms of sources of information considered most helpful, some relationship existed

between the adoption of homemaking practices and the number of sources of information. The more sources of information a homemaker had, the greater the adoption of practices.

Personal influence, an important factor affecting practice adoption, was defined by Rogers and Beal (10:329) as communication contacts involving a direct face-to-face exchange between the sender and receiver. They indicated that personal influence is important in the wide range of practice adoption situations. Four reasons were cited for its importance: (1) in most cases, people who interact tend to have similar values, a common level of discourse and are important referents to each other; (2) not only information but degrees and intensities of feeling are communicated; (3) two way communication is possible and gives the receiver an opportunity to clarify or seek additional information, and (4) personal contact normally has a greater impact on the individual than group or mass media, especially when people are at "trial" or "adoption" stages.

In summary, limited research was available that specifically related to either the characteristics of home demonstration club members who sew, their adoption of recommended clothing construction practices, or factors that would influence the adoption of recommended clothing construction practices.

The limited research found showed that certain characteristics are typical of home demonstration club members as a whole. The members could be classified according to their rate of adoption of recommended clothing practices as being either innovators or noninnovators. Various

factors were recognized as having or not having an influence on the adoption of recommended practices.

CHAPTER III

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

I. POPULATION

According to the 1966 clothing survey taken in Knox County, 42 percent (367) of the 1,007 home demonstration club members engaged in sewing that year. The present study was limited to homemakers who were known to sew. This group was further divided into two sub-populations, namely: (1) those hereafter referred to as participants who attended at least one of four Extension clothing workshops held during the period 1964-66 and constructed at least one garment in conjunction with a workshop (56 of the 367 members who sewed); and (2) those hereafter referred to as nonparticipants who did not attend any of the Extension clothing workshops held (311 of the 367 who sewed).

II. THE SAMPLES

Of the total participant populations of 56, 45 were available for interview.

A like number, 45, of the nonparticipants was randomly selected from the list of 311 home demonstration club members who sewed but did not attend workshops in 1964-66.

Each of the 90 club members was personally interviewed in a home visit.

III. INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

The schedule used in this study was developed using the Tennessee Recommended Clothing Practice Checklist, Tennessee Extension Training and Studies Form 416c2. The checklist was greatly expanded and additional face data questions were added. (see Appendix A). The following University of Tennessee staff members aided in the development of the schedule: Dr. Anna Jean Treece, Professor and Head, Department of Textile and Clothing; Helen Radar, Tennessee Extension Clothing Specialist; Geneva Potter, Tennessee Extension Assistant Clothing Specialist; Dr. Claire Gilbert, Professor and Head, Home Demonstration Methods Department; Rowena Dowlen, Professor, Textiles and Clothing; and Dr. Robert S. Dotson, Professor and Head, Tennessee Extension Training and Studies.

The schedule was designed to reveal characteristics, clothing construction practices used, and factors influencing practice adoption by home demonstration club members.

As indicated earlier, comparisons in the study were between participants and nonparticipants. Analyses were made, based on simple numbers and percents presented in tabular form. Means or medians were computed and included where appropriate.

IV. RATING EXPLANATION

Fourteen recommended clothing construction practices were included in the interview in an effort to find differences in the

practice adoption levels of participants and nonparticipants. It was assumed that all home demonstration club members who sew should have used all fourteen practices.

The following scheme was used to classify the levels of adoption of construction practices of persons interviewed: (1) no points were given if the person interviewed did not use a recommended practice to any degree; (2) one to seven points were given on ten of the practices where only certain parts of a particular practice were used; and, (3) a maximum of eight points were given if a practice was used as recommended. Each practice was weighted individually and the separate parts were rated to give a total score of eight points (see Appendix B). An average score was obtained for each person and group interviewed by adding the total points earned and dividing by the number of recommended practices.

Average ratings for individual practices also were tabulated for all interviewees, participants and nonparticipants. A rating below 5.00 was considered to be exceedingly low for any practice, suggesting the need for county Extension program emphasis in that area.

As a means of determining the factors influencing practice adoption, the practice adoption scores were related to age of homemaker, size of family, gross family income, employment of the homemaker, source of assistance and information, and previous training in clothing construction.

V. DATA ANALYSIS

The information received from the completed questionnaires was computed partially by hand and partially with the assistance of International Business Machine (IBM) computation made in the University of Tennessee Computing Center. Frequency and percentage distributions were used in the analysis of the total group, participants and non-participants.

Mean scores were used where applicable to show relation of the practice adoption scores and selected characteristics and answers of the respondents.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS OF THE STUDY

This chapter includes findings relevant to the characteristics of home demonstration club members of Knox County who were known to sew, their adoption of recommended clothing construction practices, and some of the factors influencing adoption of such practices. Comparisons were made between those participating in one or more of four Extension clothing workshops (participants) and those who did not attend one (nonparticipants) in an effort to identify generalizable group differences.

I. CHARACTERISTICS

Basic information concerning the characteristics of Knox County home demonstration club members who sew was needed to plan more effectively the clothing part of the county Extension program. Some of the characteristics are discussed below under appropriate headings.

Enjoyment of Sewing

All of the respondents were asked whether or not they enjoyed sewing (see Table I). Ninety-six percent of the home demonstration club members did enjoy sewing. All of the participants and 91 percent of the nonparticipants enjoyed sewing.

TABLE I
 NUMBERS AND PERCENTS OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION
 CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND
 NONPARTICIPANTS, ACCORDING TO THEIR
 ENJOYMENT OF SEWING*

Enjoy sewing	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Yes	86	96	45	100	41	91
No	4	4	0	0	4	9
Total	90	100	45	100	45	100

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

Marital Status

Most (93 percent) of the respondents were married as can be seen in Table II. Seven percent were widows.

Age of Homemaker

The average age for the total group was 49.3 years (see Table III). Participants averaged 51.8 years; the average age of nonparticipants was 47.8 years. Such ages are very close to the findings of a 1957 Federal Extension study (14:1) which reported that six out of ten home demonstration club members were 50 years of age.

Most homemakers (79 percent) were in the 35-64 year age category. When participants and nonparticipants are compared, slightly fewer of the former (76 percent) than the latter (83 percent) were in that age bracket. The highest percentage of participants (31 percent) were in the 45 through 54 year group; the highest percentage of nonparticipants (31 percent) were in the 35 through 44 year group.

Size of Family

The number of members in the family might be an influence on the amount of time a homemaker would have for the construction of clothing and the family need for clothing (purchased or constructed). Table IV discloses that 83 percent of all respondents had from two to five members in their families for an average of 3.2. Comparing participants with nonparticipants, a majority of the former (56 percent) had no more than two family members, the average being 3.0 members;

TABLE II

NUMBERS AND PERCENTS OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB
MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS,
ACCORDING TO MARITAL STATUS*

Marital status	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Single	0	0	0	0	0	0
Married	84	93	43	96	41	91
Widow	6	7	2	4	4	9
Total	90	100	45	100	45	100

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

TABLE III

AGES OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS
INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS,
BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTS, AND AVERAGE AGES*

Age category (in years)	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Not given	1	1	0	0	1	2
Under 25	0	0	0	0	0	0
25 - 34	7	8	2	4	5	11
35 - 44	26	29	12	27	14	31
45 - 54	25	28	13	29	12	27
55 - 64	20	22	12	27	8	18
65 - 74	10	11	5	11	5	11
75 or older	1	1	1	2	0	0
Total	90	100	45	100	45	100
Average age	49.3		51.8		47.8	

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

TABLE IV

FAMILY SIZES OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS
INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY
NUMBERS AND PERCENTS AND AVERAGES*

Size of family	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
One member	5	6	2	4	3	7
Two members	35	38	23	52	12	37
Three members	17	19	6	13	11	24
Four members	14	16	6	13	8	18
Five members	10	11	3	7	7	16
Six members	6	7	4	9	2	4
Seven members	2	2	1	2	1	2
Eight members	1	1	0	0	1	2
Total	90	100	45	100	45	100
Average number in family	3.2		3.0		3.4	

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

the majority of the latter group (56 percent) had three or more, the average being 3.4. The slightly larger family size for nonparticipants may have had some effect on their not having attended workshops.

Ages of Children

As shown in Tables V and VI, 58 percent of all respondents had no daughters; 61 percent had no sons. The largest percents of all respondents (20 and 12, respectively) had daughters and sons from 15 through 19 years of age. Slightly smaller percents (16 and 11, respectively) had daughters and sons from 10 through 14 years.

Twenty-four percent of the participants and 17 percent of the nonparticipants had no children. The largest percents of the participants (22 and 13, respectively) had daughters in the 10 through 14 years age range and sons in the 15 through 19 years range; the largest percents of nonparticipants (28 and 13, respectively) had daughters in the 15 through 19 years age range and sons in the 20 through 24 years age range. Relatively large percents of the nonparticipants (15 percent each) had daughters in the 0 through 4 years age range and 5 through 9 years age range; compared to none of the participants having daughters from 0 through 4 years and only 8 percent of them having daughters from 5 through 9 years.

From the data, then, it may be seen that nonparticipants tended to have children in a wider age range than participants, especially younger daughters and older sons. The younger children may, in part, explain why, though interested in sewing, some of these members of

TABLE V

AGES OF DAUGHTERS IN FAMILIES OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME
DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS
AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTS*

Age group (in years)**	Total (N=90)		Participants (N=45)		Nonparticipants (N=45)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Had no daughters	52	58	30	67	23	51
0 - 4	7	7	0	0	7	15
5 - 9	11	12	4	8	7	15
10 - 14	15	16	10	22	5	11
15 - 19	18	20	5	11	13	28
20 - 24	6	6	4	8	2	4
25 - 29	2	2	1	2	1	2
30 or older	2	2	0	0	2	4

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

**Some families had daughters in more than one age group; therefore, numbers and percents add up to more than totals.

TABLE VI

AGES OF SONS IN FAMILIES OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION
CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS,
BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTS*

Age group (in years)**	Total (N=90)		Participants (N=45)		Nonparticipants (N=45)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Had no sons	55	61	30	66	25	55
0 - 4	3	3	2	4	1	2
5 - 9	7	7	4	8	3	6
10 - 14	10	11	5	11	5	11
15 - 19	11	12	6	13	5	11
20 - 24	7	7	1	2	6	13
25 - 29	4	4	2	4	2	4
30 or older	2	2	1	2	1	2

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

**Some families had sons in more than one age group; therefore, numbers and percents add up to more than total.

home demonstration clubs (nonparticipants) might have found it difficult to attend workshops.

Gross Family Income

Table VII presents information relative to the various gross family income categories. Only 8 percent of all those interviewed did not answer this optional question. Sixty-three percent of all the respondents had gross family incomes between \$4,000 and \$12,000. Eighty percent of both participants and nonparticipants reported gross family incomes in excess of \$4,000. However, the median income was slightly lower for participants (\$7,750) than for nonparticipants (\$7,999). The median income for all respondents was \$7,867.

Occupations of Head of Household and Respondent

In the classification of all interviewees' husbands by occupation, data in Table VIII show that they were almost equally divided as follows: 24 percent were white collar workers; 24 percent, blue collar workers; 20 percent, professional and technical people; and 17 percent, farmers and managers. The highest percent (31) of the participants' husbands were white collar workers; the highest percent (33) of nonparticipants' husbands were blue collar workers. The next highest percent (27) of participants' husbands were professional and technical people; for nonparticipants' husbands (20 percent), farmers and managers was second. Nine percent of the husbands in each group were retired.

TABLE VII

TOTAL 1966 GROSS FAMILY INCOME OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME
DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS
AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTS,
AND MEDIAN INCOMES*

Total gross family income in dollars	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Not answered	7	8	2	4	5	11
0 - 1,999	5	6	5	12	0	0
2,000 - 3,999	6	7	2	4	4	9
4,000 - 5,999	17	19	8	18	9	20
6,000 - 7,999	15	17	8	18	7	16
8,000 - 9,999	13	15	6	14	7	16
10,000 - 11,999	11	12	7	16	4	9
12,000 - 13,999	3	3	1	2	2	4
14,000 - 15,999	4	4	1	2	3	7
16,000 - 17,999	3	3	2	4	1	2
18,000 - 19,999	1	1	1	2	0	0
20,000 - 21,999	3	3	1	2	2	4
22,000 - 23,999	1	1	1	2	0	0
24,000 - 25,999	1	1	0	0	1	2
Estimated median for those reporting		\$7,867		\$7,750		\$7,999

*Percents are rounded to nearest whole number.

TABLE VIII

OCCUPATIONS OF HUSBANDS OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION
CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND
NONPARTICIPANTS, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTS*

Occupation of husband	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Had no husband	6	6	2	4	4	9
White collar worker	22	24	14	31	8	18
Blue collar worker	22	24	7	16	15	33
Professional and technical	18	20	12	27	6	13
Farmers and managers	15	17	6	13	9	20
Retired	8	9	4	9	4	9
Total	90	100	45	100	45	100

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

With regard to the respondents themselves (see Table IX), 78 percent were not employed outside the home. More participants (27 percent) than nonparticipants (18 percent) worked outside the home. Three-fourths of the participants (9 of 12) who were employed outside the home did home sewing for others as a source of income. None of the nonparticipants did home sewing, but 8 did work outside the home.

Type of Clothing Construction Training

As noted in Table X, the majority (66 percent) of all the members interviewed had received training in clothing construction in high school. More nonparticipants (78 percent) than participants (53 percent) had received such training in high school.

All of the participants had received formal clothing construction training from Extension (in at least one workshop), but 20 percent of the nonparticipants had received clothing construction training from this same source.

Forty-seven percent of the participants reported having received some training in clothing construction from either their mother or some other member of their family. Other relatively small percents of both groups reported receiving some training from commercial classes, adult education classes and college courses.

Source of Clothing Construction Assistance in Previous Year

Forty-three percent of the respondents reported that they had received no assistance in clothing construction from anyone in the previous year (Table XI). Fifty-three percent of the nonparticipants

TABLE IX
 EMPLOYMENT OUTSIDE THE HOME OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME
 DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED,
 PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS,
 BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTS*

Employment of member outside the home	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Not employed	70	78	33	73	37	82
Employed (not seamstress)	11	12	3	7	8	18
Employed (seamstress)	9	10	9	20	0	0
Total	90	100	45	100	45	100

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

TABLE X

TYPES OF TRAINING IN CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION RECEIVED BY ALL KNOX
COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED,
PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY NUMBERS
AND PERCENTS*

Type of training**	Total (N=90)		Participants (N=45)		Nonparticipants (N=45)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None reported	3	3	0	0	3	6
High school	59	66	24	53	35	78
Extension	54	60	45	100	9	20
Mother (or other family member)	37	41	21	47	16	36
Commercial class	14	16	8	18	6	13
Adult education class	9	10	3	7	6	13
College (undergraduate)	8	9	5	11	3	6
College (graduate)	2	2	1	2	1	2

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

**Members may have had more than one type of training; therefore, numbers and percents do not total.

TABLE XI

SOURCES OF CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE RECEIVED DURING
PREVIOUS YEAR BY ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB
MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS,
BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTS*

Source of assistance**	Total (N=90)		Participants (N=45)		Nonparticipants (N=45)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None received	39	43	15	33	24	53
Home agent	25	28	18	40	7	17
Clothing leader	19	21	6	13	13	30
Neighbor or friend	9	10	7	16	2	2
Mother, daughter, or other family member	4	4	3	7	1	2
Home economics teacher	1	1	0	0	1	2

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

**Seven homemakers (four participants and three nonparticipants) reported assistance from both home agent and clothing leader; therefore, numbers and percents do not add up to total.

and 33 percent of the participants so reported.

Forty percent of the participants had received help from the home agent and 13 percent from the clothing leader. Nine percent reported assistance from both. Seventeen percent of the nonparticipants reported having help from the home agent and 30 percent from the clothing leader. Seven percent reported assistance from both.

A small percentage in each group (7 percent of the participants and 2 percent of the nonparticipants) received help from their mother, daughter or other member in the family with the construction of clothing during the previous year.

Sources of Information Received the Previous Year

Table XII shows that the majorities of all club members reported getting useful clothing information from home demonstration club meetings (82 percent reporting), University bulletins and publications (60 percent reporting) and workshops (51 percent reporting). Seventy-three percent or more of the participants received information concerning clothing construction during the previous year from the same sources.

While 73 percent of the nonparticipants received useful clothing construction information from home demonstration club meetings, a smaller group (47 percent) reported receiving such aid from University bulletins and publications.

On the whole, the participants used more different sources of information (2.8) than did the nonparticipants (1.6); while the average for all those interviewed was 2.2 different sources.

TABLE XII

SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION RECEIVED DURING
THE PREVIOUS YEAR BY ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION
CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND
NONPARTICIPANTS, BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTS*

Sources of information**	Total (N=90)		Participants (N=45)		Nonparticipants (N=45)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
None reported	3	3	1	2	2	4
Home demonstration club meetings	74	82	41	91	33	73
University bulletins and publications	54	60	33	73	21	47
Home demonstration club workshops	46	51	37	82	9	20
Magazines	13	14	7	16	6	13
Pattern publications	12	13	9	20	3	7
Radio and television	0	0	0	0	0	0
Average number of sources used		2.2		2.8		1.6

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

**Members may have had more than one source of information;
therefore, numbers and percents do not add up to total.

II. PRACTICE ADOPTION

All interviewees were questioned concerning the amount of sewing they did during the previous year and their use of recommended clothing construction practices. Practice use is discussed below under appropriate headings.

Garments Constructed

Table XIII shows the amounts of sewing done by all the home demonstration club members interviewed. The sewing can be classified into categories of tailoring, regular sewing and miscellaneous sewing.

Tailoring included suits and coats. Regular sewing included dresses, blouses, skirts, sleepwear and sportswear. Miscellaneous sewing included formals, swimwear and uniforms or costumes.

Of the tailored garments, 47 percent of all the respondents made suits; 37 percent made coats. These items were made by 60 and 56 percent of the participants and 33 and 18 percent of the non-participants, respectively. Participants made more suits (an average of 2.9) than nonparticipants (an average of 1.9); the reverse was true for coats, the former averaging 1.8 and the latter 1.9 coats.

Regular sewing was done by more respondents than either tailoring or miscellaneous sewing. For example, note that 87 percent made an average of 13.2 dresses--the largest single item reported. The participants did more sewing than the nonparticipants as evidenced by 93 percent making an average of 16.3 dresses, 62 percent making an average of 3.9 blouses, 51 percent making an average of 4.6 skirts,

TABLE XIII

PERCENTS OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS
INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS,
CONSTRUCTING GARMENTS DURING THE YEAR PRIOR
TO THE SURVEY, BY KINDS AND AVERAGE
NUMBERS OF GARMENTS CONSTRUCTED*

Kind of garment constructed	Total (N=90)		Participants (N=45)		Nonparticipants (N=45)	
	Percent	Average number	Percent	Average number	Percent	Average number
<u>Tailoring:</u>						
Suits	47	2.6	60	2.9	33	1.9
Coats	37	1.8	56	1.8	18	1.9
<u>Regular sewing:</u>						
Dresses	87	13.2	93	16.3	80	9.7
Blouses	51	3.9	62	3.9	40	3.8
Skirts	43	5.2	51	4.6	36	6.0
Sleepwear	30	3.1	40	2.8	20	3.6
Sportswear	10	6.2	9	7.8	11	5.0
<u>Miscellaneous sewing:</u>						
Formals	14	3.9	13	4.7	16	3.3
Swimwear	11	1.7	9	1.3	13	2.0
Uniforms or costumes	4	3.7	4	5.0	2	1.0

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

and 40 percent making an average of 2.8 sleepwear. Sewing by participants can be compared to 80 percent of the nonparticipants making an average of 9.7 dresses, 40 percent making an average of 3.8 blouses, 36 percent making an average of 6.0 skirts and 20 percent making an average of 3.6 sleepwear.

Only a small number of respondents did any miscellaneous sewing. Fourteen percent made an average of 3.9 formals, 11 percent an average of 1.7 swimwear, and 4 percent an average of 3.7 uniforms or costumes. In this category, more nonparticipants were sewing but making fewer garments. Of the participants, 9 percent made swimwear (for a 1.2 average), 11 percent made formals (4.7 average) and 4 percent made uniforms or costumes (5.0 average). Thirteen and 16 percent of the nonparticipants made an average of 2.0 and 3.3 swimwear and formals while only 2 percent made an average of 1.0 uniforms or costumes.

Practice Adoption Score

All interviewees were questioned concerning their adoption of the recommended clothing construction practices dealing with selected fundamental steps used in the various phases of clothing construction. Based on her adoption of part or all of each of the 14 recommended clothing construction practices included in the interview, each member was rated on each practice and given a total score (see Appendix B). The greatest percent (86) of all respondents had scores in the 40 through 89 point range (see Table XIV). The total possible score was 112. The scores for all interviewees ranged from 18 to 90; the overall average was 62 points.

TABLE XIV

PRACTICE ADOPTION SCORES OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION
CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS,
BY NUMBERS AND PERCENTS*

Practice adoption score category**	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
10 - 19	3	3	0	0	3	7
20 - 29	8	9	2	4	6	13
30 - 39	1	1	0	0	1	2
40 - 49	11	12	1	2	10	22
50 - 59	11	12	4	9	7	16
60 - 69	16	18	4	9	12	27
70 - 79	24	27	18	40	6	13
80 - 89	15	17	15	34	0	0
90 - 99	1	1	1	2	0	0
Total	90	100	45	100	45	100
Total average score	62		73		50	

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

**In the scoring scale used: no points were given if the practice was not used, one through seven points were given if only parts of the practice were used, and eight points were given if the practice was used as recommended. The practice adoption score was computed by dividing the total points earned by the number of recommended practices.

Approximately three-fourths (74 percent) of the participants had scores in the 70 through 89 range. The lowest participant score was 21; the highest was 90 and the overall average was 73 points. Twenty-seven percent of the nonparticipants had scores in the 60 through 69 point range. The lowest nonparticipant score was 18; the highest was 79, and the overall average was 50 points.

It seems logical that those participating in workshops should have made higher practice adoption scores than nonparticipants. They did.

Clothing Construction Practice Rating

Table XV gives the average practice adoption rating, by groups, for each clothing construction practice. For each practice, ratings were higher, on the average, for the participants than for the nonparticipants. Variations in the amount of difference in average scores for individual practices between participants and nonparticipants ranged from 0.65 to 3.89 points, the average for participants was 5.82 and for nonparticipants, 4.00.

A rating below 5.00 was considered to be exceedingly low for any practice suggesting the need for county Extension program emphasis in that area. Four practices (2, 3, 5, and 14) had ratings below 5.00 for participants; ten practices (2 through 5 and 9-14) were under 5.00 for the nonparticipants. For the combined group seven practices (2-5, 12-15) were under this minimum desirable level. In Table XV the 14 practices are grouped into three categories: (a) buying practices, (b) preliminary steps, and (c) construction practices.

TABLE XV

AVERAGE CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION PRACTICE ADOPTION RATINGS AND TOTAL AVERAGE RATINGS FOR ALL KNOX
COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS

Clothing construction practices*	Total members (N=90) average points	Participants (N=45) average points	Nonparticipants (N=45) average points
Buying practices:			
Selecting correct pattern sizes	6.24	6.80	5.64
Reading labels and/or hang tags	4.26	4.73	3.78
when buying fabric	1.74	2.31	1.16
Keeping a clothing plan			
Preliminary steps:			
Straightening fabric for cutting	4.63	5.16	4.09
Marking construction details	4.49	4.89	4.00
Construction practices:			
Understitching	6.76	7.64	5.87
Pressing as garment is made	6.67	7.64	6.40
Hemming	5.97	6.36	5.64
Trimming (layering, grading, beveling)			
seams	5.69	7.64	3.91
Using interfacing	5.39	6.27	4.40
Making darts	5.23	6.09	4.47
Applying zippers	4.42	5.93	2.93
Staystitching	4.40	5.64	3.20
Cleanfinishing facings	2.86	4.62	.89
Total average rating	4.91	5.82	4.00

*From 0-8 points could have been earned for each recommended practice; 0 points were given if practice was not used; 1-7 points were given if only parts of a practice were used; 8 points were given if practice was used as recommended.

Buying practices. The first three practices relate to clothing construction buying practices. In planning for and buying patterns and fabric, the participants used the recommended practices more than the nonparticipants. Practice 1 ("Selecting correct pattern sizes") averaged 6.80 for participants and 5.64 for nonparticipants. Practice 2 ("Reading labels and/or hang tags when buying fabric") averaged 4.73 and 3.78, respectively; Practice 3 ("Keeping a clothing plan") averaged 2.31 and 1.16, respectively, for participants and nonparticipants.

Preliminary steps. Practice 4 ("Straightening fabric for cutting") and Practice 5 ("Marking construction details") are generally considered to be steps preliminary to clothing construction. Practice use was weak for both practices. Ratings were under 4.63 and 4.49 points, respectively, for all interviewees. However, the ratings were higher for participants than nonparticipants on both practices; 5.16 versus 4.09 on Practice 4; and 4.89 versus 4.00 on Practice 5.

Construction practices. The construction practices, 6 through 14, are ranked in Table XV, page 43, in descending order of the average points per practice. Participants used all practices more than did nonparticipants. For example, on Practice 6 ("Understitching"), Practice 7 ("Pressing") and Practice 8 ("Hemming"), ratings were higher for participants (7.46, 7.64 and 6.36, respectively) than for nonparticipants (5.87, 6.40 and 5.64, respectively). Practice 9 ("Trimming seams") averaged 7.64 for participants, their highest practice rating, but only 3.91 for nonparticipants--a difference of 3.73 points. The

practice average for all members was 5.69 points. A relatively wide difference also may be seen in ratings for Practice 10 ("Using interfacing"). The average points for participants was 6.24 as compared with a rating of 4.40 for nonparticipants; the average rating for all members was 5.39.

The differences in average rating between participants and nonparticipants for the remaining recommended practices (11-14) were wider than those for Practice 10. With regard to Practice 11 ("Making darts"), the ratings of participants averaged a high 6.09 points; for nonparticipants, 4.47 points.

When a comparison was made between the groups regarding the adoption of Practice 12 ("Applying zippers"), ratings of participants were higher (5.93) than those of nonparticipants (2.93). For Practice 13 ("Staystitching"), the rating for participants was an acceptable 5.64; for nonparticipants, 3.27. On Practice 14 ("Cleanfinishing"), the rating for all members was a low 2.86. The rating for participants averaged 4.62 points as compared to 0.89 for nonparticipants.

These results would tend to confirm the general hypothesis that homemakers who participated in one or more Extension clothing workshops tended to use more practices than others and would likely be among the early adopters of recommended clothing construction practices.

III. FACTORS INFLUENCING PRACTICE ADOPTION

Data were collected in an effort to identify some of the factors, other than those reported above, which may have influenced the adoption

of recommended clothing construction practices. The following paragraphs discuss some of the factors which appear to have influenced all respondents to adopt or not adopt recommended clothing practices.

Age of Homemaker in Relation to Practice Adoption Score

Homemakers in the "75 or older" age group had the highest average practice adoption score (69) as shown in Table XVI. The participant's highest score (83) was in the "25-34" age group, however, only two homemakers were in this category. Nonparticipants in the "45-54" age group had the highest average score (57).

The range in average score ran from 58 for the "35-44" age group to 69 for those in the "75 or older" category for all members interviewed. The range of scores for participants was from 69 for both "45-54" and "75 or older" group to 83 for "25-34" age group. The range of scores for nonparticipants was from 45 for the "55-64" age group to 57 for the "45-54" age group. Considerable variation was the rule in comparing all categories.

Size of Family in Relation to Practice Adoption Score

The size of the family seemed to have little effect on the average clothing construction practice adoption score for all members interviewed (see Table XVII). The low score was 53 and the high, 79. Participants had higher average scores than nonparticipants regardless of the number of members in the family, three of the former having five family members averaging the highest score (80) for their group. One nonparticipant having eight members averaged highest (79).

TABLE XVI

AGES IN RELATION TO PRACTICE ADOPTION SCORES* OF ALL KNOX
COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED,
PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY
NUMBERS AND AVERAGE SCORES**

Age interval (in years)	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Average score	No.	Average score	No.	Average score
No answer	1	24	0	0	1	24
Under 25	0	0	0	0	0	0
25 - 34	7	60	2	83	5	52
35 - 44	26	58	12	70	14	48
45 - 54	25	66	13	75	12	57
55 - 64	20	59	12	69	8	45
65 - 74	10	66	5	79	5	53
75 or older	1	69	1	69	0	0
Total	90	62	45	73	45	50

*The scores were based on the rated use of 14 recommended clothing construction practices by each member interviewed and constitute percents correct.

**Scores are rounded to the nearest whole number.

TABLE XVII

SIZE OF FAMILY IN RELATION TO PRACTICE ADOPTION SCORES* OF ALL
KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED,
PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY NUMBERS
AND AVERAGE SCORES**

Size of family	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Average score	No.	Average score	No.	Average score
One member	5	56	2	78	3	42
Two members	35	66	23	73	12	52
Three members	17	62	6	72	11	56
Four members	14	56	6	73	8	44
Five members	10	56	3	80	7	46
Six members	6	53	4	64	2	32
Seven members	2	75	1	79	1	72
Eight members	1	79	0	0	1	79
Total	90	62	45	73	45	50

*The scores were based on the rated use of 14 recommended clothing construction practices by each member interviewed and constitute percents correct.

**Scores are rounded to the nearest whole number.

Gross Family Income in Relation to Practice Adoption Score

The incomes of the homemakers did not seem to have any bearing on practice adoption scores (see Table XVIII). The scores ranged from 42 for the "\$2,000-\$3,999" interval to 77 for the less than \$2,000 interval; and 79 for the only woman in the "\$24,000-\$25,999." Participants had higher scores than nonparticipants in all income categories where both were represented. The ranges in average scores were from 49 to 86 for participants and from 36 to 79 for the non-participants.

Employment of Homemaker in Relation to Practice Adoption Score

Homemakers who sewed for others as a source of income had the highest average practice adoption score (78) for all homemakers interviewed, see Table XIX. This same score was earned by the participants. No nonparticipants were employed as seamstresses.

For the nonparticipants who were employed outside the home, the score was higher (58) than that of those not employed. The reverse was true for participants; those not employed had scores of 72 as compared to those employed (other than as seamstresses) having scores of 69.

In summary, participant homemakers employed as seamstresses had the highest practice adoption scores. Other relations between homemakers' employment and scores may not be of consequence. The tendency existed for employed women in the total and nonparticipant groups to have higher scores.

TABLE XVIII

INCOMES IN RELATION TO PRACTICE ADOPTION SCORES* OF ALL KNOX
COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED,
PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY NUMBERS
AND AVERAGE SCORES**

Income (in dollars)	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Average score	No.	Average score	No.	Average score
Not answered	7	67	2	85	5	60
0 - 1,999	5	77	5	77	0	0
2,000 - 3,999	6	42	2	49	4	38
4,000 - 5,999	17	59	8	69	9	50
6,000 - 7,999	15	63	8	76	7	48
8,000 - 9,999	13	59	6	59	7	51
10,000 -11,999	11	67	7	75	4	54
12,000 -13,999	3	64	1	79	2	57
14,000 -15,999	4	57	1	86	3	47
16,000 -17,999	3	63	2	75	1	40
18,000 -19,999	1	70	1	70	0	0
20,000 -21,999	3	51	1	80	2	36
22,000 -23,999	1	52	1	52	0	0
24,000 -25,999	1	79	0	0	1	79
Total	90	62	45	73	45	50

*The scores were based on the rated use of 14 recommended clothing construction practices by each member interviewed and constitute percents correct.

**Scores are rounded to the nearest whole number.

TABLE XIX

EMPLOYMENT OUTSIDE THE HOME IN RELATION TO PRACTICE ADOPTION
 SCORES* OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS
 INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY
 NUMBERS AND AVERAGE SCORES**

Employment of member outside the home	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Average score	No.	Average score	No.	Average score
Not employed	70	60	33	72	37	49
Employed (other than seamstress)	11	61	3	69	8	58
Employed (seamstress)	9	78	9	78	0	0
Total	90	62	45	73	45	50

*The scores were based on the rated use of 14 recommended clothing construction practices by each member interviewed and constitute percents correct.

**Scores are rounded to the nearest whole numbers.

Source of Assistance in Relation to Practice Adoption Score

As shown in Table XX, the average score (74) of all interviewees was highest when they had received clothing construction assistance from their mother or daughter. The participants reporting the same source had the highest average (78). For nonparticipants, the highest average score (67) was made by the one woman who reported a home economics teacher as a source of assistance.

The second highest average score (71) for all interviewees was for those who reported the home agent as a source of assistance. For this same source, the participants' score was 75; the nonparticipants, 61.

All homemakers interviewed who reported two sources of information had the highest average score (72) (see Table XXI). Those giving one source scored an average of 58 and those mentioning none averaged 56. Participants and nonparticipants with two sources reported the highest practice adoption scores (78 and 61, respectively). However, the few (4) having two reported sources would suggest a word of caution in interpreting and applying this finding. Nevertheless, those with more reported sources of assistance tended to have higher scores.

Sources of Information in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores

Of all interviewees, those who attended workshops had the highest average score (73) (see Table XXII). Participants had higher average scores than nonparticipants for all sources considered. Among those who attended clothing workshops, participants had an average score of 75, or 10 points higher than that (65) for nonparticipants.

TABLE XX

SOURCES OF CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION ASSISTANCE USED DURING THE PREVIOUS YEAR IN RELATION TO PRACTICE ADOPTION SCORES* OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS BY NUMBERS AND AVERAGE SCORES**

Source of assistance	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Average score	No.	Average score	No.	Average score
None reported	39	56	15	70	24	48
Home agent	25	71	18	75	7	61
Clothing leader	19	52	6	67	13	45
Neighbor or friend	9	70	7	74	2	57
Mother or daughter	4	74	3	78	1	61
Home economics teacher	1	67	0	0	1	67
Total	90	62	45	73	45	50

*The scores were based on the rated use of 14 recommended clothing construction practices by each member interviewed and constitute percents correct.

**Scores are rounded to the nearest whole number.

***Members may have used more than one source of assistance; therefore, numbers do not total.

TABLE XXI

NUMBERS OF DIFFERENT SOURCES OF ASSISTANCE IN CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION USED THE PREVIOUS YEAR IN RELATION TO PRACTICE ADOPTION SCORES* OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY NUMBERS, PERCENTS, AND AVERAGE SCORES**

Number of sources used	Total			Participants			Nonparticipants		
			Average score			Average score			Average score
	No.	Percent		No.	Percent		No.	Percent	
None reported	39	43	56	15	33	70	24	54	48
One source	47	52	58	27	60	71	20	44	41
Two sources	4	5	74	3	7	78	1	2	61
Total	90	100	62	45	100	73	45	100	50

*The scores were based on the rated use of 14 recommended clothing construction practices by each member interviewed, and constitute percents correct.

**Percents and scores are rounded to the nearest whole numbers.

TABLE XXII

SOURCES OF CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION INFORMATION USED THE PREVIOUS
YEAR IN RELATION TO PRACTICE ADOPTION SCORES* OF ALL KNOX
COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED,
PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY NUMBERS
AND AVERAGE SCORES**

Sources of information	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Average score	No.	Average score	No.	Average score
None reported	3	39	1	56	2	31
Home demonstration club meetings	73	64	41	74	33	51
University bulletins and publications	54	67	33	76	21	54
Home demonstration workshops (non- participants did not complete garment)	46	73	37	75	9	65
Magazines	13	63	7	71	6	54
Pattern publications	12	71	9	75	3	59
Total***	90	62	45	73	45	50

*The scores were based on the rated use of 14 recommended clothing construction practices by each member interviewed and constitute percents correct.

**Scores are rounded to the nearest whole number.

***Members may have had more than one source of information; therefore, numbers do not add up to total.

Participants who used University bulletins and publications scored 76, those who attended workshops scored 75, those who used pattern publication scored 75, and those who attended club meetings scored 74.

Nonparticipants who reported receiving information from workshops (where no garments were completed) had highest scores (65) for their group; those not reporting any source had the lowest average score (31).

Data in Table XXIII indicate that the greater the number of different sources of clothing information mentioned, the higher the adoption score in all categories.

Types of Training in Clothing Construction in Relation to Practice Adoption Scores

Of all respondents, those who reported training in clothing construction from either college or Extension had the highest average practice adoption score (71) for each type (see Table XXIV). The same was true for nonparticipants, those mentioning both types averaging 58. At the same time, the highest average score (79) for participants was earned by those who had received college training.

Participants who received training from high school scored 73; from Extension, 73; from mother or other family member, 74; from commercial, 75. All had average scores as high as or higher than the average for the group (73).

TABLE XXIII

NUMBERS OF DIFFERENT SOURCES OF CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION INFORMATION USED THE PREVIOUS YEAR IN
RELATION TO PRACTICE ADOPTION SCORES* OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS
INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY NUMBERS,
PERCENTS AND AVERAGE SCORES**

Number of information sources	Total		Participants			Nonparticipants		
	No.	Percent	Average score	No.	Percent	Average score	No.	Percent score
None reported	3	3	39	1	2	56	2	4 31
One or two	41	46	53	7	16	65	34	76 48
Three or four	46	51	72	37	82	75	9	20 63
Total	90	100	62	45	100	73	45	100 50

*The scores were based on the rated use of 14 recommended clothing construction practices by each member interviewed, and constitute percents correct.

**Percents and scores are rounded to the nearest whole numbers.

TABLE XXIV

TYPES OF TRAINING IN CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION IN RELATION TO PRACTICE
ADOPTION SCORES* OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB
MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS,
BY NUMBERS AND AVERAGE SCORES**

Type of training	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Average score	No.	Average score	No.	Average score
None reported	3	32	0	0	3	32
High school	59	59	24	73	35	49
Extension	54	71	45	73	9	58
Mother or other family member	37	67	21	74	16	56
Commercial	14	49	8	75	6	50
College	10	71	6	79	4	58
Adult education	9	60	3	70	6	55
Total***	90	62	45	73	45	50

*The scores were based on the rated use of 14 recommended clothing construction practices by each member interviewed and constitute percents correct.

**Scores are rounded to the nearest whole number.

***Members may have had more than one source of training; therefore, numbers do not add up to totals.

Nonparticipants who had training in clothing construction (other than those previously mentioned) from mother or other family member scored 56, from commercial, 50; or from adult education, 55. These all had average scores as high as or higher than the average for their group (50). Those reporting "none" scored 32; "high school," 49.

Table XXV shows that for all groups the more different types of training a homemaker had the higher the average practice adoption score. For example, all interviewees reporting no training had average scores of 32; those reporting one type, 61; those with two, 62 (about the average for the entire group); and those with three or four had the highest score, 68.

Benefits of Sewing

Table XXVI shows that the majority of all respondents felt sewing was beneficial. Almost three-fourths (72 percent) of the respondents felt that sewing provided financial savings. Nearly one-fourth (23 percent) liked the better fit. A few women recognized other benefits from sewing such as better quality, pleasure or hobby, and individual style. Two nonparticipants (4 percent) saw no benefit to sewing.

Of the participants, 65 percent felt sewing was beneficial as a savings and 27 percent for getting a better fit. Eleven percent of the participants recognized the importance of sewing as a direct source of income.

Over three-fourths (80 percent) of the nonparticipants reported sewing to be financially beneficial. Twenty percent saw it as

TABLE XXV

NUMBERS OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF TRAINING IN CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION IN RELATION TO PRACTICE ADOPTION SCORES* OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS, BY NUMBERS, PERCENTS AND AVERAGE SCORES**

Number of types of training	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Percent	Average score	No.	Percent	Average score
None reported	3	3	32	0	0	0
One type	33	37	61	18	40	70
Two types	39	43	62	19	42	74
Three or four types	15	17	68	8	18	76
Total	90	100	62	45	100	73
				45	100	73
				3	7	32
				15	33	50
				20	44	50
				7	16	59
				45	100	50

*The scores were based on the rated use of 14 recommended clothing construction practices by each member interviewed, and constitute percents correct.

**Percents and scores are rounded to the nearest whole numbers.

TABLE XXVI

BENEFITS OF SEWING MENTIONED BY ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION
CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS,
ACCORDING TO NUMBERS AND PERCENTS*

Benefits of sewing**	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Did not feel benefits	2	2	0	0	2	4
Financial savings	65	72	29	65	36	80
Better fit	21	23	12	27	9	20
Better quality	8	9	4	9	4	9
Pleasure or hobby	8	9	5	11	3	7
Source of income	5	6	5	11	0	0
Individual style	2	2	1	2	1	2

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

**Members may have recognized more than one benefit; therefore,
numbers and percents do not add up to total.

beneficial for getting a better fit.

More nonparticipants (80 percent) than participants (65 percent) saw financial savings as a benefit, but an additional 11 percent of the participants saw sewing as a direct source of income. A larger percent of participants (27) than nonparticipants (20 percent) mentioned the better fit made possible.

Complaints with Regard to Sewing

Reference to Table XXVII shows that 54 percent of all the respondents gave some complaint about sewing. Eighteen percent stated "sewing takes too much time" and 13 percent that they were "not good enough with their sewing skills." Each of these same two complaints were reported by 18 percent of the participants. For nonparticipants, the largest percent (20) complained that "it was hard for them to get a good fit."

Small percentages of all the respondents gave complaints such as "do not like homemade clothes," "cannot find suitable materials," "it costs more than it's worth" or "it is hard on my eyes"; but 46 percent did not list complaints.

Homemakers' Reasons for Not Accepting Recommended Practices

The respondents were asked to rate various reasons, in order of importance, why they felt homemakers did not adopt recommended clothing construction practices. Table XXVIII shows that over one-half (63 percent) of the respondents gave the reason "Not enough time." Another leading reason was "Have not had proper training" (54 percent).

TABLE XXVII

COMPLAINTS WITH REGARD TO SEWING MENTIONED BY ALL KNOX COUNTY
HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB MEMBERS INTERVIEWED,
PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS,
ACCORDING TO NUMBERS AND
PERCENTS*

Complaints about sewing	Total		Participants		Nonparticipants	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
No answer	41	46	22	49	19	43
It takes too much time	16	18	8	18	8	18
Not good enough at sewing	12	13	8	18	4	9
It is hard to get a good fit	9	10	0	0	9	20
Do not like home- made clothes	5	6	3	7	2	4
Cannot find suitable materials	3	3	1	2	2	4
It costs more than it's worth	3	3	1	2	2	4
It is hard on my eyes	1	1	1	2	0	0
Total	90	100	45	100	45	100

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

TABLE XXVIII

NUMBERS AND PERCENTS OF ALL KNOX COUNTY HOME DEMONSTRATION CLUB
MEMBERS INTERVIEWED, PARTICIPANTS AND NONPARTICIPANTS, RATING
VARIOUS REASONS WHY HOMEMAKERS DID NOT ADOPT RECOMMENDED
CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION PRACTICES: FIRST
SECOND OR THIRD RANKING*

Various reasons	Total (N=90)		Participants (N=45)		Nonparticipants (N=45)	
	No.	Percent	No.	Percent	No.	Percent
Not enough time	57	63	25	56	32	71
Have not had proper training	49	54	22	49	27	60
Learned another way and do not want to change	44	49	25	56	19	42
Other more reward- ing activities claim homemakers' time and money	39	43	16	36	23	51
Do not believe practices are necessary for time required	31	34	21	47	10	22
Do not have necessary equip- ment	28	31	16	36	12	27
Have tried and found practices unsatisfactory	10	11	3	7	7	16
Cost of sewing outweighs possible benefits	9	10	7	16	2	4

*Percents are rounded to the nearest whole number.

**Numbers and percents do not total as each homemaker gave three reasons.

Fifty-six percent of the participants gave "Not enough time" and "Learned another way and do not want to change" as reasons that homemakers did not adopt recommended practices. Seventy-one percent of the nonparticipants gave the reasons of "Not enough time." Sixty percent recognized the need for training and mentioned the reason "Have not had proper training."

"Other more rewarding activities claim homemakers' time and money" was a reason given by 36 percent of participants and 51 percent of nonparticipants. However, more participants (47 percent) than nonparticipants (22 percent) felt homemakers "Do not believe practices are necessary for time required."

Seven percent of participants and 16 percent of the nonparticipants gave the reason "Have tried and found practices unsatisfactory."

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS

For Extension workers in Knox County to have a basis upon which to plan long-range educational programs in the clothing work areas, specific benchmark data were needed with regard to the 367 (42 percent of all members) home demonstration club members who constructed garments, and with regard to the construction practices they used. Since four clothing workshops had been held during the three years prior to this study, it was desired to know what differences existed between those participating and other members who had not. The purposes of this study, then, were to collect basic benchmark data for use in Knox County Extension program planning and to discover the differences in practice adoption between home demonstration club members who had attended a clothing workshop and those who had not attended a clothing workshop. Answers to the following specific questions were sought:

1. How did those who attended Extension clothing construction workshops differ characteristically from others?
2. Which of the recommended clothing construction practices were the respondents using?
3. What factors influenced club members to adopt or reject recommended practices?

The study was limited to homemakers who were known to sew. The group was divided into two sub-populations; those who had participated in at least one Extension clothing workshop in the past three years and had constructed a garment in conjunction with the workshop; and those who had not participated in any Extension clothing workshop or had not completed a garment related thereto.

Forty-five of the participants who were available for interview and 45 nonparticipants randomly selected from home demonstration club members who sewed were personally interviewed in home visits.

The interview schedule used was adapted from the Tennessee Recommended Clothing Practice Checklist. Analyses were made in numbers, percentages and averages according to all members interviewed, participants, and nonparticipants.

The interviewees were questioned concerning their adoption of fourteen recommended clothing practices. A rating scale was developed and used for each of the fourteen practices. For comparative purposes, a percentage or practice adoption score was given, based on the degree of use of all practices.

A review of the available literature disclosed that relatively few studies had been conducted in the areas related to the characteristics of home demonstration club members, practice adoption, and factors influencing practice adoption.

Findings from previous studies indicated that general characteristics describing home demonstration club members who sew included the fact that they averaged about 50 years of age, tended

to be in medium to low income groups, were not usually employed outside the home, had had some clothing construction training and used a range of sources of home economics information.

Previous findings showed that innovators tended to be among the first to try and adopt new ideas, all others being referred to as noninnovators. The speed with which practice adoption takes place had been found to be partly dependent upon the practices themselves.

Concerning factors which influence practice adoption, earlier studies have shown that certain factors do influence the adoption of practices while others do not. Factors considered influential were: aspirations and capabilities, stages of practice adoption, source of information and personal influence.

I. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

Listed below are some of the principal findings regarding characteristics of Knox County home demonstration club members who sew.

1. Almost all of the interviewees (96 percent) enjoyed sewing.
2. The average age of all interviewees was 49.3 years; participants averaged 51.8 years, and nonparticipants 47.8 years.
3. All interviewees were married (excepting six widows); the average number of family members being 3.21 for all respondents, 3.00 for participants and 3.42 for nonparticipants.
4. The median annual gross family income reported by all interviewees was \$7,867; \$7,850 for participants and \$7,999 for non-participants.

5. Twenty-two percent of all the interviewees were employed away from the home; 7 percent of the participants (not including the 20 percent who were seamstresses working at home for profit) and 18 percent of the nonparticipants were in this group (none of them being seamstresses).

6. One-third of all interviewees had received assistance in clothing construction from the home agent; this included 40 percent of the participants and 17 percent of the nonparticipants.

A summary of the major findings related to the adoption of recommended clothing construction practices by those interviewed is listed below.

1. Over one-half of the participants and one-fourth of the nonparticipants made tailored garments the previous year.

2. Participants had done a larger amount of regular sewing (e.g., dresses, blouses, skirts) than nonparticipants, though nonparticipants made more miscellaneous garments (e.g., swimwear and formals).

3. When the rating scheme was applied, practice adoption scores fell in an overall range from 18 to 90 percent for all interviewees, the participants averaging 73, and the nonparticipants averaging 50.

4. When the fourteen recommended clothing construction practices were rated individually on an 8.00 scale, four practices were found to rate exceedingly low (below 5.00) for participants and 10 were so rated for nonparticipants.

Findings listed below concern the factors which might have influenced interviewees to adopt or not adopt recommended clothing construction practices.

1. The practice adoption score appeared not to be related to the age of the homemaker; participants with the highest average score being in the "25-34" year age group, and nonparticipants with the highest scores being in the "45-54" year age group.

2. Neither size of family nor amount of gross family income appeared to have influence on practice adoption for all interviewees, participants, or nonparticipants.

3. The greater the number of sources of assistance and information the homemakers in all groups reported using in clothing construction, the higher the practice adoption scores.

4. Those who had received Extension training in clothing construction had scores comparable to those who reported college training (the high score category).

5. The more different types of training the homemaker had, the higher was the practice adoption score.

6. Nearly three-fourths of all respondents felt sewing was of greatest benefit to them in the form of financial savings, approximately one-fourth liking the better fitting garments and another one-fourth disliking sewing because it was too time consuming.

7. Over one-half of the interviewees felt homemakers did not adopt recommended clothing construction practices because of insufficient time or lack of proper training.

II. IMPLICATIONS

Some of the implications that might be drawn from the findings include the following:

1. Since participants in this study tended to be more innovative than nonparticipants and have characteristics similar to innovators in other studies, it is inferred that the clothing construction workshops held in Knox County tended to attract potential adopters or innovators.

2. Since most of the respondents interviewed liked sewing because of the financial benefits derived, it should be more clearly demonstrated that the recommended practices emphasized in the clothing workshops are profitable so that practice adoption would follow educational efforts.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Factors found to be different between and within the two participating groups should be further analyzed, and results used in planning for effective and efficient future educational clothing construction work in Knox County.

2. It is recommended that additional research be conducted to evaluate and ascertain the relative effectiveness of Extension clothing construction workshops held in Knox County.

3. Finally, additional research is needed to identify factors resulting in homemaker motivation and to design other methods of education useful in helping all homemakers realize the financial benefits of clothing construction.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Beal, George M. and Everett M. Rogers. "Informational Source in the Adoption Process of New Fabrics," Journal of Home Economics, 49:630-634, October, 1957.
2. Bonser, Howard J. Better Homemaking Practices Through Rural Community Organizations. University of Tennessee Agricultural Experiment Station Bulletin 287. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, May, 1958.
3. Fessenden, Jewel. Home Demonstration Members and Their Families. Federal Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Circular 520. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1959.
4. Hillman, Christine. Clothing Expenditures and Practices of Young Ohio Farm Families. Research Circular 70, Wooster, Ohio: Ohio Agricultural Extension Station, 1959.
5. Home Demonstration Club Women Point Up Facts and Challenges. Raleigh, North Carolina: North Carolina Agriculture Extension Service, 1957.
6. How Farm People Accept New Ideas. Farm Foundation and Federal Extension Service Cooperating, North Central Regional Publication No. 1. Ames, Iowa: Agricultural Extension Service, Iowa State College, Special Report No. 15, November, 1955.
7. Linn, Alice. "New Way to Get and Give Clothing Information," Extension Service Review, 23:162, September, 1952.
8. Lionberger, Herbert F. Adoption of New Ideas and Practices. Ames, Iowa: Iowa State University Press, 1960.
9. Roger, E. M. "Characteristics of Agriculture Innovators and Other Adopter Categories," Review of Extension Research, United States Department of Agriculture, Federal Extension Service. Washington: Government Printing Office, ESC 544, 1963.
10. Roger, Everett M. and George M. Beal. "The Importance of Personal Influence in the Adoption of Technological Changes," Social Forces, 36:329, May, 1958.
11. "Tennessee Cooperative Extension Service, Extension Home Economics, Project (V) Plan of Work for Fiscal Year 1967." Unpublished typewritten plan. Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1967.

12. Tennessee Extension Workers Handbook. Tennessee Agricultural Extension Service. Knoxville: University of Tennessee, 1962.
13. The Cooperative Extension Service Today: A Statement of Scope and Responsibility. Committee on Organization and Policy. Washington: Federal Extension Service, 1958.
14. These Are the Women Who Are Members of Home Demonstration Organizations in the United States. Report from a National Study of Home Demonstration Members. Federal Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture, Circular 528. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1957.
15. United States Bureau of Census. Census of Population, 1960, Vol. 1, Part 44. United States Department of Commerce. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1963.
16. Wilson, Meredith C., and Gladys Gallup. Extension Teaching Methods. Federal Extension Service, United States Department of Agriculture. Washington: Government Printing Office, Extension Service Circular 495, August, 1955.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

THE AGRICULTURAL EXTENSION SERVICE, UNIVERSITY OF TENNESSEE

Knoxville, Tennessee

CLOTHING SURVEY: CONSTRUCTION

INTRODUCTION: I am helping with a survey that is being made by the University of Tennessee. The purpose is to obtain information to use in planning programs helpful to homemakers. The answers you give will be added to those given by others who are being interviewed in this county to get an overall picture of clothing construction practices. Could I have a little of your time to go over these questions?

1. Do you enjoy sewing?

- _____ (1) Yes
_____ (2) No

Why _____

2. In what ways does sewing benefit you? _____

3. In what ways does it not benefit you as much as you would like?

Respondent Number _____

HDC _____

4. Sewer's training in clothing construction: (check)
- ☐ (1) None
 - ☐ (2) High School
 - ☐ (3) College
 - ☐ (4) Graduate
 - ☐ (5) Extension
 - ☐ (6) Other (specify) _____
5. During the past year, who has given you help with the construction of clothing? (check)
- ☐ (1) No one
 - ☐ (2) Neighbor or friend
 - ☐ (3) Home agent
 - ☐ (4) Home economics teacher
 - ☐ (5) Other (specify) _____
6. From which of the following sources did you receive information useful for construction of clothing during the past year?
- ☐ (1) University bulletins and publications
 - ☐ (2) Farm magazines
 - ☐ (3) Radio
 - ☐ (4) Television
 - ☐ (5) Home Demonstration Club meetings
 - ☐ (6) Home Demonstration Club workshop
 - ☐ (7) Other (specify) _____
7. Did you have a clothing plan for each family member last year?
- ☐ (1) Yes
 - ☐ (2) No
8. If yes to question #7 above, was it:
- ☐ (1) Written
 - ☐ (2) Unwritten
9. As you planned, was consideration given to: (check)
- ☐ (1) Age of family member(s)
 - ☐ (2) Activities
 - ☐ (3) Climate
 - ☐ (4) Comfort
 - ☐ (5) Fit
 - ☐ (6) Individual preferences
 - ☐ (7) Other (specify) _____

10. Have you constructed any garments within the past year?

- ____ (1) Yes
 ____ (2) No

11. Which of the garments listed below did you construct during the past year and how many of each kind did you make?

	Self	Other (who)
(1) Coats _____	_____	_____
(2) Suits _____	_____	_____
(3) Dresses _____	_____	_____
(4) Blouses _____	_____	_____
(5) Skirts _____	_____	_____
(6) Pajamas _____	_____	_____
(7) Other (specify) _____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

12. Did you read labels and/or hang tags of fabric before buying it?

- ____ (1) Yes
 ____ (2) No

13. If you read hang tags and/or labels, did you look for: (check)

- ____ (1) Fiber content
 ____ (2) Special finishes
 ____ (3) Care instructions
 ____ (4) Shrinkage
 ____ (5) Colorfastness
 ____ (6) Other (specify) _____

14. Were you generally satisfied with the piece goods which you purchased?

- ____ (1) Yes
 ____ (2) No

15. If you were dissatisfied, why? (check)

- ____ (1) Fabric shrank
 ____ (2) Fabric faded
 ____ (3) Fabric was off grain
 ____ (4) Finish was not permanent
 ____ (5) Fabric was hard to sew
 ____ (6) Fabric was hard to press
 ____ (7) Fabric wrinkled easily
 ____ (8) Other (specify) _____

16. Did you use a pattern?

- ☐ (1) Yes
☐ (2) No

17. How did you decide what size pattern(s) to use? (check)

- ☐ (1) Had body measurements taken
☐ (2) Used ready-made garment size as a guide
☐ (3) Considered body type and measurements
☐ (4) Other (specify) _____

18. Did the pattern(s) need altering?

- ☐ (1) Yes
☐ (2) No

19. If so, were they altered?

- ☐ (1) Yes
☐ (2) No

20. If yes, by whom were they altered?

- ☐ (1) Self
☐ (2) Other

21. How did you determine where and how much the pattern(s) should be altered? (check)

- ☐ (1) Pinned together and tried it on
☐ (2) Compared with body measurements
☐ (3) Other (specify) _____

22. If pattern(s) were altered, how? (check)

- ☐ (1) Added to the side seams if one inch or less was needed
☐ (2) Slashed and adjusted the needed amount
☐ (3) Folded out a tuck
☐ (4) Other (specify) _____

23. Did you straighten fabric before cutting?

- ☐ (1) Yes
☐ (2) No

24. If yes to question #23 above, how? (check)

- ☐ (1) By pulling a crosswise thread and cutting along thread
☐ (2) By tearing fabric on the crosswise grain

- _____ (3) By straightening ends and shrinking with moisture
_____ (4) By straightening ends and pulling short corners
_____ (5) Other (specify) _____

25. Did you mark construction details?

- _____ (1) Yes
_____ (2) No

26. If yes to question #25 above, which method(s) were used? (check)

- _____ (1) Tracing wheel and dressmaker's carbon
_____ (2) Tailor tacks
_____ (3) Other (specify) _____

27. Did you staystitch?

- _____ (1) Yes
_____ (2) No

28. If answer yes to question #27 above, check method(s) used

- _____ (1) Neck edge--within seam allowance of marked seamline
_____ (2) Shoulder, underarm, skirt, bodice and skirt waistline
_____ (3) Sleeve cap--on seamline, using longer stitch between notches
_____ (4) Other (specify) _____

29. Did you use an interfacing?

- _____ (1) Yes
_____ (2) No

30. If yes to question #29 above, in which area(s)? (check)

- _____ (1) Collars
_____ (2) Bodice neckline
_____ (3) Buttonhole and buttonhole areas
_____ (4) Other (specify) _____

31. When you made darts, did you: (check)

- _____ (1) Backstitch as you began to stitch the dart
_____ (2) Stitch from widest to the narrowest point
_____ (3) Tie threads at end of dart
_____ (4) Press dart over a pressing ham

32. Do you put zippers in garments?

- ☐ (1) Yes
☐ (2) No

33. Do you put zippers in by hand or machine?

- ☐ (1) Hand
☐ (2) Machine
☐ (3) Both ways

34. What are some of the characteristics you strive for in a zipper application?

- ☐ (1) Smooth and even lapping
☐ (2) Inconspicuous stitching
☐ (3) Suitable for style and type of garment

35. Do you trim (grade, layer, bevel) seams?

- ☐ (1) Yes
☐ (2) No

36. Do you clean-finish edges of facings?

- ☐ (1) Yes
☐ (2) No

37. As you made the garment, did you: (check)

- ☐ (1) Press each seam before it crossed another
☐ (2) Wait until garment was completed before doing any pressing

38. What pieces of pressing equipment do you use? (check)

- ☐ (1) Steam iron
☐ (2) Press cloth
☐ (3) Ham
☐ (4) Sleeve roll
☐ (5) Other (specify)

39. Did you understitch?

- ☐ (1) Yes
☐ (2) No

40. If answer to #39 is yes, what do you understitch? (check)

- ☐ (1) Neckline
☐ (2) Facings
☐ (3) Pockets

41. When you put in a hem, was it:

- ☐ (1) Even in width
☐ (2) Level from floor
☐ (3) Inconspicuously stitched
☐ (4) Any fullness eased evenly without pleats or tucks

42. We have listed on these cards some reasons why homemakers do not adopt recommended clothing construction practices.

- a. Please look through all the cards. Pick out the three (3) cards that show why you believe homemakers don't use recommended clothing practices. After you have selected the three (3) please hand me the rest.
- b. Now these three (3) reasons are not of the same importance. Please go through them and decide which one is probably of most importance. Give me the number on the back of that card. Also, do this with each of the remaining two cards.

RANK	1	2	3
CARD NO.			

GENERAL INFORMATION

43. Marital Status:

- ☐ (1) Single
☐ (2) Married
☐ (3) Other _____

44. Number of members in family:

- ☐ (1) Males (2) Ages _____
☐ (3) Females (4) Ages _____

45. Occupation of head of household: _____

46. Occupation of homemaker: _____

47. (Optional) Approximately what was your total family income last year.

- | | |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|
| _____ (1) 0-1,999 | _____ (9) 16,000-17,999 |
| _____ (2) 2,000-3,999 | _____ (10) 18,000-19,999 |
| _____ (3) 4,000-5,999 | _____ (11) 20,000-21,999 |
| _____ (4) 6,000-7,999 | _____ (12) 22,000-23,999 |
| _____ (5) 8,000-9,999 | _____ (13) 24,000-25,999 |
| _____ (6) 10,000-11,999 | _____ (14) 26,000-29,999 |
| _____ (7) 12,000-13,999 | _____ (15) 30,000-49,999 |
| _____ (8) 14,000-15,999 | _____ (16) 50,000-99,999 |

Name of Respondent _____ Address _____

County _____ Date _____ Number _____ H.D.C. _____

APPENDIX B

RATING SCALE OF PRACTICE ADOPTION

Question	Practices	Points
8	Keeping a written clothing plan	8
	Keeping an unwritten clothing plan	4
13	What interviewees looked for on labels and/or tags	
	Fiber content	2
	Special finishes	1
	Care instructions	3
	Shrinkage	1
	Colorfastness	1
17	Methods used by interviewees in selecting correct pattern size	
	Had body measurements taken	6
	Used ready-made garment size as guide	2
	Considered body type and measurements	8
24	How interviewees straightened fabric for cutting	
	Pulled threads	3
	Tore ends	2
	Straightened with moisture	8
	Straightened ends, pulled short corners	4
	Used edge of table as guide	3
26	Methods used in marking construction details	
	Tracing wheel and dressmaker carbon	4
	Tailor tacks	4
	Chalk	4
	Pencil	2
	Pins	2
28	Snip with scissors	1
	Areas staystitched	
	Neckedge	4
	Neckedge, shoulder, bodice seams	6
30	All above plus sleeve cap	8
	Areas interfacing was used	
	Collars	2
	Collars and bodice neckline	4

	Collars, bodice neckline, button and buttonhole area	6
	All above, cuffs, jacket hems	8
31	Methods used in making darts	
	Backstitching at beginning	1
	Stitching from wide to narrow edge	4
	Tying threads at end of dart	1
	Pressing on pressing ham	2
33-34	Methods in zipper application	
	Hand sewn	3
	Machine stitched	2
	Both hand and machine	5
	Smooth and even lapping	1
	Inconspicuously stitched	1
	Suitable for style of garment	1
35	Trimming (grading, layering, beveling) seams	
	Yes	8
	No	0
36	Cleanfinishing unnotched edges of facings	
	Yes	8
	No	0
37	Pressing practice of interviewees	
	Pressing each seam before it was crossed by another	8
	Waiting until garment was completed before pressing	0
39	Understitching	
	Yes	8
	No	0
41	Hem characteristics	
	Even in width	2
	Level from floor	2
	Inconspicuously stitched	2
	Fullness eased in evenly	2
	Total number of practices	14
	Total points per practice	8
	Total points possible	112