

PREPARATION, NEEDS, AND PRACTICES OF EXTENSION  
HOME ECONOMISTS IN CLOTHING AND TEXTILES  
SUBJECT MATTER AREA

By

NANCY ANN RUZICKA

Bachelor of Science in Home Economics

Oklahoma State University

Stillwater, Oklahoma

1978

Submitted to the Faculty of the Graduate College  
of the Oklahoma State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the Degree of  
MASTER OF SCIENCE  
December, 1979

Thesis

1979

R987p

cop. 2



PREPARATION, NEEDS, AND PRACTICES OF EXTENSION  
HOME ECONOMISTS IN CLOTHING AND TEXTILES  
SUBJECT MATTER AREA

Thesis Approved:

*Dorothy Siles*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Thesis Adviser

*Louonne Matern*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Elaine Jorgenson*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*Norman D. Burkham*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Dean of the Graduate College

1043051

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many people have been involved directly and indirectly with my graduate study. I would like to extend a grateful thank you to Dr. Grovalynn Sisler, my major thesis adviser, for her guidance and understanding during the study. Also, a special thank you goes to the other committee members, Dr. Lavonne Matern and Dr. Elaine Jorgenson, for their assistance.

My thanks and appreciation go to Marjorie Baker and Mary Lou Sadler for reviewing the questionnaire used in the study and for offering their suggestions. A thank you is also extended to Ladora Smith and Dr. William Taggart, for allowing me to distribute the questionnaire, and for their support of and enthusiasm for the study.

A final and very special thank you goes to the people closest to me--my friends, my fiancé, Gary Emberson, and especially to my parents, Mr. and Mrs. Rudy Ruzicka. Without their constant understanding, encouragement, and support, this study would not have been possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
Justification of the Study. . . . .	2
Purpose of the Study. . . . .	3
Definition of Terms . . . . .	4
II. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY. . . . .	5
Early Beginnings of the Extension Service . . . . .	5
Legislation Establishing the Extension Service. . . . .	6
Recent Developments in Extension. . . . .	7
Structure of Cooperative Extension. . . . .	8
National Level . . . . .	8
State Level. . . . .	9
County Level . . . . .	11
Extension Homemaker Groups and 4-H Clubs. . . . .	14
Previous Research . . . . .	16
Summary . . . . .	19
III. METHOD AND PROCEDURE . . . . .	21
The Sample. . . . .	21
The Instrument. . . . .	22
Collection of Data. . . . .	23
Analysis of Data. . . . .	23
IV. PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA. . . . .	24
Employment Background . . . . .	25
Extension District Representation. . . . .	25
Length of Employment in Position at Time of Study . . . . .	25
Home Economics Employment Experience . . . . .	27
County Clothing and Textiles Programs . . . . .	29
Groups With Which Respondents Work . . . . .	29
Long-Range Clothing and Textiles Programs. . . . .	30
Time Devoted to County Clothing and Textiles Programs . . . . .	31
Adult Leader Training. . . . .	31

Chapter	Page
Educational Background . . . . .	32
Academic Degrees Held . . . . .	33
Plans for Advanced Degrees . . . . .	35
Hours Beyond Last Degree Completed . . . . .	36
Colleges or Universities From Which Degrees Were Granted . . . . .	36
Major and Minor Courses of Study . . . . .	38
Clothing and Textiles Courses Taken . . . . .	40
Clothing and Textiles Courses Most Recently Taken . . . . .	42
Preferences for Updating Clothing and Tex- tiles Education . . . . .	48
Home Sewing Practices . . . . .	48
Requested Clothing and Textiles Information and Perceived Needs of the People Served . . . . .	50
Areas in Which the Greatest Number of Requests Were Indicated . . . . .	50
Perceived Needs of the People Served . . . . .	52
Success in Meeting the Perceived Needs of the People Served . . . . .	54
Adequacy of Educational Preparation . . . . .	54
Quality of Academic Preparation . . . . .	54
Competency for Instruction . . . . .	56
Needs for Instructional Assistance From State Clothing Specialists . . . . .	58
Resources and Methods Utilized in Presenting Cloth- ing and Textiles Instruction . . . . .	59
Resources Within the Extension Service . . . . .	59
Sources Other Than the Extension Service Uti- lized in Program Planning . . . . .	60
Methods of Presentation . . . . .	62
Comments of Participants . . . . .	64
Discussion of Instrument . . . . .	65
 V. SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . . .	 67
Conclusions . . . . .	71
Recommendations . . . . .	72
 BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	 74
 APPENDIX - CORRESPONDENCE AND QUESTIONNAIRE . . . . .	 76

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. District Representation in the Study. . . . .	26
II. Number of Years Respondents Had Been Employed in Position at Time of Study . . . . .	26
III. Home Economics Employment Experience of Respondents . . .	28
IV. Number of Groups With Which Respondents Met or for Which They Were Responsible . . . . .	30
V. Groups With Which Respondents Utilized Adult Leader Training. . . . .	32
VI. Dates of Degrees Granted to Respondents . . . . .	34
VII. Plans of Respondents for Furthering Their Educations. . .	35
VIII. Colleges and Universities From Which Degrees Were Granted . . . . .	37
IX. Major Courses of Study. . . . .	39
X. Minor Courses of Study. . . . .	41
XI. Clothing and Textiles Courses Taken in College. . . . .	43
XII. Most Recent Clothing and Textiles Courses Taken . . . . .	44
XIII. Dates of Most Recent Clothing and Textiles Courses Taken . . . . .	46
XIV. Clothing and Textiles Workshops Attended. . . . .	47
XV. Preferences for Updating Clothing and Textiles Education . . . . .	49
XVI. Areas in Which Respondents Received the Greatest Number of Requests . . . . .	51
XVII. More Important Needs of People Served as Perceived by the Respondents. . . . .	53
XVIII. Quality of Academic Preparation for Instruction in Clothing and Textiles . . . . .	55

Table	Page
XIX. Competencies for Instruction in Clothing and Textiles . . . . .	57
XX. Areas in Which Respondents Expressed a Need for Assistance From the State Clothing Specialists. . . . .	58
XXI. Resources Within the Extension Service Utilized for Planning County Clothing and Textiles Programs. . . . .	60
XXII. Sources Other Than the Extension Service Utilized in the County Clothing and Textiles Programs. . . . .	61
XXIII. Methods Utilized in the Presentation of Clothing and Textiles Information. . . . .	62



## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

Due to the diversity of fashions and fabrics, consumers continually have to make transitions between natural fibers and synthetic fibers and blends. New sewing techniques and clothing care procedures have to be learned by consumers in order to use the new fibers and fabrics successfully. Such transitions have caused problems for consumers, and they have sought assistance from extension home economists.

Nofflet (1960) conducted a study of home demonstration agents in Oklahoma with regard to their preparation for clothing and textiles instruction within the Cooperative Extension Service. Research was based on this philosophy:

The needs of county extension workers in the clothing and textile area of the extension service program can be met more effectively when those in a position to guide their training are aware of the training and other background experiences, practices, needs, and opinions of these agents (p. 11).

The purpose of Nofflet's (1960) study was to investigate the background and training of the home demonstration agents in clothing and textiles subject matter so that state clothing specialists and program planners might be provided with pertinent information to aid them in assisting home demonstration agents in their instruction of clothing and textiles.

Based on the results of her study, Nofflet (1960) recommended that the supervisors and clothing specialists give careful consideration to

the needs expressed by the home demonstration agents; that some plan be formulated for having all agents further their educations at regular intervals to improve their professional training; and that college courses in the area of clothing and textiles be examined to assure that the needs of the extension program were being met.

#### Justification of the Study

The clothing and textiles needs of consumers have changed since Nofflet's (1960) research was completed. New fabrics, styles, sewing techniques, and care products have emerged, and consumers who were once accustomed to sewing or purchasing garments of natural fibers were forced to learn about the upkeep of synthetic knit and woven fabrics. In 1979, the trend toward the use of natural fibers once again may produce problems for consumers. They may not be aware of proper care techniques, sewing practices, or wearing qualities of garments made of 100 percent natural fibers. In addition, woven fabrics not only of natural fibers but of synthetics and blends can create problems for consumers who have constructed garments primarily from knitted fabrics in the past. It was essential, therefore, that the preparation of home economists in this subject area be reassessed so that they could be provided with the information they need to assist consumers in their counties.

The clothing specialists at Oklahoma State University have indicated a need for improvement in the area of clothing and textiles in extension. Due to the number of years since Nofflet's (1960) study, current data are necessary in order to evaluate the clothing and textiles programs as they are being conducted within the Oklahoma

Cooperative Extension Service. By comparing the results indicated in the previous study with the current results, changes or consistent weak points may be observed. Extension program planners, state clothing specialists, and college instructors will have a better idea of problem areas in presenting clothing and textiles subject matter.

#### Purpose of the Study

The general purpose of the study was to determine the training, experience, practices, and needs of extension home economists in regard to clothing and textiles subject matter and to update information collected in Nofflet's (1960) study. A comparison of the results of both studies was made to determine changes over the past 19 years.

Specific objectives for the study were:

To investigate the county Cooperative Extension clothing and textiles programs.

To investigate the educational background and previous experience of the extension home economists.

To identify the areas of requests for clothing and textiles information and perceived needs of the people served by the extension home economists.

To determine the opinions of extension home economists with regard to the adequacy of their educational preparation and their competency levels for clothing and textiles instruction.

To determine the needs of extension home economists for instructional assistance from the state clothing specialists.

To determine the resources and instructional methods employed by extension home economists in the presentation of clothing and textiles information.

To compare data from the current study with data collected in Nofflet's (1960) study.

#### Definition of Terms

Clothing Specialist - A home economist trained in the area of clothing and textiles whose role is to provide educational leadership in the Cooperative Extension Service (Bliss, 1952).

Cooperative Extension Service - A nationwide, tax-supported organization for informal education in cooperative agreement between the land-grant colleges and the United States Department of Agriculture (Kelsey, 1963).

Extension Home Economist - A county extension employee, trained in all aspects of home economics (Kelsey, 1963).

Extension Homemaker Groups - Groups of women who take part locally in activities sponsored by the Cooperative Extension Service, previously referred to as home demonstration clubs ("Cooperative Extension Service--Born From a Need of People," 1976).

Home Demonstration Agent - The term used in the past for extension home economist (Bliss, 1952).

## CHAPTER II

### BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The Cooperative Extension Service is an associative agreement between the land-grant colleges and universities and the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) to provide communication between the USDA and the people of the United States. Through its services, practical information on subjects relating to agriculture and home economics is diffused ("Cooperative Extension Service--Born From a Need of People," 1976). An extension service is located in every state, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and within the USDA. The basic laws from which extension has grown provide an understanding of the service and its organization, but no specific law or incident created the Cooperative Extension Service.

#### Early Beginnings of the Extension Service

Seaman A. Knapp has been referred to as the "Father of the Extension Service." He summed up the basic idea of the service with this statement: "What a man hears, he may doubt; what he sees, he may possibly doubt; but what he does, he cannot doubt" ("Cooperative Extension Service--Born From a Need of People," 1976, p. 3). Knapp was a USDA employee in southern Louisiana circa 1900, and was helping to develop rice production in that area. By using one farm in each township for a demonstration farm, the area farmers had an example to

follow in raising their own rice crops. At about the same time, the boll weevil had moved into Texas from Mexico and was attacking the cotton crops. Knapp, in 1903, helped establish demonstration farms in Texas to aid the farmers in combating the boll weevil ("Cooperative Extension Service--Born From a Need of People," 1976). These and other such agricultural demonstrations throughout the nation as far back as the 1850's provided the foundation for the Cooperative Extension Service as it is recognized today.

The General Education Board in 1906 presented Knapp with one million dollars to extend his farm demonstration work, and more than one million dollars was donated by local businessmen, equipment companies, and tax units in addition to limited funds provided by the USDA. At last a dream had come true and he was able to start a network of government agents in each county of the nation.

#### Legislation Establishing the Extension Service

Abraham Lincoln signed the Morrill Act in 1862, creating the system of land-grant colleges (Kelsey, 1963). Grants of 11 million acres of land were provided so that at least one college per state could be established and maintained. The main objective was to teach branches of education related to agriculture and the mechanical arts. Congress passed the Hatch Act in 1887 to appropriate \$15,000 for every state to establish an experiment station at which agricultural research could be conducted. Further support for land-grant colleges was stipulated by the second Morrill Act, passed in 1890. Federal funds were to be applied only for instruction in agriculture, the mechanical arts, and English (Kelsey, 1963).

Senator Hoke K. Smith of Georgia and Representative Asbury F. Lever of South Carolina presented the bill that made the extension service an educational arm of the USDA in 1914. President Woodrow Wilson signed the bill, making extension a nationwide system funded and guided through a three-way partnership among federal, state, and local governments. A three-fold plan to teach, conduct research, and apply the research through extension was the method by which people would be helped to help themselves through the land-grant university system.

#### Recent Developments in Extension

Continuous renewal is essential if an organization is to be viable and effective (Schaller, 1978). Three related developments have caused a need for structural improvement in the extension service. First, more people and organizations look to the extension service for assistance. With more complex problems from a large and varied clientele, extension personnel have had to expand their skills to meet the educational needs of the public.

A second reason for renewal is due to the passage of Title XIV of the Food and Agriculture Act of 1977. Title XIV not only reemphasized the previously authorized extension programs but encouraged new initiatives. Third, the approval of certain changes made the Science and Education Administration (SEA) a strong support for the Cooperative Extension Service (Schaller, 1978). Previously, there had been four program units within extension: agriculture and natural resources, home economics; community resource development, and 4-H youth

development. Those four units were changed into six units: agriculture, natural resources, family education, rural development, 4-H development, and food and nutrition.

The Cooperative Extension Service has grown into the largest informal educational movement in the United States (Bliss, 1952). The aim of the extension service, according to Kelsey (1963, p. 36), is to "help families use their own resources of science, education, government, and society to develop useful and satisfactory lives." Extension personnel are faced with the role of hastening changes leading to progress, and in order for the extension programs to be successful, special training is necessary.

#### Structure of Cooperative Extension

The Cooperative Extension Service is designed to include agricultural and home economics education, and has three major levels: national, state, and county. Each has an organizational pattern adapted to its particular functions. Administrative, supervisory, and educational services are provided at each level.

#### National Level

Duties of extension service personnel at the national level include interpreting and preparing USDA resources for use by state extension personnel; interpreting area, national, and international situations; obtaining and organizing cooperation and support of regional and national groups; approving state extension directors; approving projects that involve federal and federal-offset funds; and informing the public about state extension programs.



## State Level

The extension service at the state level was organized to perform tasks which cannot be readily or easily done at the national or county level. State specialists provide assistance with teaching methods, presentation of information, and specialized subject matter information. They may aid directors and county extension agents in procedural work, but their main responsibility lies in solving problems scientifically. The specialists originate teaching methods and devices and prepare written materials for extension home economists, county agents, and leaders. According to the specialists at the Northwest Specialist Workshop in Pullman, Washington held in October, 1947:

The specialist has one job in program development; that job is helping the agents. He can do this by assisting in obtaining background information on the community, county, state, and national levels, helping in interpreting this information and acting as a consultant at program planning and committee meetings (Kelsey, 1963, p. 103).

Basic qualifications for the state specialists are the same as for extension agents, although some additional requirements must be met. A doctoral degree is preferred, with a minimum educational requirement of a master's degree in the designated subject matter area or a closely related area. The person should be able to teach effectively in order to assist agents in organizing and developing programs, applying effective teaching techniques, and evaluating his own and county programs. The specialist must also be able to cooperate with others so that he may analyze his field of study in relation to the total agricultural and home economics program, and in order to successfully correlate his work with that of the other extension personnel. An

interest in people of various ages and socioeconomic levels is necessary to effectively promote educational programs which will meet the needs of all people. The ability to speak and write effectively aids in the presentation of ideas through bulletins, reports, and other methods readily understood by the public. Previous experience in continuing education, Cooperative Extension, or other public service positions is also desirable.

Reisbeck (1974) found that substantial differences exist in the way subject matter specialists and county directors perceive the role expectations of the specialists. County staff members are involved continuously in planning and presentation procedures for the many programs developed throughout the year. Five distinct phases within those procedures were outlined and defined as possible role titles of state specialists. According to Reisbeck (1974), the specialists could provide services in each of the planning stages, and it was his intention to determine in what order county extension directors and state specialists would rank the five role perceptions.

The determination of needs is the beginning phase in which the needs, wants, and opportunities of county residents are considered. Resource allocation involves considering the character of programs planned in relation to the availability of human and material resources required for implementing the programs. The target audience for which the programs are planned must be determined and then contacted to generate interest in the programs during the program selling stage. The instruction of programs, or program presentation, refers to the actual gathering of county residents in which the program is

presented, and program evaluation is concerned with determining the effects of the program in regard to meeting an educational goal resulting in audience change.

Resource allocation duties were identified by both groups as the major role of the specialists. County extension directors indicated that state specialists should set their priorities in the following order: resource allocation, program selling, program teaching, program evaluation, and need determination. However, the specialists tended to visualize their roles as program evaluators, need determiners, program teachers, and program sellers, with resource allocation as their major role (Reisbeck, 1974).

State specialists in home economics are highly trained in a designated subject matter area. Their basic duty is to strengthen the home economists' leadership in helping youth and adults reach their objectives. Major responsibilities include program planning, keeping educational materials current, keeping up to date on scientific findings in specialized areas and innovative teaching methods, evaluating the county programs, and cooperating within their department and within the Division of Home Economics. For professional improvement, they are encouraged to become involved in advanced study, short courses, workshops, in-service education, professional meetings, independent study, and travel.

#### County Level

The extension service at the county level has responsibilities for directing county work in accordance with the state extension service.

Tasks include determining programs, approving personnel and plans, determining budgets, providing local funding necessary to finance the program, and carrying out previously agreed upon plans. Most of the program planning, teaching, and evaluation is done by the county extension staff members. Each office is staffed with a county extension director and/or an extension home economist, and some county offices have a person responsible solely for the 4-H program.

County extension agents comprise the most important group within the extension service. They officially represent the state land-grant universities and the USDA, and are in the position to study the problems and serve the needs of some 2,000 families in the average county (Kelsey, 1963). The extension agents are responsible for teaching facts and concepts about agriculture and home economics. The agents must be aware of the social and economic changes taking place and how they affect the lives of the people served. Because extension is a voluntary form of education, the extension agent's success is measured by the degree of confidence the people have in him (Kelsey, 1963).

Qualifications for county extension agents are divided into three broad categories: background and experience, training, and personal characteristics (Kelsey, 1963). A rural background with experience as a farm operator, homemaker, or past 4-H membership is desirable. Teaching experience is helpful, as is general experience in working with the public. The minimum educational requirement is a bachelor's degree from a recognized institution, and continuing education is necessary for promotions to advanced positions (Cooperative Extension Service, 1972a). Desirable personal characteristics include leadership, clear

and systematic thinking, effective speaking, tact, enthusiasm, faith, and integrity (Kelsey, 1963).

The county extension agent's duty is to be an organizer and teacher. Organization requires aggressiveness, while teaching requires patient and gentle direction in order to encourage self-expression and action. County agents partially write the programs for their counties, but the best programs are those which have been produced as the result of committee research findings, statements, and practices suggested from a variety of sources (Kelsey, 1963). It is to the advantage of the extension agent to utilize as many resource persons as possible in order to improve the quality of programs produced.

Thompson (1967) reported that administrators within the Cooperative Extension Service have recognized that many skills and abilities are needed by extension home economists to successfully organize and implement their programs. They supported the need for in-service training as one method of helping extension personnel broaden their educations. Studies of the academic preparation of extension personnel indicated that those who had graduated from college with a bachelor's degree in agriculture or home economics had done so 12 to 20 years prior to Thompson's (1967) study. Therefore, she indicated that those personnel had been prepared mainly for the traditional extension programs of farm and home production. They had not been especially educated to develop competencies which would aid them in broadening the educational programs they presented to county residents. Thompson (1967) further identified the competencies extension home economists

need for organizing programs as utilizing resources, making arrangements, coordinating programs, and involving as well as working with other people in the program.

Extension home economists are responsible for adult home economics education and/or 4-H youth development programs. Other leaders within the county and state are involved in program planning and in implementing the programs to meet the local needs of the people in such areas as clothing and textiles, consumer education, foods and nutrition, family relations and family life, housing and equipment, community development, and home management. The home economist serves as a teacher of home economics and related areas; develops, implements, and evaluates family living programs; informs other professional home economists in regard to research and new subject-matter information; assists with the organization and integration of the total extension program; trains extension home economists during induction; and cooperates with other staff members in developing and implementing programs. A minimum of a bachelor's degree in home economics is required, but a master's degree is desirable. Personal characteristics include sufficient knowledge of human relations to aid in teaching and motivating people; knowledge and appreciation of family living problems; and the personal appearance, manner, and home life which reflect the application of sound teaching (Kelsey, 1963).

#### Extension Homemaker Groups and 4-H Clubs

The extension homemaker groups and 4-H youth clubs with which home economists work stemmed from canning clubs inspired by Seaman Knapp's

demonstration work in agriculture ("Cooperative Extension Service--Born From a Need of People," 1976). He planned, as a specific project for girls, something that would teach them housewifely art as well as give them instruction in agriculture. He decided upon growing and canning tomatoes, and in 1910, girls formed clubs in which gardens were grown and canning was taught. This was the forerunner of 4-H clubs.

Instruction in growing and canning tomatoes for girls extended one step further to include the instruction of their mothers in areas of cooking, sewing, and home beautification, and in 1913 extension work branched out to include adult education. The homemakers formed home demonstration clubs which spread throughout the southern states and into the northern states.

Leaders of such clubs were known as home demonstration agents and they became increasingly popular during World War I due to the Federal War Emergency Fund. In cooperation with the agricultural agents, they put forth efforts to increase food production and conservation during the war. At the close of the war, additional funding made it possible for the home demonstration and agricultural agents to continue their work.

By 1933, more than a million women and girls were members of home demonstration and 4-H clubs, respectively ("Cooperative Extension Service--Born From a Need of People," 1976). During World War II a magnificent task was performed by home demonstration agents and the women and girls with whom they worked. Food conservation was stressed and women in cities, towns, and villages joined the Women's Land Army to harvest vegetables and fruits. The 4-H youth did their share by

collecting scrap metal to help the war effort. By the end of the war, farmers had a surplus of food, and extension had helped to overcome the strife.

By the fifties, 4-H had added a new phase, special interest groups, which is one of the fastest growing areas of 4-H today. They represent an example of the growth of the 4-H program since its beginnings of corn clubs for boys and canning clubs for girls. More than seven million youth are challenged throughout America to build a better America (USDA, 1975). Half a million adult and teen volunteers as well as some 4,000 professional extension workers in every state, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the the District of Columbia guide 4-H members in developing life skills.

#### Previous Research

Previous research in regard to clothing and textiles in the Cooperative Extension Service was conducted by Nofflet (1960). The purpose of her study was to investigate the background experiences, practices, needs, and opinions of home demonstration agents in the area of clothing and textiles. Her intent was to inform clothing specialists and other extension program planners of the needs of the county home economists.

The researcher communicated directly with the home demonstration agents through a questionnaire designed to collect information on the five aspects of the research problem:

Opinions of the home demonstration agents in regard to the adequacy of their clothing and textiles knowledge.

Areas in which the home demonstration agents felt a need for further instruction.



Attitudes and beliefs of home demonstration agents toward the entire clothing and textiles program.

The county clothing and textiles program as it was being conducted at the time of the study.

Educational and employment backgrounds of the home demonstration agents.

The questionnaire was mailed to 71 county home demonstration agents who were employed by the Oklahoma extension service, and who had been employed in their respective positions for at least one year as of April 1, 1960. Information was tabulated from 59 home demonstration agents representing 76.6 percent of the counties in Oklahoma. The findings were analyzed with simple summations, frequency distributions, percentages, and means.

The home demonstration agents, when asked about their preparation for instruction in clothing and textiles, more often rated it good to superior than inadequate. In three areas--construction techniques, care and upkeep of clothing, and posture and grooming--90 percent of the sample indicated good to superior preparation. Most rated their academic preparation in current textile legislation insufficient.

In another study, Webb (1978) determined that home economists and homemakers who were asked to interpret the textile care and labeling rule had little knowledge of its actual meaning. The homemakers answered as many questions correctly about the textile care labeling rule as did the home economists. Only one-third of the home economists had taken textiles courses after July, 1972, when the rule was passed. Sources of textile care labeling rule information utilized by the majority of home economists who participated in the study were Forecast

magazine, bulletins from the state clothing specialists, information from commercial companies, and popular periodicals.

In Nofflet's (1960) study, the areas in which the home demonstration agents expressed a need for further assistance were varied. Although a majority had expressed superior preparation in clothing construction, the most commonly mentioned need for assistance was also in that area. Specific needs listed included seam finishes, tailoring, linings, accessories, sewing equipment, and attachments for sewing machines. A majority of the agents expressed a need for aid in consumer education.

Nofflet ascertained that the attitudes and beliefs of the home demonstration agents in regard to the entire clothing and textiles program depended upon the background and preparation for the program. Those agents whose study had been in the area of clothing prior to employment may have been more inclined to put more emphasis on that area in their county program. In addition, they may have been more aware of the methods of preparation and presentation of the clothing and textiles program.

The average number of home demonstration clubs per county at the time of Nofflet's (1960) study was 21, with a range of seven to 65 clubs. An average of 18 4-H clubs per county under the supervision of the home demonstration agents were indicated, with a range of zero to 46. More than 50 percent of the agents indicated that they had long-range clothing and textiles programs. The average period of time that had been devoted to the program during the previous year was 10 weeks, with a range of three to 34 weeks.

Analysis of the employment backgrounds of the respondents indicated that 27 percent had been employed in the same position between five and ten years. Fifty-four percent had been employed as home demonstration agents for 10 years or longer; 42 percent had been assistant home demonstration agents for an average of 11 months; 61 percent had been home economics teachers; and 15 percent had been home economists in related positions.

In regard to the educational preparation of the respondents, 58 percent had bachelor's degrees that had been granted between 1920 and 1960. Forty-six percent had taken graduate work, and 42 percent had earned master's degrees. Ninety-three percent of the home demonstration agents indicated that they had attended Oklahoma State University at some time, 56 percent had attended other state-supported colleges in Oklahoma, 21 percent had attended Oklahoma University, 16 percent had attended private and denominational colleges in Oklahoma, and 16 percent had attended out-of-state colleges and universities.

#### Summary

The Cooperative Extension Service has evolved from the idea of one man. Seaman A. Knapp, the "Father of the Extension Service" instigated demonstration farms in the southern states circa 1900 to provide farmers with guides they could follow in producing their own crops. As that practice grew, funding became available from a variety of sources, including the federal government. Knapp was then able to place a government agent in every county in the United States to aid farmers in producing their crops.

Legislation was involved in the early beginnings of the extension service. In 1914 Senator Hoke K. Smith of Georgia and Representative Asbury F. Lever of South Carolina presented the bill that made the extension service an educational part of the USDA. The three-fold plan for teaching, conducting research, and applying research through extension was the method by which people would learn to help themselves through the educational system funded by federal, state, and local government.

Relatively little research has been done in regard to the needs, experience, and training of extension home economists who give instruction in clothing and textiles subject matter. In 1960, Nofflet conducted a study to determine that information, Thompson (1967) conducted research in regard to home economists and the competencies they have acquired for planning programs, and Webb (1978) conducted a study to determine the knowledge of homemakers and extension home economists with regard to the textile care and labeling rule. Since 1960 no studies have been conducted to determine the experience, training, and needs of extension home economists in clothing and textiles subject matter.

## CHAPTER III

### METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The purpose of the study was to determine the training, experience, practices, and needs of extension home economists in regard to clothing and textiles subject matter. The results were analyzed and compared with the finding of Nofflet (1960) when such comparisons could be made. This was done to determine the changes that have occurred within the past 19 years. Data were collected by using a questionnaire similar to that used by Nofflet (1960).

#### The Sample

A survey of extension home economists employed by the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service was conducted. A total of 77 questionnaires were mailed, one per county. Home economists to be included in the study were those who had been in their present positions for at least one year as of May 1, 1979 and worked exclusively with adult groups or with adult and youth groups. Sixty-nine (89.6%) of the questionnaires were completed and returned to the researcher. Eight (11.6%) of the participants were not eligible for consideration because they had not been employed in the positions held at the time of the study for at least one year as of May 1, 1979. This resulted in 61 questionnaires which were tabulated and used in the study. Not

every participant responded to every question, so the percentages for each item were based on the number responding.

Nofflet (1960) tabulated data from 59 questionnaires representing 76.6 percent of the Oklahoma counties. Questionnaires from the remaining 18 counties (23.4%) were not used because they were returned incomplete or because the respondents did not meet the requirements for consideration in the study.

Permission to distribute the questionnaires in the current study was obtained from Dr. W. F. Taggart, Administrator of the Extension Division. At the opening session of the Oklahoma Association of Extension Home Economists meeting May 3, 1979, Dr. Taggart announced the study and encouraged the extension home economists who would be receiving the questionnaire to participate in the study.

#### The Instrument

Due to the nature of the study, it was necessary to use Nofflet's (1960) instrument as a base. However, some of the questions were rewritten for clarity, some were added to collect additional data, and the questions were rearranged into a more logical sequence for data analysis (see Appendix). Specific questions dealt with the employment background of the participants, the county clothing and textiles programs, the educational background of the participants, the clothing and textiles information requested by and the perceived needs of the people served, the quality of the educational preparation of the participants, the needs for instructional assistance from the state clothing specialists, and the resources utilized in presenting clothing and textiles information.

The questionnaire was reviewed by two former extension home economists, one extension home economist who was employed by the Arkansas Cooperative Extension Service at the time of the study, and by the state clothing specialists. Revisions were made accordingly, before the instrument was distributed to the sample.

#### Collection of Data

A cover letter explaining the research was mailed with each questionnaire. Seventy-seven questionnaires were mailed May 4, 1979, with a due date of May 18, 1979. A few days prior to that date, a postcard was sent to the extension home economists who had not returned the questionnaire, reminding them to do so. None were received later than June 1, 1979.

#### Analysis of Data

Findings of the study were analyzed by use of summations, frequency distributions, percentages and means. Tables were utilized to present the results. To determine the changes in results reported in the current study and Nofflet's (1960) study, a visual comparison was made.

## CHAPTER IV

### PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The purpose of the study was to determine the training, experience, practices, and needs of extension home economists with regard to clothing and textiles subject matter. The data presented in this chapter were analyzed and compared with Nofflet's (1960) findings when such comparisons could be made. This was done to determine changes that have occurred in the training, experience, practices, and needs of extension home economists since the initial study was conducted.

The sample consisted of 61 extension home economists employed by the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service to work exclusively with adult groups or with adult and youth groups. They had been in their present positions for at least one year as of May 1, 1979.

The findings were presented according to the groups of data collected: the employment background of the participants the county clothing and textiles programs, the educational background of the participants, the clothing and textiles information requested by and the perceived needs of the people served, the quality of the educational preparation of the participants, the need for instructional assistance from the state clothing specialists, and the resources utilized in presenting clothing and textiles instruction. Numerical tabulations and percentages were used to interpret and present the



current data which is included in this chapter. In addition, the findings from Nofflet's (1960) study have been compared with findings from the current study when possible.

### Employment Background

Information about the employment background of the respondents was obtained. This included districts in which the respondents were employed, the length of time they had been employed there, and the length of time they had been employed in various home economics positions.

#### Extension District Representation

The state of Oklahoma is divided into five districts with the home economists working directly under the district supervisor. Results of the study were not tabulated according to district, but as an entity throughout the state. However, to present the district representation in the study, Table I was included.

#### Length of Employment in Position at Time of Study

The participants were asked to record the number of years they had been employed in the position they held at the time of the study. Results showed a range of from one to 29 years for an average of eight years. Three-fourths of the participants had held their present positions for nine years or less. Specific results are shown in Table II.

TABLE I  
DISTRICT REPRESENTATION IN THE STUDY  
(N=61)

District	N	%
Central	14	23.0
Northwest	13	21.3
Southwest	13	21.3
Northeast	12	19.7
Southeast	9	14.8
Totals	61	100.1 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Exceeds 100 percent due to rounding.

TABLE II  
NUMBER OF YEARS RESPONDENTS HAD BEEN  
EMPLOYED IN POSITION AT TIME  
OF STUDY (N=61)

Years Employed	N	%
1 through 4	17	27.9
5 through 9	29	47.5
10 through 14	7	11.5
15 through 19	2	3.3
20 through 24	4	6.6
25 through 29	2	3.3
Totals	61	100.1 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Exceeds 100 percent due to rounding.

Results of Nofflet's (1960) study showed that 29 percent of the respondents had been employed as home demonstration agents for less than five years; 29 percent had been employed between five and nine years; and 47.8 percent had been employed 10 years or longer in the positions they held at the time of the study. The average tenure indicated was eight and one-half years.

By comparison, a majority of respondents in both studies, 75.4 percent in the current study and 58 percent in Nofflet's (1960) study, had been in their present positions nine years or less. In 1960, however, almost one-half of the respondents had been in their present positions 10 years or longer compared with only one-fourth in the current study. The average tenure in both studies was approximately eight years.

#### Home Economics Employment Experience

The participants were asked to indicate their home economics employment experience according to the number of years they had been employed as extension home economists, as home economics teachers, and/or as home economists in positions other than teaching or extension. Table III indicates the results.

The majority of respondents in the current study (93%) had been employed as home economists to work with adult and youth groups, and 50 percent had experience in working with youth groups only and/or with adult groups only. Nofflet (1960) indicated the average number of years the home demonstration agents had previously been employed as home demonstration agents only, as assistants only, as home economics teachers, and as home economists in areas other than extension or

teaching. Because of a change in position titles within the Cooperative Extension Service, slightly different categories were used in the present study. Therefore, an accurate comparison was possible for only the two categories which appeared in both studies. They were home economics teachers and home economists in areas other than teaching or extension. The average number of years in which the respondents had been home economics teachers prior to employment with extension had increased by three years in the current study. There was also an increase of 7.6 years in the average number of years the respondents in the current study had been employed as home economists in areas other than extension or teaching.

TABLE III  
HOME ECONOMICS EMPLOYMENT EXPERI-  
ENCE OF RESPONDENTS  
(N=60)

Position	N	%	Range (Years)	Mean (Years)
Home Economist, Adults and Youth	56	93.3	1½-28	8.5
Home Economist, Youth Only	17	28.3	1-10	3.4
Home Economist, Adults Only	13	21.7	1-25	7.9
Home Economics Teacher	11	18.3	½-25	6.0
Home Economist (Other) <sup>a</sup>	3	5.0	1½-15	8.8

<sup>a</sup>The other positions specified were with utility companies.

## County Clothing and Textiles Programs

A specific objective of the current study was to determine the practices of the extension home economists in regard to the county clothing and textiles programs as they were being conducted at the time of the study. To meet that objective, the respondents were questioned about the number and types of groups with which they worked, the amount of time they devoted to the clothing and textiles programs in their counties, and their utilization of adult leader training.

### Groups With Which Respondents Work

The participants were asked to indicate the number of groups with which they met or for which they were responsible in regard to clothing and textiles subject matter instruction. The 59 respondents who answered this question indicated the number of extension homemaker groups, 4-H clubs, or other groups with which they worked. The other groups identified by the respondents were Headstart, TOPS, 1890 programs, church groups, study groups, community effort groups, special interest groups, and the general public. The results are shown in Table IV.

Nofflet (1960) indicated an average of 21 home demonstration clubs per home demonstration agent with a range of seven to 65 clubs; an average of 18 4-H clubs per home demonstration agent with a range of zero to 46 clubs; and a total of 46 other clubs. The other clubs were not specified, and no ranges or averages were indicated. The averages and ranges of extension homemaker groups and 4-H clubs with

which the respondents were working at the time of the current study indicated that there had been a slight decrease in the average number of extension homemaker groups and 4-H clubs within the past 19 years.

TABLE IV  
NUMBER OF GROUPS WITH WHICH RESPONDENTS  
MET OR FOR WHICH THEY WERE  
RESPONSIBLE  
(N=59)

Groups	N <sup>a</sup>	%	Number of Groups (Range)	Mean Number of Groups
Extension Homemaker Groups	59	100.0	5-50	17.1
4-H Clubs	46	78.0	4-31	13.8
Other Groups	14	23.7	1-300	25.3

<sup>a</sup>Number of home economists who worked with each type of group.

### Long-Range Clothing and Textiles

#### Programs

The participants were asked to indicate whether they had long-range clothing and textiles programs within their counties at the time of the study. The majority of respondents (77%) indicated that they did have long-range clothing and textiles programs. The results of Nofflet's (1960) study showed that only 55.9 percent of the home

demonstration agents indicated long-range clothing programs. By comparison, 22 percent more counties had long-range clothing and textiles programs in 1979 than in 1960.

#### Time Devoted to County Clothing and Textiles Programs

The participants were asked to approximate the number of weeks during the year preceding the study that they had devoted to the entire clothing and textiles programs in their counties. Tabulations from 58 of the respondents indicated that from one to 18 weeks had been spent on the county clothing and textiles programs throughout the state for an average of 5.1 weeks. The results of Nofflet's (1960) study indicated that in 1960 approximately twice as much time had been devoted to the county clothing programs. The range indicated by the respondents in 1960 was three to 34 weeks for an average of 10 weeks.

#### Adult Leader Training

The participants were asked to indicate whether they utilized adult leader training in clothing and textiles with extension home-maker groups, with 4-H clubs, and/or with any other groups for which they were responsible or with whom they worked, and to specify the number of groups within each category with which they used adult leader training. All 61 respondents indicated the utilization of adult leader training in at least one of the three groups. Responses are shown in Table V.

TABLE V  
 GROUPS WITH WHICH RESPONDENTS UTILIZED  
 ADULT LEADER TRAINING  
 (N=61)

Groups	N	%
Extension Homemaker Groups	59	96.7
4-H Clubs	47	77.0
Other Groups <sup>a</sup>	10	16.4

<sup>a</sup>Including workshops, special interest groups, Head-start, TOPS, young homemaker groups, low-income families, and non-extension homemakers.

Nofflet (1960) indicated that 94.9 percent of the respondents at the time of her study utilized adult leader training in their clothing programs for home demonstration clubs, and 62.7 percent utilized adult leader training in the 4-H clothing program. No other groups were specified in which adult leader training was used. In comparing Nofflet's (1960) findings with current data, there is very little difference in the use of adult leader training with adult groups; however, adult leader training is currently used more with 4-H clubs.

#### Educational Background

One of the objectives of the study was to determine the educational training of the participants at the time of the study. The information requested included the academic degrees held by the respondents and the colleges or universities from which they had been



granted, intentions of the respondents for working toward advanced degrees, college courses they had taken, clothing and textiles workshops they had attended, their preferences for updating their educations, and the amount of home-sewing they did for themselves or family members.

#### Academic Degrees Held

The participants were asked to list the academic degrees they held at the time of the study and the dates they were granted. Sixty-one participants responded to this question, and 96.7 percent of them indicated having bachelor's degrees that had been granted between 1935 and 1977. Nofflet (1960) indicated that 98.4 percent of the respondents in her study had received bachelor's degrees between 1920 and 1960. With the exception of the dates the degrees had been granted, the results of both studies were comparable.

Twenty-one respondents in the current study (34.4%) indicated that they had received master's degrees between 1957 and 1978. Nofflet (1960) indicated that 42.4 percent of the respondents had earned master's degrees between 1932 and 1960; therefore, eight percent fewer extension home economists held master's degrees at the time of the current study than at the time of the study in 1960. Table VI indicates the number of degrees earned as well as the dates they were earned, in five year increments.

The majority of respondents, 52.5 percent, received their bachelor's degrees between 1965 and 1974. Nineteen percent of those have since obtained master's degrees. During the 10 years immediately

preceding the current study, 42 percent of the respondents had received bachelor's degrees, whereas fewer than one-fourth of the respondents in Nofflet's (1960) study had received bachelor's degrees during the 10 years preceding that study.

TABLE VI  
DATES OF DEGREES GRANTED TO RESPONDENTS  
(N=61)

Dates	Bachelor's Degree		Master's Degree	
	N	%	N	%
1935 to 1939	1	1.7		
1940 to 1944	2	3.4		
1945 to 1949	2	3.4		
1950 to 1954	5	8.5		
1955 to 1959	4	6.8	3	14.3
1960 to 1964	9	15.3		
1965 to 1969	11	18.6	5	23.8
1970 to 1974	20	33.9	5	23.8
1975 to 1979	<u>5</u>	<u>8.5</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>38.1</u>
Totals	59 <sup>a</sup>	100.1 <sup>b</sup>	21	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Only 59 respondents indicated having bachelor's degrees, and two indicated master's degrees but no bachelor's degrees.

<sup>b</sup>Exceeds 100 percent due to rounding.

### Plans for Advanced Degrees

The participants were asked to indicate their intentions in regard to furthering their educations. Fifty-five responded to this question. The results are presented in Table VII, and have been recorded according to the degrees held at the time of the study.

TABLE VII  
PLANS OF RESPONDENTS FOR FURTHERING  
THEIR EDUCATIONS  
(N=55)

Plans	Participants With Bachelor's Degree		Participants with Master's Degree		Total <sup>a</sup>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Currently Working Toward an Advanced Degree	17	30.9	3	5.5	20	36.4
Planning to Work Toward an Advanced Degree	13	23.6	3	5.5	16	29.1
No Plans for Furthering Education	7	12.7	11	20	18	32.7
Indecisive	<u>1</u>	<u>1.8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.8</u>
Totals	38	69.0	17	30.8	55	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Percentages based on total number responding to the item.

As indicated in Table VII, 54.5 percent of the respondents with bachelor's degrees were either working toward an advanced degree or

planning to at the time of the study. Of those respondents who had no plans for furthering their educations, the majority already held master's degrees.

Of the 20 respondents who were working toward advanced degrees, 18 (90%) were working toward them at Oklahoma State University, one at Southwestern Oklahoma State University, and one at Oklahoma University.

#### Hours Beyond Last Degree Completed

The participants were asked to indicate the number of academic hours they had completed beyond the last degree they held. The sixty who responded indicated a range of zero to 32 hours for an average of 9.7 hours. Twenty percent of the total had completed no hours beyond their last degree. Forty (66.6%) respondents who had completed additional hours held bachelor's degrees, while the remaining 33.3 percent held master's degrees.

#### Colleges or Universities From Which Degrees Were Granted

The participants were asked to indicate the colleges and universities from which they had received their degrees. Fifty-nine (96.7%) indicated where they had received their bachelor's degrees, and 19 (31.1%) indicated where they had received their master's degrees. The findings are recorded in Table VIII.

The results indicate that 55.9 percent of the bachelor's degrees and 63.2 percent of the master's degrees were earned at Oklahoma State

University. Fifty-seven percent of all the degrees indicated were earned from Oklahoma State University.

TABLE VIII  
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES FROM WHICH  
DEGREES WERE GRANTED

Schools	Bachelor's		Master's		Totals	
	N	% <sup>a</sup>	N	% <sup>b</sup>	N	%
Oklahoma State University	33	55.9	12	63.2	45	57.7
Other State-Supported Universities in Oklahoma	16	27.1	6	31.6	22	28.2
Out-of-State Universities	5	8.5	1	5.3	6	7.7
Private and Denominational Colleges in Oklahoma	4	6.8			4	5.1
Oklahoma University	<u>1</u>	<u>1.7</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>—</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1.3</u>
Totals	59	100.0	19	100.1 <sup>c</sup>	78	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Based on number of respondents who held bachelor's degrees at the time of the study.

<sup>b</sup>Based on number of respondents who held master's degrees at the time of the study.

<sup>c</sup>Exceeds 100 percent due to rounding.

Nofflet (1960) indicated the colleges and universities which the participants in her study had attended rather than from which they had received their degrees. The majority (93.2%) indicated that they had

attended Oklahoma State University; 55.9 percent had attended other state-supported colleges in Oklahoma; 21 percent had attended Oklahoma University; 16.9 percent had attended private and denominational colleges in Oklahoma; and 16.9 percent had attended out-of-state colleges and universities.

The in-state colleges and universities indicated in Nofflet's (1960) study were Oklahoma College for Women, Phillips University, Oklahoma Baptist University, Cameron Junior College, Murray Junior College, and Oklahoma City University, as compared to Northeastern Oklahoma State University, Southwestern Oklahoma State University, Panhandle State University, Cameron State University, East Central, Southeastern Oklahoma State University, Northwestern Oklahoma State University, Oklahoma Christian College, Oklahoma College for Women, and Oklahoma Baptist University which were indicated in the current study.

Out-of-state colleges and universities attended by the respondents in Nofflet's (1960) study were Iowa State College, the University of Arkansas, the University of Colorado, Colorado State College, Western Kentucky State University, Mt. San Antonio College in California, and George Peabody College in Tennessee. Those indicated in the current study were Southwest Missouri State University, the University of Arkansas, Colorado State University, and Kansas State University.

#### Major and Minor Courses of Study

The participants were asked to specify their major and minor courses of study for their degrees. Fifty-three respondents indicated

a major course of study for their bachelor's degree, and 15 indicated a major course of study for their master's degree. The results are shown in Table IX.

TABLE IX  
MAJOR COURSES OF STUDY  
(N=53)

Courses	Bachelor's		Master's		Totals	
	N	% <sup>a</sup>	N	% <sup>b</sup>	N	%
Home Economics Education	46	86.8	6	40.0	52	76.5
Clothing and Textiles	2	3.8	2	13.3	4	5.9
Housing, Design, and Consumer Resources	2	3.8	2	13.3	4	5.9
Family Relations and Child Development	1	1.9	3	20.0	4	5.9
Education	1	1.9	2	13.3	3	4.5
Foods and Nutrition	1	1.9	—	—	1	1.5
Totals	53	100.1 <sup>c</sup>	15	99.9 <sup>c</sup>	68	100.2 <sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Based on N.

<sup>b</sup>Based on 15 who responded to this category.

<sup>c</sup>Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

The majority of respondents (76.5%) in the current study majored in home economics education as compared to 69.5 percent indicated in Nofflet's (1960) study. Therefore, the number of home economics

education majors employed as extension home economists at the time of the current study had increased by seven percent. In addition, there was a 2.5 percent increase in the number of respondents in the current study who had majored in family relations and child development, and a 4.5 percent increase in the number who had majored in education. The major courses of study in which decreases were indicated were clothing and textiles, 7.6 percent; housing, design, and consumer resources, 2.6 percent; and foods and nutrition, 3.6 percent.

Twenty-two of the participants indicated a minor course of study either in their bachelor's or master's degrees. The results are indicated in Table X.

Results of Nofflet's (1960) study showed that 12 different minors had been indicated by the respondents in her study, as opposed to 10 in the current study. The courses indicated in the previous study were social science, elementary education, clothing and textiles, English, foods and nutrition, commerce, mathematics, health and physical education, history, home economics education, art, and speech. Nofflet (1960) did not indicate percentages; therefore, no comparisons are possible between the two studies other than for the minor courses indicated.

#### Clothing and Textiles Courses Taken

Participants were asked to indicate the clothing and textiles courses they had taken in college (Table XI). The results of the two studies indicated that approximately 97 percent of the respondents had taken basic clothing construction. A majority of respondents in the



TABLE X  
MINOR COURSES OF STUDY  
(N=22)

Courses	Bachelor's <sup>a</sup>		Master's <sup>b</sup>		Totals	
	N	% <sup>a</sup>	N	% <sup>b</sup>	N	%
Business	3	15.8	0	0	3	13.6
Speech	2	10.5	1	33.3	3	13.6
Language Arts	2	10.5	1	33.3	3	13.6
Science Teaching	3	15.8	0	0	3	13.6
Education	1	5.3	1	33.3	2	9.1
Social Studies	2	10.5	0	0	2	9.1
English	2	10.5	0	0	2	9.1
Chemistry	2	10.5	0	0	2	9.1
Other <sup>c</sup>	<u>2</u>	<u>10.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>9.1</u>
Totals	19	99.9 <sup>d</sup>	3	99.9 <sup>d</sup>	22	99.9 <sup>d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>Based on 19 responses.

<sup>b</sup>Based on three responses.

<sup>c</sup>Home economics education and marketing.

<sup>d</sup>Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

current study indicated that they had taken basic textiles, tailoring, and flat pattern design, as compared with advanced construction, basic textiles, tailoring, and costume design which were indicated in Nofflet's (1960) study. In the current study, there was a slight increase in the number of respondents who had taken basic textiles, tailoring, flat pattern design, and economics of clothing. Substantial decreases were indicated in the current study for the following courses: advanced clothing construction, 28.8 percent; costume design, 29.7 percent; advanced textiles, 13.9 percent; clothing renovation, 12 percent; and family clothing, 10.4 percent. Fifteen percent of the respondents in Nofflet's (1960) study had studied millinery; however, none in the current study had studied it, and social/psychological aspects of clothing, consumer clothing, and fashion merchandising had not been included in the previous study. Other courses taken by respondents in Nofflet's (1960) study were visual aids in clothing, readings in textiles, decorative fabrics, custom dressmaking, children's clothing, and advanced costume design. The results of the current study are shown in Table XI.

#### Clothing and Textiles Courses Most

##### Recently Taken

The participants were asked to indicate the clothing and textiles courses they had taken most recently, as well as the dates they had taken them. Forty-five respondents specified the courses they had taken, and the results are recorded in Table XII. One-third of the respondents had not taken any clothing and textiles courses since

TABLE XI  
 CLOTHING AND TEXTILES COURSES  
 TAKEN IN COLLEGE  
 (N=61)

Courses	N	%
Basic Clothing Construction	59	96.7
Basic Textiles	48	78.7
Tailoring	39	63.9
Flat Pattern Design	33	54.1
Advanced Clothing Construction	29	47.5
Economics of Clothing	18	29.5
Costume Design	16	26.2
Social/Psychological Aspects	15	24.6
Consumer Clothing	10	16.4
Speed Techniques	9	14.8
Advanced Textiles	7	11.5
Draping	5	8.2
Family Clothing	5	8.2
Clothing Renovation	4	6.6
Fashion Merchandising	3	4.9
Millinery	0	0
Other <sup>a</sup>	7	11.5

<sup>a</sup>Including children's clothing, teaching methods of clothing, new fabrics and techniques, experimental clothing, and individual clothing instruction.

TABLE XII  
 MOST RECENT CLOTHING AND TEXTILES  
 COURSES TAKEN  
 (N=45)

Courses	N	% <sup>a</sup>
None Since Graduation	15	33.3
Construction	7	15.6
Tailoring	6	13.3
Flat Pattern	4	8.9
Social/Psychological Aspects	3	6.7
New Methods for Teaching Clothing	2	4.4
Pattern Alterations	2	4.4
Textiles	2	4.4
Applied Design	2	4.4
Shortcuts in Construction	2	4.4
Other <sup>b</sup>	5	11.1

<sup>a</sup>Based on N.

<sup>b</sup>Including experimental clothing, sewing men's pants, historic costume, speed techniques, and new fabrics and techniques.

they graduated from college. Of the courses indicated in both studies, 10 percent more of the respondents in the current study indicated that construction was the most recent course taken. Nearly one-third of the respondents in Nofflet's (1960) study, 21.3 percent more than in the current study, had indicated flat pattern design as the most recent course taken. There were no other substantial differences in the results with the exception of courses which were not indicated in both studies. Costume design, visual aids in clothing, millinery, and family clothing were indicated in Nofflet's (1960) study, and social/psychological aspects of clothing, new methods for teaching clothing, pattern alterations, and applied design were indicated in the current study.

One-third of the respondents indicated that they had not taken any clothing and textiles courses for credit since graduation from college. The range of years in which those participants graduated was from 1939 to 1970, with 46.6 percent of them having graduated since 1969. The respondents who had taken courses since graduation had done so between 1921 and 1979. More specific results are indicated in Table XIII.

Seventy-one percent of the respondents had taken their most recent clothing and textiles courses for credit between 1970 and 1979. Nofflet (1960) reported that 71.7 percent of the respondents in her study had taken courses between 1951 and 1960, indicating that in both studies, a majority of the latest clothing and textiles courses taken had been taken within nine years prior to each of the studies.

TABLE XIII  
 DATES OF MOST RECENT CLOTHING AND  
 TEXTILES COURSES TAKEN  
 (N=35)

Dates	N	%
1950 through 1954	2	5.7
1955 through 1959	1	2.9
1960 through 1964	0	0
1965 through 1969	7	20.0
1970 through 1974	13	37.1
1975 through 1979	<u>12</u>	<u>34.3</u>
Totals	35	100.0

### Clothing and Textiles Workshops

#### Attended for Non-Credit

The participants were asked to indicate clothing and textiles workshops they had attended for non-credit since they had been employed with the extension service, and the dates of each. The respondents indicated that they had taken non-credit courses from 1965 through 1979, with the majority indicating that they had attended workshops since 1969. Table XIV shows the clothing and textiles workshops specified by the participants, who in most cases listed more than one.

As Table XIV indicates, the respondents specified a wide variety of clothing and textiles workshops which they had attended for

TABLE XIV  
CLOTHING AND TEXTILES WORKSHOPS ATTENDED  
(N=47)

Workshops	N	% <sup>a</sup>
Tailoring	34	72.3
Pattern Alterations	20	42.6
Specific Sewing Techniques	10	21.3
Lingerie	9	19.1
Bishop Methods	9	19.1
4-H Clothing Projects	8	17.0
All In-Service Training	7	14.9
Sewing Menswear	7	14.9
Children's Clothing	7	14.9
Ultra Suede	4	8.5
Clothing for Young Families	4	8.5
Finishing Techniques	4	8.5
Stretch and Sew Basics	3	6.4
Fitting	3	6.4
Quick Methods	3	6.4
Other <sup>b</sup>	18	38.3

<sup>a</sup>Based on the number responding to this item.

<sup>b</sup>Including review of woven fabric techniques, sewing rainwear, textiles, What's New Susie Q, swimsuits, women's clothing, updates in various areas, sewing machines, drapery, t-shirts, and no workshops attended.

non-credit. The majority of respondents indicated that they had attended tailoring workshops.

#### Preferences for Updating Clothing and Textiles Education

The participants were asked to indicate their first, second, and third choices regarding how they would prefer to update their clothing and textiles education. Fifty-six of the respondents indicated first choices, 45 indicated second choices, and 39 indicated third choices. The results are presented in Table XV.

Nearly half (46%) of the respondents who indicated first choices preferred to update their clothing and textiles education by attending short courses during the summer. Attending weekend courses was the preference most often indicated by the respondents who indicated second choices, and talk-back television was the third choice preference most often indicated. None of the respondents selected attending regular semester classes as a method of updating their clothing and textiles education. Fourteen listed other suggestions as indicated in Table XV.

#### Home-Sewing Practices

The participants were asked to indicate whether they sewed outer garments for themselves or family members. This did not include mending, alterations, or constructing coats. If the respondents indicated that they did construct outer garments, they were to approximate the percent in regard to the total number of garments they



TABLE XV  
PREFERENCES FOR UPDATING CLOTHING  
AND TEXTILES EDUCATION

Preferences	N	%
<u>First Choices (N=56)</u>		
Short Courses During Summer	26	46.4
One Day a Week (Regular Semester)	5	8.9
Weekend Courses	5	8.9
Talk-Back Television	5	8.9
Correspondence Courses	3	5.5
Full-Term Summer School	2	3.6
No Preference	1	1.8
Regular Semester Classes	0	0
Other <sup>a</sup>	9	16.1
<u>Second Choices (N=45)</u>		
Weekend Courses	14	31.1
Short Courses During Summer	9	20.0
Talk-Back Television	8	17.8
One Day a Week (Regular Semester)	5	11.1
Correspondence Courses	5	11.1
Full-Term Summer School	2	4.4
Regular Semester Classes	0	0
Other <sup>a</sup>	2	4.4
<u>Third Choices (N=39)</u>		
Talk-Back Television	9	23.1
Correspondence Courses	7	17.9
Short Courses During Summer	6	15.4
One Day a Week (Regular Semester)	5	12.8
Full-Term Summer School	5	12.8
Weekend Courses	4	10.3
Regular Semester Classes	0	0
Other <sup>a</sup>	3	7.7

<sup>a</sup>Including classes held within a reasonable distance from county rather than in Stillwater, three-to-four day workshops during the year, in-service training, classes every third Friday, classes one day every three weeks during a regular semester, and publications and newsletters.

acquired within a year. Ninety percent of the respondents in the current study constructed garments for themselves or family members as compared to 84.8 percent of the respondents in Nofflet's (1960) study.

Of the 55 respondents who indicated that they constructed outer garments for themselves or family members, 52.7 percent constructed 50 percent or more of their garments per year; 23.6 percent constructed 11 to 49 percent of their garments per year; and 23.6 percent constructed 10 percent or fewer of the garments they acquired per year.

#### Requested Clothing and Textiles Information and Perceived Needs of the People Served

One of the specific objectives of the study was to identify the requests and perceived needs of people served. To obtain the desired information, the respondents were asked about the clothing and textiles requests received most often, what they perceived as the more important needs of the people, and how well their programs were meeting those perceived needs at the time of the study.

#### Areas in Which the Greatest Number of Requests Were Indicated

The participants listed the areas of clothing and textiles in which they received the greatest number of requests for information. Table XVI depicts the results.

The current results indicated more areas of requests than Nofflet's (1960) study. Subsequently, for the areas which were indicated

TABLE XVI  
 AREAS IN WHICH RESPONDENTS RECEIVED  
 THE GREATEST NUMBER OF REQUESTS  
 (N=60)

Areas	N	%
Construction	39	65.0
Fitting and Alterations	14	23.3
Quick Sewing Techniques	8	13.3
Tailoring	8	13.3
Care and Laundering	7	11.7
New Fabrics	6	10.0
New Tricks and Tips	6	10.0
Stain Removal	5	8.3
4-H Projects	5	8.3
Seam Finishes	4	6.7
Sewing Techniques/Specific Fabrics	4	6.7
Special Sewing Problems	3	5.0
Specific Construction Requests	13	21.7
Other Requests <sup>a</sup>	8	13.3

<sup>a</sup>Including five shirts, hems, reading pattern directions, linings, zippers, pressing, collars, sewing from measurements, pants, interfacings, and lingerie.

in both studies, fewer participants in the current study had indicated such requests. The most requested area in both studies was clothing construction, although 21.5 percent fewer indicated it in the current study. Other areas in which fewer requests were indicated in the current study were tailoring (3.6%) and new fabrics (3.6%). The number of requests for information about fitting and alterations, seam finishes, and care and laundering was the same in both studies. The selection of patterns and fabric, and buying clothing were two areas that were listed in Nofflet's (1960) study but not in the current study. Nofflet (1960) specified other requests as accessories, interlinings, care of sewing machines, and the use of attachments.

#### Perceived Needs of the People Served

The participants listed the clothing and textiles areas which they perceived as the more important needs of the people they served. Sixty-one respondents indicated at least one need. The results are given in Table XVII.

The participants in the current study indicated a larger variety of perceived needs than did the participants in Nofflet's (1960) study. Construction was the area indicated most often in both studies, and was indicated by 4.6 percent more of the respondents in the current study. Clothing consumerism was indicated by 4.9 percent fewer respondents in the current study, as were fitting and alterations (9.1%), and other needs (7.5%). Nofflet (1960) indicated other perceived

needs as assistance with wardrobe planning, seam finishes, accessories, speed techniques, interfacings, inner linings, and the selection of foundation garments.

TABLE XVII  
 MORE IMPORTANT NEEDS OF PEOPLE SERVED  
 AS PERCEIVED BY THE RESPONDENTS  
 (N=61)

Areas	N	%
Construction	39	63.9
Clothing Consumerism	26	42.6
Fittings and Alterations	10	16.4
Recycling Clothing	7	11.5
Trends/Updated Information	7	11.5
Finishing Techniques	5	8.2
Care and Laundering	5	8.2
Quick Sewing Techniques	5	8.2
Tailoring	5	8.2
Other Requests <sup>a</sup>	12	19.7

<sup>a</sup>Including achieving the professional look, textiles, mending, new fabrics, creativity, youth motivation, buying sewing machines, machine embroidery, and sewing tips.

### Success in Meeting the Perceived Needs of the People Served

Participants were asked to rate whether their programs met the perceived needs in clothing and textiles better than in other parts of the home economics extension programs, about as well as in other parts, or not as well as other parts of the programs. Sixty participants responded, and 18.3 percent indicated that they were meeting the perceived needs better than other parts of the programs. The majority (75%) indicated that they were meeting the perceived needs about as well, while 6.6 percent indicated that they were not meeting such needs as well as other parts of their programs.

### Adequacy of Educational Preparation

The respondents rated the quality of their educations and their competency levels in regard to giving instruction in clothing and textiles. Specific areas were given for the respondents to rate.

### Quality of Academic Preparation

The participants were asked to rate the quality of their academic preparation in the specified areas as superior, good, or inadequate. Fifty-six respondents indicated their feelings. The results are presented in Table XVIII.

The results of the current study indicated that a majority of respondents rated the quality of their academic preparation in areas of clothing and textiles good or superior. The only area in which the majority rated the quality of preparation inadequate was

current textile legislation. Nofflet (1960) indicated very similar findings. Social/psychological aspects of clothing had not been included in Nofflet's (1960) study.

TABLE XVIII  
 QUALITY OF ACADEMIC PREPARATION FOR INSTRUCTION IN CLOTHING AND TEXTILES  
 (N=56)

Areas	Superior		Good		Inadequate	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Construction Techniques	22	39.3	30	53.6	4	7.1
Pattern Alterations and Fitting	6	10.7	38	67.9	12	21.4
Buying Clothing	9	16.1	44	78.6	3	5.4
Wardrobe Planning	9	16.1	42	75.0	5	8.9
Textile and Fabric Selection	14	25.0	36	64.3	6	10.7
Current Textile Legislation	1	1.8	16	28.6	39	69.6
Care and Upkeep of Clothing	11	19.6	39	69.6	6	10.7
Posture and Grooming	9	16.1	37	66.1	10	17.9
Social/Psychological Aspects	9	16.1	38	67.9	9	16.1

### Competency for Instruction

The participants were asked to rate their levels of competency for instruction in the same areas as they had rated the quality of their academic preparation. The results appear in Table XIX.

The areas in which a majority of respondents rated their competencies for instruction high or very high were construction techniques (70%), wardrobe planning (56.7%), and care and upkeep of clothing (51.7%). Areas in which 50 percent or more of the respondents rated their competencies average were textile and fabric selection, posture and grooming, and social/psychological aspects of clothing. Average or high competencies were indicated for pattern alterations and fitting, and buying clothing by a majority of respondents, and in only one area, current textile legislation, did a majority of respondents (61.7%) rate their competencies low to very low.

In comparing the results presented in Table XVIII and Table XIX, the findings are closely related. The respondents rated the quality of their academic preparation good for the areas of pattern alterations, and fitting and buying clothing, while competency levels for those two areas were rated average to high. Academic preparation in wardrobe planning, care and upkeep of clothing, and construction techniques were rated good, and competency levels were rated high to very high. The academic preparation for the areas of textile and fabric selection, posture and grooming, and social/psychological aspects of clothing was rated good, but competency levels were rated average. Current textile legislation received inadequate ratings by a majority



TABLE XIX  
 COMPETENCIES FOR INSTRUCTION IN  
 CLOTHING AND TEXTILES  
 (N=60)

Areas	Very High		High		Average		Low		Very Low	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Construction Techniques	19	31.7	23	38.3	16	26.7	1	1.7	1	1.7
Pattern Alterations and Fitting	2	3.3	24	40.0	27	45.0	6	10.0	1	1.7
Buying Clothing	6	10.0	23	38.3	29	48.3	2	3.3	0	0
Wardrobe Planning	7	11.7	27	45.0	23	38.3	3	5.0	0	0
Textile and Fabric Selection	6	10.0	16	26.7	34	57.7	4	6.7	0	0
Current Textile Legislation	0	0	4	6.7	19	31.7	31	51.7	6	10.0
Care and Upkeep of Clothing	4	6.7	27	45.0	28	46.7	1	1.7	0	0
Posture and Grooming	5	8.3	22	36.7	31	51.7	2	3.3	0	0
Social/Psychological Aspects	4	6.7	16	26.7	33	55.0	6	10.0	1	1.7

of respondents in regard to academic preparation, and low to very low ratings for competency levels.

Needs for Instructional Assistance From  
State Clothing Specialists

One of the specific objectives of the study was to determine the needs of the participants for instructional assistance from the state clothing specialists. The participants indicated the areas in which they felt such needs, and the results are presented in Table XX. The greatest need for assistance was in the area of alterations followed by construction and fitting.

TABLE XX  
AREAS IN WHICH RESPONDENTS EXPRESSED A NEED  
FOR ASSISTANCE FROM THE STATE  
CLOTHING SPECIALISTS  
(N=52)

Areas	N	%
Alterations	28	53.8
Construction	22	42.3
Fitting	21	40.4
Textiles	17	32.7
Buying	12	23.1
Other <sup>a</sup>	9	17.3
No Assistance	2	3.8

<sup>a</sup>Including updating knowledge, recycling clothing, tailoring, and 4-H projects.

Results of the current study indicated that 10 percent fewer respondents expressed the need for assistance from the state clothing specialists in the area of construction. In the current study, slightly more than 50 percent of the respondents specified alterations most often as the area in which assistance is needed. Nofflet (1960) tabulated alterations and fitting together and indicated that 32 percent of the respondents had specified a need for assistance in that area. In comparing the other areas included in both studies, percentages were very close. However, none of the respondents in Nofflet's (1960) study indicated that they needed assistance from the state clothing specialists.

#### Resources and Methods Utilized in Presenting Clothing and Textiles Instruction

In an attempt to determine resources and methods employed in the presentation of clothing and textiles instruction, respondents were asked to indicate resources within the Cooperative Extension Service they utilized, other sources used, and methods of presentation excluding lectures and/or demonstrations which they found effective in the presentation of specified topics.

#### Resources Within the Extension Service

Findings indicated that participants did utilize resources within the Cooperative Extension Service. As Table XXI indicates, the majority of respondents utilized printed matter, the state specialists, and

other extension home economists. Nearly 100 percent utilized both printed matter and the state clothing specialists.

TABLE XXI  
RESOURCES WITHIN THE EXTENSION SERVICE  
UTILIZED FOR PLANNING COUNTY  
CLOTHING AND TEXTILES  
PROGRAMS  
(N=60)

Resources	N	%
Printed Matter	59	98.3
State Clothing Specialists	56	93.3
Other Extension Home Economists	44	73.3
Other Resources <sup>a</sup>	6	10.0

<sup>a</sup>Including extension homemakers, examples prepared in county, retired home economics people, and research.

#### Sources Other Than the Extension Service

##### Utilized in Program Planning

The participants indicated that they utilized sources other than the Cooperative Extension Service when planning county clothing and textiles programs. The results are presented in Table XXII.

The sources used by a majority of the respondents were printed matter, commercial companies, and local resources. In the current

study, 32.2 percent more of the respondents indicated the use of printed matter; 28.9 percent more used commercial companies; and 55.1 percent more used local resources. Nofflet's (1960) results did not indicate the use of college instructors and television and radio as separate sources. Rather, due to the lack of responses in those areas, the results were included with other sources specified.

TABLE XXII  
 SOURCES OTHER THAN THE EXTENSION SERVICE  
 UTILIZED IN THE COUNTY CLOTHING  
 AND TEXTILES PROGRAMS  
 (N=61)

Sources	N	%
Printed Matter	61	100.0
Commercial Companies	59	96.7
Local Resources	46	75.4
College Instructors	12	19.7
Television and Radio	11	18.0
Other Resources <sup>a</sup>	6	9.8

<sup>a</sup>Including former fabric store owners, local leaders, individuals, fabric store owners, and the Dallas market.

### Methods of Presentation

The participants indicated the methods of presentation other than lectures and/or demonstrations which they had found effective for instruction in the areas of buying clothing, clothing construction, care and upkeep of clothing, and grooming. The results are found in Table XXIII.

TABLE XXIII  
METHODS UTILIZED IN THE PRESENTATION OF  
CLOTHING AND TEXTILES INFORMATION

Methods	N	%
<u>Buying Clothing (N=59)</u>		
Printed Matter	42	71.2
Visual Aids	37	62.7
Dress Revues	33	55.9
Resource Persons	31	52.5
Workshops	21	35.6
Field Trips	19	32.2
Other <sup>a</sup>	4	6.8
<u>Clothing Construction (N=61)</u>		
Workshops	56	91.8
Visual Aids	46	75.4
Dress Revues	44	72.1
Printed Matter	43	70.5
Resource Persons	38	62.3
Field Trips	8	13.1
Other <sup>a</sup>	5	8.2

TABLE XXIII (Continued)

Methods	N	%
<u>Care and Upkeep of Clothing (N=58)</u>		
Printed Matter	46	79.3
Visual Aids	35	60.3
Resource Persons	17	29.3
Workshops	15	25.9
Dress Revues	5	8.6
Field Trips	3	5.2
Other <sup>a</sup>	2	3.4
<u>Grooming (N=60)</u>		
Resource Persons	45	75.0
Printed Matter	42	70.0
Visual Aids	37	61.7
Workshops	28	46.7
Dress Revues	27	45.0
Field Trips	9	15.0
Other <sup>a</sup>	4	6.7

<sup>a</sup>Including newsletter articles, displays at county fairs, radio, contests, judges' comments at fairs, extension homemaker and 4-H leaders, mass media, and CCO's.

The results indicate that a majority of the respondents utilized printed matter and visual aids for instruction in all four clothing and textiles areas indicated, and a majority utilized resource persons for all areas except the care and upkeep of clothing. Least used were field trips.

In comparing the results of the current study with Nofflet's (1960) results, the utilization of all resources (except those specified as other resources) had increased by 12 to 67 percent. The

amount of other methods of presentation specified for clothing construction and grooming were comparable for both studies, but had decreased in the current study for the areas of buying clothing and the care and upkeep of clothing.

#### Comments of Participants

The participants were invited to include comments they had in regard to the questionnaire or to the study in general. Several additional comments were included. Each of the following was made by one or two participants in the study:

1. High school home economics and 4-H club work were an important part of academic preparation for instruction in clothing and textiles.
2. Home economics education majors have little time for elective courses in college.
3. Revision of the 4-H clothing information regarding leadership materials is needed to update it and include clothing projects for handicapped and low-income youth.
4. More emphasis needs to be placed on current clothing and textiles trends as they occur.
5. Sometimes the quality of in-service training and workshops has been low and of little practicality in relation to the county needs. Attitudes, interest, enthusiasm, and expertise of the clothing specialists may affect this.
6. More knowledge has been learned from extension people than was learned in college.



7. More emphasis needs to be placed on basic clothing construction techniques and demonstration materials for persons going into extension.

8. The demands cannot be met for all the areas of clothing and textiles; an area specialist is needed in the central district.

#### Discussion of Instrument

Not every participant responded to each item on the instrument, and there were four items which were consistently answered only in part or not at all. Those were numbers 18, 19, 20, and 26 (see Appendix). If this study were repeated, those items should be rewritten for clarity.

Item 18 seemed to confuse the participants when they were asked to indicate where they were currently working toward an advanced degree. Many indicated a department within the college of home economics rather than the college or university which they were attending. Therefore, it should be specified that the researcher is interested in learning the college or university being attended rather than or in addition to the major course of study.

Many respondents left item 19 completely blank, gave only one or two choices, or merely checked three of four methods for updating their clothing and textiles educations. A possibility for clarifying that item or for obtaining more responses would be to include "None" or "Do not prefer to update education" as a choice.

Item 20 seemed to confuse some of the respondents because they made question marks in the margin or indicated that they did not know. This item should be rewritten to explain that the researcher

wants to know the area or department in which the participants received their degrees. Perhaps a list of choices should be included.

Item 26 was not practical due to the time it would take to answer as well as its limited relevance to the study. Even if the participants had a record of all workshops they had attended since their employment with extension, it would have had little meaning in this study. The range of years the respondents had been employed in their present positions was one to 29 years. Workshops attended 20 to 29 years ago could have little impact on the current situation. The number and type of workshops attended within two years prior to the study could have provided information from which to draw relative conclusions.

Item 15 may not have caused the participants any confusion but the wording could have been changed for clarity. Resource persons would most likely present their information either through lectures or demonstrations, yet the participant was asked for methods other than lectures and/or demonstrations. The item should be rewritten so that participants were asked to indicate methods other than lectures and/or demonstrations given by the participants themselves that they had found effective for the presentation of clothing and textiles information.

## CHAPTER V

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of the constant changes in fabrics and fashions, extension home economists are called upon to aid consumers in solving problems related to sewing techniques and care procedures. Extension program planners and state clothing specialists must be aware of the background and needs of the extension home economists in the area of clothing and textiles.

Nofflet (1960) conducted a study of home demonstration agents in Oklahoma and of their preparation in clothing and textiles. The purpose of her study was to investigate the knowledge and training of the extension home economists in clothing and textiles subject matter so that extension directors and clothing specialists could be provided with information which would aid them in assisting the home demonstration agents.

The purpose of the current study was to update the previous study and to compare the results in order to determine changes in the training, experience, practices, and needs of the extension home economists in clothing and textiles subject matter.

Sixty-one extension home economists who were employed by the Oklahoma Cooperative Extension Service participated in the study. The participants worked exclusively with adult groups or with adult and

youth groups, and had been employed in their present positions for at least one year as of May 1, 1979. An instrument was developed based on the one used in Nofflet's (1960) study, and data were collected by mail. Findings were analyzed by use of summations, frequency distributions, percentages, and means, and were visually compared with the results of Nofflet's (1960) study to determine changes that had occurred.

The results were presented and grouped as to employment background of the participants; county clothing and textiles programs; educational background of the participants; clothing and textiles information requested and perceived needs of the people served; quality of the educational preparation of the respondents; needs for instructional assistance from state clothing specialists; and resources utilized in presenting clothing and textiles instruction.

Participants in both studies had been employed in their present positions for an average of eight years at the time of each study. Respondents in the current study worked with 3.9 fewer extension homemaker groups and 4.3 fewer 4-H clubs than in Nofflet's (1960) study. Twenty-two percent more of the respondents in the current study had long-range clothing and textiles programs, but they devoted only one-half as much time to the clothing programs as did the respondents in Nofflet's (1960) study. Adult leader training was utilized by the respondents in both studies for extension homemaker groups in comparable frequencies, but was used slightly more by respondents in the current study with 4-H clubs.

The number of respondents in both studies who held bachelor's degrees was comparable, but eight percent fewer in the current study

held master's degrees. Slightly more than two-thirds of the participants in the current study were either working toward or planning to work toward advanced degrees. Fifty-eight percent of the degrees indicated in the current study had been granted from Oklahoma State University. Nofflet (1960) indicated that 93 percent of the respondents in her study had attended Oklahoma State University at some time.

The majority of respondents in both studies had majored in home economics education, and more than half of the respondents indicated that they had taken clothing construction, basic textiles, and tailoring in college. One-third of the respondents in the current study had taken no clothing and textiles courses since graduation. These respondents had graduated between 1939 and 1970. Construction and tailoring were indicated most often in the current study by those who had taken recent courses, as compared with flat pattern design and tailoring in Nofflet's (1960) study. Seventy-one percent of the respondents in both studies had taken their most recent clothing and textiles courses within nine years prior to each study.

The first preference indicated by the respondents in the current study for updating their educations was attending short courses in the summer. The second choice most often indicated was attending weekend courses, and talk-back television was the third choice. None of the respondents indicated a preference for attending regular semester classes. Ninety percent of the respondents in the current study and 84.8 percent in Nofflet's (1960) study indicated that they constructed garments for themselves or family members.

The majority of respondents in both studies indicated that clothing construction was the area in which they received the most requests

for information. That was also the area in which the participants in both studies perceived the greatest need. Seventy-five percent of the respondents in the current study indicated that they were meeting the perceived needs in clothing and textiles about as well as other parts of the extension program.

Participants in both studies rated their academic preparation in clothing and textiles subject matter good to superior in all areas except current textile legislation, which was rated inadequate. The majority of respondents in the current study rated their competency for instruction in the areas of construction techniques, wardrobe planning, and care and upkeep of clothing high to very high, and the majority rated their competency in teaching current textile legislation low to very low. The area in which the greatest number of respondents expressed a need for assistance was alterations. In Noflet's (1960) study, construction was identified as the area of greatest need.

Resources within the Cooperative Extension Service utilized by a majority of the respondents for clothing and textiles instruction were printed matter, state clothing specialists, and other extension home economists. Other sources indicated by a majority in the current study for use in presenting clothing and textiles information were printed matter, commercial companies, and local resources.

The methods of instruction used by the majority of participants in the current study were printed matter and visual aids, and a majority used resource persons for all areas except the care and upkeep of clothing.

## Conclusions

A majority of the participants in the current study indicated that they had long-range clothing and textiles programs, but only half as much time was being allowed for those programs as had been allowed in the previous study. Due to the increased number of subject matter areas within Cooperative Extension and the limited amount of time in which to conduct numerous programs, less time is currently available for each subject matter area.

Nearly 25 percent more of the participants in the current study than in Nofflet's (1960) study had held their present positions for nine years or less. However, 58 percent of these had received their degrees more than 10 years prior to the study. Fewer respondents in the current study held master's degrees than in Nofflet's (1960) study, but slightly more than two-thirds of the respondents in the current study were either working toward advanced degrees or planning to.

More than one-half of the degrees indicated in the current study had been granted from Oklahoma State University, and 90 percent of the respondents currently working toward advanced degrees were doing so at Oklahoma State. Nofflet (1960) indicated that 93 percent of the participants in her study had attended Oklahoma State University at some time. Therefore, courses, seminars, and workshops which could be taken as a part of the graduate degree requirements at Oklahoma State University could be planned to incorporate updating in the areas of textile legislation, alterations, fitting, construction, and clothing consumerism. These were the areas of need as identified from the survey.

Participants generally rated the quality of their academic preparation good or superior in all areas except current textile legislation. Competencies for instruction were rated average to very high in all areas except current textile legislation. Therefore, the state clothing specialists and clothing and textiles department heads should make an effort to include current textile legislation in the curriculum wherever practical. Since this is an ever changing area, updating would be necessary every three to five years.

Participants overwhelmingly identified short courses during the summer as the most preferred way of updating clothing and textiles information. Weekend courses and talk-back television were second and third preferences, respectively. In curriculum planning consideration should be given to the courses or areas which could be adaptable to these formats.

One-third of the participants in the current study indicated that they had taken no clothing and textiles courses for credit since graduation from college between 1939 and 1970. This emphasizes the necessity for well designed, up-to-date fact sheets and workshops planned by the state clothing extension specialists.

#### Recommendations

Recommendations for further study include:

1. Survey a random sample of Oklahoma adults to determine the extent of their knowledge in clothing and textiles areas and the sources they would use for information about clothing and textiles.
2. Survey members of extension homemaker groups in Oklahoma



to determine the extent to which their clothing and textiles information needs are being met by extension home economists.

3. Periodically survey extension home economists to determine current needs in clothing and textiles and plan short courses based on those needs.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- American Fabrics and Fashion. 1961, 52(Spring), 50-53.
- Anderson, E. W. An approach to effective teaching. Proceedings of the National Extension Training Conference. 1964, 2.
- Bliss, R. D. The Spirit and Philosophy of Extension Work. Washington: USDA Graduate School and Epsilon Sigma Pi, 1952.
- Cooperative Extension Service--born from a need of people. Extension Service Review, 1976 (May/June), 3-27.
- Cooperative Extension Service. Unpublished job description, extension agent. March, 1972a.
- Cooperative Extension Service. Unpublished job description, extension home economist. March, 1972b.
- Cooperative Extension Service. Unpublished job description, specialist-home economics cooperative extension. August, 1977.
- 4-H '76 Spirit of Tomorrow. Extension Service: USDA, July, 1975.
- Home-sewing fabrics unlimited. American Fabrics and Fashion. 1970, 85, 31-35.
- Kelsey, L. D. Cooperative Extension Work. Ithaca, N.Y.: Comstock Publishing Associates, 1963.
- Nofflet, J. L. A study of home demonstration agents' training, experience, practices, and needs as related to the clothing phase of the extension service program in Oklahoma. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1960.
- Reisbeck, R. F. Comparison of Oklahoma State University Extension Specialists' roles as perceived by specialists and field staff members. Unpublished dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1974.
- Report from the home-sewing front. American Fabrics and Fashion. 1973, Spring/Summer, 39.
- Schaller, W. N. New directions for Extension. Extension Service Review, 1978 (May/June), 4-5.

Spitz, G. S. Exciting careers in Extension. Forecast for Home Economics. 1976, 22(2), 62.

Thompson, E. A. Identification and evaluation of concepts for competencies of home economists in extension as a program planner. Unpublished dissertation, Oklahoma State University, 1967.

Webb, D. S. Textiles care labeling knowledge of home economists and homemakers. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University, 1978.

APPENDIX

CORRESPONDENCE AND QUESTIONNAIRE

700 W. Scott, #242  
Stillwater, Ok. 74074  
May 4, 1979

Dear Extension Home Economist:


At the opening session of the Oklahoma Association of Extension Home Economists meeting May 3, Dr. Bill Taggart announced this questionnaire, and encouraged your cooperation in completing it. It has been developed to determine the knowledge and training of Extension Home Economists in clothing and textiles subject matter. Results will aid the state staff and faculty members in the Clothing, Textiles, and Merchandising department at OSU in planning academic programs that will help you more fully meet the needs of those you serve.


Dr. Taggart, Ladora Smith, and the district supervisors have approved the study. If you have been employed in your present position for at least one year as of May 1, 1979, please complete every question on the questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed envelope. However, if you do not meet the one year requirement, please indicate so on the first page of the questionnaire and return it to me in the enclosed envelope. This will insure that you won't receive a follow-up letter.

Your participation is vital to the study, and will be greatly appreciated. This questionnaire is confidential material; therefore, the responses will remain anonymous. Your answers will be grouped comparatively with those of other Extension Home Economists throughout the state of Oklahoma. Please return the questionnaire to me before May 18, 1979.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

  
Nancy Ruzicka  
Graduate Student

  
Dr. Grovalynn Sisler  
Head, CTM Department

Dear Extension Home Economist:

This card is a reminder that the questionnaire concerning your knowledge and training in clothing and textiles subject matter is due this Friday, May 18. It is vital to the study that I have your cooperation, so please complete each question on the form and return it to me in the envelope which was provided for you. If you have already mailed the questionnaire, please disregard this note.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Nancy Ruzicka". The signature is written in dark ink and is positioned above the typed name.

Nancy Ruzicka  
Graduate Student, CTM

## QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLOTHING AND TEXTILES

1. Extension District: \_\_\_\_\_
2. County in which employed: \_\_\_\_\_
3. Number of years in present position: \_\_\_\_\_
4. Number of years employed as:
  - a. Extension Home Economist, Adults and 4-H \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. Extension Home Economist, Adults only \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Extension Home Economist, 4-H only \_\_\_\_\_
  - d. Home Economics teacher \_\_\_\_\_
  - e. Home Economist (other than Extension or teaching) \_\_\_\_\_
 Specify: \_\_\_\_\_
5. Number of groups with which you meet or for which you are responsible for clothing and textiles instruction:
  - a. Extension Homemaker Groups \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. 4-H Groups \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_
6. Do you have a long-range clothing and textiles program in your county?
  - a. Yes \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. No \_\_\_\_\_
7. Do you utilize adult leader training in clothing and textiles for the following:
  - a. Extension Homemaker Groups \_\_\_\_\_
  - b. 4-H \_\_\_\_\_
  - c. Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_
8. During the period between July 1, 1978 and July 1, 1979, how many weeks will have been devoted to the entire clothing and textiles program? \_\_\_\_\_
9. In what areas of the clothing and textiles program do you receive the greatest number of requests for information? (Explain)
10. What do you perceive as the more important needs of the people of your county in relation to the clothing and textiles program?

11. How well is your program meeting the clothing and textiles needs you identified in question #10?
- a. Better than other parts of the home economics Extension program \_\_\_\_\_
- b. About as well as other parts of the program \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Not as well as other parts of the program \_\_\_\_\_
12. Check the resources within the Cooperative Extension Service which you utilize in planning the clothing and textiles program for your county:
- \_\_\_\_\_ Printed matter (4-H guidelines, fact sheets, manuals, etc.)
- \_\_\_\_\_ State clothing specialists
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other Extension Home Economists
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other resources (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_
13. Check the areas of the clothing and textiles program in which you feel a need for instructional assistance from your state clothing specialists:
- a. Construction \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Textiles \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Fitting \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Alterations \_\_\_\_\_
- e. Buying \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_
14. Check the sources (other than the Cooperative Extension Service) from which you receive clothing and textiles information:
- a. Printed matter (magazines, newspapers, textbooks, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Local resources (store clerks, buyers, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_
- c. Commercial companies (pattern companies, etc.) \_\_\_\_\_
- d. Television and radio \_\_\_\_\_
- e. College instructors \_\_\_\_\_
- f. Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_
15. Check any methods of presentation other than lecture and/or demonstration which you have found effective in the following areas:
- a. Buying Clothing
- \_\_\_\_\_ Field trips \_\_\_\_\_ Visual aids
- \_\_\_\_\_ Printed matter \_\_\_\_\_ Dress revues
- \_\_\_\_\_ Workshops \_\_\_\_\_ Resource persons
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_
- b. Clothing Construction
- \_\_\_\_\_ Field trips \_\_\_\_\_ Visual aids
- \_\_\_\_\_ Printed matter \_\_\_\_\_ Dress revues
- \_\_\_\_\_ Workshops \_\_\_\_\_ Resource persons
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_



c. Care and Upkeep of Clothing

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Field trips           | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual aids      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Printed matter        | <input type="checkbox"/> Dress revues     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Workshops             | <input type="checkbox"/> Resource persons |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |   |

d. Grooming

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Field trips           | <input type="checkbox"/> Visual aids      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Printed matter        | <input type="checkbox"/> Dress revues     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Workshops             | <input type="checkbox"/> Resource persons |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify) _____ |   |

16. Do you do any sewing of outer garments (excluding coats) for yourself and/or your family? (This does not include mending and alterations.)

a. No \_\_\_\_\_ b. Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (If yes, specify percent below):

- 10% or less of the garments you acquire per year.  
 11% to 49% of the garments you acquire per year.  
 50% or more of the garments you acquire per year.

17. List the academic degree(s) you hold, the date(s) received, and the university from which you received it (them):

<u>DEGREE</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>UNIVERSITY</u>
---------------	-------------	-------------------

18. \_\_\_\_\_ You are planning to work toward an advanced degree.  
 \_\_\_\_\_ You are currently working toward an advanced degree. If so, specify where: \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_ You have no plans for furthering your education.

19. Indicate how you would prefer to update your clothing and textiles education by putting a 1, 2, or 3 respectively before your first, second, and third choices:

- Attending classes one day a week during a regular semester.  
 Attending a full-term summer school session.  
 Attending short courses during the summer.  
 Attending regular semester classes.  
 Attending weekend courses (2 or 3 weekends for one hour of credit).  
 Through correspondence courses.  
 By talk-back television.  
 Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

20. Major course of study: Bachelor's \_\_\_\_\_  
 Master's \_\_\_\_\_  
 Doctoral \_\_\_\_\_

Minor course of study: Bachelor's \_\_\_\_\_  
 Master's \_\_\_\_\_  
 Doctoral \_\_\_\_\_

21. Approximately how many hours beyond your last degree have you completed:  
 \_\_\_\_\_

22. Check the college clothing and textiles courses you have taken:

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Basic clothing construction           | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced clothing construction (Excluding draping, flat pattern, tailoring) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Speed techniques                      | <input type="checkbox"/> Flat pattern design   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Tailoring                             | <input type="checkbox"/> Basic textiles  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Draping                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Advanced textiles   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Clothing renovation                   | <input type="checkbox"/> Costume design  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Family clothing                       | <input type="checkbox"/> Millinery   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Economics of clothing and/or textiles | <input type="checkbox"/> Fashion merchandising and/or marketing                                      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Consumer clothing                     |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Social/psychological aspects          |  |
- Other (Specify) \_\_\_\_\_

23. Rate the quality of your academic preparation for instruction in the following:

	<u>Superior</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Inadequate</u>
a. Construction techniques	_____	_____	_____
b. Pattern alteration & fitting	_____	_____	_____
c. Buying clothing	_____	_____	_____
d. Wardrobe planning	_____	_____	_____
e. Textile and fabric selection	_____	_____	_____
f. Current textile legislation	_____	_____	_____
g. Care and upkeep of clothing	_____	_____	_____
h. Posture and grooming	_____	_____	_____
i. Social and psychological aspects	_____	_____	_____

24. Rate your level of competency for instruction in the following:

	<u>Very High</u>	<u>High</u>	<u>Average</u>	<u>Low</u>	<u>Very Low</u>
a. Construction techniques	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
b. Pattern alteration & fitting	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
c. Buying clothing	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
d. Wardrobe planning	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
e. Textile & fabric selection	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
f. Current textile legislation	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
g. Care & upkeep of clothing	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
h. Posture & grooming	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
i. Social & psychological aspects	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____



VITA<sup>2</sup>

Nancy Ann Ruzicka

Candidate for the Degree of

Master of Science

Thesis: PREPARATION, NEEDS, AND PRACTICES OF EXTENSION HOME  
ECONOMISTS IN CLOTHING AND TEXTILES SUBJECT MATTER AREA

Major Field: Clothing, Textiles and Merchandising

Biographical:

Personal Data: Born in Okarche, Oklahoma, January 15, 1956,  
the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Rudolph Ruzicka.

Education: Graduated from Yukon High School, Yukon, Oklahoma,  
May, 1974; attended Southwestern Oklahoma State Univer-  
sity, 1974-76; received Bachelor of Science in Home Econom-  
ics degree from Oklahoma State University in December,  
1978; completed requirements for the Master of Science de-  
gree at Oklahoma State University in December, 1979.

Professional Experience: Teller at bank, 1973-76; employee of  
Southwestern Bell Telephone, May, 1979, to present.

Professional Organizations: American Home Economics Association;  
Oklahoma Home Economics Association; Phi Upsilon Omicron,  
Omicron Nu.