

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Maretha Stephanie Jacobsz for the M. S. in Clothing, Textiles and  
(Name) (Degree) (Major)  
and Related Arts

Date thesis is presented July 24, 1963

Title The identification of and a comparison between trends in  
Clothing and Textiles in a selected group of Colleges and  
Universities

Abstract approved   
(Major professor)

The purpose of this study was to identify the most recent trends in Clothing and Textiles, to find whether any relationship existed between them, and whether there was difference of emphasis between large and small schools.

The information about existing trends in Clothing and Textiles was collected from literature published in Clothing and Textiles Teachers Conference Reports and in Home Economics journals. In addition, twenty catalogs from schools offering majors in Clothing and Textiles were analyzed for course content and educational objectives. The schools were divided in large and small categories according to the number of students enrolled as majors in Home Economics.

From the literature it was concluded that the following

four pairs of opposing trends existed: development of creative abilities, the development of skills; breadth in subject matter, depth in subject matter; family centeredness, subject matter orientation; general education, and professional education.

A questionnaire was devised which tested the opposing trends in the four areas of Clothing and Textiles (clothing construction, clothing selection, textiles, and consumer economics). The face-validity was checked by nine faculty members experienced in the area of Clothing and Textiles, and rechecked by three Home Economics department heads and one textiles advisor, before it was finally sent out. The questions in the first part were indirect forced-choice type and referred only to the beginning courses. In Part II, the eight trends were independently listed and each department head was asked to rate her department as to the amount of emphasis given on the issues.

The questionnaires were sent to 112 colleges and universities in the United States which offered Clothing and Textiles as a major in their Home Economics program. The chairmen of the departments were asked to participate and to return the completed questionnaires, of which 54 percent were returned.

The returned questionnaires were statistically analyzed in

the following way: means were determined for the trends for the indirect questions in Part I and for the ranking of trends in Part II in order to determine whether the trends existed and which were considered most important, Pearson  $r$  correlations were used to find the relationships between any of the trends in Part I, in Part II, and between Part I and Part II; t-test of mean differences between large and small schools were computed for each trend to find whether the difference was significant; and an analysis of variance was performed to find the significance of variance within the four areas of Clothing and Textiles in each of the trends.

Data collected revealed that the mean scores of trends differed and that breadth in subject matter scored highest in both parts of the device. Significant correlations existed between all trends in the indirect questions, and between a few trends in the direct rating scale. The relations of creativity in the latter with breadth, depth, family centeredness and subject matter were the most significant. Correlations existed between some of the trends in both parts of the questionnaire, namely: breadth, family centeredness, between general and family centeredness, and between professional and depth. The opposing trends were in the negative direction. The significant relations of all trends in the beginning courses might be due to the tendency to teach the

mastery of skills, breadth in subject matter with subject matter emphasis in the professional curricula.

There were no significant differences in the mean scores between large and small schools but significant F ratios were found within the four areas of Clothing and Textiles for each pair of variables for the small schools and between one pair of variables for the large schools.

An analysis of the course offerings, course content, and educational objectives were made from the catalog material. This revealed differences between small and large schools in general requirements for graduation and course offerings in Clothing and Textiles. Based on this information it was concluded that the small schools were more concerned with individual development of the students through a wide variety of general education courses, while the larger schools offered more courses within Clothing and Textiles and were more concerned with preparation for a professional career.

AN IDENTIFICATION OF AND A COMPARISON  
BETWEEN TRENDS IN CLOTHING AND TEXTILES  
IN A SELECTED GROUP OF  
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

by

MARETHA STEPHANIE JACOB SZ

A THESIS

submitted to

OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

in partial fulfillment of  
the requirements for the  
degree of


MASTER OF SCIENCE


August 1963

APPROVED:

  
Associate Professor of Department of Clothing  
Textiles and Related Arts

In Charge of Major

  
Acting Head of the Department of Clothing  
Textiles and Related Arts

  
Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented July 24, 1963

Typed by Opal Grossnicklaus

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An expression of sincere appreciation and special thanks is herewith extended to Dr. Anna Mary Creekmore, Associate Professor of Clothing, Textiles and Related Arts, for her patient guidance, continual encouragement and her personal interest through the preparation of this thesis.

Appreciation is also expressed to Miss Ida Ingalls, acting head of the Department of Clothing and Textiles and Related Arts for her help with the inception of this study, to the faculty members in the School of Home Economics for their kindness and concern during the course of the study, and to the people who have responded so readily to the questionnaires.

Special thanks is extended to my family and friends in the Republic of South Africa for their continuous interest and encouragement in my studies.

Acknowledgment is also extended to the trustees of the "Pres. Steyn-Gedenkfonds" and to the "Cape Province Women's Agricultural Association," both South African fellowships, and to my parents, whose financial aid made this study abroad possible.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
Need for the study.....	2
Statement of the problem.....	3
Objectives.....	4
Definition of terms.....	4
Abbreviations.....	6
Delimitations.....	7
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	8
Development of creative ability and skills.....	11
Breadth and depth in subject matter.....	15
Professional and general education.....	17
Family centeredness and subject matter orientation....	21
PROCEDURE.....	26
Identification of trends.....	26
Classification of Clothing and Textiles.....	27
Construction of the questionnaire.....	28
Selection of the subjects.....	29
Method of recording the scores.....	30
Statistical treatment of the data.....	31
Limitations and scope.....	33
ANALYSIS OF DATA.....	35
Returns from the questionnaires.....	35
Statistical analysis.....	36
Review of catalog material.....	47
CONCLUSIONS.....	49
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	54
APPENDIX.....	59
Cover letter.....	59
Questionnaire used in the study.....	60



## LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1a Means of pairs of variables for large and small schools and total for Part I of the questionnaire.	37
1b Means of variables for large and small schools and total for Part II of the questionnaire.	38
2a Pearson r correlations between pairs of variables in Part I of the questionnaire.	40
2b Pearson r correlation between variables in Part II of the questionnaire.	41
2c Pearson r correlations between corresponding variables in Part I and Part II.	43
3 Equality of means of corresponding variables between large and small schools for Part I.	44
4a Mean scores for test variables for small schools when F ratios showed significant differences within the four areas of Clothing and Textiles.	45
4b Mean scores for test variables for large schools when F ratios showed significant difference within the four areas of Clothing and Textiles.	46

AN IDENTIFICATION OF AND A COMPARISON  
BETWEEN TRENDS IN  
CLOTHING AND TEXTILES IN A  
SELECTED GROUP OF  
COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

INTRODUCTION

The vast social and economic changes in recent years have made it difficult to identify the specifics and to recognize the limits in any field of knowledge. This is particularly true when there is lack of agreement among those who are especially concerned with the objectives and philosophy of a specific body of knowledge. Therefore, the concern in this study was with the place and approach to Clothing and Textiles as an area of specialization within the field of Home Economics. The position of Home Economics in general and Clothing and Textiles in particular has become during recent years a point of interest and concern for every person involved with professional growth. Furthermore, it seems that there are desirable attributes which have caused controversy within the field and which have been vigorously debated in the professional journals in recent years. The following statements illustrate some of the issues:

Creativeness in extending, applying, and disseminating knowledge to improve personal and family living, is one of the qualities that should characterize the successful home economist (34, p. 693).

In recommending professional attributes the following is emphasized: depth in subject matter, ability to plan and see the total picture of a program, willingness to participate in professional organizations, and creativity in teaching (36, p. 18).

Administrators want highly professional teachers in their schools, and parents want highly professional teachers working with their children (36, p. 16).

Home Economics students must have a considerable educational experience in breadth as well as in depth (29, p. 19).

A distinction must be made between the development of certain skills which are vital to professional competence only and the mastery of disciplines which prepare one to continue lifelong process of education (29, p. 19).

In order to keep abreast with the ever increasing theories and proposals for Home Economics, this study was undertaken to determine the present position of Clothing and Textiles as an academic discipline and to identify, categorize, and interpret those issues which describe the present thinking, as well as to determine which of them are perhaps significant for the future.

#### Need for the study

A review of the literature revealed that very little has been done in identifying the contemporary position of Clothing and

Textiles as a part of Home Economics and of evaluating the existence and importance of different approaches in the teaching process. However, in light of the increasing emphasis put upon human behavior, the future, and on preparation for change, it seemed that a study with emphasis on the identification of the present place of Clothing and Textiles would be most important. A study of this kind could help to direct future activities as well as to emphasize the importance of Clothing and Textiles in the Home Economics program.

Although this study was not designed to direct curriculum planning, it is possible that it might lead to further exploration into the importance of the different approaches - how they relate to each other and how they can be included.

#### Statement of the problem

The main purpose of this study was to identify and compare trends that are current in the Home Economics thinking of today as revealed in the Clothing and Textiles area. It was also hoped that the study would help in clarifying the place of Clothing and Textiles in the Home Economics program.

### Objectives

1. To identify the current trends in Clothing and Textiles.
2. To find the direction of emphasis in Clothing and Textiles in colleges and universities and to determine the relationship between these directions.
3. To find whether a difference in trends exist between larger and smaller colleges and universities.
4. To find whether there are any significant difference in trends in the four basic areas of Clothing and Textiles (construction, selection, textiles and consumer economics).
5. To find whether any relationship exists between objectives of large and small colleges and universities, which offer clothing and textiles, and the identified trends.

### Definition of terms

Basic areas of Clothing and Textiles are those areas into which all clothing and textiles subject matter can be divided.

Breadth in subject matter occurs when the emphasis is on knowledge related to a specific subject but reaching out to cover many aspects of it.

Depth in subject matter involves the understanding of the

significant ideas, definitions, and concepts within a specific aspect of the total, or concentration of interest on a segment of the field.

Development of creativity results from emphasis on conception of ideas with the value placed on the obtaining of pleasure derived from the seeing, feeling, and working with the materials in the development of ideas.

Development of skills results from the acquisition of ability in handling or using certain techniques to obtain specific results or standards of efficiency.

Family centeredness emphasizes the essential services of Clothing and Textiles that are directly related to the family, the ultimate concern and reason for the knowledge.

General education is the result of a variety of experiences included in a curriculum or course which prepares a person for life, regardless of vocational plans.

Professional education consists of specialized instruction related to a specific profession, use, or occupation, and is studied for professional advancement.

Subject matter orientation is the gainful pursuit of knowledge in the subject matter area which is the goal in itself.

## Abbreviations

To simplify the discussion of items and for ease in tabulation the following abbreviations were used in the sections on Procedure, Statistical analysis, and Conclusions.

### Categorized trends or issues

Development of creative ability	Creat
Development of skills	Skill
Depth in subject matter	Depth
Breadth in subject matter	Bread
Family centeredness	Family
Subject matter orientation	Subj
Professional education	Profes
General education	Gener

### Areas of Clothing and Textiles

Construction	Con
Clothing selection	Sel
Textiles	Tex
Consumer economics	Eco

### Sizes of schools

Large: more than 200 students enrolled as majors in

Home Economics and having 40 or more graduating seniors during 1959-1960.

Small: less than 200 students enrolled as majors in Home Economics and having less than 40 graduating seniors during 1959-1960.

Total: all schools included in the analysis of data.

### Delimitations

Since it was felt that the schools which offer a major program in Clothing and Textiles would be the best source of information concerning the most recent trends, the participants for this study were limited to colleges and universities in the Home Economics degree granting institutions which offered a major in Clothing and Textiles.



## REVIEW OF LITERATURE

In recent years there has been an increased interest in the development of Clothing and Textiles as a field of academic study but, unfortunately, there is a great deal of controversy as to its main emphasis and its role.

... study in textiles and clothing can contribute to an understanding of the self, to a realization of the speed of change affecting our lives, and to an ability to make some of the adjustments demanded in a dynamic society. It can help an individual see the interrelation between one's practices and the cultural environment and provide a medium through which one can understand some of the important economic, social, and political forces operating in a nation and between nations (16, p. 635).

Because Clothing and Textiles is influenced by these changes -- social, economic, and political -- we should expect a reflection of them in program planning in order to realize the most from study in this area.

An investigation of the literature uncovered the humanistic aspect of Clothing and Textiles as well as the social and physical science content. The need for research in these areas was voiced at a conference of home economists, sociologists, and economists, held in 1947 at the Teachers College, Columbia University (38, p. 185). Since then amazing progress has been made in amount

of research relating clothing to other disciplines.

James McCain (27), stated in 1961 that an increase in the humanistic content of the curriculum in all areas of Home Economics could add to the understanding of its place in the world of today. He also suggested that the physical science content be decreased and the social science content of the curriculum be increased. Yet as early as 1959 a research study by Sarah Lee on a comparison of these titles revealed that the latter of McCain's suggestions related to Home Economics, was already recognizable (26, p. 789). This study also revealed that there was a sharp decline in research related to historical and art contents of Clothing and Textiles.

One year later, Margaret Warning published an article in which she explored the future of Clothing and Textiles and commented with alarm on the decline in the cultural content in Home Economics curricula. She pleaded for more research in Historic Costume and Historic Textiles (44, p. 646).

In 1962 Ruth Sybers and Mary Ellen Roach reported that the increasing interest in the sociological aspects of Clothing and Textiles was related to the "increasing interest in the accumulation of knowledge about human behaviour" (38, p. 184). They also

felt that the interest runs parallel with the changing world-wide social and cultural conditions. They traced the development of the study of the social aspects of clothing and summarized the current emphasis on clothing research under the following headings: social status, social mobility, occupation, social control, motivation, attitudes, theory and methods. For the future they suggested further studies concerning "people and their related clothing behavior" (38, p. 187).

As a result of an experiment completed in 1959, Mary Wines (46), concluded that the enrichment of clothing could take place only if the other disciplines, such as sociology, psychology, and economics were incorporated in the exploration of Clothing and Textiles. This attitude was further stressed in the report of the 1962 Clothing and Textile Teachers Conference of the Central Region when a note was made that "cooperative research with related disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, should be encouraged" (14, p. 23).

In the literature cited above, there is evidence of the broad scope of the area of Clothing and Textiles and the reflection of its sensitivity to social change which results in different interpretations of the subject matter and in different approaches.

During the process of reviewing the literature concerning Clothing and Textiles, the writer discovered many controversial points which were discussed more or less fully. These points were then listed and analyzed further. It was found that the greater majority of them could be grouped under issues as revealed in the following:

1. Development of creative ability as opposed to skills.
2. Emphasis on breadth in subject matter or on depth in subject matter.
3. Professional as opposed to general education.
4. Family centeredness as opposed to subject matter orientation.

Development of creative ability as opposed to the development of skills

There are two aspects of education that have received a great deal of attention during the past years: creativity, because of the great upsurge of interest in the use of leisure, and skills, because proficiency makes for greater employability and personal security, self fulfillment and satisfaction.

In a book entitled "Creativity" (35) Paul Smith made the following statement: "Recent developments, especially in sciences

indicates that we must develop our creativity far beyond anything previously dreamed of, it is possible that our very survival may depend on this" (35, p. 9).

Doris Johnson concurred with this opinion in a "New Direction in Clothing Construction" and discussed the opportunities clothing construction provides for helping people achieve a more pleasant life through the use of increased leisure time for creative experiences. She indicated that it could provide outlets for tensions and give opportunities for self expression in a modern world (22, p. 753).

A similar idea was also expressed at the Sixteenth Conference of College Teachers of Clothing and Textiles, namely that one of the additional values of clothing construction was,

While rising income has reduced the economic need for clothing construction, increased mechanization and leisure have resulted in an increased psychological need for creative activity. Clothing construction may help to satisfy this need for creative expression, which may be at different levels (13, p. 21).

Alice McDonald analyzed creative ability as expressed in performance of student teachers and concluded that the level of performance seemed directly related to the level of creativity of the student as a person (28, p. 668). And according to Dr. Gilmore,

creativity is a professional asset to the college teacher, secondary teacher, research worker and to the home economist who goes into retailing, journalism or homemaking (13, p. 18-24). Barber also supported these observations and concluded that "if we want to make the most of our capabilities for good, for the realization and actualization of potential experiences of value, we have to be creative" (6, p. 322). At the same time he considered skills and the ability to do some things important, because it gives "power to the possessor" (6, p. 321).

Others have a similar feeling toward creativity and skills. Jane Werden commented on both aspects in her article "The place of Clothing Construction in the College Program" thus:

Skill is involved in any course in clothing construction; of this there is no question. However, the emphasis does not have to be on skill alone. Skill is involved in courses in many other fields. We have to master the basic skills in our fields before we can use them to advance knowledge and be creative (45, p. 340).

Furthermore Karlyne Anspach surmised that with increased mass-produced articles offered at lower prices, there will exist the demand for personal attributes or tailoring and couture dressmaking, and that "it is the personal qualities of the skilled craftsmen that the mechanism of industry strives to imitate" (4, p. 430).

Hoobler also suggests that with what science and its resultant technologies have brought to the modern world, "the world needs curious, receptive, and creative scholars versed in the knowledge and skills of Home Economics as well as other phases of learning" (20, p. 154).

However there are authorities in the field who believe that the emphasis should shift away from training in skills to a program built on a broader base. At a 1962 Clothing and Textile Teachers Conference the future of clothing and textiles was seen "as a swing away from courses devoted entirely to skills, and greater emphasis being given to history, literature, art and economics in the home economics curriculum" (14, p. 38). This trend was also noticeable in a research study on curriculum change where two-thirds of the major changes in course content was due to "less emphasis on manipulative skills" (21, p. 239).

McCain urged in the opening address of the French Lick seminar that Home Economics in higher education should make "appropriate disposition of courses that teach only skills and that are, therefore, vocational in character and of those that overlap and duplicate content" (5, p. 20).

Much literature was found in which both of these aspects of the educational program in Clothing and Textiles was discussed.

Some writers contended that the emotional process of creativity should come before the development of the skilled process while others felt that skills must be developed for the handling of materials with professional efficiency.

#### Emphasis on breadth or depth in subject matter

Another issue that seemed significant in the literature published during the past ten years occurred possibly as the result of increased emphasis on research and of expanding knowledge in the area. Greater depth of training and specialized competence in one or more areas of Home Economics appeared important, and at the same time breadth of knowledge in Home Economics was felt necessary for better understanding of the scope of the field (5, p. 25, 26).

Breadth in subject matter was best illustrated in an experiment reported by Mary Wines, in which the subject matter of a children's clothing class was enriched by the application of other disciplines such as sociology, psychology, and economics. This approach provided greater breadth and scope to the field of Clothing and Textiles (46, p. 353).

Furthermore, at the French Lick Seminar the consensus of opinion was that if Home Economics was to stand the test of



maturity as a professional field it must:

Liberalize the content of Home Economics courses and recognize the professional courses, taught with breadth and vision, can make an important contribution to the education of all university students (5, p. 22).

However the need for depth of training and specialized competence in one or more areas of Home Economics was also emphasized because of the increase in knowledge and expanding research (5, p. 26). This same attitude was held by Clara Ridder as shown by the following:

Some may think that home economists no longer need breadth throughout the field of home economics. Some believe that depth in one of the particular areas is the answer to the increased need for greater professional knowledge and ability, if home economists are to meet the challenges of their particular fields. Others think that depth in a particular area loses perspective and relevance unless supported by a strong base encompassing the whole of the arts and sciences of home economics. They believe that the strength of a home economist is in direct proportion to her understanding of the totality of the areas encompassed in home economics and her ability to focus on a particular problem without losing perspective (31, p. 1).

Breadth in the core curriculum and depth in the majoring area was proposed as a means of achieving a logical balance (31, p. 6). All this can be viewed against the background of an article published

in the Journal of Home Economics in 1956, entitled "Clothing and Textiles Move Forward," in which breadth and depth of approach to subject matter was clearly introduced with the Clothing and Textiles goals. In this article general goals in Clothing and Textiles were stated, which all students in Home Economics should acquire. In addition to these goals the importance of preparing for a profession was also stressed in which depth of subject matter should be achieved (16, p. 637).

From the analysis of the literature on these two important aspects it became clear that both breadth and depth in subject matter were held to be important to the total program of Home Economics. However, the authorities differed in their approach to subject matter emphasis. Some felt breadth should be emphasized and others felt that depth was vital for advanced study.

#### Professional as opposed to general education

The responsibility of the educational programs and the emphasis on quality in education in Home Economics is and has been of concern for some time. Pleas for both professional and general education have been published in the journals and have been discussed at conferences.

In 1959 Eppright felt that one of the most important

challenges of that day was to strengthen education for the professions (18, p. 690). During March, 1963, the placement office at Cornell University reported that it had already received 380 job requests for Home Economists, stating that "specialists in the various Home Economics subject matter areas are sought after, rather than teachers of general Home Economics" (9, p. 450). In the same month, Dr. Hoobler published an article in which she indicated that professional workers in Home Economics are needed mainly because this age has brought "vast opportunities and responsibilities, vast technological advances, and vast areas of new knowledge. . . ." (20, p. 154).

Others have been concerned about professional training also. In June 1963, Schlacter et al. published an article which had this introduction: "Growth and increasing stature of Home Economics as an academic discipline today demands more professional competence and sophistication of those who enter the field" (33, p. 423). Considering the fact that an estimated 98 percent of the women in this country would be employed sometime during their lives. Tripple believed it most important that the higher education experience should include preparation for a career. She also noted that "While homemaking classes have gone from specialization to generalization, most other

workers--including the homemaker--have gone from generalization to specialization" (40, p. 659). In a panel discussion conducted by Lois Gilmore at the sixteenth annual Conference of Clothing and Textile Teachers, Central Region, it was stated "that within the past 15 years the primary emphasis in the colleges has shifted to professional education" (13, p. 16).

On the other hand there are those people who feel that the educational experience should include a serious concern for the relationship between materials and people which is obtained from a broad college experience. According to the research done by Marilyn Horn on trends in curriculum changes it seemed that when the core in Home Economics was reduced professional courses in the areas of specialization were added. At the same time when credit requirements outside Home Economics were changed, provision was made for increasing opportunity for a liberal education (21, p. 218). In 1959 a revision of the curriculum at Michigan State University provided for a broader base of subject matter in liberal arts (43, p. 25). These references seemed to indicate that a trend toward more general education was being considered.

Moreover Leahy warned against too early specialization

since there were too many professional Home Economists who had little knowledge of the scope of the field (25, p. 331). McCain also felt that Home Economics as the institution for educating women, had deviated from its original moorings in the liberal arts (5, p. 23).

The liberal arts can give homemakers a better conception of their own place and work in the world, by the study of the history and literature of other peoples and tongues. They can be trained to recognize beauty of color and outline, and the hand to express it in constructing and adorning the house beautiful" (27, p. 15).

He believed that the liberal arts courses were too many times replaced by those with emphasis on skills instead of principles. He felt that the humanistic and social science content of curricula for all fields of specialization in Home Economics was necessary (5, p. 20). In addition, Tead hopefully stated that teachers whose liberal arts education was not eclipsed by their training in subject matter (39, p. 235) and, according to Rogers, women derive more benefit than men from programs which included more liberal arts, "because they are less concerned with specialization and professional preparation" (32, p. 22).

From the literature concerned with the professional and general aspects of the Home Economics program in colleges and

universities it seemed that writers were apt to emphasize one of the two issues although the other was never excluded altogether. It was, therefore, assumed that both these issues were significant.

#### Family centeredness as opposed to subject matter orientation

During the past decade a concern for families has developed throughout the world. This concern is not new for Home Economists. "After all, isn't Home Economics an assembling of the 'root subjects' to apply to problems of the home and family?" (23, p. 189).

A statement of the purpose of Home Economics in higher education made by the American Home Economics Association in 1949. Among other points included:

. . . Regardless of the type of institution, however a Home Economics department should have as a fundamental purpose education for home and family living (1, p. 6).

And in the New Directions for Home Economics published in 1959:

Home Economics is the field of knowledge and service primarily concerned with strengthening family life through: educating the individual for

family living, improving the services and goods used by families, conducting research to discover the changing needs of individuals and families and the means of satisfying these needs, furthering community, national and world conditions favorable to family living (2, p. 1-2).

These statements seemed to indicate continued concern for the family.

In an analysis of Clothing and Textiles in 1960, Warning placed priority on research significant to better family living for the future (44, p. 646). Her thought was shared also by other research workers. Victoria Blum, who after having conferences with high school and college Home Economics students, concluded that "home economics works to improve community, national, and world conditions favorable to family living" (7, p. 221). Pearl Swanson felt that the factor of change posed the greatest challenge to Home Economics and that:

People will find satisfactions in living only to the extent that they can deal with their needs and with the circumstances of their times. In all aspects of our profession -- teaching, extension, and research -- we aim to help individuals and families develop competences fundamental to effective living (37, p. 161).

Doris Johnson supported this standpoint and indicated that we ought to show that every field of Home Economics could serve

a vital role in preparing young people for the serious problems of family living in the modern world (22, p. 752). A sentence from the bulletin of the College of Home Economics, Pennsylvania State University, 1959, states emphatically:

This is the challenge of the mid-century to higher institutions that they develop essential services in Home Economics appropriate to the potential power of home and family life in this society (30, p. 17).

In 1952 the Clothing and Textiles Teachers Conference of the Western Region was entirely devoted to clothing problems of the family, their personal concerns, how their money was spent and its relationship with the selection, use, and care of family clothing (10). Only ten years later, at one of the 1962 conferences it was interesting to note that not a single aspect of family clothing or clothing and the direct relation to families was on the conference schedule. The entire program was spent on the development of subject matter areas and on the understanding of Clothing (14). The emphasis on subject matter, research in subject matter areas, and future directions for the profession was especially noticeable in the conference reports of the past few years and indicates a shift of emphasis perhaps.



Doretta Hoffman, in a speech entitled "A look for the Future," said that "we must redefine our goals, establish clear priorities and promote a new sense of purpose in the schools and in the nation." She felt that the emphasis in the clothing and textiles program must be on "clear-cut goals" and "the improvement of educational quality" in the field (13, p. 9). She also believed that:

Higher education is the source of supply of trained people, of specialists for management and operation, and of research for the advancement of basic knowledge and the application of that knowledge through new processes and new procedures (13, p. 11).

In addition, she emphasized the need of teaching with basic principles, for encouraging the students to do advanced work in clothing, and for keeping the subject matter up to the intellectual ability of the students with consideration for the time and money spent during the process.

Furthermore, at the eighteenth Conference of College Teachers of Clothing and Textiles, Central Region, the position of clothing in all its important aspects was emphasized. Careful consideration was given to the research opportunities for the future, in which the possibilities are unlimited if the planning process and the methodology is sound (14, p. 17-22). The discussion was concluded with the note: "One should not learn subject matter but

should learn from subject matter" (14, p. 28).

Although Home Economics has been and continues to be vitally concerned with home and families, an increased emphasis on subject matter orientation, and specialization was apparent from the literature.

The review of the literature from many writers about Home Economics and Clothing and Textiles revealed that leaders of the field have different ideas as to the approach to the educational program. Their publications present opposing issues, each of which could be stressed and from which the choices for the future will be made.

## PROCEDURE

Since the aim of this study was to explore the important issues in Clothing and Textiles as well as to find the immediate trends evolving from them, it was necessary to analyze the approaches used in classes to determine which were most important. In order to accomplish this goal the procedure developed through the following steps: (1) An identification of the trends which existed in the literature concerning Clothing and Textiles and Home Economics, (2) the division of Clothing and Textiles into four main aspects, (3) the development of the questionnaire to be sent to department heads, (4) the statistical analysis of the data from the questionnaires and (5) a summary of catalog material.

### Identification of trends

After reviewing the more recent written resources in Clothing and Textiles a long list was made of the topics discussed, which were then grouped according to opposing or different points of view. When this grouping was completed it was found that many of the controversial ideas could be classified in one of four pairs of opposing categories. These categories, or issues, were assumed to be evidence of trends in Clothing and Textiles and are as follows: (1) professional education versus a general education,

(2) development of the creative ability versus skills, (3) depth in subject matter and breadth in subject matter, and (4) family centeredness versus subject matter orientation.

#### Classification of Clothing and Textiles into four areas

Based upon an analysis of these topics (40) and on two studies of clothing research, one by Karlyne Anspach (3) and the other by Sarah Lee (25), the Clothing and Textiles area for this study was divided into four main aspects which seemed to cover the field. These were:

1. Clothing selection which included all aspects of selection, sociological, psychological and historical influences, the role of fashion, and artistic considerations.
2. Clothing construction, covering designing, construction problems, and flat pattern and draping where it is considered an outgrowth of elementary construction.
3. Textiles, including all aspects of identification, construction, and use of textiles.
4. Consumer economics, including all consumer aspects such as labeling and quality as well as the economic forces in the textile and clothing industry.

### Construction of the questionnaire

A questionnaire was constructed to cover the four aspects of Clothing and Textiles, each related to the four pairs of trends derived from the analysis of the literature. Thus a total of 32 questions concerning work being done in the beginning courses of the four areas mentioned was devised, with a forced choice question "a" and "b" for every pair of opposing issues (Appendix B). The respondents were asked to put a checkmark in the scale which indicated the approach or emphasis they felt represented their department thus:

1. Much emphasis on "a".
2. Emphasis on "a" with inclusion of "b"
3. Equal emphasis on "a" and "b"
4. Emphasis on "b" with inclusion of "a"
5. Much emphasis on "b"

To determine the face-validity of these questions, they were listed under the categories in which they belonged and were given to eight faculty members and three graduate assistants, all experienced in the area of Clothing and Textiles. They were asked to evaluate each question as to clarity and as to the relationship of the issue under which it appeared. Nine of these people returned the questions with their comments and suggestions which were

carefully considered and revisions or changes made.

The second part of the questionnaire was added to determine the philosophy of the department as seen by the chairmen of Clothing and Textiles in the various universities.

After revisions were made, the questionnaire and a copy of the cover letter were given to three department heads of the School of Home Economics and one textile instructor for a final check. These people were selected mainly because of their interest in the research and their knowledge of either Clothing and Textiles or the objectives of Home Economics. After they returned the instrument it was again revised, although the changes suggested were minor.

The questionnaire, consisting of 32 questions in Part I concerning the beginning courses, and eight items in Part II, relating to the departmental philosophy, was sent to 112 colleges and universities in the United States, accompanied with the cover letter and a self-addressed envelope.

#### Selection of the subjects

It was assumed that universities and colleges would be the main power in directing, using, and interpreting the thinking in Clothing and Textiles area of Home Economics, thus a list was

made of the schools which offered an under-graduate major in this area (41). These were separated into two groups: those with large Home Economics enrollment (more than 200 students as majors in Home Economics and having more than 40 graduating seniors during 1959-1960), and those with less Home Economics enrollment (fewer than 200 students as majors in Home Economics during 1959-1960) (41, p. 60-82).

The questionnaire was sent to the chairmen of the Clothing and Textile departments in each school, and they were asked to answer the questions or to consult staff members directly concerned with the beginning courses.

#### Method of recording the scores

Since the questions in Part I were forced choice type, a scoring procedure was devised which used only part "a" of each pair of questions. If the checkmark appeared opposite "much emphasis on 'a'", a score of four was given to the entry, if the checkmark appeared opposite "much emphasis on question 'a' with inclusion of 'b'", three was the score and so on to no score for "much emphasis on 'b'". Thus a score was obtained for the "a" part of each question for every oppositional pair of issues. It was assumed that the score for question "b" could be determined

by subtracting the score for "a" from the total possible score. After rating the individual questions the scores for all questions for each issue were added to get the totals. Part I and Part II of the questionnaires were scored separately.

Part II of the questionnaire was a rating scale consisting of three possible ranks which were scored one, two, and three, depending on the response of the subject. A weighting of three was given to the highest rating and one to the lowest.

#### Statistical treatment of the data

To discover the leading trends in all the schools and to compare the trends with the two sizes of schools, it was necessary to determine the means of the variables, or trends, for both parts of the questionnaire. Therefore, means were determined for each variable within school size and for all schools.

To determine whether a significant relation existed between any of the identified trends as measured in Part I and in Part II of the questionnaire Pearson  $r$  correlations were computed between each variable and every other one. It was recognized that Pearson  $r$  correlations between variables in Part I and Part II did not exactly fit the data, but since no other method of analysis was applicable, coefficients between the variables were determined.



Significant differences existing between the means of the small and the large schools on each of the trends in Part I were determined by the t-test. This was done because it was believed that size of school might have an effect on the interpretation of trends.

The F test was used to determine whether in each trend there was any significant difference between the four areas in Clothing and Textiles. In addition when a significance F ratio was reported, the data were further analyzed to find the specific areas (Construction, Selection, Textiles, Consumer economics) between which the significance occurred.

#### Summary of catalog material

In order to find the provision made for education in Clothing and Textiles at college level, the catalogs of ten large and ten small colleges and universities were briefly reviewed. Since catalogs were not available from all the universities who returned questionnaires, a random sample was chosen from among those available to whom questionnaires were sent. Therefore, those analyzed were not necessarily universities from which questionnaires were received.

The catalog offerings were studied and the following

information was recorded: objectives of the university; objectives of the school or department of Home Economics; general requirements for a degree, with special observation as to amount and hours required in the humanities, social and physical sciences, and course offerings in Clothing and Textiles. Particular attention was paid to special Clothing and Textile courses for consumer economics and family clothing.

#### Limitations and scope of the study

Although the universities and colleges selected varied in size of school, they all offered a major program in Clothing and Textiles (41). As a result the difference in observations between large and small schools could not be expected to be wide; therefore, interpretations of findings should be considered in this light.

Because the forced-choice questions in Part I of the questionnaire were not independent, the results must be analyzed with this limitation in mind also. However, the writer felt that, since the questions referred to beginning courses in the field, it would be impossible to emphasize both issues in one course. Furthermore, since some of the issues might be excluded or marked low because of the pressure of public opinion, this type of question

was considered advisable.

It was felt that the open and very direct ranking scale in Part II might lead subjects to giving a biased opinion of what they would like to emphasize in their schools and was not necessarily an indication that the emphasis actually occurred in practice. Furthermore, the ranking was limited to three orders which perhaps influenced the assessment of the importance of a trend in the department. A pretest of the questionnaire accompanied with an interview with some different university department heads would have been advisable, but since it was necessary to collect the data during the end of the academic year, it was impossible to do that.

Another problem that may have affected results was that department heads, because of their administrative responsibilities, may not have known exactly what emphasis was given in the classes. This limitation was foreseen and a suggestion was made in the cover letter to consult the teachers of the beginning courses.

The review of catalogs was not complete on every point because specifics concerning course offerings could not be categorized in every case, observations of objectives and general aims of the school were of necessity subjective in nature.

## RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF DATA

The results and analysis of the data will be discussed under the following headings: (1) returns from the questionnaires, (2) statistical analysis of the data, and (3) review of catalog material.

### Returns from the questionnaires

To obtain evidence of the existence of the previously identified trends in Clothing and Textiles and to compare these trends, a questionnaire (Appendix B) was sent to 112 colleges and universities offering majors in Clothing and Textiles in their Home Economics programs (41). The information sought concerned only the beginning courses offered and the philosophy and objectives of the department.

Returns were obtained from 73 colleges and universities, two of these no longer offered any Home Economics courses, and three were received too late to be analyzed. Two schools indicated that they did not have time to respond within the time limit, and six others were not completed satisfactorily. There were 60 usable questionnaires, or 54 percent of the total to be analyzed. The response was considered very good in spite of the time of the year the questionnaires were sent.

Among the 60 institutions from which questionnaires were received, 21 were classified as large schools and 39 as small schools.

### Statistical analysis

The findings were considered under the following divisions:

- (1) Means of variables for Part I and Part II of the questionnaire,
- (2) all possible correlations between variables within Part I and within Part II and between Part I and Part II, (3) t-test of significant difference between means of Part I and means of Part II, (4) analysis of variance within areas of Clothing and Textiles for large and small schools.

Mean scores and standard deviations were computed for each of the variables for the small, the large, and all the schools for Part I of the questionnaire. Bread/Depth in subject matter produced the highest and lowest mean scores in both large and small schools. The means of the other three variables did not differ as much as Bread/Depth. Family/Subj showed the least difference.

Table 1a Means of pairs of variables for large and small schools and total for Part I of the questionnaire.

	Creat/Skill	Bread/Depth	Family/Subj	Gener/Profes
Large	7.29/8.71*	10.76/5.24	6.86/9.14	7.62/8.38
Small	6.61/9.39	11.08/4.92	8.44/7.66	7.70/8.30
Total	6.85/9.15	10.93/5.08	7.88/8.12	7.67/8.33
Stand dev.	2.713	2.562	2.995	2.293

\*/Mean scores of the opposing pairs of variables for Part I of the questionnaire.

The high scores in both skills and breadth was noticeable for beginning courses, where because of time limits it would be impossible for instructors to give students an opportunity to be creative, and at the same time provide for breadth in subject matter.

The mean scores and standard deviations for Part II of the questionnaire were also compared. It was again found that breadth scored highest for both large and small schools and that family centeredness and skills scored the lowest. (The small differences in scores must be viewed in the light of the limited scale that subjects were given in rating their departments).

Table 1b Means of variables for large and small schools and total for Part II of the questionnaire.

School	Creat	Skill	Bread	Depth	Family	Subj	Gener	Profes
Large	2.62	1.90	2.81	2.62	1.85	2.43	2.49	2.81
Small	2.59	2.13	2.82	2.49	2.15	2.41	2.65	2.51
Total	2.6	2.05	2.82	2.55	2.0	2.4	2.57	2.62
St Dev. *	.611	.617	.39	.53	.707	.554	.669	.580

\* Standard Deviation.

It was felt that the scores for this part of the questionnaire would reveal indirectly the variables the department heads considered to be the most important, since each would perhaps project her own feelings into her assessment of the department. Little difference occurred between large and small schools on any of the variables except family centeredness and skills which scored extremely low for the large schools. Both variables were low for the small schools also.

Comparing the results of Part I and Part II of the questionnaire, it was interesting to find that breadth in subject matter scored highest for both sections of the questionnaire, and that the reverse was true for skills and creativity. The low score for

skills on Part II of the questionnaire might be due to considerable pressure in all areas of Home Economics on this issue. In contrast, the high score of creativity might possibly be because of the acceptability of this idea at the present time.

A preliminary check of the mean scores of the large and the small schools indicated very little difference and, therefore, Pearson  $r$  correlations were computed between the mean scores on each of the variables in Part I (Table 2a), in Part II (Table 2b), and between corresponding variables of Part I and Part II of the questionnaires for all schools (Table 2c).

The results of the comparison between variables in Part I revealed a significant relation of the .01 level of confidence between all four of the pairs of variables: Creat/Skill, Bread/Depth, Family/Subj, and Gener/Profes. However, conclusions regarding this high significance must be viewed in the light of the interdependence of the questions because of the forced choice scoring procedure.



Table 2a Pearson r correlations between pairs of variables in Part I of the questionnaire.

	Creat/Skill	Bread/Depth	Family/Subj	Gener/Profes
Creat/Skill		.44**	.386**	.442**
Bread/Depth			.546**	.418**
Family/Subj				.482**
Gener/Profes				

\*\* Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The high number of significant relations between pairs of variables revealed the existence and was considered evidence of the use of all approaches in beginning courses in the Clothing and Textile programs.

The variables in Part II of the questionnaire were independently scored and, therefore, the relation between all the variables could be determined. However, the responses in Part II referred to the whole of the Clothing and Textile program. Positive correlations at the .01 level of confidence were observed between creativity and family centeredness, skills and subject matter, and at the .05 level of confidence between creativity and breadth, depth, and subject matter, and between breadth and subject matter (Table 2b).

Table 2b Pearson r correlation between variables in Part II of the questionnaire.

	Creat	Skill	Bread	Depth	Famil	Subj	Gener	Profes
Creat		.254*	.268*	.347**	.276*			
Skill						.380**		
Bread						.264*		
Depth								
Famil								
Subj								
Gener								
Profes								

\* Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

\*\* Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The interrelation of creativity, breadth, and subject matter emphasis was interpreted to mean that administrators felt that subject matter was important but a broad approach was necessary for an expression of creativity, another desired outcome. The four significant relations of creativity to four other variables was considered evidence of the desirability of this approach. However, the interrelationship of these variables might be due to the limited range of scores.

The relationship of creativity with breadth and with subject matter, and of skills with subject matter, was also observed within Part I of the questionnaire.

The results of the Pearson  $r$  correlation between corresponding variables in Part I and Part II showed only a few significant relations (Table 2c). The only positive relation at the .01 level of confidence was found to exist between family centeredness in Part I and creativity in Part II. Because of the interdependence of scores a negative correlation between subject matter in Part I and creativity in Part II resulted.

Table 2c Pearson r correlations between corresponding variables in Part I and Part II.

Part II								
	Creat	Skill	Bread	Depth	Famil	Subj	Gener	Profes
Part I								
Creat	-	-	-				-	-
Skill	-				-	-		
Bread	-		.296*	-		-	-	-
Depth	-		-.296*		-			
Famil	.357**	-			.307*	-		-
Subj	-.357**	-		-	-.307*		-	
Gener	-			-.274*	.319*	-		-
Profes	-	-		.274*	-.319*		-	

\*\*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

\*Significant at the .05 level of confidence.

-Negative direction, blanks are positive.

Even though only a few significant relations existed, they were the same as were found to exist between the variables in Part I. It was also interesting to note that the majority positive and negative coefficients were in the same direction as in Part I of the questionnaire (Table 2a). This seemed to indicate that the department heads' evaluation reflected the practices found in the beginning courses to some extent.

A t-test of the significance of the difference between means was performed for each pair of variables for the large and small schools (Table 3). No significant differences were found from the computations between large and small schools for Part I of the questionnaire.

Table 3 Equality of means of corresponding variables between large and small schools for Part I

Creat/Skill	Breadth/Depth	Famil/Subj	Gener/Profes
.89	.091	1.14	.508

In the analysis of the data it was found that the differences between trends for the large and small schools were not significant in the beginning classes. This could be because all of the schools offered a major program in Clothing and Textiles, or that the difference in school sizes was not wide enough to result in significant differences between means. If the ten largest and the ten smallest schools from the sample had been contrasted, indications were that significant differences would have occurred.

An analysis of variance was performed for the two groups

of schools to determine whether the variation within the four areas of Clothing and Textiles was significant for every pair of variables in Part I of the questionnaire. The F ratios revealed a significance between the four areas of Clothing and Textiles. An analysis of the means indicated that in each of the areas a different trend existed and that clothing selection scored highest in skills, while clothing construction, textiles, and consumer economics scored highest in breadth in subject matter. The low scores were found in the opposite trends (Table 4a).

Table 4a Mean scores for test variables for small schools when F ratios showed significant differences within the four areas of Clothing and Textiles.

	Creat/Skill	Bread/Depth	Famil/Subj	Gener/Profes
<u>F-ratios:</u>	<u>6.203*</u>	<u>11.737*</u>	<u>5.369*</u>	<u>10.851*</u>
Sel	1.205/2.795	2.128/1.872	2.026/1.974	2.385/1.615
Con	1.743/2.257	3.308/.692	1.846/2.154	1.462/2.538
Tex	2.102/1.898	2.872/1.128	2.536/1.464	2.154/1.846
Eco	1.59/2.41	2.923/1.097	2.026/1.974	.692/2.308

\*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

The F ratio for the large schools revealed a significance at

the .01 level of confidence for the Gener/Profes trend only  
(Table 4b).

Table 4b. Mean scores for test variables for large schools when  
F ratios showed significant difference within the four  
areas of Clothing and Textiles.

	Creat/Skill	Bread/Depth	Famil/Subj	Gener/Profes
<u>F-ratios</u>	<u>1.775</u>	<u>1.543</u>	<u>2.406</u>	<u>5.442*</u>
Sel	1.50/2.50	2.28/1.72	1.50/2.5	2.363/1.637
Con	2.5/1.50	3.00/1.00	1.60/2.40	1.50/2.50
Tex	1.91/2.09	2.77/1.33	2.14/1.86	2.273/1.727
Eco	2.00/2.00	2.82/1.18	1.73/2.27	1.520/2.50

\*Significant at the .01 level of confidence.

A further analysis of the means of the areas within trends indicated that clothing selection means were highest and at approximately the same level in breadth, in subject matter, and in family centeredness; and that clothing construction, consumer economics, and textiles were highest in breadth in subject matter. The latter three observations were the same as for small schools.

Finally there was much less difference between the four

areas of Clothing and Textiles in the large schools than there was for the small schools. This indicates that trends were more evenly distributed among the four areas of Clothing and Textiles for the large schools.

#### Analysis of data obtained from the study of catalogs

An analysis of catalogs from the schools did not reveal substantial differences concerning general credit hour requirements, or Home Economics requirements for graduation between small and large schools.

It was found that the objectives of the small schools emphasized personal development as a primary goal of education and that general or professional goals were secondary. Since the small schools were all departments of Home Economics under another school, separate objectives were not listed and if any were mentioned, the college or university objectives concerning personal and family living preparations were stressed. In contrast to this, the large schools always mentioned preparation for a professional career as one of the three main objectives. The other objectives were providing for a general background and providing for personal enrichment. The large schools had



Clothing and Textiles departments and provided two or three areas in which students in Clothing and Textiles could specialize.

School requirements within the humanities, social sciences, and physical sciences showed a wide difference between large and small schools. These requirements varied between 50 to 85 semester hours for the small schools (except for one which had an exceptionally low requirement of 25 semester hours), and between 28 and 48 for the large schools. In three of the large and six of the small schools special reference was made to the reasons why these were included, mainly to provide background for learning experiences in obtaining the objectives of the school.

The Clothing and Textile offerings for the small schools varied between 14 and 31 semester hours with an average of 21. For the large schools the semester hours in Clothing and Textiles varied from 30 to 68 with an average of 41. Only three small schools allowed for specific consumer economics courses in Clothing and Textiles, while all the large schools provided at least three semester hours. Family clothing was offered in only three large schools and in none of the small schools.

## CONCLUSIONS

Since continuous change is a part of any body of knowledge it is also necessary that continuous evaluation of the thinking in the area take place. The aim of this study was to identify the trends in Clothing and Textiles, to compare, and to evaluate them. The identification of the trends was based on a number of published articles, Clothing and Textiles Teachers Conference Reports, and catalog material from a sample of 20 colleges and universities which offered programs for Clothing and Textiles majors in their Home Economics programs.

One aspect which seemed significant from catalog material and was apparent in different ways was the importance placed on humanities, social sciences and physical sciences in the curriculum. Some acquaintance with these three bodies of knowledge was considered necessary to all the areas of Home Economics since the catalog material disclosed that all were included in the degree requirements, although the semester hours required varied from school to school.

It seemed, from the literature, that leaders in the field were concerned about Clothing and Textiles and that great effort was being made to establish a basic body of knowledge from which Clothing and Textiles could grow.

Furthermore the literature revealed that the future Home Economist will have to prepare herself in many ways. She will need to have professional attributes such as skills, a depth of knowledge in subject matter, and an ability to do creative thinking. She will also have to keep up with an expanding field of knowledge and the constant changes which accompany accelerated technical progress. At the same time she must have a vision of the total field, with breadth in subject matter, and the intellectual ability to interpret, apply and evaluate her profession in every day living.

The direction for Clothing and Textiles in the future seemed to emphasize no dominant trend; however, several important ones existed. They included the following eight categories which covered a variety of minor issues: development of creative abilities, the development of skills, breadth in subject matter, depth in subject matter, family centeredness, subject matter orientation, general and professional education.

Since there were so many different issues that seemed significant the observer concluded that all might be important in the total program and that the problem was to decide which issues to include and how, when and where.

The relation between the trends were investigated to find

whether any significance existed. The dominant pattern showed more relation between trends in the beginning courses as tested by the indirect questionnaire in Part I than there were in the direct ranking scale for trends in the second part. All the variables in Part I were related, but in Part II only creativity was related to four other variables namely: to breadth, depth, family centeredness and subject matter; and skills and breadth with subject matter. The lack of many significant correlations in the second part of the questionnaire might be because of the very small ranking scale, or because participants considered most of them important and ranked them high. (Only family centeredness and skills scored low). There were a few significant relationships between variables in the two parts. This indicated either little relationship between beginning courses and what the chairman of a department felt was important, or a tendency to answer a direct ranking scale according to what the chairmen would like her department to be. The latter was perhaps noticeable in the mean scores for the variables, in Part II, which scored exceptionally low in family centeredness and skills. This might also be due to considerable pressure against these ideas from outside sources.

The statistical comparison between trends in large and

small schools was not as significant as was expected. Indications were that if only the upper and lower ten questionnaires for large and small schools had been compared, a larger difference in means scores on the variables would have occurred between them and would probably have been significant.

According to the analyzed data, there was no significant difference between the mean scores of variables from either the direct or indirect questioning. The t-test of equality of means also showed no significant difference.

The difference in variance within the four areas of Clothing and Textiles showed that the large schools in three out of the four pairs of trends had less significance than the smaller schools. It was concluded that in large schools the specific trends were more evenly spread among the four areas of Clothing and Textiles than they were in the smaller schools.

The catalog material revealed that large schools provided much more opportunity for professional specialization in Clothing and Textiles than did the small schools since they offered a wider variety of choices and since they had two or three programs for majors in Clothing and Textiles. At the same time the small schools provided the opportunities for taking many courses for

a much broader background in the humanities, social, and physical sciences, while the large schools required only a few courses in these areas.

It seemed evident that more than one important trend existed and was practiced in the Clothing and Textiles area, that for beginning courses there seemed to be much more relationship between trends than for the whole department, and that there was a difference in trends between small and large schools.

The evidence was, however, that although large and small schools differed widely in their course offerings and opportunities, the same trends were followed in beginning courses. This, coupled with the fact that humanities, social and physical sciences are included in course offerings, suggested that all the trends were important issues and should be considered in the departmental objectives.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Home Economics Association. Home Economics in higher education. Washington, 1949. 177 p.
2. American Home Economics Association. Home economics new directions. A statement of philosophy and objectives. Prepared by the Committee on Philosophy and Objectives of Home Economics of the American Home Economics Association. June 1959. 14 p.
3. Anspach, Karlyne. Clothing research in Home Economics, 1925-58. *Journal of Home Economics* 51:767-770. Nov. 1959.
4. Anspach, Karlyne. Clothing and the mobility concept. *Journal of Home Economics* 53:428-430. June 1961.
5. Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges, Home Economics Division. Report of the proceedings of the Home Economics Seminar. French Lick, Indiana, July 24-28, 1961, n. d. 49 p.
6. Barber, R. L. The humanities: Their contribution to creative living. *Journal of Home Economics* 55:321-322. May 1963.
7. Blum, Victoria. Put your best speech forward. *Journal of Home Economics* 55:221-222. March 1962.
8. Bricker, A. J. The professions - Partner with liberal arts. *Journal of Home Economics* 53:428-430. June 1961.
9. College reports heavy demands for Graduates. *Journal of Home Economics* 55:450. June 1963.
10. College Teachers of Textiles and Clothing. Western Region. Proceedings of the fourth annual conference, Hotel Canterbury San Francisco, California, Sept. 2-5, 1952. n. d. 30 numb. leaves. (Mimeographed)

11. College Teachers of Textiles and Clothing. Central Region. Proceedings of the fourteenth annual conference, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, Nov. 13-15, 1958. n.d. 66 numb. leaves. (Mimeographed)
12. College Teachers of Textiles and Clothing. Central Region. Proceedings of the fifteenth annual conference, North Dakota State College, Fargo, North Dakota. Oct. 28-31, 1959. n.d. 34 numb. leaves. (Mimeographed)
13. College Teachers of Textiles and Clothing. Central Region. Proceedings of the sixteenth annual conference, LaSalle Hotel, Chicago, Illinois, Oct. 27-29, 1960. n.d. 42 numb. leaves. (Mimeographed)
14. College Teachers of Textiles and Clothing. Central Region. Proceedings of the eighteenth annual conference, The Palmer House, Chicago, Illinois. Oct. 24-27, 1962. n.d. 46 numb. leaves. (Mimeographed)
15. College Teachers of Textiles and Clothing. Western Region. Proceedings of the seventh annual conference, Washington State University, Pullman, Washington, Oct. 13-15, 1960. n.d. 24 numb. leaves. (Mimeographed)
16. College Teachers of Textiles and Clothing. All Regions. Results of a work conference: Clothing and Textiles Move Forward. Journal of Home Economics 48:635-639. Oct. 1956.
17. College Teachers of Textiles and Clothing. All Regions. Results of the second work conference: Clothing and Textiles further Progress. Journal of Home Economics 53:678-680. Oct. 1961.
18. Eppright, Ercel S. The challenge of today. Journal of Home Economics 51:690-693. Oct. 1959.



19. Gilmore, Lois. A.H.E.A. plans for action; Textiles and Clothing 1960-1961. *Journal of Home Economics* 52:579. Sept. 1960.
20. Hoobler, Icie Macy. Is Salomon's house a modern Utopia? *Journal of Home Economics* 55:153-156. March 1963.
21. Horn, Marilyn J. Curriculum change. How widespread? *Journal of Home Economics* 55:237-240. April 1963.
22. Johnson, Doris. A new direction in clothing construction. *Journal of Home Economics* 52:752-753. Nov. 1960.
23. Leahman, Ruth T. What the doctoral programs need. *Journal of Home Economics* 54:189-190. March 1962.
24. Leahy, Dorothy M. Education for general and professional home economics. *Journal of Home Economics* 48:331-333. May 1956.
25. Leahy, Dorothy M. New direction for teacher education in home economics. *American Vocational Journal* 35:43-44. May 1960.
26. Lee, Sarah. Trends in clothing and textile research. *Journal of Home Economics* 51:789-799. Nov. 1959.
27. McCain, James. Home economics, frill or fundamental? *Practical Home Economics* 7:15, 32. Oct. 1961.
28. McDonald, Alice O. Indicators for creative teaching. *Journal of Home Economics* 53:667-669. Oct. 1961.
29. Mate, Hubert E. No place for mediocrity. *Journal of Home Economics* 55:19. Jan. 1963.

30. Pennsylvania State University, College of Home Economics. Development of home economics in the United States, with special reference to its purposes and integrating function. (College of home economics. Publication no. 156) n.d. 17 p.
31. Ridder, Clara. The central part of home economics - the core. An unpublished article prepared for the Journal of Home Economics, 1963. 6 p.
32. Rogers, Frances Millet. Higher education in the United States. Cambridge, Massachusetts, Harvard University Press, 1952. 54 p.
33. Schlachter, J. D. et al. Social science methodology. Journal of Home Economics 55:423-427. June 1963.
34. Scott, Dorothy D. et al. The challenge of today. Journal of Home Economics 51:687-694. Oct. 1959.
35. Smith, Paul. Creativity. New York, Hastings House, 1959. 210 p.
36. Spencer, Lucille B. Our professional attributes. Journal of Home Economics 55:16-18. Jan. 1963.
37. Swanson, Pearl. New resources for research. Journal of Home Economics 53:161-172. March 1961.
38. Sybers, Ruth and Mary Ellen Roach. Clothing and human behaviour. Journal of Home Economics 54:184-187. March 1962.
39. Tead, Ordway. A ten year look ahead at the liberal arts college. Educational record 40:228-236. July 1959.
40. Tripple, Patricia A. The sensitive American, tomorrow's teaching. Journal of Home Economics 53:659. Oct. 1961.

41. U. S. Dept. of Agriculture. Agricultural Research Service in Cooperation with Office of Education, Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare. Titles of completed theses in Home Economics and Related Fields in Colleges and Universities of the United States, 1961-1962. U. S. Government Printing Office: 1963 O-672124. 49 numb. leaves. (Mimeographed)
42. U. S. Dept. of Health, Education and Welfare. Office of Education. Home Economics in degree-granting institutions, 1959-1960. n. d. 86 numb. leaves. (Mimeographed)
43. Wallace, M. D. Future explorations in home economics. Journal of Home Economics 51:25-27. Jan. 1959.
44. Warning, M. Future explorations in home economics. Clothing. Journal of Home Economics 52:646. Oct. 1960.
45. Warden, Jane. The place of clothing construction in the college program. Journal of Home Economics 52:340-341. May 1960.
46. Wines, Mary. Experiment: One step at a time. Journal of Home Economics 51:352-353. May 1959.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

2500 Monroe Street  
Corvallis, Oregon  
May 13, 1963

Dear Madam:

I am a student from the Republic of South Africa working towards a master degree in Clothing and Textiles at Oregon State University. For my research project I hope to analyze the trends in Clothing and Textile education at Colleges and Universities in the United States. I would have enjoyed interviewing you personally, but since this is impossible, may I request that you respond to the enclosed questionnaire.

The questions in Part I refer to the beginning classes in the various areas of clothing and textiles, including clothing construction, selection, consumer buying, and textiles. You may find it difficult to rate all of the questions, personally, and if so, you may consult the instructors concerned with that area. Feel free to make any comments you desire on the questions. In Part II please rate your department as to the emphasis placed on the eight issues listed.

Enclosed is a self-addressed envelope for your convenience in replying. Thank you for your time and your comments. It would be most helpful if I could have your reply by June 7, 1963, as my time in this country is running short. I hope that the findings from this research project will be helpful for Clothing and Textile education here as well as in the Republic of South Africa.

Yours sincerely,

Maretha S. Jacobsz

## APPENDIX B

## PART I

Put a checkmark in the scale which indicates the approach or emphasis in your department.

- Scale: 1. Much emphasis on "a".  
 2. Emphasis on "a" with some inclusion of "b".  
 3. Equal emphasis on "a" and "b".  
 4. Emphasis on "b" with some inclusion of "a".  
 5. Much emphasis on "b".

Is the emphasis on:

1. a. the conception of original ideas in clothing construction and the carrying out of these ideas by the student?

- b. the mastery of techniques through a knowledge of the principles of construction in more than one garment?

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

2. a. projects in clothing selection which allow the student the opportunity to experiment with the elements of costume to express originality?

- b. the mastering of techniques in the use of line, color, style, etc., in selecting becoming clothes?

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

3. a. laboratory experiences in which your students can compare and evaluate textile characteristics such as finishes, fibers, etc., for different purposes?

- b. the identification of fibers and fabrics according to their physical and chemical characteristics and manufacturing processes?

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

4. a. the inclusion of projects in which students experiment with different approaches to the buying of clothing and textiles based on needs and wants--such as sale buying, gifts, etc.?

- b. the mastery of techniques concerned with where, when, and what to buy to get the best quality for the money?

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

5. a. the selection of design, pattern and fabric for becomingness and suitability to personal characteristics in construction classes?
- b. the principles of clothing construction as they apply to different fabrics and to different garment details?
6. a. a wide variety of experiences such as artistic expression, wardrobe planning, budgeting, buying, and social-psychological significance?
- b. the selection of clothes from a single point of view such as the artistic, the economic or socio-psychological point of view?
7. a. a variety of fibers, yarns, fabric construction and finishes as well as production, manufacturing, use and care of textiles?
- b. the study of textile fibers according to generic types only and their physical and chemical characteristics?
8. a. the inclusion of a wide range of topics in the study of consumer buying such as international influences of textiles, consumer organizations, and labeling.
- b. what, when, and where to buy specific items of clothing in order to make the widest choice?
9. a. time management, energy requirements and costs relative to constructing clothing for the family?
- b. the details of various methods and techniques of construction centered around the principles?
10. a. symbolism attached to the use of clothing and the cultural significance to families in different socio-economic levels?
- b. the application of the principles of clothing selection in the choice of specific garments from the artistic and practical point of view?
11. a. the selection of textiles for clothing and household use from the standpoint of suitability to construction, occasion, purpose and to family needs and wants?
- b. the comparison of fibers, fabrics, finishes, etc. on the basis of physical characteristics?

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

	1
	2
	3
	4
	5

- |   |                          |   |
|---|--------------------------|---|
| 12. a. the importance of individual satisfaction for family members in spending the clothing dollar?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| b. in consumer buying the analysis comparison and evaluation of clothing and household textiles for specific end use?                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 13. a. the achievement of personal satisfaction for students making garments in the classroom?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| b. superior quality in a variety of construction techniques in garments made in the classroom?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 14. a. the social significance of clothing as it applies to families in general, to different socio-economic groups and cultures?                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| b. the relation of elements and principles of design to the individual's personal characteristics and his use of clothes?                           | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 15. a. a knowledge of currently popular but standard fabric names for clothing and household textiles related to consumer use?                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| b. the physical and the chemical characteristics of the different fibers and the technical processes involved in making fabrics?                    | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |
| 16. a. money management as related to the buying of clothes and household textiles for different socio-economic groups?                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | 1 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 2 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 3 |
| b. the comparison of prices and qualities in the consumer buying of clothing and textiles for serviceability and suitability to a specific purpose? | <input type="checkbox"/> | 4 |
|   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 5 |

## PART II

Please rate your department as to the emphasis given on each of the eight issues listed

Scale: a. Much emphasis; b. Less emphasis; c. Very little emphasis

	a	b	c		a	b	c
Breadth in subject matter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Family centeredness	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Depth in subject matter	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	General education	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development of creative thinking	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Professional preparation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development of skills	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Subject matter oriented	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>