A COMPARISON OF CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION METHODS

A Problem

By Evelyn Carlson Senecal

Submitted to the College of Home Economics of Michigan State University of Agriculture and Applied Science in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Department of Textiles, Clothing, and Related Art

1959-1960

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to Dr. Mary L. Gephart, Associate Professor in the Department of Textiles, Clothing, and Related Art at Michigan State University, for her assistance and guidance in planning and directing this study; to Mrs. Jane Blocker, Mrs. Phyllis Chana, and Mrs. Adelaide Tirrell of Flint, Michigan, judges of the finished garment; to the undergraduate students enrolled in section 141 of the Home Economics Clothing Course 101 at Flint Junior College for their participation in the pilot study; and to the adult women enrolled in section 142 of the Home Economics Clothing Course 101 and to the adult women in the Bishop I Sewing Class at Whittier Junior High School whose participation and cooperation were essential throughout the entire study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

List of Tables - (Continued)

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

As the United States proceeded into the Twentieth Century, the Industrialization Era advanced at full speed. Along with mechanization, mass production techniques and labor problems developed. These conditions have been instrumental in the value changes and living patterns of the American people. Industrialization has not only affected the technical skills; practical skills, also, have been influenced.

In many cases innovations and new procedures have completely replaced the former structure. Some times they have failed and disappeared. Other times they have taken their place along side the existing system, fusing or compromising with it to function together or separately within the same society. It is this last condition with which the writer is concerned in this study. The key example has been chosen from the field of the practical homemaking skills--that of sewing.

Speed, simplification, and efficiency have become factors to consider as the values and living

norms of a people alter in a new era. In the past half-century this new emphasis has reached the individual women sewers as well as the garment industry. Methods of hand and machine sewing have represented the values and standards in sewing techniques of the American women. Simultaneously, the garment industry has introduced new speed methods in mass produced clothing. Many of these factory techniques have been used recently by women sewers to their satisfaction, somewhat altering their values and standards in personal sewing. Resulting from these two approaches to sewing, two dominate patterns of thought have evolved.

At the present time many women who sew for themselves and their families tend to follow one of two methods of clothing construction. One method of sewing follows the traditional, custom system of construction; the other consists of speed techniques of sewing taken from the industrial field of garment construction. An example of an outstanding individual advocating each of these methods of clothing construction is (a) Evelyn A. Mansfield, who uses the techniques of traditional clothing construction and (b) Edna Bryte Bishop, a leader teaching the speed method. These two methods are basically different

in approach and philosophy to clothing construction. Both Evelyn Mansfield and Edna Bryte Bishop require a high level of skill and will not compromise with inferior or inaccurate work. Since both methods are accepted and followed in formal instruction of clothing construction in American educational institutions, it will be the purpose of this study to investigate these methods to determine the processes and procedures used, the techniques and skills involved, and the values and standards of each.

Evelyn A. Mansfield

In 1953 the Houghton-Mifflin Company published Clothing Construction, a book written by Evelyn A. Mansfield. This 454-page book is a compilation of traditional techniques of pattern alteration, custom sewing, and information about sewing equipment and fabrics. Clearly illustrated with over 650 photographs and drawings, the reader can follow step-by-step descriptions of the fine and detailed techniques used in the traditional methods of clothing construction.

By 1958 over one-hundred universities, colleges, and institutions throughout the United States had adopted this book as a text. Carnegie Institute of Technology, Columbia University, Michigan State

University, and Purdue University are among this group (see Appendix II).

Miss Mansfield earned her Bachelor of Science degree in 1929 at the University of Nebraska. She attended Teachers College, Columbia University, where she received her Master of Arts degree in 1934. The following year Miss Mansfield studied draping and pattern making with Mademoiselle Louise Le Jeune of Paris, France. She then joined the teaching profession and during summer vacations attended various schools of design, clothing and textile seminars, and art academies from coast to coast. These experiences provided the opportunity to learn new developments and to perfect methods, thereby contributing a progressive understanding of the clothing construction process.

In 1957 Evelyn Mansfield joined the staff of Michigan State University, rising to the rank of Associate Professor in the Department of Textiles, Clothing, and Related Arts. Throughout her career she has been recognized by her students as well as her colleagues in the teaching profession for her dedication to teaching the fine and detailed techniques of clothing construction leading to the development of skill. In the early 1950's, the

faculty of Michigan State University voted her a recipient of the all-university Distinguished Teachers Award, symbolizing her high merits and achievements in the field of teaching. Miss Mansfield withdrew from active teaching at this university in 1958 to reside with her father in Belle Plaine, Nebraska.

Evelyn Mansfield's students have been impressed with the vast wealth of knowledge she has in the clothing construction field. Sharing her skills, techniques, and past experience with her college students has been a patient, untiring, and earnest endeavor she has undertaken as a teacher. This sense of dedication is also exhibited in her desire to induce each student to develop individual creativity and to obtain this sense of achievement through high standards and goals. She tries to help each student become sensitive to the total effect of the garment to be constructed. Students working closely with Evelyn Mansfield realize she considers each garment in clothing construction a work of creative art and skill. Perfection in every detail is strived for to achieve a finished garment of superb quality. The design of each garment is modified and adapted to the student for excellent

fit and fine appearance. Miss Mansfield emphasizes the importance of this fulfillment in each garment so strongly that one's attention is placed upon the work of art rather than upon the master instructor. Evelyn Mansfield believes that a well-designed garment in clothing construction is basic to the whole concept of custom construction. Because of this emphasis, Miss Mansfield is not widely known as an individual. She does not "sell herself"; she lets the fine-quality garments constructed under her guidance speak for themselves and the high standards which she upholds.

In considering Miss Mansfield's many achievements and her development of technical skill, the reader could easily formulate an incorrect mental impression of her. This impression might be quite different from the one obtained when meeting her in reality. Evelyn Mansfield is a petite woman whose slight features and quiet temperament are strongly contrasted by her flashing brown eyes and quick thinking. Her quiet, unassuming manner and modest acceptance of honorable awards is another personal characteristic. Former students and personal friends remember Evelyn Mansfield vividly and the high standards which she upholds.

Miss Mansfield's experiences and acquaintances with other fashion and clothing construction leaders have helped her in compiling the many tested techniques in custom fitting and construction for publication. In 1948 Miss Mansfield co-authored the book Dress Design with Miss Marion Hillhouse. This book clearly defines and illustrates the principles of flat pattern design and draping. Miss Hillhouse, a colleague of Evelyn Mansfield, is an Associate Professor in the Department of Textiles, Clothing, and Related Art at Michigan State University. Miss Hillhouse received her Master of Art degree from Teachers College, Columbia University. She, too, had studied in Paris and for several summers attended various schools of art throughout the United States.

Edna Bryte Bishop

Edna Bryte Bishop has been in the clothing construction field for many years. Aging in her seventies now, Mrs. Bishop still maintains the vigor and ambition so characteristic of her personality. Although Mrs. Bishop began her nation-wide lecture presentations for the Bishop method of speed sewing only twelve years ago, she had spent years developing and mastering her skill and methods. Her experiences range from the high-speed machines in garment factories

to the level of teaching clothing construction in colleges. Originally from Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, Edna Bryte Bishop has demonstrated her methods all over the United States. She has worked in designing and alterations for fashion magazines as well as high-style designers, such as Schiaparelli and Anne Fogarty. She is now the Education Director for the Advance Pattern Company.

Mrs. Bishop has written of her philosophy and method of teaching: "I believe I have something that gives women much happiness. This is a real service, and that is what you are here on this earth for...to serve in any way that will bring happiness and give help to others."

This portion of her philosophy is one example of the drawing power she holds. Her followers are sincere and extremely conscientious to follow her methods accurately. In her lectures and workshops at department stores and schools throughout the nation, she strives for a family feeling within the group. The personal touch so evident in her manner keeps her "family" of followers constant and growing.

Attendance at her lectures have grown to large proportions in recent years. Women return year after year to the department stores or lecture halls where

she is speaking. Mrs. Bishop has a remarkable memory for recognizing familiar attendants. She often pauses during her informal talks to direct a question to one of her followers. New, attentive people also catch her eye, and she chooses to call upon them to meet her personally following her lectures. The psychological effect of this special recognition by Mrs. Bishop in her large "family" certainly helps explain part of the positive reaction of the groups. Mrs. Bishop strongly emphasizes that she is working and lecturing for her listeners, not for herself. She is dedicated to teaching students her method of clothing construction.

Her informal, "family"-type instruction has been accepted by a majority of those who attend her lectures and read her educational material. In its broadened concept, Bishop Instruction is so geared to the public understanding that it has thereby helped to raise the standard of living as it has raised the level of home sewing for so many women and brought renewed interest in clothing construction throughout the United States.

Mrs. Bishop is an excellent business woman, superb publicity agent, and clever organizer. In the past twelve years her method has been accepted as the core method for teaching of sewing classes throughout the public school systems of the city of Chicago,

Illinois, and the states of Oregon and Washington. The State Department of Maryland has instituted the Bishop method of clothing construction in all public schools. Flint, Michigan; Denver, Colorado; Dallas, Texas; and Saginaw and Detroit, Michigan, are cities with the largest adult enrollment in organized Bishop classes in the United States (listed in descending order). Her method of instruction has extended to Alaska, Hawaii, and the Polynesian, Chinese, Japanese, and German cultures.

An outstanding example of the fast acceptance and growth of the Bishop method of clothing construction is the adult education program in Flint, Michigan. In 1954 the Edna Bryte Bishop method was introduced by the Bishop Sewing Classes to the Mott Foundation Program. The fall enrollment totaled 240 adult women in the ten-week session of study divided into 16 classes. Nearly five years later, the 1958 fall quarter enrollment of the year-around program totaled 1,441 women in 80 classes; the 1958-1959 annual program alone totaled 4,447 women in 283 classes (see Appendix III).

In Flint 31 Bishop instructors teach classes throughout the weekday and evening. Certification for the instructors require a substantial knowledge

of clothing construction, a week's attendance at Mrs. Bishop annual workshop in Michigan, attendance at most visiting lectures by Mrs. Bishop throughout the year, and completion of Bishop courses I and II. Gertrude Harper, Bishop Sewing Coordinator of the Flint Mott Foundation Program, reaffirms Mrs. Bishop's statement that the instructors are Mrs. Bishop's main pupils who spread her knowledge. It is extremely important, therefore, that they understand and believe the Bishop philosophy and the latest revised methods of clothing construction. The instructors are given uniform teaching schedules. Requirements for each course are identical among all class sections. Each course uses specific, required patterns which eliminate confusion created by sewing "too much too soon".

Mrs. Bishop states, "After the sewing machine was invented, nobody came along to tell us how to get the most out of it. Women are not mechanically minded. We needed know-how along with modern machine methods. When you have little money, little children, and little time, you can't spend hours learning how to sew. But you have got to strive for perfection, perfect cutting, perfect sewing, perfect fitting, and perfect and frequent pressing...or anyway, as nearly

perfect as y u can do."

Her 223-page book, The Bishop Method of Clothing Construction, is product of 30 years experience and ten years of writing a d c mailing. Her co-worker, Marjorie Stetler Arch, is now the Bishop instructor for the Advance Pattern Company. She is also the current national president of the Home Economics Honorary, Kappa Omicron Phi. Marjorie Arch is a graduate of Indiana State Teachers College.

Grain perfection, accuracy in preparing, cutting and marking fabric, perfection in stitching, perfection in pressing, and attainment of quality look with the right trimming detail are the five main principles underlying the Bishop method of clothing construction.

Mrs. Bishop has used many catchy phrases repeatedly in expressing specific "learnings" embodied in her method. Some of her expressions include: "Be grain perfect"; "do not teach to much t o s on"; "use directional staystitching and pressing"; "sew in unit construction"; and "avoid that fireside look".

Comparison of Methods

The Bishop techniques commonly require less pinning in construction, fewer finishing details (some details are eliminated), and fewer trial fittings to the wearer than the traditional, custom method of

construction. During her lectures, Edna Bryte Bishop demonstrates how motion study and organization with the unit method of construction reduces the clothing construction working time. Her techniques and management principles together result in faster construction work. Mrs. Bishop admits, however, that custom appearance and fit are somewhat sacrificed when speed techniques of construction are used.

The traditional method basically embodies the same principles of accuracy and perfection of grain and detail as those set forth in Bishop education material. Management of time is not strongly emphasized, and the techniques many times require time-consuming hand work and more frequent fittings for a custom appearance.

One specific difference in philosophies of the two methods is that Mrs. Bishop clearly states that the garments constructed by her method will be comparable in construction to any garment bought ready-made, but the personal fit will be better. Miss Mansfield strives for a quality garment with custom construction in technical detail and perfection of fit. The concept of perfection of fit of garments and the techniques of construction differ in the two clothing construction methods. The degree of

perfection of sewing skill executed is extremely high for each method.

Purpose of Study

It is the purpose of this study to compare, rate, and evaluate (a) the technical skills developed and mastered by beginning adult women sewers instructed by the Edna Bryte Bishop method and the traditional method of custom sewing and (b) the psychological satisfactions of beginning adult women sewers derived from their end product and their ability to learn how to sew.

Objectives of Study

The specific objectives of this study are:

1) To complete the purpose of this study to compare, rate, and evaluate (a) the technical skills developed and mastered by beginning adult women sewers instructed by the Edna Bryte Bishop method and the traditional method of custom sewing and (b) the obvious personal psychological satisfactions of beginning adult women sewers derived from their end product and their ability to learn how to sew;

2) To obtain the experience of research study, thereby broadening the writer's knowledge of research techniques; and

3) To develop a clearer sense of objective comparison and evaluation of two highly contrasted methods of clothing construction.

CHAPTER II

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The techniques, skills, and psychological factors basic to beginning adult women sewers in clothing construction classes were tested. Two comparable methods of sewing were chosen; the Bishop method and the traditional custom method.

The methods and procedures for developing this study included a pilot study followed by the selection of the population and the formulation and administration of the instruments for this study.

Selection of the Population

The city of Flint, Michigan, was the ideal location in which to conduct this study because the Mott Foundation has a large-scale adult education program. The Bishop Sewing Department sponsored by the Mott Foundation has the largest enrollment of Bishop followers in the world. Flint Community Junior College offered one adult sewing class for college credit; the traditional method of clothing construction was followed in this class. Therefore, it is ideal to study these two patterns of thought,

reasonings, and techniques in this area in the United States.

Beginning classes were selected because more basic learnings of each method were presented to a larger number of beginning sewers than advanced clothing construction classes.

The Flint Junior College class and the Bishop class selected for this study were taught by the same instructor, thus eliminating one variable.

Formulation and Administration of the Instruments

1) Survey:--After evaluation of the responses in pretesting, the first instrument was reworded and distributed as a pilot study to Flint Junior College students in the Clothing Construction Course I 'l, section 142. After further analysis and rewording, the instrument was distributed to the two sewing groups chosen for this study.

A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix III. This survey was designed to secure basic information on the population (description and background), their psychological attitudes and expectations, and their desires for learning and achievement.

Questions I through V defined the population;

questions VI through XIII gave a more detailed description of the population and their backgrounds in clothing construction; questions XIV through XXIII were designed to reveal the personal attitudes of the population. Multiple-choice questions comprised the greater portion of the study; the last group of questions to the survey allowed space for free-response answers. A few unrelated questions to the survey were included for the writer's personal inquiry as a teacher.

At the time of administration of the instrument, neither group had started construction of blouses. The Bishop class had learned some of the basic technical skills and principles of this method; they had completed an apron and a gathered skirt by the Bishop first learnings method. Therefore, it might be assumed that these members could have formulated some basic concepts and personal opinions on the basic learnings.

The college class, on the other hand, had not begun clothing construction. The content of previous class meetings included basic selection of clothing, color and design in clothing selection, and basic textile information. Some comments on ideas about expectations on course content as related to previous class meetings might be expected since both classes had begun prior to

the study.

All of the college class members (seven) chose style number three of Advance Pattern Number 9043. Eight of the eleven Bishop members surveyed chose the same style. Since only one style of blouse was selected for this study, another variable was eliminated.

The instrument was designed to be completed by the women within two hours because of class time limits; both groups completed the survey in one hour class time. Both groups completed the survey in the evening hours, so psychological and physical conditions could be considered similar.

The instructor distributed the instrument among both groups and clarified questions for the participants.

2) Panel of judges:--A panel of four judges were chosen to score and evaluate the completed blouses. The judges were selected on the basis of their ability to be objective in criticism and scoring. Each judge had received Bachelor of Science degrees in home economics; they also had had clothing construction classes in college. Although personal biases could not be eliminated entirely, objectivity of judging was stressed. Because of educational background and training of these judges, the writer feels confident that basic objectivity among these judges was kept at a high level.

Each judge evaluated the blouses independently without time limit (see the General Information for Panel of Judges, Appendix IV, for specific information on evaluation). A copy of the instrument is included in Appendix V.

3) Instructor evaluations:--An instrument was formulated for the instructor of both classes. Each adult class member was scored and evaluated (see Appendix VI). Technical skills were rated in numbers one through fourteen (Part I); appearance of the finished garments was rated in the following twelve questions (Part II); and personal characteristics and qualities were evaluated in the final nine questions (Part III). Space was provided for comments qualifying the ratings.

CHAPTER III

ANALYSES OF DATA

Analysis of the Survey Instrument

The responses were tabulated, summarized, and recorded (see Appendix III). Responses to the direct answer questions were calculated by percentages; open-end questions were divided into categories and summarized in the discussion.

I) Description and background of population:-- Seven women were enrolled in the college class; a majority of them (four) were majors in home economics. Eleven women were enrolled in the Bishop sewing class; none of this group were home economists.

TABLE I

AGE OF PARTICIPANTS

Age (Years)	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
19 or less	2	28.6	1	9.1
20 - 24	2	28.6	1	9.1
25 - 29	1	14.3	2	18.2
30 - 39	2	28.6	5	45.5
40 - 49	------	----------	1	9.1
50 - 59	------	----------	1	9.1

The age range differed slightly in the two groups. A majority of the Bishop women (seven) were from the ages 25 through 29; the ages ranged from under 20 years through 50 to 59 years. The college women were almost equally distributed in the age groups through 39 years; the ages ranged from under 20 years through 30 to 39 years.

From adult education class enrollments, it could be assumed that older women generally enroll in a course of instruction which does not carry college credit. Considering ages of college students and the statistics of this study, college-credit courses generally enroll women younger in age than the adult education classes. Younger women seem to have different values and standards than older women. This one factor might lead one to expect different values, standards, and objectives in

the two clothing construction groups.

TABLE 2

MARITAL STATUS OF PARTICIPANTS

Marital Status	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Single	2	28.6	------	----------
Engaged	1	14.3	------	----------
Married	4	57.1	9	81.8
Widowed	------	----------	2	18.2

All the Bishop population were currently married or had been married (two were widows). We could expect the goals and objectives of the Bishop group to be more family-centered than the college students. The college credit suggests one goal for the college class members. Furthermore, almost one-half of the members of the college class were single or engaged; job opportunities might influence their objectives.

TABLE 3

OCCUPATION OF PARTICIPANTS

Occupation	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Student	2	28.6	------	----------
Part-time employee	4	57.1	1	9.1
Full-time employee	1	14.3	4	36.4
Anticipated employment	------	----------	------	----------
Full-time homemaker	------	----------	6	54.5
Types of Employment				
Professional	3	42.9	1	9.1
Unskilled	1	14.3	------	----------
Clerical	------	----------	2	18.2
Creative skilled	------	----------	1	9.1
Operative	------	----------	1	9.1

As can be expected, all the college members are "students" literally. Interestingly enough, however, a majority of them (five) classified themselves as partially or fully employed. Only two of the seven checked the student response. Furthermore, the two members who checked the student response are not married. All of the married college students were partially or fully employed. The unmarried women

who classified themselves as students did not respond to the anticipated employment response (to show future profession).

None of the Bishop women responded as students. Six reported they were full-time housewives; the others were employed part or full-time. This limited group tends to indicate that homemakers are revealing renewed interest in the practical homemaking skills and that full-time housewives and employed women are interested in learning a satisfactory method of clothing construction.

The comparison of types of employment is interesting. From the analysis of responses, the college group showed a majority of the workers were classified in professional fields; the Bishop group members proved to be more diversified in clerical, skilled, creative work, and operative jobs. However, not all the participants clarified their particular types of employment.

TABLE 4

EDUCATIONAL LEVEL OF PARTICIPANTS

Formal Education Completed	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Jr. High	7	100.0	4	36.4
Sr. High	7	100.0	6	54.5
Beyond High School	1	14.3	3	27.3

All but one of the college students responded to the freshmen classification. The college entrance requirements include a high school diploma. One student had completed two and one-half years beyond high school.

Not all the Bishop members had completed high school. Four did not have high school diplomas; six had diplomas. Three of the high school graduates had additional formal education beyond high school; they are presently employed. Only one woman who did not complete high school was employed (she was the oldest in the group and was employed as a clerk).

Presumably, the college students were seeking college degrees. Four of them are majors in home economics; Clothing Construction Course 101 is a core course within this curriculum. It is to be expected that later they would use their clothing construction

credits at another institution towards a bachelor degree.

The Bishop women, however, did not indicate to have this educational goal in mind. They were attending non-credit classes.

TABLE 5

PREVIOUS CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION CLASSES

Type of Training	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Class instruction	5	71.4	7	63.6
Learned at home	6	85.7	10	90.9
No sewing training	1	14.3	1	9.1
Range of sewing experience in years	3-20		1-35	
Ave. yr. sewing experience	8.5		14.1	
Types of Class Instruction				
Jr. High School	3	42.9	7	63.6
Sr. High School	4	57.1	3	27.3
4-H Club	2	28.6	2	18.2
Future Homemakers of America Club	1	14.3	------	----------
Girl Scouts of America	1	14.3	------	----------
Adult education	------	----------	1	9.1
Singer center	------	----------	2	18.2

All but two college students had had clothing construction classes in junior or senior high school. They classified the classes as beginning or intermediate classes. One of the two women who had received no school clothing instruction had learned to sew from a relative.

All but four Bishop students had clothing construction in school, ranging from beginning to advanced classes. Three of the four women who had no training in school had learned some sewing from their mothers. The fourth woman did not specify, but she had sewed for 11 years.

In summary, all of the Bishop group had sewed before, whereas 86 per cent of the students had sewed before coming to college.

Eighty-six per cent of the college women had learned some sewing techniques from their mothers or aunts; they had sewed over a range of three to 20 years, averaging eight and one-half years each.

Ninety-one per cent of the Bishop women responded that they had learned some sewing techniques at home; the years of sewing ranged from one to 35, averaging about 14 years each.

Seventy-one per cent of the college students had supplemented their sewing training by taking one or more classes from organizations or at school; 64 per cent

had done so in the Bishop class.

Table 5 shows the percentage of population in each group with no formal training is comparable.

TABLE 6

PREVIOUS CLOTHING-RELATED JOBS

Types of Jobs	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Garment factory worker	2	28.6	------	----------
Ready-to-wear sales clerk	2	28.6	------	----------

Four students in the college class had been employed in a clothing-related job; none of the Bishop sewers had been employed in this type of work. Two of the college members had worked in garment factories from one to five years; the two other college members had worked as sales clerks from four months to one year.

TABLE 7

PREVIOUS OPERATION OF SEWING MACHINES

Types of Machines	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Kenmore	5	71.4	4	36.4
Necchi	1	14.3	------	----------
Singer	6	85.7	7	63.6
White	2	28.6	4	36.4
Others	2	28.6	3	27.3
Treadle	6	85.7	7	63.6
Electric	6	85.7	10	90.9
Automatic	1	14.3	1	9.1
None	------	----------	1	9.1

The college group had operated more types of sewing machines than the Bishop group. Kenmore, Singer, and White were commonly used in the college group, while only Singer and White were commonly used by the Bishop group. More women had operated the electric sewing machines than the treadle machines in the Bishop group. This may be surprising since this group represents a wider age range, and it might be expected that more treadle machines would have been operated by the older women in the Bishop group. An equal number of women had operated treadle as electric machines in the college group. Only one member in each group had operated an automatic sewing machine.

"What cotton fabrics have you worked with in clothing construction?"--

A majority of women in both groups had sewed with corduroy, broadcloth, gingham, and muslin. In addition, within the Bishop group a majority of women had sewed with percale; a majority of the college group had had experience with gabardine, marquisette, terrycloth, velveteen, and voile. This indicates that a majority of college students have used more cotton fabrics than the Bishop group. Furthermore, the college group checked 22 fabrics with which they had had previous experience; the Bishop group responded to 18 fabrics.

"What garments or articles have you constructed at home, school, work, and group organizations?"--

Twenty-three types of garments were listed (see Appendix III). Each of these garments had been constructed by at least one woman in the Bishop group; every type of garment except the coats had been constructed by women in the traditional, college class. A majority of Bishop women had sewed blouses (sleeveless and with set-in sleeves), skirts (gathered, pleated, and straight), dresses, girls' pajamas, and aprons. A majority of the college women had sewed blouses (sleeveless and with set-in sleeves), skirts (gathered, pleated, flared, and straight), dresses,

and aprons. Previously, the majority of women in both groups have sewed similar garments. There was no way of comparing the average number of each type of garment constructed by each woman because over one-third of the Bishop participants in the survey misinterpreted the question in the survey.

"What construction details have you made on a garment?"--

A majority of both groups have sewed on buttons, turned hems, set in slide fasteners and sleeves, and made pleats, tucks, darts, gathers, cuffs, patch pockets, and plackets. Furthermore, a majority of college students had sewed fitted facings and made bound buttonholes. A majority of the Bishop group had sewed buttons with a shank, made machine and hand-worked buttonholes, and set in pockets.

While college students worked with more fabrics, the Bishop participants had sewed a greater variety of construction details. This is unusual because the survey showed that the college group had more formal training in clothing construction. Perhaps this difference can be explained by the fact that the average age of Bishop women was higher, providing a wider span of years for experiences and

that a majority of them were homemakers (a role which offers opportunity for clothing construction).

When considering use of seam tape, bias tape, and self-made belts, it was found that the majority of both groups responded affirmatively. Self-covered buttons and buckles were used by five of the members in the traditional group (71 per cent) as contrasted to only three members in the Bishop class (27 per cent).

In consideration of past experiences, the majority of adult women who participated in the study appeared to have some familiarity with basic construction details. Therefore, the conclusion might be drawn that the adult women enrolled in these classes not entirely for beginning clothing instruction. The fact is important to point out here that both courses of study required a beginning course as a prerequisite to advanced study in clothing construction.

"Which garments and construction details do you think will be too difficult for you to attempt after completion of this class?"--

Almost one-half of the college class and Bishop class participants felt that coats, suits, and men's trousers would be too difficult to attempt after completion of the current class. In addition,

the Bishop participants felt that jackets would be too difficult. Other difficult construction details listed by the Bishop class included bound buttonholes and tailored collars. These two construction details required specialized skills which they had not developed. The college class listed no construction details too difficult to learn, nor had they previously experienced sewing as many construction details as the Bishop class. It would appear that the college class expected to learn many details.

"Which garments and construction details do you consider fun to do?"--

When considering which garments and construction details were fun to do, a high percentage (43 per cent) of the college students mentioned a gathered skirt, tucks, and darts; 46 to 65 per cent of the Bishop class responded to sleeveless blouses; gathered, pleated, flared, and straight skirts; girls pajamas, machine-worked buttonholes; and hems. This is quite a contrast. The Bishop class considered all types of skirts fun to sew, while the college class felt that only the gathered skirt was fun to do. Three college students (27 per cent) felt that no garment or construction details whatsoever would be fun to do; one participant in the Bishop group (9 per cent)

felt similarly. On the whole, the Bishop participants expected to enjoy the construction class more than the college students.

21) Attitudes of the participants:

"What were your four main purposes in taking this course?"--

TABLE 8
PURPOSES OF TAKING COURSE

Main Purposes	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Learn newest techniques	4	57.1	10	90.9
Learn fashion coordination	4	57.1	------	----------
Requirement for advanced study	5	71.4	6	54.5
Learn pattern alteration	4	57.1	7	63.6
Save money	------	----------	6	54.5

The four main purposes given by the college group are: learn the newest techniques, learn about fashion coordination, complete requirement for advanced study, and learn about pattern alteration; the main purposes listed by the Bishop group are: learn the newest techniques, complete requirement for advanced study, learn about pattern alteration, and save money. Each purpose was selected by a majority of class

members indicating multiple response to this question. Three of the four purposes mentioned in each group are identical. (These purposes for taking the class are not the same as the reasons listed for taking an advanced class on page 52.)

"Can you think of any disadvantages in taking this course?"--

TABLE 9
DISADVANTAGES OF CLASS

Listed Disadvantages	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Class held too long	2	28.6	------	----------
Choice of method restricted	------	----------	2	18.2

Two participants in each group mentioned disadvantages of taking the course. Time length (mentioned by a member of the college class) and method restrictions (response recorded from the Bishop class) were the two main disadvantages. However, the majority felt that there were no main disadvantages in taking the class.

"Can you think of any advantages in taking this course?"--

TABLE 10
ADVANTAGES OF CLASS

Listed Advantages	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Learn new method	2	28.6	4	36.4
Learn about new fabrics	2	28.6	1	9.1
Learn about color selection	2	28.6	------	----------
Save money	1	14.3	2	18.2
Learn pattern alteration	1	14.3	4	36.4
Learn method's principles	2	28.6	1	9.1
Sharing experiences with new friends	------	----------	2	18.2
Learn speed techniques	------	----------	4	36.4
Opportunity to develop hobby	------	----------	1	9.1

All of the participants listed one or more advantages to the class. The college students responded that they learned about new methods of construction, new fabrics, colors in clothing selection, money management in the clothing budget, pattern alterations, and traditional clothing construction principles. Some of these areas had been covered prior to the survey in this class.

The Bishop women responded to all except one of

the learnings listed in Table 10. Over one-third (36 per cent) of the Bishop followers listed the advantages of learning a new method, pattern alterations, and speed techniques. This favorable reaction to learning follows along with the philosophy of Mrs. Bishop' teachings. She stresses these three advantages in lectures to all adult women.

"Do you expect your finished garments will be better, the same, or poorer than similar ready-to-wear garments?"--

When asked whether the participants expected their garments to be better, the same, or poorer than similar ready-to-wear garments, only one member of the college class felt her finished garment would not be better. One-hundred per cent of the Bishop women felt their garments would be better than ready-to-wear garments. This expectation is high and above that attained or strived for by many women sewing for themselves. Mrs. Bishop teaches and strives for perfection, but she admittedly states that she accepts and hopes to attain (with her speed techniques) products of comparable standards to quality ready-to-wear garments.

"Are you more interested in the techniques of sewing construction or skills or in the fundamental principles and knowledge of application of these principles of sewing?"--

TABLE II
COMPARISON OF INTEREST

Area of Interest	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Technical skills	4	57.1	5	45.5
Principles and values	3	42.9	5	45.5
No comment	------	----------	1	9.1

It was assumed prior to this study that the college group would be interested in the fundamental principles and a knowledge of the application of the principles of sewing and that the Bishop group would be primarily interested in the techniques of sewing construction or skills. However, the analysis of responses (see Table II) indicated that these two groups are about equally divided in their responses to the question.

"Would you like to have a set of samples on construction details (for example, a corded buttonhole)?"--

TABLE 12

DESIRE FOR SET OF CONSTRUCTION DETAILS

Reply	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Yes	6	85.7	10	90.9
No	1	14.3	1	9.1

Before this study the writer thought that the college class might like to have a set of samples on construction details. They could be used later for teaching aids. It was assumed that the Bishop class would not be interested because they would have no practical use for them. The majority of responses from both classes, however, were affirmative (86 to 91 per cent) in making sets of construction details.

"Do you think that you will accept the methods taught in this class if they are different from those you learned before?"--

TABLE 13
ACCEPTANCE OF METHOD

Reasons for Acceptance of Method	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Method applicable today	2	28.6	------	---------
Other methods unknown	2	28.6	1	9.1
Future methods better	1	14.3	1	9.1
Faster method	-------	----------	5	45.5
Easier method	-------	----------	4	36.4
Better-looking product	-------	----------	2	18.2

A majority of the groups felt that they would accept the method taught in the class even if it were different from the one learned before. The reasons, "Faster method" and "Easier method", listed in Table 13 are unique objectives of the Bishop method of sewing. The reason, "Better-looking product", is generally accredited to traditional sewing, although none of the college class members mentioned it. However, two Bishop participants (18 per cent) listed this reason. Attitude responses in the two groups corresponded in many instances throughout this study instead of showing contrast as might have been expected from diverse groups.

"Do you think that you will accept the methods taught in this class as the only good and reasonable methods?"--

TABLE 14
ACCEPTANCE OF METHODS AS GOOD AND REASONABLE

Responses	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Affirmative	2	28.6	3	27.3
Negative	5	71.4	7	63.6
No comment	------	----------	1	9.1
Reasons for Negative Responses				
Future methods better	2	28.6	3	27.3
Other methods acceptable	2	28.6	3	27.3
Teacher biased	1	14.3	------	----------
Individual methods should blend	-----	----------	1	9.1

A great similarity existed between the groups, especially in the negative and affirmative responses and the reasons given for the negative response. The Bishop members appeared to feel the same as the college group; they did not feel that the method they would learn was the only good method of teaching clothing construction.

"Do you feel that the method taught in the class will be the most practical today for your use and standards?"--

TABLE 15
ACCEPTANCE OF METHOD'S PRACTICAL USE

Responses	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Affirmative	5	71.4	11	100.0
Negative	------	---------	------	---------
Undecided	2	28.6	------	---------
Reasons for Affirmative Responses				
Needs met	3	42.9	2	18.2
Method faster	------	---------	4	36.4
Method understood	------	---------	3	27.3
Other methods unknown	------	---------	1	9.1

The survey showed a slight difference in the reasoning of the group members in this question. All of the Bishop women responded affirmatively; only 71 per cent of the college group responded affirmatively. The remaining 29 per cent of the college group gave no explanations for their indecisive responses (see Table 15). The Bishop participants appeared confident in giving explanations; four different responses were given. The explanation might be that Bishop classes are not core courses within a curriculum offered for credit toward a degree. The women have explicit personal reasons for

wanting to learn how to sew. They have "shopped around" asking about classes within their social groups. Bishop classes for adult women have always emphasized the practical aspect of the skill, while in a college class the fundamental principles are given greater emphasis.

"Do you expect you will follow the methods you learn in the class after you complete the course?"--

TABLE 16
ATTITUDE ON FOLLOWING METHOD

Responses	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Affirmative	3	42.9	11	100.0
Negative	4	57.1	-----	----------

When asked whether one would follow the methods one learned in the class after completion of the course, the Bishop members responded 100 per cent affirmatively (see Table 16). On the other hand, the college students were divided between affirmative and negative responses. Each group further expressed that their individual needs were met by following their respective method of clothing construction. The college class explained that they would not follow the methods learned in class because future methods might be better, other methods would be

useful when combined with the traditional method of construction, and it is impossible to comprehend all of the techniques of the traditional method. The Bishop group felt that they would follow the Bishop method of clothing construction because they did not kn w of any other method of construction at the time of the survey, and because they felt that the Bishop method is fast, easy, and accurate.

"Do you feel you can learn effectively in an informal atmosphere?"--

Both groups responded 100 per cent affirmatively to the question asking whether they felt they could learn effectively in an informal atmosphere. Over one-third of the members in each class felt that in an informal situation, questions could be answered, ideas could be shared in the class, and the casualness of everyday living would be continued in the class.

"Do you welcome the opportunity of socialization with other women in a clothing construction class?"--

All but one of the 11 Bishop participants welcomed the opportunity of socialization with other women in a clothing construction class. The dissenter toward socialization in the group explained that her job met her social needs adequately. All of the college class members preferred the opportunity of socialization.

The members giving one or more reasons for their positive reaction to the question listed the advantages of friendship, the exchange of ideas, and the sharing of common interests (see Table 17).

TABLE 17

PREFERENCE FOR SOCIALIZATION

Reasons for Socialization	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Exchange of ideas	5	71.4	2	18.2
Friendship	4	57.1	5	54.5
Share common interests	1	14.3	3	27.3

"Do you think you could learn clothing construction techniques from demonstrations on television?"--

TABLE 18

EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION

Views on Educational Television	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Affirmative	1	14.3	2	18.2
Negative	5	71.4	8	72.7
Undecided	1	14.3	1	9.1

On the whole, both groups felt they could not learn clothing construction techniques from demonstrations on

television (see Table 18). This question was asked for the writer's personal inquiry. Those who felt that television was possible as a learning device specified that the demonstrations should be kept simple. Negative responses were balanced from both groups. Lack of thorough explanation and lack of personal time to view television were given as two reasons. This last reason indicated a misunderstanding of the question because it was assumed that one would have the time to watch the television demonstration if one had time to come to school for similar instruction. One Bishop adult mentioned the impossibility of asking questions. The personal explanation is a value she placed especially high. Actually, the writer has observed that most students watching a demonstration do not ask questions even when they have time and the opportunity. The objection appears to be a psychological restriction of not having the freedom of choice to ask questions.

"Do you prefer films (movie) over television for learning clothing construction techniques?"--

TABLE 19
COMPARISON OF EDUCATIONAL VALUE OF TELEVISION AND FILM

Preference of Media	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Film over TV	2	28.6	1	9.1
TV over film	4	57.1	10	90.9
Undecided	1	14.3	------	----------
Reasons for Television Preference				
Lack of time for examination	2	28.6	1	9.1
Questions can not be answered	1	14.3	2	18.2
Attention not attained in film	1	14.3	------	----------
Personal dislike	------	----------	2	18.2

Although television was rejected in a general question about television instruction (in which the respondent undoubtedly compared classroom with television instruction), it seemed to be favored over film for learning clothing construction techniques (see Table 19).

The class members gave one or more reasons for their preference of television over film instruction

(see Table 19). These reasons are incomplete responses because they do not seem to compare the two media in question.

"What is your degree or standard of quality for your finished garment constructed in this class?"--

TABLE 20

EXPECTATION OF ACCEPTABILITY OF FINISHED GARMENT

Acceptability	College Class Number	College Class Percentage	Bishop Class Number	Bishop Class Percentage
Acceptability to the Instructor				
Perfection in all details	3	42.9	3	27.3
Acceptable in all details	4	57.1	6	54.5
Acceptable in most details	------	----------	2	18.2
Acceptability to the Participant				
Acceptable in all details	5	71.4	4	36.4
Acceptable in most details	2	28.6	7	63.6

Success in clothing construction was desired by all participants according to the recorded responses in the survey. Degree of success, if based upon the acceptability question, seemed to be different for the two groups (see Table 20). In the college class a majority of participants responded to "acceptability in all

details to the instructor" rather than "perfection in all details". Furthermore, the college class expected a garment to be "acceptable in all details to themselves" rather than "acceptable in most details to themselves". In comparing the two groups from these responses, however, the college students expressed a desire to attain perfection in more details than the Bishop group.

The Bishop class as a majority felt that they wanted their garments "acceptable in all details to the instructor" rather than having "perfection in all details" or being "acceptable in most details to the instructor". However, they also felt they wanted their garments to be acceptable to themselves in most details rather than all details. If the garment is acceptable in all details to the instructor, but only in most details to the individual, reasoning would follow that the participant is more critical of the garment than the instructor. In actual practice this writer feels this situation is rarely found when a teacher rates student work; therefore, the analysis of responses here seems quite contradictory to real-life situations.

"Do you think that the money involved in enrollment in this class has affected the desire you have to learn?"--

TABLE 21
ATTITUDE ON COST OF CLASS

Desire to Learn vs. cost of class	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Money affected desire to learn	2	28.6	------	----------
Money has not affected desire to learn	5	71.4	11	100.0

A majority of members in each class felt that the money involved in enrollment in class had not affected their desire to learn (see Table 21). Explanations for the affirmative responses were "getting their money's worth" and "fear of class repetition" (therefore costing more money and time).
Those members who responded negatively to this question mentioned the worthiness of the class and said they did not mind spending the money for the course fee and the equipment since they were learning a new method of clothing construction.

"Do you expect to take further clothing construction classes?"--

TABLE 22
INTEREST IN ADDITIONAL CLASSES

Interest Response	College Class		Bishop Class	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Affirmative	6	85.7	10	90.9
Negative	1	14.3	1	9.1
Reasons for Affirmative Response				
Desire to learn	2	28.6	8	72.7
Curriculum requirement	4	57.1	-----	-----
Desire to improve skill	-----	-----	2	18.2

All but one member in each class desired to enroll in the next clothing construction class. Over 60 per cent of the students of each class further mentioned they wanted to take the next class as soon as possible. Both classes expressed their desire to learn more about clothing construction; the Bishop women further mentioned their desire to improve skill; the college women specified that the next class would fulfill curriculum requirements. A comparison of the reasons for taking advanced clothing construction courses shows that the Bishop women were concerned about learning the techniques of clothing

construction; the college students placed curriculum requirements first and a desire to learn second (see Table 22). The college students appeared to be professionally-directed; the homemakers in the Mott Foundation Bishop class were judging clothing construction classes from the practical viewpoint.

With the college group, a comparison of the purposes for taking the course (see Table 8, page 35) with reasons for enrolling in an advanced clothing construction course (see Table 22, page 52) indicate a strong orientation to curriculum requirements; learning new techniques or the related procedures were lesser in importance. With the Bishop group, a comparison of these two tables shows a strong motivation to learn new techniques in clothing construction. The comparisons of these two questions shows a clear differentiation of the two classes, the purposes in their specific formsof education, and the general purposes of the two educational institutions represented.

Analysis of Score Sheets by the Panel of Judges

The analysis responses on the score sheets of the four judges were summarized and recorded. The ratings for each skill were totalled; specific comments of each judge were recorded in a summary.

1) Mastery of technical skill:

TABLE 23

STITCHING ABILITY OF STUDENTS AS RATED BY JUDGES IN USE OF CARBON LINES

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Straight, Clear Carbon Lines		
Mastery of skill	1	1
Average mastery of skill	2	3
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	1	--------
Stitching Over Carbon Lines		
Mastery of skill	--------	1
Above average mastery of skill	1	--------
Average mastery of skill	1	2
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	2	1
Straight Stitching Lines		
Above average mastery of skill	2	1
Average mastery of skill	2	3

The traditional method used by the college class required that all seam lines be carbon marked; these carbon lines mark the width of the seam and guide the line of stitching. Three of the four judges felt that the college class acquired at least an average mastery of marking straight, clear carbon lines; one of these judges rated the group as having achieved the mastery of this skill (see Table 23). All the judges (four) rated the skill of stitching over the carbon lines as average; two of these judges, however, felt the stitching was unacceptable to them even though the mastery of skill was average.

The speed method of clothing construction followed by the Bishop group does not carbon mark the seam lines with the result that there is less carbon marking and fewer guide lines. Only detailed points, such as darts, leats, and fold lines, are carbon marked; seam lines are stitched using a guage on the machine. All the judges scored carbon lines of the Bishop class as straight and clear.

On the average, the judges scored the mastery of straight stitching lines higher for the college group than the Bishop group (see Table 23). The stitching lines of the college class were guided by carbon lines; the stitching lines of the Bishop class

were determined by the edge of the seam allowance running along a stitching guide placed on the throat plate of the sewing machine. The stitching lines of both groups were acceptable to all of the judges.

TABLE 24

RATINGS BY JUDGES
FOR THREADS SECURELY FASTENED AT EDGES

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Above average mastery of skill	1	---
Average mastery of skill	3	2
Below average mastery of skill	---	1
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	---	1

Thread ends were securely fastened in the college group by backstitching or tieing the threads. In the Bishop class 50 per cent of the judges felt that the ends were not securely fastened; the backstitch method was used. One judge commented that the threads were not closely clipped in the Bishop class; Mrs. Bishop stresses close clipping of thread ends to keep construction work neat in appearance. However, the degree of close clipping is a value judgment upon which the judge and Mrs. Bishop do not seem to be in agreement.

TABLE 25

RATINGS BY JUDGES
FOR CORRECT STITCHING LENGTHS

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Regular Stitching		
Above average mastery of skill	2	--------
Average mastery of skill	1	4
Below average mastery of skill	1	--------
Staystitching		
Above average mastery of skill	1	1
Average mastery of skill	1	3
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	1	--------
Skill not acceptable	1	--------

One of the judges rated the regular stitching done by the college group as average and one below average as compared to the four judges who rated the Bishop group as having stitching as average (see Table 25). Although the length of the regular machine stitches in the college class were rated above average by 50 per cent of the judges, the length of the staystitches fell below average. The judges who rated length of staystitches as below average also rated the mastery of skill unacceptable

to them. On the whole, the Bishop group of blouses received a rating of average from all the judges in scoring the length of staystitches.

TABLE 26

RATINGS OF JUDGES ON BLOUSES IN SEAM WIDTHS, STAYSTITCHING WIDTHS, HEMS OF BLOUSES, HEMS OF SLEEVES, AND HEMS OF FACINGS

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Seam Widths		
Mastery of skill	---	1
Above average mastery of skill	1	---
Average mastery of skill	2	2
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	1	---
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	---	1
Staystitching Widths		
Mastery of skill	---	1
Above average mastery of skill	---	2
Average mastery of skill	1	1
Below average mastery of skill	1	---
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	2	---

TABLE 26 - Continued

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Hems of Blouses		
Above average mastery of skill	2	1
Average mastery of skill	1	1
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	1	---
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	---	1
Skill not acceptable	---	1
Hems of Sleeves		
Above average mastery of skill	1	---
Average mastery of skill	2	2
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	1	1
Skill not done and unacceptable	---	1
Hems of Facings		
Above average mastery of skill	---	1
Average mastery of skill	2	---
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	1	2
No comment	1	1

Each class received an average rating from 50 per cent of the judges in all wing correct width for the

seams (see Table 26). The college class had some irregular allowances (some allowances were wider than required). Both methods of clothing construction required main construction seams to be finished five-eighths of an inch in width.

The Bishop class received higher ratings than the college class for stitching the correct width for staystitching lines. All the judges felt the mastery of skill for this group was average to above average. On the other hand, all four judges felt the mastery of skill in the college group was below average to average; two judges felt the widths were unacceptable in the college group. The traditional method has a staystitching width one-sixteenth of an inch or a few threads from the carbon line of the seam line. The Bishop method specifies that staystitching should be one-half of an inch from the outside edges of the fabric (in other words, one-eighth of an inch from the seam line).

The hem allowances for the blouse hem, sleeves, and facings in the college class were acceptable to a majority of the judges; hem allowances in the Bishop class were rated "unacceptable" and "below average" by the majority of judges (see Table 26). Comments concerning the work of the Bishop class were directed to improvements of details, such as the clipped

thread ends, the variations in hem widths, and the twisted hems. Both groups were expected to use two-inch sleeve hems and facing allowances according to the commercial pattern. The bottom edge of the blouses could be finished in a hem of one-quarter of an inch in width or by two rows of stitching near the pinked lower edge of garment.

TABLE 27

RATINGS BY JUDGES ON BLOUSES FOR GENERAL EFFECT OF FITTED FACINGS, GUSSETS, HEMS OF BLOUSES, SLIDE FASTENERS, HEMS OF SLEEVES, DARTS, AND TUCKS

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Fitted Facings		
Mastery of skill	---	1
Above average mastery of skill	3	---
Average mastery of skill	---	1
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	1	1
Skill not acceptable	---	1
Gussets		
Above average mastery of skill	1	---
Average mastery of skill	2	2
Below average mastery of skill	---	1
No comment	1	1

TABLE 27 - Continued

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Hems of Blouses		
Above average mastery of skill	1	1
Average mastery of skill	3	3
Slide Fasteners		
Mastery of skill	1	----
Above average mastery of skill	1	1
Average mastery of skill	1	1
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	----	1
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	----	1
No comment	1	----
Hems of Sleeves		
Above average mastery of skill	2	1
Average mastery of skill	1	----
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	----	2
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	1	1
Darts		
Mastery of skill	1	----
Above average mastery of skill	1	2
Average mastery of skill	2	2

TABLE 27 - Continued

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Tucks		
Above average mastery of skill	3	2
Average mastery of skill	--------→	2
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	1	----------

Three-fourths of the judges scored the general effect of the fitted facings to be above average in mastery of skill in the college group; in the Bishop group the ratings ranged from "mastery of skill" to "skill not acceptable" (see Table 27). Although the skill of the Bishop class was lower than the other group on the average, the Bishop method of understitching in the fitted facings was highly approved and recommended by the majority of judges. Since the mastery of skill was not high, some facings tended to roll over, revealing the understitching on the outside of the garment. The facings were completely concealed in the garments which were constructed by a student with a higher degree of skill. The facings sewed by the traditional method lay flat but were not completely

concealed. Therefore, in this part of the garment, the college class exhibited better mastery of technical skill, but the method followed by the Bishop class was more desirable.

The general effect of the gussets was more desirable in the college class than in the Bishop class (see Table 27). The traditional method omitted top-stitching because the use of additional tape in the corners reinforced the gussets. In the Bishop method either top-stitching around the entire gusset or stitching in the corners going outward about one-fourth of an inch into the main piece of the garment was taught. Neither of these acceptable alternatives were attempted by the Bishop members, thereby lowering the rating of acceptability to the judges in this class. The corners were reinforced well in the college group, thereby helping raise the rating to above average for mastery of stitching gussets. Staystitching was noticable around the gussets in two blouses made by Bishop members. Both groups of gussets revealed some puckers at the corners.

In Table 27 it can be seen the judges rated both groups the same for general effect of the blouse hems. The evenness and flatness of hems in the college class, however, were considered much better than those same qualities in the Bishop class. Using the Bishop

method, either the hem could be sewed by machine into a one-fourth of an inch hem or the bottom edge could be pinked and double-stitched. Seam tape bound or stitched flat to the bottom edge of the garments was also acceptable in the traditional method. (This choice of method can be found on page 371 in Clothing Construction by Evelyn A. Mansfield.)

The judges commented that the slide fasteners were inserted successfully and neatly in the college class; the laps covering the teeth of the slide fasteners tended to twist in the Bishop class. Also, the widths of the laps in the college group were more desirable to the judges than those in the Bishop group. On the whole, the general effect of the slide fasteners was slightly higher in the college class than in the Bishop class (see Table 27).

Three-fourths of the judges rated the sleeve hems of the Bishop group as unacceptable (see Table 27). This was explained by the comments that a majority of the sleeve hems were stitched by hand; the Bishop method teaches the sleeve hems of cotton blouses should be sewed by the blind-stitch technique on the sewing machine. Two of the judges rated the sleeve hems of the college group as above average; they commented upon the even, neat hand stitches of the traditional method.

All darts were sewed with average or above average mastery of skill according to the ratings of judges (see Table 27). The college class ranged from "average" to "mastery of skill"; the Bishop class ranged from "average" to "above average mastery of skill". Three of the four judges felt that darts stitched by the college group had excellent, tapered points.

The responses concerning the general effect of the tucks were varied. Several of the tucks in the blouses of the college class were pulled out because the threads were not securely tied. The lockstitch technique in the Bishop method seemed to be correctly executed or adequate to hold the waistline tucks.

TABLE 28

RATINGS BY JUDGES ON FINAL USES FOR SHAPING AND PRESSING DURING CONSTRUCTION

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Above average mastery of skill	1	1
Average mastery of skill	2	1
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	--------	2
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	1	--------

Generally, both groups had pressed as recommended in construction of blouses. Pressing techniques, which are very similar for both groups, were demonstrated in each class; both methods suggest pressing before the garment is finished. In the Bishop method, pressing is referred to as a technique in the unit method of clothing construction. Some emphasis is placed on shaping the garment in the pressing procedure of the traditional method. An average rating was given to each group by at least a majority of the judges. The quality of pressing in the college group was rated below average and unacceptable by one of the judges; with the Bishop class, the quality of pressing was average but unacceptable to two of the judges. Some women in the Bishop group had not shaped and pressed their garments during construction.

2) Appearance of the garments:

TABLE 29

RATINGS BY JUDGES ON BLOUSES
FOR PRESSED APPEARANCE

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Above average mastery of skill	1	1
Average mastery of skill	2	2
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	1	----------
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	----------	1

Although appearance of the pressed garments depended to a large extent upon the fiber content, fabric weave, and finish, each group of blouses were rated "average" and "above average" in appearance by a majority of judges (see Table 29). They were pressed equalled well in all areas and produced the general effect of a pressed appearance.

TABLE 30

RATINGS BY JUDGES ON BLOUSES
FOR CORRECT STITCHING TENSION

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Above average mastery of skill	3	1
Average mastery of skill	1	3

The adult women in the Bishop class had more difficulty than the college women in judging the correct stitching tension to be used for their fabrics. The ratings showed that the college group was rated higher than the Bishop group in correct tension in stitching seams (see Table 30). Evidence showed that the tight tension of the machine stitches tended to pucker the seamlines of the garments sewed by the Bishop class, thereby lowering the quality of a pear-ance.

TABLE 31

RATINGS BY JUDGES ON APPEARANCE OF BLOUSES FOR ELIMINATION OF PUCKERS, CUTTING ON GRAIN, NEAT FITTED FACINGS, SMOOTH SLIDE FASTENERS, FLAT GUSSETS AND HEMS, STRAIGHT HEM ALLOWANCES ON SLEEVES, LOCATION OF DARTS AND TUCKS, FRAYING OR PULLING OUT, AND CLEAN SEAM FINISHES

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Elimination of Puckers		
Above average mastery of skill	1	1
Average mastery of skill	2	2
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	1	1

TABLE 31 - Continued

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Cutting on Grain		
Mastery of skill	1	---
Above average mastery of skill	2	4
Average mastery of skill	1	---
Neat Fitted Facings		
Above average mastery of skill	2	---
Average mastery of skill	1	4
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	1	---
Smooth Slide Fasteners		
Above average mastery of skill	2	---
Average mastery of skill	1	3
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	1	---
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	---	1

TABLE 31 - Continued

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Flat Gussets		
Mastery of skill	1	---
Above average mastery of skill	1	---
Average mastery of skill	---	2
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	2	---
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	---	2
Flat Hems		
Above average mastery of skill	1	1
Average mastery of skill	1	1
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	2	1
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	---	1
Straight Hem Allowances on Sleeves		
Mastery of skill	1	---
Above average mastery of skill	---	1
Average mastery of skill	2	2
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	1	1

TABLE 31 - Continued

Ratings	College Class (Number of Ratings)	Bishop Class (Number of Ratings)
Location of Darts		
Above average mastery of skill	2	2
Average mastery of skill -	1	1
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	1	---
No comment	---	1
Location of Tucks		
Above average mastery of skill	2	2
Average mastery of skill	---	1
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	1	---
Below average mastery of skill and unacceptable	1	---
No comment	---	1
Fraying or Pulling Out		
Above average mastery of skill	2	1
Average mastery of skill	2	2
Average mastery of skill, but unacceptable	---	1
Clean Seam Finishes		
Above average mastery of skill	3	---
Average mastery of skill	1	4

The two groups received similar ratings for garments free from puckers caused by dart "dimples", overeasing, and so forth (see Table 31). Gussets rated by the judges and recorded in the table indicates a similar high rating for few puckers at the corners of gussets (a difficult construction detail and one hard to do without puckers using cotton resin-finished fabrics).

The blouses in each group were cut on the grain of the fabric. On the average, the judges rated this skill as above average. Furthermore, the judges mentioned the grain of the gussets and facings in the blouses of the college class were cut with a slightly higher degree of mastery of skill than the gussets and facings of the Bishop group, although each group received satisfactory scores.

A majority of judges rated the appearance of the fitted facings higher in the college class than the Bishop class (see Table 31). Edge-stitching on the finished edge of the facings should have been closer in both groups. The college class could have trimmed the edges closer. The technique of clean finishing the facing edge was following by the members of the Bishop class.

The above average appearance of the slide

fastener in the college group of bl uses might well be attributed to the above average technical skill developed in this class (see Table 31). The judges rated as average the technical skill used in inserting the slide fastener by the women in the Bishop group, causing the final general appearance of the closing to be lower in comparison to the college class.

The judges were equally divided in each group upon acceptability of the appearance of the gussets and hems (see Table 31). In comparison of appearance, the gussets in the college group rated from "average" to "mastery of skill"; the gussets in the Bishop group rated from "below average" to "average" in appearance.

A majority of the hems of the blouses were average in appearance in both the Bishop and the college classes.

As shown in Table 31, the ratings were nearly identical for both groups in the striaghtness of hems of sleeves. Again, average scores were given to the majority of garments in each class.

The judges found it difficult to score the location of the darts and tucks. The majority of the judges felt that they could not determine the correct location unless each garment was modelled by its owner and maker. Nevertheless, ratings were given because

the darts and tucks could be inspected for centering within the garment. Each group received above average scores for both tucks and darts (see Table 31). Two judges did not fully understand the question and gave "unacceptable" ratings.

The scores of the college group were equally divided between average and above average appearance with no fraying or pulling out. One judge felt that the seams needed more detailed finishes in the Bishop group, therefore the average rating was lowered (see Table 31).

The college class members had received an above average score on clean seam finishes; the seams had been edge-stitched and pinked by the traditional method. The Bishop class received average ratings from all four of the judges (see Table 31). Two of the judges mentioned that no finishing had been done in the seams of a majority of the Bishop blouses. According to the Bishop method of clothing construction, seams need not be finished or trimmed if the cotton fabric is firm and does not ravel easily.

Analysis of the Instructor Score Sheets Compared with Ratings by Panel of Judges

The Individual Project Score Sheets were summarized for each clothing construction class; the rating given in the majority of individual score sheets for each question was recorded on the Summary of Individual Projects Score Sheet for each clothing construction class. General comments for each class were recorded there also. Part I and II of the Individual Project Score Sheet are identical to the score sheets used by the panel of judges; therefore, the analysis of these two sections compares the ratings of the instructor with the general ratings of the judges. Part III of the Individual Project Score Sheet used by the instructor evaluated the two groups according to class interest, attendance, and so forth.

I) Technical skill mastery:

Use of carbon lines.--The instructor rated both groups as having "average mastery of skill" in drawing straight, clear carbon lines. This rating coincided with the ratings of the majority of judges who scored these groups. The adult women in the college class marked carbon lines accurately in all details; the women in the Bishop class marked carbon lines in most details according to the method of clothing construction

followe'. The instructor noted that the women in the college grou> were very conscientious in marking the lines accurately.

The instructor agreed with a majority of the judges in rating mastery of skill in stitching over carbon lines. A ove average scores were generally given the college grou> and average scores were given the Bishop group. Both grou>s did accurate stitc.ing in ost details according to the method of construction followed.

Straight stitching lines.--Both classes usually did accurate stitching. The mastery of skill in the college group, however, was generally above average, while the skill develo.ed in the Is op grou> proved to be average. These ratings were similar to the ratings recorde.! by at least one-half of the judges.

Stitching locked at edges.--The instructor inspected the blouses before the judges inspected them. An above average rating was given the college class for the securely tied threads at seam e'ges; an average rating was given the Bishop class. The instructor felt that the lockstitching technique use.! in the Bishop group was not successful, and therefore an unacce>table rating was given it. The average

ratings given the college group by three of the four judges could be due to extensive testing of the garments.

Correct stitching lengths.--The length of stitch for staystitching in the college group was longer than the traditional method allows; consequently, the instructor scored this skill as inaccurate, below average, and unacceptable according to most details of the method followed. The judges were divided in their ratings (see page 57).

The staystitching and regular machine stitching techniques for the blouses in the Bishop class were done with only average skill, but this class followed correct procedures for the Bishop method. Over one-half of the judges rated staystitching and regular machine stitching similar to the instructor.

In the college class, the length of stitches for regular stitching was an improvement over the incorrect length of stitch for staystitching. An above average rating was given this stitching which was executed accurately according to the traditional method.

Correct seam and hem allowances.--The college group allowed accurate widths for seams, blouse hems,

sleeve hems, and facing hems according to the traditional method of clothing construction. Inaccurate allowances were found in staystitching; a majority of the staystitching lines were less than one-half of an inch from the edge of the fabric. On the average, the Bishop class received lower scores for their efforts; staystitching allowances were accurate, but seam width (five-eighths of an inch) and the facing hem allowances (two inches) were accurate in only some details. The hems of the blouses (one-fourth of an inch) and the sleeve hems (two inches) were inaccurate according to the Bishop method. Over 50 per cent of the hem allowances in the blouses measured one-half of an inch or more; three hems were sewed by hand instead of by machine; and six sleeve hems were less than one inch.

The instructor rated the facing and blouse hems of the college class comparable to the ratings made by a majority of judges (see page 59). Seam allowances, staystitching allowances, and sleeve hem allowances were rated "above average", "below average", and "above average" respectively in mastery of skill. Each rating by the instructor was slightly higher than the ratings given by the majority of the judges.

In the Bishop class the allowances for seam

widths, hems of blouses and sleeves were rated "below average" and "unacceptable" to the instructor. The allowance for staystitching widths and facing hems were rated "average" and "acceptable" to the instructor. All of these scores except the facing hems for the Bishop group were slightly lower than the ratings recorded by a majority of the judges. The facing hem allowances in the Bishop group were rated "average" by the instructor, while one-half of the judges rated them "below average".

The instructor felt that the women in the college group were more conscientious about measuring correct allowances than the Bishop group. Higher accuracy ratings for width of seams and hems were given to the college group in both the ratings of the judges and the instructor, although the judges and the instructor were not always in agreement on the level of the accomplishment.

Fitted facings.--The fitted facings of the Bishop group tended to "roll over" to the right side of the garment. This was caused partially by inaccurate work in the Bishop method of construction. Therefore, the rating for the general effect of the facings was average. In the very few garments which

were constructed according to the Bishop method, the facings lay flat and were completely concealed. Since the method was not followed accurately, the instructor found them unacceptable to her.

The women in the college class followed the traditional method and sewed the fitted facings accurately in all details. The technical skill developed was above average and acceptable to the instructor.

Gussets.--Although two of the four judges had rated each group average in development of skill for sewing gussets, the instructor rated the college group of blouses above average and the Bishop group of blouses average. Both groups of gussets had some puckers in the corners; this could have been eliminated by clipping into the corners closer to the stitching line. The college class reinforced the corners of the gussets with seamtape, while the Bishop class did not reinforce the corners. Top-stitching was not done in either group. The college class followed the traditional method accurately in all details except clipping to the stitching line to eliminate puckering. The Bishop class was inaccurate in following most details of the method; they did not reinforce the gussets by top-stitching or stitching in the corners, and they did not

clip the corners sufficiently to eliminate puckering. The instructor felt that the gusset construction of the Bishop class was unacceptable because the method was not followed.

Hem of blouse.--In the blouses sewed by the college class the hems were flat and even. The general effect was above average in mastery of skill. The traditional method was followed accurately in all details.

On the other hand, in the Bishop class the hems of the blouses were uneven. Many hems did not follow the Bishop method of construction because they were sewed by hand and because the hem allowances were incorrect. The hems were acceptable, however, to the instructor because they were firm and flat.

Slide fasteners.--The instructor rated the slide fasteners of the college group higher than the slide fasteners of the Bishop group; the groups were given ratings of "mastery of skill" and "above average mastery of skill" respectively. The lap width of the slide fasteners was accurate in both groups; the teeth were concealed adequately in the college group of blouses but inadequately in the Bishop group of garments. The ratings of the

instructor were comparable to the ratings of the judges. Both groups inserted the slide fasteners according to the method followed.

Sleeve hem.--The general effect of the sleeve hems in the college group were above average as compared to the average effect of the sleeve hems in the Bishop group. The women in the college class sewed even, neat stitches, while the women in the Bishop class sewed uneven stitches that were too long. The traditional method was followed accurately in the college class. The women in the Bishop class did not follow the Bishop method which requires the blind-stitch technique on the sewing machine. Many sleeve hems were sewed by hand.

Darts and tucks.--Both groups were rated below average in the mastery of skill for sewing tucks because the ends of threads were insecurely fastened and the stitches were not straight. This rating was lower than the average ratings of the judges.

The instructor agreed with the judges in grading the mastery of skill in sewing darts above average in the Bishop group and excellent in the college group.

Shaping and pressing during construction.--Both

groups had done acceptable, average work in pressing each unit before final construction of the garment. The garments which were not pressed until they were finished lowered the group average slightly. Both methods were followed accurately in most details.

2) Appearance of the garments:

Pressing.--Both groups of bl uses were pressed, but the general effect was average. Since some detailed areas had not been pressed earlier in construction, the final appearance of these areas were not excellent. Techniques of pressing in both methods of clothing construction were followed.

Correct stitching tension.--After teaching each class and helping each member, the instructor felt that both groups had developed an acceptable, average skill in judging correct stitching tension according to the method of clothing construction followed. The judges felt that the college class had developed this skill better than the Bishop class.

Elimination of puckers.--The instructor gave the college group an average rating for elimination of puckers and the Bishop class an unacceptable, below

average rating for elimination of puckers caused from dart "dimples", overease, and so forth. Since the construction of darts and gussets were generally better in the college group than in the Bishop group, as might be expected more puckers were eliminated in the college group.

Cut on grain of fabric.--The women in the college class showed complete mastery of skill in cutting fabric on the grain. The bodice, gussets, and facings were cut correctly. The bodices and facings of the blouses in the Bishop group, however, were not cut as accurately as the other group. Both classes followed their respective methods of planning and cutting accurately. Perfection of cutting was more difficult to attain in the Bishop method by the beginner sewer; the pattern was pinned to the fabric at the corners, and the instructor noted the difficulty expressed by the beginner sewers who had not developed skill in cutting. For these women, the patterns tended to slip on the fabric, thereby lowering the ease of cutting on the grain of the fabric.

Neat fitted facings.--Facings cut on the grain of the fabric fitted into the garment smoothly; the fitted facings in the college group of blouses had been

cut on grain while the facings in the Bishop group of blouses seemed not to have been cut exactly on the grain. The free edges of the facings were finished equally well in both groups. The instructor agreed with the judges in rating the appearance of the fitted facings as above average in the college group and average in the Bishop group.

Smooth slide fasteners.--The college class received an above average rating in appearance of the slide fasteners; the Bishop class received an average rating. In the Bishop group the tapes covering the teeth of the slide fasteners tended to twist, therefore lowering the rating of the appearance of the side closings. Both methods of construction were followed accurately in all details. These ratings coincided with the ratings recorded by the majority of the judges.

Flat gussets.--Since both groups cut the gussets accurately, there was no twisting or undesirable bulky pulling in the gusset pieces. Both sets of gussets lay flat; only the puckers in the corners gave some difficulty, thereby lowering the appearance from excellent to an above average rating with both classes.

Flat hems.--The women in the college class

accurately sewed the hems of the bl uses according to the traditional method. The hems were flat and neat, receiving an excellent rating.

A majority of the hems sewed by the women in the Bishop class were bulky and uneven; many hems were not sewed by the prescribed method. The women had not pressed the hems during the hemming procedure, therefore, the average appearance was lower in comparison to the appearance of the hems in the college group.

Straight hem allowances on sleeves.--"Average in appearance" was the rating given sleeve hem allowances in the college group and "below average appearance" was given the sleeve hem allowances in the Bishop group of blouses. The blouses in the Bishop class were rated lower because not all details were accurately followed in the method, and the hems of the sleeves were uneven.

Location of darts and tucks.--The instructor could accurately rate the appearance of the dart and tuck locations. The college group of blouses rated excellent; the Bishop group rated average. The higher rating was given because the women in the college class had pattern and garment fittings before final construction. At these fittings, the locations of the darts and tucks were changed so as to fit the wearer. The women in the

Bishop class did not have fittings; therefore, the l cations of darts and tucks were not altered to the wearer.

No fraying or pulling out.--The garments in the college class appeared to be firm in construction detail. There was no fraying or pulling out in the corners of the gussets and so forth. The college class received a rating of excellent.

The women did not follow the Bisho method of construction in reinforcing the gussets and finishing the seam allowances. Some of the corners of the gussets had begun to pull out and the seam allowances were fraying. The Bisho class received a rating of below average in appearance.

Clean seam finishes.--The instructor and the judges rated the college group of garments higher than the Bisho grou of garments for appearance of clean seam finishes. The seams were finished in the blouses of the college class, thereby getting a rating of excellent. The women following the Bishop method of construction did not finish the seam allowances. The seam allowances had begun to fray. This group received an unacceptable and average rating by the instructor.

3) Personal evaluation:

The instructor rated both groups above average in personal interest in the class, obedience to the instructor's directions, and comprehension of the philosophy of the method of clothing construction followed.

The class attendance and feeling of group membership were excellent in the college group as compared to above average in the Bishop group. The general ratings of the Bishop class were lower because attendance waned near the end of the course of instruction, and the women did not seem to socialize or knit into an informal group.

The comprehension of the sewing techniques and the prompt completion of assignments were above average in the college class and average in the Bishop class. The adult women in the Bishop class were not "students" as were the members of the other group. They comprehended the instructions slower than the members of the college class. The Bishop women also did not feel that it was essential to complete assignments promptly. Most of of these women were homemakers and therefore had duties and responsibilities at home to share with the clothing construction work.

The women of the Bishop class never worked ahead

of the instructor. The college women sometimes worked ahead.

The Bishop women were more independent in sewing their garments. They rarely consulted friends; they seldom asked the instructor for advice or clarification of technical details. The college women were average in independence. The members of this close-knit group felt free to ask questions among the group as well as to the instructor directly.

CHAPTER IV

EVALUATIONS AND SUMMARY

Evaluations

At the beginning of the study the following basic assumptions were made about the Bishop and the college clothing construction classes:

1) Both classes would consistently follow the method of clothing construction used in their respective classes. The college members, working for an acceptable grade in the three-credit course, would therefore follow the technical skills according to the method of clothing construction. The Bishop class members, learning the newest, speed techniques, would follow the speed methods of clothing construction consistently because women adopting the Bishop method have often been recognized for their intense and constant interest, enthusiasm, and acceptance of Mrs. Bishop's learnings.

2) Both clothing construction groups would accept the method taught in their respective classes even if that method were different from the methods of construction learned previously.

3) The instructor would assume different roles

while teaching each class. The methods of approach, attitudes toward the clothing construction method taught, and the methods of instruction would be different in the two classes.

The writer expected that each group of members would have different main purposes for enrolling in the clothing construction classes. Specifically, the adult women in the Bishop class would want to (a) get out for the evening for socialization purposes and (b) learn the basic sewing skills for simple and practical uses in homemaking; the women in the college class would want to (a) receive college credit toward a bachelor degree, allowing them to enter the professional field of home economics and (b) learn the traditional, fundamental principles of clothing construction and the knowledge of application of these principles.

In this study it was also expected that the college students would feel that an academic atmosphere is conducive to learning, while the Bishop women would feel that they could learn more effectively in an informal atmosphere.

Other expectations were that the fundamental principles basic to the speed and the traditional methods of clothing construction would affect the standard

of quality of construction of the garments; the degree of technical skills developed and the appearance of the finished garments probably would be higher in the class using the traditional, custom method of clothing construction than the class following the speed method of construction; and, lastly, Bishop women would develop a group-membership feeling, while the college students would not organize so noticeably into an informal group.

After completion of the study, these assumptions and expectations were reviewed, evaluated, and summarized as follows:

1) It was assumed that both classes would follow their respective methods of clothing construction consistently. When judges and the instructor score sheets analyzing the finished garments of each class were evaluated, they showed that the members of the college class consistantly followed the traditional method of clothing construction. However, the Bishop members did not use the speed method of construction consistently; they often used other methods learned previously (for example, sewing sleeve hems by hand instead of by machine, omitting understitching in the fitted facings, and tieing threads instead of lockstitching).

The Bishop class did not develop a close-knit group feeling (see page 88). In view of this fact, one might venture to say that, in a sense, Mrs. Bishop did not have a "family" of followers in this group of Flint adult women. There did not seem to exist a group attitude pressuring them to learn and follow Mrs. Bishop' teachings as might have been expected from women who have heard and read so much about Mrs. Bishop. The writer as instructor might not have sufficiently inspired the group with the Bishop image to enlist their complete acceptance of her methods. With these points in mind, it can be understood why the women in the Bishop class returned to methods of construction used previously after orientation to the new, unfamiliar techniques.

2) Over three-fourths of the members in both groups felt they would accept the methods of clothing construction taught in their respective classes if they were different from the methods of construction learned previously (see page 41). This response correlates with the basic assumption. Both groups expressed confidence that the methods taught in their respective classes were practical and applicable for use.

3) The instructor felt she assumed different

roles while teaching each class. In the Bishop class her method of approach was personal, easy-going, and sociable; in the college class her method of approach was slightly more impersonal and technical. Instruction to the Bishop class emphasized management of time, having fun while sewing, and learning the unique Bishop basic learnings; the college class received instruction which was more academic and emphasized high standard of skill and objective, analytical reasoning. In both classes the instructor felt that cheerfulness, patience, and enjoyment of teaching and helping others were important personal qualities necessary for an optimum learning situation.

The main reasons for taking the course among the Bishop women were not primarily for socialization and for learning the basic sewing skills as had been expected. From the survey instrument it was found that the four main purposes were (a) to learn the newest techniques, (b) to complete requirements for an advanced course in Bishop sewing, (c) to save money, and (d) to learn how to alter patterns to fit themselves. They were equally divided in stating their interest of learning techniques of common sewing skills or learning the fundamental principles of Bishop sewing and the application of these principles. A majority of the members

welcomed the opportunity of socialization with the other women in the clothing construction class, but not one of them stated this reason as one of the four main purposes for taking the course.

A majority of the college members listed "college credit" as one of the four main reasons for enrollment in class. This confirmation of part of the assumption was counterbalanced by the findings that the students expressed more interest in learning the common technical skills of clothing construction than the fundamental principles of this traditional method and its applications.

The causes of the contradition to the stated assumption might be traced to the selection of the population for the study. The size of the sample population was too small for accurate testing.

It has been expected that the college students were conditioned to formal classroom instruction and they would feel that this instruction given in an academic atmosphere would be more conducive to effective learning than an informal atmosphere where free discussion and personalized instruction would be conducted. It was assumed that the Bishop women would prefer the informal type of teaching over the formal, academic instruction.

The question in the instrument which was selected to secure this information was worded as follows: "Do you feel you can learn effectively in an informal atmosphere?

Why?"

This question was worded with no comparison of the two methods of instruction. The women were perhaps misled for the true information sought. In consideration of this fact, an accurate evaluation of this expectation can not be ascertained. However, instructors could well give the responses to the question some priority in their classes since 100 per cent of the participants in each class responded affirmatively.

The different fundamental principles underlying the speed and the traditional methods of clothing construction affected the standards of final quality in clothing construction and were so rated by the judges and the instructor. These principles are given on pages 12 through 14 in the introduction. The analyses of data of the rating instruments used by the panel of judges and the instructor indicate that the development of sewing skill, the fit of the garments, and the techniques of construction in the garments sewed by the traditional, custom method had a higher standard of quality than the garments constructed by the Bishop speed method. This difference in quality found by testing and analysis verifies the expectation.

The degree of technical skill developed and

the appearance of the finished garments were higher in the class following the traditional method of construction than the class following the speed method. This statement is in accordance with the analyses of data recorded from rating instruments. Throughout the entire judging of the finished garments of each class, the judges and the instructor repeatedly scored the college class higher than the Bishop class in development of technical skill and appearance of the garment.

According to indications found in the analysis of data in the rating instrument used by the instructor, the Bishop women did not develop a group-membership feeling, and the college students did organize into an informal group. This reversal of the expected group action might be explained by a thorough examination of the backgrounds of the group members. Apparently, attitudes, social needs, and common experiences of the Bishop members were lacking which would appear to be essential for group cohesion.

Evaluation of the Instruments

1) Evaluation of the survey:

Description and background of the population.--The

differences in development of technical skill and personal satisfactions derived from the end product can be partially explained by the varied background of the population. On the average, the Bishop women were not employed and were older in age (all having been married) than the college women. They had a lower level of formal education, more class experience in clothing construction, a longer period in years of sewing experience, fewer clothing-related jobs, more experience in operating sewing machines, less experience in sewing with a variety of cotton fabrics, and a wider range of experience in construction of garments and with technical details. At the same time, they felt limited in that some garments and construction details were too difficult to do, but others more fun to do than the college group.

Attitudes of the participants.--Throughout the analysis of instruments there was amazing similarity in attitude responses of the two groups. Goals were varied and some thought patterns were slightly different, but, on the whole, both groups of participants felt the same.

The responses were similar in main purposes for taking the course and the advantages and disadvantages

of the class. Attitudes on levels of quality of the finished garment, course objectives, method acceptance, practicality of methods, effective teaching methods, educational television and films, and financial values of the course were similar also. Finally, both classes desired sets of sample construction details, socialization with other group members, success in clothing construction, and advanced clothing construction classes.

Although accomplishment and skill was desired by all, an analysis of the data showed diversity of standards in quality and workmanship.

Responses varied in future use of method and desired quality level in the construction of a garment.

This study proved to be most interesting to the writer in respect to the philosophy, the theortical point of view, and the attitudes of the two groups. Since these groups responded similarly instead of being strikingly different as expected, perhaps the instructor had more levelling influence than she realized. Also, the small size of the sample might account for this similarity.

2) Evaluation of the panel of judges score sheets:

The judges were instructed to be as objective as

possible in scoring the testing instrument. They inserted helpful comments to clarify and justify their ratings.

Although some technical skills and qualities of appearance were varied in score ratings, there appeared to be considerable similarity and agreement in most cases among the judges.

On the whole, the judges graded the technical skill mastery and the appearance of the finished garments of the college class (traditional method followed) higher than the Bishop class (speed method followed). Only in certain, specific areas did the Bishop women receive higher ratings (correct length of stitch for staystitching and width of staystitching). In the survey instrument the Bishop group expressed a desire and expectation for a high degree of quality in their finished garments. In this study, material evidences tend to substantiate the fact that the Bishop class did not attain this high quality. The blouses were given ratings which indicate the method of instruction was not followed, many details were omitted, mastery of skill was not highly developed, and a quality appearance was lacking.

It must be clarified that 11 women in the Bishop class participated in the survey; 8 of them

sewed bl uses which were judge.i by the instructor and the judges. Therefore, in c nsideration of this fact, it is important to remember that high quality of construction was desired by Bisho> women in the survey; but only 73 per cent of these women actually completed bl uses which were judged.

3) Instructor evaluation:

On the whole, the rating scores on the mastery of technical skill and appearance of the finished garments by the instructor were similar to the scores given by the judges. Some variances in ratings were given for correct stitching length, seam and hem allowances, and the fastening of threads.

An evaluation, rating personal characteristics and qualities of each member of the class, completed the rating. These ratings were instrumental in helping validate assumptions made in the section on Evaluations of the Assumptions (for example, the attitudes toward group membership was rated and applied to assumption number seven).

Summary

In final summary, the writer feels the purpose and objectives of this research study were fulfilled. The purpose of this research problem was to compare,

rate, and evaluate technical skills developed and mastered and psychological satisfactions derived from sewing in a college and a Bishop class in beginning clothing construction; the objectives concerned gaining the experience of research study, comparing and evaluating results of testing.

A questionnaire was devised to secure information regarding personal experience of sewing skill, clothing construction standards, personal goals and values, and degree of success expected in the course. A panel of judges and the instructor inspected and scored the construction of the blouses giving substantial material evidence on a comparison of the technical skills developed and the appearance of the finished garments in the two classes. Furthermore, the instructor rated personal qualities and characteristics of each group as objectively as possible upon the termination of the classes.

The level of skill and quality of appearance of the garments, together with the basic principles of the specific method of clothing construction followed, seemed to be directly related to the quality of the finished blouses of both classes. The ratings by the judges and the instructor revealed that the quality of the blouses constructed by the college

class was superior in most details to the quality exhibited by the Bishop class. The analysis of the testing instrument indicated that technical skill was more highly developed in the college class than in the Bishop class; also, the appearance ratings of the finished garments were higher in the college class in the construction of cotton blouses.

The writer feels, however, that the results of the rating instruments adequately supports the recommended practice of certain construction techniques used in each method of clothing construction if skillfully and accurately executed. Bishop techniques and procedures, such as understitching the facings, guiding the staystitching line by means of a gauge on the sewing machine, and lockstitching the waistline tucks, have proved to be successful and preferred over procedures used in the traditional method of construction for similar situations. The following traditional techniques and procedures were rated higher than the Bishop method of clothing construction: the method of cutting fabric; the procedure of checking location of darts and tucks during fittings; the techniques of fastening thread ends, reinforcing gusset corners, inserting slide fasteners, and hand stitching hems; and the method of finishing seams.

The psychological satisfactions of the participants in this study are expressed in part by their attitude responses in the survey. Responses seemed to reflect their standards, goals, and interest in clothing construction. A summary of the analysis of these responses indicate that a majority of the participants in both groups expressed a desire to learn in an informal atmosphere, to socialize in class with the other members, to obtain a set of sample construction details, to accept the method of clothing construction taught and use these techniques for practical use at home, to succeed in the class, and to take an advanced course in construction. It might be advisable for instructors to consider these attitudes as they could become very important for optimum learning and student-teacher relationships.

Furthermore, the population of this study varied in age, educational background, values, goals, purposes in taking the class, previous clothing construction experience, and personal standards of construction quality (see pages 97 and 98 for comparison of the two groups). The writer feels it important to mention that the analysis of the survey instrument seemed to indicate that these characteristics and qualities of the selected population have helped explain attitude

responses; however, the size of the sample of this population is too small to support an accurate generalization for other groups.

All the objectives were fulfilled in this study through the development, analysis, and evaluation of this research problem. The writer feels that this problem has been invaluable in gaining experience in using research techniques, developing objective reasoning, and writing and evaluating a constructive report.

LIST OF REFERENCES

Books

Arny, Clara Brown. Evaluation in Home Economics. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1953.

Bane, Allyne. Creative Sewing in Professional Touches for the Home Dressmaker. New York: McGraw-Hill Books Co., Inc., 1956.

Bishop, Edna Bryte and Arch, Marjorie Stotler. The Bishop Method of Clothing Construction. Chicago: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1959.

Erwin, Mabel D. Clothing for Moderns. New York: Macmillan Co., 1957.

Latzke, Alpha and Baxter, Laura. Today's Clothing. New York: J. B. Lippincott Co., 1949.

Mansfield, Evelyn A. Clothing Construction. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1953.

Williamson, Maude and Lyle, Mary S. Home aking Education for Adults. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1949.

Wingo, Caroline E. The Clothes You Buy and Make. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1953.

Leaflets and Bulletins

Advance Pattern Company. Detail Delights of the Bishop Method of Clothing Construction. New York: Advance Pattern Co. Press, n.d.

_____. It's Easy as "A", "B", "C" to Learn to Sew. Bulletin No. 3, New York: Advance Pattern Co. Press, n.d.

_____. Let the Experts Tell You. Bulletin No. 2, New York: Advance Pattern Co. Press, n.d.

List of References - (Continued)

Bishop, Edna Bryte. Basic Sewing Steps. New York: Advance Pattern Co. Press, n.d.

_____. Details for the Quality Look. New York: Advance Pattern Co. Press, n.d.

_____. Pattern Alterations for the Majority. New York: Advance Pattern Co. Press, n.d.

Mott Foundation Program. The Bishop Method of Clothing Construction. Flint, Michigan: Flint Board of Education Press, n.d.

Newspapers

Flint Journal. June 5, 1959, p. 17.

Other Sources

Flint Junior College. Bishop Instructors Staff Meeting. Oct.-Dec., 1959.

Flint Oak Grove Campus. Personal interview with Gertrude Harper, Bishop Coordinator for the Mott Foundation. Oct 23, 1959.

Letter from Mary E. Gephart, Associate Professor in the Department of Textiles, Clothing, and Related Art at Michigan State University, East Lansing, Michigan. January 15, 1960.

APPENDIX

APPENDIX I

Colleges, universities, and institutions at which Evelyn A. Mansfield's book Clothing Construction has been adopted as a text by 1958:

Alabama College
Albion College, Mich.
Albright College, Pa.
Alcorn A. and M. College, Miss.
Allen University, S.C.
Arkansas Polytechnic College
Ashland College, Ohio
Bakersfield College, Calif.
Brigham Young University, Utah
Carnegie Institute of Technology, Pa.
Chic School of Fashion Design, N.Y.
Christian College, Mo.
College of Puget Sound, Wash.
College of Southern Utah
Columbia University, N.Y.
Cornell College, Iowa
Del Mar College, Tex.
DePauw University, Ind.
Dixie College, Utah
Drexel Institute of Technology, Pa.
Emmanuel Missionary College, Mich.
Florida State University
Friends Bible College, Kans.
Gallaudet College, Washington, D.C.
Howard College, Ala.
Illinois Wesleyan University
Juanita College, Pa.
Kansas State College
Kimbles School of Sewing, Mich.
Longwood College, Va.
MacMurray College, Ill.
Mercy College, Mich.
Mercyhurst College, Pa.
Michigan State University
Millikin University, Ill.
Montana School of Mines
Montclair State College, N.J.
Morehead State College, Ky.
Murray State College, Ky.
New York State Agricultural and Technical Institute, Cobleskill, N.Y.
North Central College, Ill.
North Texas State College
Northern Michigan University
Ontario Agricultural College, Can.
Oregon State College
Palm Beach Junior College, Fla.
Pembroke State College, N.C.
Pennsylvania State University
Purdue University, Ind.
Radford College, Va.
Richmond Professional Institute, Va.
Russell Sage College, N.Y.
Sacramento State College, Calif.
Sacramento Junior College, Calif.
St. Joseph College, Md.
St. Mary-of-the-Woods College, Ind.
St. Olaf College, Minn.
Salem College, N.C.
San Diego Junior College, Calif.
San Diego State College, Calif.
San Francisco State College, Calif.
San Jose Junior College, Calif.
San Jose State College, Calif.
Seattle Pacific College, Wash.
Seattle University, Wash.
Seton Hill College, Pa.
S.T.C., Buffalo, N.Y.
S.T.C., Farmington, Maine
S.T.C., Framingham, Mass.
S.T.C., Mansfield, Pa.
Syracuse University, N.Y.
University of Akron, Ohio
University of Alberta at Clagary, Can.
University of Alberta at Edmonton, Can.
University of British Columbia, Can.
University of California, Berkeley
University of California at Los Angeles

Appendix I - (Continued)

University of California, Davis
University of Manitoba, Can.
University of Massachusetts
University of Minnesota:
  Duluth Branch
  Institute of Agriculture
University of Missouri
University of Nebraska
University of Oklahoma
University of Omaha, Neb.
University of Rhode Island
University of Toledo, Ohio
University of Toronto, Can.
University of Utah
University of Wisconsin
Villa Julie Junior College, Md.
Virginia State College
West Virginia State College
Western Kentucky State College
Western Washington College of Education
Whitworth College, Wash.
Willamette University, Oreg.
Wisconsin State College:
  Stevens Point
Woman's College of the University of North Carolina
Wright Junior College, Ill.

APPENDIX II

STATISTICS OF BISHOP ENROLLMENT IN FLINT

Bishop classes in Flint, Michigan, have totalled an enrollment of 9,700 people since the beginning in 1954.

Seasonal Enrollment for 1958-1959

Fall, 1958 -	99	Bishop adult classes -	1,441 women
	1	Bishop youth class -	25 girls
Winter, 1958 -	99	Bishop adult classes -	1,371 women
	2	Bishop youth classes -	51 girls
Spring, 1958 -	61	Bishop adult classes -	854 women
	1	Bishop youth class -	32 girls
Summer, 1958 -	29	Bishop youth classes -	673 girls

Annual total - 283 classes with enrollment of 4,447

1959 Attendance at Lectures

Fall, 1959 -	9	meetings with	30 people attending
Winter, 1959 -	9	meetings with	31 people attending
Spring, 1959 -	5	meetings with	30 people attending
Summer, 1959 -	6	meetings with	103 people attending

Annual total - 30 meetings with 194 people attending

1959 Division of Classes

The Bishop Department of the Mott Foundation Program now is instructing classes in 25 Flint schools. There are 31 instructors on the payroll. The classes are currently divided thus:

Beginners Class	- 3 sections
Bishop I Class	- 97 sections
Bishop II Class	- 63 sections
Bishop III Class	- 39 sections
Bishop IV Class	- 20 sections
Bishop V Class	- 15 sections
Bishop VI Class	- 7 sections
Quality Dressmaking	- 6 sections

Total of 250 sections

APPENDIX III

Clothing Interest Survey
Fall, 1969

I. Class: Bishop Sewing I _____; Flint Junior College Clothing 101 _____
(b) Flint Junior College Major field of study _____

II. Age: Under 20 ___; 20-24 ___; 25-29 ___; 30-39 ___; 40-49 ___; 50-59 ___; 60 or over ___

III. Marital Status: Single ___; Divorced ___; Married ___; Widowed ___

IV. Occupation: Student ___; Full-time homemaker ___; Full-time employee (specify) _____; Part-time or temporary employee (specify) _____; anticipated employment (specify) _____

V. Years of school completed, excluding kindergarten _____

WHAT PAST EXPERIENCES IN CLOTHING CONSTRUCTION HAVE YOU HAD?

VI. (a) Clothing in Junior High School (check) ___; Content of clothing course(s) _____

(b) Clothing in Senior High School (check) ___; Content of clothing course(s) _____

(c) Organizations:
(1) 4-H Club clothing project (check) ___;
(2) Girl Scouts clothing project (check) ___;
(3) Future Homemakers Club clothing project (check) ___;
(4) Adult Class (check) ___;
(5) Singer Sewing Center (check) ___;
(6) Other clothing projects (specify) _____

(d) At home: From whom have you learned _____;
About how long have you sewed _____ years

(e) At work:
(1) Job related to clothing construction (specify): _____;
There _____; Length of time _____
(2) Job related to clothing ready-to-wear (specify) _____;
There _____; Length of time _____

VII. Which sewing machines have you operated prior to enrollment of this class? (check) None ___; Elna ___; Kenmore ___; Necchi ___; Pfaff ___; Singer ___; White ___; Others (specify) _____

(b) Which type of machines have you operated? (check) Treadle ___; Electric ___; Automatic electric ___

VIII. What cotton fabrics have you worked with in clothing construction? batiste ___; corduroy ___; glazed chintz ___; broadcloth ___; chambray ___; chiffon ___; crinoline ___; denim ___; drill ___; gabardine ___; gingham ___; hopsacking ___; indianhead ___; lawn ___; marquisette ___; muslin ___; organdy ___; percale ___; piqué ___; plisse ___; sateen ___; terrycloth ___; velveteen ___; voile ___; others (specify) _____

IX. What garments or articles have you constructed at home, school, work, and group or anizations? (Please answer by the approximate number which you have made.)

(a) Sleeveless blouse _____
(b) Blouse or dress with set-in sleeve _____
(c) Blouse or dress with gusset _____
(d) Gathered skirt _____
(e) Pleated skirt _____
(f) Flared or circular skirt _____
(g) Straight, slim skirt _____
(h) Dress _____
(i) Whole slip _____
(j) Half slip (full) _____
(k) Pajamas (girls) _____
(l) Pajamas (boys) _____
(m) Woman's slacks _____
(n) Shorts or bermudas _____
(o) Jacket _____
(p) Coat _____
(q) Suit _____
(r) Apron _____
(s) Scarf _____
(t) Boys' or Men's trousers _____
(u) Men's shirts _____
(v) Baby clothes _____

Appendix III - (Continued)

(w) Formal____
(x) Others (specify)_____

Household items:
(a) Bathroom or kitchen towels_____
(bb) Draperies or curtains_____
(cc) Sheets_____
(dd) Pillowcases_____
(ee) Pillow covers_____
(ff) Tablecloth and napkins_____
(gg) Slipcovers for furniture_____
(hh) Others (specify)_____

What construction details have you made on a garment? (check)
(a) Sewed-on buttons_____
(b) Buttons with a shank_____
(c) Bound or corded buttonholes_____
(d) Hand-worked buttonholes_____
(e) Machine-worked buttonholes_____
(f) Set-in sleeves_____
(g) Gusset_____
(h) Tailored collar_____
(i) Fitted facing_____
(j) Cuffs_____
(k) Patch pockets_____
(l) Set-in pockets_____
(m) Zipper_____
(n) Kick placket_____
(o) Pleats_____
(p) Tucks_____
(q) Darts_____
(r) Gathers_____
(s) New_____
(u) Others (specify)_____

Have you used seam tape____; bias tape____; a self-covered button or buckle____; self-made belt____(check if answer is yes)?

Which garments and construction details do you think will be too difficult for you to attempt after completion of this class?
(a) List letters of garments from question IX, (a) through (x):_____;
(b) List letters of construction details from question X, (a) through (t)_____

Which garments and construction details do you consider fun to do:
(a) List letters of garments from question IX, (a) through (x):_____
(b) List letters of construction details from question X, (a) through (t):_____

HOW DO YOU FEEL ABOUT THE FOLLOWING?

What were your four main purposes in taking this course? (List in order, such as 1st, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th)
(a) Getting out for the evening_____
(b) Learning ordinary sewing techniques_____
(c) Learning the newest techniques_____
(d) Learning how to sew fast_____
(e) Clothing care_____
(f) Coordinate fashion_____
(g) Learning how to save money_____
(h) Requirement for advanced course_____
(i) Requirement for job_____
(j) Learn how to alter to your figure_____
(k) Others (specify)_____

Do you think that the money involved in enrollment in this class has affected the desire you have to learn?_____How or in what way?_____

Can you think of any disadvantages in taking this course?_____If so, what?_____

Can you think of any advantages in taking this course?_____If so, what?_____

Appendix III - (Continued)

XXVIII. Do you expect your finished garments will be better ___, the same ___, or poorer ___ than similar ready-to-wear garments? (check one)

XXIX. Are you more interested in (a) the techniques of sewing construction or skills ___ or (b) the fundamental principles and knowledge of application of these principles of sewing ___? (check only one)

XXX. Would you like to have a set of samples on construction details (for example, a corded buttonhole)? _____(Yes or No)

XXXI. Do you think that you will accept the methods taught in this class if they are different from those you learned before? _____Explain _____

XXXII. Do you think that you will accept the methods taught in this class as the only good and reasonable methods? _____Why? _____

XXXIII. Do you feel that the methods taught in this class will be the most practical for your [illegible] and your standards today? _____Explain _____

XXXIV. Do you expect you will follow the methods you learn in the class after you complete the course? _____Why? _____

XXXV. Do you feel you can learn effectively in an informal atmosphere? _____Why? _____

XXXVI. Do you think you could learn clothing construction techniques from demonstrations on television? _____Explain _____

XXXVII. Do you prefer films (movie) over television for learning clothing construction techniques? (Yes or No) _____Explain _____

XXXVIII. Do you welcome the opportunity of socialization with other women in a clothing construction class? _____Why? _____

XXXIX. Do you truly expect to have the garments you sew in this class worn in the future? _____

XXX. What is your degree or standard of quality for your finished garment constructed in this class? (check)
(a) Perfection in all details ___
(b) Acceptable in all details to the instructor ___
(c) Acceptable in most details to the instructor ___
(d) Acceptable in at least a few details to the instructor ___
(e) Not acceptable to the instructor ___

XXXI. Do you think your finished garment will be (a) Acceptable to you in all details ___; (b) Acceptable to you in most details ___; (c) Acceptable to you in at least a few details ___; (d) Not acceptable to you ___.

XXXII. Do you want to succeed in mastering the major techniques taught in this class? ___

XXXIII. Do you expect to take further clothing construction classes? ___If so, why? ___ Less? _____

APPENDIX IV

Flint Community Junior College
Home Economics Dept.

General Information for Panel of Judges

These blouses are divided into two groups. Seven are in Group A; there are eight in Group B.

All of these cotton blouses were made by beginning adult women sewers in the same pattern style. Women who sewed the blouses in Group A were instructed by the Bishop method of clothing construction; women in Group B by the traditional custom method (as illustrated by Evelyn A. Mansfield's book, Clothing Construction).

In scoring these blouses, do not be specifically concerned over the fiber content, pattern or color of fabric, size, or pattern design. Also, time is not a factor in determining the ability to comprehend and successfully accomplish technical skills. None of the blouses have been worn or laundered.

Do not score each blouse individually. Rather, take your general impression of the entire set of blouses and give one score to each set.

Addition al room is provided for specific comments you may feel necessary to submit.

Please try to be as objective as possible in scoring the blouses.

Flint Community Junior College
Home Economics Dept.

APPENDIX V

JUDGES SCORE SHEET

Score each area selecting the most appropriate answer from each of the two scoring sets, a-f and 1-2.

a. Mastery of skill
b. Above average mastery of skill
c. Average mastery of skill
d. Below average or inadequate mastery of skill
e. Skill not acceptable
f. Skill not done

1. Skill acceptable to you
2. Skill unacceptable to you

For example, one might score the fitted facing as a-1 in Group A and c-2 in Group B.

TECHNICAL SKILL MASTERY	Group A	Comments	Group B	Comments
1. Straight, clear carbon lines				
2. Stitching over carbon lines				
3. Straight stitching lines				
4. Stitching locked at edges				
5. Correct stitch length for: a. Staystitching				
b. Regular stitching				
c. Others				
6. Correct allowances for: a. Seam widths				
b. Staystitching width				
c. Hem of blouse				
d. Sleeve hem				
e. Facing hem				
7. Fitted facing (general effect)				
b. Lies Flat				

Appendix V - (Continued)

TECHNICAL SKILL MASTERY	Group A	Comments	Group B	Comments
c. Completely concealed				
8. Gusset (general effect)				
b. No puckers				
c. Corners reinforced well				
d. Top-stitching straight (if used)				
9. Hem of blouse (general effect)				
b. Even				
c. Flat				
10. Slide Fastener (general effect)				
b. Teech concealed				
c. Lap width appropriate				
11. Sleeve hem (general effect)				
b. Even, neat stitches				
12. Darts (general effect)				
13. Tucks (general effect)				
14. Shaping and pressing during construction				
APPEARANCE				
1. Pressing (general effect)				
b. All specific areas				
2. Stitching tension correct				
3. Elimination of puckers from dart dimples, overease, etc.				

APPEARANCE	Group A	Comments	Group B..	Comments
4. Cut on grain of fabric (blouse)				
b. Gusset				
c. Facing				
5. Neat fitting facing				
6. Smooth slide fastener				
7. Flat gusset				
8. Flat hem on blouse				
9. Straight hem allowance on sleeves				
10. Location of:				
a. Darts				
B. Tucks				
11. No fraying or pulling out				
12. Clean seam finishes				

Instructor Score Sheet

for Individual Projects

Score each area selecting the most appropriate answer from each of the three scoring sets, a-f, 1-2, & w-z.

a. Mastery of skill
b. Above average mastery of skill
c. Average mastery of skill
d. Below average or inadequate mastery of skill
e. Skill not acceptable
f. Skill not done

1. Skill acceptable to you
2. Skill unacceptable to you

w. Accuate work in all details according to the method of clothing construction followed
x. Accurate work in most details according to the method of clothing construction followed
y. Inaccurate work in most details according to the method of clothing construction followed
z. Inaccurate work in all details according to the method of clothing construction followed

TECHNICAL SKILL MASTERY	GROUP A	COMMENTS	GROUP B	COMMENTS
1. Straight, clear carbon lines				
2. Stitching over carbon lines				
3. Straight stitching lines				
4. Stitching locked at edges				
5. Correct stitch length for: (a) Staystitching				
(b) Regular stitching				
(c) Others				
6. Correct allowances for: (a) Seam widths				
(b) Staystitching width				
(c)Hem of blouse				

Appendix VI - (Continued)

TECHNICAL SKILL MASTERY cont'd	Group A	Comments	Group B	Comments
(d) Sleeve hem				
(e) Facing hem				
7. Fitted Facing (general effect)				
(b) Lies flat				
(c) Completely concealed				
8. Gusset (general effect)				
(b) No puckers				
(c) Corners reinforced well				
(d) Top stitching straight (if used)				
9. Hem of blouse (general effect)				
(b) Even				
(c) Flat				
10. Slide fastener (general effect)				
(b) teeth concealed				
(c) Lap width appropriate				
11. Sleeve hem (general effect)				
(b) even, neat stitches				
12. Darts (general effect)				
13. Tucks (general effect)				
14. Shaping and pressing during construction				

Appendix VI - (Continued)

APPEARANCE	Group A	Comments	Group B	Comments
1. Pressing (general effect)				
(b) All specific areas				
2. Stitching tension correct				
3. Elimination of puckers from dart dimples, overease, etc.				
4. Cut on grain of fabric (blouse)				
(b) Gusset				
(b) Facing				
5. Neat fitted facing				
6. Smooth slide fastener				
7. Flat gusset				
8. Flat hem on blouse				
9. Straight hem allowance on sleeve				
10. Location of: (a) Darts				
(b) Tucks				
11. No fraying or pulling out				
12. Clean seam finishes				
PERSONAL EVALUATION				
1. Personal interest				
2. Class attendance				

PERSONAL EVALUATION	Group A	Comments	Group B	Comments
3. Feeling of group-membership				
4. Independence in work				
5. Followed instructor's d rections				
6. Comprehension of sewing techniques				
7. Comprehension of method philosophy				
8. Prompt completion of assignment				
9. Worked ahead of instructor				

Appendix VI - (Continued)

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
TEXTILES, CLOTHING AND RELATED ARTS
COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS