

and three Oregon Public Welfare Commission employees who worked directly with trainees in work-training programs. Ten types of outerwear were specified by those interviewed as the most satisfactory types of outerwear for the work-training program. These types were: all-purpose coats, tailored dresses, tailored suits, tailored blouses, street shoes, nylon hosiery, handbags, tailored skirts, cardigan sweaters, and gloves.

Forty-seven women enrolled in work-training programs completed the questionnaire and met the criteria established by the writer which included having a yearly family income which ranked as low-income when using the Orshansky income scale as a guide.

These low-income women obtained clothing from 14 different sources, but 88.4 percent of the total number of outerwear items were obtained from seven clothing sources: department stores, dress shops, gifts, homemade, shoe stores, handed down, and rummage and garage sales. Some outerwear items were obtained from one or more of three sources of used clothing, handed down, thrift shops, and rummage and garage sales, by 70.2 percent of the respondents; however, all respondents obtained outerwear from sources of new clothing

The sources of information which influenced the clothing selection practices of the largest percentages of respondents were friends, magazines, television, newspapers, and teachers.

Six of the ten types of outerwear designated as most satisfactory for the work-training program by the work-training personnel were

obtained by a larger percentage of respondents after entering the program than before entering.

Over 68 percent of the respondents owned more clothing for classroom and job-interview wear than for at-home wear, however many women did not own the ten types of outerwear designated as most satisfactory for classroom and job-interview wear by the work-training personnel.

Less than half of the respondents, 44.7 percent, classified their wardrobes as satisfactory for classroom wear before they entered the training program.

The clothing problems encountered by the respondents included, obtaining outerwear too casual for classroom wear reported by 87.2 percent, and obtaining outerwear too dressy for classroom wear reported by 68 percent. Certain functions were avoided by some respondents because they believed their wardrobes were unsuitable for the occasions, including social functions, employment interviews and church services.

Clothing Selection Practices and Related
Clothing Problems of a Selected
Group of Low-Income Women

by

Veneita Augusta Stender

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Science

June 1970

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

Associate Professor of Clothing, Textiles and Related Arts
in charge of major

Redacted for Privacy

Head of Department of Clothing, Textiles and Related Arts

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented June 12, 1969

Typed by Gwendolyn Hansen for Veneita Augusta Stender

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her deep appreciation to her advisor, Marie Diedesch, Associate Professor of Clothing, Textiles, and Related Arts, for her advice, encouragement, and efficient guidance.

Appreciation is expressed to the work-training personnel who participated in the interviews, to Dr. Florence Petzel, Head, Clothing, Textiles and Related Arts who gave suggestions during development of the study, and to Dr. May DuBois, Professor of Home Economics Education and the low-income women who gave suggestions during development of the questionnaire.

The writer is grateful to Mr. Phil Ryan, director of the computer center, Southwestern Oregon Community College, for developing the program used in this study and for his competent instruction in the use of the computer.

A special thanks is extended to my husband, Duffy Stender and my sons Steve and Greg whose patience and understanding have made this study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	2
Purpose and Objectives of the Study	3
The Questions	4
Definition of Terms	4
Limitations of the Study	6
The Assumptions	7
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	9
Characteristics of Low-Income Women	9
Work-Training Programs for Low-Income Women	17
The Importance of Clothing in Relation to Work- Training	21
PROCEDURE	25
Interviews With Work-Training Program Personnel	25
Purpose of the Interviews	25
Selection of Interview Participants	26
Procedure Used In Conducting Interviews	27
Data Obtained From the Interviews	28
Importance of clothing in work-training	28
Characteristics of outerwear satisfactory for classroom use	29
Satisfactory outerwear for the on-the- job training period	29
Satisfactory outerwear for the job- interview situation	30
Number and type of outerwear items for classroom wear	30
Questionnaire to Obtain Information from Trainees	34
Purpose of the Questionnaire	34
Selection of Participants	35
Procedure Followed in Developing and Administering the Questionnaire	35

	Page
RESULTS OF THE STUDY	38
General Information Regarding Respondents	38
The Clothing Sources From Which the Respondents Obtained Outerwear Items	41
Influence of Sources of Information on Selection of Outerwear Items	49
Outerwear Items Obtained by the Respondents for Classroom Wear	51
Outerwear Items Owned by Respondents for Classroom and Job-Interview Wear and for At-Home Wear	56
Wardrobe Classifications as Considered by the Respondents Before Entering the Training Program	63
Problems Encountered After Obtaining Outerwear Items	67
Functions Avoided by the Respondents Because They Believed Their Clothing Was Unsuitable	69
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	71
RECOMMENDATIONS	79
BIBLIOGRAPHY	80
APPENDICES	84
Appendix A. Interview Guide	84
Appendix B. Questionnaire	88

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Scale of low-income criteria developed by Orshansky for families of different composition, by household size and nonfarm residence, March 1965.	10
2. The number of interview participants indicating the type and number of outerwear items they considered most satisfactory for a wardrobe for classroom wear for women entering a work-training program.	31
3. Scale of low-income criteria developed by Orshansky for families of different composition, by household size and nonfarm residence, March 1965.	39
4. The number and percentage of respondents enrolled in each type of training program and general information regarding their age, income range, and family size.	40
5. The total number of outerwear items obtained by the respondents from each clothing source.	42
6. The number and percentage of respondents who obtained outerwear items from each clothing source.	43
7. The number and percentage of respondents indicating the influence of various sources of information on their selection of outerwear items.	50
8. Number and percentage of respondents who obtained outerwear items for classroom wear.	53
9. The number and percentage of respondents who owned specific types of outerwear at the time of the interview, and the mean number they owned for classroom and job-interview wear and for at-home wear.	58
10. The number and percentage of respondents and the classifications they considered applicable to their wardrobes before entering the training program.	64

Table	Page
11. The number and percentage of respondents who encountered problems after obtaining outerwear items for their wardrobe.	68
12. The number and percentage of respondents who avoided attending specific functions because they believed their clothing was not suitable.	70

CLOTHING SELECTION PRACTICES AND RELATED
CLOTHING PROBLEMS OF A SELECTED
GROUP OF LOW-INCOME WOMEN

INTRODUCTION

The low-income families of our nation have become one of the primary considerations of national legislation designed to raise the standards of living and to increase the opportunities for these families to effectively cope with their environment. Much of this legislation has created programs which provide education and work-training opportunities for low-income individuals. Significant numbers of low-income women have responded to these opportunities for increased education and development of wage-earning skills by enrolling in work-training programs. Participation in a training program has been a rewarding and inspiring experience for many of these women; yet participation often created problems which had to be resolved before they could successfully complete their training. One of the problems encountered by the low-income women who enrolled in work-training programs was that of obtaining clothing satisfactory for classroom wear and for the job-interviews they encountered upon completion of the training period.

This study is an effort to obtain information concerning the clothing selection practices and related clothing problems of low-income women enrolled in work-training programs at two Oregon

Community Colleges, Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon and Southwestern Oregon Community College, Coos Bay, Oregon.

Need for the Study

As low-income women continued to participate in the work-training programs established through national, state and local anti-poverty projects, the case workers, counselors and instructors who worked with them appeared increasingly aware of the unique problems created by the training program itself. The need for increased knowledge and understanding of methods to assist these low-income women to make effective adjustments to the demands of the work-training program has been expressed by those who work with them. Interviews with Oregon Public Welfare Commission personnel, including project specialists in Eugene and Coos Bay, Oregon, have revealed that obtaining clothing satisfactory for the role of student and job-trainee is one of the problems faced by these low-income women.

Studies have been made of the clothing selection practices and clothing problems of women college students and other selected groups, but to the author's knowledge no studies have been made of the clothing selection practices or clothing problems of low-income women who enter work-training programs. Clothing selection guides designed for low-income women are not currently available and would

definitely be a useful tool for case workers and work-training instructors as they assist and counsel the trainees. This type of guide could be developed from information obtained through this study. It seems evident that such information is necessary if realistic assistance in the area of clothing selection is to be made available to these low-income women.

The author intends to use the findings of this study as the basis for the development of clothing selection information, designed for low-income women, which could be included in work-training programs as an instructional unit.

Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The underlying purpose of this study is to obtain information which will be useful in assisting low-income women resolve the clothing problems they may encounter while enrolled in work-training programs.

In an effort to achieve this goal, specific objectives have been formulated. These objectives are:

1. To determine the actual clothing selection practices of low-income women in relation to their personal wardrobe.
2. To identify factors that influence the clothing selection practices of low-income women.
3. To identify some of the clothing problems related to the

selection practices of low-income women.

4. To determine the type and number of outerwear items needed for a satisfactory wardrobe for low-income women enrolled in work-training programs conducted at Lane Community College and Southwestern Oregon Community College.

The Questions

1. Do low-income women include used clothing in their wardrobes?
2. Do low-income women select the types of clothing needed for the classroom, on-the-job training and job-interview situations they encounter in their work-training programs?
3. Do the wardrobes of low-income women contain more clothing for home wear than clothing for classroom wear?
4. Do the clothing selection practices of low-income women result in wardrobes which lack the clothing necessary for classroom, on-the-job training and job-interview situations?

Definition of Terms

1. Work-training program--an educational program, which generally consists of classroom instruction, on-the-job training, and

- preparation for the job interview, designed to prepare unemployed and underemployed persons for wage earning.
2. On-the-job training--work experience, usually under close supervision and closely related to the classroom instruction phase of work-training programs.
 3. Trainee--person enrolled in a work-training program.
 4. Job-interview--the personal interview generally required by the prospective employer as part of the employment procedure.
 5. Low-income women--women whose family income falls within the low-income classification on the Orshansky scale. (See p. 10 for greater detail.)
 6. Public Assistance--welfare programs that provide money payments and service to needy individuals and families, financed from general revenue.
 7. Project specialists--public welfare personnel who develop and coordinate the work-training of public assistance recipients.
 8. Caseworkers--public welfare personnel who work directly with individuals and families receiving public assistance.
 9. Family--a group of persons usually related, who consider themselves to be one family in financial matters.
 10. Clothing sources--ways in which clothing was acquired.
 - a. Gift--Unused clothing received as a gift from another person.
 - b. Homemade--clothing made at home or by a dressmaker.

- c. Handed down--used clothing received from other family members or from persons outside the immediate family unit.
11. Satisfactory wardrobe--garments and accessories appropriate in type and number for the situations encountered in a work-training program.
 12. Outerwear--garments and accessories excluding underwear, nightwear, and lounge wear.
 13. Types of clothing
 - a. House dresses--dresses used for housework and home wear.
 - b. Dressy--outerwear which is elaborate in design, trim, or type of fabric and more suitable for formal occasions because of style or fabric.
 - c. Sports--outerwear which is often termed casual, more vivid in color, patterning and fabric contrast than tailored types.
 - d. Tailored--outerwear which is simple in styling, conservative, impersonal streetwear appropriate for business.
 - e. At-home wear--outerwear which is worn only at home due to style or condition.

Limitations of the Study

The study will be limited to women residing within the state of Oregon and meeting the following criteria:

- a. Family income falls within the range of "low-income" as

determined by the Orshansky scale of income. (See page 10)

- b. Under 50 years of age.
- c. Have children living at home.
- d. Currently enrolled in a work-training program conducted by one of the following Oregon Community Colleges:

Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon

Southwestern Oregon Community College, Coos Bay, Oregon

Only the outerwear items, including shoes, hosiery hats, handbags and gloves, in the personal wardrobe of the low-income women will be examined in this study.

The study will not include clothing maintenance and care practices.

The Assumptions

1. Having clothing acceptable for various situations is important to the low-income women.
2. Limited income will affect the clothing expenditures of low-income women.
3. Low-income women will answer questions in an honest and sincere manner when the purpose of the study is explained if they have the assurance their names will not be associated with the questionnaire.
4. Low-income women often have a lower than average reading

level which usually corresponds to the amount of formal education they have completed.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Characteristics of Low-Income Women

The study of low-income groups does not fit precisely into any of the major disciplines. Sociologists, psychologists and economists have evidenced concern for a definition of low-income and a description of the characteristics of the groups which fit the definition.

The establishment of procedures for determining which income level was to be classified as low-income has been the basis for several studies. Sar Levitan, Economist, Upjohn Institute for Employment Research, Kalamazoo, Michigan stated,

While there is no consensus about the income needed by individuals and families to maintain them at a level above the threshold of poverty, the data prepared by Miss Mollie Orshansky of the Social Security Administration (Department of Health, Education and Welfare) are widely accepted (11, p. 1).

Orshansky used tabulations from the 1964 Current Population Survey, compiled by the Bureau of Census, in developing income standards which she computed at two levels, the poverty level and the low-income level. These standards were based essentially on the amount of income remaining after allowance for an adequate diet at minimum cost. In explaining the procedures used in arriving at the standards, Orshansky stated,

These measures of poverty and low-income are based on the amounts needed by families of different size and composition to purchase nutritionally adequate diets at minimum cost when no more than a third of the family income is used for food. The lower level of the two measures, now generally adopted as the poverty level, is based on the restricted variety of foods suggested in the United States Department of Agriculture economy food plan for emergency use or when funds are very low. The near-poor level is derived from the Department of Agriculture, low-cost food plan, which has long been used by public and private welfare agencies as a benchmark in developing standards of need (21, p. 20).

Persons rated poor or near-poor by these measures were considered by most authorities to be in the low-income category.

Table 1. Scale of low-income criteria developed by Orshansky for families of different composition, by household size and nonfarm residence, March 1965 (21, p. 23).

Number of family members Head under age 65	Yearly Income at low-income level. Non-farm
1 member	\$1, 920 or below
2 members	2, 760 or below
3 members	3, 210 or below
4 members	4, 075 or below
5 members	4, 755 or below
6 members	5, 340 or below
7 or more members	6, 500 or below

Orshansky refined the basic data to take account of the age and sex of the family head and also estimated that families residing on farms needed less cash than nonfarm families (21).

The definition of low-income was further clarified by Helen Lamale, Chief, Division of Living Condition Studies of the United

States Department of Labor who stated,

'Low' means in relation to the distribution level of income of all families and 'income' means money income before taxes as defined by the Census Bureau and used in most household surveys including the Bureau of Labor Statistics (10, p. 1).

Orshansky reported that her criteria for determining low-income yielded a total of 34.1 million persons living under the poverty level and another 15.7 million living in the near-poor range in the United States in 1964 (21). Total resident population in the United States in 1964 was 191.4 million (28, p. 11).

Much of the literature reviewed by the writer indicated that women constituted a significant percentage of the total number of individuals living at the low-income level and that families headed by women were especially vulnerable to poverty. Gunnar Myrdal, Director, Institute For International Economic Studies, Stockholm, Sweden in a report on poverty in the United States estimated that families whose head is female encountered poverty more frequently than other families (18, p. 47).

In reporting a research project on poverty in the United States, carried out at the New School For Social Research, New York, Dr. Oscar Ornati, Professor of Economics at the New School stated, "The risk of poverty for families headed by a female is high and apparently growing" (19, p. 47).

The 1967 report of the President and Council of Economic

Advisers indicated that in the United States in 1965, 37 percent of all families headed by a woman were ranked as poor, compared with 11 percent of those families headed by a male. This report also showed that in 1965 the total number of poor families headed by a woman was 1.9 million (35, p. 139).

Orshansky reported that families consisting of a mother and young children ranked in the lowest income group (20). A large percentage of this group received public assistance through the Aid For Dependent Children Category, Bureau of Family Services, United States Department of Health, Education and Welfare. A report of the Advisory Council On Public Welfare showed that in June, 1965, 4,832,000 individuals were receiving public assistance through this category and that 900,000 were mothers (29, p. 8-9).

In a 1965 report on characteristics of families receiving Aid For Dependent Children, Henry Miller, member of the faculty, School of Social Welfare, University of California, Berkeley, California, indicated that over 29 percent of these mothers were widowed, divorced or separated, compared with 6.1 percent of the general population: that the median years of education was 8.7; and that less than half were in the labor force (15, p. 339-401). Robert Mugge of the Division of Program Statistics and Analysis, Bureau of Family Service, Department of Health, Education and Welfare reported in a study conducted by this bureau, that the lower the educational

attainment of the woman, the longer the duration of dependence on Aid For Dependent Children for her family (17).

In further study of the characteristics of low-income women, it was found that some social scientists regard the low-income groups as a culture within our society. Oscar Lewis, Professor of Anthropology, University of Illinois stated,

In anthropological usage the term culture implies, essentially, a design for living which is passed down from generation to generation. In applying this concept of culture to the understanding of poverty, I want to draw attention to the fact that poverty in modern nations is not only a state of economic deprivation of disorganization, or the absence of something. It is also something positive in the sense that it has a structure, a rationale, and defense mechanisms. In short it is a way of life, remarkably stable and persistent, passed down from generation to generation along family lines (12, p. 52).

Oliver Moles, of the Division of Research, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare in reporting a sociological study of 800 families with low incomes, indicated that those living on a marginal income must adapt their mode of living to the limitations imposed upon them, and that life for the low-income families was different than for those of other income levels, but separating cause and effect is difficult. He reported that certain kinds of behavior may lead to poverty; however, poverty causes survival stresses which make primary demands on energies and resources (16).

In discussing living patterns of the poor, Lewis indicated that

the "culture of poverty" had certain modalities and distinctive psychological and sociological consequences for its members (12, p. 52).

Warren Haggstrom, Assistant Professor of Social Work, Syracuse University stated, "Social scientists have arrived at a rough consensus about the modal personality in neighborhoods of poverty" (5, p. 206).

In a presentation made at the 71st Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association in Philadelphia in 1963, Haggstrom synthesized some of the research on the psychological characteristics of the poor published during the fifteen year period prior to that time. Some of the characteristics he reported are, the restriction of interest to self, family and immediate neighborhood, the lack of participation in the community, the suspicion for those outside their own group, the lack of motivation and the inability to cooperate with each other in the solution of problems which they regard as important. He related that they are concerned mainly with the present and tend to believe that it is futile to think of the future and consequently do little planning. A lack of occupational and verbal skills and a lack of leadership traits, coupled with a sense of inability to affect what will happen to their lives, further restricts their progress (5, p. 206-207).

In a 1965 research project to determine whether families

dependent on financial aid from social welfare agencies were different from other low-income families, Robert Stone, director of the Institute for Social Science Research, San Francisco State College, and Frederic Schlamp, Research and Statistics department, California State Department of Social Welfare, found some differences between the two groups.

Some of the findings indicated that those receiving aid for a long period of time were characterized by handicapping factors in three areas, economic, social and psychological. In the economic area there was a lower level of foresight practices, a consistently lower level of living. In the matter of finding jobs those on long term assistance relied on friends, want ads and the employment service. They found a general lack of identification with the world of work, and they did not participate in mutual aid activities or belong to organizations to any extent. There also seemed to be a general withdrawal which was a handicap to employment. These findings substantiated the contentions submitted by Haggstrom (27).

Lola Ireland and Arthur Besner, Division of Research, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare reported in an interpretation of research on the low-income outlook on life, that low-income women often developed a great emotional attachment to their children as compensation for the lack of communication with their husbands and that in their role in the

neighborhood and community the low-income woman's contacts were limited mainly to relatives and a few close neighbors (8).

Frank Riessmann, Chairman, Department of Psychology, Bard College, New York, in his 1962 book entitled The Culturally Deprived Child, which is an account of his study of low-income groups, indicated that fear of embarrassment from new experiences hindered socialization of low-income individuals and that they usually did not belong to clubs, organizations, Parent-Teacher Associations, or other community organizations. He further related that they felt more insecure outside the neighborhood and often did not have the transportation necessary to take them beyond its confinement, so shopping was done at neighborhood stores (23, p. 25-48).

Louise Richards, Research Psychologist and special consultant, Division of Research, Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare reported in a study of the consumer buying practices of low-income individuals that most did not use deliberation in buying or have the opportunity to shop widely for the most economical purchases. They tended to depend on known merchants or relatives for judgement of what to buy (22).

A study of the consumer practices of families living in a low-cost housing project in New York was conducted in 1962 by David Caplovitz, Senior Study Director of the National Opinion Research Center, University of Chicago. He found that those with the lowest

income and the least education preferred to shop at nearby stores, thus narrowing the scope of their shopping opportunities. He also found that buying from peddlers and salesmen in the home was fairly widespread; however, only two percent of the sample reported buying clothing in this manner. Extensive use of credit was found, and one in five of those interviewed reported that they maintained a revolving credit account at department stores or clothing shops (1, p. 49-79).

These sources relating the characteristics of low-income groups indicated that there are some immediate and direct consequences of being poor, as well as a large number of secondary consequences to be considered in relation to the clothing selection practices and problems of low-income women.

Work-Training Programs for Low-Income Women

In a report on poverty and work-training programs in the United States, Thomas Gladwin, anthropologist and author stated,

The concept of the culture of poverty forms a key element in the intellectual underpinnings of the recent legislation designed to curb poverty, thus allowing skill training to occupy an important if not central place in poverty alleviation programs (4, p. 112).

The close relationship of poverty and inadequate education was stressed in a report of the Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity which indicated that a growing problem in the United States was one of able-bodied people who were poor and unemployable

due to low levels of education and lack of training (2, p. 38). Many of these low-income and unemployable individuals were women as the sources cited have shown.

Studies of recent work-training program enrollment reports showed that low-income women have responded in significant numbers to the opportunities for increased education and skill training. The 1967 Manpower Report of the President indicated that during 1966 a total of 86,259 women were enrolled in institutional and on-the-job training programs under the Manpower Development and Training Act (36, p. 278). A Bureau of Public Assistance report on the national enrollment in work experience and training programs, operated under Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act, showed that in December of 1966, 38,838 of the 70,645 trainees enrolled at that time were women (37). The number of female trainees increased to 39,345 in February 1967 (38).

A study of reports concerning the various types of work-training programs indicated that three separate programs carried the primary responsibility for the work-training of low-income adults.

The Manpower Development and Training Program was authorized by the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962. This act authorized federally supported occupational training for individuals facing particular employment needs. Responsibility for administering the Manpower Training Program is shared jointly by

the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare. The program is administered locally through the State Employment Service (30, p. 1-2). The 1965 Catalog of Federal Programs For Individual and Community Improvement reported that this program provided occupational training for unemployed and under-employed persons who were unable to obtain appropriate full-time employment without training (34, p. 308). A report on the Training Activities under the Manpower Development and Training Act published by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare indicated that the program is flexible with a variety of training arrangements and services such as basic literacy instruction, counseling and pre-vocational instruction provided for the trainees when needed. This source also reported that this training has been provided mainly through the classroom instructional approach and carried out in publicly financed vocational education institutions such as community colleges. In conjunction with the program, some on-the-job training was conducted in which the trainee learned at the job site while making products or giving service and earned wages for this work (30, p. 9-20).

It was reported in a 1966 Manpower Evaluation Report on the Training of Public Assistance Recipients that women represented 49.6 percent of the total number of public assistance trainees and that almost 84 percent of these women were heavily burdened as heads of

families (31, p. 4). A 1964 Manpower Evaluation Report on the Occupational Training of Women, based on a study of the first 27,000 women trained through manpower programs, reported that 33.4 percent had less than a high school education; 56.2 percent had completed high school; and only 10.4 percent had more than a high school education. The age range of this group was 18.4 percent under 20, 22.4 percent between 20-24 years, 45.9 percent between 25-44 years and 13.3 percent were 45 years or older (33, p. 8-9). Of this group of trainees 49.4 percent were trained for clerical and sales occupations (33, p. 7). The total number of women enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Programs conducted between August 1962 and December 31, 1966 totaled 228,600 (32, p. 6-9).

The Work Experience and Training Program Provided by Title V of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 provided federal funds to the state public welfare agencies for projects designed to raise the employability of needy persons. The participants in work-experience projects were also furnished with money payments, medical care and social services, including Adult Basic Education as needed. Title V programs were administered by the Bureau of Family Services of the Welfare Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare (30, p. 3). A 1966 report on the status of women showed that 133,000 women had been enrolled in Title V programs between December 1964 and December 1966 (32, p. 7).

The Vocational Rehabilitation Program also provided training for a significant number of individuals each year. Any disabled person was eligible for these services; however, low-income persons were favored. The services included evaluation, medical care, therapy, prosthetic devices, counseling and guidance in addition to occupational training. The Smith-Fess Act of 1920 added monies for training of the industrially disabled to the matching grants for Vocational Education begun under the Smith Hughes Act of 1917. The case load under this program for the 1966 fiscal year was 720,000 (14, p. 1-54).

The Importance of Clothing In Relation to Work-Training

The 1967 Annual Report of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare on Training Activities Under Manpower Development and Training explained that many of the trainees needed an introduction to the importance of punctuality, the acceptance of supervision, the necessity of appropriate dress, and the need for acceptable behavior (30, p. 45). Gladwin, in his report on work-training programs related that in these programs people were trained how to talk, how to look, how to behave, and how to inform themselves about job prospects (4, p. 118).

In doctoral research conducted at Michigan State University in 1960, Mary Lou Rosencranz found significant relationships between

social class and clothing awareness. When responding to drawings depicting clothing and character incongruities, the upper class women who participated in her study mentioned clothing more often and mentioned clothing incongruities more frequently than did the lower class women (24, p. 18-22).

In a study of clothing and social relations conducted at the University of Chicago, in 1959, Gregory Stone stated,

When we consider clothing with reference to its place in the socialization process it becomes quite clear that all major changes in social position, moving through the different stages of formal education, getting a job, marriage, parenthood, illness or death are marked by changes of wardrobe (25, p. 4).

In a 1955 study conducted at Michigan State College concerning the importance of clothing in relation to occupational life, Gregory Stone and William Form found that there were a large number of specific occupations in which great stress was placed upon the appearance of the employees. They found that office personnel placed greater importance on contact with the public and had a greater desire to make satisfactory impressions on others than did the manual workers interviewed in the study. The office personnel interviewed in this study believed that good clothes were prescribed by some job situations; that good appearance was as much a part of the job as ability; and that an appropriately dressed person was essential for meeting the public. They also believed that others tended to

judge their work performance to some degree by the way in which they dressed (26, p. 13-46).

Katherine Hall, in doctoral research conducted at Pennsylvania State University in 1955 found that women who held jobs as secretaries owned more clothing for work than women who worked as sales clerks, nurses or beauty operators (6, p. 25).

Various studies showed that clothes have an influence on the impressions one conveys to others. In doctoral research conducted at the University of Southern California in 1951, Thomas Hoult developed an attractiveness rating scale to show that clothing affects one's impressions of another person. When using panels of student judges to rate the attractiveness of college men shown in photographs, he found that clothing appeared to be positively associated with the attractiveness ratings when the judges were not acquainted with the men pictured (7).

In a study conducted at Florida State University in 1961, Helen I. Douty used photographs to obtain responses from 90 women to determine the effect of clothing in structuring the perception of persons in a one contact situation. She found that first impressions of a person showed some relationship to first impressions of the person's wearing apparel (3, p. 92-95).

Lipsett, Rodgers and Kentner of the Rochester Institute of Technology, Personnel Selection and Recruitment Department

indicated that interviewers undoubtedly made many assumptions through observation of the appearance of the job applicant (13, p. 226).

In describing employment interview techniques, Newell Kephart, Associate Professor of Industrial Psychology, Purdue University, stressed that in certain types of jobs neatness and appropriateness in dress were an essential qualification. Receptionists, salespersons, and those whose jobs involve frequent meetings with the public must be capable of giving proper attention to their dress as an integral qualification for their jobs (9, p. 150).

PROCEDURE

The first step in proceeding with this study was to obtain information which would be useful in the construction of a questionnaire to be used to determine the clothing needs of low-income women enrolled in work-training programs. This information was obtained through interviews with individuals directly involved in the training of low-income women. The second step was to construct a questionnaire utilizing the information obtained from the interviews. The third step involved pretesting the questionnaire and administering it to low-income women enrolled in work-training programs conducted at Lane Community College and Southwestern Oregon Community College. The fourth step was analyzing the data from the questionnaires to determine the clothing selection practices and the related clothing problems indicated by the respondents.

Interviews With Work-Training Program Personnel

Purpose of the Interviews

Specific purposes of the interviews were to determine: 1) the importance of clothing as a factor in the low-income trainees' development and successful completion of the work-training programs in which they were enrolled, 2) the type, characteristics and minimum number

of outerwear items the interview participants considered most satisfactory for classroom use by the trainees, 3) the ways in which outerwear items necessary for the on-the-job training period and the job-interview situation would differ from items for classroom wear.

Selection of Interview Participants

Six individuals who were actively engaged in work with low-income trainees were selected for the interviews. Three of the participants were employed as instructors in the community colleges, one at Southwestern Oregon Community College and two at Lane Community College. Of these three, one held a degree in home economics, one a degree in business, and the third had extensive experience and training in secretarial work. The other three participants were employed by the Oregon Public Welfare Commission as project specialists and caseworkers, two in Coos County and one in Lane County. Of these three, all had training and experience in social work and two held degrees in social work. Two of the six participants were male and four were female. The participants had worked with varying numbers of trainees during the previous year. One instructor reported working with 20 trainees and one project specialist had worked with over 400 trainees. The participants reported that 80 to 100 percent of the trainees they had worked with

during the previous year were women. The types of work-training programs in which the trainees were enrolled included Manpower Development and Training Programs, Economic Opportunity Act Title V Programs, and Vocational Rehabilitation Programs. The trainees were preparing for work in various types of occupations including accounting, bookkeeping, data processing, secretarial work, and health aide work.

Procedure Used In Conducting Interviews

The same interview guide, developed by the writer, was used during each of the six individual interviews (Appendix A). The same questions were asked by the writer during each interview; the length of interview time per person varied from one hour to one and one-half hours. The following questions were included in Section I of the interviews:

1. Of what importance is satisfactory clothing to the low-income woman's development and success in the work-training program?
2. What are the characteristics of satisfactory outerwear items needed for classroom use by the work-training student?
3. Would the characteristics of satisfactory outerwear items needed for the on-the-job training period differ from those

for classroom use?

4. Should the outerwear items for the job interview differ from those for on-the-job training?

Using Section II of the interview guide (Appendix A), the interview participants were asked to indicate the type and number of each type of outerwear they considered most satisfactory for classroom wear for a woman entering a work-training program.

Data Obtained From the Interviews

Importance of clothing in work-training. The six interview participants indicated that satisfactory clothing is extremely important to the low-income trainees' development and success in a work-training program. Four of the interview participants indicated that from an economic standpoint, clothing is important as employers often will not hire job applicants who lack satisfactory dress and that the value of a work-training program is measured in terms of the number of trainees successfully employed upon their completion of training. One participant indicated that trainees when hired, are often placed higher on the pay scale if they present themselves well and dress appropriately for the job interview. The six participants indicated that when the trainees feel appropriately dressed their self-confidence is greatly increased, thus showing the importance of appropriate clothing.

Characteristics of outerwear satisfactory for classroom use.

The six participants indicated that clothing suitable for office work would be most satisfactory for classroom wear since most of the trainees were preparing for occupations involving office or secretarial work. Three of the participants said that in some instances a limited clothing allotment is provided for the trainee, and they believed this allotment should be used for wardrobe items for classroom wear which would later be suitable for work. In a description of outerwear considered suitable for office work, the six participants stated that garments with basic lines and garments conservative in style, color, texture and design were more satisfactory than any "extremes" in attire. Four of the participants believed that tailored or semi-tailored types of outerwear would be more satisfactory than dressy or casual types. The six participants said that slacks and other types of pants were not appropriate for classroom wear. Five participants specified nylon hosiery as the most satisfactory type of hosiery, and street shoes as the most suitable type of footwear.

Satisfactory outerwear for the on-the-job training period. The six interview participants indicated that clothing for classroom wear would generally be suitable for the on-the-job training period. Three of the participants reported that in some instances the firms in which the trainees complete their on-the-job training specify the type of apparel considered most satisfactory for this phase of the training.

Satisfactory outerwear for the job-interview situation. Five of those interviewed said that clothing satisfactory for the job-interview would differ from clothing for classroom and on-the-job training situations.

Three participants believed that a semi-tailored suit or basic dress would be most satisfactory; three believed that gloves should be worn; and two specified street shoes with mid-heels as the appropriate type of footwear. All participants indicated that the outerwear items worn for the interview should be appropriate for the job for which the trainee was being interviewed.

Number and type of outerwear items for classroom wear. In Part II of the interview the participants were asked to indicate the number of each type of outerwear they considered most satisfactory for classroom wear for a woman entering a work-training program. A table listing 13 categories of outerwear with various types of items included in each category was provided by the writer (Appendix A).

As shown in Table 2, the six participants generally agreed on the type of outerwear considered most satisfactory but there was little agreement on the number of items they believed necessary. In the coat category the six participants indicated that one all-purpose coat would be satisfactory.

In the suit category, three respondents recommended one

Table 2. The number of interview participants indicating the type and number of outerwear items they considered most satisfactory for a wardrobe for classroom wear for women entering a work-training program.

Type of outerwear	Number of outerwear items suggested					Type of outerwear	Number of outerwear items suggested					
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	12
COATS						BLOUSES						
All-weather	6					Dressy	1	1				
Dressy						Sports		1				
Summer						Tailored		4	1	1		
Winter						Daily						
Raincoat	1					SWEATERS						
Carcoat						Pullover	1	1				
Jacket						Cardigan	3	1				
SUIT						Shell						
Dressy	1					Dressy						
Knit	1					OTHER GARMENTS						
Sports						Slacks						
Pants						Shorts						
Tailored	3			1		Capris/long pants						
SKIRTS						Sweatshirts						
Dressy						Cape						
Sports						Stole						
Tailored	1	3	1	1		Culottes						
Daily												

Table 2. (Continued)

Type of outerwear	Number of outerwear items suggested					Type of outerwear	Number of outerwear items suggested					
	1	2	3	4	5		1	2	3	4	5	12
DRESSES						SHOES						
House	1					Street	2	3	1			
Daily						Dress	1					
Tailored	3	3				Casual		1				
Dressy	1											
GALOSHES						HOSIERY						
	2					Nylon Hose			3	1	1	
GLOVES						HATS						
	3					Dressy type						
HANDBAGS						Rain						
	4	2										

tailored suit, one participant suggested four tailored suits, one participant suggested one dress suit and one knit suit, and one participant said no suits would be needed.

In the skirt category, the six participants agreed that tailored type skirts would be most satisfactory with the suggested number varying from one to four.

Tailored type dresses were recommended by all six participants, with three indicating that one dress would be adequate, and three indicating that two dresses would be adequate.

Tailored blouses were recommended by all six participants with four indicating that two tailored blouses would be needed.

Two types of sweaters were recommended by those interviewed. Two participants said pullover types would be most satisfactory and four said cardigan type sweaters would be needed; the number suggested varied from one to two.

The interview participants stated that street shoes would be the most satisfactory type of footwear. The number recommended varied from one pair to three pairs with half of the participants indicating that two pairs would be needed by the trainees.

The six participants agreed that nylon hose would be the most satisfactory type of hosiery and said that from three to twelve pairs would be needed. Half of the participants said three pairs would be adequate.

Those interviewed indicated that they considered handbags necessary for the training period with four indicating one handbag as satisfactory.

Half of those interviewed said one pair of gloves would be needed, as the trainees are often called for job interviews directly from the classroom.

Two interview participants said that one pair of galoshes or some type of rainboots would be necessary. Four participants did not consider this type of footwear essential.

Hats were not considered necessary for the training by the participants. The participants said slacks, shorts, capri-pants, culottes, sweatshirts, capes and stoles were not suitable for the trainee to wear for the activities associated with the training program.

Questionnaire to Obtain Information from Trainees

Purpose of the Questionnaire

The main purpose of the questionnaire was to obtain information regarding the clothing selection practices of low-income women enrolled in work-training programs at Lane Community College and Southwestern Oregon Community College and to determine the related clothing problems encountered by the trainees. The questionnaire was also designed to obtain information pertaining to the respondents'

income and the number of family members supported by the income. This information was needed to determine placement of the respondents in the low-income category when using the Orshansky income scale as a guide.

Selection of Participants

The following conditions were established as criteria to be used in the selection of individuals for this study. The study was to include women:

1. Who were enrolled in a work-training program at Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon or Southwestern Oregon Community College, Coos Bay, Oregon.
2. Whose family income ranged within the low-income category as determined by the Orshansky scale.
3. Who had children living at home.
4. Who were under 50 years of age.

Procedure Followed in Developing and Administering the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed utilizing information obtained from the six interviews with work-training program personnel. The questionnaire was then read by four Oregon State University Home Economics faculty members who offered suggestions for improvement.

Revisions were then made. The questionnaire was then checked for computer programming feasibility by a member of the Statistics Department, Oregon State University.

The questionnaire was pretested by five low-income women who had been enrolled in work-training programs at Southwestern Oregon Community College. Comments and suggestions were made by the test group and revisions were made by the writer.

Arrangements were made to facilitate administration of the questionnaire to groups of trainees enrolled in the office occupations training programs conducted at Lane Community College and Southwestern Oregon Community College. The writer administered the questionnaire to ten groups composed of six to twenty trainees. The writer administered the questionnaire in the same manner to each group. The procedure consisted of an explanation of the project and directions for completion of the questionnaire. An overhead projector with transparencies duplicating each page of the questionnaire was used by the writer as a means of clarifying directions since it was known to the writer that some of the respondents had not completed a high school education and had less than a tenth grade reading level.

The writer used a set of ten colored posters to illustrate general characteristics of three types of outerwear items mentioned in the questionnaire, sports, tailored and dressy, so that each group would have the same concept, as the writer, of these three types.

The writer remained with each group, to answer questions, during the completion of the questionnaire.

Of the 67 questionnaires completed by respondents enrolled in work-training programs, 47 questionnaires were usable and were completed by respondents who met the established criteria. This was a large percentage of the low-income women enrolled in work-training programs conducted by the two community colleges at the time the questionnaires were administered.

Using information submitted by the writer, a computer program for analysis of data from the questionnaires was developed by the director of the Computer Center at Southwestern Oregon Community College. The writer was instructed in the use of the computer program developed for this study and operated the computer to compile the data obtained from the questionnaires and calculate the percentage distributions used in the study.

RESULTS OF THE STUDY

General Information Regarding Respondents

The 47 women included in this study were enrolled in work-training programs conducted at two Oregon Community Colleges; 78.7 percent were enrolled at Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon and 21.3 percent were enrolled at Southwestern Oregon Community College, Coos Bay, Oregon. The length of time the respondents had been enrolled in these training programs ranged from one month to eight months. As shown in Table 4, 55.3 percent of the respondents were enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Programs, 36.2 percent were enrolled in Economic Opportunity Act Title V Programs, and 8.5 percent were enrolled in Vocational Rehabilitation Programs. The respondents were training for office occupations including secretarial, clerk typist and bookkeeping positions.

Information regarding each respondent's income and family size was necessary for determining their placement in the low-income category. The 47 respondents included in this study met the low-income criteria when using, as a guide, the Orshansky non-farm income scale which is shown in Table 3.

Table 3. Scale of low-income criteria developed by Orshansky for families of different composition, by household size and nonfarm residence (21, p. 20).

Number of family members Head under age 65	Yearly income at low-income level, Nonfarm before taxes
1 member	\$1,920
2 members	2,760
3 members	3,210
4 members	4,075
5 members	4,755
6 members	5,340
7 or more members	6,500

Table 4 shows that the largest percentage of respondents received the lowest yearly income; 48.9 percent reported that their family income before tax deductions for the previous year was \$1,000-\$2,000. Twenty of these women were in the 20-30 year age range, two in the 31-40 year age range and one was in the 41-50 year age range. These women had from one to four children living at home and supported by this income.

A yearly income of \$2,001-\$3,000 was received by 34.1 percent of the respondents. Of this group two were under 20 years of age, eight were in the 20-30 year age range, three in the 31-40 year age range and three in the 41-50 year age range. The number of children supported by this income ranged from one to five.

A yearly income of \$3,001-\$4,000 was received by 6.4 percent of the respondents and three to five children were supported by this income.

Table 4. The number and percentage of respondents enrolled in each type of training program and general information regarding their age, income range, and family size.

General Information	Number	Percent
Community college attended		
Lane Community College	37	78.7
Southwestern Oregon Community College	10	21.3
Type of training program in which enrolled		
Manpower Development and Training Programs	26	55.3
Economic Opportunity Title V Programs	17	36.2
Nondisabled Vocational Rehabilitation Programs	3	6.4
Vocational Rehabilitation Programs	1	2.1
Age range		
Under 20 years	3	6.3
20-30	32	68.1
31-40	6	12.8
41-50	6	12.8
Family income before tax deductions for past year		
\$1000-\$2000	23	48.9
\$2001-\$3000	16	34.1
\$3001-\$4000	3	6.4
\$4001-\$5000	5	10.6
Number of family members supported by the income		
2 members	13	27.7
3 members	16	34.1
4 members	9	19.1
5 members	5	10.6
6 members	4	8.5
Number of children living at home and supported by the family income		
1 child	13	27.6
2 children	17	36.2
3 children	8	17.0
4 children	6	12.8
5 children	3	6.4

The highest yearly income \$4,001-\$5,000, was received by 10.6 percent of the respondents. Four to five children were supported by this income.

Of the 47 respondents 95.8 percent were heads of their households; 4.2 percent reported that one adult in addition to themselves was supported by their income.

The Clothing Sources From Which the Respondents Obtained Outerwear Items

The respondents indicated the types of outerwear they currently owned and the number of each type obtained from the clothing sources included in the questionnaire. At the time the questionnaires were administered the 47 respondents owned a total of 2730 outerwear items which had been obtained from 14 different sources. As shown in Table 5, the total number of outerwear items obtained from each source by the 47 respondents ranged from six items obtained from "other" sources to 957 items obtained from department stores. Seven clothing sources including department stores, dress shops, gifts, homemade, shoe stores, handed down, and rummage and garage sales, accounted for 88.4 percent of the total number of outerwear items obtained by the respondents.

The data were then analyzed to determine the percentage of respondents who had obtained outerwear items from each of the 14

shown in Table 6. When the source from which the percentage of respondents obtained outerwear is placed first in order of decreasing percentage, the source from which the smallest percentage obtained outerwear is placed last the sources rank as follows: 1) department store, 2) gift shop, 3) dress shop, 4) handed down, 5) homemade, 6) shoe store, 7) variety store, 8) discount store, 9) rummage and garage sale, 10) mail order, 11) thrift shop, 12) supermarket, 13) drug store, 14) other. Of the 47 women 33 or 70.2 percent obtained outerwear from one or more of three sources of used clothing, handed down, gift shops, and rummage and garage sales; however, all respondents obtained outerwear from sources of new clothing.

Table 5. The total number of outerwear items obtained by the respondents from each clothing source.

Source	Number of Items	Percentage of Items
Department store	957	35.7
Dress shop	356	13.0
Gift	330	12.1
Homemade	239	8.8
Shoe store	202	7.4
Handed down	195	7.1
Rummage & Garage sales	119	4.3
Mail order	77	2.8
Discount store	75	2.8
Variety store	66	2.4
Thrift shop	52	2.0
Supermarket	42	1.5
Drug store	14	.1
Other	6	.0
Total	2730	100.0

Table 6. The number and percentage of respondents who obtained outerwear items from each clothing source.

Number of outerwear items	Gift		Handed Down		Homemade		Mail Order		Rummage & Garage Sales		Thrift Shop		Discount Store		Variety Store		Drug Store		Super- market		Department Store		Dress Shop		Shoe Store		Other	
	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent
<u>Coats</u>																												
1	16	34.4	4	8.5	0	0.0	2	4.3	1	2.1	1	2.1	2	4.2	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	19.1	9	19.1	0	0.0	1	2.1
2	3	6.4	3	6.4	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	12.8	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-8	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	20	42.9	7	14.9	1	2.1	3	6.4	3	6.3	1	2.1	2	4.2	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	23	48.9	15	31.9	0	0.0	1	2.1
<u>Suits</u>																												
1	9	19.1	7	14.9	5	10.6	2	4.3	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	11	23.4	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	4	8.5	1	2.1	1	2.1	2	4.3	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.5	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-9	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	15	31.8	9	19.1	6	12.7	4	8.6	2	4.2	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	21	44.6	11	23.3	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Dresses</u>																												
1	11	23.4	3	6.4	4	8.5	3	6.9	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.6	3	6.4	0	0.0	1	2.1
2	3	6.4	3	6.4	7	14.9	6	12.8	1	2.1	0	0.0	2	4.2	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.6	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	3	6.4	5	10.6	5	10.6	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.6	9	19.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	1	2.1	3	6.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	1	2.1	1	2.1	5	10.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.6	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-10	<u>2</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>6.9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
11-20	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	20	42.5	14	29.7	28	60.5	10	21.8	5	10.5	2	4.2	4	8.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	26	55.1	22	46.7	0	0.0	1	2.1
<u>Capes</u>																												
1	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Stoles</u>																												
1	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Skirts</u>																												
1	2	4.2	2	4.2	6	12.8	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	6	12.8	3	6.4	2	4.2	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	9	19.1	5	10.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	2	4.2	1	2.1	2	4.2	0	0.0	1	2.1	2	4.2	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	2	4.2	5	10.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-10	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8.5</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	11	23.3	8	17.9	17	36.0	5	10.6	3	6.3	3	6.3	4	8.4	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	22	46.7	15	31.8	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 6. (Continued)

Number of outerwear items	Gift		Handed Down		Homemade		Mail Order		Rummage & Garage Sales		Thrift Shop		Discount Store		Variety Store		Drug Store		Super- market		Department Store		Dress Shop		Shoe Store		Other			
	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent		
Blouses																														
1	6	12.8	2	4.2	4	8.5	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	5	10.6	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	6	12.8	3	6.4	3	6.4	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	2	4.2	1	2.1	0	0.0	9	19.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	1	2.1	2	4.2	0	0.0	2	4.2	1	2.1	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	1	2.1	2	4.2	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.6	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	1	2.1	2	4.2	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-10	0	0.0	3	6.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	14.9	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
11-20	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	14	29.8	13	27.5	13	27.5	3	6.3	3	6.3	2	4.2	6	12.6	2	4.2	1	2.1	1	2.1	31	65.7	12	25.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Sweaters																														
1	8	17.0	3	6.4	3	6.4	1	2.1	2	4.2	2	4.2	2	4.2	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	9	19.1	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	3	6.4	1	2.1	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.5	2	4.2	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0
3	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	14.9	2	4.2	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0
4	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	1	2.1	2	4.2	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-10	2	4.2	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.6	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
11-20	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	19	40.3	7	14.8	8	17.0	1	2.1	4	8.4	5	10.5	3	6.3	2	4.2	1	2.1	0	0.0	30	63.7	13	27.5	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0
Sweatshirts																														
1	3	6.4	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	14.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1
2	1	2.1	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-10	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	5	10.6	4	8.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.3	0	0.0	2	4.2	13	27.6	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1
T Shirts																														
1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-10	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
	1	2.1	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0	1	2.1	7	14.8	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 6. (Continued)

Number of outerwear items	Gift		Handed Down		Homemade		Mail Order		Rummage & Garage Sales		Thrift Shop		Discount Store		Variety Store		Drug Store		Super- market		Department Store		Dress Shop		Shoe Store		Other			
	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent		
<u>Pants</u>																														
1	4	8.5	2	4.2	2	4.2	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.5	3	6.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	3	6.4	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	4	8.5	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	7	14.9	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.5	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-10	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>14.9</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	8	17.0	5	10.6	4	8.4	3	6.3	5	10.5	0	0.0	2	4.2	1	2.1	1	2.1	1	2.1	29	61.7	11	23.3	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Shoes</u>																														
1	2	4.2	3	6.4	0	0.0	1	2.1	2	4.2	0	0.0	2	4.2	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.5	1	2.1	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	1	2.1	1	2.1	5	10.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.5	1	2.1	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	1	2.1	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	1	2.1	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-10	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>14.9</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
11-20	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>8.5</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	6	12.6	6	12.8	0	0.00	2	4.2	5	10.5	3	6.3	4	8.4	3	6.4	0	0.0	3	6.3	17	36.1	5	10.5	32	68.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Rainboots</u>																														
1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.6	0	0.0	5	10.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	5	10.6	0	0.0	7	14.8	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Hosiery</u>																														
1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	2	4.2	2	4.2	3	6.4	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	2	4.2	4	8.5	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	2	4.2	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-10	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>10.6</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
11-20	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	6	12.7	3	6.3	7	14.7	17	36.0	3	6.3	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Hats</u>																														
1	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	17.0	5	10.6	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	6	12.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	14	29.7	7	14.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 6. (Continued)

Number of outerwear items	Gift		Handed Down		Homemade		Mail Order		Rummage & Garage Sales		Thrift Shop		Discount Store		Variety Store		Drug Store		Super- market		Department Store		Dress Shop		Shoe Store		Other	
	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent	No.	Per- cent
<u>Handbags</u>																												
1	7	14.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	2	4.2	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	10	21.3	3	6.4	7	14.9	1	2.1
2	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0	2	4.2	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	8	17.0	0	0.0	4	8.5	0	0.0
3	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	12.8	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0
4	2	4.2	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2.1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	11	23.3	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1	2	4.2	2	4.2	4	8.4	7	14.9	0	0.0	0	0.0	29	61.7	3	6.4	13	27.6	1	2.1
<u>Gloves</u>																												
1	3	6.4	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.5	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
2	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0	0	0.0	4	8.5	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0
3	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	6	12.8	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.4	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
5	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
6-10	<u>2</u>	<u>4.2</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
	6	12.7	3	6.3	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	2.1	6	12.7	0	0.0	0	0.0	18	38.3	4	8.5	0	0.0	0	0.0

Department stores were the source of clothing for the largest percentage of respondents, and more outerwear items were obtained from this source than from other sources; however, four types of outerwear items were obtained by more respondents from other sources. Shoes were obtained from shoe stores by 68.0 percent of the respondents, and obtained from department stores by 36.1 percent; dresses were made at home by 60.5 percent of the respondents and obtained from department stores by 55.1 percent; rainboots were obtained from shoe stores by 14.8 percent of the respondents and from department stores by 10.6 percent; stoles were obtained from gift sources by 8.5 percent of the respondents. None of the respondents obtained stoles from department stores.

As shown in Table 6, the type of outerwear obtained from department stores by the largest percentage of respondents was blouses which were obtained by 65.7 percent. The types of outerwear obtained from the other clothing sources by the largest percentage of respondents included the following: shoes, obtained from shoe stores by 68.0 percent; dresses, made at home by 60.5 percent; dresses, obtained from dress shops by 46.7 percent; coats and dresses, obtained from gift sources by 42.5 percent; handed-down dresses, obtained by 29.7 percent; dresses, obtained from mail order sources by 21.8 percent; handbags, obtained from variety stores by 18.9 percent; hosiery, obtained from supermarkets by

14.7 percent; handbags and blouses, obtained from discount stores by 12.6 percent; shoes and pants, obtained from rummage and garage sales by 10.5 percent; sweaters, obtained from thrift shops by 10.5 percent; hosiery obtained from drugstores by 5.4 percent; and sweaters, obtained from "other" sources by 4.2 percent.

A summary of the respondents' clothing selection practices, concerning the sources from which they obtained clothing, shows that outerwear items were obtained from 14 different sources; however, 88.4 percent of the total number of outerwear items were obtained from seven sources. These seven sources included department stores, dress shops, gifts, homemade, shoe stores, handed down, and rummage and garage sales. Department stores were the source of clothing for the largest percentage of respondents and the largest percentage of outerwear items obtained from any one source was obtained from department stores, 35.7 percent.

Outerwear items were obtained from one or more of three sources of used clothing, handed down, thrift shops and rummage and garage sales by 33 women or 70.2 percent of the respondents. Thus, question number one, which asked, "Do low-income women include used clothing in their wardrobes?" was answered in the affirmative. However, the total number of outerwear items obtained from the three sources of used clothing was small, 13.4 percent, when compared with the total number obtained by the

respondents from the 11 sources of new clothing, 86.6 percent.

Influence of Sources of Information on
Selection of Outerwear Items

The respondents indicated the sources of information which influenced their selection of outerwear items. Seventeen sources of information were reported to have some influence or great influence on selection of outerwear by varying numbers of respondents. As shown in Table 7, these sources were: friends, magazines, television, newspapers, teachers, store clerks, daughter, mother, other relatives, project director, son, neighbors, husband, caseworker, father, radio and other. To show the total percentage of respondents influenced to any degree by each source of information listed, the number of respondents reporting the source as a great influence, and the number reporting the source as some influence were combined and designated as total influence as shown in Table 7.

Five sources of information were reported as influences by over 50 percent of the respondents. These sources were as follows: friends, 76.6 percent; magazines, 65.7 percent; television, 59.6 percent; newspapers 53.2 percent; and teachers, 53.2 percent. Seven sources of information were reported as influences on selection of outerwear by 25 to 50 percent of the respondents. These sources

Table 7. The number and percentage of respondents indicating the influence of various sources of information on their selection of outerwear items.

Information	Total Influence		Great Influence		Some Influence		No Influence	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Friends	36	76.6	7	14.9	29	61.7	11	23.4
Magazines	31	65.7	8	17.0	23	48.9	16	34.9
Television	28	59.6	3	6.4	25	53.2	19	40.4
Newspapers	25	53.2	2	4.2	23	48.9	22	46.8
Teachers	25	53.2	6	12.8	19	40.4	22	46.8
Store Clerks	22	46.8	1	2.1	21	44.7	25	53.2
Daughter	17	36.2	2	4.2	15	31.9	30	63.8
Mother	14	29.8	3	6.4	11	23.4	33	70.2
Other Relatives	13	27.6	2	4.2	11	23.4	34	72.3
Project Director	13	27.6	3	6.4	10	21.3	34	72.3
Son	12	25.5	2	4.2	10	21.3	35	74.5
Neighbors	12	25.5	0	0.0	12	25.5	35	74.4
Husband	9	19.1	7	14.9	2	4.2	38	80.8
Caseworker	8	17.0	1	2.1	7	14.9	39	83.0
Other	6	12.8	3	6.4	3	6.4	41	87.2
Father	5	10.6	0	0.0	5	10.6	42	89.4
Radio	5	10.6	0	0.0	5	10.6	42	89.4

were as follows: store clerks, 46.8 percent; daughters, 36.2 percent; mother, 29.8 percent; other relatives 27.6 percent; project director, 27.6 percent; son, 25.5 percent; and neighbors, 25.5 percent. Five sources of information were reported as influences on selection of outerwear by less than 25 percent of the respondents and were as follows: husband, 19.1 percent; caseworker, 17 percent; other sources of information, 12.8 percent; radio, 10.6 percent; and father, 10.6 percent.

In summary, friends were rated as an influence on outerwear selection by the largest percentage of respondents 76.6 percent. Magazines, television, newspapers, and teachers were rated as an influence on selection of outerwear by over 50 percent of the respondents. Teachers were rated as an influence on clothing selection by more respondents than were any other persons listed with the exception of friends; apparently then, the respondents considered teachers as an important source of clothing selection information.

Outerwear Items Obtained by the Respondents for Classroom Wear

The respondents indicated the type and number of outerwear items they obtained for classroom and job-interview wear before entering the training program and the type and number of items they obtained for classroom and job-interview wear after entering

the program. The respondents also indicated the type and number of outerwear items they believed their wardrobes lacked after they entered the work-training program.

In an earlier section of the study, work-training personnel specified ten types of outerwear as the most satisfactory types for classroom and job-interview use. These types were all-purpose-coats, tailored suits, tailored dresses, tailored skirts, tailored blouses, cardigan sweaters, street shoes, nylon hosiery, handbags and gloves. Nine of these ten types were lacking in the wardrobes of more respondents than were other types of outerwear, according to their judgement. The greatest number of respondents, 40.4 percent, believed their wardrobes lacked tailored dresses. Other types they felt their wardrobes lacked were as follows: tailored suits, 38.2 percent; tailored skirts, 31.8 percent; tailored blouses, 29.8 percent; handbags, 29.8 percent; street shoes, 27.6 percent; nylon hosiery, 25.5 percent; and gloves, 10.6 percent.

Some respondents had obtained outerwear for classroom use both before and after entering training. Of the total respondents, 25.5 percent had not obtained outerwear at either time. Slightly less than 50 percent of the 47 respondents, 48.9 percent, obtained outerwear for classroom use before entering the work-training program and 36.2 percent of the 47 respondents obtained the types specified as most satisfactory for classroom and job-interview use by the work-

Table 8. Number and percentage of respondents who obtained outerwear items for classroom wear.

Type of outerwear item	Obtained items before entering training		Believed wardrobe lacked items after entering training		Obtained items after entering training	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Coats</u>						
Carcoats	3	6.4	1	2.1	0	0.0
Jackets	2	4.2	7	14.9	1	2.1
Raincoat	0	0.0	4	8.5	1	2.1
All-purpose coat	4	8.5	9	19.1	2	4.2
Dress coat	3	6.4	12	25.5	2	4.2
<u>Suits</u>						
Sports	2	4.2	5	10.6	1	2.1
Tailored	4	8.5	18	38.2	9	19.1
Dress	2	4.2	10	21.3	2	4.2
Pants suit	2	4.2	4	8.5	3	6.4
<u>Dresses</u>						
House	2	4.2	2	4.2	2	4.2
Tailored	7	14.9	19	40.4	12	25.5
Dressy	1	2.1	1	2.1	4	8.5
<u>Skirts</u>						
Sports	6	12.8	6	12.8	3	6.4
Tailored	6	12.8	15	31.9	2	4.2
Dressy	2	4.2	3	6.4	1	2.1
<u>Blouses</u>						
Sports	4	8.5	5	10.6	2	4.2
Tailored	5	10.6	14	29.8	4	8.5
Dressy	2	4.2	7	14.8	0	0.0

Table 8. (Continued)

Type of outerwear item	Obtained items before entering training		Believed wardrobe lacked items after entering training		Obtained items after entering training	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Sweaters</u>						
Pullover	4	8.5	7	14.9	3	6.4
Cardigan	3	6.4	12	25.5	2	4.2
Shell	4	8.5	9	19.1	1	2.1
Dressy	2	4.2	4	8.5	0	0.0
<u>Pants</u>						
Jeans	1	2.1	4	8.5	1	2.1
Cutoffs	1	2.1	0	0.0	0	0.0
Culottes	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0
Slacks	2	4.2	5	10.6	2	4.2
Shorts	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0
Other pants	1	2.1	2	4.2	0	0.0
<u>Other Outerwear</u>						
Sweatshirts	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
T-Shirts	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Capes	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Stoles	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other	0	0.0	1	2.1	1	2.1
<u>Shoes</u>						
Casual	5	10.6	13	27.6	9	19.1
Street	1	2.1	11	27.6	6	12.8
Dress	4	8.5	11	23.4	6	12.8
<u>Boots</u>						
Rainboots	0	0.0	6	12.8	1	2.1
Other boots	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0

Table 8. (Continued)

Type of outerwear item	Obtained items before entering training		Believed wardrobe lacked items after entering training		Obtained items after entering training	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Hosiery</u>						
Nylon Hosiery	4	8.5	12	25.5	11	23.4
Patterned Hosiery	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Footlets	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Anklelets	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Other	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
<u>Hats</u>						
Dressy	1	2.1	1	2.1	0	0.0
Rain Hats	0	0.0	2	4.2	0	0.0
<u>Handbags</u>						
	3	6.4	14	29.8	6	12.8
<u>Gloves</u>						
	1	2.1	5	10.6	2	4.2

training personnel. A slightly larger percentage of respondents, 53.2 percent, obtained outerwear for classroom use after entering the program. Of the total respondents 48.9 percent obtained the types of outerwear considered most satisfactory by the work-training personnel.

Six of the ten types of outerwear considered most satisfactory for the training period were obtained by more respondents after they entered the program than before they entered. As shown in Table 8, these types were tailored dresses, tailored suits, handbags, street shoes, nylon hosiery, and gloves.

A summary of the responses relating to the types of outerwear selected before and after entry into the training program supplies some answers for question number two. Do low-income women select the types of clothing needed for the classroom, on-the-job training and job-interview situations they encounter in their work-training programs? Before their entry into the training program 36.2 percent of the respondents obtained one or more of the types of outerwear considered most satisfactory by the work-training personnel. After entry into the program 48.9 percent of the respondents obtained the suggested types of outerwear.

Outerwear Items Owned by Respondents for Classroom
and Job-Interview Wear and for At-Home Wear

The respondents designated the type and number of outerwear items presently owned for classroom and job-interview wear. They

also indicated the type and number of outerwear items used only for at-home wear, consequently any items used for classroom and job-interview wear were not included in this category. Of the 47 respondents 68.1 percent owned more outerwear for classroom and job-interview wear than for at-home wear; 4.5 percent owned the same number of outerwear items for both situations; and 27.6 percent of the respondents owned less outerwear for classroom and job-interview wear than for at-home wear.

The types of outerwear considered most satisfactory for classroom and job-interview wear by the work-training personnel were owned by more respondents than were other types of outerwear in eight of the ten outerwear categories specified by the work-training personnel. Some of the ten types, however, were not owned by many of the respondents. Table 9 includes the percentage of respondents owning the types of outerwear considered most satisfactory for classroom and job-interview wear. The type owned by the greatest number of respondents, 97.9 percent, was tailored skirts. The mean number of skirts owned by this group of respondents was 1.9. A mean of 4.6 tailored dresses was owned for classroom and job-interview wear by 61.7 percent of the respondents; 38.3 percent owned no tailored dresses. Nylon hosiery was owned for classroom and job-interview wear by 55.3 percent of the respondents with a mean of 3.6 pairs; 44.7 percent of the respondents said they owned no nylon

Table 9. The number and percentage of respondents who owned specific types of outerwear at the time of the interview, and the mean number they owned for classroom and job-interview wear and for at-home wear.

Type of outerwear	Respondents Who Owned Outerwear Items For Classroom and Job-Interview Use			Respondents Who Owned Outerwear Items For At-Home Wear		
	Number	Percent	Mean Number of Items Owned By This Group	Number	Percent	Mean Number of Items Owned By This Group
Coats						
Jacket	11	23.4	2.3	17	36.2	1.4
Carcoat	7	14.9	1.5	10	21.3	1.1
Raincoat	10	21.8	1.0	5	10.6	1.0
All Purpose	20	42.5	1.4	8	17.0	1.5
Dress Coat	21	44.7	1.5	8	17.0	3.1
Suits						
Sports	9	19.1	1.2	6	12.2	1.5
Tailored	24	51.1	2.5	4	8.5	2.2
Dress Suit	8	17.0	1.8	1	2.1	1.0
Pants Suit	3	6.3	1.6	5	10.6	2.0
Dresses						
House Dresses	10	21.3	2.7	25	53.2	4.0
Tailored	29	61.7	4.6	2	4.2	4.5
Dressy	11	23.4	6.3	7	14.8	3.8
Skirts						
Sports	13	27.7	6.0	17	36.2	5.0
Tailored	46	97.9	1.9	5	10.6	2.6
Dressy	3	6.4	4.3	1	2.1	2.0
Blouses						
Sports	10	21.3	4.0	24	51.1	4.8
Tailored	17	36.2	4.6	4	8.5	1.7
Dressy	7	14.9	2.5	5	10.6	2.0

Table 9. (Continued)

Type of outerwear	Respondents Who Owned Outerwear Items For Classroom and Job-Interview Use			Respondents Who Owned Outerwear Items For At-Home Wear		
	Number	Percent	Mean Number of Items Owned By This Group	Number	Percent	Mean Number of Items Owned By This Group
Sweaters						
Pullover	17	36.2	4.0	12	25.5	3.0
Cardigan	23	48.8	2.4	11	23.4	1.9
Shell	13	27.6	3.4	6	12.8	3.1
Dressy	2	2.1	9.0	0	0.0	0.0
Pants						
Jeans	0	0.0	0.0	22	46.8	2.1
Cutoffs	0	0.0	0.0	12	25.5	2.9
Culottes	1	2.1	1.0	1	2.1	1.0
Slacks	2	4.2	3.5	26	55.3	2.7
Shorts	0	0.0	0.0	15	31.9	3.8
Other Pants	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Other Outerwear						
Sweatshirts	2	4.2	1.5	18	38.2	2.8
T-Shirts	0	0.0	0.0	6	12.8	3.8
Capes	1	2.1	1.0	1	2.1	1.0
Stoles	0	0.0	0.0	0	0.0	0.0
Other	1	2.1	10.0	2	4.2	3.0
Shoes						
Casual	29	61.7	2.4	23	48.9	2.0
Street	24	51.1	2.4	6	12.8	2.1
Dress	17	36.2	3.2	5	10.6	1.0
Boots						
Rainboots	4	8.5	1	5	10.6	1.2
Other Boots	1	2.1	1	5	10.6	1.6

Table 9. (Continued)

Type of outerwear	Respondents Who Owned Outerwear Items For Classroom and Job-Interview Use			Respondents Who Owned Outerwear Items For At-Home Wear		
	Number	Percent	Mean Number of Items Owned By This Group	Number	Percent	Mean Number of Items Owned By This Group
Hosiery						
Nylon Hosiery	26	55.3	3.6	5	10.6	2.8
Patterned Hosiery	1	2.1	1.0	2	4.2	2.0
Footlets	0	0.0	0.0	3	6.4	4.6
Anklelets	0	0.0	0.0	3	6.4	2.0
Other	0	0.0	0.0	2	4.2	3.0
Hats						
Dressy	6	12.8	2.1	3	6.4	1.0
Rain hats	2	4.2	1.0	2	4.2	1.5
Handbags	25	53.2	2.6	9	19.1	1.4
Gloves	13	27.6	2.8	4	8.5	1.5

hosiery or any other type of hosiery.

A mean of 2.6 handbags for classroom and job-interview use was owned by 53.2 percent of the respondents; 46.8 percent of the respondents owned no handbags. Street shoes for classroom and job-interview wear were owned by 51.1 percent of the respondents, with a mean of 2.4 pairs; 48.9 percent of the respondents said they owned no street shoes. Tailored suits were owned for classroom and job-interview wear by 51.1 percent of the respondents, a mean of 2.5 tailored suits was owned for this purpose; 48.9 percent of the respondents owned no tailored suits for classroom and job interview wear. A mean of 2.4 cardigan sweaters was owned by 48.8 percent of the respondents for classroom and job-interview wear; 51.1 percent reported that they owned no cardigan sweaters. All-purpose coats were owned by 42.5 percent of the respondents for classroom and job-interview use, with a mean of 1.4 coats; 57.5 percent of the respondents owned no all-purpose coat. A mean of 4.6 tailored blouses was owned by 36.2 percent of the respondents for classroom and job-interview use; 63.8 percent of the respondents owned no tailored blouses. A mean of 2.8 pairs of gloves was owned for job-interview use by 27.6 percent of the respondents; 72.3 percent owned no gloves.

Of a number of types of outerwear not suggested as most satisfactory by the work-training personnel, two types, dress coats

and casual shoes were owned by more respondents than the types of coats and shoes specified as most satisfactory. Casual shoes were owned by 61.7 percent of the respondents; street shoes, the type specified as most satisfactory were owned by 51.1 percent. Dress coats were owned by 44.7 percent of the respondents; all-purpose coats the type specified, were owned by 42.5 percent of the respondents.

As shown in Table 9, the type of outerwear owned by the greatest number of respondents for at-home wear was different from the type owned for classroom wear in all outerwear categories except one. Casual shoes were owned by more respondents for both classroom wear and at-home wear. Slacks were the type of at-home wear owned by the greatest number of respondents, 55.3 percent; other types of at-home wear, house dresses and sports blouses were owned by 53.2 percent and 51.1 percent respectively, other types of at-home wear were owned by less than 50 percent of the respondents.

Information not included in Table 9, showed that the number of outerwear items owned for classroom and job-interview use ranged from four items reported by one respondent to 176 items reported by another respondent. A mean of 31.5 outerwear items or pairs of items was owned for classroom and job-interview wear by the 47 respondents and the median number owned was 23.

The lowest number of outerwear items owned for at-home wear

was zero reported by one women, who indicated that all of the outerwear items she owned were worn for classroom and job-interview use and were counted in that category, even though they also served as at-home wear. The greatest number of outerwear items owned for at-home wear was 86 reported by one respondent. A mean of 23.7 items for at-home wear was owned by the 47 respondents and the median number was 15.

A summary of responses concerning the types of outerwear owned for classroom and job-interview wear and for at-home wear, shows that the types of outerwear considered most suitable for classroom and job-interview wear by the work-training personnel interviewed in the study were owned by 52.6 percent of the respondents. However, 47.4 percent of the respondents did not own these types of outerwear. Over 68 percent of the respondents owned more outerwear for classroom and job-interview wear than for at-home wear. Therefore, question number three, which asked, "Do the wardrobes of low-income women contain more clothing for home wear than clothing for classroom wear?" was answered in the negative.

Wardrobe Classifications as Considered by the Respondents Before Entering the Training Program

The respondents indicated how they considered their wardrobes before they entered the training program by selecting the

classifications they believed applicable to their wardrobes at that time. These classifications are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. The number and percentage of respondents and the classifications they considered applicable to their wardrobes before entering the training program.

Wardrobe classification	Number	Percent
Lacking in some accessory items	29	61.8
Lacking in some necessary outerwear items	25	53.2
Satisfactory for classroom wear	21	44.7
Too worn or shabby for classroom wear	15	31.9
Too casual for classroom wear	9	19.1
Too dressy for classroom wear	3	6.4

Accessory items, including hats, handbags, shoes and gloves, were considered separately from outerwear items in this section of the study to obtain a more accurate wardrobe classification from the respondents. Two or more classifications were selected by 70.2 percent of the respondents, as applicable to their wardrobes; 29.8 percent of the respondents selected only one classification as applicable to their wardrobes before their entry into the program.

As shown in Table 10, 61.8 percent of the respondents classified their wardrobes as lacking in some accessory items. These respondents also designated one or more additional classifications as applicable to their wardrobes. Over half of the respondents, 53.2 percent, reported that their wardrobes lacked some necessary

outerwear items before they entered the training program. Of this group, 16 said their wardrobes also lacked some necessary accessory items, and ten said that in addition to lacking outerwear items, their wardrobes were too worn or shabby for classroom wear.

Less than half of the respondents, 44.7 percent, said their wardrobes were satisfactory for classroom wear. Of this group only six did not specify an additional classification; the remaining 15 women selected one or more additional classifications as applicable to their wardrobes. These same 15 respondents said their wardrobes also lacked some accessory items; in addition, five believed their wardrobes lacked some necessary outerwear items; three felt their wardrobes were too worn or shabby for classroom wear; two felt their wardrobes were too casual for classroom wear and two said their wardrobes were too dressy for classroom wear.

Other wardrobe classifications selected by the respondents were: wardrobe too casual for classroom wear, specified by 19.1 percent; and wardrobe too dressy for classroom wear, specified by 6.4 percent.

The respondents were then divided into two groups, Group A and Group B. Group A comprised the respondents who classified their wardrobes as satisfactory for classroom wear and included 44.7 percent of the respondents. Group B comprised the respondents who did not classify their wardrobes as satisfactory for classroom wear

and included 55.3 percent of the respondents. The responses of the two groups were then compared. In analyzing the comparisons it was found that Group B included the respondents who avoided attending employment interviews because they considered their wardrobes unsuitable for the occasion. Group B also included more respondents who encountered clothing problems than Group A after they had obtained outerwear items for their wardrobes. The clothing problems of the Group B respondents included: used items lacking labels giving care directions; poorly constructed items; improperly fitting items; soiled items; damaged items; and items too casual for classroom wear. One problem, items too dressy for classroom wear, was designated by more respondents from Group A than from Group B.

A summary of information regarding the wardrobe classifications the respondents considered applicable to their wardrobes before entering the training program provides some answers for question number four. Do the clothing selection practices of low-income women result in wardrobes which lack the clothing necessary for classroom, on-the-job training and job-interview situations? Over half of the respondents, 53.2 percent, classified their wardrobes as lacking in some necessary outerwear items. Less than half of the respondents, 44.7 percent, classified their wardrobes as satisfactory for classroom wear before they entered the training program. Some women, 31.9 percent, said their wardrobes were too worn or shabby

for classroom wear. Therefore, there was some indication of an affirmative answer to question number four. Do the clothing selection practices of low-income women result in a wardrobe lacking in the clothing necessary for classroom, on-the-job training and job-interview situations?

Problems Encountered After Obtaining Outerwear Items

Clothing problems were encountered by 97.9 percent of the respondents after they had obtained outerwear items for their wardrobe. This group of respondents sometimes or always encountered one or more of the clothing problems shown in Table 11. The largest percentage of these respondents reported that the outerwear items they obtained were too casual for classroom wear. This problem was sometimes encountered by 83 percent of the respondents and always encountered by 4.2 percent. Obtaining poorly constructed outerwear items was a problem sometimes encountered by 78.7 percent of the respondents and a problem always encountered by 6.4 percent. Obtaining outerwear items too dressy for classroom wear was a problem sometimes encountered by 68.1 percent of the respondents.

As shown in Table 11, other problems sometimes or always encountered by the respondents after they obtained outerwear items included improperly fitting items; used items lacking labels giving care directions; damaged items; and soiled items.

Table 11. The number and percentage of respondents who encountered problems after obtaining outer-wear items for their wardrobe.

Problem Encountered	Always		Sometimes		Never	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Items too casual for classroom wear	2	4.2	39	83.0	6	12.8
Poorly constructed items	3	6.4	37	78.7	7	14.9
Items too dressy for classroom wear	0	0.0	32	68.1	15	31.9
Improperly fitting items	1	2.1	30	64.0	15	31.9
Used items lack labels giving care directions	7	14.9	23	48.9	17	36.2
Damaged items	0	0.0	26	55.3	21	44.7
Soiled items	0	0.0	19	40.4	28	59.6

In summary, some answers are provided for question number two. Do low-income women select the types of clothing needed for the classroom, on-the-job training and job-interview situations they encounter in their work-training programs? Forty-one women or 87.2 percent, sometimes selected outerwear they later considered too casual for classroom wear and 32 women or 68.1 percent, sometimes selected outerwear they later considered too dressy for classroom wear. It is apparent then that many of the women in this study did not always select the types of outerwear needed for classroom and job-interview use and later considered this a problem.

Functions Avoided by the Respondents Because They
Believed Their Clothing Was Unsuitable

Certain functions were avoided by 46.8 percent of the respondents because they considered their clothing unsuitable for the occasion. Some respondents avoided more than one type of function for this reason. As shown in Table 12, the greatest number of respondents, 21.3 percent, avoided "other" functions which they said included social activities, dates and dances. Employment interviews and church services were avoided by 14.9 percent of the respondents because they considered their clothing unsuitable. Work-training classes were attended even though the respondents may have believed their clothing unsuitable.

The percentage of respondents who avoided employment interviews because they considered their wardrobes unsuitable, was

small, 14.9 percent. However, for these women the lack of suitable clothing was critical and may have prevented them from obtaining employment after completion of their training program.

Table 12. The number and percentage of respondents who avoided attending specific functions because they believed their clothing was not suitable.

Function Avoided	Number	Percent
Other (Social functions)	10	21.3
Employment interviews	7	14.9
Church services	7	14.9
College lectures	4	8.5
Club meetings	3	6.4
Childrens' school functions	1	2.1
Parent-Teacher meetings	0	0.0
Work-training classes	0	0.0

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to obtain information about the clothing selection practices and related clothing problems of low-income women enrolled in work-training programs. Trainees engaged in work-training programs conducted at two Oregon community colleges, Southwestern Oregon Community College, Coos Bay, and Lane Community College, Eugene, were used as the subjects for this study.

To obtain the background information necessary in developing the study and constructing the questionnaire, the writer interviewed three community college instructors and three public welfare commission employees who worked directly with trainees in work-training programs. Information was obtained through the interviews, regarding the importance of clothing in relation to the training program, the type and number of outerwear items considered most satisfactory for the training program, and the ways clothing for the on-the-job training period and the job-interview varied from clothing considered satisfactory for classroom wear.

The six individuals interviewed, emphasized that satisfactory clothing was important in low-income women's development and success in completing a work-training program. The types of outerwear considered most satisfactory for classroom wear by the six

interview participants were: all-purpose coats, tailored dresses, tailored blouses, street shoes, nylon hosiery, and handbags. Additional types of outerwear suggested by three to five of those interviewed were tailored suits, tailored skirts, cardigan sweaters, and gloves. Though there was general agreement by the interview participants on the types of outerwear items considered most satisfactory for the training program, there was little agreement on the number of items of each type of outerwear they believed necessary.

The work-training personnel interviewed said that unless the firm with which the trainee was engaged in on-the-job training specified certain types of outerwear, clothing for the on-the-job training period would not differ from clothing for classroom wear.

Five of the six interviewed said that clothing satisfactory for the job-interview would differ from clothing for classroom and on-the-job training situations. Clothing basic in line and more conservative in style, design and color was suggested as more appropriate for the job-interview than the sports types and dressy types sometimes used for classroom and on-the-job training situations.

Four questions were developed by the writer and a questionnaire was formulated to collect data regarding the clothing selection practices and related clothing problems of low-income women enrolled in work-training programs. This questionnaire was

administered by the writer to groups of women enrolled in work-training programs at the two Oregon community colleges included in the study. Sixty-seven women enrolled in work-training programs completed the questionnaires, and 47 met the established criteria. The writer operated a computer to compile the data obtained from the questionnaires and to compute percentage distributions.

The greatest number of respondents, 55.3 percent, were enrolled in Manpower Development and Training Programs; 36.2 percent were enrolled in Economic Opportunity Act Title V Programs; and 8.5 percent were enrolled in Vocational Rehabilitation Programs. The greatest number of respondents, 48.9 percent, had the lowest yearly income \$1000-\$2000, and reported that from one to five children were supported by this income. Forty-five women or 95.8 percent of the respondents were heads of their households.

Information regarding clothing selection practices showed that the respondents obtained clothing from 14 different sources. When the sources of outerwear were listed according to the highest percentage of responses, the sources ranked as follows: 1) department store, 2) gift, 3) dress shop, 4) handed down, 5) homemade, 6) shoe store, 7) variety store, 8) discount store, 9) rummage and garage sales, 10) mail order, 11) thrift shop, 12) supermarket, 13) drug store, and 14) other. Of the total number of outerwear items

obtained by the 47 respondents, 88.4 percent were obtained from seven of the 14 sources listed in the questionnaire: department stores, shoe stores, dress shops, gifts, homemade, handed down, and rummage and garage sales. Of the 47 women, 33 or 70.2 percent obtained outerwear from one or more of three sources of used clothing, handed down, thrift shops, and rummage and garage sales. The percentage of outerwear items obtained from the three sources of used clothing was small, 13.4 percent, when compared with the total number of items obtained by the respondents from the 11 sources of new clothing, 86.6 percent. The largest percentage, 35.7 percent, of all outerwear items was obtained from department stores. This information regarding the respondents' selection of used clothing provides an affirmative answer to question number one which asked, "Do low-income women include used clothing in their wardrobes?"

Seventeen sources of information were influences on the clothing selection practices of varying numbers of respondents. Five of these sources were said to have some influence or great influence by more than 50 percent of the respondents. Friends were rated as an influence by the greatest number of respondents, 78.6 percent. Magazines were rated as an influence by 65.7 percent of the respondents; television by 59.6 percent; and newspaper and teachers were

both rated as influences by 53.2 percent. Teachers were rated as an influence by more respondents than were other persons listed, with the exception of friends; thus, the respondents apparently considered teachers as an important source of clothing selection information.

The respondents designated the types and numbers of outerwear they had obtained for classroom and job-interview use before they entered the training program, the types and numbers of items they believed their wardrobes lacked after they entered the program, and the types and numbers of outerwear items obtained for classroom and job-interview use after they entered the program. Many respondents believed their wardrobes lacked nine of the ten types of outerwear designated as most satisfactory for classroom and job-interview wear, by the work-training personnel interviewed in the study. The percentage of respondents who believed their wardrobes lacked these nine types of outerwear was larger than the percentage who lacked other types of outerwear. In addition, six of the ten types of outerwear considered most satisfactory by the work-training personnel were obtained by a larger percentage of respondents after entering the program than before entering the program. The responses relating to the types of outerwear selected before and after entry into the training program provides some answers for question number two. Do low-income women select the types of

clothing needed for the classroom, on-the-job training and job-interview situations they encounter in their work-training programs? Before their entry into the training program 36.2 percent of the respondents obtained one or more of the types of outerwear considered most satisfactory by the work-training personnel. After entry into the program 48.9 percent of the respondents obtained the suggested types of outerwear. Over one fourth of the respondents, 25.5 percent, did not obtain outerwear for classroom use before or after their entry into the training program.

A summary of responses concerning outerwear owned for classroom and job-interview use, and at-home wear showed that over 50 percent of the respondents did not own seven of the ten types of outerwear considered most satisfactory for the classroom and job-interview situations by the work-training personnel. However, 68.1 percent of the 47 respondents owned more outerwear items for classroom and job-interview use than for at-home wear. Therefore, question number three which asked, "Do the wardrobes of low-income women contain more clothing for home wear than clothing for classroom wear?" was answered in the negative.

From six wardrobe classifications presented by the writer, the respondents selected one or more classifications they believed applicable to their wardrobes before they entered the training program. Two or more classifications were selected by 70.2 percent,

and 29.8 percent selected one classification. Less than half of the respondents classified their wardrobes as satisfactory for classroom wear. The respondents were then divided into two groups, those who classified their wardrobes as satisfactory for classroom wear were designated as Group A, and those who did not classify their wardrobes as satisfactory, were designated as Group B. The percentage of respondents who did not classify their wardrobes as satisfactory for classroom wear was larger, 55.3 percent, than the percentage of respondents who did classify their wardrobes as satisfactory, 44.7 percent. When analyzing the responses of the two groups, it was found that all respondents who avoided employment interviews because they believed their wardrobes were unsatisfactory were in Group B. Over half of the respondents, 53.2 percent, classified their wardrobes as lacking in some necessary outerwear items though the reasons were not enumerated. Therefore, there was some indication of an affirmative answer to question number four which asked, "Do the clothing selection practices of low-income women result in a wardrobe lacking in the clothing necessary for classroom, on-the-job training and job-interview situations?"

Having obtained outerwear items for their wardrobes that were either too casual or too dressy for classroom wear was a problem encountered by a large percentage of the respondents. Of the 47 respondents, 87.2 percent had obtained outerwear too casual for

classroom wear and 68.1 percent had obtained outerwear too dressy for classroom wear. Evidently many of the women in this study did not always select the types of outerwear needed for classroom and job-interview use and later considered this a problem.

Some respondents avoided attending specific functions because they felt their clothing was not suitable for the occasion. Social functions were avoided by 21.3 percent of the respondents, employment interviews 14.9 percent, and church services by 14.9 percent. Even though the percentage of respondents who avoided employment interviews was small, for these women, the lack of suitable clothing was critical and may have prevented them from obtaining employment.

The number of respondents in this study was small, yet represented a large percentage of the low-income women enrolled in work-training programs at the two community colleges included in the study. The information can be considered accurate only for this group of low-income women, yet the findings reflect some clothing selection practices of low-income women which deserve further study.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The writer believes that information from this study regarding the low-income respondents' sources of clothing, sources of clothing selection information, types of outerwear obtained before and after entry into the training program, and clothing problems will be useful to those who work with low-income women enrolled in work training programs.

The writer recommends that information regarding selection of used clothing be included in clothing selection information to be presented to low-income women entering work-training programs. The writer further recommends that information regarding the types of clothing considered most satisfactory for a work-training program by the work-training personnel and reported lacking by the greatest number of respondents be considered in the development of a suggested wardrobe for low-income women entering work-training programs.

The writer suggests that further study in the area of clothing for low-income women include the study of clothing expenditures, the study of clothing care practices and the development of new techniques to effectively assist low-income women increase their skill in clothing selection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Caplovitz, David. The poor pay more. New York, Free Press, 1963. 225 p.
2. Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America. Task Force on Economic Growth and Opportunity. The disadvantaged poor: education and employment. Washington, D. C., 1966. 447 p.
3. Douty, Helen Irene. The influence of clothing on perception of persons in single contact situations. Ph.D. thesis. Tallahassee, Florida State University, 1962. 145 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)
4. Gladwin, Thomas. Poverty U.S.A. Boston, Little, Brown and Company, 1967. 182 p.
5. Haggstrom, Warren C. The power of the poor. In: Mental health of the poor, ed. by Frank Riessman, Jerome Cohen and Arthur Pearl. New York, Free Press, 1964. p. 206-207.
6. Hall, Katherine. A study of some factors that contribute to satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the clothing of ninety-two low income families. Ph.D. thesis. State College, Pennsylvania State University, 1955. 238 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)
7. Hoult, Thomas Ford. Experimental measurement of clothing as a factor in some social ratings of American men. American Sociological Review 19:324-328. 1954.
8. Irelan, Lola and Arthur Besner. Low-income outlook on life. Welfare in Review 3:13-19. Sept., 1965.
9. Kephart, Newell C. The employment interview in industry. New York, McGraw-Hill, 1955. 277 p.
10. Lamale, Helen. Low-income. In: Proceedings of the conference on buying and consumption practices of low-income families, ed. by Irene Oppenheim. New York, New York University, 1964. p. 1.

11. Levitan, Sar A. Programs in aid of the poor. Kalamazoo, Michigan, W. E. UpJohn Institute for Employment Research, 1965. 59 p.
12. Lewis, Oscar. In: Poverty American style, ed. by Herman P. Miller, Belmont, California, Wadsworth, 1966. 304 p.
13. Lipsett, Laurence, Frank P. Rodgers and Harold M. Kentner. Personnel selection and recruitment. Boston, Allyn and Bacon, 1964. 230 p.
14. Mangum, Garth L. and Lowell M. Glenn. Vocational rehabilitation and federal manpower policy. Washington, D. C. National Manpower Policy Task Force, Institute of Labor and Industrial Relations, 1967. 57 p.
15. Miller, Henry. Characteristics of aid for dependent children families. Social Service Review 39:339-401. 1965.
16. Moles, Oliver C. J. Child training practices among low-income families. Welfare in Review 3:1-19. Dec., 1965.
17. Mugge, Robert. Aid to families with dependent children. Social Security Bulletin 26:3-14. Mar., 1963.
18. Myrdal, Gunnar. Challenge to affluence. New York, Pantheon, 1962. 172 p.
19. Ornati, Oscar. Poverty amid affluence. New York, Twentieth Century Fund, 1965. 208 p.
20. Orshansky, Mollie. Counting the poor. Social Security Bulletin 28:3-29. Jan., 1965.
21. Orshansky, Mollie. Recounting the poor-a five-year review. Social Security Bulletin 29:20-37. April, 1966.
22. Richards, Louise G. Consumer practices of the poor. Welfare in Review 3:1-13. Nov., 1965.
23. Riessman, Frank. The culturally deprived child. New York, Harper & Row, 1962. 140 p.
24. Rosencranz, Mary Lou. Clothing symbolism. Journal of Home Economics 54:18-22. 1962.

25. Stone, Gregory Prentice. Clothing and social relations: a study of appearance in the context of community life. Ph.D. thesis. Chicago, University of Chicago, 1959. 706 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)
26. Stone, Gregory Prentice and William H. Form. The social significance of clothing in occupational life. East Lansing, Michigan, 1955. 53 p. (Michigan. State College. Agricultural Experiment Station. Technical Bulletin 247)
27. Stone, Robert C. and Frederick T. Schlamp. Characteristics associated with receipt and non receipt of financial aid from welfare agencies. Welfare in Review 3:1-11. July 1965.
28. U. S. Bureau of the Census. Current population reports. Washington, D. C., July 1964. 2 p. (Population Estimate Ser. P-25, no. 286)
29. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Advisory Council on Public Welfare. Having the power we have the duty. Washington, D. C., 1966. 148 p.
30. U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Education and training, expanding the choices. Fifth annual report on training activities under manpower, development and training act. Washington, D. C. 1967. 107 p.
31. U. S. Department of Labor. Training of public assistance recipients under the manpower development and training act. Washington, D. C., 1966. 29 p. (Manpower Evaluation Report no. 6)
32. U. S. Department of Labor. Interdepartmental Committee and Citizens' Advisory Council on the Status of Women. Third Annual Report. Report on progress in 1966 on the status of women. Washington, D. C., 1966. 111 p.
33. U. S. Department of Labor. Office of Manpower, Automation and Training. Occupational training of women under the manpower development and training act. Washington, D. C., 1964. 19 p. (Manpower Evaluation Report no. 3)
34. U. S. Office of Economic Opportunity. Catalog of Federal programs for individual and community improvement. Washington, D. C. 1965. 414 p.

35. U. S. President. Economic report of the president: The annual report of the council of economic advisers. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967. 314 p.
36. U. S. President. Manpower report of the president and a report on manpower requirements, resources, utilization and training. Washington, D. C., U. S. Government Printing Office, 1967. 285 p.
37. Work experience and training program under title V of the economic opportunity act of 1964 as amended. Welfare in Review 5:38. April, 1967.
38. Work experience and training program under title V of the economic opportunity act of 1964 as amended. Welfare in Review 5:36-37. June-July, 1967.

APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW GUIDE

APPENDIX A

Interview Guide

Determining the Clothing Needs of
Low-Income Women Enrolled in Work-Training Programs

Use of Interview Guide

This guide is to be used when interviewing public welfare personnel and work-training instructors, to gain information for use in determining the clothing needs of low-income women while they are engaged in work-training programs.

Purpose of Interview

The purpose of this interview is to gain information about the clothing needs of low-income women while they are engaged in work-training programs in community colleges. I would like information from you because you work more closely with the women engaged in work-training programs and probably know more about their needs than anyone else.

The information from this interview will be compiled and used in developing a section of a Master's thesis on the Clothing Selection Practices and Related Clothing Problems of a Selected Group of Low-Income Women, and will later be used in developing a realistic clothing unit to be included in the personal development section of work-training programs conducted at Southwestern Oregon Community College.

Your name will not be used.

Background Information:

City in which interviewee is employed _____.

Position _____ Background _____.

Within the last year approximately how many clients/students have you worked with who were enrolled in work-training programs? _____.

How many of those clients/students were women? _____.

In what types of work-training programs were the female clients/students enrolled? _____.

_____.

(Before beginning the clothing related part of the interview discuss the definitions of the terminology to be used in regard to the training programs and the items of clothing to be considered so that interviewer and interviewee are communicating within the same frame of reference.)

I. Interview Questions:

1. Of what importance is satisfactory clothing to the low-income woman's development and success in the work-training program?

2. What are the characteristics of satisfactory outerwear items needed for classroom use by the work-training student?
3. Would the characteristics of satisfactory outerwear items needed for the on-the-job training period differ from those for classroom use?
4. Should the outerwear items for the job interview differ from those for on-the-job training?
5. Do most of the female clients/students who enter the work-training programs have satisfactory outerwear for classroom use?
6. Do they have satisfactory outerwear for the on-the-job training period?
7. Do they have satisfactory outerwear for the job-interview?

(If answer to 5, 6, or 7 was no, ask one or more of the following questions.)

8. What would be necessary to make the outerwear more satisfactory for classroom use?
9. What would be necessary to make the outerwear more satisfactory for the on-the-job training period?
10. What would be necessary to make the outerwear more satisfactory for the job-interview?

II.

Indicate which of the following outerwear items would be most satisfactory for a wardrobe for classroom wear for a woman entering a work-training program.

Article	Number Needed	Pertinent comments would be helpful
COATS		
___ All-weather		
___ Dressy		
___ Summer		
___ Winter		
___ Raincoat		
___ Carcoat		
___ Jacket type		

Article	Number Needed	Pertinent Comments would be helpful.
<u>SUITS</u>		
___ Dressy		
___ Knit		
___ Sports		
___ Pants		
___ Tailored		
<u>DRESSES</u>		
___ House		
___ Daily		
___ Tailored		
___ Dressy		
<u>SKIRTS</u>		
___ Dressy		
___ Sports		
___ Tailored		
___ Daily		
<u>BLOUSES</u>		
___ Dressy		
___ Sports		
___ Tailored		
___ Daily		
<u>SWEATERS</u>		
___ Pullover		
___ Cardigan		
___ Shell		
___ Dressy		
<u>OTHER GARMENTS</u>		
___ slacks		
___ shorts		
___ Capri-pants		
___ Sweatshirts		
___ Cape		
___ Stole		
___ Culottes		
<u>SHOES</u>		
___ Street		
___ Dressy		
___ Casual		
<u>HOSIERY</u>		
___ Nylon hose		
___ Anklets		
___ Patterned		
<u>HAT</u>		
___ Dressy		
___ Rain		
___ <u>HANDBAG</u>	___ <u>GALOSHES</u>	___ <u>GLOVES</u>

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

I. General Information:

Name of community college in which you are enrolled: Lane _____ Southwestern Oregon _____

Mailing address _____

Type of training program in which you are enrolled:

Manpower Development and Training _____ Economic Opportunity _____ Vocational
Rehabilitation _____ Title V _____ Other _____

Type of occupation you are training for _____

Age: Under 20 _____ 20-30 _____ 31-40 _____ 41-50 _____ Over 50 _____

Total family income before tax deductions: Check (✓) the figures nearest to your family
income for the past year

\$1000-\$2000 _____	\$4001-\$5000 _____	\$7001-\$8000 _____
\$2001-\$3000 _____	\$5001-\$6000 _____	\$8001-\$9000 _____
\$3001-\$4000 _____	\$6001-\$7000 _____	Over \$9000 _____

Number of family members supported by this income _____

Number of children living at home and supported by the family income _____

II. Indicate the number of items, in your present wardrobe, obtained from each source. Place the correct number in each space unless you have placed a 0 in the first column

	Total number in Present Wardrobe	Gift	Handed down	Homemade	Mail Order	Rummage sale	Garage sale	Thrift shop	Discount store	Variety store	Drug store	Supermarket	Department store	Dress shop	Shoe store	Other
Coats																
Suits																
Dresses																
Skirts																
Blouses																
Sweaters																
Pants																
Sweatshirts																
T-shirts																
Capes																
Stoles																
Shoes																
Rainboots																
Hosiery																
Hats																
Handbags																
Gloves																

III. When obtaining outerwear items, how often do you find facilities for trying on the wardrobe items:

_____ Always _____ Sometimes _____ Never

IV. Before you entered the work-training program, how did you consider your wardrobe: Place a check (✓) in the correct space

- _____ Satisfactory for classroom
- _____ Too dressy for classroom wear
- _____ Too casual for classroom wear
- _____ Too worn or shabby for classroom wear
- _____ Lacking in some necessary outerwear items
- _____ Lacking in some accessory items

V. Directions: Please indicate as accurately as possible, the number of wardrobe items in each category by placing the correct number in each space

	Number you owned <u>before</u> entering the work-training program	Number obtained for classroom wear <u>before</u> you entered the program	Number you believe your wardrobe lacked <u>after</u> you entered the program	Number obtained for classroom wear and interviews <u>after</u> you entered the program	Total number now owned for classroom wear and job interviews	Total number now owned only for at-home wear. Do not count items worn for classroom wear and job interviews
<u>COATS</u>						
Jackets						
Carcoat						
Raincoat						
All Purpose						
Dressy						
<u>SUITS</u>						
Sports						
Tailored						
Dressy						
Pants Suit						
<u>DRESSES</u>						
House						
Tailored						
Dressy						
<u>SKIRTS</u>						
Sports						
Tailored						
Dressy						
<u>BLOUSES</u>						
Sports						
Tailored						
Dressy						
<u>SWEATERS</u>						
Pullover						
Cardigan						
Shell						
Dressy						
<u>PANTS</u>						
Jeans						
Cutoffs						
Culottes						
Slacks						
Shorts						
Other Pants						

<u>OTHER OUTERWEAR</u>	Number you owned <u>before</u> entering the work-training program	Number obtained for classroom wear <u>before</u> you entered the program	Number you believe your wardrobe lacked <u>after</u> you entered the program	Number obtained for classroom wear and interviews <u>after</u> you entered the program	Total number now owned for classroom wear and job interviews	Total number now owned only for at-home wear. Do not count items worn for classroom wear and job interviews
Sweatshirts						
T-Shirts						
Capes						
Stoles						
Other						
<u>SHOES</u>						
Casual						
Street						
Dressy						
<u>BOOTS</u>						
Rainboots						
Other Boots						
<u>HOSIERY</u>						
Nylon Hosiery						
Patterned Hosiery						
Footlets						
Anklelets						
Other						
<u>HATS</u>						
Dressy						
Rain						
<u>HANDBAGS</u>						
<u>GLOVES</u>						

VI. Do you sometimes avoid attending certain functions because you believe your clothing is not suitable: _____ Yes _____ No

Indicate which functions you avoid for this reason. Place a check (✓) in the correct space

- _____ Class _____ PTA meetings _____ Club meetings
 _____ Your child's school functions _____ College lectures
 _____ Church _____ Employment interviews
 _____ Other (write in the functions)

VII. Indicate how much the following sources of information influence you when you select outerwear items for your wardrobe. Place a check (✓) in the correct space.

	No influence	Some influence	Great influence
Newspapers			
Magazines			
Radio			
Television			
Husband			
Son			
Father			
Mother			
Daughter			
Other relatives			
Friends			
Neighbors			
Caseworker			
Project director			
Teachers			
Store clerks			
Other			

VIII. Indicate how often you encounter the following problems after obtaining outerwear items for your wardrobe. Place a check (✓) in the correct space.

	Always	Sometimes	Never
Used items lack labels giving care directions			
Poorly constructed items			
Improperly fitting items			
Damaged items			
Soiled items			
Items too dressy for classroom wear			
Items too casual for classroom wear			