

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Linda Courtney Thiel for the Master of Science
(Name of Student) (Degree)

in Clothing, Textiles, and Related Arts presented on August 2, 1967
(Major) (Date)

Title: A GUIDE FOR AN ADEQUATE WARDROBE FOR SPECIFIC
OCCASIONS ENCOUNTERED BY WOMEN STUDENTS ATTENDING
OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

Abstract approved: Redacted for Privacy
Marie Diedesch

This thesis is a study of the types and numbers of items of apparel in a selected group of Oregon State University women's present college wardrobes and in a college wardrobe they consider to be adequate, the occasions for which each type of clothing is worn, the amount of time each type of clothing is worn, and the percentage of the clothing budget to be spent for each type of clothing.

This study was selected because the present information concerning wardrobe needs available to students entering Oregon State University is very limited. Letters were sent to the Deans of Women at 39 colleges and universities in Oregon, Washington, and northern California to determine the amount and type of information concerning clothing that is available to women entering these institutions. The 35 replies received indicated that one college sends incoming

women students a suggested list of minimum and average numbers of items of apparel for their college wardrobes; 13 colleges or universities have publications containing specific information on types of clothing for various occasions, (similar to the information found in Oregon State University's student handbook); 14 colleges or universities have a publication which mentions clothing, and eight colleges or universities have no information available concerning clothing. .

Although little information is available to the college student, the literature reviewed stressed the importance of clothing to the present day university woman. A review of studies concerning the psychological and sociological significance of clothing show that if a woman student has a wardrobe that is adequate for the occasions which arise, she will feel more at ease, be less concerned about her appearance, and therefore, she will be better able to meet the demands of college life.

According to one study reviewed, high school girls think that college women need more clothing than college women consider necessary. Since research found that women buy most of their clothing before they enter college, information concerning a college wardrobe seemed to be an evident need before they arrive on campus. Other studies pointed out that talking to college women was the best source of information on college wardrobe needs. Therefore, a

selected group of women students on the Oregon State University campus was contacted through interviews and questionnaires for their advice regarding a college wardrobe.

Twelve junior or senior women majoring in Clothing, Textiles, and Related Arts were interviewed to ascertain the current terminology used by women students to describe their clothing and the occasions for which each type of clothing was worn. This information was used in the preparation of a questionnaire.

Questionnaires were given to 283 sophomore and junior women students who were registered in the School of Home Economics, had completed a course in clothing selection, and had been admitted to Oregon State University no later than fall term, 1966. Questionnaires were returned by 147 students, and 113 questionnaires met the established criteria. This was a 40 percent useable return of the total number of questionnaires distributed. The data from these questionnaires was compiled by computer and analyzed by the writer.

The data revealed that the respondents owned a mean of 154.92 items of apparel, and they thought a mean of 148.30 items of apparel would be adequate. The sorority women owned more of all types of clothing than did the non-sorority women, and the quantity the sorority women considered to be adequate for all seven types of clothing exceeded the quantity considered adequate by the non-sorority women. However, 81.98 percent of the respondents indicated their

present wardrobes were adequate for the occasions they had encountered at Oregon State University.

The total cost for an adequate wardrobe as indicated by the respondents was a mean of \$1708.73. The percentage of the clothing budget to be spent for each type of clothing was allocated by the respondents as follows: 41.20 percent for campus apparel, 21.37 percent for church or dressy apparel, 9.63 percent for unclassified apparel (undergarments, hosiery, nightwear and loungewear), 9.16 percent for formal apparel, 8.88 percent for casual apparel, 5.27 percent for semi-formal apparel, and 4.49 percent for grubby apparel.

The respondents reported that they wore each type of clothing the following percentage of the time during a school year: campus apparel, 37.09 percent; casual apparel, 26.96 percent; grubby apparel, 26.89 percent; church or dressy apparel, 7.86 percent; semi-formal apparel, .85 percent; and formal apparel, .35 percent.

The percentage of the clothing budget to be spent for each type of clothing (excluding unclassified apparel) was compared to the percentage of the time each type of clothing was worn, but the percentages were not the same for any of the six types of clothing. Campus clothing was worn the highest percentage of the time and was also designated the highest percentage of total cost; semi-formal apparel ranked fifth in both categories, but there was no correlation

between the percentage of time the other types of clothing were worn and the percentage of total cost designated for each.

A total of 67 women or 59.82 percent of the respondents said they brought some clothing to the campus they did not need, and 89 women or 79.46 percent of the respondents reported they needed some items of apparel they did not bring to the campus.

Eleven of the 12 women interviewed indicated the wardrobe requirements would be the same for a woman entering Oregon State University as a freshman, sophomore or junior. Therefore, the writer recommended that the findings of this study, specifically a list of the items of apparel to be included in an adequate wardrobe, should be made available to women students entering Oregon State University.

A Guide for an Adequate Wardrobe for Specific
Occasions Encountered by Women Students
Attending Oregon State University

by

Linda Courtney Thiel

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the

degree of

Master of Science

June 1968

APPROVED:

Redacted for Privacy

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

Redacted for Privacy

Acting Head of Department of Clothing, Textiles and Related Arts

Redacted for Privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented _____

Typed by Jean Nyberg for _____
Linda Courtney Thiel

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer wishes to express her sincere appreciation to her advisor, Marie Diedesch, Associate Professor of Clothing, Textiles, and Related Arts, for her inspiration and competent guidance throughout this study.

Appreciation is expressed to Dr. May DuBois, Professor of Home Economics Education, and the graduate students in Clothing, Textiles, and Related Arts for their suggestions during the development of the questionnaire, to Dr. Roger Peterson and David Niess for their advice on statistics and computer programming, and to the National Science Foundation for the grant to defray the expense of computer processing the data obtained in the questionnaires.

A special thanks is extended to the 12 junior and senior women who participated in the interviews and to the sophomore and junior women who answered the questionnaire.

Deepest gratitude is expressed to my husband, Norman Thiel, whose courage and unselfishness in an adverse situation have made my graduate study possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Need for the Study	1
Purpose and Objectives of the Study	3
The Hypotheses	3
Definition of Terms	4
Limitations of the Study	5
The Assumptions	5
REVIEW OF LITERATURE	7
Psychological and Sociological Significance of Present Day Clothing	7
Current Trends in Wardrobe Planning and Purchasing	10
Sources of Information on Wardrobe Needs	12
Factors Affecting Wardrobe Selection	13
Quantity of Clothing	13
Distribution of Cost	14
Occasions	15
Sorority Identification	16
PROCEDURE AND RESULTS OF THE STUDY	18
Letters to Colleges and Universities	18
Selection of Colleges and Universities	18
Information Received	19
Interviews	22
Purpose of the Interviews	22
Selection of Subjects	22
Procedure Followed	22
Data Obtained	23
Types of clothing	23
Specific occasions for clothing types	26
Items of apparel	28
Wardrobe requirements	29
Questionnaire	29
Purpose of the Questionnaire	29
Selection of Subjects	30
Procedure Followed	30
Analysis of Data	31
Items of apparel owned and the number of items thought to be adequate	32
Items of apparel owned and the number thought to be adequate by sorority and by non-sorority respondents	58

Costs considered average for an adequate wardrobe	67
Frequency of wear for each type of clothing	67
Average cost for each type of clothing compared to frequency of wear	76
Types of clothing brought to the campus and not needed	78
Types of clothing needed and not brought to the campus	79
Adequacy of respondents' present wardrobes	80
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	82
RECOMMENDATIONS	90
BIBLIOGRAPHY	95
APPENDIX A	98
APPENDIX B	99
APPENDIX C	101
APPENDIX D	102
APPENDIX E	107

LIST OF TABLES

Table		
1	Percentage of clothing budget spent on each type of clothes (21, p. 33).	15
2	The source and type of information on wardrobe requirements available to incoming women students at 35 colleges or universities in Oregon, Washington, and northern California.	20
3	The number of women interviewed and the terms they applied to the type of clothing appropriate for six groups of occasions.	24
4	The number of women interviewed who indicated specific occasions for which each type of clothing is appropriate.	27
5	The number of items of apparel in the respondents' present wardrobes and the number of items of apparel in a wardrobe they consider adequate.	61
6	The number of items of apparel included for each type of clothing in the respondents' present wardrobes and in a wardrobe they consider adequate.	66
7	The average cost for each item of apparel and the total cost for the number recommended for an adequate wardrobe.	68
8	The number of times during a school year that each type of clothing was worn.	75
9	The percentage of the total cost of an adequate wardrobe designated for each type of clothing as compared to the percentage of time each type of clothing was worn.	77
10	The number and percentage of respondents who brought to the campus excess items of one or more types of clothing.	79

Table

11	The number and percentage of respondents who needed more items of one or more types of clothing they did not bring to the campus.	80
12	Types of clothing and number of items of apparel suggested for an adequate wardrobe for a woman entering Oregon State University.	92

A GUIDE FOR AN ADEQUATE WARDROBE FOR SPECIFIC
OCCASIONS ENCOUNTERED BY WOMEN STUDENTS
ATTENDING OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY

INTRODUCTION

Most women who enter a university anticipate a profitable experience personally and socially as well as scholastically. Wardrobe requirements are a concern of most women making college plans. Will their present wardrobes be adequate for college or will they need different types of clothing? How large a wardrobe and how many garments of each type will be needed? These and other questions arise, and often information is not available to provide the answers.

This study has been undertaken in an attempt to obtain the necessary information to answer some of these questions.

Need for the Study

The mounting costs involved in obtaining a higher education have led to the study and the publication of information to assist the student with scholastic and financial problems. It is quite easy to determine the requirements for tuition, books, fees, board and room, but information concerning personal needs, including clothing, is scant. Clothing is usually an area of major concern and the largest personal expense for women students.

In past years the Deans of Women at Oregon State University

have indicated that requests for information on wardrobe requirements have been made by girls who plan to enter Oregon State University, and students in clothing selection classes have also indicated that they would have appreciated guidance in wardrobe planning prior to entering the university.

The 1966-67 Oregon State University Bulletin, which is sent to incoming students during the summer prior to their arrival on campus, has one small section concerning campus dress. The information given is limited to less than a half page in a small pamphlet and some statements are out-of-date (13). Since this information was written several years ago and the writer was not able to determine how the information was obtained or by whom it was written, it seems evident a current and scientific study is needed to supply incoming women students with more accurate and up-to-date information to meet their needs.

The Oregon State University handbook, the Beaver Code, is given to all students after they arrive on the campus. It contains a chart titled "Women's Dress Suggestions" which indicates the type of clothing appropriate for various occasions (12). Presently, the information found in the Beaver Code and the Oregon State University Bulletin is all that is available to a student before or after arriving on the Oregon State University campus.

Purpose and Objectives of the Study

The general purpose of this study is to obtain information that can be used by incoming women students as a guide in planning a wardrobe that is adequate for the occasions they may encounter at Oregon State University.

In order to achieve the general purpose of this study specific objectives have been set forth. These objectives are:

1. To classify clothing needs by the occasions for which each type of clothing is worn.
2. To determine the types and numbers of articles needed for an adequate wardrobe for a woman student attending Oregon State University.
3. To determine the amount each type of clothing is worn.
4. To determine the percentage of the clothing budget to be spent for each type of clothing.

The Hypotheses

1. The average wardrobe of the Oregon State University home economics women student exceeds a wardrobe they will establish as adequate.
2. The quantity of clothing considered to be adequate will increase with affiliation with a sorority.

3. The percentage of the clothing budget the respondents will recommend for each type of clothing will not be the same as the percentage of the time it is worn.
4. Women entering the university generally bring more semi-formal apparel than they need.
5. Women entering the university generally bring more campus clothing than they need.
6. Women entering the university generally do not bring some items of apparel they need after they arrive on campus.

Definition of Terms

1. Adequate wardrobe -- garments and accessories appropriate in number and type for the variety of occasions encountered at Oregon State University.
2. Core curriculum -- courses that are required for all students registered in the School of Home Economics.
3. Item of apparel -- a specific garment or piece of clothing, namely a coat, dress, or skirt, and accessories worn in pairs such as shoes or gloves.
4. Occasion -- a particular event.
5. Type of clothing -- a classification of apparel into groups as determined by the occasions for which it is worn.
6. Women students -- female persons of the average under-

graduate age engaged in a course of study at the university level.

Limitations of the Study

The clothing requirements to be considered in this study will be determined for a school year beginning in September and ending in June and will include only the clothing required for campus life and campus related activities.

This study will include factors concerning outergarments, shoes, hosiery, hats and handbags, but it will not include information regarding special sportswear or small accessories such as belts, neck scarfs or jewelry.

The subjects responding, by means of a questionnaire, will be limited to sophomore or junior women attending Oregon State University during 1967 who are registered in the School of Home Economics and are enrolled in home economics classes in the core curriculum. The subjects must have completed the course entitled Clothing Selection at Oregon State University or the equivalent at another college or university.

The Assumptions

1. The goal of a college woman is maximum satisfaction for time and money spent in planning and purchasing her wardrobe.

2. Having the accepted clothing for each occasion is important to a college woman.
3. Freshmen women are not as qualified as sophomore and junior women to give advice on wardrobe needs because they have not completed a school year on the Oregon State University campus.
4. Sophomores and juniors are equally qualified to give advice on wardrobe needs because they have lived through at least one school year on the university campus.
5. Senior women are beginning to plan their post-college wardrobe and are not as interested in a college wardrobe as are sophomore and junior women.
6. Junior and senior Clothing, Textile, and Related Arts majors, selected upon recommendation of some Clothing, Textile, and Related Arts faculty members, are qualified to determine the types of clothing appropriate for various occasions and the current terminology used in describing this clothing.
7. The wardrobe that is thought to be adequate by home economics students will be typical of students in other areas of study on the same campus. This assumption is based on the findings of Phyllis Hardy Atherton at Pennsylvania State College (2, p. 26) and Mary S. Ryan at Cornell University (19, p. 15).

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Psychological and Sociological Significance of Present Day Clothing

The psychological and sociological importance of clothing as part of the culture of the United States during the Twentieth Century has been the topic of many studies. As early as 1918 George Van Ness Dearborn thought that comfort was the prime consideration in the physiology and psychology of clothing. He stated,

Being well dressed . . . is part of the essential ratio between happiness and personal ability and efficiency which I am continually trying to emphasize (6, p. 53).

In 1926 Grace Morton, Head of the Textiles and Clothing Division at the University of Nebraska, wrote an article concerning the psychology of dress that appeared in the Journal of Home Economics. She said,

Clothes help to make us self-confident, self-respecting, jolly, free or they make us self-conscious, shy, sensitive, restrained. They determine how much we go into society, the places we go to, the exercise we take. They help us to get jobs and to hold them, to miss them and to lose them (10, p. 585).

In a paper presented at the 1948 Conference of College Teachers of Textiles and Clothing in New York City, Dr. George W. Hartmann, professor of educational psychology at Teachers College, Columbia University, reinforced the psychological importance of clothing. He said that no one can question that clothing has been, is and

presumably always will be both a prominent personal problem and a major social issue (8, p. 298). Dr. Hartman pointed out the importance of clothing and a person's attitude toward clothing when he stated,

Eduationally, clothing is a persistent 'interest center' in everyone's life. Though it varies greatly in intensity and expression, few would deny that it is one of life's fundamentals. Yet, curiously enough, most people also make an essentially superficial approach to this ever-recurring topic, as though a feeling of being engaged in the trivial were inseparable from it (8, p. 295).

During recent years many studies have been undertaken to learn more about the psychological and sociological affects of clothing on individuals. In 1952 Mary S. Ryan conducted a survey of the opinions of college girls at Cornell University in regard to the confidence, or lack of confidence, they felt concerning their clothing. She found that 80 percent of the women felt that it was very important to be well dressed, and only three percent said that being well dressed was not important. Over half of the women said that being well dressed meant having clothing appropriate for the occasion. A significant relationship was found between how well dressed they felt, the number of articles they felt a woman needed, and the actual number of articles owned. The reasons given for the importance of being well dressed were: 1) When the women were well dressed, they were less self-conscious and could forget themselves, please others, and think of other things. 2) By being well dressed the women could gain the

desired ends socially, attract the opposite sex, and obtain a job.

3) Being well dressed is a means of expressing one's personality and mood. 4) Being well dressed can compensate for deficiencies in other areas (19, p. 30-31). In analyzing the results of her study Ryan concluded,

If the girl feels well dressed, she thinks that she is apt to be more talkative, peppier, can enter more into the activities at hand and feel a part of the group. When a girl feels poorly dressed, she thinks that she is quieter, self-conscious, that she tries to keep away from the center of activity, and she may feel that she is a spectator and not a part of the group (17, p. 799).

The importance of clothing to the college age person was stressed by Dr. Adeline M. Hoffman, Chairman of the Department of Clothing and Textiles in the School of Home Economics at Southern Illinois University. In 1963 in an article in the Journal of Home Economics she stated,

. . . Clothing is an important center of interest in the lives of most people and takes on its greatest importance in adolescence and early adulthood. Clothing is not only a major category of expenditure but also an important area of personal satisfaction and a means of social identification (9, p. 665).

Although reports suggested that at some schools like New York University many students have created their own fashion as a result of non-conformity, this does not hold true for all schools (4, p. 44). Bernard Snyder, an Austin clothier whose shops are favored by University of Texas students, says that students conform beautifully.

He reports that most co-eds are style conscious, tend to conform and really go for a fashion if it is new and fits in with their regular thinking (4, p. 63).

The sources cited reveal that the clothing one wears has an influence on one's social adjustment and psychological well being. With these facts in mind, this study has been undertaken to provide information for women students who will attend Oregon State University. This guide should be helpful in planning their wardrobes before they arrive on campus. Based on the resource literature, it seems apparent that if a woman student has a wardrobe that is adequate for the occasions which arise, she will feel more at ease, be less concerned about her appearance, and therefore, she will be better able to meet the demands of college life.

Because schools of Home Economics have recognized the importance of the sociological and psychological aspects of clothing, a doctoral degree is offered in this area at several universities.

Current Trends in Wardrobe Planning and Purchasing

An article which appeared in the August, 1965 issue of Seventeen magazine noted that clothes vary from campus to campus, but that the dress is usually casual and study grubbies, consisting of cut-off jeans and shirts or sweatshirts, are essential from coast to coast. Clothes that are comfortable, appropriate, reasonably

wrinkle free and easy to care for are recommended (23).

In an article concerning college wardrobe planning in the 1967 edition of Off To College, the editors of Mademoiselle magazine advised college freshmen to start college with a basic wardrobe. The editors emphasized that the student must not buy too much before going to college, but should save some money for special items later on. They pointed out that geographical location is an important consideration in wardrobe planning because of the climatic and regional differences in the way students dress (14).

A Fairchild News Service survey conducted in 1966 indicated that wardrobe costs for women can be estimated at two hundred dollars to five hundred dollars per year. Estimates given for West Coast schools indicated five hundred dollars for Stanford University and three hundred dollars for the University of California at Berkely. The survey found that incoming freshmen generally buy more than the returning student and that the longer a woman is in college, the less she buys. Most of the freshmen shopped at home, but upper-class women tended to wait and shop at familiar local stores near the campus (1).

In a study made at Purdue University in 1957, Madeline Russel found that 46 percent of the freshmen that were studied purchased most of the new items in their wardrobes the summer before entering school (16, p. 37).

Sources of Information on Wardrobe Needs

Russell's study revealed that the most useful source of information about college wardrobe needs was college friends (16, p. 37). In Laura Jean Turner's study at Kansas State University in 1964, 91.22 percent of the respondents rated talking to college women as a good source of information on type and quantity of apparel needed. Visiting the college campus was also rated as a good source of information by 85.97 percent of the respondents. High school friends, older brothers, and college catalogs were rated as poor sources of information on wardrobe needs (21, p.22). The Russell and Turner studies corroborated the suggestion made in Seventeen magazine that the best way to find out about wardrobe needs is to talk to college students and keep alert on campus visits (23).

Additional sources of information mentioned as being helpful in wardrobe planning are magazines and college boards in department stores (14). In a study made at Kansas State University in 1965, Elaine Carlson found that 150 of the 194 freshmen women studied looked at fashions in magazines before buying (5, p. 26). However, these sources of information were not rated for effectiveness.

If it is true that the incoming freshman buys more before coming to college than the returning student, it is especially important that she is provided with adequate information to determine the apparel

she will need.

Factors Affecting Wardrobe Selection

Quantity of clothing needed by college and university women, the distribution of cost for the various types of clothing, occasions encountered by college and university women, and sorority identification as an influence on clothing requirements are factors to be considered in this study. Other research in which these factors have been studied is cited to establish a framework of reference for this study.

Quantity of Clothing

Ryan found in her study that high school girls thought college girls needed more clothes than the college girls considered necessary. This corroborated the feeling among most of the college girls interviewed at Cornell University that freshmen brought too many clothes. However, the study showed that the college girls owned more clothes than the high school girls. The explanation for this was that the college girls were still wearing clothes they had in high school (18, p. 7).

In 1964 Turner interviewed 60 senior women at Kansas State University to determine the general types of apparel and the quantity considered necessary for a freshman woman's wardrobe. A list of

the items and the number of each considered necessary as determined by the mean and the mode is included in Appendix E (21).

A study was conducted by Henrietta Thompson and Mary Neville Edmonds at the University of Alabama in 1960 to determine a minimum college wardrobe for a freshman. Opinions were obtained from freshmen and senior women concerning outer garments essential for a minimum wardrobe. The seniors recommended more skirts, bobby socks, and lightweight church and street dresses than did the freshmen. The freshmen recommended slightly more tailored suits, lightweight school dresses, formals, blouses, evening shoes, hats and gloves than did the seniors. Both groups agreed on all other items (20).

Distribution of Cost

Turner asked the women to indicate the percentage of the clothing budget to be spent on each type of clothing for low, moderate, and high budgets. The largest percentage at all three levels was spent for school clothes. The percentage spent for play clothes and party clothes increased proportionately with the increase in expenditure. The percentage spent for dress clothing remained quite constant at all three levels. For comparison, the results are given in Table 1 (21, p. 33).

Table 1. Percentage of clothing budget spent on each type of clothes (21, p. 33).

Type of Clothes	Moderate Percentage	Low Percentage	High Percentage
School clothes	40.9 - 44.9	45.2 - 54.4	35.9 - 39.9
Dress clothes	18.4 - 22.5	19.0 - 22.9	19.0 - 23.3
Play clothes	12.9 - 16.9	11.0 - 15.0	14.0 - 18.0
Party clothes	12.9 - 16.9	9.5 - 13.7	15.6 - 19.6

In doctoral research conducted at Ohio State University in 1961, Charlotte Wolf Baumgartner found quality was less important than quantity or style in determining the individuals satisfaction with their wardrobes (3, p. 204). However, in regard to quality, 94.73 percent of the women in Turner's study thought the student with a low budget should buy fewer, high quality items (21, p. 34).

Occasions

In Russell's study 135 of the 162 students questioned said they did not have the appropriate apparel for some occasions they had encountered (16, p. 37). In a 1964 study at Iowa State University, Mary Lee Glenn found 24 of the 40 women she interviewed had brought at least one garment they later decided was inappropriate for their college wardrobe (7, p. 26-27).

The general types of apparel established by Turner included church or occasions where church clothes are worn, formal dress,

school clothes, and sportswear. She found that school clothes were worn for local shopping, informal dates, varsity sports events, class, campus meetings, and the library. Church clothes were worn for shopping in large cities, Sunday dress dinners and dates, church, teas, concerts, plays, banquets, and homecoming. Hats were a part of the ensemble for church and teas. Sportswear was worn for intramural sports events (21, p. 37-38).

Thompson and Edmonds' study indicated that clothes similar to those listed by Turner were appropriate with one exception. The women at the University of Alabama wore suits or street dresses and hats to football games (20).

Sorority Identification

Forty-four percent of the women studied by Thompson and Edmonds belonged to sororities. They found that a woman belonging to a sorority would need more dressy clothes than the non-sorority woman (20). Turner found that 71.43 percent of the sorority women and 62.07 percent of the non-sorority women felt it took more clothes to belong to a sorority (21, p. 42).

A study made by Elizabeth Craft Patton in 1964 at the University of Alabama confirmed her hypothesis that sorority women would be more aware of the prestige factors in clothing than non-sorority women. This hypothesis was found to be highly

significant (15, p. 68).

Baumgartner's study revealed that identification with a fraternal organization was the most discriminating of all variables studied in determining clothing expenditure (3, p. 199).

PROCEDURE AND RESULTS OF THE STUDY

Since the purpose of this study was to obtain information concerning wardrobe requirements to be used by women students planning to attend Oregon State University, the writer first wanted to find out what publications or sources of information on wardrobe requirements some other western colleges and universities had available for their students. Therefore, the first step in the procedure was to write letters to colleges and universities to request this information. The second step was to interview Oregon State University women to learn the current terminology used by the students to describe their clothing and the occasions for which each type of clothing was worn. This information was needed before the questionnaire could be constructed. The third step was to construct, distribute, compile, and analyze the questionnaire.

Letters to Colleges and Universities

Selection of Colleges and Universities

Letters were sent to the Deans of Women at colleges and universities in Oregon, Washington, and northern California to request information concerning wardrobe needs that is available to women entering their institution. The selection of the colleges and universities was based on the following criteria. First, it must be located

in the states of Oregon, Washington or California north of 36 degrees latitude. South of this latitude the climate is much different from the Willamette Valley where Oregon State University is located and definite changes of seasons do not occur. Second, the institution must have an enrollment of at least 500 students as determined by their 1964 enrollment figures (22). Third, the college or university must grant at least a bachelor's degree.

Information Received

Thirty-nine institutions met the established criteria and letters requesting the desired information were sent to the Deans of Women (Appendix A and B). Thirty-five replies were received. The most common source of information on wardrobe requirements was found in Associated Women Students' publications. Twelve colleges or universities sent the writer this type of publication which included a section on dress. Student handbooks from nine colleges or universities included limited information on wardrobe needs. Other sources of information on wardrobe requirements included a Young Women's Christian Association handbook, Dean of Students communique, dormitory brochures, letters to new students, and pages from unidentified publications.

As indicated in Table 2, the written material received by the writer was grouped according to the amount and comprehensiveness

of information on wardrobe requirements that it contained. Eight colleges or universities reported that they had no pamphlet or letter available for incoming students. Seven schools have publications that include a general paragraph about wardrobe requirements. These general paragraphs appeared in student handbooks at four colleges or universities, in one Associated Women Students' publication, in one Young Women's Christian Association publication, and in one unidentified publication. Two of the publications listed were from the same college.

Table 2. The source and type of information on wardrobe requirements available to incoming women students at 35 colleges or universities in Oregon, Washington, and northern California.

Type of Information	Associated Women Students' Publication	Student Handbook	Other*	Total
No information				8
General paragraph	1	4	2	7**
Limited information on dress for occasions	1	4	2	7
Specific information on dress for groups of occasions	10	0	3	13
Specific list of items			1	1

*The term other includes letters, Young Women's Christian Association handbook, Dean of Students communique, dormitory brochures, and information from unidentified sources.

**One college sent both the Associated Women Students publication and the student handbook which each had a paragraph on dress.

Limited information on dress for various occasions is available at seven colleges or universities as presented in four student handbooks, in one Associated Women Students' publication, in a residence hall pamphlet, and a directive for women students.

Specific information on dress for various occasions or groups of occasions is available at 13 colleges or universities. Detailed information appeared in Associated Women Students' publications from ten colleges or universities. At three other colleges or universities similar information is given in a mimeographed list of guidelines for student dress, in a residence hall leaflet, and in one unidentified publication. One college sends to incoming women students a specific list of minimum and average numbers of items suggested for her college wardrobe.

The women's dress suggestions given in the Oregon State University student handbook, the Beaver Code 1966-67, would be classified as containing specific information on dress for groups of occasions. The information included in this section of the student handbook was assembled by a small group appointed by the Associated Women Students (12).

Interviews

Purpose of the Interviews

Interviews were set up to collect information that would be helpful in formulating the questionnaire to be used in this study. The purpose of the interviews was to ascertain the current terminology used by Oregon State University women students to describe: 1) the general groups or types of clothing they now own, 2) the occasions for which each type of clothing is worn, and 3) the items of apparel included in each of these groups.

Selection of Subjects

Twelve Oregon State University women majoring in Clothing, Textiles, and Related Arts were selected upon recommendation of Clothing, Textile and Related Arts faculty members. Three junior sorority women, three senior sorority women, three junior independent or non-sorority women and three senior non-sorority women were selected to represent both the sorority and independent women students' viewpoints.

Procedure Followed

Personal interviews of one half to one hour in length were conducted by the writer. The same questions were asked during

each interview, and the writer used the same format to record the replies given by each woman. The following questions were asked by the writer.

1. What occasions are encountered by an Oregon State University woman that influence wardrobe requirements?
2. What type of clothing is appropriate for each of these occasions?
3. Group occasions together that require the same type of clothing. What term would you apply to the apparel appropriate for each group of occasions?
4. What items of apparel would be included in each group of occasions?
5. Would the wardrobe requirements for an entering freshman differ from those for a sophomore or junior transfer student? If so, how?

Data Obtained

Types of clothing. Since six women or half of the group interviewed divided the types of clothing appropriate for related occasions into six separate groups, these six groups are used. Four women indicated that five groups were sufficient, and two women said that seven groups were needed. The women who listed five groups combined two groups which were listed separately by the women who

indicated six groups. Those listing seven groups divided one of the groups listed by the women who indicated six groups.

Table 3 gives the number of women who indicated each term as it applied to the type of clothing appropriate for six groups of occasions. Some women indicate more than one term for each group; therefore, each column will not total twelve.

Table 3. The number of women interviewed and the terms they applied to the type of clothing appropriate for six groups of occasions.

Group I	Group II	Group III	Group IV	Group V	Group VI
8 Grubby	7 Casual	12 Campus	10 Church	10 Semi-	12 Formal
4 Grubby-grubby	5 Nice	3 Dressy campus	3 Dressy campus	formal	
1 Double grubby	1 Dressy grubby	2 Nice campus			
	1 Good grubby				

Group I, the most informal type of clothing, was called grubby by eight women, grubby-grubby by four women and double grubby by one woman who divided the group to include both grubby and double grubby. Group I will hereafter be called grubby.

Group II, the type of clothing that was not quite as informal as grubby, was called casual by seven women, nice grubby by five women, dressy grubby by one woman and good grubby by one woman. One woman indicated that the type of clothing could be called either

nice grubby or casual, and one woman indicated the group should be divided into two groups called nice grubby and casual. Group II will hereafter be called casual.

Group III, the type of clothing that was not as informal as casual, was called campus by all 12 women interviewed. Five women indicated that this group should include a more dressy form of campus wear which was called dressy campus by three women and nice campus by two women. Group III will hereafter be called campus.

Group IV, the type of clothing that is more formal than campus, was called church by ten women, dressy by three women and dressy campus by three women. Two women indicated the group could be called either church or dressy, and one woman thought it could be called church or dressy campus. Group IV will hereafter be called church.

Group V, a more formal type of clothing than church, was called semi-formal by ten women, and two women thought that no semi-formal group was necessary. Group V will hereafter be called semi-formal.

Group VI, the most formal type of clothing, was called formal by all 12 women. However, two women thought that groups V and VI could be combined and called semi-formal and formal. Group VI will hereafter be called formal.

No effort was made to name the group of clothing that includes

undergarments, hosiery, nightwear, and loungewear since most of these items are not worn for any specific group of occasions. For identification this group of items will hereafter be called unclassified.

Specific occasions for clothing types. Each woman interviewed grouped together the occasions for which each type of clothing would be appropriate. The list of occasions was not presented by the writer but supplied by each woman; therefore, all of the women may not have recalled or had not experienced the same occasions. This may be the reason many occasions were mentioned by only a small number of women (Table 4).

From three to five women indicated grubby attire is appropriate for grubby dances, picnics, studying and the beach. Exchanges, firesides, fraternity functions, and lounging were each mentioned by one woman as being occasions for which grubby attire could be worn.

Three or four women said casual attire is worn for casual dances, informal dates, picnics and the beach. Occasions cited by one or two women were bowling, casual parties, exchanges, intramural spectator sports, and tennis.

All 12 women interviewed stated that campus attire is worn for classes. Other occasions mentioned by four to seven women were home games, movies, library, dates, shopping in Corvallis, and Memorial Union dances. One or two women mentioned exchanges,

Table 4. The number of women interviewed who indicated specific occasions for which each type of clothing is appropriate.

Grubby	Casual	Campus	Church	Semi-formal	Formal
5 Grubby dance	4 Casual dance	12 Classes 7 Home game	10 Teas 9 Church	4 Campus dance	5 Campus dance
4 Picnic	4 Informal date	6 Movies 5 Library	9 Concert 7 Dress dinner	3 Concert 2 Banquets 2 Sorority banquet	1 House dance 1 Sorority initiation
3 Beach	4 Picnic	4 Dates	4 Dinner out	1 Dinner out	
1 Exchanges	3 Beach	4 Local shopping	3 Portland games	1 House dance	
1 Firesides	2 Bowling	4 Memorial Union dance	2 Banquets		
1 Fraternity function	2 Casual party	2 Exchanges	2 Portland shopping		
1 Lounging	2 Exchanges 2 Intramural spectator sports 1 Tennis	2 Portland shopping 1 Bowling 1 Fireside 1 Meetings	1 Dates 1 Plays 1 Reception 1 Wedding		

shopping in Portland, bowling, firesides, and meetings as being appropriate occasions for campus attire.

From seven to ten women said church attire is worn for teas, church, concerts, and dress dinners. Dinner out, Portland games, banquets, Portland shopping trips, dates, plays, receptions, and weddings were each listed by one to four women as being occasions for which church attire is appropriate.

Three or four women said semi-formal attire is appropriate for campus dances and concerts. Banquets, sorority banquets, dinner out, and house dances were indicated by one or two women as occasions when semi-formal attire is worn.

Five women said formal attire is worn for campus dances. House dances and sorority initiation were each listed by one woman as being occasions for which formal attire is worn.

Items of apparel. The 12 women interviewed were asked to indicate the items of apparel that would be included for each group of occasions. At times the same item was listed by an individual as belonging to two groups, although the writer requested each item be listed in the group for which it is most often worn. In Appendix C each item of apparel appears in the group indicated by the majority of the women. Items of apparel mentioned by only one woman are not included.

Wardrobe requirements. Six of the women interviewed thought the wardrobe requirements for an entering freshman would be the same as those for a sophomore or junior transfer student. Five women said the wardrobe requirements for a freshman, sophomore, and junior student would be about the same. One woman thought the junior student would need more church clothes and would have different tastes.

Questionnaire

Purpose of the Questionnaire

The questionnaire was composed to determine:

1. The average number of each specific item of apparel presently owned by Oregon State University women students.
2. The number of each item of apparel they consider to be adequate.
3. The cost they consider average for each item of apparel.
4. The number of times each type of clothing is worn.
5. The type of clothing women students bring to the campus and do not need.
6. The type of clothing women students do not bring to the campus and need after they arrive.

Selection of Subjects

The following criteria were established as requirements to be met by the subjects for this study:

1. A sophomore or junior woman student attending Oregon State University during 1967.
2. Registration in the School of Home Economics and enrollment in a home economics class in the core curriculum.
3. Completion of the course Clothing Selection or the equivalent at another college or university.
4. Admittance to Oregon State University no later than fall term 1966.

Procedure Followed

The questionnaire was composed using the information obtained during the 12 interviews with junior and senior Clothing, Textile and Related Arts majors. One professor of Home Economics Education and five graduate students in the Department of Clothing, Textiles and Related Arts read the questionnaire and offered comments and suggestions for improvement. Revisions were made for clarity and ease in responding. The questionnaire was then checked for computer programming by a member of the Statistics Department at Oregon State University.

Eight sophomore or junior women enrolled in the course entitled Clothing Selection were asked to pretest the questionnaire and make comments or suggestions. Only three questionnaires were returned to the writer and these were checked to determine clarity. Before final distribution deletions and changes were made.

Home economics faculty teaching classes included in the core curriculum were contacted, and their permission was obtained to distribute the questionnaires in their classes. The writer spoke to each class very briefly to explain the study and to request the students' cooperation.

A total of 283 questionnaires were distributed in 20 classes. Of the 147 questionnaires completed and returned, 113 questionnaires met the established criteria and were useable for this study. These were then submitted for computer programming.

Analysis of Data

When the questionnaires were computer programmed they were divided into two groups: the respondents who were affiliated with a sorority and those who were not affiliated with a sorority. All data was recorded for each group separately, and the total data for the sorority and non-sorority women was recorded. The information regarding sorority and non-sorority respondents was not required for all parts of the study, but the results have been included in the tables

for future reference. Only that data relevant to this study as determined by the purpose and hypotheses has been analyzed.

Items of apparel owned and the number of items thought to be adequate. The respondents owned a mean of 154.92 items of apparel, and they thought a mean of 148.30 items of apparel would be adequate. The respondents owned more grubby, campus and unclassified items of apparel than they considered necessary for an adequate wardrobe. They owned fewer casual, church or dressy, semi-formal and formal items of apparel than they thought to be adequate.

Specific information about each item of apparel appears in Table 5, and the number of items of apparel included for each type of clothing appears in Table 6. The information pertaining to the range of items owned and items thought to be adequate was obtained from the computer data sheets and does not appear in either table.

As indicated in Table 6, a mean of 12.23, a median of 12, and a mode of ten grubby items of apparel were owned by the respondents. A mean of 11.91, a median of 11, and a mode of ten grubby items of apparel were thought to be adequate.

As indicated in Table 5, the respondents owned a mean of .74 parkas, and they thought a mean of 1.02 parkas would be adequate. The number of parkas owned ranged from zero reported by 40

women to three indicated by three women. The mode and the median of one parka were owned by 65 women. The number of parkas thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by ten women to two parkas recommended by 12 women. The mode and the median of one parka were thought to be adequate by 91 women.

A mean of .66 windbreakers was owned by the respondents, and a mean of .93 windbreakers was considered to be adequate. The number of windbreakers owned ranged from the mode of zero reported by 52 women to three windbreakers owned by one woman. The median of one windbreaker was owned by 49 respondents. The number of windbreakers considered adequate ranged from zero indicated by 21 women to three windbreakers thought necessary by one woman. The mode and the median of one windbreaker were thought to be adequate by 80 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 3.26 sweatshirts, and they thought a mean of 2.58 sweatshirts would be required for an adequate wardrobe. The number of sweatshirts owned ranged from zero reported by seven women to nine sweatshirts owned by one woman. The mode and the median of three sweatshirts were owned by 29 women. The number of sweatshirts thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by one woman to eight sweatshirts recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of two sweatshirts were thought to be adequate by 49 women.

A mean of 1.96 jerseys or tee shirts was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 1.64 jerseys or tee shirts was considered to be adequate. The number of jerseys or tee shirts owned ranged from the mode of zero reported by 41 women to 20 jerseys or tee shirts owned by one woman. The median of one jersey or tee shirt was owned by 19 women. The number of jerseys or tee shirts considered to be adequate ranged from the mode of zero indicated by 31 women to seven jerseys or tee shirts recommended by one woman. The median of one jersey or tee shirt was thought to be adequate by 30 respondents.

A mean of 1.66 pairs of cut-offs was owned by the respondents. They considered a mean of 1.82 pairs of cut-offs to be adequate. The number of cut-offs owned ranged from zero reported by 23 women to seven pairs of cut-offs owned by one woman. Thirty-six women owned the mode and the median of two pairs of cut-offs. The number of cut-offs thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by ten women to four pairs of cut-offs recommended by five women. The mode and the median of two pairs of cut-offs were considered to be adequate by 52 women.

The mean number of jeans owned by the respondents was 1.66 pairs, and a mean of 1.75 pairs of jeans was thought to be adequate. The number of jeans owned ranged from zero reported by 21 women to seven pairs of jeans owned by one woman. The mode and the

median of two pairs of jeans were owned by 36 women. The number of jeans thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 12 women to five pairs of jeans recommended by two women. The mode and the median of two pairs of jeans were considered adequate by 51 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 2.29 pairs of tennis shoes, and they thought a mean of 2.17 pairs of tennis shoes would be adequate. The number of pairs of tennis shoes owned by the respondents ranged from zero reported by three women to six pairs owned by one woman. Thirty-four women owned the mode and the median of two pairs of tennis shoes. The number of tennis shoes thought adequate ranged from one pair indicated by 16 women to four pairs suggested by six women. The mode and the median of two pairs of tennis shoes were thought to be adequate by 68 women.

As indicated in Table 6, a mean of 12.63, a median of 11, and a mode of nine casual items of apparel were owned by the respondents. A mean of 14.02, a median of 14, and a mode of 11 casual items of apparel were thought to be adequate.

As indicated in Table 5, a mean of .67 car coats was owned by the respondents, and they considered a mean of .87 car coats to be adequate. The number of car coats owned ranged from zero reported by 51 women to four car coats owned by one woman. The mode and the median of one car coat were owned by 52 women. The

number of carcoats thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 21 women to two car coats suggested by six women. The mode and the median of one car coat were thought to be adequate by 86 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 2.74 shifts, and they thought a mean of 2.99 shifts would be adequate. The number of shifts owned ranged from zero reported by 11 women to nine indicated by two women. The mode and the median of three shifts were owned by 29 women. The number of shifts thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by three women to nine suggested by one woman. The mode of two shifts was considered adequate by 39 women, and the median of three shifts was thought to be adequate by 27 women.

A mean of 3.52 pairs of capris or long pants was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 3.57 pairs of capris or long pants was considered to be adequate. The number of capris or long pants owned ranged from zero reported by three women to nine pairs indicated by three women. The mode of two pairs of capris or long pants was owned by 28 women and the median of three pairs of capris or long pants was owned by 20 women. The number of capris or long pants considered adequate ranged from one pair indicated by one woman to nine pairs suggested by one woman. The mode and the median of three pairs of capris or long pants were thought to be adequate by 39 women.

A mean of 2.83 bermudas was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 3.15 bermudas was thought to be adequate. The number of bermudas owned ranged from zero reported by nine women to nine pairs owned by one woman. The mode and the median of two pairs of bermudas were owned by 33 women. The number of bermudas considered adequate ranged from zero indicated by three women to eight pairs suggested by one woman. The mode of two pairs of bermudas was thought to be adequate by 34 women, and the median of three pairs of bermudas was considered adequate by 32 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 1.24 casual sets, and they thought a mean of 1.90 casual sets would be adequate. The number of casual sets owned ranged from the mode of zero reported by 44 women to eight casual sets owned by one woman. The median of one casual set was owned by 33 women. The number of casual sets considered adequate ranged from zero indicated by 12 women to five casual sets recommended by four women. The mode and the median of two casual sets were thought to be adequate by 48 women.

A mean of 1.63 pairs of sandals was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 1.54 pairs of sandals was thought to be adequate. The number of pairs of sandals owned ranged from zero reported by ten women to seven pairs owned by one woman. The mode and the median of one pair of sandals were owned by 48 women. The number of pairs of sandals thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by three

women to three pairs of sandals suggested by six women. One and two pairs of sandals were each thought to be adequate by 52 women. The median was determined to be two pairs of sandals.

As indicated in Table 6, a mean of 62.16, a median of 55, and a mode of 52 items of apparel for campus wear were owned by the respondents. A mean of 54.28, a median of 51, and a mode of 53 items of apparel for campus wear were thought to be adequate.

As indicated in Table 5, the respondents owned a mean of 1.21 campus coats, and they thought a mean of 1.15 campus coats would be required for an adequate wardrobe. The number of campus coats owned ranged from zero reported by nine women to three indicated by five women. The mode and the median of one campus coat were owned by 76 women. The number of campus coats thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by one woman to five suggested by one woman. The mode and the median of one campus coat were considered adequate by 98 women.

A mean of 1.14 raincoats was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 1.11 raincoats was thought to be adequate. The number of raincoats owned ranged from zero reported by 16 women to four owned by one woman. The mode and the median of one raincoat were owned by 72 women. The number of raincoats thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by four women to three recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of one raincoat were

considered adequate by 94 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 1.43 lightweight casual suits, and they thought a mean of 1.56 lightweight casual suits would be adequate. The number of lightweight casual suits owned ranged from zero reported by 28 women to eight owned by one woman. The mode and the median of one lightweight casual suit were owned by 40 women. The number of lightweight casual suits thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by nine women to five suggested by one woman. The mode and the median of one lightweight casual suit were considered adequate by 50 women.

A mean of 1.30 winter-weight casual suits was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 1.64 winter-weight casual suits was thought to be adequate. The number of winter-weight casual suits owned ranged from zero reported by 35 women to six winter-weight casual suits owned by one woman. The mode and the median of one winter-weight casual suit were owned by 38 women. The number of winter-weight casual suits thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 13 women to eight suits suggested by one woman. The mode and the median of two winter-weight casual suits were considered adequate by 45 women.

A mean of 5.50 lightweight casual dresses was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 5.20 lightweight casual dresses was thought to be adequate. The number of lightweight casual dresses

owned ranged from zero reported by five women to 20 lightweight casual dresses owned by each of two women. The mode of four lightweight casual dresses was owned by 16 women, and the median of five lightweight casual dresses was owned by 14 women. The number of lightweight casual dresses thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by three women to 20 lightweight casual dresses suggested by one woman. The mode and the median of five lightweight casual dresses were considered to be adequate by 25 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 2.84 winter-weight casual dresses, and they thought a mean of 3.30 winter-weight casual dresses would be adequate. The number of winter-weight casual dresses owned ranged from the mode of zero reported by 21 women to nine reported by three women. The median of two winter-weight casual dresses was owned by 18 women. The number of winter-weight casual dresses thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by ten women to nine winter-weight casual dresses suggested by one woman. The mode of four winter-weight casual dresses was recommended by 24 women, and the median of three winter-weight casual dresses was considered adequate by 21 women.

A mean of 1.69 jumpers was owned by the respondents, and they considered a mean of 1.87 jumpers to be adequate. The number of jumpers owned ranged from the mode of zero reported by 31 women to nine jumpers owned by one woman. The median of one jumper

was owned by 28 women. The number of jumpers thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 17 women to nine jumpers suggested by one woman. The mode and the median of two jumpers were considered adequate by 45 women.

A mean of 10.57 skirts was owned by the respondents, and they thought a mean of 7.98 skirts would be adequate. The number of skirts owned ranged from zero reported by one woman to 36 skirts owned by one woman. The mode and the median of ten skirts were owned by 21 women. The number of skirts thought to be adequate ranged from one indicated by one woman to 22 suggested by one woman. The mode of ten was thought to be adequate by 32 women, and the median of eight was considered to be adequate by 11 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 9.91 sweaters, and they thought a mean of 7.70 sweaters would be adequate. The number of sweaters owned ranged from two sweaters reported by three women to 25 sweaters reported by two women. The mode and the median of ten sweaters were owned by 17 women. The number of sweaters thought to be adequate ranged from three sweaters indicated by four women to 15 sweaters suggested by five women. The mode of five sweaters was considered to be adequate by 26 women, and the median of seven sweaters was thought to be adequate by ten women.

A mean of 11.26 blouses was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 8.52 blouses was considered to be adequate. The number

of blouses owned ranged from two blouses owned by one woman to 35 blouses reported by two women. The mode and the median of ten blouses were owned by 21 women. The number of blouses thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by one woman to 25 suggested by one woman. The mode of ten blouses was thought to be adequate by 31 women, and the median of eight blouses was considered to be adequate by 12 women.

A mean of 3.44 pairs of flats was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 3.12 pairs of flats was thought to be adequate. The number of pairs of flats owned ranged from zero reported by 13 women to nine pairs reported by five women. The mode of four pairs of flats was owned by 23 women, and the median of three pairs of flats was owned by 14 women. The number of pairs of flats thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by seven women to nine suggested by two women. The mode of two pairs of flats was considered adequate by 31 women, and the median of three pairs of flats was thought to be adequate by 22 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 2.66 pairs of little or stack heels, and they thought a mean of 2.41 pairs of little or stack heels would be adequate. The number of little or stack heels owned ranged from zero reported by nine women to nine pairs indicated by four women. The mode and the median of two pairs of little or stack heels were owned by 33 women. The number of little or stack heels

thought to be adequate ranged from zero suggested by two women to eight pairs recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of two pairs of little or stack heels were thought to be adequate by 41 women.

The respondents owned a mean of .98 pairs of loafers, and they thought a mean of 1.12 pairs of loafers would be adequate. The number of pairs of loafers owned ranged from zero indicated by 25 women to three pairs reported by three women. The mode and the median of one pair of loafers were owned by 68 women. The number of pairs of loafers thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 12 women to four pairs recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of one pair of loafers were considered adequate by 78 women.

A mean of 1.09 pairs of boots was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 1.06 pairs of boots was thought to be adequate. The number of pairs of boots owned ranged from zero reported by eight women to three pairs of boots indicated by two women. The mode and the median of one pair of boots were owned by 89 women. The number of pairs of boots thought to be adequate ranged from the mode and the median of one pair of boots recommended by 106 women to two pairs of boots suggested by seven women.

The respondents owned a mean of 3.39 campus handbags, and they thought a mean of 2.98 campus handbags would be adequate.

The number of campus handbags owned ranged from one handbag reported by 17 women to nine handbags indicated by three women. The mode and the median of three campus handbags were owned by 33 women. The number of campus handbags thought to be adequate ranged from one handbag suggested by 14 women to nine handbags recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of three campus handbags were considered adequate by 34 women.

A mean of 2.51 pairs of campus gloves was owned by the respondents, and they thought a mean of 2.35 pairs of campus gloves would be adequate. The number of pairs of campus gloves owned ranged from zero indicated by nine women to nine pairs reported by three women. The mode and the median of two pairs of campus gloves were owned by 32 women. The number of pairs of campus gloves thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by four women to nine pairs suggested by one woman. The median and the mode of two pairs of campus gloves were considered adequate by 45 women.

A mean of 1.24 umbrellas was owned by the respondents, and they thought a mean of 1.21 umbrellas would be adequate. The number of umbrellas owned ranged from zero indicated by four women to five umbrellas owned by one woman. The mode and the median of one umbrella were owned by 86 women. The number of umbrellas thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by two women

to two umbrellas recommended by 26 women. The mode and the median of one umbrella were considered adequate by 85 women.

As indicated in Table 6, a mean of 16.00, a median of 14, and a mode of 12 church or dressy items of apparel were owned by the respondents, and a mean of 17.22, a median of 17, and a mode of 17 church or dressy items of apparel were thought to be adequate.

As indicated in Table 5, the respondents owned a mean of 1.12 dressy coats, and they thought a mean of 1.19 dressy coats would be adequate. The number of dressy coats owned ranged from zero reported by 18 women to three indicated by five women. The mode and the median of one dressy coat were owned by 69 women. The number of dressy coats thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by one woman to three recommended by two women. The mode and the median of one dressy coat were considered adequate by 92 women.

The respondents owned a mean of .97 lightweight dressy suits, and they thought a mean of 1.49 lightweight dressy suits would be adequate. The number of lightweight dressy suits owned ranged from zero indicated by 41 women to four reported by three women. The mode and the median of one lightweight dressy suit were owned by 45 women. The number of lightweight dressy suits thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by ten women to four suits suggested by one woman. The mode and the median of one lightweight

dressy suit were considered adequate by 49 women.

A mean of 1.41 winter-weight dressy suits was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 1.66 winter-weight dressy suits was thought to be adequate. The number of winter-weight dressy suits owned ranged from zero indicated by 22 women to five suits owned by one woman. The mode and the median of one winter-weight dressy suit were owned by 45 women. The number of winter-weight dressy suits thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by seven women to four suits recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of two winter-weight dressy suits were thought to be adequate by 45 women.

A mean of 2.10 lightweight dressy dresses was owned by the respondents, and they thought a mean of 2.32 lightweight dressy dresses would be adequate. The number of lightweight dressy dresses owned ranged from zero owned by 17 women to nine lightweight dressy dresses owned by one woman. The mode and the median of two lightweight dressy dresses were owned by 30 women. The number of lightweight dressy dresses thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by four women to five dresses recommended by two women. The mode and the median of two lightweight dressy dresses were considered adequate by 42 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 1.97 winter-weight dressy dresses, and they thought a mean of 2.27 winter-weight dressy

dresses would be adequate. The number of winter-weight dressy dresses owned ranged from zero indicated by 16 women to nine winter-weight dressy dresses owned by one woman. The mode and the median of two winter-weight dressy dresses were owned by 40 women. The number of winter-weight dressy dresses thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by five women to five winter-weight dressy dresses recommended by three women. The mode and the median of two winter-weight dressy dresses were thought to be adequate by 44 women.

A mean of 1.53 hats was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 1.58 hats was thought to be adequate. The number of hats owned ranged from the mode of zero indicated by 34 women to six hats reported by two women. The median of one hat was owned by 30 women. The number of hats thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 19 women to six hats recommended by two women. The mode and the median of two hats were thought to be adequate by 44 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 3.21 pairs of heels for church or dressy occasions, and they thought a mean of 2.93 pairs of heels would be adequate. The number of pairs of heels owned ranged from zero reported by one woman to seven pairs of heels owned by one woman. The mode of two pairs of heels was owned by 37 women and the median of three pairs of heels was owned by 21 women. The number of pairs of heels thought to be adequate ranged from zero

indicated by one woman to six pairs of heels recommended by three women. The mode and the median of three pairs of heels were considered adequate by 39 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 1.55 handbags for church or dressy occasions, and they thought a mean of 1.84 handbags would be adequate. The number of handbags owned ranged from zero indicated by 23 women to six handbags reported by one woman. The mode and the median of one handbag were owned by 35 women. The number of handbags thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by eight women to six handbags recommended by one woman. The median and the mode of two handbags were thought to be adequate by 41 women.

A mean of 2.14 pairs of gloves for church and dressy occasions was owned by the respondents, and they thought a mean of 1.94 pairs of gloves would be adequate. The number of pairs of gloves owned ranged from zero indicated by 13 women to nine pairs of gloves owned by one woman. The mode and the median of two pairs of gloves were owned by 44 women. The number of pairs of gloves thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by seven women to eight pairs of gloves suggested by one woman. The mode and the median of two pairs of gloves were considered adequate by 51 women.

As indicated in Table 6, a mean of 4.17, a median of four, and a mode of three semi-formal items of apparel were owned by the

respondents. A mean of 4.70, a median of four, and a mode of four semi-formal items of apparel were thought to be adequate.

As indicated in Table 5, the respondents owned a mean of 1.82 cocktail or party dresses, and they thought a mean of 1.88 cocktail or party dresses would be adequate. The number of cocktail or party dresses owned ranged from zero indicated by 14 women to seven cocktail or party dresses owned by one woman. The median of two cocktail or party dresses was owned by 37 women and 37 women also owned one cocktail or party dress. The number of cocktail or party dresses thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by four women to six dresses recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of two cocktail or party dresses were thought to be adequate by 54 women.

A mean of 1.19 pairs of dressy heels was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 1.39 pairs of dressy heels was thought to be adequate. The number of pairs of dressy heels owned ranged from zero reported by 30 women to four pairs owned by one woman. The mode and the median of one pair of dressy heels were owned by 43 women. The number of pairs of dressy heels thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 13 women to four pairs recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of one pair of dressy heels were thought to be adequate by 52 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 1.01 small handbags for

semi-formal occasions, and they thought a mean of 1.18 small handbags would be adequate. The number of small handbags owned ranged from zero indicated by 36 women to five small handbags owned by one woman. The mode and the median of one small handbag were owned by 49 women. The number of small handbags thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by ten women to three handbags recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of one small handbag were thought to be adequate by 74 women.

A mean of .15 pairs of gloves for semi-formal occasions was owned by the respondents, and they thought a mean of .25 pairs of gloves would be adequate. The number of pairs of gloves owned ranged from the mode and the median of zero indicated by 98 women to two pairs of gloves reported by two women. The number of pairs of gloves considered adequate ranged from the mode and the median of zero indicated by 91 women to two pairs of gloves recommended by two women. The respondents were asked not to repeat gloves they had listed under church or dressy apparel.

As indicated in Table 6, a mean of 5.28, a median of four, and a mode of three formal items of apparel were owned by the respondents. A mean of 6.54, a median of seven, and a mode of seven formal items of apparel were thought to be adequate.

As indicated in Table 5, the respondents owned a mean of .26 evening coats, and they thought a mean of .57 evening coats would be

adequate. The number of evening coats owned ranged from the mode and the median of zero indicated by 88 women to two evening coats owned by each of four women. The number of evening coats thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 51 women to two evening coats recommended by two women. The mode and the median of one evening coat was thought to be adequate by 60 women.

The respondents owned a mean of .37 evening wraps, and they thought a mean of .66 evening wraps would be adequate. The number of evening wraps owned ranged from the mode and the median of zero indicated by 72 women to two evening wraps owned by one woman. The number of evening wraps considered adequate ranged from zero indicated by 39 women to two evening wraps recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of one evening wrap were thought to be adequate by 73 women.

A mean of 1.58 long formals was owned by the respondents, and they thought a mean of 1.39 long formals would be adequate. The number of long formals owned ranged from zero indicated by 22 women to six long formals owned by one woman. The median of one long formal was owned by 35 women, and 35 women also owned two long formals. The number of long formals thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 13 women to four long formals recommended by two women. The mode and the median of one long formal were considered adequate by 50 women.

A mean of .79 short formals was owned by the respondents, and they thought a mean of 1.10 short formals would be adequate. The number of short formals owned ranged from the mode of zero indicated by 53 women to five short formals owned by one woman. The median of one short formal was owned by 41 women. The number of short formals thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 31 women to five short formals suggested by one woman. The mode and the median of one short formal was considered adequate by 50 women.

The respondents owned a mean of .78 pairs of evening shoes, and they thought a mean of 1.01 pairs of evening shoes would be adequate. The number of pairs of evening shoes owned ranged from the mode and the median of zero indicated by 57 women to four pairs owned by one woman. The number of pairs of evening shoes thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 31 women to two pairs of evening shoes recommended by 32 women. The mode and the median of one pair of evening shoes were considered adequate by 50 women.

The respondents owned a mean of .71 evening bags, and they thought a mean of .86 evening bags would be adequate. The number of evening bags owned ranged from zero indicated by 49 women to three evening bags reported by two women. The mode and the median of one evening bag were owned by 50 women. The number of

evening bags thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 30 women to two evening bags recommended by 14 women. The mode and the median of one evening bag were thought to be adequate by 69 women.

A mean of .79 pairs of long gloves for formal occasions was owned by the respondents, and they thought a mean of .95 pairs of long gloves would be adequate. The number of pairs of long gloves owned ranged from zero owned by 30 women to three pairs owned by one woman. The mode and the median of one pair of long gloves were owned by 78 women. The number of pairs of long gloves considered adequate ranged from zero indicated by 15 women to two pairs recommended by nine women. The mode and the median of one pair of long gloves were considered adequate by 89 women.

As indicated in Table 6, a mean of 42.45, a median of 36, and a mode of 26 unclassified items of apparel were owned by the respondents. A mean of 39.63, a median of 34, and a mode of 30 unclassified items of apparel were thought to be adequate.

As indicated in Table 5, the respondents owned a mean of 4.68 brassieres, and they thought a mean of 4.41 brassieres would be adequate. The number of brassieres owned ranged from two brassieres owned by seven women to 15 brassieres owned by one woman. The mode of three brassieres was owned by 34 women, and the median of four brassieres was owned by 21 women. The number of brassieres

thought to be adequate ranged from two recommended by six women to ten brassieres suggested by one woman. The mode and the median of four brassieres were considered adequate by 33 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 2.46 girdles, and they thought a mean of 2.31 girdles would be adequate. The number of girdles owned ranged from zero indicated by one woman to eight owned by one woman. The mode and the median of two girdles were owned by 51 women. The number of girdles thought to be adequate ranged from zero recommended by one woman to six suggested by one woman. The mode and median of two girdles were considered adequate by 78 women.

A mean of 11.00 pairs of panties was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 9.96 pairs of panties was thought to be adequate. The number of panties owned ranged from four pairs owned by one woman to 30 pairs of panties owned by one woman. The mode and the median of 10 pairs of panties were owned by 35 women. The number of pairs of panties thought to be adequate ranged from five pairs indicated by four women to 30 pairs of panties suggested by one woman. The mode and the median of ten pairs of panties were considered adequate by 33 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 1.18 pairs of petti-pants, and they thought a mean of 1.06 pairs of petti-pants would be adequate. The number of petti-pants owned ranged from the mode of

zero indicated by 44 women to six pairs of petti-pants owned by one woman. The median of one pair of petti-pants was owned by 32 women. The number of petti-pants considered adequate ranged from the mode of zero indicated by 40 women to six pairs of petti-pants suggested by one woman. The median of one pair of petti-pants was considered adequate by 39 women.

A mean of 4.17 slips was owned by the respondents, and a mean of 3.51 slips was thought to be adequate. The number of slips owned ranged from one indicated by three women to nine reported by five women. The median of four slips was owned by 31 women and 31 women also owned three slips. The number of slips thought to be adequate ranged from one slip indicated by one woman to nine slips recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of three slips were considered adequate by 36 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 6.34 pairs of nylons and they thought a mean of 6.97 pairs of nylons would be adequate. The number of pairs of nylons owned ranged from one pair of nylons owned by each of two women and 35 pairs of nylons owned by one woman. The mode of three pairs of nylons was owned by 34 women and the median of five pairs of nylons was owned by 16 women. The number of nylons considered adequate ranged from zero indicated by two women to 35 pairs of nylons suggested by one woman. The mode of three pairs of nylons was considered adequate by 28 women, and the

median of five pairs of nylons was thought to be adequate by 16 women.

A mean of 1.20 pairs of textured stockings was owned by the respondents, and they thought a mean of 1.11 pairs of textured stockings would be adequate. The number of pairs of textured stockings owned ranged from the mode and the median of zero indicated by 58 women to nine pairs of textured stockings owned by one woman. The number of pairs of textured stockings thought to be adequate ranged from the mode and the median of zero indicated by 57 women to nine pairs of textured stockings suggested by one woman.

The respondents owned a mean of 2.47 pairs of socks, and they thought a mean of 2.52 pairs of socks would be adequate. The number of pairs of socks owned ranged from zero indicated by 16 women to eight pairs owned by one woman. The mode and the median of two pairs were owned by 31 women. The number of pairs of socks considered adequate ranged from zero indicated by eight women to nine pairs of socks recommended by one woman. The mode and the median of two pairs of socks were thought to be adequate by 46 women.

A mean of .85 pairs of knee socks were owned by the respondents, and a mean of 1.18 pairs of knee socks were thought to be adequate. The number of pairs of knee socks owned ranged from the mode and the median of zero indicated by 63 women to four pairs of

knee socks reported by two women. The number of pairs of knee socks considered adequate ranged from the mode of zero indicated by 44 women to four pairs of knee socks recommended by six women. The median of one pair of knee socks was considered adequate by 27 women.

A mean of 2.94 nightgowns was owned by the respondents, and they thought a mean of 2.27 nightgowns would be adequate. The number of nightgowns owned ranged from zero indicated by six women to nine owned by one woman. The mode of one nightgown was owned by 25 women, and the median of three nightgowns was owned by 24 women. The number of nightgowns thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by four women to six suggested by two women. The mode and the median of two nightgowns were considered adequate by 42 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 1.84 pajamas, and they thought a mean of 1.56 pajamas would be adequate. The number of pajamas owned ranged from the mode of zero indicated by 32 women to nine pairs owned by one woman. The median of two pairs of pajamas was owned by 28 women. The number of pajamas thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by 26 women to five pairs of pajamas recommended by two women. The mode and the median of two pairs of pajamas were considered adequate by 38 women.

A mean of 1.80 robes was owned by the respondents, and they

thought a mean of 1.44 robes would be adequate. The number of robes owned ranged from zero indicated by one woman to five robes owned by one woman. The mode of one robe was owned by 50 women, and the median of two robes was owned by 41 women. The number of robes thought to be adequate ranged from zero indicated by one woman to three robes recommended by five women. The mode and the median of one robe were considered adequate by 66 women.

The respondents owned a mean of 1.52 pairs of slippers, and they thought a mean of 1.33 pairs of slippers would be adequate. The number of pairs of slippers owned ranged from zero indicated by five women to four pairs reported by two women. The mode and the median of one pair of slippers were owned by 57 women. The number of pairs of slippers thought to be adequate ranged from the mode and the median of one pair of slippers recommended by 76 women to two pairs of slippers recommended by 37 women.

Items of apparel owned and the number thought to be adequate by sorority and by non-sorority respondents. The respondents who were not affiliated with a sorority thought that an adequate wardrobe would consist of a mean of 145.60 items of apparel. The respondents who were affiliated with a sorority thought an adequate wardrobe would consist of a mean of 155.64 items of apparel, or 6.44 percent more items of apparel than considered adequate by the non-sorority

women. The quantity considered by sorority women to be adequate for all seven types of clothing exceeded the quantity thought to be adequate by non-sorority women. The sorority women thought an adequate wardrobe would include a mean of .82 more grubby items of apparel, 1.84 more casual items of apparel, 4.56 more campus items of apparel, .90 more church or dressy items of apparel, .69 more semi-formal items of apparel, .19 more formal items of apparel, 1.04 more unclassified items of apparel, or a total of 10.04 more items of apparel than the non-sorority women considered necessary for an adequate wardrobe.

As shown in detail in Table 5, no specific item of apparel thought to be adequate by the sorority women greatly exceeded the number thought to be adequate by the non-sorority women, but there was a slight increase in the quantity of 40 of the 63 total items of apparel recommended by the sorority women.

The sorority respondents owned larger wardrobes and more of all types of clothing than did the non-sorority respondents. Women not affiliated with a sorority owned a mean of 148.64 items of apparel and the sorority women owned a mean of 175 items of apparel, or 15.06 percent more items of apparel than the non-sorority women. Sorority women owned a mean of 3.23 more grubby items of apparel, 2.35 more casual items of apparel, 11.50 more campus items of apparel, 1.18 more church or dressy items of apparel,

1.53 more semi-formal items of apparel, 1.30 more formal items of apparel, 5.27 more unclassified items of apparel, or a total of 26.36 more items of apparel than the non-sorority women owned.

Both groups of women had more items of apparel in their present wardrobes than in a wardrobe they considered adequate. The sorority women owned 11.07 percent more items of apparel than they considered to be adequate, and the non-sorority women owned 2.04 percent more items of apparel than they thought would be adequate. Sorority woman had a mean of 1.00 fewer casual items of apparel, .29 fewer church or dressy items of apparel, and .44 fewer formal items of apparel than they thought would be adequate. The sorority women had a mean of 2.09 more grubby items of apparel, 12.98 more campus items of apparel, .10 more semi-formal items of apparel, and 5.92 more unclassified items of apparel, or a total of 19.36 more items of apparel than they considered to be adequate. The non-sorority women owned a mean of .32 fewer grubby items of apparel, 1.51 fewer casual items of apparel, .57 fewer church and dressy items of apparel, .74 fewer semi-formal items of apparel, and 1.55 fewer formal items of apparel than they considered to be adequate. The non-sorority women owned a mean of 6.04 more campus items of apparel, 1.69 more unclassified items of apparel, or a total of 3.04 more items of apparel than they thought would be adequate.

Table 5. The number of items of apparel in the respondents' present wardrobes and the number of items of apparel in a wardrobe they consider adequate.

Type of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Number in Present Wardrobe									Number Thought to be Adequate								
	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total			Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode
<u>Grubby</u>																		
Parka	.97	1	1	.66	1	1	.74	1	1	1.03	1	1	1.01	1	1	1.02	1	1
Windbreaker	.67	1	1	.65	1	0	.66	1	0	.97	1	1	.92	1	1	.93	1	1
Sweatshirt	4.13	4.5	5	2.94	3	3	3.26	3	3	2.87	3	2	2.47	2	2	2.58	2	2
Jersey/ T Shirt	2.83	2	0	1.64	1	0	1.96	1	0	1.87	1.5	1	1.55	1	0	1.64	1	0
Cut-offs	1.43	1	1	1.74	2	2	1.66	2	2	1.73	2	2	1.86	2	2	1.82	2	2
Jeans	1.77	1	1	1.63	2	2	1.66	2	2	1.77	2	2	1.75	2	2	1.75	2	2
Tennis shoes	2.80	3	3	2.11	2	2	2.29	2	2	2.27	2	2	2.13	2	2	2.17	2	2
<u>Casual</u>																		
Car coat	.47	0	0	.75	1	1	.67	1	1	.86	1	1	.87	1	1	.87	1	1
Shift	3.40	3	3	2.49	2	3	2.74	3	3	3.50	3	2	2.81	3	2	2.99	3	2
Capris/ Long pants	3.86	4	4	3.40	3	2	3.52	3	2	3.60	3	3	3.55	3	3	3.57	3	3
Bermudas	3.37	3	2	2.64	2	2	2.83	2	2	3.50	3	2	3.02	3	3	3.15	3	2
Casual set (long or short)	1.46	1	1	1.16	1	0	1.24	1	0	2.23	2	2	1.78	2	2	1.90	2	2
Sandals	1.80	2	2	1.57	1	1	1.63	1	1	1.67	2	2	1.49	1	1	1.54	2	1-2

Table 5 (cont.)

Types of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Number in Present Wardrobe									Number Thought to be Adequate								
	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total			Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode
<u>Campus</u>																		
Campus coat (warm)	1.30	1	1	1.18	1	1	1.21	1	1	1.27	1	1	1.11	1	1	1.15	1	1
Raincoat	1.40	1	1	1.05	1	1	1.14	1	1	1.20	1	1	1.07	1	1	1.11	1	1
Casual suit																		
Lightweight	1.63	1.5	2	1.35	1	1	1.43	1	1	1.50	1	1	1.58	1	1	1.56	1	1
Winterweight	1.23	1	0	1.33	1	1	1.30	1	1	1.43	1	1	1.71	2	2	1.64	2	2
Casual dress																		
Lightweight	7.03	7	7	4.94	5	4	5.50	5	4	5.86	5	5	4.96	5	5	5.20	5	5
Winterweight	3.93	4	4	2.45	2	0	2.84	2	0	4.07	4	3	3.02	3	4	3.30	3	4
Jumper	2.13	2	0	1.53	1	1	1.69	1	0	2.17	2	2	1.76	2	2	1.87	2	2
Skirt	10.83	10	10	10.47	10	12	10.57	10	10	7.70	7	5	8.08	8	10	7.98	8	10
Sweater	10.97	10	10	9.53	8	3	9.91	10	10	8.10	8	5	7.55	7	5	7.70	7	5
Blouse	13.20	10.5	10	10.55	10	10	11.26	10	10	8.90	8.5	10	8.39	8	10	8.52	8	10
Flats	4.33	4	4	3.12	3	4	3.44	3	4	3.93	3.5	2	2.83	2	2	3.12	3	2
Little/Stack																		
Heels	2.53	2	2	2.71	2	2	2.66	2	2	2.50	2	2	2.37	2	2	2.41	2	2
Loafers	1.13	1	1	.93	1	1	.98	1	1	1.17	1	1	1.11	1	1	1.12	1	1
Boots	1.07	1	1	1.10	1	1	1.09	1	1	1.03	1	1	1.07	1	1	1.06	1	1
Handbag	3.83	3	3	3.23	3	3	3.39	3	3	3.33	3	2	2.86	3	3	2.98	3	3
Gloves	2.77	2	2	2.42	2	2	2.51	2	2	2.20	2	2	2.41	2	2	2.35	2	2

Table 5 (cont.)

Types of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Number in Present Wardrobe									Number Thought to be Adequate								
	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total			Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode
Umbrella	1.30	1	1	1.22	1	1	1.24	1	1	1.27	1	1	1.19	1	1	1.21	1	1
<u>Church or Dressy</u>																		
Dressy coat	1.10	1	1	1.12	1	1	1.12	1	1	1.17	1	1	1.19	1	1	1.19	1	1
Suit																		
Lightweight	.80	1	0	1.02	1	1	.97	1	1	1.27	1	1	1.57	2	2	1.49	1	1
Winterweight	1.23	1	1	1.47	1	1	1.41	1	1	1.57	1.5	1	1.70	2	2	1.66	2	2
Dressy dress																		
Lightweight	2.63	2	2	2.90	2	1	2.10	2	2	2.53	3	3	2.24	2	2	2.32	2	2
Winterweight	2.60	2	2	1.75	2	2	1.97	2	2	2.50	3	3	2.19	2	2	2.27	2	2
Hat	1.70	1	1	1.47	1	0	1.53	1	0	1.50	1	1	1.60	2	2	1.58	2	2
Heels	3.50	3	3	3.11	3	2	3.21	3	2	3.10	3	2	2.87	3	3	2.93	3	3
Handbag	1.63	2	1	1.52	1	1	1.55	1	1	2.07	2	2	1.76	2	2	1.84	2	2
Gloves	2.40	2	2	2.05	2	2	2.14	2	2	2.17	2	2	1.86	2	2	1.94	2	2
<u>Semi-formal</u>																		
Cocktail or party dress	2.43	2	2	1.60	1	1	1.82	2	1-2	2.30	2	2	1.72	2	2	1.88	2	2
Dressy heels	1.53	1.5	1	1.06	1	1	1.19	1	1	1.60	1.5	1	1.31	1	1	1.39	1	1
Small bag	1.17	1	1	.95	1	1	1.01	1	1	1.10	1	1	1.21	1	1	1.18	1	1
Gloves	.17	0	0	.16	0	0	.15	0	0	.20	0	0	.27	0	0	.25	0	0
<u>Formal</u>																		
Evening coat	.30	0	0	.24	0	0	.26	0	0	.60	1	1	.55	1	1	.57	1	1

Table 5 (cont.)

Types of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Number in Present Wardrobe									Number Thought to be Adequate								
	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total			Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode
Evening wrap	.50	0	0	.33	0	0	.37	0	0	.70	1	1	.65	1	1	.66	1	1
Long formal	1.80	2	2	1.51	1	1	1.58	1	1-2	1.30	1	1	1.42	1	1	1.39	1	1
Short formal	1.03	1	0	.70	1	0	.79	1	0	1.27	1	1	1.04	1	1	1.10	1	1
Evening shoes	1.07	1	0	.68	0	0	.78	0	0	1.10	1	1	.98	1	1	1.01	1	1
Evening bag	.73	1	0	.70	1	1	.71	1	1	.80	1	1	.88	1	1	.86	1	1
Gloves (long)	.83	1	1	.77	1	1	.79	1	1	.90	1	1	.96	1	1	.95	1	1
<u>Unclassified</u>																		
Brassiere	5.47	5	3	4.40	4	3	4.68	4	3	4.70	4.5	5	4.30	4	4	4.41	4	4
Girdle	2.80	3	2	2.34	2	2	2.46	2	2	2.40	2	2	2.28	2	2	2.31	2	2
Panties	11.43	10.5	7	10.84	10	10	11.00	10	10	9.70	9	7	10.05	10	10	9.96	10	10
Petti-pants	1.07	.5	0	1.22	1	0	1.18	1	0	.90	0	0	1.12	1	1	1.06	1	0
Slip	4.53	4	4	4.04	4	3	4.17	4	3	3.83	4	4	3.40	3	3	3.51	3	3
Nylons	8.03	5	3	5.72	5	3	6.34	5	3	7.90	5	3	6.63	5	3	6.97	5	3
Textured Stockings	1.47	.5	0	1.10	0	0	1.20	0	0	1.20	0	0	1.07	1	0	1.11	0	0
Socks	2.30	2	2	2.53	2	2	2.47	2	2	2.37	2	2	2.58	2	2	2.52	2	2
Knee socks	.97	0	0	.81	0	0	.85	0	0	.83	0	0	1.30	1	0	1.18	1	0
Nightgown	3.03	3	4	2.90	3	1	2.94	3	1	2.43	2.5	3	2.22	2	2	2.27	2	2

Table 5 (cont.)

Types of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Number in Present Wardrobe									Number Thought to be Adequate								
	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total			Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode
Pajamas	1.87	2	0	1.83	2	0	1.84	2	0	1.47	2	2	1.59	2	2	1.56	2	2
Robe	1.87	2	2	1.77	2	1	1.80	2	1	1.43	1	1	1.45	1	1	1.44	1	1
Slippers	1.47	1	1	1.54	1	1	1.52	1	1	1.23	1	1	1.36	1	1	1.33	1	1

Table 6. The number of items of apparel included for each type of clothing in the respondents' present wardrobes and in a wardrobe they consider adequate.

Type of Clothing	Number in Present Wardrobe									Number Thought to be Adequate								
	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total			Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode	Mean	Median	Mode
Grubby	14.60	13.5	12	11.37	12	10	12.23	12	10	12.51	12.5	11	11.69	11	10	11.91	11	10
Casual	14.36	13.0	12	12.01	10	9	12.63	11	9	15.36	14.0	12	13.52	13	12	14.02	14	11-12
Campus	70.61	62.0	59	59.11	53	48	62.16	55	52	57.63	52.0	45	53.07	50	53	54.28	51	53
Church or Dressy	17.59	15.0	13	16.41	14	11	16.00	14	12	17.88	17.5	16	16.98	18	18	17.22	17	17
Semi-formal	5.30	4.5	4	3.77	3	3	4.17	4	3-4	5.20	4.5	4	4.51	4	4	4.70	4	4
Formal	6.23	6.0	3	4.93	4	3	5.28	4	3-4	6.67	7.0	7	6.48	7	7	6.54	7	7
Unclassified	46.31	38.5	28	41.04	36	26	42.45	36	26	40.39	33.0	30	39.35	35	31	39.63	34	30
Total Number of Items	175.00	152.5		148.64	132		154.92	136		155.64	140.5		145.60	138		148.30	138	

The median for the 30 sorority respondents is indicated by .5 if the median falls between two numbers. There was an uneven number of non-sorority respondents; therefore, the median falls on a whole number.

Costs considered average for an adequate wardrobe. Each respondent was asked to state the price she considered average for each item of apparel. The mean cost for each item of apparel and the total cost for the number recommended for an adequate wardrobe are listed in Table 7. The sorority respondents indicated the highest average cost on 39 of the 63 items of apparel, and the non-sorority women indicated the highest average cost on 24 items.

The total cost for the number of items considered adequate as determined by the sorority women was higher for all seven types of clothing than that determined by the non-sorority women. The total cost for an adequate wardrobe was a mean of \$1830.21 as indicated by the sorority women, \$1658.66 as indicated by the non-sorority women, and \$1708.73 as indicated by all of the respondents.

The total cost for the number of items of apparel thought to be adequate for each type of clothing was allocated by the respondents as follows: \$76.83 for grubby apparel, \$151.84 for casual apparel, \$703.89 for campus apparel, \$365.04 for church or dressy apparel, \$90.06 for semi-formal apparel, \$156.62 for formal apparel, and \$164.45 for unclassified apparel.

Frequency of wear for each type of clothing. The respondents were asked to indicate the number of times per week, month or year they wore each type of clothing during a school year. The maximum

Table 7. The average cost for each item of apparel and the total cost for the number recommended for an adequate wardrobe.

Types of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost
<u>Grubby</u>									
Parka	18.97	1.03	19.54	19.35	1.01	19.54	19.25	1.02	19.64
Windbreaker	8.07	.97	7.34	8.24	.92	7.58	8.20	.93	7.63
Sweatshirt	4.73	2.87	13.58	4.30	2.47	10.62	4.41	2.58	11.38
Jersey/T shirt	4.80	1.87	8.98	4.06	1.55	6.29	4.25	1.64	6.97
Cut-offs	5.10	1.73	8.82	4.87	1.86	9.06	4.93	1.82	8.97
Jeans	7.03	1.77	12.44	6.32	1.75	11.06	6.51	1.75	11.39
Tennis shoes	5.20	2.27	11.80	4.93	2.13	10.50	5.00	2.17	10.85
Grubby - Total Cost			82.50			74.65			76.83
<u>Casual</u>									
Car coat	23.85	.86	20.51	25.76	.87	22.41	25.56	.87	22.24
Shift	9.31	3.50	32.59	9.51	2.81	26.72	9.46	2.99	28.29
Capris/long pants	11.60	3.60	41.76	10.94	3.55	38.84	11.12	3.57	39.70
Bermudas	7.20	3.50	25.20	6.58	3.02	19.87	6.75	3.15	21.26
Casual set	13.08	2.23	29.17	14.38	1.78	25.60	14.57	1.90	27.68
Sandals	7.80	1.67	13.03	8.40	1.49	12.52	8.23	1.54	12.67
Casual - Total Cost			162.26			145.96			151.84
<u>Campus</u>									
Campus coat	41.72	1.27	52.98	44.51	1.11	49.41	43.78	1.15	50.35

Table 7 (cont.)

Types of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost
Raincoat	23.27	1.20	27.92	25.76	1.07	27.56	25.09	1.11	27.85
Casual suit									
<i>Lightweight</i>	25.36	1.50	38.04	24.29	1.58	38.38	24.57	1.56	38.33
<i>Winterweight</i>	32.69	1.43	46.75	29.73	1.71	50.84	30.49	1.64	50.00
Casual dress									
<i>Lightweight</i>	9.48	5.86	55.55	8.25	4.96	40.92	8.57	5.20	44.56
<i>Winterweight</i>	22.07	4.07	89.82	20.41	3.02	61.64	20.87	3.30	68.87
Jumper	17.68	2.17	38.37	16.23	1.76	28.56	16.63	1.87	31.10
Skirt	9.13	7.70	70.30	9.56	8.08	77.24	9.56	7.98	76.29
Sweater	12.17	8.10	98.58	11.08	7.55	83.65	11.37	7.70	87.55
Blouse	10.47	8.90	93.18	9.95	8.39	83.48	10.20	8.52	86.90
Flats	10.93	3.93	42.95	11.13	2.83	31.50	11.07	3.12	34.54
Little/stack heels	13.24	2.50	33.10	13.64	2.37	32.33	13.54	2.41	32.63
Loafers	11.29	1.17	13.21	11.23	1.11	12.47	11.25	1.12	12.60
Boots	14.33	1.03	14.76	14.29	1.07	15.29	14.30	1.06	15.16
Handbag	8.67	3.33	28.87	8.41	2.86	24.05	8.48	2.98	25.27
Gloves	5.59	2.20	12.30	5.72	2.41	13.79	5.84	2.35	13.72
Umbrella	6.60	1.27	8.38	6.81	1.19	8.10	6.75	1.21	8.17
Campus - Total Cost			765.06			679.21			703.89

Table 7 (cont.)

Types of Cloth- ing and Items of Apparel	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost
<u>Church or Dressy</u>									
Dressy coat	51.33	1.17	60.06	47.88	1.19	56.98	48.82	1.19	58.10
Suit									
Lightweight	28.40	1.27	36.07	29.87	1.57	46.90	29.51	1.49	43.97
Winterweight	38.52	1.57	60.48	36.71	1.70	62.41	37.17	1.66	61.70
Dressy dress									
Lightweight	23.45	2.53	59.33	21.54	2.24	48.25	22.06	2.32	51.18
Winterweight	25.56	2.50	63.90	24.30	2.19	53.22	24.62	2.27	55.89
Hat	8.54	1.50	12.81	9.14	1.60	14.62	8.99	1.58	14.20
Heels	16.50	3.10	51.15	17.59	2.87	50.48	17.30	2.93	50.69
Handbag	9.07	2.07	18.77	8.99	1.76	15.82	9.13	1.84	16.80
Gloves	6.57	2.17	14.26	6.41	1.86	11.92	6.45	1.94	12.51
Church or Dressy - Total Cost			376.83			360.60			365.04
<u>Semi-formal</u>									
Cocktail or party dress	30.35	2.30	69.81	27.63	1.72	47.52	28.35	1.88	53.30
Dressy heels	18.04	1.60	28.86	18.82	1.31	24.65	18.60	1.39	25.85
Small bag	7.33	1.10	8.06	7.95	1.21	9.62	7.78	1.18	9.18
Gloves	7.20	.20	1.44	6.84	.27	1.85	6.92	.25	1.73
Semi-formal - Total Cost			108.17			83.64			90.06

Table 7 (cont.)

Types of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost
<u>Formal</u>									
Evening coat	42.00	.60	25.20	38.27	.55	21.05	39.31	.57	22.41
Evening wrap	24.00	.70	16.80	25.18	.65	16.37	24.87	.66	16.41
Long formal	36.43	1.30	47.36	36.93	1.42	52.44	36.80	1.39	51.15
Short formal	33.48	1.27	42.52	29.18	1.04	30.35	30.36	1.10	33.40
Evening shoes	18.91	1.10	20.80	18.79	.98	18.41	18.82	1.01	19.01
Evening bag	7.64	.80	6.11	8.31	.88	7.31	8.14	.86	7.00
Gloves (long)	7.76	.90	6.98	7.57	.96	7.27	7.62	.95	7.24
Formal - Total Cost			165.77			153.20			156.62
<u>Unclassified</u>									
Brassiere	5.27	4.70	24.77	5.06	4.30	21.76	5.12	4.41	22.58
Girdle	9.13	2.40	21.91	9.06	2.28	20.66	9.08	2.31	20.97
Panties	1.90	9.70	18.43	1.90	10.05	19.10	1.90	9.96	18.92
Petti-pants	4.76	.90	4.28	4.56	1.12	5.11	4.61	1.06	4.89
Slip	6.90	3.83	26.43	6.51	3.40	22.13	6.61	3.51	23.20
Nylons	1.87	7.90	14.77	1.96	6.63	12.99	1.94	6.97	13.52
Textured stockings	3.06	1.20	3.67	2.88	1.07	3.08	2.92	1.11	3.24
Socks	1.89	2.37	4.48	1.79	2.58	4.62	1.82	2.52	4.59
Knee socks	2.65	.83	2.20	2.42	1.30	3.15	2.47	1.18	2.91

Table 7 (cont.)

Types of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost	Mean Cost	Mean Number Adequate	Total Cost
Nightgown	6.52	2.43	15.19	6.32	2.22	14.03	6.50	2.27	14.76
Pajamas	6.32	1.47	9.29	6.18	1.59	9.83	6.21	1.56	9.69
Robe	12.21	1.43	17.46	12.05	1.45	17.47	12.36	1.44	17.80
Slippers	5.53	1.23	6.80	5.49	1.36	7.47	5.55	1.33	7.38
Unclassified - Total			169.68			161.40			164.45
Total Cost for Adequate Wardrobe			1830.21			1658.66			1708.73

length of the 1966-1967 Oregon State University school year was 238 days, or 34 weeks, or eight months. Since the respondents did not indicate a specific length of time they wore each type of clothing, the number of times each type of clothing was worn is indicated in days. The following equivalents were used to obtain the number of days each type of clothing was worn during a school year: six or seven times a week is equivalent to 221 days, four or five times a week is equivalent to 153 days, two or three times a week is equivalent to 85 days, once a week is equivalent to 34 days, twice a month is equivalent to 16 days, once a month is equivalent to eight days.

As shown in Table 8, the type of clothing called grubby was worn a mean of 151.48 times during a school year. The number of times grubby apparel was worn ranged from the mode of 221 days indicated by 46 women to three days per school year stated by one woman. Twenty-seven women said they wore grubby apparel the median of 153 times per school year.

The type of clothing called casual was worn a mean of 151.84 times during a school year. The number of times casual apparel was worn ranged from the mode of 221 days per school year indicated by 41 women to eight times per school year indicated by one woman. Thirty-five women said they wore casual apparel the median of 153 times during the school year.

The type of clothing called campus was worn a mean of 208.96

times during a school year. The number of times campus apparel was worn ranged from the mode and the median of 221 days per school year indicated by 94 women to 85 times per school year indicated by one woman.

The type of clothing called church or dressy was worn a mean of 44.31 times during a school year. The number of times church and dressy apparel was worn ranged from 221 times per school year indicated by one woman to once a school year stated by one woman. Sixty-seven women said they wore church or dressy apparel the mode and the median of 34 times during a school year.

The type of clothing called semi-formal was worn a mean of 4.80 times during a school year. The number of times semi-formal apparel was worn ranged from 34 times per school year indicated by one woman to zero indicated by one woman. Twenty women wore semi-formal apparel the mode of once during a school year. Fifteen women wore semi-formal apparel the median of three times during a school year.

The type of clothing called formal was worn a mean of 2.01 times during a school year. The number of times formal apparel was worn ranged from 16 times per school year indicated by one woman to zero stated by 16 women. Twenty-eight women wore formal apparel the mode of once per school year, and 22 women wore formal apparel the median of twice during a school year.

Table 8. The number of times during a school year that each type of clothing was worn.*

Type of Clothing	Sorority			Non-Sorority			Total		
	Mean	Mode	Median	Mean	Mode	Median	Mean	Mode	Median
Grubby	167.03	221	221	142.96	221	153	151.48	221	153
Casual	136.31	85	153	157.06	221	153	151.84	221	153
Campus	202.87	221	221	211.16	221	221	208.96	221	221
Church or Dressy	46.30	34	34	44.07	34	34	44.31	34	34
Semi-formal	5.17	8	4	4.67	2	3	4.80	1	3
Formal	2.30	2	2	1.91	1	1	2.01	1	2

* The maximum number of days in the 1966-1967 school year was 238 days, or 34 weeks or 8 months.

Average cost for each type of clothing compared to frequency of wear. The total cost for each type of clothing indicated in Table 7 was used to determine the percentage designated for each type of clothing in Table 9. Since unclassified apparel was worn with many types of clothing, it was not included when the percentage of the total cost to be spent for each type of clothing was determined. The mean number of times during a school year that each type of clothing was worn, Table 8, was used to determine the percentage of the time each type of clothing was worn as indicated in Table 9.

Analysis of the data given by the respondents showed that they wore grubby apparel 26.89 percent of the time and they would spend 4.98 percent of the total cost of an adequate wardrobe for grubby apparel. Casual apparel was worn 26.96 percent of the time and the respondents would spend 9.83 percent of the total cost for casual apparel. Campus apparel was worn 37.09 percent of the time and 45.58 percent of the total cost of an adequate wardrobe would be spent for campus apparel. Church or dressy apparel was worn 7.86 percent of the time and 23.64 percent of the total wardrobe cost would be spent for this apparel. Semi-formal apparel was worn .85 percent of the time and 5.83 percent of the total wardrobe cost would be spent for semi-formal apparel. Formal apparel was worn .35 percent of the time and 10.14 percent of the total cost for an adequate wardrobe would be spent for formal apparel.

Table 9. The percentage of the total cost of an adequate wardrobe designated for each type of clothing as compared to the percentage of time each type of clothing was worn.

Type of Clothing	Percentage of Time Worn			Percentage of Total Cost.		
	Sorority	Non-Sorority	Total	Sorority	Non-Sorority	Total
Grubby	29.83	25.45	26.89	4.97	4.99	4.98
Casual	24.35	27.96	26.96	9.77	9.75	9.83
Campus	36.23	37.59	37.09	46.07	45.36	45.58
Church or dressy	8.26	7.84	7.86	22.69	24.08	23.64
Semi-formal	.92	.83	.85	6.52	5.59	5.83
Formal	.41	.33	.35	9.98	10.23	10.14

*The total cost included only outer garments. Unclassified items of apparel were not included as they were worn with many types of clothing.

When ranking the six types of clothing in order with the type of clothing having the highest percentage of total cost first and the type of clothing having the lowest percentage of total cost last, the order appears as follows: 1) campus, 2) church or dressy, 3) formal, 4) casual, 5) semi-formal, 6) grubby.

When ranking the six types of clothing in order with the type of clothing worn the highest percentage of the time first and the type of clothing worn the lowest percentage of the time last, the order appears as follows: 1) campus, 2) casual, 3) grubby, 4) church or dressy, 5) semi-formal, 6) formal.

Only two types of clothing appear in the same position in both

the percentage of cost and the percentage of time worn listing.

Campus apparel appears first in both lists and semi-formal apparel appears fifth in both lists. There was no correlation between the amount of money to be spent for grubby, casual, church or dressy, or formal apparel as compared to the amount of time these types of clothing were worn during a school year.

Types of clothing brought to the campus and not needed. If the respondents brought some clothing to the campus when they entered Oregon State University that they did not need, they were asked to indicate the type of clothing. Sixty-seven respondents said they brought some clothing they did not need. Some of the respondents brought more than one type of clothing they did not need; therefore, the number column for the total respondents as recorded in Table 10 does not total 67.

As indicated in Table 10, 24 women or 21.06 percent of the respondents said they brought to the campus more grubby apparel than they needed. Ten women or 8.85 percent of the respondents reported they brought excess casual apparel. Eighteen women or 15.93 percent of the respondents indicated they brought excess campus apparel. Ten women or 8.85 percent of the respondents said they brought more church or dressy apparel than they needed. Twenty women or 17.70 percent of the respondents reported they brought

excess semi-formal apparel, and 30 women or 26.55 percent of the respondents indicated they brought excess formal apparel.

Table 10. The number and percentage of respondents who brought to the campus excess items of one or more types of clothing.

Type of Clothing	Sorority		Non-Sorority		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grubby	8	26.67	16	19.28	24	21.06
Casual	2	.07	8	9.64	10	8.85
Campus	3	.10	15	18.07	18	15.93
Church or dressy	0	--	10	12.05	10	8.85
Semi-formal	4	1.33	16	19.28	20	17.70
Formal	9	30.00	21	25.30	30	26.55

Types of clothing needed and not brought to the campus. The respondents were asked to indicate the types of clothing they needed after they arrived on the Oregon State University campus but had not brought with them. Eighty-nine respondents said they needed some items of apparel they did not bring. Some of the respondents said they needed more than one type of clothing they did not bring; therefore the number column for the total respondents as recorded in Table 11 does not total 89.

As indicated in Table 11, 16 women or 14.16 percent of the respondents said they needed grubby apparel they did not bring to the campus. Forty-three women or 38.05 percent of the respondents

reported they needed casual apparel they did not bring. Thirty-two women or 28.32 percent of the respondents said they needed more campus apparel. Twenty-six women or 23.01 percent of the respondents indicated they needed church or dressy apparel they did not bring. Sixteen women or 14.16 percent of the respondents reported they needed more semi-formal apparel, and 17 women or 15.04 percent of the respondents said they needed more formal apparel than they brought to the campus.

Table 11. The number and percentage of respondents who needed more items of one or more types of clothing they did not bring to the campus.

Type of Clothing	Sorority		Non-Sorority		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Grubby	6	20.00	10	12.05	16	14.16
Casual	13	4.33	30	36.14	43	38.05
Campus	5	1.67	27	32.53	32	28.32
Church or dressy	8	26.67	18	21.69	26	23.01
Semi-formal	6	20.00	10	12.05	16	14.16
Formal	3	.10	14	16.87	17	15.04

Adequacy of respondents' present wardrobes. Ninety-one women or 81.98 percent of the respondents indicated that their present wardrobes were adequate for the occasions they had encountered at Oregon State University. Twenty women or 18.02 percent of the respondents thought their present wardrobes were not adequate

for the occasions they had encountered. Two women did not answer this question.

Twenty-four women or 79.31 percent of the sorority respondents felt their present wardrobes were adequate, and 67 women or 82.76 percent of the non-sorority respondents thought their present wardrobes were adequate for the occasions they had encountered at Oregon State University.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The general purpose of this study was to obtain information that can be used by incoming women students as a guide in planning a wardrobe that is adequate for the occasions they may encounter at Oregon State University. Information was needed concerning 1) the occasions for which each type of clothing is worn, 2) the types and numbers of articles that are required for an adequate wardrobe, 3) the amount of time each type of clothing is worn, and 4) the percentage of the clothing budget that is to be spent for each type of clothing.

Letters were sent to the Deans of Women at 39 colleges and universities in Oregon, Washington, and northern California to determine the amount and type of information available to women entering these institutions. The 35 replies received indicated that the most common source of information on wardrobe needs was found in Associated Women Students' publications and that student handbooks supplied limited information. Eight colleges or universities had no information available concerning clothing; seven colleges or universities had publications containing a short paragraph concerning clothing; seven colleges or universities had publications containing limited information on types of clothing for various occasions; 13 colleges or universities had publications containing

specific information on types of clothing for various occasions, and one college specified that it sends incoming women students a suggested list of minimum and average numbers of items of apparel for their college wardrobes.

Twelve junior or senior women majoring in Clothing, Textiles and Related Arts at Oregon State University were interviewed to ascertain the current terminology used by women students to describe their clothing and the occasions for which each type of clothing was worn. This information was used in the preparation of the questionnaire.

Those interviewed divided the types of clothing appropriate for related occasions into six separate groups: grubby, casual, campus, church or dressy, semi-formal, and formal. A seventh group including undergarments, hosiery, nightwear, and loungewear was not named by those interviewed, but for identification the writer referred to this group as unclassified.

The women interviewed were asked if the wardrobe requirements for an entering freshman would be the same as those for a sophomore or junior transfer student. Six women said the wardrobe requirements would be the same, and five women said the requirements would be about the same for freshmen, sophomores, and juniors. From these answers it can be assumed that an adequate wardrobe determined by this study would be as applicable for the

woman entering Oregon State University as a sophomore or junior as it would be for the freshman woman.

Questionnaires were given to 283 sophomore and junior women students attending Oregon State University who were registered in the School of Home Economics, had completed a course in clothing selection, and had been admitted to Oregon State University no later than fall term, 1966. Questionnaires were returned by 147 students and 113 questionnaires met the established criteria. This was a 40 percent useable return of the total number of questionnaires distributed. The data from these questionnaires was compiled by computer and analyzed by the writer.

The respondents indicated the number of each item of apparel they owned and the number of each item they thought would be adequate. The respondents owned more grubby, campus and unclassified items of apparel than they considered necessary for an adequate wardrobe, and they owned fewer casual, church or dressy, and semi-formal items of apparel than they thought to be adequate. However, 81.98 percent of the respondents indicated their present wardrobes were adequate for the occasions they had encountered at Oregon State University. The respondents owned a mean of 154.92 items of apparel, and they thought a mean of 148.30 items of apparel would be adequate. Therefore hypothesis one, stating that the average wardrobe of the Oregon State University home economics women students

exceeds a wardrobe they will establish as adequate, was accepted.

The respondents who were affiliated with a sorority owned more of all types of clothing than did the respondents who were not affiliated with a sorority. The sorority women owned a mean of 175 items of apparel and the non-sorority women owned a mean of 148.64 items of apparel, or 15.06 percent fewer items of apparel than the sorority women. Twenty-four women or 79.31 percent of the sorority respondents thought their present wardrobes were adequate, and 67 women or 82.76 percent of the non-sorority respondents thought their present wardrobes were adequate for the occasions they had encountered at Oregon State University.

The sorority women indicated an adequate wardrobe would consist of a mean of 155.64 items of apparel and the non-sorority women said an adequate wardrobe would consist of a mean of 145.60 items of apparel or 6.44 percent fewer items of apparel than indicated by the sorority women. The quantity considered by sorority women to be adequate for all seven types of clothing exceeded the quantity considered adequate by the non-sorority women. Therefore the second hypothesis, stating that the quantity of clothing considered to be adequate will increase with affiliation with a sorority, was accepted.

The average cost of each item of apparel was needed as a basis to determine the percentage of the clothing budget to be spent for each

type of clothing. The total cost for an adequate wardrobe as indicated by the respondents was a mean of \$1708.73. The total cost for the number of items of apparel thought to be adequate for each type of clothing was allocated by the respondents as follows: \$76.83 or 4.49 percent for grubby apparel, \$151.84 or 8.88 percent for casual apparel, \$703.89 or 41.20 percent for campus apparel, \$365.04 or 21.37 percent for church or dressy apparel, \$90.06 or 5.27 percent for semi-formal apparel, \$156.62 or 9.16 percent for formal apparel, and \$164.45 or 9.63 percent for unclassified apparel.

The respondents indicated the frequency of wear for each type of clothing. Since they cited the number of times per week, month or year that each type of clothing was worn but did not indicate a specific length of time in hours, the number of times each type of clothing was worn was indicated in days. The maximum length of the 1966-1967 Oregon State University school year or the maximum number of times a type of clothing could be worn was 238 days. The respondents wore campus apparel a mean of 208.96 times during a school year or 37.09 percent of the time, casual apparel was worn a mean of 151.84 times or 26.96 percent of the time, grubby apparel was worn a mean of 151.48 times or 26.89 percent of the time, church or dressy apparel was worn a mean of 44.31 times or 7.86 percent of the time, semi-formal apparel was worn a mean of 4.80 times or .85 percent of the time, and formal apparel was worn a mean of

2.01 times or .35 percent of the time.

The percentage of time each of the six types of clothing (excluding unclassified apparel) was worn was compared to the percentage of the total cost designated for each type of clothing. Two types of clothing ranked in the same position as determined by the percentage of time they were worn and the percentage of the total cost. Campus clothing was worn the highest percentage of the time (37.09 percent) and was also designated the highest percentage of total cost (45.58 percent). Semi-formal apparel ranked fifth in both the percentage of time it was worn (.85 percent) and the percentage of total cost (5.83 percent). There was no correlation between the percentage of time grubby, casual, church or dressy, or formal apparel were worn and the percentage of total cost designated for each. Even though two types of clothing ranked in the same position, the percentage of time each type of clothing was worn and the percentage of the total cost were not the same for any of six types of clothing. Therefore hypothesis three, stating that the percentage of the clothing budget the respondents will recommend for each type of clothing will not be same as the percentage of the time it is worn, was accepted.

The respondents reported they owned a mean of .53 fewer semi-formal items of apparel than they considered to be adequate. Only 20 women or 17.70 percent of the respondents said they brought more semi-formal apparel to the campus than they needed.

Therefore hypothesis four, stating that women entering the university generally bring more semi-formal clothing than they need, was rejected.

Only 18 women or 15.93 percent of the respondents indicated they brought more campus apparel to the campus than they needed. Therefore hypothesis five, stating that women entering the university generally bring more campus clothing than they need, was rejected.

Twenty-four women or 21.06 percent of the respondents reported they brought more grubby apparel than they needed, ten women or 8.85 percent brought excess casual apparel, ten women or 8.85 percent brought excess church or dressy apparel, and 30 women or 26.55 percent brought more formal apparel than they needed. A total of 67 women or 59.82 percent of the respondents said they brought some clothing to the campus they did not need.

The percentage of the respondents who indicated they needed and did not bring sufficient items of some type of apparel were as follows: 38.05 percent needed casual apparel, 28.32 percent needed campus apparel, 23.01 percent needed church or dressy apparel, 15.04 percent needed formal apparel, 14.16 percent needed grubby apparel and 14.16 percent needed semi-formal apparel. A total of 89 women or 79.46 percent of the respondents indicated they needed some items of apparel they did not bring to the campus. Therefore

hypothesis six, stating that women entering the university generally do not bring some items of apparel they need after they arrive on campus, was accepted.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The writer hopes that the information concerning the wardrobe requirements for an Oregon State University woman student obtained in this study will be made available to women planning to enter this university. The data obtained in this study also should be useful to high school home economics teachers and counselors who advise high school seniors who plan to enter Oregon State University, as well as to those teaching or enrolled in clothing courses at this university.

The adequate number of items of apparel in Table 5 are indicated by the mean, median, and mode which often vary. Because only one number can be used for a recommended list of an adequate wardrobe for a woman entering Oregon State University, the writer established an adequate number for each item by using the mean, the mode and the median number of items of apparel thought to be adequate by the respondents. In some instances the mode differed significantly from the mean and the median; therefore, the adequate number was determined primarily by averaging the mean and the median to the nearest whole number. However in a few instances the mode was the same as either the mean or the median and then the mode influenced the decision. The writer's personal judgment was the deciding factor in listing one evening coat or wrap as adequate

rather than listing one of each as indicated by the median and the mode. The writer felt justified to list only one evening coat or wrap because of the mean number of these items owned and the large number of respondents who thought their wardrobes were adequate without them. The respondents indicated that a mean of .57 evening coats and a mean of .66 evening wraps would be adequate, but a mean of .26 evening coats and a mean of .37 evening wraps were owned by the respondents. Since the majority of the respondents (81.98 percent) indicated their present wardrobes were adequate, the writer assumed both an evening coat and an evening wrap were not necessary. The writer considers the number of items of apparel listed in Table 12 to constitute an adequate wardrobe for a woman entering Oregon State University.

Table 12. Types of clothing and number of items of apparel suggested for an adequate wardrobe for a woman entering Oregon State University.

Types of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Adequate Number
Grubby	
Parka	1
Windbreaker	1
Sweatshirt	2
Jersey/T shirt	1
Cut-offs	2
Jeans	2
Tennis shoes	<u>2</u>
Total Grubby	11
Casual	
Car coat	1
Shift	3
Capris/long pants	3
Bermudas	3
Casual sets	2
Sandals	<u>1-2</u>
Total Casual	13-14
Campus	
Campus coat	1
Raincoat	1
Casual suit	
Lightweight	1
Winterweight	2
Casual dress	
Lightweight	5
Winter weight	3
Jumper	2
Skirt	8
Sweater	7
Blouse	8
Flats	3
Little/stack heels	2
Loafers	1
Boots	1
Handbag	3
Gloves	2

Table 12 (cont.)

Types of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Adequate Number
Umbrella	<u>1</u>
Total Campus	51
Church or Dressy	
Dressy coat	1
Dressy suit	
Lightweight	1
Winterweight	2
Dressy dress	
Lightweight	2
Winterweight	2
Hat	2
Heels	3
Handbag	2
Gloves	<u>2</u>
Total Church or Dressy	17
Semi-formal	
Cocktail or party dress	2
Dressy heels	1
Small bag	<u>1</u>
Total Semi-formal	4
Formal	
Evening coat or wrap	1
Long formal	1
Short formal	1
Evening shoes	1
Evening bag	1
Gloves (long)	<u>1</u>
Total Formal	6
Unclassified	
Brassiere	4
Girdle	2
Panties	10
Petti-pants	1
Slip	3
Nylons	6
Textured stockings	0-1

Table 12 (cont.)

Types of Clothing and Items of Apparel	Adequate Number
Socks	2
Knee socks	1
Nightgown	2
Pajamas	2
Robe	1
Slippers	1
Total Unclassified	35-36
Total Number of Items of Apparel	137-139

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Apparel hangs up tab as college costs rise. *Women's Wear Daily* (New York) p. 1, col. 4-5. September 20, 1966.
2. Atherton, Phyllis Hardy. A comparison of the college wardrobes considered essential by two hundred freshmen and junior women students at the Pennsylvania State College. Master's thesis. State College, Pennsylvania State College, 1953. 56 numb. leaves.
3. Baumgartner, Charlotte Wolfe. Factors associated with clothing consumption among college freshmen. Ph.D. thesis. Columbus, Ohio State University, 1961. 280 numb. leaves. (Microfilm)
4. Campus '65. *Newsweek* 65:43-63. March 22, 1965.
5. Carlson, Elaine Elizabeth. Selected factors which may influence buying habits of freshmen women at Kansas State University. Master's thesis. Manhattan, Kansas State University, 1965. 59 numb. leaves.
6. Dearborn, George Van Ness. The psychology of clothing. *Psychological Monographs* 26:1-72. 1918.
7. Glenn, Mary Lee. Factors related to anticipated and actual wardrobe needs of freshmen women at Iowa State University. Master's thesis. Ames, Iowa State University, 1964. 69 numb. leaves.
8. Hartman, George W. Clothing: personal problem and social issue. *Journal of Home Economics* 41:295-298. June 1949.
9. Hoffman, Adeline Mildred. College clothing expenditures. *Journal of Home Economics* 52:665-666. October 1960.
10. Morton, Grace M. Psychology of dress. *Journal of Home Economics* 18:584-586. October 1926.
11. National Association of Women Deans and Counselors. List of members. Washington, D.C., July 1966. 64 p.

12. Oregon State University. Beaver code, 1966-1967; a handbook of information for students. Corvallis, Oregon, nd. 72 p.
13. Oregon State University. General information, 1966-67. Corvallis, Oregon. 1965. 64 p. (Bulletin no. 121)
14. Our college wardrobe. In: Off To College, 1967. Washington, D. C. Guidance Research Group, 1966. p. 52-55.
15. Patton, Elizabeth Craft. An analysis of prestige factors in clothing as related to selected groups of freshmen and senior sorority and non sorority women at the University of Alabama. Master's thesis. Tuscaloosa, University of Alabama, 1964. 76 numb. leaves.
16. Russell, Madeline. A study of the wardrobe needs of Purdue University freshmen women for participation in activities outside the classroom. Master's thesis, Lafayette, Ind., Purdue University, 1957. 49 numb. leaves.
17. Ryan, Mary S. Effect on college girls of feeling well dressed. Journal of Home Economics 43:799. December, 1951.
18. Ryan, Mary S. Psychological effect of clothing, comparison of college students with high school students, rural with urban students, boys with girls. Ithaca, N. Y., July 1953. 36 p. (Cornell University. Agricultural Experiment Station. Bulletin 898)
19. Ryan, Mary S. Psychological effects of clothing, survey of the opinions of college girls. Ithaca, N. Y., Sept. 1952. 39 p. (Cornell University. Agricultural Experiment Station. Bulletin 882)
20. Thompson, Henrietta and Mary Neville Edmonds. A minimum college wardrobe for a freshman. Journal of Home Economics 52:662-664. October 1960.
21. Turner, Laura Jean. Factors affecting freshmen women's wardrobes as recommended by senior women. Master's thesis. Manhattan, Kansas State University, 1964. 83 numb. leaves.

22. U. S. Office of Education. Education Directory, 1965-1966.
Part 3. Higher education. Washington, D. C., 1966. 242 p.
23. What the college catalogs don't tell you. Seventeen 24:238-239.
Aug. 1965.

APPENDICES

School of Home Economics 98
Oregon State University
Corvallis, Oregon 97330
February 17, 1967

I am a graduate student in the Clothing, Textiles, and Related Arts Department at Oregon State University and am conducting a study of the requirements for an adequate wardrobe for a woman entering Oregon State. This research is part of my thesis, and hopefully, the information obtained will be made available to women before they enter this university in order to help them plan their college wardrobe.

Does your institution have any information on wardrobe requirements or suggested clothing needs of a woman student on your campus? Do you have a pamphlet or letter which is available to incoming students? I would appreciate receiving a copy of any literature you may have concerning the clothing needs of a girl at your institution.

If you wish a copy of the results of my study, please return the enclosed card and I shall be happy to send you the information when it is completed.

Very truly yours,

Linda Courtney Thiel

APPENDIX B

LIST OF COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES TO WHICH
LETTERS WERE SENTCalifornia

California State College, Hayward
Chico State College, Chico
Fresno State College, Fresno
Humbolt State College, Arcata
Mills College, Oakland
* Sacramento State College, Sacramento
* San Francisco College for Women, San Francisco
San Francisco State College, San Francisco
San Jose State College, San Jose
Stanford University, Stanford
University of California, Berkley
University of California, Davis
* University of the Pacific, Stockton
* University of San Francisco, San Francisco
University of Santa Clara, Santa Clara

Oregon

Eastern Oregon College, La Grande
Lewis and Clark College, Portland
Linfield College, McMinnville
Marylhurst College, Marylhurst
Oregon College of Education, Monmouth
Pacific University, Forest Grove
Portland State College, Portland
Reed College, Portland
Southern Oregon College, Ashland
University of Oregon, Eugene
Universtiy of Portland, Portland
Willamette University, Salem

Washington

Central Washington State College, Ellensburg
Eastern Washington State College, Cheney
Gonzaga University, Spokane
Pacific Luthern University, Tacoma

Appendix B (cont.)

Seattle University, Seattle
Walla Walla College, College Place
Washington State University, Pullman
Western Washington State College, Bellingham
Whitman College, Walla Walla
Whitworth College, Spokane
University of Puget Sound, Tacoma
University of Washington, Seattle

* Replies were not recieved from these colleges and universities.

APPENDIX C

Items of Apparel Included in Each Type of Clothing*

Grubby	Casual	Campus	Church	Semi-Formal	Formal	
Cut-off jeans	Bermudas	Blouses	Dressy coat	Cocktail or	Evening bag	Bras
Jeans	Capris	Boots	Dressy dress	party dress	Evening coat	Girdles
Jersey	Car coat	Campus coat	Gloves	Dressy heels	Evening shoes	Knee socks
Parka	Long pants	Casual dress	Hat	Gloves	Evening wrap	Nightgowns
Sweatshirts	Sandals	Casual suit	Heels	Small purse	Gloves	Nylons
Tennis shoes	Shifts	Flats	Purse		Long formal	Pajamas
T shirt	Swimsuit	Jumpers	Suit		Short formal	Panties
Windbreaker		Little or				Petti-pants
		stack heels				Robe
		Loafers				Slippers
		Purse				Slips
		Raincoat				Socks
		Skirts				Textured
		Sweaters				stockings
		Umbrella				

*Each item of apparel appears in the group indicated by the majority of the women interviewed. Items of apparel mentioned by only one woman are not included.

CLOTHES! CLOTHES! CLOTHES!

Remember the hours you spent on that complicated clothing inventory for Clothing Selection? Wouldn't you like to see it replaced with a simplified inventory? This is one goal I hope to achieve as a result of this questionnaire which is part of the research for my thesis.

A second goal is to provide a guide for an adequate wardrobe for an Oregon State University woman student. Now that you've been on this campus at least a full year, I am sure you know better what clothes you need than you did before you came. You can share your experience with future students by filling out this questionnaire.

The groups or types of clothing and the items included in each were established through interviews with college women at Oregon State. I need your help to determine the average price, type, and number of articles needed for an adequate wardrobe and the amount each type of clothing is worn.

This study will be limited to a campus wardrobe. It will include shoes, hats, handbags, and gloves but it will not include small accessories such as belts, neck scarves, and jewelry.

I know how busy you are at this time of the year, but I will be most grateful if you will take a little time to complete this questionnaire and return it to the class in which you received it. I will greatly appreciate your cooperation, and if a simplified inventory for Clothing Selection and a clothing guide for new students result from this study, future students will be indebted to you.

If you are interested in receiving the results when this study is completed, you may come to my office next fall and I will be happy to give you a copy.

Linda Courtney Thiel

Graduate Student in
Clothing, Textiles and Related Arts

I. General Information:

103

Name _____ Sophomore ☐ Junior ☐

I entered Oregon State University _____ Term, 196 ____.

I am registered in the School of Home Economics. Yes ☐ No ☐

I have taken Clothing Selection, CT 211, or the equivalent at another college or university. Yes ☐ No ☐

I received the questionnaire in _____ (course and number).

I am a sorority pledge or member. Yes ☐ No ☐

II. Directions: Please complete the following inventory as accurately as possible.
Do not leave any blank spaces but write "0" if that item is not applicable.

Column 1. If you have recently taken Clothing Selection, CT 211, you may wish to refer to your clothing inventory to expedite listing the number of garments you now have in your campus wardrobe.

Column 2. Please indicate the number of items you think would be required for an adequate wardrobe. An adequate wardrobe shall be defined as one that includes garments and accessories appropriate in number and style for the variety of occasions you have encountered at Oregon State University. With an adequate wardrobe you should feel comfortable and well dressed for a variety of occasions. However, keep in mind the usually limited closet space.

Column 3. Please state the price that you consider average for each item even though you do not have the item in your own wardrobe.

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>
Specific items included in each type of clothing	*Number in your present wardrobe	Number thought to be adequate	Average cost of each item
<u>Grubby</u>			
<u>Parka</u>			
<u>Windbreaker</u>			
<u>Sweatshirt</u>			
<u>Jersey/T shirt</u>			
<u>Cut-offs</u>			
<u>Jeans</u>			
<u>**Tennis shoes</u>			

*The clothing requirements will be determined for a school year beginning in September and ending in June, so please include only those items you bring to the campus during this period.

**Each item will be listed only once although it may be worn with more than one type of clothing.
Example: tennis shoes may be worn for grubby, casual and campus but are listed only under grubby.

Specific items included in each type of clothing	1 Number in your present wardrobe	2 Number thought to be adequate	3 Average cost of each item
<u>Casual</u>			
Car coat			
Shift			
Capris/long pants			
Bermudas			
Casual set (long or short)			
Sandals			
<u>Campus</u>			
Campus coat (warm)			
Raincoat			
Casual suit			
<u>Lightweight</u>			
<u>Winter weight</u>			
Casual dress			
<u>Lightweight</u>			
<u>Winter weight</u>			
Jumper			
Skirt			
Sweater			
Blouse			
Flats			
Little/stack heels			
Loafers			
Boots			
Handbag			
Gloves			
Umbrella			
<u>Church or Dressy</u>			
Dressy coat			
Suit			
<u>Lightweight</u>			
<u>Winter weight</u>			

Specific items included in each type of clothing	<u>1</u> Number in your present wardrobe	<u>2</u> Number thought to be adequate	<u>3</u> Average cost of each item
<u>Church or Dressy (cont.)</u>			
Dressy dress			
<u>Lightweight</u>			
<u>Winter weight</u>			
<u>Hat</u>			
<u>Heels</u>			
<u>Handbag</u>			
<u>Gloves</u>			
<u>Semi-formal</u>			
<u>Cocktail or party dress</u>			
<u>Dressy heels</u>			
<u>Small bag</u>			
Gloves (do not repeat if listed above)			
<u>Formal</u>			
<u>Evening coat</u>			
<u>Evening wrap</u>			
<u>Long formal</u>			
<u>Short formal</u>			
<u>Evening shoes</u>			
<u>Evening bag</u>			
<u>Gloves (long)</u>			
<u>Unclassified</u>			
<u>Brassiere</u>			
<u>Girdle</u>			
<u>Panties</u>			
<u>Petti-pants</u>			
<u>Slip</u>			
<u>Nylons</u>			
<u>Textured stockings</u>			
<u>Socks</u>			
<u>Knee socks</u>			

Specific items included in each type of clothing	1	2	3
	Number in your present wardrobe	Number thought to be adequate	Average cost of each item
<u>Unclassified (cont.)</u>			
<u>Nightgown</u>			
<u>Pajamas</u>			
<u>Robe</u>			
<u>Slippers</u>			

III. Directions: Please indicate how often you wear each type of clothing by placing a check in the appropriate column. These are approximate averages per week or month during the school year.

Type of clothing	6 or 7 times a week	4 or 5 times a week	2 or 3 times a week	Once a week	Twice a month	Once a month	*Less than once a month
<u>Grubby</u>							
<u>Casual</u>							
<u>Campus</u>							
<u>Church or Dressy</u>							
<u>Semi-formal</u>							
<u>Formal</u>							

*If you wear a type of clothing less than once a month, please indicate the number of times per year it is worn.

IV. When you entered Oregon State University, did you bring any clothing that you did not need? Yes ☐ No ☐

If you answered yes, please check the type of clothing you brought and did not need.

Grubby ☐ Casual ☐ Campus ☐ Church or Dressy ☐ Semi-formal ☐ Formal ☐

V. After you arrived on the Oregon State University campus, did you find you needed some items of apparel you did not bring? Yes ☐ No ☐

If you answered yes, please check the type of clothing you needed and did not bring.

Grubby ☐ Casual ☐ Campus ☐ Church or Dressy ☐ Semi-formal ☐ Formal ☐

VI. Do you consider your own wardrobe to be adequate for the occasions you have encountered at Oregon State University? Yes ☐ No ☐

APPENDIX E

A comparison of the items of apparel thought to be adequate for a woman at Oregon State University as determined by the respondents in this study and the items of apparel considered necessary for a woman at Kansas State University as determined by the senior women interviewed by Turner (21, p. 29-31).

<u>Items of apparel</u>	Number thought to be adequate, Oregon State University, 1967		Number considered necessary, Kansas State University, 1964*	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mode</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Parka	1.02	1		
Windbreaker	.92	1		
Sweatshirt	2.58	2	1.4	0
Jersey/T shirt	1.64	0		
Cut-offs	1.82	2		
Jeans	1.75	2	.93	0
Tennis shoes	2.17	2	1.0	1
Car coat	.87	1	.54	1
Shift	2.99	2		
Capris/long pants	3.57	3	2.8	2
Bermudas	3.15	2	3.3	2
Casual set	1.90	2		
Sandals	1.54	1		
Campus coat	1.15	1	1.0	1
Raincoat	1.11	1	.9	1

Appendix E (cont.)

<u>Items of apparel</u>	Number thought to be adequate, Oregon State University, 1967		Number considered ne cessary, Kansas State University, 1964 *	
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mode</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Casual suit			..105	0
Lightweight	1.56	1		
Winterweight	1.64	2		
Casual dress			5.6	6
Lightweight	5.20	5		
Winterweight	3.30	4		
Jumper	1.87	2		
Skirt	7.98	10	13.5	20
Sweater	7.70	5	9.9	10
Blouse	8.52	10	10.1	10
Flats	3.12	2	1.4	1
Little/stack heels	2.41	2		
Loafers	1.12	1	2.0	2
Boots	1.06	1		
Handbag	2.98	3	2.4	1.5
Campus gloves	2.35	2		
Umbrella	1.21	1		
Dressy coat	1.19	1	1.1	1
Dressy suit			1.96	2
Lightweight	1.49	1		
Winterweight	1.66	2		
Tailored dress			1.73	0
Dressy dress			2.49	2

Appendix E (cont.)

	Number thought to be adequate, Oregon State University, 1967		Number considered necessary, Kansas State University, 1964*	
<u>Items of apparel</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mode</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Lightweight	2.32	2		
Winterweight	2.27	2		
Hat	1.58	2		
Heels	2.93	3	4.0	3
Dressy handbag	1.84	2	2.42	1.5
Gloves	1.94	2		
Cocktail or party dress	1.88	2	2.15	2
Dressy heels	1.39	1		
Small handbag	1.18	1		
Evening coat	.57	1	.19	0
Evening wrap	.66	1		
Long formal	1.39	1	.10	0
Short formal	1.10	1	.49	0
Evening shoes	1.01	1	1.0	1
Evening bag	.86	1	1.1	.61
Gloves (long)	.95	1		
Brassiere	4.41	4	5.0	4
Girdle	2.31	2	1.77	2
Panties	9.96	10	9.24	7-10
Petti-pants	1.06	0	.05	0
Slip	3.51	3	3.29	4
Nylons	6.97	3	4.4	6

Appendix E (cont.)

	Number thought to be adequate, Oregon State University, 1967		Number considered necessary, Kansas State University, 1964*	
<u>Items of apparel</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mode</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>Mode</u>
Textured stockings	1.11	0		
Socks (ankle and crew)	2.52	2	10.1	0
Knee socks	1.18	0		
Nightgown	2.27	2		
Pajamas	1.56	2	3.14	3
Robe	1.44	1		
Slippers	1.33	1		

* Blank spaces indicate that the specific item was not included in the study made at Kansas State University.