

AN ABSTRACT OF THE THESIS OF

Ruth E. Van Slyke for the degree of Master of Science in
Apparel, Interiors, and Merchandising presented on July 26, 1988.

Title: Wardrobe Expenditures of Women Employed Full-Time
in Five Occupational Categories

Redacted for privacy

Abstract approved: _____

Ardis W. Koester

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare annual work wardrobe expenditures, work wardrobe expenditure influences, and selected demographic characteristics of women employed full-time in five occupational categories: professional and technical, managerial and administrative, sales, clerical, and other.

The survey questionnaire included an itemized list of 37 wardrobe items in five groups representative of clothing and accessories women might wear for work and work-related activities. Respondents indicated the total number of each item purchased and total dollar expenditure per item. Respondents also indicated annual expenditures for dry cleaning, alteration and repair; expenditure influences; and selected demographic characteristics. Following pretesting of the survey instrument, the mail questionnaire was sent to 825 women randomly selected from the city directory for neighboring cities Lewiston, Idaho and Clarkston, Washington, who had been employed full-time during the previous year (1985) and who agreed by introductory phone call to participate in the study. Data from a

total of 259 returned, usable questionnaires were included. The sample included an uneven distribution of respondents: 24.3% Professional-Technical, 20.5% Managerial-Administrative, 8.5% Sales, 29.7% Clerical, and 17.0% Other.

One-way analysis of variance, post hoc Tukey's test, Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance, and chi-square test of independence were used to test for significance of differences among occupational categories. Multiple Classification Analysis was used to test for significance of expenditure differences among occupational categories after controlling for the influence of significant demographic characteristics. The Scheffe's test using adjusted mean expenditures was used to reduce the probability of a Type I error.

Significant differences among occupational categories were found for educational level, job income before taxes, and total family income before taxes. Significant differences among occupational categories were not found for marital status, age, presence in the home of children 18 years of age and under, years of employment at present job, and total years of employment.

Significant differences among occupational categories were found for total work wardrobe, footwear and annual dry-cleaning expenditures. However, after controlling for the influence of significant demographic characteristics, significant differences in total work wardrobe expenditures among occupational categories were not found.

The average annual 1985 work wardrobe expenditure of study respondents was \$886; average expenditures ranged from \$11 to \$5925.

Average annual work wardrobe expenditures by occupational category were: Management-Administrative (\$1019), Professional-Technical (\$967), Sales (\$943), Clerical (\$912), and Other (\$535). Survey respondents spent about half (50.3%) of the total work wardrobe expenditure on outerwear, 14.5% on footwear, 14.3% on lingerie, 12.5% on accessories, and 8.4% on protective outerwear. The mean expenditure for outerwear was \$460; for footwear, \$132.

About half of the survey respondents reported annual work wardrobe dry-cleaning expenditures under \$25, about one-fourth reported spending from \$25 to \$50, and one-fourth reported spending \$51 or more. Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative respondents tended to report higher annual dry-cleaning expenditures, and the Other respondents reported annual dry-cleaning expenditures under \$25.

Significant differences among occupational categories for expected wear life of work wardrobe garments and for work uniform requirements were found. Most survey respondents reported wearing work wardrobe garments for 2 to 3 years or 4 to 5 years. Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative respondents tended to wear work wardrobe garments longer, while the Other respondents reported the least years of wear life.

Most survey respondents did not wear a uniform for work; however, about one-half of the Other occupational category respondents and one-fifth of the Professional-Technical respondents reported wearing a work uniform most of the time.

Wardrobe Expenditures of Women Employed Full-Time
in Five Occupational Categories

by

Ruth E. Van Slyke

A THESIS

submitted to

Oregon State University

in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the
degree of

Master of Science

Completed July 26, 1988

Commencement June 1989

APPROVED:

Redacted for privacy

Associate Professor of Apparel, Interiors, and Merchandising

Redacted for privacy

Head of Department of Apparel, Interiors, and Merchandising

Redacted for privacy

Dean of Graduate School

Date thesis is presented July 26, 1988

Typed by Express Typing Service for Ruth E. Van Slyke

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to thank Dr. Ardis W. Koester, Assistant Professor of Apparel, Interiors, and Merchandising, for her guidance and encouragement throughout this study. Appreciation is also extended to the other committee members, Dr. Sally Francis, Dr. Arlene Holyoak, and Dr. Patricia Wells.

Special thanks is expressed to the following individuals who have contributed to the completion of this study:

Dr. Corinne Rowe for her advice concerning the statistical treatment of the data and for her assistance with computer analysis.

Dr. Peggy Pletcher for her encouragement and support during the completion of this study.

Ellen Boslau for her assistance with the pretest phase of this study.

The writer's family for their encouragement and understanding throughout the graduate study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER

1	INTRODUCTION	1
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Definition of Terms as Used in This Study	5
	Purpose	7
	Objectives	7
	Assumptions	8
	Limitations	9
2	REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
	An Overview of Employed Women	10
	Occupational Categories of Employed Women	18
	Wardrobe Inventories	20
	Wardrobe Expenditures	25
	Wardrobe Expenditure Influences	38
	Summary	51
3	PROCEDURE	59
	Hypotheses	59
	Development of the Instrument	60
	Pretesting the Instrument	65
	Selection of the Sample	67
	Data Collection	70
	Analysis Procedure	72
4	RESULTS	76
	Description of the Sample	77
	Wardrobe Inventory of Expenditures and Items Purchased	107
	Wardrobe Expenditure Influences	133
	Presentation of Findings Related to Hypotheses	156
	Summary of Responses to the Open-Ended Question	176
5	CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION	180
	Conclusions	180
	Discussion	185
6	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	217
	Summary	217
	Recommendations	231
	REFERENCES	235

APPENDIX

A	Questionnaire Cover Letter	243
B	Questionnaire	244
C	Criteria for Instrument Evaluation by Professional Panel	250
D	Criteria for Instrument Evaluation by Pretest Respondents	251
E	Phone Interview Format	252
F	One-week Follow-up Postcard	253
G	Three-week Follow-up Letter	254
H	Instrument Coding Instructions	255
I	Occupational Listings for Coding Instructions	261
J	Wardrobe Expenditure Inventories for Total Sample and Each of the Five Occupational Categories	263

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Number and Percentage of Full-time Employed Women by Occupational Category	79
2 Frequency Distribution of Full-time Employed Women by Occupational Category (<u>n</u> = 259)	80
3 Cross-Tabulation of Marital Status by Occupational Category	84
4 Cross-Tabulation of Marital Status by Occupational Category	85
5 Cross-Tabulation of Age by Occupational Category	87
6 Women with Children in the Home Age 18 and Under by Occupational Category	89
7 Respondents' Report of Age Distribution of Children at Home 18 Years of Age and Under by Occupational Category	90
8 Cross-Tabulation of Education by Occupational Category	93
9 Cross-Tabulation of Years of Employment at Present Job by Occupational Category	96
10 Cross-Tabulation of Total Years of Employment by Occupational Category	99
11 Cross-Tabulation of Job Income Before Taxes by Occupational Category	101
12 Cross-Tabulation of Total Annual Family Income Before Taxes by Occupational Category	105
13 Range and Means of Items Purchased and Expenditures by Occupational Category	111
14 Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory Expenditures by Occupational Category	113
15 Average Dollar Expenditure of Wardrobe Subcategories	116
16 Average Expenditure per Item Purchased by Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory and Occupational Category	120
17 Protective Outerwear--Range and Means of Items Purchased and Expenditures by Occupational Category	122

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
18	Outerwear--Range and Means of Items Purchased and Expenditures by Occupational Category	124
19	Footwear--Range and Means of Items Purchased and Expenditures by Occupational Category	126
20	Lingerie--Range and Means of Items Purchased and Expenditures by Occupational Category	128
21	Accessories--Range and Means of Items Purchased and Expenditures by Occupational Category	129
22	Annual Work Wardrobe Dry-Cleaning Expenditures by Occupational Category	131
23	Annual Work Wardrobe Alteration and Repair Expenditures by Occupational Category	134
24	Work Wardrobe Expenditures for 1985 as Compared to Previous Year as Reported by Occupational Category	136
25	Reasons Given for "Spending More" than Previous Year by Occupational Category	138
26	Reasons Given for "Spending Less" than Previous Year by Occupational Category	141
27	Adequacy of Current Work Wardrobe by Occupational Category	144
28	Reasons Given for Inadequate Work Wardrobe Size by Occupational Category	146
29	Cross-Tabulation of Years of Garment Wear Life by Occupational Category	149
30	Frequency of Uniform Worn for Work by Occupational Category	151
31	Method of Uniform Acquisition by Occupational Category	153
32	Mean Scores of Level of Importance of Selected Purchasing Factors by Occupational Category	155
33	Summary of Rank Order of Purchasing Factors by Occupational Category	157
34	Analysis of Variance of Wardrobe Total Inventory Expenditures by Occupational Category	158

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
35 Tukey's Test Differences Between Total Work Wardrobe Mean Expenditures by Occupational Category	160
36 Analysis of Variance of Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory Expenditures by Occupational Category	161
37 Tukey's Test Differences Between Outerwear Mean Expenditures by Occupational Category	163
38 Tukey's Test Differences Between Footwear Mean Expenditures by Occupational Category	164
39 Analysis of Variance of Dry-Cleaning and Alteration/Repair Expenditures by Occupational Category	165
40 Cross-Tabulation of Marital Status by Occupational Category	167
41 Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA of Demographic Characteristics by Occupational Category	168
42 Multiple Classification Analysis of Mean Expenditure Dollars by Occupational Category	171
43 Scheffe's Test Difference Between Adjusted Expenditure Dollar Means	171
44 Cross-Tabulation of Frequency of Uniform Worn for Work by Occupational Category	174
45 Cross-Tabulation of Method of Uniform Acquisition by Occupational Category	175
46 Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for Total Sample	264
47 Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for Professional-Technical Occupational Category	265
48 Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for Managerial-Administrative Occupational Category	266
49 Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for Sales Occupational Category	267
50 Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for Clerical Occupational Category	268
51 Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for Other Occupational Category	269

Wardrobe Expenditures of Women Employed Full-Time in Five Occupational Categories

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

One of the most striking demographic changes in the United States labor force in recent decades has been the dramatic increase in the number of employed women. According to the U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1986), 54.2% of the female population was in the work force in 1985. In 1950, women accounted for less than 30% of the total labor force; by 1985, women accounted for 44% (U.S. Dept. Commerce, BLS, 1986). During the early 1980's women were projected to account for seven out of every ten additions to the labor force (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983a). Through the mid-1990's the chief cause of labor force growth will be the continued, though slower, rise in the number and proportion of women who seek jobs. Women will account for more than three-fifths of the labor force growth during 1984-95 (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1987:14).

Several groups of women have been identified as being responsible for growth in labor force activity. The fastest increasing group of women is 25 to 34 years of age. The proportion of divorced, widowed, separated, and never-married women entering the labor force is greater than ever before. Over 50% of all married women are employed outside the home (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983:22).

Women today do not wait until their youngest child is in school before entering or re-entering the work force. In 1985 nearly 62% of

all women with children under 18 were in the labor force, and the majority work full-time (Hayghe, 1986). Over half (54%) of married mothers of children under age 6 were in the labor force in 1986; and over two-thirds (68%) of single female parents were employed in 1986 (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1987).

Women are no longer casual labor force participants. Three out of four employed adult women work full-time (35 or more hours per week), and three out of five adult employed women work 50 to 52 weeks per year. The average 20-year-old female can expect to spend 25 years in the labor force. This pattern of a more continuous work history of women is expected to expand career and advancement opportunities in the 1980's and beyond (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983a:1-22).

The job mix for women continues to expand. Although the majority of employed women began the 1980's in traditional clerical and service occupations (U.S. Dept. of Labor, 1980:2), a substantial number are beginning to enter the professional-technical occupations with higher status and earnings, such as doctors, lawyers, and accountants, and are acquiring managerial-administrative positions (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983a:140). Women are training and entering or moving up into higher paying occupations. By 1986, 45% of all accountants and auditors were women compared to 34% in 1979. By 1986, women comprised 15% of the lawyers (10% in 1979), 30% of the computer analysts (20% in 1979), 29% of the managers in marketing and advertising (14% in 1979), 29% of the managers and administrators (22% in 1979), and 34% of the sales workers (28% in 1979) (U.S. Dept. Commerce, BLS, 1986).

Many reasons have been cited for the increased numbers of women joining the labor force, including the changing roles of women,

changing jobs, and a changing economy (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986). The reason most often given by women is economic necessity. The traditional belief that women work for "pin money" is no longer true. This is illustrated by the number of women who work to support themselves and their families or to supplement family income. Two incomes are required to maintain the level of living and meet expectations of families (Basil, 1972:29). There is evidence that without the wife's earnings, the income of many families would not provide a minimum level of living (Epstein, 1970:43, Foster, 1981). With the changing attitudes toward gender roles, women are entering the work force not just for the second paycheck or to get away from the limitations of the household, but because of a sense of professional achievement, personal satisfaction, and to utilize their education (Darling, 1975; Scanzoni, 1977; Yankelovich, 1981).

At the beginning of the 1980's, women working full-time averaged about \$6 for every \$10 earned by men. Although earning parity with men was nearly achieved in some newer fields, and in some traditional jobs for women, most women were at the lower end of the pay scale (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983b:28). By the beginning of 1987, women were earning \$7 for every \$10 earned by men (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986).

In 1985, both husband and wife had earnings in nearly two-thirds of married couple families with at least one spouse employed. The mean earnings of dual earner couples was \$39,390, if both worked full-time. Mean earnings were \$24,230 if only the husband was an earner. The ratio of mean earnings of all working wives to those of all working husbands increased from 55% in 1981 to 57% in 1983 for

full-time work year round (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986).

Even though their earnings were relatively low, working wives contributed about 25% of the total family income in 1978 (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983:28). By 1984, the median family income was 40% higher if the wife worked than if the wife had not been in the labor force (Childrens Defense Fund, 1984:71).

Although employed women recognize their contribution to the total family income, they often overlook job-related expenses, such as additional food costs, additional transportation, household help, child care, and clothing for the work wardrobe. These expenses reduce the income available from earnings by one-fourth to one-half, depending on the number and ages of children (U.S. Dept. Labor, 1969:36).

Several consumer expenditure studies suggest employed women tend to have greater clothing needs than women not employed outside the home (Brew, O'Leary, & Dean, 1956; Celanese Fibers Marketing, 1979; Dardis, Derrick, & Lehfeld, 1981; Erickson, 1968). Other studies suggest the occupation of employed women may be as useful as age, income, and the number and ages of children in studying clothing expenditures and wardrobe inventories (Hovermale, 1962; Lipka, 1977; Shaninger & Allen, 1981).

The perceived importance of the work wardrobe may influence work wardrobe expenditures. Although "dress codes" may not be formalized, many companies and businesses enforce informal expectations of dress (Form & Stone, 1955; Kiechel, 1983; Rabolt, 1984; Tate & Glisson, 1961; Turecamo, 1982). Employed women report that clothes do make a

difference in how they are viewed by bosses, colleagues, and clients (Lapitsky & Smith, 1981; Mocoovsky, 1976; Solomon & Douglas, 1983). Working women report clothing is used as an occupational strategy.

With the overall increase of women in the work force, and specifically movement of women into professional and technical jobs, can it be expected that they will require clothing of a higher quality, greater variety, and greater quantity than women who remain in the home? Do wardrobe expenditures of working women differ according to occupational category? Is there a relationship between wardrobe expenditures and years of employment at present job and total years of employment? Is there a relationship between wardrobe expenditures and selected demographics including age, marital status, children in the home 18 years of age and under, and income of working women in various occupational categories?

Answers to these questions might help women make intelligent, knowledgeable decisions with regard to entering the work force and in establishing a realistic clothing budget based on survey data of women in similar occupations. An initial review of literature revealed that although employment status is recognized as being useful in studying wardrobe expenditures of working women, very little research has been conducted dealing with the relationship of occupation and wardrobe expenditures.

Definition of Terms as Used in This Study

Wardrobe expenditures:

Outlay of disposable income for apparel items. Wardrobe expenditures include not only apparel items such as protective

outerwear, outerwear, lingerie, and shoes but also accessories including jewelry, handbags, scarves, belts, umbrellas, briefcases, and hats (Lipka, 1977:5).

Wardrobe inventory subcategories:

Protective Outerwear: winter and all-weather coats, jackets and parkas, capes, other.

Outerwear: Uniforms, suits, jacket/matching skirt or pants, jackets, vests, slacks, jeans, culottes, skirts, blouses, knit tops, T-shirts, pullover sweaters, sweaters, dresses, other.

Footwear: uniform shoes, dress shoes, casual shoes, boots, other.

Lingerie: hose, socks, slips, camisoles, bras, panties, other.

Accessories: umbrellas, hats, gloves, handbags, briefcases, scarves, jewelry, other.

Full-time employment:

Gainfully employed 35 hours or more per week for 40 or more weeks per year (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:37).

Occupational categories of employed women. Defined according to the

U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1980:10):

1. Professional-technical: includes accountants, engineers, lawyers-judges, physicians, registered nurses, teachers, technicians, writers, artists, entertainers.
2. Managerial-administrative (except farm): includes bank officials, financial managers, buyers, purchasing agents, food service workers, sales managers-department heads (retail trade).
3. Sales: includes sales representatives (including wholesale), sales clerks, retail.
4. Clerical: includes bank tellers, bookkeepers, cashiers, office machine operators, secretaries, typists, shipping-receiving clerks.
5. Other: includes craft, operatives, transport equipment operatives, service.

Purpose

The purpose of this research was to examine and compare wardrobe expenditures of women employed full-time in five occupational categories: professional and technical; managerial and administrative; sales; clerical; and other (craft, operatives, transport equipment operatives, service).

Goals of this study were to learn about wardrobe expenditures for women in various occupational categories; to determine the relationship of selected demographic characteristics and wardrobe expenditures; and to learn about selected wardrobe expenditure influences and work wardrobe expenditures.

Objectives

The objectives of this study of women employed full-time in the five occupational categories previously mentioned were:

1. To examine the wardrobe expenditures for women employed full-time in the five occupational categories.
2. To examine the following selected demographic characteristics of women employed full-time in the five occupational categories:
 - a. marital status,
 - b. age,
 - c. presence in the home of children 18 years of age and under,
 - d. years of formal education,
 - e. years employed at present job,
 - f. total years of employment,

- g. personal income from job before taxes, and
 - h. total family income before taxes.
3. To compare wardrobe expenditures of women employed full-time in the five occupational categories, with selected demographic characteristics (same as 2a-h).
 4. To examine the following selected wardrobe expenditure influences on women employed full-time in the five occupational categories:
 - a. wardrobe expenditure changes,
 - b. wardrobe adequacy,
 - c. expected wear life of work wardrobe garments,
 - d. work uniform requirement, and
 - e. factors influencing purchase of work wardrobe.

Assumptions

1. Information requested on the questionnaire was supplied by the participant in an accurate manner.
2. Personal work wardrobe expenditures for the previous year were accurately recalled.
3. A valid random sample was selected which was representative of the full-time employed women in Lewiston, Idaho, and Clarkston, Washington.

Limitations

1. Much of the data were obtained by recall of expenditures during the previous year and are average estimates rather than exact amounts.
2. The sample was limited to full-time employed women living in Lewiston, Idaho, and Clarkston, Washington.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature review, related to this study of wardrobe expenditures of women employed full-time in five occupational categories, is presented under the following sections: An Overview of Employed Women; Occupational Categories of Employed Women; Wardrobe Inventories; Wardrobe Expenditures; and Wardrobe Expenditure Influences.

An Overview of Employed Women

Employed women are changing every sector of society. Their entry into the work force has been referred to as one of the most socially significant phenomena of this century. Entry of women into the labor force began, and was encouraged by the government and industry, during World War II; the number of working women grew to almost 60% (Basil, 1972:19).

Although the growth rate of women in the work force tapered off slightly during the late 1940's and 1950's, from 1960 to the present it has again increased in a "self-sustained revolutionary fashion" (Malabre, 1978). Women have become firmly established members of the labor force. During the 1970's, the labor force activity by women was dramatic, with nearly 12 million women joining the ranks. These women accounted for 60% of the total labor force growth during that period (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:3). By 1985, 54.2% of the adult female population was in the work force (U.S. Dept. Commerce, BLS, 1986),

compared to 51% in 1980. The number of working women in 1980 equalled approximately 44.1 million (52%) of the total labor force (U.S. Dept. Labor, 1980:3). Women will account for more than three-fifths of the labor force growth during 1984-1995 (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1987:14).

Many reasons have been given for the massive number of women joining the labor force. They are complex, involving economic, political, legal, and cultural factors in addition to specific family situations. The reasons most frequently cited include the following: technology has produced jobs requiring less physical effort; time-saving devices for the home have created "free-time" for the homemaker; the national economy has created new jobs; legislation has encouraged more equal opportunities for women; a higher level of living is expected by families and two incomes are required (Basil, 1972; Lazer & Smallwood, 1977:18-19). Other researchers tie the labor force activity of women to the decreasing number of children (Reische, 1972) and to the increased educational level of women (Darling, 1975).

Ozawa (1976:455) surveyed a group of working mothers representative of several occupational categories. Of this group, 89% of the mothers employed in clerical, sales, service, and other blue-collar occupations and 71% of the mothers who were professional workers stated that they were working for economic reasons. Epstein (1970:43) polled professional women about their reasons for working and reported that 84% worked out of "economic necessity."

According to the United States Department of Labor (1983b:24), 16% of all families were headed by women in 1982. The female head of

household group, which includes families headed by single, divorced, separated, and widowed women, is growing in number. For this group of women, employment may be necessary to support self and family.

Another type of economic motivation for women working is the desire to obtain a higher level of living. Lazer and Smallwood (1977:19) investigated the buying behavior of a group of working wives and found that wives often enter the work force to achieve specific short-term goals. The researchers concluded that basically women work outside the home for economic reasons and are job, rather than career, oriented.

Other researchers concur and conclude that women tend to view their employment not as a career but as a job (Bartos, 1977; Stemm, 1980; Tweeten, 1980). If this is true, then the wife's income may support or add to the family's goals rather than personal goals (Feather & Whiston, 1987:10-13).

Barth and Watson (1967:399) examined 1960 census data and found that working wives' earnings constituted 32% of joint family earnings. They hypothesized that the work, occupational level, and income of a working wife would have a major impact on a family's life style. Traditionally the husband's occupation has been the predictor of life style.

There is evidence that without the wife's earnings, the income of many families would not provide a minimum level of living. Foster and Ferguson (1981:120-124), using 1972-73 Consumer Expenditure Survey Data, studied the effects of wife's income on major household expenditures. They concluded that once the effects of family income

were taken into account, wife's employment had no effect on major expenditures. The wife's employment had an indirect effect because total family income was higher. Families were not spending the additional income any differently than the husband's income.

Sampson, Dunsing and Hafstrom (1975:266-297) studied 191 disadvantaged families and 488 typical families to determine factors affecting the employment status of the wife-mother. Three factors were identified as being significant: husband's feelings about the wife working; the youngest child's educational status; and the frequency of family members helping at home. The researchers' conclusions were in agreement with Weil (1961:91-96) who attempted to discover factors related to actual planned participation of married women with children in the labor force. She studied 200 married women with children. Of the 200 women, 100 were working (60% in Professional-Technical and Managerial occupations), 50 were planning to go to work, and 50 did not plan to work. Weil concluded that in addition to the importance of the youngest child being of school age, and a favorable attitude of the husband towards the wife's working, the career orientation of the wife was a determining factor. Wife's work orientation was defined as: wife worked in a professional, technical, managerial or administrative occupation before marriage; wife had specialized training; wife had work experience after marriage; husband had professional or managerial status.

Another factor contributing to the increased labor force participation by women is the women's movement. Yankelovich (1981:72), based on 10 years of study, concluded that changing norms

regarding society's expectations of a woman as wife and mother, and society's expectations of a man as husband and father, are transforming the institution of the workplace and the family. This change reflects a shift in the workplace. Scanzoni (1977) reported that with changing attitudes toward gender roles, women are entering the work force not just for the second paycheck or to get away from the limitations of the household, but because of a sense of professional achievement and personal satisfaction.

Parnelius (1975) compared attitudes and expectations of women in 1969 and 1973 identifying trends in sex-role definition. She found sex-role definitions had shifted. Many young women rejected economic dependence of the traditional wife-mother role; however, they did not reject marriage and children. They believed their careers were of equal importance to their husbands'.

The demographic characteristics of working women have changed significantly during the last 20 years. Some of these changes include: age shifts, number of working wives, marital status, educational level, income distribution, employment status, and work continuity.

Women 25 through 34 years of age accounted for almost half of the increase in the number of female workers during the 1970's. Sixty-four percent of all women in this age group (25-34) were working or looking for work in 1979 and the first half of 1980. Fifty-four percent of the mothers in this age group were working in 1979 (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:1).

The female population is aging. In 1900 the median age of women in the United States was 22.4 years. By 2000 the median age of women is expected to be 38.2 years. The percentage of female adults ages 25 to 44 is 5% lower than in 1950; however, that age group still represents one-fourth of the total number of working women (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983a:2).

Women are not casual labor force participants. Two out of three working women in 1979 were employed at least 40 weeks and worked 35 or more hours each week. Twenty-seven percent of the 2.9 million women who experienced unemployment in 1979 found jobs within one month or less; only 16% were unemployed the entire year (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:1). Women are less likely than men to hold a second job; however, the proportion of women holding a second job doubled during the 1970's (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:15-22).

In response to the demand for additional workers, and the social and demographic changes over the last three decades, the number of wives in the labor force has more than tripled. By 1979, 50% of all wives were working, compared to 41% in 1970 and 22% in 1950.

As wives joined the labor force, the number of working mothers with preschool-age children also increased. Participation rate for wives with children under 6 years of age increased from 30% in 1970 to 45% in 1980, to 54% in 1987 (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1987). Participation rate for wives with children under 18 years in 1979 was almost 50% (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:27); by 1982 the participation rate for wives with children under age 18 had grown to 56% (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983a).

Another segment of the female working population that has increased in numbers is the group of single, never-married, divorced, or separated women. In 1982, one out of every nine women in the labor force (9 million) was in this group and maintained a family. This represents a 57% growth rate since 1972 (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983a:24). According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1987), 68% of single female parents were employed in 1986.

Women have not reached educational parity with men; however, changes are taking place. In 1979, working women had completed, on the average, the same number of years of education as men, 12.6 years. The proportion of working women 25 years of age and older with a college education was 17%. Twenty-three percent of working men 25 years of age and older had college educations (U.S. Dept. Labor, 1982:24-37). In 1949, women were awarded 25% of all bachelor degrees and 10% of all doctorates; in 1972, women were awarded 41% of all bachelor degrees and 16% of the doctorates (Lazer & Smallwood, 1977:17).

The estimated combined yearly income of working women in the United States in 1979 was approximately \$250 billion. Although it is accepted that women deserve equal pay for equal work, on the average, women's earnings lag behind men's in the same job categories. Women hold the majority of jobs in 50 professional occupations, and 36% of the managerial-administrative jobs. However, men tend to be employed in the top of the better-paying professions (U.S. Dept. Commerce, BLS, 1986). Women working full-time averaged \$6 for every \$10 earned by

men during the 1960's. By 1970, women averaged \$6.30 for every \$10 earned by men; by 1985, women working full-time earned \$7 for every \$10 earned by men (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986). Although earnings parity with men has almost been achieved in new fields, such as computer science, most women are still at the lower end of the pay scale (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:48). The median earnings in 1982 of full-time employed women workers was \$18,300 for professional-technical occupations, \$17,518 for managerial-administrative occupations, \$11,250 for sales occupations, and \$12,920 for clerical occupations; for other occupations the range was \$7,776 to \$9,080 (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986).

In March 1979, both husband and wife were earners in 51% of married couple families. By 1985, 63% of married couples were dual earners (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986). The median income of these families was about \$23,000 in 1979 and \$32,468 in 1985, compared to \$17,000 in 1979 and \$24,230 in 1985 for families with only the husband working. Even though their incomes were relatively low, women contributed approximately one-fourth of the family income in 1978 (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:48). The proportion of family income earned by working wives varied depending on the extent of the wife's work experience, ranging from 38% in 1979 to 57% in 1983 if wives worked full-time all year. In 1985, 18% of wives had earnings that exceeded their husbands' earnings, and 8% of wives had earnings of 80% to 100% of their husbands' earnings (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986).

Occupational Categories of Employed Women

The Occupational Outlook Handbook (1987), published by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, listed occupational categories and occupations within each category. Occupations are divided into white-collar and blue-collar occupations. White-collar occupational categories include: professional-technical, managerial-administrative, sales and clerical. Blue-collar occupational categories include: craft, operatives (except transport), transport operatives, and service.

Growth rates among the two groups vary. White-collar workers, both male and female, once a small proportion of the labor force, now represent about half of the total. Since 1960, the total number of service workers has increased; the number of blue-collar workers has increased more slowly than the number of white-collar workers; and the number of farm workers has declined.

The increase in numbers of women working is the result of a growing occupational demand for workers. However, employment opportunities for women still tend to be concentrated in relatively few occupational categories. The majority, 55%, of employed women began the 1980's in the traditional clerical and service occupations (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:1).

The United States Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics makes reference to sectors of the economy and the proportion of women working in each of two sectors: the goods-producing sector and the service-producing sector. Included in the goods-producing sector are: mining, construction, manufacturing of durable goods, manufacturing of

nondurable goods. The service-producing sector of the economy includes: transportation and public utilities, wholesale trade, retail trade, finance, insurance and real estate, services, federal government, state and local government (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983a:9).

Women are on the payrolls of every major industry group but are concentrated in the service-producing sector of the economy. Women comprised half of the employees in the service-producing sector in 1982. In contrast, one-fourth of the employees in the goods-producing sector in 1982 were women (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983b:8).

Three of the service-producing industries, including retail trade, health services, business and educational services, and state and local government, accounted for most of the job gains for women over the past decade. Of the 13 million increase in the number of women working since 1970, three-fourths were in the fast growing service-producing sector, which tended to have the lowest paying industry jobs (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983b:8).

Between 1972 and 1983, the number of women working in clerical and professional occupations increased by more than 50% to include 52% of all working women. A substantial increase also occurred in the service occupation category, which in 1982 accounted for one out of five employed women (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983b:10).

Other changes in participation by women in occupational categories have occurred since 1970. In 1982, 99% of all secretaries, 96% of all nurses, and 82% of all elementary school teachers were women. A decade ago, three-fourths of all women employed in

professional fields were nurses or teachers. By 1982, the proportion of professional women employed as nurses or teachers declined to one-half. The proportion of women doctors, lawyers, and accountants, however, is increasing (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1985).

There is evidence that women are training and moving into higher paying fields. In 1985, women comprised 45% of all accountants and auditors, 15% of all lawyers, 30% of all computer analysts, 29% of all managers and administrators, and 34% of all sales workers (U.S. Dept. Commerce, BLS, 1986). However, between 1984 and 1995 the majority of occupations with the largest expected job growth included lower-paying jobs such as cashiers, janitors, nursing aides, waitresses, and retail sales workers (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1985).

Wardrobe Inventories

Winakor (1969:631-632) identified wardrobe inventory as one of three parts in the process of clothing consumption. Clothing acquisition, clothing discard, and clothing stock or inventory are interrelated. Clothing is added to inventory by acquisition and removed from inventory by discard. Inventory is continually changing as acquisition and discard take place.

Winakor (1969) considered wardrobe inventory the stock of garments that an individual or family possessed at a given time. The inventory represents only garments available for regular use, including garments temporarily stored, clothing in use, and clothing in the process of being cared for (cleaning, mending).

Because of the intricate relationship of inventory to the other parts of clothing consumption, Winakor (1969) and Brew, O'Leary and Dean (1956) suggested that when collecting data, a researcher must rely on the judgment of survey respondents. Clothing which the owner does not intend to wear within a one-year period is not counted as inventory even though it has not technically been discarded.

In a study of 900 families, Brew, O'Leary and Dean (1956) reported they found that respondents may be uncertain if a garment will be worn again. They also found that stored clothing may become obsolete because of size change of the owner, fashion change, and shared items of clothing. Winakor (1969:630) reported that garments may be acquired for temporary use by borrowing or renting.

Specific sources of clothing for wardrobe inventory have been observed by several researchers. Brew, O'Leary and Dean (1956) concluded that the average family acquired the largest portion of clothing by purchasing ready-to-wear. They found that the wives in the study had acquired only 10% of their wardrobe inventory by gift, and home sewing accounted for only 6% of the total inventory (4). Winakor (1969:630) reported that the relative importance of specific sources of clothing varies with time, place, economic and social circumstances, and with characteristics of families and individuals.

Brew, O'Leary and Dean (1956), Foght and Winakor (1967), Hovermale (1962), Lipka (1977), and Tweeten (1980) used one-year periods for collecting clothing acquisition data. Winakor (1969:632) suggested that periods of measurement of clothing acquisition less

than one year give biased data. One year encompasses a full cycle of seasons, both social and climatic.

Survey data on clothing inventories and amounts of clothing acquired were collected by Brew, O'Leary and Dean (1956:1). Families were asked to report the number of articles of clothing on hand that were in current use or that would be used again. Families also reported kinds and amounts of clothing acquired during the year preceding the interview. These data included numbers of garments acquired and expenditures. The data were collected during an interview in the home. Recall was facilitated by an itemized list of garments for each family member.

Brew, O'Leary and Dean (1956:2) found that on the average, families in the study owned more clothing than had been anticipated. Some of the clothing was not in good repair, but the families considered it part of the inventory. The researchers concluded that families, if necessary, could get along without new clothing for considerable periods of time. They found that wardrobe inventory was reflective of family income. Higher income families in the study owned 35% more clothing and purchased 75% more clothing in one year than did lower income families. Women in higher income families owned 26% more clothing and purchased 43% more clothing items during one year than did wives in lower income families.

Clothing inventory may reflect the employment status and occupation of women. Lipka (1977) and Hovermale (1962) studied clothing expenditures of employed women and reported clothing practices including wardrobe inventories. In a study of 30 business and

professional women, Lipka (1977:49) found that the outerwear category of clothing inventory represented the greatest numbers of clothing items in the work wardrobes of participants. Outerwear included blouses, skirts, slacks, dresses, suits, sweaters, and pantsuits.

Hovermale (1962) surveyed the clothing practices of 314 women employed full-time in either clerical or professional occupations. She found no significant difference in the number of garments owned by clerical and professional women in her study..

Although the Brew, O'Leary, Dean study (1956:21) included a relatively small number of working wives, some general inventory patterns were evident. Differences in wardrobe inventories of wives who did and wives who did not work for paid employment were relatively small. The differences in quantities purchased during the year of study were considerable. Wives who were not employed outside the home purchased only two-thirds as many items of clothing as did wives who were employed. No differences were shown between working and non-working wives in the methods of clothing acquisition, including gifts and home sewn, for wardrobe inventory items.

Clothing inventory, the second part of the process of clothing consumption, has been defined by Winakor (1966) as the "use, maintenance and storage of garments by the family." Market demand and acquisition of new clothing may be explained partly in terms of how much clothing people have on hand from previous periods (Stone & Rowe, 1957). Wagner (1982:11-12) used 1972-73 Consumer Expenditure Survey data of 10,034 households in 26 sampling units to study family clothing consumption and expenditures. She concluded that there are

limits to the number of clothing items that can be either worn or stored. The "saturation of demand" level for sub-classes of clothing, such as hosiery, nightwear, undergarments, is met with fewer garments than the saturation level for outerwear. Categories of clothing with fewer style options are saturated much easier than clothing in general.

The final step in the process of clothing consumption is discard. Discard, according to Winakor (1969:629-634) occurs when a garment leaves the possession of the family. Methods of discard include throwing away, giving away, selling, or exchanging. Winakor suggested that the timing of discard or inventory replacement may be a function of income. She proposed a two-part theory relating the durability of clothing to income. Clothing is either durable or non-durable. Staple clothing items, such as stockings and underwear, are usually of low-unit cost and are purchased out of regular income, thus they are non-durable. Non-durable clothing items wear out and are replaced frequently without regard for temporary fluctuation in income. Durable clothing items, such as coats and suits, have higher unit costs. Such expenditures are postponable and are either planned in anticipation of increased income or purchased out of windfall income.

Chun (1987) investigated clothing disposal practices of 89 female university students age 18 to 30. She found significant differences between fashion innovators and non-fashion innovators in length of time blouses and dresses were retained. Fashion innovators wore wardrobe items for a shorter time than did non-fashion innovators,

were less likely to use clothing for rags, and reported clothing discard due to fashionability and conformity.

The International Fabricare Institute predicts the average life expectancy of textile items receiving average care and wear (Consumer Affairs Update, 1986). The average wear-life of clothing depends on fabric and style; however, the average life-expectancy is 3 to 4 years for coats and blazers; 3 years for blouses, dresses, slacks, and sweaters; 2 to 4 years for suits; 2 to 3 years for shirts and skirts; 1 to 2 years for lingerie; and 1 year for uniforms.

Wardrobe Expenditures

Personal philosophies about the importance of clothing, which are derived from one's own experience, will greatly influence how money is spent for clothing (Oppenheim, 1965:131). The quantity of money expended for clothing varies depending on sex, age, family size, climate, personal aesthetics, social needs, occupation, and family income (Troelstrup, 1974).

According to the Consumer Price Index, apparel and upkeep prices in 1985 rose 4.4% over those in 1984. Women's suits (up 24%) and women's separates and sportswear (up 13.6%) led the increase in clothing prices from December 1984 to September 1985. During this period, prices for women's clothing increased 8.5% as compared to 4.4% for all apparel (Courtless, 1986:17).

The annual clothing expenditure per person for 1985 was \$617. This amount exceeded 1984 spending by \$25 per person. The increase

was due to higher prices (76%) and to increased buying (24%) (Courtless, 1986:17).

Although apparel prices are increasing, and consumers are spending more for clothing, the expenditure for clothing is a shrinking percentage of total personal consumption expenditures. During 1985, consumer units spent an average of 5.5% of total consumption expenditures for apparel and related services. In 1972-73, 7.7% of total consumption expenditures were spent for apparel and related services (Courtless, 1986:17). In 1961, 8.5% of total consumption expenditures were spent for apparel and related services, and in 1946 apparel expenditures accounted for 12% of total consumption expenditures (Flint, 1973).

Dardis, Derrick and Lehfeld (1981) used data from the 1972-73 Bureau of Labor Statistics Consumer Expenditure Survey, the most recent and comprehensive source of consumer expenditure data at the time, to examine clothing expenditures. They found that clothing expenditures, including clothing upkeep services, comprised 7% of total household expenditures. Hovermale (1962) studied clothing expenditures of clerical and professional women and found that the respondents in the study spent 8.3% of total household expenditures for clothing and clothing upkeep. Both studies (Dardis, Derrick & Lehfeld, 1981; Hovermale, 1962) confirmed the clothing expenditure proportion of total consumer expenditures as reported by Flint (1973) and Courtless (1986).

One of the main demographic factors related to wardrobe size and amount spent is gender. Ryan (1966:120) concluded, after reviewing current clothing consumption studies, that wives tended to spend less

for clothing than their husbands did if family income was low. The reverse was true for middle-income wives, who tended to spend more than their husbands. Erickson (1968:14-19) analyzed data from the 1960-61 Survey of Consumer Expenditures and reported that women of all ages spent more money for clothing than did men. Women spent 38% more for clothing than men did at ages 18 to 24, and 26% more than men did at ages over 25.

Age influences clothing expenditures. Ryan (1966:120) reported that young adult women spend more dollars for clothing and purchase more clothing items than do older adult women. Erickson (1968:15) reported that women ages 18 to 24 reported the highest clothing expenditures. As the age of women increased from 25 to 65, fewer clothing items were purchased but the price paid for clothing peaked between ages 25 to 65. Erickson indicated a possible explanation might be the need to dress appropriately for social and professional roles which require more expensive clothing, especially for the woman in line for promotion or at the height of a career. In her study, Erickson found that women reporting higher incomes were more apt to be employed than were women with lower incomes.

Henry (1972) studied clothing expenditure patterns of 311 married working and non-working women and reported a significant and positive relationship between a woman's clothing expenditure and her age. Brew, O'Leary and Dean (1956:13) found age to be an important determinant of clothing expenditures. In this study, it was found that women ages 30 to 39 purchased two times more clothing than did women age 60; peak clothing expenditures were at age 35.

Dardis, Derrick and Lehfeld (1981) confirmed the relationship of age to clothing expenditures. Review of 1972-73 Consumer Expenditure Survey data revealed a decline in clothing expenditures after the head of household reached 55 years old. Families headed by persons, male or female, who were 45 and younger spent from 18% to 31% more for clothing than did households headed by persons 65 and older.

Age also influences clothing expenditures for different categories of clothing. Erickson (1968:16) reported that expenditures for most types of clothing for women increased steadily till age 24. The 18- to 24-year-old woman spent more for suits, dresses, lingerie, and accessories. After age 24, the peak in clothing expenditures was for coats, fur accessories, and hats. Erickson found that with advancing age, even after 64, prices paid increased steadily for the following items: heavy winter coats, lightweight coats and toppers, suits, street dresses, blouses, skirts, lingerie, shoes, hats, and purses.

Family size has been identified as influencing clothing expenditures. Flint (1973) studied data from the 1960-61 Consumer Expenditure Survey of 10,382 families and reported that clothing expenditures increased as family size increased and as the family progressed through the family life cycle. Flint determined that 16% of family clothing expenditure variation could be explained by family life cycle stage and family size. Wagner (1982), using 1972-73 Consumer Expenditure Survey data from 10,034 households, reported that family size was a major determinant of family clothing expenditures.

Erickson (1968:19) reviewed 1960-61 Consumer Expenditure Survey data and reported that single women families spent more for clothing

than did any other family type or size; women heads of households with children spent less for clothing than did other women in the study.

Brew, O'Leary and Dean (1956:16) reported that wives with two children spent 20% less on clothing than did wives with no children. Dardis, Derrick and Lehfeld (1981) reported contradictory clothing expenditure patterns. Husband-wife families in their study spent less than other families for clothing. Henry (1972), after examining clothing expenditure patterns of working and non-working married women, found no relationship between children in the home and clothing expenditures. Dardis, Derrick and Lehfeld also reported no significant difference for clothing expenditures between households with children under age 6 and other households studied.

Galbraith (1966) indicated in an analysis of various consumer buying research that clothing expenditures were directly related to several socio-economic factors, including education. As education increased, so did clothing expenditures. Flint (1973) reported that clothing expenditures increased as educational level of the family head increased. Flint explained 5% of the variation in clothing expenditures by variation in educational level of family head. Wagner's (1982) analysis of 1972-73 Consumer Expenditure Survey data supported Flint's findings. Wagner concluded that clothing expenditures increase with increasing educational level.

Dardis, Derrick and Lehfeld (1981) in their review of 1972-73 Consumer Expenditure Survey data reported that the educational level of the household head was related to clothing expenditures. An upward trend in clothing expenditures as education increased from grade

school to some college was reported. Clothing expenditures were similar for some college and a college degree.

Ryan (1966:120) reported that income was related to wardrobe size and to the total wardrobe expenditure. She reported that as income increased, the absolute and relative amount spent for clothing increased up to a certain point. At higher income levels, the amount in actual dollars spent on clothing may still increase but the relative amount decreases. Galbraith (1966) and Flint (1973) reported similar findings. Flint reported that clothing expenditures increased as family disposable income increased and that 36% of the variation in clothing expenditures can be explained by disposable income.

Erickson (1968:17) found total clothing expenditures for all ages increased as income increased for the families she studied. Increases represented purchases of more clothing items and an increase in expenditure per item. Employed women showed the highest clothing expenditures of the groups she studied; however, women in the highest income families in her study were also more apt to be employed than were women in the lower income families.

Dardis, Derrick and Lehfeld (1981) reported that clothing expenditures were positively and significantly related to income. Clothing and clothing upkeep accounted for 7.8% of total consumer expenditures for all income levels studied. Brew, O'Leary and Dean (1956:9) found that women in higher income levels purchased 43% more clothing than did women in low income groups; however, they spent twice as much. As income increased, unit price paid increased.

Hovermale (1962) studied clothing expenditures of 314 single women employed full-time in clerical or professional occupations. As

household income increased, the percentage of total household expenditures spent for clothing decreased. Higher income participants spent 2.4% less for clothing than did the lower income participants.

Ryan (1966:121) and Galbraith (1966) each concluded that clothing expenditures were directly related to occupation and the work status of the wife. Ryan reported that women working outside the home had larger wardrobes and spent more on clothing than did wives who were not employed outside the home. Galbraith tied education, income, and occupational levels together; as these variables increased, so did the total clothing expenditure. Much of the literature reviewed considered work status of the wife and occupation in relation to clothing expenditures.

Flint (1973), using data from the 1960 Consumer Expenditure Survey, analyzed family clothing expenditures in relation to socio-economic status (as measured by Duncan's Socio-economic Index: occupation, education, and income) and selected family characteristics of family life cycle, family size, and number of earners within the family unit. Duncan (1961) had concluded that occupation may be important in determining clothing expenditures in two ways. He suggested that occupation helps determine a family's socio-economic index, and, regardless of socio-economic index, workers in different occupations may have different clothing expenditures. Duncan ranked major occupational groups and assigned each a socio-economic index number.

Flint concluded that clothing expenditures were positively related to Socio-economic Index scores and that about 5% of the

variation in clothing expenditures was explained by variation in the Socio-economic Index. Flint reported that clothing expenditures were also related to occupation of the family head. The Sales category had a lower Socio-economic Index score than did either the Professional/Technical or the Non-farm Managers, Officials and Proprietors category, yet families with household head in a sales occupation had the highest family clothing expenditures, followed by non-farm managers and professional-technical. Flint reported that 6% of clothing expenditure variation was due to occupation of the head of household. She reported that clothing expenditures also increased with the number of earners within the family unit; 10% of clothing expenditure variation could be explained by number of earners within the family unit.

Wagner's (1982) analysis of 1972-73 Consumer Expenditure Survey data confirmed Flint's findings, with slight variation. Wagner reported that the largest mean clothing expenditure was among families headed by professionals or managers. Families headed by clerical or sales workers reported higher clothing expenditures than families headed by blue-collar workers.

Wagner (1982) confirmed Dardis, Derrick, Lehfeld's (1981) finding that families in which wives were employed spent more for clothing than did families in which the wife did not work. Wagner reported that families in which the wife worked spent one-third more; the Dardis, Derrick, Lehfeld (1981) study reported that the wives working increased clothing expenditure by almost one-fourth. The same trend was found by Brew, O'Leary and Dean (1956:8), who reported that wives not employed purchased two-thirds as much as did employed wives.

Tweeten (1980) confirmed the influence of the wife's employment status on clothing expenditures. Tweeten studied one-year clothing expenditures and employment status of 327 randomly selected women. She found that women employed full-time tended to spend more annually for clothing than did women not employed or women employed part-time. However, women not employed tended to have higher annual clothing expenditures than did women employed part-time. Women employed full-time reported higher family incomes and tended to work at white-collar jobs.

A 1979 Celanese Fibers Marketing report concluded that the average working woman spends more per year on work apparel alone than her non-working counterpart spent on an entire wardrobe, and that clothing expenditures of working women are related to occupation.

Caudle (1962) reported contradictory data. She studied expenditures of 205 wives employed full-time as clerical workers and 205 wives not employed. All wives in the sample had husbands working full-time. Caudle reported no significant difference of clothing expenditures between households of wives employed and wives not employed.

Recognizing the relationship of employment status and clothing expenditures, Britton (1974:3) developed clothing budgets based on 1960-61 Survey of Consumer Expenditures data. Prices were updated with Consumer Price Index figures for 1972. Britton developed budgets at three cost levels, using the same economic levels as USDA food plans: economy, low-cost, and moderate-cost. Shoes were included in the budget allowance for clothing; however, cost of clothing materials

(fabric and notions) and upkeep were not included. Britton recommended adding 10% to 15% to the cost of a given budget to cover upkeep and materials. The moderate-cost level budget for the West included comparisons of employed and not employed women ages 25 to 64. The clothing budget amount recommended for a married woman not employed was \$263 per year. The annual clothing budget amount recommended for a married woman employed full-time was \$311; for a single woman employed full-time, \$295.

The clothing budgets developed by Britton (1974) included recommendations for employed women in addition to women not working; however, occupational status was not considered. Several researchers have reported the influence on clothing expenditures by the occupation of the working woman. Schaninger and Allen (1981:198) studied influences on consumption patterns of 225 families and found that the wife's occupational status was significantly related to clothing purchases. Schaninger and Allen, using Hollingshead's Index of Social Position, grouped full-time working wives by social status of the wife's occupation. High occupational status working wives included managerial, professional, administrative, and semi-professional categories. Low occupational status working wives included secretarial, clerical, retail, technicians, blue-collar, and service categories. Schaninger and Allen (1981:193) found that the wife's occupation was significant before and after controlling for income. The low status wives purchased more \$25-\$40 dresses than did the high status wives. The high status wives purchased more \$41-\$60 dresses than did the low status wives. Schaninger and Allen suggested that

use of the wife's occupational category holds promise and might enhance explanations of family lifestyle and consumption patterns.

Dardis, Derrick and Lehfeld (1981) agreed that occupation is an important influence on clothing expenditures. They found that white-collar workers spent from 14% to 18% more money for clothing than did blue-collar workers.

The influence of occupational status was studied by Hovermale (1962). The 314 women in her study were employed full-time in professional and clerical occupations. She found that clothing practices varied slightly between the clerical and professional women in type of apparel purchased. The professional and clerical women reported similar clothing expenditures, similar unit price paid, and similar number of items purchased. However, professional workers purchased more at the upper level price range and clerical workers purchased more at the lower level of price range. Clerical women spent 9.9% of total income for clothing and upkeep; the professional women spent 7.8% of total income for clothing and upkeep.

Lipka (1977) surveyed 30 randomly selected women employed full-time in professional and secretarial-clerical occupations. The annual clothing expenditure for clothing worn primarily for work and work-related activities ranged from \$40 to \$1,185; the average expenditure was \$432. Hovermale (1962) reported an average clothing expenditure of \$485 for working women in her study; clothing expenditures reported in Hovermale's study were total clothing expenditures, not just expenditures for the work wardrobe.

Expenditures for clothing care were reported by several researchers. Lipka (1977) reported a minimal expenditure for dry cleaning; alteration costs averaged less than \$5 per study respondent. Erickson (1968) reported an average family expenditure of \$59 per year for clothing upkeep. Wagner (1982) reported that expenditures by families for clothing related services (dry cleaning, alteration and repair) were significantly higher among families with non-working wives than among families with working wives.

A great variation in the annual dollar expenditure for clothing has been reported, ranging from a low of \$192 to \$600 reported by 38% of the career women in Taylor's (1983) study, to a high of \$1,700 reported by Associated Merchandizing Corporation (1979). Tweeten (1980) reported that half of all women in her study spent less than \$500 annually for personal wardrobes.

Rabolt (1984) studied 588 women in a wide range of careers, most in middle management positions. She reported that the amount spent for the work wardrobe the previous year ranged from \$200 to \$2,000 and up. The majority (30%) of the career women in her study spent from \$500 to \$999 annually on their career wardrobes. Slightly fewer (23%) spent from \$1,000 to \$1,500; 10% spent up to \$2,000; and 10% spent over \$2,000.

In addition to studying the influence of occupation on clothing expenditures, several researchers reported the proportion of clothing expenditure dollars spent for categories of clothing. Gilmore (1939:39) studied business and professional women and reported 14% of the clothing expenditure was spent for protective outerwear (coats and

outdoor wraps), 24% was spent for outerwear, 7% for lingerie, 16% for footwear, and 12% for accessories. Monroe and Pennell (1939:10) reported similar findings. The professional women in their study spent slightly more for outerwear and more for lingerie than did the women in Gilmore's study.

Hovermale (1962:110) and Lipka (1977:47) reported about the same proportion of the total clothing expenditure for the wardrobe categories. The greatest proportion of dollars and the greatest proportion of number of items purchased were reported for the outerwear category. The smallest proportion of the total clothing expenditure was spent for accessories. The respondents in Lipka's (1977) study spent a greater proportion of the clothing dollar (54%) for outerwear than did the respondents in Hovermale's (1962) study (32%). The respondents in Lipka's study spent less (16%) for protective outerwear than the respondents in Hovermale's study (29%). The proportion of the clothing expenditure spent for footwear was 14% in the Hovermale study and 16% in the Lipka study. For accessories, 10% of the clothing expenditure was spent in the Hovermale study; 14% in the Lipka study.

Hovermale (1962:110) reported that professional women spent proportionally more of their clothing dollars for coats and dresses, the clerical workers spent proportionally more for footwear, hosiery, and lingerie.

Wardrobe Expenditure Influences

The literature reviewed in this section will focus on the importance of clothing in occupational role; clothing interest; and clothing purchasing criteria. Clothing interest, the reasons particular garments are purchased, and the use of clothing in the occupational role may influence wardrobe expenditures of working women.

Importance of Clothing in Occupational Role

Form and Stone (1955) studied the social significance of clothing in occupational life of 108 men. This study, one of the first major attempts to appraise the relevance of clothing to occupational role, suggested that occupation may be an important variable to use in studying clothing behavior. Dress may function as a symbol which can be used in the work situation to influence others. Form and Stone found that men in higher prestige occupations (white-collar jobs) considered clothing to be more important than did men in lower prestige occupations (blue-collar jobs). The white-collar employee who was upwardly mobile spent an appreciable amount of money on clothing.

Appearance may play an important role in the occupation of an individual. Clothing, a part of total appearance may aid an individual in the acquisition of a position, retention of that position, and advancement (Macovsky, 1976; Champagne, 1973:64). Dearborn (1918-1919) suggested a positive relationship existed between clothing and job successes. He believed that a first appearance is

often very significant and, more importantly, very lasting. Dyer (1923:5) wrote: "If men and women could realize how carefully their dress is examined and judged when they apply for a position, they would make their clothing a deliberate study."

Working women are becoming aware that appearance may aid in getting and keeping a job. The majority of 6,000 career-oriented women surveyed throughout the United States claimed that clothes do make a difference in how a person is viewed by bosses, colleagues, and clients (Solomon & Douglas, 1983:59). Clothing can be used as an occupational strategy; business people use clothing to seek advancement because it has been found that apparel cues communicate career intent (Solomon, 1986). Lapitsky and Smith (1981) in an earlier study found that an attractively dressed writer received higher ratings on intelligence, talent, sincerity, and ability than did unattractively dressed writers.

The 1980 Celanese Fibers Marketing Study concluded that the clothing needs of women entering the work force differed from those of women at home and that the type of clothing and clothing needs depended on the type of employment. Key determinants in occupational clothing purchase and importance were linked to self-image, aspiration level, and fashion orientation or interest. Secondary influences were found to include marital status, husband's occupation and income, personal and community interests and activities, peer group, and social class.

Ericksen (1983) studied the relationship of self-image/clothing image to clothing worn for work of 227 women faculty and staff of

three universities. Her purpose was to develop a model using the theoretical self-image, clothing image, and achievement motivation to predict a woman's clothing behavior for work. She found that self-image/clothing image is predictive of work clothing. Women most often wore outfits similar to their self-image beliefs and avoided those which were unlike their self-image beliefs.

Rabolt's (1984) study confirmed the findings of the Celanese Fibers Marketing Study (1980) and of Ericksen (1983). Career aspirations do influence the perceived importance of clothing for work. Rabolt reported that the career women in her study who had planned a career or who were developing a career perceived dress differently than those who had just a job. Rabolt concluded that working women differ in their attitude toward the importance of clothing. The career women with planned goals considered clothing to be more important than those women with jobs.

Dress codes, written or unwritten, seem to be part of the business world. Firms concerned with their public image and the appearance of employees view professional dress as an attitude of respect for the company and its clients. Therefore, career women working in such an environment were expected to be sensitive to those managerial established norms and accept influence on their career dress (Kiechel, 1983). In some industries and professions, dress codes do not exist (academia or research). Internal standards for performance are expected and a "public image" is not perceived as important. In business, where a public image is crucial, the appearance of employees becomes a concern of management (Kiechel,

1983). Some firms, such as banks, explain in detail what their employees should and should not wear. Other firms promote a dress code by example. There is no formal dress code; however, if the informal dress code is broken, the employee would be reprimanded (Turecamo, 1982).

The degree of formality in career dress of women seems to depend on the career. Williams (1977) and Solomon and Douglas (1983) found business dress differed according to geography, climate, and industry or profession. They reported a range of acceptable career dress for women. Dillon (1980) found male professionals perceived formality of dress to be appropriate for women employees more often than did women professionals. Williams (1977) studied the "typical" successful woman executive and found no established pattern of dress. She found that style of dress varied considerably and most women interviewed were curious about what other business women were wearing. Damhorst (1982) studied people in middle and upper management to determine how formality of dress affected perceptions of others in a business setting. The formality of the clothing did affect the descriptions of role, status, behavior and traits.

The amount of career dress influence working women accept seems to vary. Kelly, Blouin, Glee, Sweat, and Arledge (1982) studied career appearance perceptions and found that those students and recruiters who expected to have daily contact with clients reacted more positively to career appearance than those who expected to have little contact with clients. Career women who were more visible to clients or superiors in the business setting were expected to accept

more influence on their dress than those who were less visible. Robertson (1971) suggested that those who have been employed in careers for a long period of time were expected to be influenced less by the work environment.

The career-oriented women in Rabolt's (1984) study perceived clothing to be important. Less than half reported there were implied or formal dress codes for their positions. Most held middle management positions. One-third reported that they interacted daily with the public or with clients, and two-thirds were visible on a daily basis to superiors. The majority (70% of 588 respondents) wore formal, tailored clothing on the job; however, most reported adding "personal touches" to their outfits. Only 12% wore "completely unique" outfits and 8.5% wore "current fashion." Rabolt (1984) found dress approval was most often sought from superiors, and male superiors were more influential than were female superiors.

Clothing Interest

Clothing interest has been described as the primary motivator for clothing purchases. "Our interest in clothing, the reasons we choose particular garments, the effects of clothing on behavior and the way we perceive clothing are all dependent on social and cultural factors" (Ryan, 1966:2). Gurel and Deemer (1974) defined clothing interest as:

the attitudes and beliefs about clothing. The knowledge and attention paid to clothing, the concern and curiosity a person has about his or her own clothing and clothing of others. This interest may be manifest by an individual's practices in regard to clothing itself...the amount of time, energy, and money he or she is willing to spend on clothing; the degree to which he/she uses clothing in an experimental manner; and his/her awareness of fashion and what is new."

To measure the money, time, energy, and attention given to clothing, Rosencranz (1949) developed a clothing interest questionnaire. She studied women from diverse socio-economic backgrounds, age, education, and occupation. Rosencranz concluded that wardrobe is probably the most sensitive indicator of a woman's clothing interest. Her findings indicated that significant positive relationships existed between the scores on the clothing interest questionnaire and occupation and income. In a later study, Rosencranz (1962:22) reported women who scored high in fashion interest and awareness usually had higher incomes, higher social status, and higher educational levels than did women who scored lower.

Bonaker (1970) reported slightly contradictory findings. She reported that age, marital status, and sex were the most significant indicators of clothing interest, and weak relationships existed between clothing interest and educational level, income, occupation, social class, and number of children.

Flaten (1983) studied the influence of selected demographics (age, marital status, educational level, dependent children, and employment) on clothing interest of baby boom generation adult women and older adult women. She found no significant differences in clothing interest between these two groups of adult women and concluded that demographics may not be the most important determinants of change in clothing interest.

Age was found to be significantly related to clothing interest. Young women in Sproles and Geistfeld's (1978) study were found to be more clothes conscious. Women under 30 years of age in Scruggs'

(1977:10) study exhibited higher clothing interest. Horridge and Richards (1984) studied the clothing interest and economic clothing practices of professional home economists and found high fashion awareness for women between 25 and 34 years of age and low fashion awareness for women between 35 and 44 years of age.

Fashion interest may be related to employment status and occupation. Sproles and Geistfeld (1978) reported clothing interest to be higher among better educated women who were employed and had husbands in higher status occupations and income levels. Tweeten (1980) studied 327 women to identify clothing interest levels of employed and nonemployed women. She reported no difference between clothing interest levels of the employed and nonemployed women in her study; however, she did find significant differences between clothing interest of full-time and part-time employed women. Horridge (1984) found high fashion awareness for women in business and public relations fields of home economics, and low fashion awareness for women in food service fields of home economics.

Feather and Whiston (1987) examined nonurban women's occupations and their husbands' occupations to determine if women's clothing interests were affected by the type of employment held by either or both individuals. The researchers surveyed 476 women and found that a woman's occupation did not significantly affect her interest in clothing but her husband's occupation did. Women married to hourly wage earners revealed less interest in clothing and fashion than did women married to professionals or farm owner/operators. Wives of farm

owner/operators revealed greater interest in appearance than did those married to professionals or hourly wage earners.

Several studies indicate that women with high fashion interest may spend more for clothing. Douglas (1976) investigated clothing purchasing patterns and clothing interest of working and nonworking women and found those with higher clothing interest spent more for clothing. Lipka (1977) found a positive correlation between clothing interest and clothing expenditures. Subjects in her study with high clothing interest tended to spend more for clothing than did subjects with low clothing interest.

Clothing Purchasing Criteria

Clothing consumption research indicates that before an individual will purchase a specific garment, the garment must meet a minimum level of requirements for the individual (Ryan, 1966:164-174). Requirements or specifications defined by an individual for use when comparing products are defined as evaluative criteria (Engel, Kollat, & Blackwell, 1973). Jenkins and Dickey (1976:151) defined evaluative criteria as "specifications or standards used by consumers in comparing and assessing alternatives and play a prominent role in the decision making process." Jenkins and Dickey suggested that evaluative criteria used by a specific consumer group may provide insight into the wants and needs of the group.

Several studies identified evaluative criteria used by families in clothing decision making. There is disagreement among studies on the relative importance of the identified criteria. Consumers in an early study identified clothing appearance as the chief factor sought

for clothing purchase; other factors of less importance were color preference, style, ease of care, economical, durable, and suitable to the situation (Van Syckle, 1951:154). Hall (1955) studied factors that contribute to clothing satisfaction and dissatisfaction of low-income families. Hall reported that wives ranked comfort first, followed by style and color; quality was ranked over price in importance. Bruskins Associates (1978) surveyed 1,267 persons and found that price, comfort, and quality were the most important criteria consumers considered in the purchasing process of clothing. Care instructions, in addition to color, fit, price, and care, were identified by participants in a study by Blackwell and Hilliker (1978) as being important in the purchasing process of garments. Galbraith (1966) reported that evaluative criteria of primary importance in clothing selection were color, fit, and becomingness; criteria of secondary importance were fabric performance and ease of care.

Kundel (1976) interviewed 186 married industrial workers and their wives to determine clothing practices and preferences. The wives were asked how important a series of 16 characteristics were to them when selecting a dress to wear places where they wanted to look their best. The four characteristics rated as most important were: fit, comfort, price, and I like it. The characteristics of least importance were: clothing similar to what friends are wearing and latest style. When making clothing choices, the wives preferred quality over price. Sproles and Geistfeld's study (1978) confirmed these findings. They observed the purchasing behavior of 989 women and reported that the women considered quality and comfort were more

important in determining clothing satisfaction than were style and price. The main dissatisfaction with clothing was the quality of construction.

McCall (1977) surveyed employed and nonemployed women and found employed women to be a distinct market segment. In addition to time being the most important factor influencing clothing buying practices of employed women, McCall found the women in her study considered suitability for work and flattering style to be more important than price when purchasing clothing. A report by Associated Merchandizing Corporation (1979) maintained that working women were less price resistant than nonworking women and preferred investment quality apparel which fit into their existing wardrobes.

Tweeten (1980) found that cost was important to full-time and part-time employed women in her study; however, cost was more important to part-time or unemployed women than to full-time employed women. Tweeten found that color, quality, ease of care, comfort, styling, fabric, and fit were not significantly different for women employed full-time, employed part-time, or unemployed.

Age may influence the importance of evaluative criteria when purchasing clothing. Fortenberry (1976) studied the clothing buying practices of professional women age 50 and over. She reported that fit, price, and construction were more important to study participants than were brand name in clothing selection and purchasing. Taylor (1983) studied the clothing buying practices of young career women and found slightly different influential factors. Most young career women in Taylor's study shopped for clothing brands. Style and construction

were more important than price when selecting clothing. The factors that most influenced the style of clothing selected were figure and image projection. Seasonal popularity and similar to what friends were wearing were less important factors influencing the style selected.

Consumer preferences for one clothing evaluative criterion over another may reflect clothing values. Lapitsky and Smith (1981:47) identified five clothing values of consumers. Aesthetic value was identified as a desire for, appreciation of, or concern with beauty in clothing. Economic value was identified as the desire for comfort in clothing and for conservation of time, energy, and money in relation to clothing usage and selection. Political value was defined as a desire for obtaining prestige, distinction, leadership or influence through clothing usage. Social I value was identified as an expression of regard for fellow beings through clothing usage. Social II value was identified as the desire for obtaining social approval through clothing usage with conformity playing a prominent role. Lapitsky and Smith found that aesthetic and economic values were more dominant values of adult women than were the other three values. Lapitsky and Smith (1981) were in agreement with Altpeter (1963:67), who studied clothing consumer behavior and values of women 20 to 40 years of age. Altpeter found that the majority of women in her study had high aesthetic and economic values. Political, Social I, and Social II values were less important.

McDonough (1983) explored consumers' preference for aesthetic and performance attributes of innerwear (sleepwear and underwear) and

outerwear. She defined aesthetic attributes as durability, color, fabric, design, trim, garment design, and no puckers. She defined performance attributes as long wear life, shrinkage control, comfortable, nonirritating, and easy care. The 131 Extension home economists and 57 university students of Home Economics reported higher scores for aesthetics than performance for the outerwear category of clothing.

Morganosky (1984) investigated consumers' valuation of clothing and accessory items on the basis of aesthetic and utilitarian qualities. Differences in the dollar amount consumers said they would be willing to pay for the item served as an indication of value. The 102 women shoppers reported they were willing to pay the most for high aesthetic items regardless of utility. Subjects were willing to pay the least for low aesthetic, low quality items. The demographics--age, income, marital status, number of children, and education level--were not found to be significantly related to the dollar amounts that subjects said they were willing to spend. Morganosky found aesthetic clothing value to be an important value in the American clothing value scale, as did Lapitsky and Smith (1981), Altpeter (1963), and McDonough (1983).

Jenkins and Dickey (1976) studied the evaluative criteria used by 224 mothers classified as lower and middle socio-economic consumers. They reported that the criteria most useful in discriminating among segments of consumers were the following factors: quality, care-performance, appearance-brand, approval, economy, and refinement conscious (conservative taste). Jenkins and Dickey

identified four consumer types: Fashion Advocates (emphasize approval of others; deemphasize care-performance, quality, and economy; are young, unemployed, or employed in semi-skilled occupations); Quality Seekers (emphasize quality; are middle aged, upper middle class, well educated; and have husbands with professional-technical occupations); Frugal Aesthetics (deemphasize quality and care-performance; emphasize economy, approval, appearance, brand; are lower class; and have limited education); Concerned Pragmatics (all criteria are important except approval; quality and care-performance most important; economy and refinement were secondary; are lower middle class, with better than average education).

Fashion interest may affect evaluative criteria used by employed women in clothing decision making. Bonaker (1970) found that women with low fashion interest were more concerned with cost and utility. Those with high fashion interest showed more concern with personal appearance and status motives. Horridge and Richards (1984) reported similar findings. Low fashion awareness subjects valued economy factors more than the high fashion awareness subjects did; high fashion awareness subjects valued quality over price. Horridge And Richards (1984) reported that the majority of professional women in their study used clothing as a means of self-expression and consciously preferred to wear clothing styles that differed from those worn by peers. Garment style was a more influential purchase criterion than garment price.

Rabolt (1984) found that career women in her study accepted the most career dressing influence from others in the work setting. One's

reference group need not be a group to which one belongs, but it may be a group to which one aspires. Russell (1982:30) confirmed the findings reported by Rabolt. Russell found that career dressing of subjects in her study was more influenced by co-workers than by supervisors; however, supervisors did influence their work wardrobes.

Summary

An Overview of Employed Women

Women have become firmly established members of the work force. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1987), women will account for more than three-fifths of the labor force growth during 1984-1995. Reasons for the increase in numbers of working women are varied, including changing roles of women brought on by the women's movement, a changing economy, changing jobs, personal achievement, and satisfaction. Other studies point to the decreasing number of children keeping women at home and the increasing educational educational level of women as reasons for women entering and staying in the labor force. However, an underlying reason for the labor force activity of women is economic. An increasing number of families are headed by single women. Studies indicate that without the wife's earnings, the income of many families would not provide a minimal level of living and the wife's income has a major impact on a family's life style.

Demographic characteristics of working women have changed during the past twenty years. Changes relate to age shifts, increased work continuity, number of working wives and working mothers, marital

status, educational level and income distribution. Women are reaching educational parity with men.

Women's earnings, on the average, lag behind earnings of men in the same job categories. Men tend to be employed in the top of the better-paying professions. Women tend to be at the lower end of the pay scale even in new fields where earning parity with men has almost been achieved.

Occupational Categories of Employed Women

According to the Occupational Outlook Handbook (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1987), employment opportunities for women still tend to be concentrated in traditional occupational categories. The majority of employed women began the 1980s in traditional clerical and service occupations (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983b). Three-fourths of the increase in jobs held by women from 1970 to 1982 were in the service-producing sector, which tended to have the lowest paying jobs. Between 1972 and 1983, the number of women working in clerical and professional occupations increased by more than 50% to include 53% of all working women (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983b).

There is evidence that women are training and moving into higher-paying fields and professions. The proportion of professional women employed as teachers and nurses has declined and the proportion of women doctors, lawyers, and accountants has increased. However, between 1984 and 1995, the majority of occupations with the largest expected growth include lower-paying jobs most often filled by women (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1985).

Wardrobe Inventories

"Clothing inventory" has been defined as the use, maintenance and storage of garments and is closely related to clothing acquisition and discard. Clothing inventory studies reviewed tended to focus on one-year periods of time to encompass a full cycle of seasons. The demand for new clothing may be explained in part by how much clothing is on hand from previous periods. Researchers found that families acquired most clothing in inventory by purchasing new, the family clothing budget was larger than was expected, families could get along without new clothing for considerable periods of time, and wardrobe inventory was reflective of family income.

Clothing inventory practices of working women were studied by several researchers. The occupation of working women was not found to be significant in determining the wardrobe inventory size of professional and clerical women studied; however, working women reported the outerwear category of their wardrobes represented the greatest number of clothing items. Women who worked reported larger clothing inventories than women who were not employed (Hovermale, 1962; Lipka, 1977).

Wardrobe Expenditures

The annual per capita expenditure for clothing for 1985 was \$617, a 4.4% increase over 1984. Although apparel continues to increase in price, the proportion of total family expenditures spent for clothing has decreased since 1946 (Courtless, 1986; Dardis, Derrick & Lehfled, 1981; Flint, 1973; Hovermale, 1962).

A review of literature indicated that clothing expenditures are related to gender, age, family size, education, income and occupation. Wives, other than low income, spend more for clothing than do husbands; and women of all ages spend more for clothing than do men (Erickson, 1968; Ryan, 1966).

Several studies indicated a positive and significant relationship between age and clothing expenditures. Young adult women spend more for clothing and purchase more clothing than do older adult women (Brew, O'Leary & Dean, 1956; Dardis, Derrick & Lehfeld, 1981; Erickson, 1968; Henry, 1972; Ryan, 1966).

Family size may influence clothing expenditures. Studies indicated that wives with children and single women children spend less for clothing than do other women (Brew, O'Leary & Dean, 1956; Erickson, 1968; Flint, 1973; Wagner, 1982). Other studies reported no relationship between children under age 18 in the home and clothing expenditures of women (Dardis, Derrick & Lehfeld, 1981; Henry, 1972).

Clothing expenditures are related to education. Clothing expenditures increased as educational level increased (Dardis, Derrick & Lehfeld, 1981; Flint, 1973; Galbraith, 1966; Wagner, 1982).

Studies indicated wardrobe size and expenditures were related to income. As income increased, the absolute and relative amount spent for clothing increased, but the relative amount decreased. Increases in clothing expenditures per item also increased as income increased (Brew, O'Leary & Dean, 1956; Dardis, Derrick & Lehfeld, 1981; Erickson, 1968; Flint, 1973; Galbraith, 1966; Ryan, 1966).

The employment status and occupation of women may influence clothing expenditures. In several studies, employed women reported higher clothing expenditures than did women not employed (Brew, O'Leary & Dean, 1956; Dardis, Derrick & Lehfeld, 1981; Erickson, 1968; Galbraith, 1966; Hovermale, 1962; Ryan, 1966; Tweeten, 1980; Wagner, 1982).

In other studies, clothing expenditures were found to be positively related to socio-economic index scores. Clothing expenditures were found to be related to occupation of family head (Flint, 1973; Wagner, 1982). Several researchers reported the influence on clothing expenditures by the occupations of the working wife. High occupational status working wives spent significantly more for clothing than did low occupational status working wives (Dardis, Derrick & Lehfeld, 1981; Schaninger & Allen, 1981). The influence of occupational status on clothing expenditures was not significant in another study; however, higher occupational status women purchased more clothing items at the upper level price range than did the low occupational status women (Hovermale, 1962).

Expenditures for clothing care were minimal, and may be higher for families with non-working wives than among families with working wives (Erickson, 1968; Lipka, 1977; Wagner, 1982).

A great variation among working women in annual dollar expenditures for clothing was reported. The Professional, Secretarial-Clerical women in Lipka's (1977) study spent an annual average of \$432 for their work wardrobes. The working women in Hovermale's (1962) study spent an annual average of \$485 for total

wardrobes. Tweeten (1980) reported that half of the working women in her study spent less than \$500 annually for clothing. Taylor (1983) reported that over one-third of the career women in her study spent from \$192 to \$400 annually for clothing. The career women in Rabolt's (1984) study reported spending from \$500 to \$900 annually for clothing.

Several studies reported the percentage of total clothing expenditure spent for categories of the wardrobe. Most working women spent the largest percentage of the total wardrobe expenditure for outerwear, followed by expenditures for protective outerwear, footwear, accessories, and lingerie (Gilmore, 1939; Hovermale, 1962; Lipka, 1977; Monroe and Pennell, 1939).

Wardrobe Expenditure Influences

Several researchers reported that clothing was an important tool in the acquisition of a job, and in job success. Working women reported that clothes do make a difference in how they are perceived on the job; however, the type of clothing needs of the working women may depend on the specific job (Celanese Fibers Market Study, 1980; Form & Stone, 1955; Lapitsky & Smith, 1981; Macovsky, 1976; Champane, 1973; Solomon, 1986; Solomon & Douglas, 1983).

The importance of clothing in the occupational role may depend on the career aspirations of working women. Career women with planned goals, actively developing a career, perceived clothing to be more important than did the woman with a job (Celanese Fibers Market Study, 1980; Ericksen, 1983; Rabolt, 1984).

The wide range of appropriate career dress and degree of formality in business dress for women depends on climate, industry,

profession, geography, and if there is a written or unwritten dress code for the particular business or company (Damhorst, 1982; Dillon, 1980; Kiechel, 1983; Solomon & Douglas, 1983; Turecamo, 1982; Williams, 1977).

The amount of work wardrobe influence accepted by working women depended on their amount of daily contact with clients and supervisors (Kelly, Blouin, Gleen, Sureat & Arledge, 1982; Rabolt, 1984; Robertson, 1971).

Clothing Interest. Clothing interest has been described by several researchers as the primary motivator for clothing purchase (Gurel & Deemer, 1975; Rosencranz, 1949; Ryan, 1966). A significant, positive relationship may exist between clothing interest and clothing expenditure (Douglas, 1976; Lipka, 1977; Rosencranz, 1949, 1962).

The relationship between clothing interest and income, social status, education, age, gender, marital status, occupation, and number of children have been studied by several researchers, with varying and contradictory conclusions. Demographics may not be the most important determinants of clothing interest (Bonaker, 1970; Feather & Whiston, 1987; Flaten, 1983; Horridge & Richards, 1984; Rosencranz, 1962; Scrugges, 1977; Sproles & Geistfeld, 1978).

Clothing Purchasing Criteria. The evaluative criteria used by families and individuals to make decisions to purchase specific items of clothing have been identified in several studies. There is disagreement among studies on the relative importance of the identified criteria. Criteria identified as being important to the clothing decision-making process include: appearance, color, style,

ease of care, cost, durability, suitability to the occasion, quality, fit, fabric performance, and personal preference (Blackwell & Hilliker, 1978; Bruckins Associates, 1978; Engel, Kollat & Blackwell, 1973; Kundel, 1976; Jenkins & Dickey, 1976; Hall, 1955; Ryan, 1966; Sproles & Geistfeld, 1978; Van Syckle, 1951).

Other studies surveyed employed and nonemployed women to determine the evaluative criteria most important to working women in the clothing decision-making process. There seemed to be some agreement that working women consider suitability and style to be more important than price. Working women were found to be less price resistant and preferred quality (Fortenberry, 1976; McCall, 1977; Taylor, 1983; Tweeten, 1980).

Consumer preferences for one clothing evaluative criterion over another may reflect clothing values. Several researchers studied clothing values and concluded aesthetic clothing values to be important to the American consumer, and both aesthetic and economic clothing values were dominant values of adult women. Political and social values less important clothing values (Altpeter, 1963; Lapitsky & Smith, 1981; McDonough, 1983; Morganosky, 1984).

Fashion interest may affect evaluative criteria used by working women in clothing decision making. Women with low fashion interest were more concerned with cost and utility than were women with high fashion interest. Women with high fashion interest were concerned with personal appearance and status motives (Bonaker, 1970; Horridge & Richards, 1983; Rabolt, 1984; Russell, 1982).

CHAPTER 3

PROCEDURE

The procedure for this wardrobe expenditure and wardrobe inventory study of women employed full-time in five occupational categories is presented according to the following topics:

Hypotheses, Development of the instrument, Pretesting the instrument, Selection of the sample, Data collection, Coding and handling of the data, and Analysis procedure.

Hypotheses

1. There are no differences in the following work wardrobe expenditures for one year among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) total work wardrobe expenditures, (b) work wardrobe expenditures for protective outerwear, (c) work wardrobe expenditures for outerwear, (d) work wardrobe expenditures for footwear, (e) work wardrobe expenditures for lingerie, (f) work wardrobe expenditures for accessories, (g) dry-cleaning expenditures of the work wardrobe, and (h) alteration and repair expenditures of the work wardrobe.
2. There are no differences for the following selected demographic characteristics among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) marital status, (b) age, (c) presence in the home of children 18 years of age and under, (d) years of formal education, (e) years employed at present job,

- (f) total years of employment, (g) personal income from job before taxes, and (h) total family income before taxes.
3. There are no relationships between work wardrobe expenditures for one year of women employed full-time in five occupational categories and selected demographic characteristics (2a-h).
 4. There are no differences for the following wardrobe expenditure influences among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) wardrobe expenditure change, (b) wardrobe adequacy, (c) expected wear life of work wardrobe garments, (d) work uniform requirement, and (e) factors influencing purchase of work wardrobe.

Development of the Instrument

Lipka's (1977) clothing expenditure inventory, based on Hovermale's (1962) expenditure inventory, was adapted for use in this study. The checklist format was changed to simplify reporting. The itemized list of clothing and accessory items was expanded and modified to include most possible items of apparel worn for work or work-related activities by women employed full-time in the five occupational categories under consideration in this study. Instrument review by family resource management, and clothing and textiles, faculty for instrument validity prompted further modification.

The wardrobe expenditure inventory used for this study included five wardrobe inventory subcategories: Protective Outerwear (Q1-Q5); Outerwear (Q6-Q16); Footwear (Q17-Q21); Lingerie (Q22-Q28); and Accessories (Q29-Q37). Included as the last wardrobe item in each

subcategory section was the item "other," providing an opportunity for respondents to add items that were not included in the identified wardrobe item inventory of clothing working women might wear for work or work-related activities. Opportunity to specify "other" was given by means of a blank line; however, respondents did not identify items added.

A review of expenditure studies (Brew, O'Leary & Dean, 1956; Hovermale, 1962; Lipka, 1977; Winakor, 1969) suggests that periods of measurement shorter than one year give biased data on wardrobe acquisition. Wardrobe expenditures are seasonal and one year encompasses a full cycle of seasons, both climatic and social. For this study, the researcher selected to use the calendar year for wardrobe expenditure recall since most employed women might find it easier to review expenditures from January through December of the previous year. For some occupations, expenditure records of clothing purchased for work are filed for tax purposes, from January through December.

Although some error is expected in reporting by recall, Saltford and Roy (1981) suggest that the recall method can be used successfully to gather family clothing consumption data. They compared the clothing purchases of 43 families who kept diaries of their clothing purchases with the clothing purchases recalled at the end of the same month by 50 different families. By collecting clothing consumption data exclusive of other consumer expenditures, the differences between recall and diary methods were minimized.

Brew, O'Leary, and Dean's (1956) study of clothing expenditures concluded that the largest portion of clothing for women, both employed women and homemakers, was acquired by purchasing new items. They reported that only one-tenth of the yearly clothing acquisitions of women studied were received as gifts. Hovermale suggested, after her 1962 clothing expenditure study of employed women, that in order to secure complete representation of clothing acquired during the period of one year, it would be desirable to acquire data about clothing acquired as gifts, in addition to data about clothing acquired by purchasing. Because this study examined expenditures, not methods of acquisition, the researcher determined to keep the instrument as simple as possible and not include data for clothing acquisitions as gifts.

According to Brew, O'Leary and Dean (1956), the median price of clothing items is more descriptive and statistically useful than the average price in expenditures studies, and recall of expenditures results in respondents reporting an average price somewhat higher than the median. However, for this study the researcher determined to ask for the total cost for number of items purchased (Q1-Q37). Respondents were instructed to estimate if the exact amount spent and number purchased could not be recalled exactly.

Questions 38 and 39 (see Appendix B) ask for estimated expenditures for one year for dry cleaning, alterations, and repair of clothing worn primarily for work and work-related activities. Because Questions 38 and 39 ask for expenditure data, they follow the wardrobe expenditure inventory checklist (Dillman, 1978).

The questions related to wardrobe expenditure influences were added to the survey instrument to further explain and define the work wardrobe expenditures reported by the survey respondents. Question 38 asked if the work wardrobe expenditures reported for the survey year were about the same, more, or less than usual. Question 38a identified possible reasons for spending more than usual; Question 38b identified possible reasons for spending less than usual. Questions 38a and 38b were developed by the researcher.

To determine restrictions on the type of clothing the survey respondents purchased for work, Question 41 asked if a work uniform was worn for work most of the time, sometimes, or never. Question 41a identified methods of work uniform acquisition that might reflect on the total work wardrobe expenditure reported by respondents who wore a uniform most of the time for work (Winakor, 1969:630-631).

The demand for newly purchased clothing may be explained in part by how much clothing one has on hand from previous periods (Brew, O'Leary & Dean, 1956; Winakor, 1969). Instead of including a wardrobe inventory checklist requesting the number of work wardrobe items on hand prior to the survey year, Question 43 was developed. Question 43 asked if the work wardrobe included an adequate number or inadequate number of garments. Possible reasons for an inadequate number of garments in the work wardrobe were identified in Question 43a.

Expected wear life of work wardrobe garments is related to wardrobe inventory and expenditures so Question 44 asked the average number of years the respondents continue to wear most of the garments in the work wardrobe for work.

Personal preferences influence the selection of work wardrobes and work wardrobe expenditures. Question 42a-k requested information about the importance of "purchasing factors" influencing the purchase of clothing for work. Identified purchasing factors were: (a) fits well, (b) feels comfortable, (c) in price range I can afford, (d) I like it, (e) easy to care for, (f) good color for me, (g) quality construction and fabric, (h) expresses my individuality, (i) fashionable garment, (j) similar to what co-workers are wearing, and (k) meets employer expectations. Question 42 was developed after reviewing studies by Tweeten (1980), Flaten (1983), and Kundel (1976).

Families do not select clothing uninfluenced by the world around them (Pederson, 1984). A demographic data section was included in this study to determine the relationship between selected demographic characteristics and clothing expenditures and wardrobe inventories of women employed full-time in the five occupational categories considered in this study. Demographic characteristics selected for examination in this study included: (a) marital status, (b) age, (c) presence in the home of children 18 years of age and under, (d) years of formal education, (e) years employed at present job, (f) total years of employment, (g) personal income from job before taxes, and (h) total family income before taxes.

The format and ordering of demographic data Questions 45 through 52 (see Appendix B) were developed according to Dillman's (1978) recommendations. Specific demographic characteristics were included after reviewing clothing expenditure studies (Brew, O'Leary &

Dean, 1956; Dardis, Derrick, & Lehfeld, 1981; Erickson, 1968; Fortenberry, 1976; Hovermale, 1962; Lipka, 1977; Tweeten, 1980).

Question 53, requesting job title, and Question 54, asking for a description of the respondent's present job, were included as the last questions of the survey. The researcher used this information to place each survey respondent in the appropriate occupational category of interest to this study.

Pretesting the Instrument

The mail questionnaire was pretested in two stages according to the Total Design Method procedure outlined by Dillman (1978:156-158). Prior to the second stage of pretesting a "mock-up" questionnaire in final form was produced.

A panel of three professionals in clothing and textiles, and family resource management, who understood the purposes and objectives of the study, evaluated the questionnaire in terms of question usefulness, appropriateness, and validity. In addition, this panel reacted to conciseness and clarity of instructions, clarity of questions, need for additional question responses, and questionnaire format and appearance (Appendix C).

Following the first stage of pretesting, the wardrobe inventory list of itemized articles of clothing and accessories was revised. Categories were combined where appropriate, and the order of questions changed to simplify recording and to increase the probability of completed and usable returned questionnaires. Question wording was

also changed to increase clarity and responses added to obtain more accurate data.

The second stage of pretesting the questionnaire followed, as closely as possible, the planned sample selection and data collection procedure outlined for the study. However, for the pretest, the sample site was changed to avoid contamination of the sample. The pretest sample selected was representative of the five occupational categories considered in the study.

For the pretest, the researcher planned to randomly select 50 employed women from the "A" alphabetical listings of the Boise city directory compiled from census data. However, a Boise city directory of census data had not been published, so the pretest sample selection procedure was changed. Three Boise-area businesses which employed women in the five occupational categories of interest to this study were contacted and permission was granted to discuss the survey with women employees. Initial contact was made with women employees during a lunch hour at each business location, at which time it was determined if the employed women met the full-time employment requirement and agreed to participate in the pretest. A total of 36 full-time employed women volunteered to participate in the pretest phase of the study.

Within two weeks of the initial contact, a cover letter (Appendix A) and questionnaire were sent to each member of the pretest sample. (The pretest questionnaire did not include Questions 51 and 52.) A coded, stamped, self-addressed envelope for questionnaire return was included with the mailing. Subsequent mail contacts were made at

one- and three-week intervals to encourage questionnaire completion for the pretest procedure (see Appendices F and G).

Following return of 21 completed questionnaires, the researcher contacted each pretest respondent by phone. The pretest sample included six Professional-Technical respondents, two Managerial-Administrative respondents, four Clerical respondents, seven Sales respondents, and two Other respondents. A standard set of questions was used to evaluate the questionnaire (Appendix D). Each of the pretest respondents was asked to react to the clarity of instructions and questions, need for additional responses, amount of time required to complete the questionnaire, and any other problems encountered with the procedure.

Evaluations of the returned questionnaires and evaluation responses of the pretest respondents were considered and appropriate minor revisions were made prior to printing of the questionnaire in final form. Pretest respondents indicated that the wardrobe inventory took longer to complete than anticipated.

Selection of the Sample

The Total Design Method for sampling of published telephone directories was used to obtain the sample for the study (Dillman, 1978:234-236). The Lewiston, Idaho-Clarkston, Washington area was selected as the sample site because the researcher resides in Lewiston, Idaho. The two cities, separated by the Snake River, represented a sufficiently large population and business and service

district to provide adequate sample subjects representative of the five occupational categories considered in this study.

For this study, a sample of 825 women employed full-time (35 hours or more per week for 40 or more weeks per year) during 1985 was randomly selected. According to the United States Department of Labor, two-thirds of working women are employed full-time (1980:15). Using this statistic as a guide, a calling list of 1225 random listings was compiled for an initial phone interview. From the list of 1225, a sample of 825 women who met the full-time employment requirement during 1985 was obtained.

Dillman (1978:20-21) predicted at least a 60% response rate will be obtained with mail surveys if the Total Design Method is implemented. The researcher determined that 500 responses, or usable returned questionnaires were needed for data analyses.

A sample of 1225 names was systematically drawn according to the following procedure. The Lewiston-Clarkston City Directory, 1985 edition, published by Johnson Printing was the source of random sample selection for this study. This directory, compiled from 1980 census data and updated annually, included alphabetical residential listings of all residents in the combined Lewiston-Clarkston area. Each alphabetical listing included the following: name of husband, wife's first name and place of employment, husband's occupation, address, phone number, and the names and years of birth of minor children.

The first step was to identify by check (✓) each listing in the directory of an employed woman; 5206 employed women were identified.

The second step was to determine the sample interval, or the number of identified listings to be skipped, between each listing selected. To determine the sample interval, the total number of employed women identified in step one (5206) was divided by 1225, the number of listings needed for the initial phone interview. The sample interval was 4.5, or 4.

The third step was to select a listing within the first sample interval, which would be the first of 1225 listings needed. Starting with the "A" listings, the first interval of 4 was counted off. A random number within the interval size was selected (3) and that number (3) denoted the first listing.

Subsequent listings were determined by counting off the determined sample interval, starting with the first listing (third name listed in first interval) selected in step three. The process of counting off the interval of 4 and selecting listings continued until 1225 listings were identified for the initial phone interviews.

Telephone calls to the 1225 random numbers were made during January and February, 1986. Since late afternoon and evening calls between 4 p.m. and 9:30 p.m. would likely find working women at home, the initial contact was made during that time. Hours of calling were adjusted slightly to find some employed women at home.

The purpose of the initial telephone interview was to obtain a sample of 825 employed women who were willing to participate in the study and who met the full-time employment requirement of the study. A guide dialogue was used, based on the Total Design Method format (Appendix E).

A sample of 825 was obtained after the first 1225 calls were made.

Data Collection

The survey questionnaire format and data collection implementation were in accordance with the Total Design Method for mail surveys (Dillman, 1978). Questionnaires were printed on white stock and assembled in stapled booklet format measuring 6 1/8 x 8 1/4 inches, a 74% size reduction. Both sides of the page were printed in an attempt to shorten the visual appearance of the instrument as well as minimize mailing costs.

Each questionnaire was prefaced by a signed cover letter from the researcher and research advisor. The letter was printed on Oregon State University College of Home Economics letterhead.

Each mailing included a 6 1/2 x 3 1/2 inch return envelope with first-class postage. Return envelopes were encoded, in the upper left corner, with the respondents identification number. The identification number provided a means of identifying non-respondents, yet retained anonymity of the questionnaire itself. The cover letter explained the code to the respondent and served the dual function of allaying doubts about anonymity and encouraging return of the survey.

The self-administered questionnaire, comprised of items to be measured plus selected demographic information, was mailed in a first-class 3 1/2 x 6 1/2 inch envelope one week after the

initial telephone interview. The envelope included Oregon State University College of Home Economics identification to match the letterhead used for the cover letter.

The questionnaire and subsequent follow-up notifications were mailed on Tuesdays, in an attempt to obtain delivery during the week and to allow time for processing the returned questionnaires over the weekend, as suggested by Dillman (1978:183).

One week after the initial mailing, a follow-up postcard (Appendix F) was mailed to the entire list of respondents. For those who had completed and returned their questionnaires, it served as a thank-you; for non-respondents, it served as a reminder.

Three weeks after the initial mailing, a letter and replacement questionnaire were sent to 620 non-respondents. It informed those not yet responding that their questionnaires had not been received and appealed for their return (Appendix G).

A total of 36 questionnaires were returned undelivered. Of the 268 completed questionnaires returned, 9 were unusable.

Coding and Handling of Data

The questionnaire was not precoded, since precoding may distract respondents with information that is meaningless to the process of responding to questions. As the completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher, they were numbered with participant's identification number. To simplify the handling of data, expenditure data were rounded to the nearest dollar.

Respondent responses to Questions 53 and 54 were coded by the researcher to represent one of the five identified occupational

categories in this study (Appendix I). The United States Department of Labor occupational classifications were used to determine occupation placement (U.S. Dept. Labor, 1980:10-11).

Analysis Procedure

Since the researcher had access to University of Idaho research funds and statistical analyses services as a member of the University of Idaho College of Agriculture faculty, the Computer Services Center and the Statistical Consulting Center of that institution were used for the analysis phase of the study.

The SPSSX Batch System, a comprehensive social sciences statistical software package, was used for managing, analyzing, and displaying the data. Responses from 259 usable surveys were coded and recorded by the researcher on a floppy disc file, then transferred to the University of Idaho mainframe computer for statistical analysis. Numbers were assigned to represent each response. Missing values were coded as "0" (Appendix H) (Norusis, 1983:1-6).

Data were organized first by running frequency tables and obtaining descriptive statistics by occupational category for dollars spent and number of items purchased. Cross-tabulation was used to organize responses for clothing expenditures (Questions 39-40), expenditure influences (Questions 38, 38a, 38b, 40, 41, 42a-k, 43, 43a, 44), and demographic characteristics (Questions 45-53) by occupational category.

Independent variables identified for this study were the five occupational categories: Professional-Technical, Managerial-Administrative, Sales, Clerical, and Other. Dependent variables identified for this study were: total subcategory expenditures for protective outerwear, total subcategory expenditures for outerwear, total subcategory expenditures for footwear, total subcategory expenditures for lingerie, total subcategory expenditures for accessories, and total wardrobe expenditures.

To analyze Hypothesis 1, a one-way analysis of variance was run for each of the six dependent variables (each of the wardrobe inventory subcategory expenditures and total wardrobe expenditures) by occupational category. Tukey's test was used as a post hoc test to indicate between which occupational categories significant differences were found (Bruning & Kintz, 1977:122-24). One-way ANOVA was also run for dry-cleaning, alteration, and repair expenditures by occupational category. A 95% confidence level was used to retain or reject the null-hypothesis.

To analyze Hypothesis 2, two statistical tests were used: the chi-square and the Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance. The chi-square statistic was calculated to test the significance level of marital status, a nominal level variable. Five response categories were collapsed into two, married and not married, to increase power of the test.

The Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance test of ranks was used as a non-parametric alternative to analysis of variance. The

Kruskal-Wallis test is appropriate for ordinal or categorical level of measurement, in this case age, education, income, years of employment, and presence in the home of children 18 years of age and under. The test compares sums of rankings for each of the categories of the nominal scale variable, in this case the five occupational categories. Categories of responses were collapsed where necessary to ensure at least five cases per cell and to increase power of the test. Significance at the .05 level was used to retain or reject the null-hypothesis (Blalock, 1979:367-368; Mendenhall & Larson, 1974:433-436).

To analyze Hypothesis 3, Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) was used. MCA is a technique for examining results of ANOVA and is particularly useful in examining correlation of nominally measured variables or predictors and those variables which are attribute variables and not experimentally manipulated (Kim & Kohout, 1975:409-410). MCA was used to determine if occupational category made a difference in total wardrobe expenditures after controlling for the influence of the co-variants (demographics) on total wardrobe expenditure.

MCA was run first using all co-variants (demographics). Marital status was made into a dummy dichotomous variable for this test.

To strengthen the MCA test, MCA was run a second time using only those co-variants that were found to be significant in the first MCA test. The ETA statistic was computed to show the proportion of variation in expenditures that could be explained by occupation. Multiple R squared was computed to show the proportion of expenditure

variation that could be explained by the combined effects of occupation and significant demographics (co-variants) after controlling for the influence of demographics. MCA also computed mean expenditures by occupational category after adjusting for the influence of occupation and co-variants (demographics) (Andrews, Morgan, Songuest, & Klem, 1973:538-540; Kim & Kohout, 1975:409-410).

To reduce the probability of a Type I error a post hoc test for simultaneous inference, the Scheffe's Test, was run, using the adjusted means from the MCA table (Bruning & Kintz, 1977:125-127).

To analyze Hypothesis 4, the chi-square test statistic was calculated to examine differences of expenditure influence by occupational category. Significance at the .05 level was used to retain or reject the null hypothesis. The response categories were collapsed when possible to increase power of the test. Those variables of qualitative nature and without adequate responses of five per cell were not statistically analyzed.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The first section of the presentation of findings includes a description of the sample by occupational category and the demographics of concern in this study: marital status; age; presence in the home of children 18 years of age and under; educational level; years of employment at present job; total years of employment; annual income from job before taxes; total family annual income before taxes.

The second section of the presentation of findings describes the number of wardrobe items purchased within each wardrobe inventory subcategory and the total wardrobe expenditures by occupational category. Expenditures for dry cleaning and for alteration and repair by occupational category are also described.

The third section of the presentation of findings includes a description of the selected influences on work wardrobe expenditures by occupational category. The selected work wardrobe expenditure influences under study included: amount of work wardrobe expenditure compared to the previous year; reasons for spending more; reasons for spending less; adequacy of number of garments in the work wardrobe; reasons for inadequate number of garments in the work wardrobe; expected wear life of work wardrobe; wearing of a uniform for work; method of uniform acquisition; importance of selected purchasing factors.

The fourth section of the presentation of findings includes presentation of results of hypotheses testing.

The final section of the presentation of findings includes a summary of comments from the survey open-ended question requesting additional information about work wardrobe expenditures.

Description of the Sample

Eight hundred twenty-five work wardrobe expenditure inventory surveys were sent to women who had been employed full-time during the previous calendar year and who had agreed to participate in the study. Thirty-six surveys were returned undelivered. Two hundred sixty-eight completed surveys (32%) were returned. Nine were determined to be unusable.

Returned surveys were determined unusable if a pattern of inappropriate responses was present; if Questions 53 and 54, requesting present job title and job description, were unanswered; or if wardrobe inventory responses to Questions 1 through 37 did not include both the number of items purchased and total dollar expenditure.

Respondents were asked to indicate with "0" those wardrobe inventory items not purchased for work during the previous year. The wardrobe expenditure inventory was designed to prompt a more accurate recall of numbers of items purchased and total expenditures for the work wardrobe, but each respondent was not expected to have made purchases of each inventory item (Q1-Q37) or in each inventory subcategory.

Sample by Occupational Category

Responses to survey Questions 53 and 54, requesting job title and description, were used by the researcher to place each respondent in one of the five occupational categories of interest to this study: Professional-Technical, Managerial-Administrative, Sales, Clerical, and Other. Table 1 shows numbers and percentages of the 259 survey respondents by occupational category.

The Clerical occupational category was the largest category, with 29.7% (77) of the total survey respondents. The Professional-Technical occupational category included 24.3% (63) of the total survey respondents, followed by the Managerial-Administrative occupational category with 20.5% (53) of the total survey respondents and the Other occupational category with 17.0% (44) of the total survey respondents. The Sales occupational category was the smallest category, with 8.5% (22) of the total survey respondents.

Frequency distributions of total survey respondents by job title and within each of the five occupational categories are presented in Table 2. The largest job title category of total survey respondents was self-reported as non-college teachers (11.6%, 30) in the Professional-Technical occupational category. The next largest job title group self-reported as secretaries (10.4%, 27) in the Clerical occupational category. Slightly fewer survey respondents self-reported as office managers (9.7%, 25) in the Managerial-Administrative group. Assemblers in the Other occupational category and nurses or dieticians in the Professional-Technical occupational category each comprised

Table 1

Number and Percentage of Full-time Employed Women
by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Number	Percentage
Professional-Technical	63	24.3
Managerial-Administrative	53	20.5
Sales	22	8.5
Clerical	77	29.7
Other	44	17.0
Total	259	100.0

Table 2

Frequency Distribution of Full-time Employed Women
by Occupational Category (n = 259)

Occupational Category	Frequency	% of Occupational Category	% of Total Sample
<u>Professional-Technical</u>			
Teachers, Non-college	30	46.0	11.6
Nurses/Dieticians	14	22.2	5.4
Teachers, College	4	6.3	1.5
Social Workers	3	4.8	1.2
Computer Specialists	2	3.2	.8
Engineering & Science Technicians	2	3.2	.8
Engineers	1	1.6	.4
Systems Analysts	1	1.6	.4
Personnel/Labor Relations	1	1.6	.4
Physicians/Dentists	1	1.6	.4
Chiropractors	1	1.6	.4
Pharmacists	1	1.6	.4
Health Technologists/Technicians	1	1.6	.4
Grant Writing Technicians	1	1.6	.4
Resource Planners	1	1.6	.4
	<u>63</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>24.3</u>
<u>Managerial-Administrative</u>			
Office Managers	25	47.2	9.7
Sales Managers/Department Heads	8	15.1	3.1
Health Administrators	5	9.4	1.9
Bank Officers/Financial Managers	5	9.4	1.9
Controllers/Treasurers/Public Administrative	2	3.8	.8
Food Service Managers	2	3.8	.8
School Administrators	2	3.8	.8
Feed Lot Managers	2	3.8	.8
Building Managers	1	1.9	.4
Public Administration	1	1.9	.4
	<u>53</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>20.5</u>

Table 2 (continued)

Occupational Category	Frequency	% of Occupational Category	% of Total Sample
<u>Sales</u>			
Sales Clerks	9	40.9	3.5
Sales Representatives	4	18.2	1.5
Insurance Agents/Brokers	4	18.2	1.5
Real Estate Agents	2	9.1	.8
Travel Agents	2	9.1	.8
Stocks & Bonds Sales	1	4.5	.4
	<u>22</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>8.5</u>
<u>Clerical</u>			
Secretaries	27	35.1	10.4
Bookkeepers	7	9.1	2.7
Office Machines Operators	7	9.1	2.7
Billing Clerks	5	6.5	1.9
Shipping-Receiving Stock Clerks	5	6.5	1.9
Cashiers	4	5.2	1.5
Receptionists	4	5.2	1.5
Banks Tellers	3	3.9	1.2
Insurance Adjusters	3	3.9	1.2
Library Assistants	3	3.9	1.2
Mail Carriers	2	2.6	.8
Payroll Clerks	2	2.6	.8
Teachers Aides	2	2.6	.8
Typists	2	2.6	.8
Telephone Operators	1	1.3	.4
	<u>77</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>29.7</u>
<u>Other (Craft, Operatives, Transport, Service)</u>			
Assemblers	14	31.8	5.4
Medical Assistants	9	20.5	3.5
Food Service Workers	6	13.6	2.3
Hairdressers	5	11.4	1.9
Custodians	4	9.1	1.5
Childcare Workers	2	4.5	.8
Police/Law Enforcement	2	4.5	.8
Gardeners	1	2.3	.4
Veterinary Assistants	1	2.3	.4
	<u>44</u>	<u>100.0</u>	<u>17.0</u>

5.4% (14) of total survey respondents. Other job titles were reported by nine or fewer survey respondents.

Over half (52.3%, 34) of the 63 Professional-Technical survey respondents reported themselves as teachers: 30 non-college teachers and 4 college-level teachers. The next largest job title group in the Professional-Technical occupational category was nurses and dieticians (22.2%, 14), followed by social workers (4.8%, 3) computer specialists (3.2%, 2), and engineering and science technicians (3.2%, 2). The nine additional job title groups in the Professional-Technical occupational category included one respondent each.

The Managerial-Administrative occupational category, with 53 respondents, included: office managers (47.2%, 25), sales managers and department heads (15.1%, 8), health administrators (9.4%, 5), bank officers and financial managers (9.4%, 5), and feedlot managers (3.8%, 2). Two job title groups within the Managerial-Administrative occupational category each had only one respondent (1.9%): building manager and public administrator.

Of the five occupational categories, Sales had the least number of respondents (22). Job title groups were: sales clerks (40.9%, 9), insurance agent brokers (18.2%, 4), sales representatives (18.2%, 4), travel agents (9.1%, 2), real estate agents (9.1%, 2), and stocks and bonds salesperson (4.5%, 1).

The largest of the five occupational categories was Clerical, with 77 respondents. The job titles were: secretaries (35.1%, 27), bookkeepers (9.1%, 7), office machine operators (9.1%, 7), billing clerks (6.5%, 5), shipping and receiving stock clerks (6.5%, 5),

cashiers (5.2%, 4), receptionists (5.2%, 4), insurance adjusters (3.9%, 3), mail carriers (2.6%, 2), payroll clerks (2.6%, 2), teachers aides (2.6%, 2), and typists (2.6%, 2).

Assemblers (31.8%, 14) comprised the largest job title group in the occupational category Other, followed by medical assistants (20.9%, 9), food service workers (13.6%, 6), hairdressers (11.4%, 5), childcare workers (4.5%, 2), police officers (4.5%, 2), gardener (2.3%, 1), and veterinary assistant (2.3%, 1).

Marital Status

Cross-tabulation of marital status by occupational category is shown in Table 3. Of the total survey sample of 259 respondents, 85.7% (222) were married, 6.9% (18) were divorced, and 5.8% (15) were single. The responses to widowed and separated were .8% (2) for each marital status category.

Response categories "single," "widowed," "divorced," and "separated" were collapsed to form a new category "not married." The response category "married" remained the same. Cross-tabulation of marital status, "married" and "not married," by occupational category is shown in Table 4.

The response pattern to the marital status question by each of the five occupational categories was similar to the response pattern of the total survey sample. Most respondents were married. Of the five occupational categories, Sales respondents reported the largest percentage married (95.5%), while Clerical respondents reported the smallest (80.5%). Professional-Technical respondents reported

Table 3

Cross-Tabulation of Marital Status by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Single <u>n</u> (%) [*]	Married <u>n</u> (%)	Widowed <u>n</u> (%)	Divorced <u>n</u> (%)	Separated <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	3 (4.7)	58 (92.1)	- -	2 (3.2)	- -
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	2 (3.8)	45 (84.9)	1 (1.9)	4 (7.5)	1 (1.9)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	1 (4.5)	21 (95.5)	- -	- -	- -
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	5 (6.5)	62 (80.5)	1 (1.3)	8 (10.4)	1 (1.3)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	4 (9.1)	36 (81.8)	- -	4 (9.1)	- -
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	15 (5.8)	222 (85.7)	2 (.8)	18 (6.9)	2 (.8)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

Table 4
 Cross-Tabulation of Marital Status by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Married <u>n</u> (%) [*]	Not Married <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	58 (92.1)	5 (7.9)
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	45 (84.9)	8 (15.1)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	21 (95.5)	1 (4.5)
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	62 (80.5)	15 (19.5)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	36 (81.8)	8 (18.2)
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	222 (85.7)	37 (14.3)

Note: Five categories collapsed into two for hypothesis testing.

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

92.1% married; Managerial-Administrative respondents, 84.9%; and Other occupational category respondents, 81.8%.

Age

Survey respondents were distributed into six age groups as reported in Table 5. Over half (58.3%) of the total survey respondents were between 25 and 44 years of age. The largest group (29.7%, 77) of total survey respondents were 25 to 34 years of age. Slightly fewer respondents (28.6%, 74) were 35 to 44 years of age, followed by 24.7% (64) who were 45 to 54 years of age. Only 11.2% (29) of the respondents were between 55 and 65 years of age, and .4% (1) were 66 years of age or older. The youngest age category, 18 to 24 years of age, was reported by only 5.4% (14) of the total survey respondents.

Similar age response patterns were observed in each of the five occupational categories, with slight variations reported by Managerial-Administrative and Clerical respondents. The Managerial-Administrative respondents differed from other occupational categories, with more respondents (32.1%, 17) in the older (45-54 years of age) group and fewer respondents (20.7%, 11) in the younger (25-34 years of age) group.

Clerical respondents differed from the other occupational categories, with more respondents (28.6%, 22) in the older (45-54 years of age) group and fewer respondents (23.4%, 18) in the younger (35-44 years of age) group. The Clerical respondents also had more respondents (9.1%, 7) in the youngest age group (18-24 years of age) and fewer respondents (7.8%, 6) in the "55 to 65 years" age group.

Table 5

Cross-Tabulation of Age by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	18-24 yrs	25-34 yrs	35-44 yrs	45-54 yrs	55-65 yrs	66 yrs +
	<u>n</u> (%) [*]	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	1 (1.6)	21 (33.3)	21 (33.3)	14 (22.2)	6 (9.5)	- -
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	1 (1.9)	11 (20.7)	15 (28.3)	17 (32.1)	9 (17.0)	- -
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	2 (9.1)	6 (27.3)	7 (31.8)	4 (18.2)	3 (13.6)	- -
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	7 (9.1)	23 (29.9)	18 (23.4)	22 (28.6)	6 (7.8)	1 (1.3)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	3 (6.8)	16 (36.4)	13 (29.5)	7 (15.9)	5 (11.4)	- -
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	14 (5.4)	77 (29.7)	74 (28.6)	64 (24.7)	29 (11.2)	1 (.4)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

The only respondent (1.3%, 1) in the "66 years or over" age group was reported in the Clerical occupational category.

Presence in the Home of Children Age 18 and Under

About half (50.6%, 131) of the total survey respondents (259) reported the presence in the home of children age 18 and under. Slightly less than half (49.4%, 128) of the total survey respondents reported having no children age 18 and under in the home. The presence in the home of children age 18 and under is reported by occupational category in Table 6.

More of the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents (60.3%) reported the presence in the home of children age 18 and under; followed by 54.5% of Other occupational category respondents and 53.2% of the Clerical occupational category respondents. Fewer respondents in the Managerial-Administrative occupational category (39.6%) and the Sales occupational category (31.8%) reported children in the home age 18 and under.

Respondents who reported having children age 18 and under in the home were asked to indicate the number of children in each of five age categories. Table 7 shows the number and percentage of survey respondents with children in each age category, by occupational category. Of the 131 total survey respondents with children age 18 and under in the home, 35.1% (46) reported children in the "6 to 10 years" age category; 33.6% (44), "13 to 15 years" age category; 32.1% (42), "16 to 18 years" age category; 29.0% (38), "5 years and under" age category; 21.6% (27), "11 to 12 years" age category.

Table 6
 Women with Children in the Home Age 18 and Under
 by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Children in Home Age 18 and Under	
	Yes <u>n</u> (%)*	No <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	38 (60.3)	25 (39.7)
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	21 (39.6)	32 (60.4)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	7 (31.8)	15 (68.2)
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	41 (53.2)	36 (46.8)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	24 (54.5)	20 (45.5)
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	131 (50.6)	128 (49.4)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

Table 7

Respondents' Report of Age Distribution of Children at Home 18 Years of Age and Under
by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u>	Number and Percentage of Respondents With Children				
		< 5 yrs <u>n</u> (%) [*]	6-10 yrs <u>n</u> (%)	11-12 yrs <u>n</u> (%)	13-15 yrs <u>n</u> (%)	16-18 yrs <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical	38	15 (39.5)	14 (36.9)	10 (26.3)	10 (26.3)	11 (28.9)
Managerial-Administrative	21	5 (23.8)	3 (14.3)	2 (9.5)	10 (47.6)	5 (23.8)
Sales	7	1 (14.3)	1 (14.3)	2 (28.6)	3 (42.9)	2 (28.6)
Clerical	41	11 (26.8)	18 (43.9)	8 (19.5)	8 (19.5)	13 (31.7)
Other	24	6 (25.0)	10 (41.7)	5 (20.8)	13 (54.2)	11 (45.8)
Total respondents	131	38 (29.0)	46 (35.1)	27 (20.6)	44 (33.6)	42 (32.1)

Note: Multiple responses were possible.

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents reporting.

Of the 38 Professional-Technical occupational category respondents with children, 39.5% reported a child in the youngest age category, "5 years and under." Slightly fewer respondents (36.9%) reported a child in the "6 to 10 years" age category. The Professional-Technical respondents reported 10 or 11 children (26.3% to 28.9%) in each of the other three age categories.

Almost 48% (47.6%) of the 21 Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents with children in the home age 18 and under reported a child in the "13 to 15 years" age category; 23.8% in both the oldest ("16 to 18 years") and youngest ("5 years and under") age category; 14.3% in the "6 to 10 years" age category; and 9.5% in the "11 to 12 years" age category.

Of the 7 Sales occupational category respondents with children in the home age 18 and under, 42.9% reported a child in the "13 to 15 years" age category and 28.5% reported a child in either the "16 to 18 years" or "11 to 12 years" age category.

Of the 41 Clerical occupational category respondents with children in the home age 18 and under, 43.9% reported a child in the "6 to 10 years" age category; 31.7% in the "16 to 18 years" category; 26.8% in the "5 years and under" age category; and 19.5% in either the "11 to 12 years" or "13 to 15 years" age category.

Over half (54.2%) of the 24 respondents in the Other occupational category reported a child in the "13 to 15 years" age category; 45.8% in the "16 to 18 years" age category; 41.7% in the "6 to 10 years" age category; 25.0% in the "5 years and under" age category; and 20.8% in the "11 to 12 years" age category.

Educational Level

The eight response categories for highest educational level attained were collapsed into the following five categories: "grade school, some high school"; "high school graduate"; "some college, associate degree"; "bachelor's degree"; "some graduate work, advanced degree." Cross-tabulation of education by occupational category is shown in Table 8. As a result of combining response categories, 43.2% (112) of the total survey respondents reported completing "some college, associate degree," and 4.3% (11) reported "grade school, some high school." Of the total survey respondents, 69.8% reported an educational level completed at or above the "some college, associate degree" level, including "bachelor's degree" and "some graduate work, advanced degree."

Professional-Technical occupational category respondents reported achieving the highest levels of education. Of the 63 Professional-Technical respondents, 98.4% reported their highest educational level at the "some college, associate degree" level or above. Over half (57.1%, 36) reported attaining the "some graduate work or graduate degree" level. Almost 20% (19.1%, 12) reported their highest education at the "bachelor's degree" level. Slightly more (22.2%, 14) reported completing "some college, associate degree." Only one respondent (1.6%) reported at the "high school graduate" level.

Overall, the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reported attaining educational levels lower than those attained by the Professional-Technical respondents. Three-fourths (75.4%) of the 53 Managerial-Administrative respondents reported an

Table 8

Cross-Tabulation of Education by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Highest Educational Level Completed				
	Grade School, Some High School <u>n</u> (%) [*]	High School Graduate <u>n</u> (%)	Some College, Associate Degree <u>n</u> (%)	Bachelor's Degree <u>n</u> (%)	Grad Work, Graduate Degree <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	- -	1 (1.6)	14 (22.2)	12 (19.1)	36 (57.1)
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	2 (3.8)	11 (20.8)	28 (52.8)	7 (13.2)	5 (9.4)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	1 (4.5)	7 (31.8)	12 (54.6)	2 (9.1)	- -
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	3 (3.9)	30 (39.0)	39 (50.6)	4 (5.2)	1 (1.3)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	5 (11.3)	18 (40.9)	19 (43.2)	1 (2.3)	1 (2.3)
Total respondents	11 (4.2)	67 (25.9)	112 (43.2)	26 (10.0)	43 (16.6)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

educational level at the "some college, associate degree" or higher level. Analysis of the results showed that 52.8% (28) at "some college, associate degree" level, 13.2 (7) at the "bachelor's degree" level, and 9.4% (5) at the "some graduate work, advanced degree" level. One-fifth (20.8%, 11) reported their highest education at the "high school graduate" level; and 3.8% (2) reported at the "grade school, some high school" level.

Sales occupational category respondents (22) reported lower educational levels attained than either the Managerial-Administrative or Professional-Technical occupational category respondents. Of the 22 Sales respondents, 63.7% reported their highest educational level at the "some college, associate degree" or higher level, including 9.1% (2) completing at the "bachelor's degree" level. There was no response by Sales occupational category respondents at the "some graduate work, advanced degree" level. About one-third (31.8%, 7) of the Sales respondents reported "high school graduate" as the highest educational level attained. One respondent (4.5%) reported at the "grade school, some high school" level.

Clerical occupational category respondents reported slightly lower education level attained than did the Sales occupational category respondents. Over half (57.1%) of the 77 Clerical occupational category respondents reported highest education at the "some college, associate degree" or higher level, including 5.2% (4) at the "bachelor's degree" level and 1.3% (1) at the "some graduate work, advanced degree" level. Over one-third (39%, 30) of the Clerical respondents reported their highest education at the "high

school graduate" level; and 3.9% (3) reported at the "grade school, some high school" level.

The lowest educational level attained was reported by the Other occupational category. Less than half (47.8%) of the 44 respondents in the Other occupational category reported their highest education at the "some college, associate degree" or higher level, including 2.3% reporting at the "bachelor's degree" level and 2.3% at the "some graduate work, advanced degree" level. Forty percent (40.9%, 18) of the Other occupational category respondents reported their highest education at the "high school graduate" level and 11.3% (5) of the respondents reported at the "grade school, some high school" level.

Years of Employment at Present Job

Years employed at present job is presented by occupational category in Table 9. The six response categories of years employed at present job included the following: "less than 2 years," "2 to 5 years," "6 to 10 years," "11 to 15 years," "16 to 20 years," and "21 years and over." Years of employment at present job for total survey respondents (259) were concentrated in three response categories: 29.7% (77) reported "6 to 10 years," 26.6% (69) reported "2 to 5 years", and 17.0% (44) reported "11 to 15 years" at present job. Few survey respondents reported total employment at present job at the low or high end of the range of categories: 11.6% (30) reported "less than 2 years," 8.9% (23) reported "16 to 20 years," and 6.2% (16) reported "21 years and over" at present job.

Years of employment at the present job by the 63 Professional-Technical occupational category respondents were concentrated into the three middle response categories. Over

Table 9

Cross-Tabulation of Years of Employment at Present Job by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Less than	2-5 yrs	6-10 yrs	11-15 yrs	16-20 yrs	21 yrs +
	2 yrs <u>n</u> (%)*	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	6 (9.5)	13 (20.6)	17 (27.0)	14 (22.2)	8 (12.7)	5 (8.0)
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	3 (5.6)	16 (30.2)	15 (28.3)	8 (15.1)	9 (17.0)	2 (3.8)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	3 (13.6)	8 (36.4)	7 (31.8)	3 (13.6)	- -	1 (4.6)
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	12 (15.6)	23 (29.8)	22 (28.6)	11 (14.3)	3 (3.9)	6 (7.8)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	6 (13.6)	9 (20.5)	16 (36.4)	8 (18.2)	3 (6.8)	2 (4.5)
Total respondents	30 (11.6)	69 (26.6)	77 (29.7)	44 (17.0)	23 (8.9)	16 (6.2)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

one-fourth (27.0%, 17) reported "6 to 10 years," 22.2% (14) reported "11 to 15 years," and 20.6% (13) reported "2 to 5 years." Eight (12.7%) of the Professional-Technical respondents reported years of employment at present job in the higher category of "16 to 20 years," and five (8.0%) reported at the highest category, "21 years and over." Slightly less than 10% (9.5%, 6) of the Professional-Technical respondents reported employment at present job was "less than 2 years."

Over half of the 53 Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reported years of employment at present job in two response categories: "2 to 5 years" (30.2%, 16) and "6 to 10 years" (28.3%, 15). Almost one-third of the Managerial-Administrative respondents reported years of employment at present job in the two higher categories: "16 to 20 years" (17.0%, 9) and "11 to 15 years" (15.1%, 8). Few Managerial-Administrative respondents reported years of employment at present job at the extreme ends of the response range: 5.6% (3) reported "less than 2 years" and 3.8% (2) reported "21 years and over."

Sales occupational category respondents reported fewer years employed at present job than did either the Professional-Technical or the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents. Over two-thirds of the 22 Sales occupational category respondents reported employment at present job between 2 and 10 years: 36.4% (8) reported "2 to 5 years" and 31.8% (7) reported "6 to 10 years." Less than 15% of the Sales respondents reported years at present job in the other four categories.

Years employed at present job for the 77 Clerical occupational category respondents is similar to that for Sales occupational category respondents. Over half of the Clerical occupational category respondents reported years employed at present job at two category levels: 29.8% (23) at "2 to 5 years" and 28.6% (22) at "6 to 10 years." In this occupational category, 15.6% or less reported years employed at present job in the other response categories.

The 44 Other occupational category respondents reported about the same number of years employed at present job as did the Sales occupational category respondents. Over one-third (36.4%, 16) of the Other occupational category respondents reported "6 to 10 years" employment at present job. Less than one-fourth of Other occupational category respondents reported years of employment at present job at "2 to 5 years" (20.5%, 9) or "11 to 15 years" (18.2%, 8). Other responses were reported by less than 15% of the respondents.

Total Years of Employment

Total years of employment by occupational category is presented in Table 10. Six response categories were identified. Most of the total survey respondents (78.8%) reported at the three highest response categories: "11 to 15 years," "16 to 20 years," and "21 years and over." Total survey respondents (259) reported almost equal total years of employment in the upper three response categories, ranging from 27.4% at the "11 to 15 years" level to 24.7% at the "16 to 20 years" level. Of total respondents, 13.9% (36) reported total years of employment at the "6 to 10 years" level; 6.6% (17) at the "2 to 5 years" level; and .8% (2) at the "less than 2 years" level.

Table 10

Cross-Tabulation of Total Years of Employment by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Less than 2 yrs		2-5 yrs		6-10 yrs		11-15 yrs		16-20 yrs		21 yrs +	
	<u>n</u>	(%)*	<u>n</u>	(%)	<u>n</u>	(%)	<u>n</u>	(%)	<u>n</u>	(%)	<u>n</u>	(%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	-	-	4	(6.3)	11	(17.5)	19	(30.2)	12	(19.0)	17	(27.0)
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	-	-	2	(3.8)	5	(9.4)	11	(20.8)	14	(26.4)	21	(39.6)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	-	-	14	(18.2)	2	(9.1)	5	(22.7)	4	(18.2)	7	(31.8)
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	1	(1.3)	3	(3.9)	12	(15.6)	22	(28.5)	21	(27.3)	18	(23.4)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	1	(2.3)	4	(9.1)	6	(13.6)	14	(31.8)	13	(30.0)	6	(13.6)
Total respondents	2	(.8)	17	(6.6)	36	(13.9)	71	(27.4)	64	(24.7)	69	(26.6)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

Response patterns of total survey respondents varied slightly for total years of employment by occupational category. Both the Managerial-Administrative and Sales occupational category respondents had higher percentages in the "21 years and over" category.

Annual Job Income Before Tax

Four of the total survey respondents (259) did not answer Question 51 requesting annual job income before taxes for the survey year. Nine job income response categories were identified. Fourteen of the 45 cross-tabulation cells (31%) showed no response, and 28 of the 45 cells (62%) had fewer than five responses. To simplify reporting and interpreting, the nine response categories were collapsed to form five categories.

The two original response categories of "less than \$6,000" and "\$6,000 to \$9,999" were combined to form the new category of "less than \$10,000." The four response categories at the upper income range ("-\$25,000 to \$29,999," "\$30,000 to \$34,999," "\$35,000 to 39,999," "\$40,000 and above") were combined to form the new category "\$25,000 or more." The three original middle income categories remained unchanged. The final five job income response categories were: "less than \$10,000," "\$10,000 to \$14,999," "\$15,000 to \$19,999," "\$20,000 to \$24,999," and "\$25,000 or more." Survey respondents' response to the five job income categories by occupational category is presented in Table 11.

Over one-fourth (28.2%, 72) of the total survey respondents (255) reported an annual job income before taxes of "\$10,000 to \$14,999." Slightly less than one-fourth (23.9%, 61) of the total survey respondents reported job incomes at the next higher level, "\$15,000 to

Table 11

Cross-Tabulation of Job Income Before Taxes by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting	Less than \$10,000	\$10,000-\$14,999	\$15,000-\$19,999	\$20,000-\$24,999	\$25,000 or more
	<u>n</u>	<u>n</u> (%)*	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical	63	2 (3.2)	4 (6.3)	17 (27.0)	22 (34.9)	18 (28.6)
Managerial-Administrative	53	3 (5.6)	10 (18.9)	14 (26.4)	16 (30.2)	10 (18.9)
Sales	21	7 (33.3)	6 (28.6)	5 (23.8)	- -	3 (14.3)
Clerical	75	15 (20.0)	35 (46.7)	17 (22.7)	6 (8.0)	2 (2.6)
Other	43	14 (32.6)	17 (39.5)	8 (18.6)	1 (2.3)	3 (7.0)
Total respondents	255	41 (16.1)	72 (28.2)	61 (23.9)	45 (17.7)	36 (14.1)

Number of non-respondents = 4

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents reporting.

\$19,999." Fewer respondents (17.6%, 45) reported annual job incomes in the "\$20,000 to \$24,999" category. The smallest number of total survey respondents reported job incomes in the lowest (16.1%, 41) and highest (14.1%, 36) income categories.

Most Professional-Technical occupational category respondents reported annual job incomes in the upper income categories. Over one-third (34.9%, 22) of the 63 Professional-Technical respondents reported annual job incomes of "\$20,000 to \$24,999"; over one-fourth reported annual job incomes at the middle level, "\$15,000 to \$19,999"; and less than 10% reported annual job incomes at the lower two levels.

Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reported a lower level of annual job income than did Professional-Technical occupational category respondents. Over half (56.6%) of the 53 Managerial-Administrative respondents reported annual job incomes between \$15,000 and \$24,999. The same percentage (18.9%, 10) reported annual incomes at the highest level, "\$25,000 and more," and the lower level of "\$10,000 to \$14,999." The smallest percentage (5.6%, 3) reported job incomes at the lowest level, "less than \$10,000."

Over half of the 21 Sales occupational category respondents (61.9%) reported annual job incomes at the lower two income levels. One-third (33.3%, 7) of the Sales respondents reported an annual job income at the lowest level, "less than \$10,000." Over one-fourth (28.6%, 6) of the Sales respondents reported an annual job income at the "\$10,000 to \$14,999" level. Middle incomes of \$15,000 to \$19,999 were reported by less than one-fourth (23.8%, 5) of the Sales

respondents. Three (14.3%) of the Sales occupational category respondents reported annual job incomes at the highest level, "\$25,000 or more."

Clerical occupational category respondents reported a job income concentration at the lower-middle income levels, slightly higher job levels than Sales occupational category respondents' but lower than both Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents'. Over two-thirds of the 75 Clerical occupational category respondents (69.4%) reported annual job incomes between \$10,000 and \$19,999. One-fifth of Clerical respondents (20.0%, 15) reported annual job incomes at the lowest level, "less than \$10,000." Only 10.6% (4) of the Clerical occupational category respondents reported incomes at the highest two job income levels including \$20,000 and above.

The 43 Other occupational category respondents reported the lowest annual job incomes of the five occupational categories. Over two-thirds (72.1%) of the Other occupational category respondents reported annual job incomes at the two lower income levels including \$14,999 and below. Less than 10% of Other respondents reported annual job incomes in either of the upper two levels including \$20,000 and above.

Total Family Income Before Taxes

Eleven of the total survey respondents (259) did not answer Question 52 requesting total family income before taxes for the survey year. Twelve income response categories, ranging from less than \$10,000 to \$60,000 and above, were identified. Fourteen of the 60 cross-tabulation cells showed no response and 34 of the 60 cells had

fewer than five responses. To simplify reporting and interpreting, the twelve response categories were collapsed to form five categories. The three original income response categories at the lower end of the income range were combined to form a new category, "less than \$20,000." The next two original income response categories were combined to form a new category, "\$20,000 to \$29,999." The next two original income response categories were combined to form a new category, "\$30,000 to \$39,999." The next two original income response categories were combined to form a new category, "\$40,000 to \$59,999." The final three original income responses were combined to form a new category, "\$60,000 and above." Survey respondents' response to the five total family income categories by occupational category is presented in Table 12.

Total annual family income before taxes for the survey respondents (248) was distributed among the three middle income levels. Of the 248 survey respondents, over one-fourth (29.0%, 72) reported family incomes at the "\$40,000 to \$59,999" level; one-fourth (24.6%, 61) reported family incomes at the "\$30,000 to \$39,999" level; and one-fourth (25.8%, 64) reported family incomes at the "\$20,000 to \$29,999" level. Total family income at the lowest level, "less than \$20,000," was reported by 14.5% (36) of the 248 survey respondents. Only 6.1% (15) of the survey respondents reported total family incomes at the highest level, "\$60,000 and above."

A higher percentage of Professional-Technical occupational category respondents reported 248 family income at a higher level than did the total survey respondents overall. Over one-third (38.3%, 23) of the 60 Professional-Technical occupational category respondents

Table 12

Cross-Tabulation of Total Annual Family Income Before Taxes by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u>	Less than \$20,000 <u>n</u> (%)*	\$20,000-\$29,999 <u>n</u> (%)	\$30,000-\$39,999 <u>n</u> (%)	\$40,000-\$59,999 <u>n</u> (%)	\$60,000 or more <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical	60	4 (6.7)	11 (18.3)	12 (20.0)	23 (38.3)	10 (16.7)
Managerial-Administrative	50	7 (14.0)	11 (22.0)	9 (18.0)	20 (40.0)	3 (6.0)
Sales	21	1 (4.8)	6 (28.5)	8 (38.1)	5 (23.8)	1 (4.8)
Clerical	74	12 (16.2)	26 (35.1)	20 (27.0)	15 (20.3)	1 (1.4)
Other	43	12 (27.9)	10 (23.3)	12 (27.9)	9 (20.9)	- -
Total respondents	248	36 (14.5)	64 (25.8)	61 (24.6)	72 (29.0)	15 (6.1)

Number of non-respondents = 11

*Percentage of occupational category and total respondents reporting.

reported total family incomes at the "\$40,000 to \$59,999" level. A higher percentage of Professional-Technical respondents reported family incomes at the "\$60,000 and above" level than did respondents in the other four occupational categories.

Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents (50) reported lower family incomes than did the Professional-Technical respondents. A higher percentage of Managerial-Administrative respondents than Professional-Technical respondents reported family incomes at the lower two income levels. A slightly higher percentage of Managerial-Administrative respondents (40.0%) than Professional-Technical respondents (38.3%) reported family incomes at the "\$40,000 to \$59,999" level; however, a lower percentage of Managerial-Administrative respondents (18.0%, 6.0%) reported at the "\$30,000 to \$39,999" and the "\$60,000 and above" levels than did Professional-Technical respondents (20.0%, 16.7%).

Sales occupational category respondents (21) reported lower family incomes than did the Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative respondents. Over one-third (38.1%, 8) of the Sales respondents reported at the "\$30,000 to \$39,999" family income level. A smaller percentage of Sales respondents (23.5%, 5) than Professional-Technical or Managerial-Administrative respondents reported family incomes at the higher "\$40,000 to \$59,999" level. A higher percentage of Sales respondents than Professional-Technical or Managerial-Administrative respondents reported family incomes at the "\$20,000 to \$29,999" level. Sales occupational category respondents, however, did report fewer family

incomes at the lowest income level than did the other four occupational categories.

Clerical occupational category respondents (74) reported lower family incomes than did Professional-Technical, Managerial-Administrative or Sales occupational category respondents. A higher percentage of Clerical respondents than Professional-Technical, Managerial-Administrative or Sales respondents reported incomes at the lower two income levels. Over one-third (35.1%, 26) of the Clerical respondents reported family incomes at the "\$20,000 to \$29,999" level, and 16.2% (12) reported incomes at the lowest level, "less than \$20,000."

Other occupational category respondents (43) reported family incomes fairly evenly distributed across the four lower income levels. Other occupational category respondents reported more family incomes at the lowest level, "less than \$20,000," than did the other four occupational category respondents. A lower percentage of Other occupational category respondents reported family incomes at the "\$40,000 to \$59,999" level than did the Professional-Technical, Managerial-Administrative or Sales respondents. Other occupational category respondents reported no family incomes at the highest level, "\$60,000 and above."

Wardrobe Inventory of Expenditures and Items Purchased

The wardrobe expenditure inventory section of the survey questionnaire included a list of 37 wardrobe items (Q1-Q37) representative of the type of clothing and accessories working women

might wear primarily for work and work-related activities. The 37 wardrobe items were grouped into five wardrobe inventory subcategories as follows: protective outerwear (Q1-Q5), outerwear (Q6-Q16), footwear (Q17-Q21), lingerie (Q22-Q28), and accessories (Q29-Q37). The survey respondents were asked to indicate the number of each of the 37 clothing and accessory items in their work wardrobe which were worn primarily for work and work-related activities that they acquired by purchasing during the survey year (January through December, 1985). Clothing items purchased included ready-to-wear, home sewn, and custom sewn. Respondents were asked to indicate the total amount spent per item type purchased and to estimate the total amount spent if exact recall were not possible.

All 259 survey respondents indicated acquisition of wardrobe items worn primarily for work and work-related activities; however, not all respondents acquired clothing and accessories representative of each of the 37 wardrobe items (Q1-Q37) and not all respondents acquired wardrobe items in each of the five inventory subcategories.

Expenditures for work wardrobe care during the survey year under consideration (January through December, 1985) are reported in this section. Work wardrobe care expenditures were not added to the total wardrobe inventory, but were considered separately. Question 39 asked for estimated annual dry-cleaning expenditures of the work wardrobe; Question 40 asked for estimated annual expenditures for work wardrobe alteration and repair.

The wardrobe expenditure inventory resulted in an analysis of the annual work wardrobe expenditures of 259 survey respondents, and a

specific analysis of the work wardrobe expenditure patterns of the five occupational categories of concern to this study. A complete summary of inventory item (Q1-Q37) expenditures and number of purchases for the total survey respondents (259) is presented in Appendix J. The inventory summary (Appendix J) includes the number of each inventory item purchased, total expenditure per inventory item, average expenditure per item purchased, and the valid cases (number of respondents) for each inventory item. Inventory subcategory (protective outerwear, outerwear, lingerie, footwear, accessories) totals are also presented.

An inventory summary for each of the five occupational categories of concern to this study: Professional-Technical, Managerial-Administrative, Sales, Clerical, and Other is reported in Appendix J. Results of the expenditure inventory were summarized for presentation in this chapter. The average expenditure for each wardrobe inventory subcategory and each occupational category was of primary concern to this study. Expenditures per item and specific types of items purchased were of importance only as they related to expenditure patterns. For purposes of reporting, expenditure dollars were rounded to the nearest dollar; number of items purchased were rounded to the nearest whole number.

Total Work Wardrobe Expenditure Inventory

The total survey respondents (259) purchased a total of 17,005 items and spent \$229,417 for work wardrobes during the survey year, January through December, 1985. The average number of items purchased totaled 66; range was 2 to 489 items per respondent (259). The

average expenditure per respondent (259) totaled \$886; range was \$11 to \$5,925 per respondent. Means were rounded to the nearest whole dollar or number. Results are presented in Table 13.

Professional-Technical occupational category respondents (63) purchased an average of 62 items; range was 14 to 206 items. The average expenditure by the Professional-Technical respondents was \$967; range was \$108 to \$2,330.

Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents (53) accounted for the highest average number of work wardrobe items and the highest average expenditure of the five occupational categories. The average number of items purchased by Managerial-Administrative respondents was 74 items; the average expenditure was \$1,019. Items purchased per respondent ranged from 2 to 206. The expenditure per respondent ranged from \$51 to \$5,902.

Sales occupational category respondents accounted a lower average number of items and a lower average expenditure per respondent than did the Professional-Technical or the Managerial-Administrative respondents. Sales occupational category respondents (22) purchased an average of 58 items, ranging from 18 to 173 items per respondent. The average expenditure by Sales respondents was \$943; range was \$174 to \$3,926.

Clerical occupational category respondents purchased a higher average number of items than did Professional-Technical or Sales occupational category respondents and a lower average number of items than did the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents. Clerical respondents (77) purchased an average of 73

Table 13
Range and Means of Items Purchased and Expenditures
by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Items Purchased			Expenditures		
	Total	Range	Mean ^a <u>n</u>	Total \$	Range \$	Mean ^b \$
Professional- Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	3,922	14-206	62	60,905	108-2,330	967
Managerial- Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	3,930	2-206	74	53,994	51-5,925	1,019
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	1,277	18-173	58	20,751	174-3,926	943
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	5,643	7-489	73	70,219	11-4,240	912
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	2,233	2-159	51	23,548	52-1,960	535
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	17,005	2-489	66	229,417	11-5,925	886

^aMeans rounded to nearest whole number.

^bMeans rounded to nearest whole dollar.

items; range was 7 to 489 items per respondent. Clerical respondents made a lower average expenditure per respondent than did Professional-Technical, Managerial-Administrative, or Sales occupational category respondents. Clerical occupational category respondents spent an average of \$912; range was \$11 to \$4,240.

The Other occupational category respondents accounted for the lowest average number of items and the lowest average expenditure of the five occupational categories. The Other occupational category respondents (44) purchased an average purchase of 51 items; range was 2 to 159 items per respondent. The Other occupational category respondents spent an average of \$535; range was \$52 to \$1,960.

Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory Expenditures

Wardrobe inventory subcategory expenditures by occupational category are presented in Table 14. Total survey respondents (259) spent 50.3% of the total work wardrobe expenditure on outerwear, 14.5% on footwear, 14.3% on lingerie, 12.5% on accessories, and 8.4% on protective outerwear. The percentage of total work wardrobe expenditure for each wardrobe inventory subcategory varied slightly by occupational category.

The percentage of total work wardrobe expenditure for protective outerwear was less than for the other wardrobe inventory subcategories. The percentage of total work wardrobe expenditure for protective outerwear ranged from 7.4% (by Sales occupational category respondents) to 11.0% (by Other occupational category respondents).

The largest percentage of total work wardrobe expenditure was spent for outerwear. The percentage ranged from 43.1% (by Other

Table 14

Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory Expenditures by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Protective Outerwear \$ (%)*	Outerwear \$ (%)	Footwear \$ (%)	Lingerie \$ (%)	Accessories \$ (%)	Total Expendi- tures \$ (%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	5,427 (8.9)	31,640 (51.9)	8,148 (13.4)	7,429 (12.2)	8,261 (13.6)	60,905 (100.0)
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	4,149 (7.7)	28,262 (52.4)	8,166 (15.1)	7,634 (14.1)	5,783 (10.7)	53,994 (100.0)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	1,540 (7.4)	11,350 (54.7)	3,029 (14.6)	2,361 (11.4)	2,471 (11.9)	20,751 (100.0)
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	5,596 (8.0)	33,999 (48.4)	10,091 (14.4)	10,086 (14.3)	10,447 (14.9)	70,219 (100.0)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	2,585 (11.0)	10,140 (43.1)	3,905 (16.6)	5,217 (22.1)	1,701 (7.2)	23,548 (100.0)
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	19,297 (8.4)	115,391 (50.3)	33,339 (14.5)	32,727 (14.3)	28,663 (12.5)	229,417 (100.0)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

occupational category respondents) to 54.7% (by Sales occupational category respondents). Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents spent 51.9% and 52.4%, respectively, of the total work wardrobe expenditure for outerwear. Clerical occupational category respondents spent 48.4% of the total work wardrobe expenditure for outerwear.

Respondents in all five of the occupational categories spent about the same percentage of total work wardrobe expenditure for footwear, lingerie, and accessories. The percentage of total work wardrobe expenditure for footwear ranged from 13.4% (by Professional-Technical respondents) to 16.6% (by Other occupational category respondents). Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents spent 15.1% of the total wardrobe expenditure for footwear. Clerical and Sales occupational category respondents spent 14.4% and 14.6%, respectively, of the total work wardrobe expenditure for footwear.

The percentage of total work wardrobe expenditure for lingerie ranged from 11.4% (by Sales occupational category respondents) to 22.1% (by Other occupational category respondents). Managerial-Administrative and Clerical occupational category respondents spent 14.1% and 14.3%, respectively, of the total work wardrobe expenditure for lingerie. Professional-Technical occupational category respondents spent 12.2% of the total work wardrobe expenditure for lingerie.

The percentage of total work wardrobe expenditure for accessories ranged from 7.2% (by Other occupational category

respondents) to 14.9% (by Clerical occupational category respondents). Professional-Technical respondents spent 13.6% of the total work wardrobe expenditure for accessories; Sales and Managerial-Administrative respondents spent 11.9% and 10.7%, respectively, of the total work wardrobe expenditure for accessories.

Average Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory Expenditures

All survey respondents (259) did not make a purchase in each of the wardrobe inventory subcategories. The percentage of total survey respondents making a wardrobe inventory subcategory expenditure ranged from 72.6% (for protective outerwear) to 98.8% (for lingerie). Almost all survey respondents reported expenditures for outerwear, footwear, and lingerie. Fewer total survey respondents reported expenditures for protective outerwear and accessories. Expenditure patterns were similar for respondents of each of the five occupational categories. The average expenditure for each wardrobe inventory subcategory by respondents who made a purchase and the percentage of occupational category respondents who made a purchase are presented by occupational category in Table 15.

The average expenditure for protective outerwear by 72.6% of the total survey respondents was \$103. The expenditure for protective outerwear was less than the expenditure for each of the other wardrobe inventory subcategories and a smaller percentage of total survey respondents reported expenditures for protective outerwear than for each the other wardrobe inventory subcategories. The highest average expenditure (by 96.9% of the total survey respondents) was \$460 for outerwear. Average expenditures for footwear and lingerie were \$132

Table 15

Average Dollar Expenditure by Wardrobe Subcategories

Occupational Category	Total Respondents <u>n</u>	Average Expenditure \$ ^a	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u> (%) ^b
Protective Outerwear			
Professional-Technical	63	115	47 (74.6)
Managerial-Administrative	53	106	39 (73.6)
Sales	22	110	14 (63.6)
Clerical	77	106	53 (68.8)
Other	44	74	35 (79.5)
Total	259	103	188 (72.6)
Outerwear			
Professional-Technical	63	519	61 (96.8)
Managerial-Administrative	53	544	52 (98.1)
Sales	22	516	22 (100.0)
Clerical	77	447	76 (98.7)
Other	44	236	40 (90.9)
Total	259	460	251 (96.9)
Footwear			
Professional-Technical	63	131	62 (98.4)
Managerial-Administrative	53	157	52 (98.1)
Sales	22	144	21 (95.5)
Clerical	77	138	73 (94.8)
Other	44	89	44 (100.0)
Total	259	132	252 (97.3)
Lingerie			
Professional-Technical	63	118	63 (100.0)
Managerial-Administrative	53	147	52 (98.1)
Sales	22	107	22 (100.0)
Clerical	77	133	76 (98.7)
Other	44	121	43 (97.7)
Total	259	128	256 (98.8)
Accessories			
Professional-Technical	63	153	54 (85.7)
Managerial-Administrative	53	126	50 (94.3)
Sales	22	124	20 (90.9)
Clerical	77	154	68 (88.3)
Other	44	50	34 (77.3)
Total	259	127	226 (87.3)

^aDollars rounded to nearest whole dollar.

^bPercentage of occupational category or total respondents.

and \$128, respectively, for the 97.3% and 98.8% of total survey respondents who reported. Average expenditure for accessories was \$127 for the 87.3% of total survey respondents who reported.

Average expenditures for protective outerwear by occupational category ranged from \$74 (by 79.5% of the Other occupational category respondents) to \$115 (by 74.6% of the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents). Sales occupational category respondents who made purchases (63.6%) spent an average of \$110 for protective outerwear; Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents who made purchases (73.6%) and the Clerical occupational category respondents who made purchases (68.8%) each spent an average of \$106 for protective outerwear.

Average expenditures by all occupational categories were higher for outerwear than for the other wardrobe inventory subcategories. Average expenditures by occupational category for outerwear ranged from \$236 (by 90.9% of the Other occupational category respondents) to \$544 (by 98.1% of the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents). The average outerwear expenditure by 96.8% of the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents was \$519. The average outerwear expenditure by 100% of the Sales occupational category respondents was \$516. The average outerwear expenditure by 98.7% of the Clerical occupational category respondents was \$447.

Average expenditures for footwear by all five occupational categories were considerably less than the average expenditure for outerwear; however, average footwear expenditures were more than expenditures for protective outerwear, lingerie, and accessories for

all occupational categories except for the Professional-Technical occupational category where an average \$131 was spent on footwear and \$153 on accessories. The average expenditure by occupational category for footwear ranged from \$89 (by 100% of the Other occupational category respondents) to \$157 (by 98.1% of the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents). The average expenditure for footwear by 95.5% of the Sales occupational category respondents was \$144. The average expenditure for footwear by 94.8% of the Clerical occupational category respondents was \$138.

Average expenditures for lingerie by the five occupational categories ranged from \$107 (by 100% of the Sales occupational category respondents) to \$147 (by 98.1% of the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents). The average lingerie expenditure by 98.7% of the Clerical occupational category respondents was \$133. The average lingerie expenditure by 97.7% of the Other occupational category respondents was \$122 and by 100% of the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents was \$118.

Average expenditures for accessories by occupational category ranged from \$50 (by 77.3% of the Other occupational category respondents) to \$154 (by 88.3% of the Clerical occupational category respondents). The average expenditure for accessories by 85.7% of the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents was \$153. The average accessories expenditure by 90.9% of the Sales occupational category respondents was \$124 and by 94.3% of the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents was \$116.

Average Expenditure Per Item by Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory and Occupational Category

The average expenditure per item purchased by wardrobe inventory subcategory and occupational category is presented in Table 16. Total survey respondents who purchased protective outerwear spent an average of \$58 per protective outerwear item purchased. The average per item expenditure by the total survey respondents who made purchases was \$26 for outerwear, \$32 for footwear, \$4 for lingerie, and \$14 for accessories.

For each of the five occupational categories, the average per item expenditure was greatest for protective outerwear and smallest for lingerie. Per item expenditure for footwear tended to be slightly greater than for outerwear. The per item expenditure for accessories tended to be greater than the per item expenditure for lingerie. The per item expenditure for accessories tended to be less than the per item expenditure for footwear, outerwear, and protective outerwear.

Average per item expenditure for protective outerwear ranged from \$39 (by the Other occupational category respondents) to \$67 (by the Sales occupational category respondents). The average per item expenditure for protective outerwear by the Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents was \$65. The average per item expenditure for protective outerwear by Clerical occupational category respondents was \$60, slightly less than the average per item expenditure for protective outerwear by Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents.

Table 16

Average Expenditure per Item Purchased
by Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory and Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory				
	Protective Outerwear \$	Outerwear \$	Footwear \$	Lingerie \$	Accessories \$
Professional- Technical	65	31	34	4	16
Managerial- Administrative	65	29	35	3	14
Sales	67	27	30	4	15
Clerical	60	24	31	3	14
Other	39	18	29	4	8
Total respondents	58	26	32	4	14

Note: Dollars rounded to nearest whole dollar.

Range and Mean Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory Expenditures and Items Purchased by Occupational Category

To further describe the work wardrobe expenditures of the survey respondents by occupational category, the range of numbers of items purchased and the mean number of items purchased by those who made purchases are presented by wardrobe inventory subcategory. The range of expenditures and the mean expenditure by occupational category of those respondents who made purchases are presented by wardrobe inventory subcategory. Not all survey respondents made purchases in each of the wardrobe inventory subcategories.

Protective Outerwear. The range and mean of total number of items purchased and the range and mean of total expenditures for protective outerwear are summarized by occupational category and presented in Table 17. The total number of protective outerwear items purchased by 188 (72.6%) of the total survey respondents ranged from 1 to 6, with a mean of 2 items after rounding to the nearest whole number. The total expenditure for protective outerwear by the total survey respondents who reported purchases (188) ranged from \$2 to \$460, with a mean expenditure of \$103. Respondents of all five occupational categories who reported purchases purchased a mean of 2 protective outerwear items.

The total mean expenditure for protective outerwear by respondents who reported purchases ranged from a low total mean expenditure of \$74 (by the Other occupational category respondents) to \$115 (by the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents). The total mean expenditure for protective outerwear by Managerial-Administrative and Clerical occupational category

Table 17

Protective Outerwear--Range and Means
of Items Purchased and Expenditures
by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u> (%) ^a	# Items Purchased		\$ Expenditure	
		Range	Mean # of Garments ^b	Range \$	Mean \$ ^c
Professional- Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	47 (74.6)	1-6	2	10-335	115
Managerial- Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	39 (73.6)	1-5	2	3-401	106
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	14 (63.6)	1-3	2	12-321	110
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	53 (68.8)	1-5	2	13-460	106
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	35 (79.6)	1-5	2	2-260	74
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	188 (72.6)	1-6	2	2-460	103

^aPercentage of occupational category or total respondents.

^bMean number of items rounded to nearest whole number.

^cMean expenditure dollars rounded to nearest whole dollar.

respondents (\$106) was lower than the total mean expenditure by Professional-Technical occupational category respondents. The total mean expenditure for protective outerwear by Sales occupational category respondents (\$110) was lower than the total mean expenditure by Professional-Technical occupational category respondents, but higher than the total mean expenditure reported by Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents.

Outerwear. The range and mean of total number of items purchased and the range and mean of total expenditures for outerwear are summarized by occupational category and presented in Table 18. The total number of outerwear items purchased by the total survey respondents (251, 96.9%) ranged from 2 to 92 items, with a mean of 17 items. The mean number of items purchased by each of the occupational categories was about the same, ranging from a mean low of 14 items purchased (by the Other occupational category respondents) to a mean high of 19 items purchased (by Managerial-Administrative, Sales, and Clerical occupational category respondents).

The total expenditure for outerwear by the total survey respondents ranged from \$18 to \$2,625, with a mean of \$446. The total mean expenditure for outerwear ranged from a low total mean expenditure of \$236 (by the Other occupational category respondents) to a high total mean expenditure of \$544 (by the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents). The total mean outerwear expenditures by Professional-Technical occupational category respondents (\$519) was lower than the total mean outerwear expenditure by Managerial-Administrative occupational

Table 18

Outerwear--Range and Means of
Items Purchased and Expenditures
by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting		# Items Purchased		\$ Expenditure	
	<u>n</u>	(%) ^a	Range	Mean # of Garments ^b	Range \$	Mean \$ ^c
Professional- Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	61	(96.8)	2-56	17	40-1,650	519
Managerial- Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	52	(98.1)	3-83	19	18-1,154	544
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	22	(100.0)	5-64	19	66-2,625	516
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	76	(98.7)	2-92	19	32-1,700	447
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	40	(90.9)	2-45	14	20-900	236
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	251	(96.9)	2-92	17	18-2,625	446

^aPercentage of occupational category or total respondents.

^bMean number of items rounded to nearest whole number.

^cMean expenditure dollars rounded to nearest whole dollar.

category respondents but higher than the total mean outerwear expenditure by the Sales occupational category respondents (\$516). The total mean outerwear expenditure by Clerical occupational category respondents (\$447) was higher than the total mean outerwear expenditure by the Other occupational category respondents but lower than the total mean outerwear expenditures by respondents of the other three occupational categories.

Footwear. The range and mean of total number of items purchased and the range and mean of total expenditures for footwear are summarized and presented in Table 19. The total number of footwear items purchased by the total survey respondents (252, 97.3%) ranged from 1 to 20, with a mean of 3 items. The total expenditure for footwear by the total survey respondents ranged from \$6 to \$626, with a mean of \$129.

The mean number of footwear items purchased by each occupational category was about the same. The Other occupational category respondents purchased a mean of 3 footwear items; Managerial-Administrative and Sales occupational category respondents purchased a mean of 5 footwear items. Professional-Technical and Clerical occupational category respondents purchased a mean of 4 footwear items.

The total mean expenditure for footwear by respondents ranged from \$89 (by the Other occupational category respondents) to \$157 (by the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents). In increasing amounts spent, the total mean expenditure for footwear by Professional-Technical occupational category respondents was \$131;

Table 19

Footwear--Range and Means of
Items Purchased and Expenditures
by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting		# Items Purchased		\$ Expenditure	
	<u>n</u>	(%) ^a	Range	Mean # of Garments ^b	Range \$	Mean \$ ^c
Professional- Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	62	(98.4)	1-12	4	12-350	131
Managerial- Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	52	(98.1)	1-13	5	6-628	157
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	21	(95.5)	1-11	5	21-355	144
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	73	(94.8)	1-20	4	8-520	138
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	44	(100.0)	1-10	3	12-446	89
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	252	(97.3)	1-20	4	6-628	129

^aPercentage of occupational category or total respondents.

^bMean number of items rounded to nearest whole number.

^cMean expenditure dollars rounded to nearest whole dollar.

by Clerical occupational category respondents was \$138; and by Sales occupational category respondents was \$144.

Lingerie. The range and mean of total number of items purchased and the range and mean of total expenditures for lingerie are summarized and presented in Table 20. The total number of lingerie items purchased by the total survey respondents (256, 98.8%) ranged from 1 to 329, with a mean of 34 items. The mean number of total lingerie items purchased ranged from 26 items (by the Sales occupational category respondents) to 43 items (by the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents).

The total expenditure for lingerie by the total survey respondents ranged from \$4 to \$910, with a mean of \$128. The total mean expenditure for lingerie by respondents ranged from \$107 (by the Sales occupational category respondents) to \$147 (by the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents).

Accessories. The range and mean of total number of items purchased and the range and mean of total expenditures for accessories are summarized and presented in Table 21. The total number of accessory items purchased by the total survey respondents (226, 87.3%) ranged from 1 to 82, with a mean of 8 items. The mean number of total accessory items purchased ranged from 6 items (by the Other occupational category respondents) to 11 items (by the Clerical occupational category respondents).

The total expenditure for accessories by the total survey respondents ranged from \$3 to \$1,588, with a mean of \$127. The total mean expenditure for accessories reported by respondents ranged from

Table 20

Lingerie--Range and Means of
Items Purchased and Expenditures
by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u> (%) ^a	# Items Purchased		\$ Expenditure	
		Range	Mean # of Garments ^b	Range \$	Mean \$ ^c
Professional- Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	63 (100.0)	1-127	32	15-475	118
Managerial- Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	52 (98.1)	4-175	43	4-391	147
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	22 (100.0)	5-83	26	10-418	107
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	76 (98.7)	4-329	40	11-910	133
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	43 (97.7)	3-100	29	5-640	121
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	256 (98.8)	1-329	34	4-910	128

^aPercentage of occupational category or total respondents.

^bMean number of items rounded to nearest whole number.

^cMean expenditure dollars rounded to nearest whole dollar.

Table 21

Accessories--Range and Means of
Items Purchased and Expenditures
by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u> (%) ^a	# Items Purchased		\$ Expenditure	
		Range	Mean # of Garments ^b	Range \$	Mean \$ ^c
Professional- Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	54 (85.7)	1-31	10	10-635	153
Managerial- Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	50 (94.3)	1-29	8	8-825	116
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	20 (90.9)	1-22	8	6-500	124
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	68 (88.3)	1-82	11	6-1,588	154
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	34 (77.3)	1-24	6	3-134	50
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	226 (87.3)	1-82	8	3-1,588	127

^aPercentage of occupational category or total respondents.

^bMean number of items rounded to nearest whole number.

^cMean expenditure dollars rounded to nearest whole dollar.

\$50 (by the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents) to \$154 (by the Clerical occupational category respondents). The total mean expenditure for accessories by the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents (\$153) was about the same as the total mean expenditure by the Clerical occupational category respondents. The total mean expenditures by the Managerial-Administrative and Sales occupational category respondents were lower than the total mean expenditures by the Clerical and Professional-Technical occupational category respondents.

Wardrobe Care Expenditures

Dry Cleaning. Survey respondents were asked (Q39) to estimate the dollar amount spent during 1985 (January through December) for dry cleaning of wardrobe worn primarily for work and work-related activities. The five identified response categories were: "under \$25," "\$25 to \$50," "\$51 to \$75," "\$76 to \$100," and "over \$100.) Responses are reported by occupational category in Table 22.

Over one-half of the total survey respondents (54.8%) reported spending under \$25 for dry cleaning. Less than one-fourth (22.0%) of the total survey respondents reported spending \$25 to \$50 for dry cleaning, and about the same percentage (23.2%) reported spending \$51 or more for dry cleaning.

Slightly less than half (47.6%) of the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents reported spending under \$25 for dry cleaning of work wardrobes. Slightly over one-fourth (28.6%) of the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents reported

Table 22
Annual Work Wardrobe Dry-Cleaning Expenditures
by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Under \$25 <u>n</u> (%) [*]	\$25-\$50 <u>n</u> (%)	\$51-\$75 <u>n</u> (%)	\$76-\$100 <u>n</u> (%)	Over \$100 <u>n</u> (%)
Professional- Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	30 (47.6)	18 (28.6)	6 (9.5)	2 (3.2)	7 (11.1)
Managerial- Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	24 (45.3)	13 (24.6)	5 (9.4)	5 (9.4)	6 (11.3)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	11 (50.0)	7 (31.9)	2 (9.1)	1 (4.5)	1 (4.5)
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	43 (55.8)	14 (18.2)	9 (11.7)	7 (9.1)	4 (5.2)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	34 (77.3)	5 (11.4)	3 (6.8)	1 (2.3)	1 (2.3)
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	142 (54.8)	57 (22.0)	25 (9.7)	16 (6.2)	19 (7.3)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

spending \$25 to \$50 for dry cleaning, and slightly less than one-fourth (23.8%) reported spending \$51 or more for dry cleaning.

Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents tended to spend more for dry cleaning than did the Professional-Technical respondents. Less than half (45.3%) of the Managerial-Administrative respondents reported spending under \$25 for dry cleaning of work wardrobes. One-fourth (24.6%) of the Managerial-Administrative respondents reported spending \$25 to \$50 for dry cleaning, and almost one-third (30.1%) reported spending \$51 or more for dry cleaning.

Sales occupational category respondents tended to spend less for dry cleaning than did the Professional-Technical and the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents. Half of the Sales respondents reported spending under \$25 for dry cleaning and almost one-third (31.9%) reported spending from \$25 to \$50 for dry cleaning of work wardrobes. Fewer Sales occupational category respondents (18.1%) than Professional-Technical or Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reported spending \$51 or more for dry cleaning of work wardrobes.

Clerical occupational category respondents tended to spend less for dry cleaning of work wardrobes than did Professional-Technical, Managerial-Administrative, or Sales occupational category respondents; however, a higher percentage (11.7%) of Clerical respondents than Professional-Technical or Sales respondents reported spending \$51 to \$75 for dry cleaning of work wardrobes. Over half (55.8%) of the Clerical occupational category respondents reported spending under

\$25 for dry cleaning of work wardrobes. Over one-fourth (26.0%) of the Clerical respondents reported spending \$51 or more for dry cleaning of work wardrobes.

The Other occupational category respondents reported spending less for dry cleaning of work wardrobes than did any of the other occupational categories. Over three-fourths (77.3%) of the Other occupational category respondents reported spending under \$25 for dry cleaning; and 11.4% reported spending \$25 to \$50 for dry cleaning of work wardrobes.

Alteration and Repair. Survey respondents were asked (Q40) to estimate the dollar amount spent during 1985 (January through December) for alteration and repair of clothing worn primarily for work and work-related activities. The five identified response categories were: "under \$25," "\$26 to \$50," "\$51 to \$75," "\$76 to \$100," and "over \$100." Responses by occupational category are presented in Table 23.

Most of the total survey respondents (85.4%) reported spending under \$25 for alteration and repair of work wardrobes. Similar expenditure trends for alteration and repair were observed among the five occupational categories.

Wardrobe Expenditure Influences

This section of the presentation of findings includes a description of the selected influences on work wardrobe expenditures. The selected expenditure influences of interest to this study were: work wardrobe expenditure as compared to the previous year, reasons

Table 23

Annual Work Wardrobe Alteration and Repair Expenditures
by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Under \$25 <u>n</u> (%) [*]	\$25-\$50 <u>n</u> (%)	\$51-\$75 <u>n</u> (%)	\$76-\$100 <u>n</u> (%)	Over \$100 <u>n</u> (%)
Professional- Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	51 (81.0)	5 (7.9)	5 (7.9)	2 (3.2)	- -
Managerial- Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	46 (86.8)	3 (5.7)	3 (5.7)	1 (1.8)	- -
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	18 (81.8)	3 (13.6)	1 (4.6)	- -	- -
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	68 (88.3)	5 (6.5)	1 (1.3)	1 (1.3)	2 (2.6)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	38 (86.4)	4 (9.1)	- -	- -	2 (4.5)
Total (<u>n</u> = 259)	221 (85.4)	20 (7.7)	10 (3.9)	4 (1.5)	4 (1.5)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

for spending more, and reasons for spending less; adequate work wardrobe size, and reasons for an inadequate number of garments in work wardrobe; expected wear life of work wardrobe garments; work uniform requirements, and method of work uniform acquisition; importance of eleven factors influencing the purchase of work wardrobes.

Work Wardrobe Expenditure Changes

Over half (56.0%) of the total survey respondents reported work wardrobe expenditures for 1985 were "about the same as usual." Responses are reported in Table 24. Slightly fewer than one-fourth (22.4%) of the total survey respondents reported spending "more than usual" during 1985 for work wardrobes, and about the same number of respondents (21.6%) reported spending "less than usual." Similar responses were reported by each of the five occupational categories.

Over half the respondents of each of the five occupational categories reported spending "about the same as usual" for work wardrobes, ranging from 51.9% of the Clerical occupational category respondents to 68.2% of the Sales occupational category respondents. One-fourth (25.4%) of the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents, one-fourth (26.4%) of the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents, and one-fourth (25.0%) of the Other occupational category respondents reported spending "more than usual" for work wardrobes. Fewer Sales (13.6%) and Clerical (5.2%) occupational category respondents reported spending "more than usual" for work wardrobes.

Table 24

Work Wardrobe Expenditures for 1985 as Compared to Previous Year
as Reported by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Amount Spent		
	More than Usual <u>n</u> (%) ^a	Less than Usual <u>n</u> (%)	Same as Usual <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	16 (25.4)	12 (19.0)	35 (55.6)
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	14 (26.4)	9 (17.0)	30 (56.6)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	3 (13.6)	4 (18.2)	15 (68.2)
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	4 (5.2)	23 (29.9)	40 (51.9)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	11 (25.0)	8 (18.2)	25 (56.8)
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	58 (22.4)	56 (21.6)	145 (56.0)

Chi-square = 6.45831

df = 8

Significance = 0.5960

Min E.F. = 4.757

Cells with E.F. < 5 = 2 of 15 (13.3%)

^aPercentage of occupational category or total respondents.

The response to spending "less than usual" ranged from a low of 17.0% reported by the Managerial-Administrative respondents, to a high of 29.9% reported by Clerical respondents. More Clerical occupational category respondents than the other occupational category respondents reported spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes. The other three occupational categories--Professional-Technical, Sales, and Other--reported about the same number of respondents spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes: 19.0%, 18.2%, and 18.2%, respectively.

Reasons for Spending More. Respondents who reported spending "more than usual" for work wardrobes (Q38) were asked in Question 38a to indicate as many reasons as applied for spending "more than usual." The six response categories identified were: new job, job promotion, weight change, change in family status, purchase of maternity wardrobe, and other. The 58 survey respondents who spent "more than usual" for work wardrobes responded 69 times to the identified response categories. The major reasons reported for spending "more than usual" were: "weight change" (32.8%), "other" (32.8%), "new job" (20.7%), and "job promotion" (20.7%). The least reported reasons for spending "more than usual" were: "change in family status" (6.9%) and "purchase of maternity wardrobe" (5.2%). Respondents who indicated "other" as a reason for spending "more than usual" were not provided an opportunity to explain what the other reason was. Responses by occupational category are presented in Table 25.

Professional-Technical respondents reported "other" reasons (50.0%) and "weight change" (25.0%) most often for spending "more

Table 25

Reasons Given for "Spending More" than Previous Year by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u>	New Job <u>n</u> (%) [*]	Job Promotion <u>n</u> (%)	Weight Change <u>n</u> (%)	Change in Family Status <u>n</u> (%)	Purchase of Maternity Wardrobe <u>n</u> (%)	Other <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical	16	2 (12.5)	2 (12.5)	4 (25.0)	1 (6.3)	1 (6.3)	8 (50.0)
Managerial-Administrative	14	1 (7.1)	5 (35.7)	4 (28.6)	2 (14.3)	- -	5 (35.7)
Sales	3	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	- -	- -	1 (33.3)
Clerical	14	5 (35.7)	3 (21.4)	7 (50.0)	- -	1 (7.1)	2 (14.3)
Other	11	3 (27.3)	1 (9.1)	3 (27.3)	1 (9.1)	1 (9.1)	3 (27.3)
Total respondents	58	12 (20.7)	12 (20.7)	19 (32.8)	4 (6.9)	3 (5.2)	19 (32.8)

Multiple responses = 69
 Cells with <5 = 25 (83%)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents reporting.

than usual" for work wardrobes. Job-related reasons, "new job" and "job promotion," were given by a total of one-fourth (25.0%) of the Professional-Technical respondents as reasons for spending "more than usual." The least reported reasons by Professional-Technical respondents for spending "more than usual" for work wardrobes were "change in family status" (6.3%) and "purchase of maternity wardrobe" (6.3%).

The reasons given by Managerial-Administrative respondents were about the same as those given by Professional-Technical respondents for spending "more than usual" on work wardrobes. Major reasons reported by Managerial-Administrative respondents were "job promotion" (35.7%), "other" (35.7%), and "weight change" (28.6%). Less reported reasons for spending "more than usual" were "change in family status" (14.1%) and "new job" (7.1%).

The major reasons reported by one-third (33.3%) of the Sales occupational category respondents for spending "more than usual" for work wardrobes were the same as those given by Professional-Technical respondents: "new job," "job promotion," "weight change," and "other."

The major reasons reported by the Clerical occupational category respondents for spending "more than usual" for work wardrobes were almost the same as those given by Sales and Professional-Technical respondents: "weight change" (50.0%), "new job" (37.5%), and "job promotion" (21.4%). "Purchase of maternity wardrobe" (7.1%) was the least reported reason given by Clerical respondents for spending "more than usual."

The reasons reported most often by the Other occupational category respondents for spending "more than usual" for work wardrobes were slightly different than the reasons given by the other four occupational category respondents. "New job," "weight change," and "other" were each reported by 27.3% of the respondents; however, "job promotion" joined "change in family status" and "purchase of maternity wardrobe" as one of the least often cited reasons for spending "more than usual" for work wardrobes.

Reasons for Spending Less. Survey respondents who reported spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes (Q38) were asked in Question 38b to indicate as many reasons as applied for spending less. The six response categories identified as reason for spending less were: "weight change," "change in family status," "purchase of maternity wardrobe," "anticipated retirement," "unforeseen financial expenses," and "other."

The 56 survey respondents who reported spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes (Q38) responded 75 times to reasons for spending less. The major reasons reported by the 56 survey respondents for spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes were: "other" (43.9%), "unforeseen financial expenses" (36.8%), and "weight change" (21.0%). Fewer survey respondents reported "change in family status" (12.3%), "purchase of maternity wardrobe" (10.5%), and "anticipated retirement" (7.0%) as reason for spending "less than usual" on work wardrobes. Responses are presented by occupational category in Table 26.

Respondents in each of the five occupational categories reported similar response distributions among the reasons for spending "less

Table 26

Reasons Given for "Spending Less" than Previous Year by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting	Weight Change	Change in Family Status	Purchase of Maternity Wardrobe	Anticipate Retirement	Unforeseen Financial Emergency	Other
	<u>n</u>	<u>n</u> (%) [*]	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)	<u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical	12	2 (16.7)	- -	- -	- -	5 (41.7)	8 (66.7)
Managerial-Administrative	9	- -	1 (11.1)	1 (11.1)	2 (22.2)	3 (33.3)	3 (33.3)
Sales	3	- -	1 (33.3)	1 (33.3)	- -	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)
Clerical	23	9 (39.1)	4 (17.4)	3 (13.0)	2 (8.7)	8 (34.8)	8 (34.8)
Other	8	1 (12.5)	1 (12.5)	1 (12.5)	- -	4 (50.0)	4 (50.0)
Total respondents	56	12 (21.0)	7 (12.3)	6 (10.5)	4 (7.0)	21 (36.8)	25 (43.9)

Multiple responses = 75
 Cells with <5 = 25 (83%)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents reporting.

than usual" for the work wardrobe. Two-thirds (66.7%) of the twelve Professional-Technical occupational category respondents who reported spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes indicated "other" as the major reason. "Unforeseen financial emergencies" was reported by 41.7% and "weight change" was reported by 16.7% of the twelve Professional-Technical occupational category respondents as reasons for spending "less than usual."

One-third (33.3%) of the nine Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents who reported spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes reported "other" or "unforeseen financial emergencies" as major reasons. "Anticipate retirement" was reported by 22.2% of the nine, and "change in family status" and "purchase of maternity wardrobe" were reasons given by 11.1% of the nine Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents for spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes.

Two-thirds (66.7%) of the three Sales occupational category respondents who reported spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes indicated "other" as the major reason. One-third (33.3%) of Sales occupational category respondents who spent "less than usual" for their work wardrobes cited "change in family status," "purchase of maternity wardrobe," and "unforeseen financial emergency" as reasons.

Over one-third (39.1%) of the 23 Clerical occupational category respondents who reported spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes indicated "weight change" as a reason; 34.8% cited "unforeseen financial emergencies" and "other" as reasons for spending "less than usual." Of the Clerical occupational category respondents who

reported spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes, 17.4% cited "change in family status" and 13.0% cited "purchase of maternity wardrobe" as reasons. "Anticipate retirement" was cited by 8.7% of the 23 Clerical occupational category respondents who reported spending "less than usual" for their work wardrobes.

Fifty percent of the eight Other occupational category respondents who reported spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes cited "unforeseen financial emergency" and "other" as reasons. Fewer Other occupational category respondents (12.5%) who reported spending "less than usual" for work wardrobes cited "weight change," "change in family status," or "purchase of maternity wardrobe" as the reason for spending less.

Adequate Wardrobe Size

Survey respondents were asked (Q43) to indicate whether they considered their current work wardrobe to include an "adequate number of garments" or an "inadequate number of garments." Responses are presented in Table 27.

Over half (61.4%) of the total survey respondents reported their current work wardrobes included an "adequate number of garments." Over one-third (38.6%) of respondents reported their current work wardrobe included an "inadequate number of garments." The range of response among the five occupational categories, respondents reporting an "adequate number of garments" in the work wardrobe was from 54.5% (Sales respondents) to 69.8% (Managerial-Administrative respondents). The range of response from occupational category respondents reporting an "inadequate number of garments" in the work wardrobe ranged from

Table 27
Adequacy of Current Work Wardrobe
By Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Adequate <u>n</u> (%) [*]	Inadequate <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	36 (57.1)	27 (42.9)
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	37 (69.8)	16 (30.2)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	12 (54.5)	10 (45.5)
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	47 (61.0)	30 (39.0)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	27 (61.4)	17 (38.6)
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	159 (61.4)	100 (38.6)

Chi-square = 2.50405

df = 4

Significance 0.6439

Min E.F. = 8.494

Cells with EF <5 = none

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

30.2% (Managerial-Administrative respondents) to 45.5% (Sales respondents).

Reasons for Inadequate Wardrobe Size. The 100 survey respondents who reported their work wardrobe included "an inadequate number of garments" (38.6%) were asked in Question 43a to indicate reasons why the work wardrobe was considered inadequate. The five response categories identified as possible reasons for an inadequate number of work wardrobe garments were: "garments don't fit," "garments not in fashion," "not enough variety," "garments need repair," and "other." One hundred respondents who considered their work wardrobes to include an "inadequate number of garments" made 149 responses. Almost two-thirds (65.0%) of the 100 survey respondents reported work wardrobes were inadequate due to "not enough variety." Over one-fourth of the 100 survey respondents reported that work wardrobes were inadequate because "garments don't fit" (27.0%) or cited "other" reasons (26.0%) for inadequate wardrobe size. The reasons reported less often for inadequate wardrobe size by the 100 survey respondents were "garments not in fashion" (18.0%) and "garments need repair" (13.0%). Respondents who indicated "other" as reason for inadequate work wardrobe were not provided an opportunity to explain what the other reason was. Responses are presented by occupational category in Table 28.

Respondents of each of the five occupational categories reported the same major reasons for having an inadequate work wardrobe size.

Two-thirds (66.7%) of the 27 Professional-Technical occupational category respondents who reported an inadequate work wardrobe size

Table 28

Reasons Given for Inadequate Work Wardrobe Size by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u>	Work Wardrobe Garments:				
		Don't Fit <u>n</u> (%)*	Not in Fashion <u>n</u> (%)	Not Enough Variety <u>n</u> (%)	Need Repair <u>n</u> (%)	Other <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical	27	9 (33.3)	3 (11.1)	18 (66.7)	1 (3.7)	7 (25.9)
Managerial-Administrative	16	4 (25.0)	4 (25.0)	10 (62.5)	- -	6 (37.5)
Sales	10	2 (20.0)	1 (10.0)	4 (40.0)	2 (20.0)	5 (50.0)
Clerical	30	11 (36.7)	9 (30.0)	23 (76.7)	6 (20.0)	2 (6.7)
Other	17	1 (5.9)	1 (5.9)	10 (58.8)	4 (23.5)	6 (35.3)
Total respondents	100	27 (27.0)	18 (18.0)	65 (65.0)	13 (13.0)	26 (26.0)

Multiple responses = 149
Cells with <5 = 13 (52.0%)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents reporting.

cited "not enough variety" as the major reason. One-third (33.3%) of the 27 Professional-Technical occupational reported their work wardrobe garments "don't fit," and one-fourth (25.9%) reported "other" as reason for an inadequate work wardrobe. Fewer respondents reported their work wardrobe garments were "not in fashion" (11.1%) or "need repair (3.7%).

Ten of the sixteen Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents (62.5%) who reported their work wardrobes were inadequate cited "not enough variety" as the major reason. Six of the sixteen Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents (37.5%) cited "other" as reason for inadequate work wardrobe size, and four (25.0%) reported their work wardrobe garments "don't fit" or are "not in fashion."

Half (50.0%) of the ten Sales occupational category respondents who reported an inadequate work wardrobe size cited "other" as the reason; 40.0% cited "not enough variety" in their work wardrobes; 20.0% reported their work wardrobe garments "don't fit" or "need repair"; and 10.0% reported their work wardrobe garments were "not in fashion."

Of the 30 Clerical occupational category respondents who reported an inadequate work wardrobe size, 76.7% cited "not enough variety" as the major reason. Eleven of the 30 Clerical occupational category respondents (36.7%) cited their work wardrobe garments "don't fit"; nine (30.0%) cited their work wardrobe garments were "not in fashion"; six (20.0%) cited "needs repair"; and two (6.7%) cited "other" reasons.

Over half (58.8%) of the seventeen Other occupational category respondents who reported an inadequate number of work wardrobe garments cited "not enough variety" and over one-third (35.3%) cited "other" as reasons. Four (23.5%) of the seventeen Other occupational category respondents cited work wardrobe garments "need repair," and one (5.9%) cited "don't fit" or "not in fashion" as reason for an inadequate work wardrobe size.

Expected Wear Life of Work Wardrobe Garments

Survey respondents were asked to indicate the average number of years they continue to wear most of the garments in their work wardrobes (Q44). Years of continued wear response categories were identified as: "1 year or less," "2 to 3 years," "4 to 5 years," "6 or more years." Responses are shown in Table 29.

Over one-third (42.1%) of total survey respondents (259) indicated they continue to wear most of the garments in their work wardrobes 2 to 3 years. Slightly more than one-third (37.8%) of total survey respondents indicated they continue to wear most work wardrobe garments 4 to 5 years; 13.1% reported continuing to wear work wardrobe garments for 6 or more years; and 7.0% reported wearing most of their work wardrobe garments for 1 year or less.

Response patterns by Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative respondents were similar. The largest number of Professional-Technical (54.0%) and Managerial-Administrative (43.4%) respondents continue to wear work wardrobe garments to work for "4 to 5 years"; followed by "2 to 3 years" and "6 or more years." The smallest number of Professional-Technical (6.3%) and

Table 29
 Cross-Tabulation of Years of Garment Wear Life
 by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	1 yr or less		2-3 yrs		4-5 yrs		6 yrs +	
	<u>n</u>	(%)*	<u>n</u>	(%)	<u>n</u>	(%)	<u>n</u>	(%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	4	(6.3)	15	(23.8)	34	(54.0)	10	(15.9)
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	2	(3.8)	20	(37.7)	23	(43.4)	8	(15.1)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	1	(4.5)	10	(45.5)	7	(31.8)	4	(18.2)
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	2	(2.6)	40	(51.9)	25	(32.5)	10	(13.0)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	9	(20.5)	24	(54.5)	9	(20.5)	2	(4.5)
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	18	(7.0)	109	(42.1)	98	(37.8)	34	(13.1)

Chi-square = 35.82317

df = 12

Significance = 0.0003

Min E.F. = 1.529

Cells with EF 5 = 5 of 20 (25%)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

Managerial-Administrative (3.8%) respondents continue to wear work wardrobe garments to work for "1 year or less."

The largest percentage of Sales (45.5%), Clerical (51.9%), and Other (54.5%) occupational category respondents continue to wear work wardrobe garments to work "2 to 3 years"; followed by "4 to 5 years." The Other occupational category reported a higher percentage of respondents (20.5%) than did the other four occupational categories who continue to wear work wardrobe garments for "1 year or less."

Work Uniform Requirement

Survey respondents were asked (Q41) whether they wore a uniform for work during 1985, the survey year. Three response categories were identified: "most of the time," "sometimes," and "never." Responses are reported in Table 30.

Most of the total survey respondents (77.6%) reported "never" wearing a uniform for work. About one-fifth (20.1%) of the total survey respondents reported wearing a uniform for work "most of the time," and 2.3% reported wearing a uniform for work "sometimes."

Similar response patterns to the frequency of wearing a uniform for work were reported among the occupational categories. The percentage of occupational category respondents who reported "never" wearing a uniform for work ranged from 50.0% (Other occupational category respondents) to 90.9% (Clerical occupational category respondents). The percentage of occupational category respondents who reported wearing a uniform for work "most of the time" ranged from 7.8% (Clerical occupational category respondents) to 47.7% (Other occupational category respondents).

Table 30
 Frequency of Uniform Worn for Work
 by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Most of the time <u>n</u> (%) [*]	Sometimes <u>n</u> (%)	Never <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	13 (20.6)	3 (4.8)	47 (74.6)
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	9 (17.0)	1 (1.9)	43 (81.1)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	3 (13.6)	- -	19 (86.4)
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	6 (7.8)	1 (1.3)	70 (90.9)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	21 (47.7)	1 (2.3)	22 (50.0)
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	52 (20.1)	6 (2.3)	201 (77.6)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

Method of Uniform Acquisition. Those survey respondents who indicated in Question 41 the wearing of a uniform for work "most of the time" were asked to indicate (Q41a) how the work uniform was acquired. Methods of acquisition identified for this study were: "purchase my own uniform," "rent my uniform," "uniforms provided by employer," "receive a uniform allowance from employer," and "other."

Fifty-three survey respondents indicated they wore a uniform for work "most of the time." Fifty-six responses to methods of acquisition are displayed in Table 31.

Most (62.0%) of the 53 survey respondents reported "purchase my own uniform" as the acquisition method. Slightly more than one-third (38.0%) of the 53 survey respondents reported their uniforms for work were "provided by employer," and 8.0% reported they "receive a uniform allowance from employer." No responses to "other" or "rent my uniform" were given as methods of uniform acquisition.

Similar methods of uniform acquisition were reported by Professional-Technical, Managerial-Administrative, and the Other occupational category respondents. About two-thirds (61.5%, 66.6%, 66.7%) of the respondents of these three occupational categories reported they acquired their work uniforms by purchasing their own. About one-third (30.8%, 44.4%, 38.1%) of the respondents of these three occupational categories reported their work uniform was provided by the employer.

Conversely, two-thirds (66.7%) of the Sales occupational category respondents reported their "uniforms provided by employer," and one-third (33.3%) reported "purchase my own uniform."

Table 31

Method of Uniform Acquisition by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u>	Purchase My Own <u>n</u> (%)*	Rent <u>n</u> (%)	Provided by Employer <u>n</u> (%)	Uniform Allowance <u>n</u> (%)	Other <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical	13	8 (61.5)	- -	4 (30.8)	1 (7.7)	- -
Managerial-Administrative	9	6 (66.7)	- -	4 (44.4)	- -	- -
Sales	3	1 (33.3)	- -	2 (66.7)	- -	- -
Clerical	7	3 (42.9)	- -	2 (28.6)	2 (28.6)	- -
Other	21	14 (66.7)	- -	8 (38.1)	1 (4.8)	- -
Total respondents	53	32 (62.0)	- -	20 (38.0)	(8.0)	- -

Multiple responses = 56

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents reporting.

Most Clerical occupational category respondents (42.9%) reported "purchase my own uniform"; however, over one-fourth (28.6%) reported "receive a uniform allowance" and over one-fourth reported "provided by employer."

Factors Influencing Purchase of Work Wardrobes

Survey respondents were asked to rate the level of importance of eleven factors (Q42a-k) when purchasing clothing to be worn primarily for work and work-related activities. The three rating levels were: "very important," "important," and "little or no importance." The eleven purchasing factors were: (a) "fits well," (b) "feels comfortable," (c) "in a price range I can afford," (d) "I like it," (e) "easy care," (f) "good color on me," (g) "quality construction and fabric," (h) "expresses my individuality," (i) "fashionable garment," (j) "similar to what co-workers are wearing," and (k) "meets employer expectations."

Each of the three rating levels of importance was assigned a value: 3 was assigned to "very important," 2 was assigned to "important," and 1 was assigned to "little or no importance." Mean scores were computed for each factor by occupational category. The results are presented in Table 32. Mean scores by occupational category ranged from highest to lowest for purchasing factors (b) "feels comfortable" and (a) "fits well," and decreased gradually from factor (d) "I like it" to (c) "in a price range I can afford" through (g) "quality fabric and construction." The last four factors, (h) "expresses my individuality" through (k) "meets employer expectations," had the lowest mean scores.

Table 32

Mean Scores of Level of Importance of Selected Purchasing Factors
by Occupational Category

Purchasing Factor	Occupational Category					
	Total Group	Prof.- Tech.	Mngrl.- Admin.	Sales	Clerical	Other
a. Fits well	2.86	2.90	2.89	2.82	2.83	2.84
b. Feels comfortable	2.88	2.94	2.91	2.86	2.79	2.91
c. In a price range I can afford	2.56	2.65	2.55	2.45	2.52	2.57
d. I like it	2.74	2.81	2.70	2.77	2.73	2.70
e. Easy care	2.58	2.57	2.55	2.68	2.51	2.70
f. Color good on me	2.49	2.46	2.62	2.23	2.58	2.31
g. Quality construction/fabric	2.49	2.54	2.59	2.68	2.39	2.36
h. Expresses my individuality	1.85	1.87	2.04	1.73	1.77	1.80
i. Fashionable garment	1.76	1.75	1.81	1.77	1.73	1.75
j. Similar to what co-workers are wearing	1.37	1.35	1.42	1.23	1.29	1.55
k. Meets employer expectation	2.05	1.84	2.23	1.91	2.05	2.23

Note: Mean score values of level of importance:

3 = Very important

2 = Important

1 = Little or no importance

The mean scores of "level of importance" of the eleven purchasing factors were ranked by occupational category. Table 33 presents a summary of the rank order of the purchasing factors.

The ranking of mean scores showed few differences of level of importance of the purchasing factors among the five occupational categories. The same two factors "fits wells" and "feels comfortable" were ranked highest by all occupational category respondents; followed by a group of five factors: "I like it," "easy care," "in a price range I can afford," "quality construction and fabric," and "good color on me." The group of four factors rated the lowest by all occupational category respondents were: "expresses my individuality," "meets employer expectations," "fashionable garment," and "similar to what co-workers are wearing."

Presentation of Findings Related to Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1

There are no differences in the following work wardrobe expenditures for one year among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) total work wardrobe, (b) work wardrobe expenditures for protective outerwear, (c) work wardrobe expenditures for outerwear, (d) work wardrobe expenditures for footwear, (e) work wardrobe expenditures for lingerie, (f) work wardrobe expenditures for accessories, (g) dry-cleaning expenditures of the work wardrobe, and (h) alteration and repair expenditures of the work wardrobe.

One-way analysis of variance was run for total wardrobe inventory expenditures by occupational category. The results are shown in Table 34. The calculated F ratio for total wardrobe expenditure differences among occupational categories was 3.2552 at the .0126 F probability

Table 33

Summary of Rank Order of Purchasing Factors by Occupational Category

Purchasing Factor	Total Group	Occupational Category				
		Prof.- Tech.	Mngrl.- Admin.	Sales	Clerical	Other
Feels comfortable	1	1	1	1	2	1
Fits well	2	2	2	2	1	2
I like it	3	3	3	3	3	3-4*
Easy care	4	4	7	4-5*	5	3-4*
In a price range I can afford	5	5	4	6	6	5
Quality construction/ fabric	6-7*	6	6	4-5*	7	6
Color good on me	6-7*	7	5	7	4	7
Meets employer expectation	8	9	8	8	8	8
Expresses my individuality	9	8	9	10	9	9
Fashionable garment	10	10	10	9	10	10
Similar to what co-workers are wearing	11	11	11	11	11	11

*Represents tie in ranking.

Table 34

Analysis of Variance of Wardrobe Total Inventory Expenditures
by Occupational Category

Source	<u>df</u>	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	<u>F</u> Ratio	<u>F</u> Probability
Total Expenditures					
Between groups	4	6883875.62	1720968.90	3.2552	.0126 *
Within groups	254	134286956.8	528688.80		
Total	258	141170832.5			

*Significant at .05 level.

level. Significant differences were found for total wardrobe expenditures among occupational categories.

The post hoc Tukey's test (Bruning & Kintz, 1977:122-123) was run, and the critical difference of \$427.49 computed (Table 35). The basic computational formula for Tukey's test is:

$$C.diff. = \underline{qr} \sqrt{\frac{ms_{\text{within gp. error}}}{\underline{n} \text{ (per gp.)}}}$$

If the difference between any two mean expenditures is greater than the computed critical difference, the difference is significant. Significant total wardrobe mean expenditure differences were found between both the Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative occupational categories and the Other occupational category. The differences between total wardrobe mean expenditures of both the Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative occupational categories (\$967 and \$1,019, respectively) and the Other occupational category (\$535) (see Table 13) exceeded the \$427.49 critical difference.

One-way analysis of variance for each of the five clothing inventory subcategories by occupational category was run. The \underline{F} statistic was calculated. Results are presented in Table 36. The .05 confidence level was used.

The calculated \underline{F} ratio for Protective Outerwear expenditure differences among occupational categories was 1.2970 at the .2729 \underline{F} probability level; significant differences were not found.

Table 35

Tukey's Test Differences Between Total Work Wardrobe
Mean Expenditures by Occupational Category

	Managerial- Administrative \$	Sales \$	Clerical \$	Other \$
Professional-Technical	52.00	24.00	55.00	432.00 *
Managerial-Administrative		76.00	107.00	484.00 *
Sales			31.00	408.00
Clerical				377.00

Calculated critical difference all groups = \$427.49.

*Significant at .05 level.

Table 36

Analysis of Variance of Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory Expenditures
by Occupational Category

Source	<u>df</u>	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	<u>F</u> Ratio	<u>F</u> Probability
Protective Outerwear Expenditures					
Between groups	4	3849.03	9623.76	1.2970	.2729
Within groups	183	1357864.08	7420.02		
Total	187	1396359.1			
Outerwear Expenditures					
Between groups	4	2359252.72	589813.18	3.2508	.0127 *
Within groups	246	44632737.31	1811433.8915		
Total	250	46991990.03			
Footwear Expenditures					
Between groups	4	120884.55	30221.13	2.9163	.0220 *
Within groups	247	2559628.12	10362.86		
Total	251	2680512.67			
Lingerie Expenditures					
Between groups	4	37799.90	9449.97	.8187	.5142
Within groups	251	2897128.52	11542.34		
Total	255	2934928.43			
Accessories Expenditures					
Between groups	4	292776.33	73194.08	2.0212	.0925
Within groups	221	8003075.93	36213.01		
Total	225	8295852.27			

*Significant at .05 level.

The calculated F ratio for Outerwear expenditure differences among occupational categories was 3.2508 at the .0127 F probability level; significant differences were found. The post hoc Tukey's test calculated critical difference was \$801.83 (Table 37). Significant differences between occupational categories were not found.

The calculated F ratio for Footwear expenditure differences among occupational categories was 2.9163 at the .0220 F probability level; significant differences were found. The post hoc Tukey's test calculated critical difference was \$60.62 (Table 38). A significant difference in Footwear expenditure between Managerial-Administrative occupational category and Other occupational category was found. The mean expenditures for footwear by Managerial-Administrative and Other occupational category respondents were \$157 and \$89, respectively. The difference between the two categories exceeded the critical difference of \$60.62.

The calculated F ratio for Lingerie expenditure differences among occupational categories was .8187 at the .5142 F probability level; significant differences were not found.

The calculated F ratio for Accessories expenditure differences among occupational categories was 2.0212 at the .0925 F probability level; significant differences were not found.

One-way analysis of variance was run for dry-cleaning expenditures and for alteration and repair expenditures, by occupational category. Results are shown in Table 39. The calculated F ratio for dry-cleaning expenditure differences among occupational categories was

Table 37

Tukey's Test Differences Between Outerwear Mean Expenditures
by Occupational Category

	Managerial- Administrative \$	Sales \$	Clerical \$	Other \$
Professional-Technical	25.00	3.00	72.00	238.00
Managerial-Administrative		28.00	97.00	308.00
Sales			69.00	280.00
Clerical				211.00

Calculated critical difference all groups = \$801.83.

Table 38

Tukey's Test Differences Between Footwear Mean Expenditures
by Occupational Category

	Managerial- Administrative \$	Sales \$	Clerical \$	Other \$
Professional-Technical	26.00	13.00	7.00	42.00
Managerial-Administrative		13.00	19.00	68.00 *
Sales			6.00	55.00
Clerical				49.00

Calculated critical difference all groups = \$60.62.

*Significant at .05 level.

Table 39

Analysis of Variance of Dry-Cleaning and Alteration/Repair Expenditures
by Occupational Category

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F Ratio	F Probability
Dry Cleaning Expenditures					
Between groups	4	3.08	.77	3.2094	.0136 *
Within groups	254	61.06	.24		
Total	258	64.14			
Alteration/Repair Expenditures					
Between groups	4	.23	.05	.4583	.7663
Within groups	254	32.19	.12		
Total	258	32.42			

*Significant at .05 level.

3.2094 at the .0136 F probability level; significant differences in dry-cleaning expenditures among occupational categories were found. The calculated F ratio for alteration and repair expenditure differences among occupational categories was .4583 at the .7663 F probability level; significant differences in alteration and repair expenditures among occupational categories were not found.

Hypothesis 2

There are no differences for the following selected demographic characteristics among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) marital status, (b) age, (c) presence in home of children 18 years of age and under, (d) years of formal education, (e) years employed at present job, (f) total years of employment, (g) personal income from job before taxes, and (h) total family income before taxes.

The chi-square statistic was calculated by cross-tabulation of marital status by occupational category. The five original marital status categories were collapsed into two categories, married and not married, for statistical analyses purposes. Results are shown in Table 40. The calculated chi-square (6.04935) did not indicate significance ($p = 0.1955$). Significant differences in marital status by occupational category were not found.

Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance was run for each of the demographic variables (b-h) by occupational category. The chi-square statistic was calculated; .05 level of significance was used. Results are shown in Table 41.

The calculated chi-square (6.9424) did not indicate significant differences in age among occupational categories ($p = .1390$). The calculated chi-square (8.4960) did not indicate significant differences in the presence of children in the home 18 years of age and

Table 40
 Cross-Tabulation of Marital Status by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Not Married <u>n</u> (%)*	Married <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical (<u>n</u> = 63)	5 (7.9)	58 (92.1)
Managerial-Administrative (<u>n</u> = 53)	8 (15.1)	45 (84.9)
Sales (<u>n</u> = 22)	1 (4.5)	21 (95.5)
Clerical (<u>n</u> = 77)	15 (19.5)	62 (80.5)
Other (<u>n</u> = 44)	8 (18.2)	36 (81.8)
Total respondents (<u>n</u> = 259)	37 (14.3)	222 (85.7)

Chi square = 6.04935

df = 4

Min E.F. = 3.143

Significance = 0.1955

Cells with less 5 = 10%

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

Table 41

Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA of Demographic Characteristics
by Occupational Category

Demographic Characteristic	Chi Square	Signi- cance	Corrected for Ties Chi Square	Signi- cance
Age	6.4825	.1659	6.9424	.1390
Children in home age 18 and under	6.3716	.1731	8.4964	.0750
Education	112.1777	.0000 *	119.7755	.0000 *
Years employed present job	7.1925	.1261	7.5915	.1077
Total years of employment	8.0608	.0894	8.5530	.0733
Personal income from job before taxes	75.7429	.0000 *	81.6539	.0000 *
Total family income before taxes	23.0465	.0001 *	24.5124	.0001 *

*Significant at .05 level.

under among occupational categories ($p = .0750$). The calculated chi-square (119.7755) indicated significant differences in education among occupational categories ($p = .0000$). The calculated chi-square (7.5915) did not indicate significant differences in years employed at present job among occupational categories ($p = .1077$). The calculated chi-square (8.5533) did not indicate significant differences in total years of employment among occupational categories ($p = .07333$). The calculated chi-square (81.6539) indicated significant differences in personal job income before taxes among occupational categories ($p = .0000$). The calculated chi-square (24.5124) indicated significant differences in total family income before taxes among occupational categories ($p = .0001$).

Hypothesis 3

There are no relationships between clothing expenditures for one year for women employed full-time in five occupational categories and selected demographic characteristics: (a) marital status, (b) age, (c) presence of children in the home 18 years of age and under, (d) years of formal education, (e) years employed at present job, (f) total years of employment, (g) personal income from job before taxes, and (h) total family income before taxes.

Multiple Classification Analysis (MCA) was used to determine whether occupational category made a difference in total wardrobe expenditures after controlling for the influence of co-variants (demographics a-h). MCA was run using all co-variants. Marital status (covariant) was made into a dummy dichotomous variable for this test. To strengthen the MCA test, MCA was run a second time using only those co-variants that were found to be significant in the first MCA test: marital status, age, years of present employment, and total family income before taxes.

The MCA test indicated a significant difference in total work wardrobe expenditures among occupational categories at .023 significance level. The calculated ETA was 0.23, meaning that 23% of variation in expenditure among occupational categories could be explained by occupation. The calculated Multiple R Squared was .164, meaning that when controlling for the influence of demographics 16.4% of expenditure difference between occupational categories could be explained by occupation. See Table 42.

To reduce the probability of a Type I error (reject the hypothesis when should accept), a post hoc test for simultaneous inference, the Scheffe's Test, was run using adjusted means (adjusted mean expenditures). If the difference between any two means is larger than the critical difference (in this case \$618.20) the means are assumed to be significantly different. See Table 43.

The basic computational formula for critical difference is:

$$C.diff = \sqrt{(a - 1) \underline{F}_{df_{a-1}, df_{error}}} \sqrt{\frac{2ms_{within\ gp.\ error}}{n \text{ (per gp.)}}}$$

where: a = number of groups to be compared,

F = the tabled F value for the appropriate df.

For this study the critical difference was \$618.20. The adjusted means from the MCA table (Table 42) were used.

None of the differences between any two adjusted means were greater than the critical difference, so none were assumed to be significantly different. The Scheffe's Test showed no significant

Table 42

Multiple Classification Analysis of Mean Expenditure Dollars
by Occupational Category

	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u>	Mean Expenditures	
		Unadjusted \$	Adjusted* \$
Professional-Technical	60	948.50	883.05
Managerial-Administrative	50	1,043.04	1,049.14
Sales	21	873.89	869.19
Clerical	74	917.38	940.89
Other	43	527.51	573.17

Total respondents reporting = 248

ETA = 0.23

Multiple R² = .164

*After controlling for co-variants.

Table 43

Scheffe's Test Difference Between Adjusted Expenditure Dollar Means
by Occupational Category

	Managerial- Administrative \$	Sales \$	Clerical \$	Other \$
Professional-Technical	166.09	13.91	57.84	309.88
Managerial-Administrative		179.95	108.25	475.97
Sales			71.70	296.02
Clerical				367.72

Critical difference all groups = \$618.20.

difference in work wardrobe expenditures among occupational categories.

Hypothesis 4

There are no differences for the following wardrobe expenditure influences among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) wardrobe expenditure changes, (b) work wardrobe adequacy, (c) expected wear life of work wardrobe garments, (d) work uniform requirement, (e) factors influencing purchase of work wardrobe.

Cross-tabulation of each wardrobe expenditure influence by occupational category was run. The chi-square test statistic was calculated; a significance level of .05 was used to determine significance.

Wardrobe Expenditure. Cross-tabulation of total work wardrobe expenditure compared to the previous year by occupational category showed no significant differences. The chi-square statistic (6.45831) was not significant ($p = .5960$) (see Table 24 for results). Most total survey respondents (56.0%) reported spending "about the same as usual" for work wardrobes during the survey year; 22.4% reported spending "more than usual" for work wardrobes; and 21.6% reported spending "less than usual."

Cross-tabulation of reasons for spending "more than usual" and for spending "less than usual", by occupational category, are reported in Table 25 and Table 26, respectively. Because of inadequate numbers of respondents, and fewer than five expected cases per cell, statistical analysis was not conducted.

Adequacy of Wardrobe. Cross-tabulation of adequate number of garments in work wardrobe by occupational category did not show significant differences (chi-square statistic = 2.50405, $p = .6439$)

(see Table 27). Most total survey respondents reported an adequate number of work wardrobe garments.

Cross-tabulation of the five reasons for an inadequate number of garments in the work wardrobe by occupational category produced a table with thirteen cells (52.0%) with less than five responses (see Table 28). "Not enough variety" was the reason given by 65.0% of 100 survey respondents who reported an inadequate wardrobe size. The chi-square statistical test was not conducted to show level of significance.

Wear Life of Wardrobe. Cross-tabulation of expected wear life of work wardrobe garments by occupational category was conducted. The calculated chi-square (35.8217) was significant ($p = .003$) (see Table 29).

Uniform Requirement. Cross-tabulation of wearing of uniform for work "most of the time" and "never" by occupational category showed significance (chi-square statistic = 29.54996, $p = .0000$). Results are shown in Table 44. The category "sometimes" was omitted from the statistical test, since only six respondents reported "sometimes" wearing a work uniform, and a high percentage of cells contained fewer than five cases.

Cross-tabulation of work uniform acquisition by respondents (20.1%) who reported wearing a work uniform "most of the time" is reported in Table 45. The original five response categories were collapsed to form three categories. Statistical analysis was not conducted because of inadequate number of valid cases and a high percentage of cells containing fewer than five cases. Collapse of the

Table 44
 Cross-Tabulation of Frequency of Uniform Worn for Work
 by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u>	Wearing of Uniform	
		Most of the time <u>n</u> (%)*	Never <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical	60	13 (20.7)	47 (78.3)
Managerial-Administrative	52	9 (17.3)	43 (82.7)
Sales	22	3 (13.6)	19 (86.4)
Clerical	76	6 (7.9)	70 (92.1)
Other	43	21 (48.8)	22 (51.2)
Total respondents	253	52 (20.6)	201 (79.4)

Chi-square = 29.54996

df = 4

Significance = 0.0000

Min. E.F. = 4.522

Cells with E.F. <5 = 1 of 10 (10%)

Note: For statistical purposes, the three response categories were collapsed into two; the respondents (6) reporting "sometimes" wearing a uniform for work were not included in the calculations.

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

Table 45

Cross-Tabulation of Method of Uniform Acquisition
by Occupational Category

Occupational Category	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u>	How Uniforms Acquired		
		Purchase Own <u>n</u> (%)*	Provided by Employer <u>n</u> (%)	Uniform Allowance <u>n</u> (%)
Professional-Technical	13	8 (61.5)	4 (30.8)	1 (7.7)
Managerial-Administrative	9	6 (66.7)	4 (44.4)	- -
Sales	3	1 (33.3)	2 (66.7)	- -
Clerical	7	3 (42.9)	2 (28.6)	2 (28.6)
Other	21	14 (66.7)	8 (38.1)	1 (4.8)
Total	53	32 (62.0)	20 (38.0)	4 (8.0)

Multiple responses = 56

Cells with E.F <5 = 11 (73.3%)

*Percentage of occupational category or total respondents.

five original response categories into three categories produced 73.3% of cells with fewer than five cases (see Table 45).

Purchasing Factors. The importance of eleven purchasing factors when purchasing clothing for work were analyzed by occupational category. Each level of importance was assigned a value and mean scores were computed for each of the eleven factors by occupational category (see Table 32 for results). Ranking by means scores showed little difference among the five occupational categories. The same two factors were rated highest and the same four factors were rated lowest by all occupational categories (see Table 33).

Additional statistical tests were not conducted.

Cross-tabulation by occupational category produced numerous cells with fewer than five cases.

Summary of Responses to the Open-Ended Question

The questionnaire design allowed for optional open-ended remarks to be added by the respondents on the back page of the survey booklet. Sixty-two (24.3%) of the total survey respondents provided additional comments about their clothing expenditures for work wardrobes.

Comments are organized by topic and occupational category.

Respondent comments were summarized around the following general topics: explanation of why the expenditure for work clothing was less than usual or less than one might expect; dissatisfaction with general quality of clothing for the price; dissatisfaction with selection available to meet personal tastes and for hard to fit sizes;

expression of personal philosophy about wardrobe development and the importance of the work wardrobe and image; special job-related requirements and problems related to work clothing from a safety standpoint; alternatives to paying full price, frequency of yard-sale buying and used clothing acquisition; problems of finding time to shop for clothing.

Professional-Technical Occupational Category

Fourteen (22.2%) of the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents wrote additional comments about their wardrobes for work. Most respondents mentioned they tended to buy quality and shop carefully. Many bought work clothing on sale and seldom paid full price. Several mentioned they spent less because they have no time to shop and when they did purchase new work clothing, they shopped from catalogs.

Professional-Technical respondents tended to express dissatisfaction with the styles available to meet their special needs: petite sizes, large sizes, medical requirements for clothing. They expressed dissatisfaction with the quality of ready-to-wear and felt prices were "outrageous." One respondent mentioned sewing as an alternative to buying clothing for special needs.

Several Professional-Technical respondents mentioned job requirements limiting the type of clothing appropriate for work, even when a uniform is not required.

Managerial-Administrative Occupational Category

Thirteen (24.5%) of the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents provided additional information about their work

wardrobes. Several of the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents expressed dissatisfaction with the quality and availability of ready-to-wear to meet their special needs and personal tastes. Managerial-Administrative respondents tended to buy on sale and shop from catalogs for their work wardrobes.

Several Managerial-Administrative respondents indicated they spent less for their work wardrobes than one might expect because they buy used clothing at better quality consignment shops, and several travel to large coastal cities for major shopping at reduced prices. Other respondents expressed the philosophy of buying "outfits" rather than one separate at a time, to save time and shopping to match later. Managerial-Administrative respondents expressed the importance of "investment" dressing and explained their larger than usual clothing expenditure on buying in anticipation of a job promotion. A small group of the Managerial-Administrative respondents indicated their lack of interest in clothing and reluctance to invest much money in a work wardrobe.

Sales Occupational Category

Seven (31.8%) of the Sales occupational category respondents provided additional information about their work wardrobes. Sales respondents expressed a need to dress to meet the public. Several indicated they will spend more for quality suits and blouses if the styles are classic enough to wear for several years.

One respondent who worked in a clothing store indicated she spent more because she qualified for a discount from her employer. Few Sales respondents indicated they bought clothing on sale; however,

several respondents bought used clothing at consignment shops and yard sales.

Clerical Occupational Category

Seventeen (22.1%) of the Clerical occupational category respondents provided additional information about their work wardrobes. Clerical respondents tended to spend less due to job insecurity of husbands. Several indicated they spent less on their work wardrobes but shopped more sales and used clothing outlets. Several respondents saved clothing dollars by sewing "most of my work wardrobe."

Other Occupational Category

Eleven (25.0%) of the Other occupational category respondents provided information about their work wardrobes. The Other occupational category respondents indicated they spent very little for work wardrobes because of the uniform requirement or the nature of their jobs.

CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Conclusions

The objectives of this study of women employed full-time in five identified occupational categories were: (1) to examine the work wardrobe expenditures; (2) to examine the following selected demographic characteristics: marital status, age, presence in the home of children 18 years of age and under, years of formal education, years employed at present job, total years of employment, personal income from job before taxes, total family income before taxes; (3) to examine the following work wardrobe expenditure influences: work wardrobe expenditure changes compared to previous year; work wardrobe adequacy; expected wear life of work wardrobe garments; factors influencing the purchase of work wardrobe (purchasing factors); and (4) to compare work wardrobe expenditures of women employed full-time in the five occupational categories with selected demographic characteristics.

To test for possible differences and relationships, four main null hypotheses were postulated. A significance level of .05 was selected as the criterion. From the results of statistical analyses of the data the following conclusions have been drawn regarding the five null hypotheses posed.

Hypothesis 1

There are no differences in the following work wardrobe expenditures for one year among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) total work wardrobe, (b) work wardrobe expenditures for protective outerwear, (c) work wardrobe

expenditures for outerwear, (d) work wardrobe expenditures for footwear, (e) work wardrobe expenditures for lingerie, (f) work wardrobe expenditures for accessories, (g) dry-cleaning expenditures of the work wardrobe, and (h) alteration and repair expenditures of the work wardrobe.

Hypothesis 1a. Differences in total work wardrobe expenditures by occupational category ($p = .0126$) attained the level of significance set for this study. The post hoc Tukey's test indicated significant differences between occupational categories. Therefore, null hypothesis 1a was rejected.

Hypothesis 1b. Differences in protective outerwear expenditures by occupational category ($p = .2729$) did not attain the level of significance set for this study. Therefore, null hypothesis 1b was retained.

Hypothesis 1c. Differences in outerwear expenditures by occupational category ($p = .0127$) attained the level of significance set for this study. The post hoc Tukey's test did not indicate significant differences between occupational categories. Therefore, null hypothesis 1c was rejected.

Hypothesis 1d. Differences in footwear expenditures by occupational category ($p = .0220$ level) attained the level of significance set for this study. The post hoc Tukey's test indicated a significant difference between occupational categories. Therefore, null hypothesis 1d was rejected.

Hypothesis 1e. Differences in lingerie expenditures by occupational category ($p = .5142$) did not attain the level of significance set for this study. Therefore, null hypothesis 1e was retained.

Hypothesis 1f. Differences in accessories expenditures by occupational category ($p = .0925$) approached the level of significance set for this study. Therefore, null hypothesis 1f was retained.

Hypothesis 1g. Differences in dry-cleaning expenditures by occupational category ($p = .0136$) attained the level of significance set for this study. Therefore, null hypothesis 1g was rejected.

Hypothesis 1h. Differences in alteration and repair expenditures by occupational category ($p = .7663$) did not attain the level of significance set for this study. Therefore, null hypothesis 1h was retained.

Hypothesis 2

There are no differences for the following selected demographic characteristics among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) marital status, (b) age, (c) presence in the home of children 18 years of age and under, (d) years of formal education, (e) years employed at present job, (f) total years of employment, (g) personal income from job before taxes, and (h) total family income before taxes.

Hypothesis 2a. The chi-square value of 6.04937 ($p = 0.1955$) did not attain the level of significance set for this study. Significant differences in marital status by occupational category were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2a was retained.

Hypothesis 2b. The chi-square value of 6.4825 ($p = 0.1390$) did not attain the level of significance set for this study. Significant differences in age by occupational category were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2b was retained.

Hypothesis 2c. The chi-square value of 6.3716 ($p = 0.0750$) approached the level of significance set for this study. Significant differences in presence of children in the home 18 years of age and

under by occupational category were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2c was retained.

Hypothesis 2d. The chi-square value of 112.1777 ($p = 0.0000$) attained the level of significance set for this study. Significant differences in years of formal education by occupational category were found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2d was rejected.

Hypothesis 2e. The chi-square value of 7.1925 ($p = 0.1077$) did not attain the level of significance set for this study. Significant differences in years employed at present job by occupational category were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2e was retained.

Hypothesis 2f. The chi-square value of 8.0608 ($p = 0.0733$) approached the level of significance set for this study. Significant differences in total years of employment by occupational category were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2f was retained.

Hypothesis 2g. The chi-square value of 75.7429 ($p = 0.0000$) attained the level of significance set for this study. Significant differences in personal income from job before taxes by occupational category were found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2g was rejected.

Hypothesis 2h. The chi-square value of 23.0465 ($p = 0.001$) attained the level of significance set for this study. Significant differences in total family income from job before taxes by occupational category were found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2h was rejected.

Hypothesis 3

There are no relationships between work wardrobe expenditures for one year of women employed full-time in five occupational categories and selected demographic characteristics: (a) marital status, (b) age, (c) presence in the home of children 18 years of

age and under, (d) years of formal education, (e) years employed at present job, (f) total years of employment, (g) personal income from job before taxes, and (h) total family income before taxes.

MCA calculated unadjusted ETA value was 0.23, meaning 23% of the variation in expenditures among occupational categories could be explained by occupation. MCA calculated Multiple R Squared value was 0.164, meaning 16.4% of the variation of expenditures among occupational categories could be explained by the combined effects of occupation after controlling for co-variants. A relationship was found between expenditures and selected demographic variables. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Hypothesis 4

There are no differences for the following wardrobe expenditure influences among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) wardrobe expenditure change, (b) work wardrobe adequacy, (c) expected wear life of work wardrobe garments, (d) work uniform requirement, and (e) factors influencing purchase of work wardrobe.

Hypothesis 4a. The chi-square value of 6.45831 ($p = 0.5960$) did not attain the level of significance set for this study. Differences in work wardrobe expenditures compared to previous year by occupational category were not significant. A statistical test for differences by occupational category for reasons for spending more was not possible due to small number of responses. A statistical test for differences by occupational category for reasons for spending less was not possible due to small number of responses. Therefore, null hypothesis 4a was retained.

Hypothesis 4b. The chi-square value of 2.50405 ($p = 0.6439$) did not attain the level of significance set for this study. Differences

by occupational category in work wardrobe adequacy were not significant. A statistical test was not conducted for differences by occupational category in reasons for an inadequate wardrobe. Therefore, null hypothesis 4b was retained.

Hypothesis 4c. The chi-square value of 35.8217 ($p = 0.003$) attained the level of significance set for this study. Differences by occupational category in the average wear life of work wardrobe were significant. Therefore, null hypothesis 4c was rejected.

Hypothesis 4d. The chi-square value of 29.54996 ($p = 0.0000$) attained the level of significance set for this study. Differences by occupational category in work uniform requirement were significant. Therefore, null hypothesis 4c was rejected. A statistical test for differences by occupational category in method of uniform acquisition was not feasible due to small number of responses.

Hypothesis 4e. A statistical test for differences by occupational category in level of importance of purchasing factors was not conducted. Rank order of mean scores of level of importance by occupational category produced no differences. Therefore, null hypothesis 4e was retained.

Discussion

Sample by Occupational Category

The survey sample of 259 women employed full-time included an uneven distribution of respondents in the five occupational categories. The Professional-Technical occupational category comprised 24.3% of the total sample; the Managerial-Administrative

occupational category, 20.5% of the total sample; the Sales occupational category, 8.5% of the total sample; the Clerical occupational category, 29.7% of the total sample; and the Other occupational category, 17.0% of the total sample.

The sample distribution of respondents by occupational category was not reflective of the national or state employment trends of working women as might be expected from a randomly selected sample. The reference citations for national and state comparisons are U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics (1980:10-11) and the Idaho Department of Employment, Bureau of Planning, Research and Evaluation (1980:20). The sample included a higher percentage (24.3%) of Professional-Technical occupational category participants than the national average (16.1%) and the state averages for Idaho (14.8%) and Washington (16.6%). Job mix within the Professional-Technical occupational category included a higher percentage of non-college teachers (46%) than the national average (34%) and a higher percentage of nurses (22.2%) than the national average (18%).

Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reflected a higher percentage (20.5%) of the total sample than the national average (6.4%) and state averages for Idaho (5.4%) and Washington (7.4%). Office managers comprised 47.5% of the Managerial-Administrative occupational category; the national average is 5%.

The percentage of Sales occupational category respondents (8.5%) to the total sample was more reflective of the percentage found

nationally (6.9%) and statewide (8.8% Idaho, 7.1% Washington). Since only one-fourth of sales workers work full-time, according to the U.S. Department of Labor (1980:19), one might have expected an even smaller percentage of Sales occupational category respondents in the total sample of full-time employed women.

The survey sample included a smaller percentage (29.7%) of Clerical occupational category respondents than the national average (35%) and the state averages for Idaho (33.4%) and Washington (35.1%). However, the job mix within the Clerical occupational category was reflective of the national average. Secretaries comprised 35% of the Clerical occupational category respondents; the national average is 33%.

The Other occupational category included 17% of the total respondents, which is less than the national average (33.8%) and the state averages for Idaho (35%) and Washington (32%). The job mix within the Other occupational category included a higher percentage of assemblers (31%) and medical assistants (20%); the national averages are 5.4% and 3.5%, respectively.

The higher percentage of Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative respondents may be reflective of the types of employment opportunities available to women in the geographical area from which the sample was drawn. The survey site, Lewiston, Idaho-Clarkston, Washington, represents a population area (35,000, combined cities; 50,050, combined counties), business district, and service center adequate in size to provide sample subjects representative of the five occupational categories considered in this

study. The area provides considerable medical and educational services to the population, including: a large regional medical center and hospital, a community hospital, numerous health care facilities for the aging retirement population, a four-year state college and vocational school, a community college, a business school, plus a public school system and five parochial grade schools. In addition to the traditional professional-technical employment opportunities in health care and education available to area women, several district, state, and federal offices are located in Lewiston, providing clerical jobs. Businesses employing women in manufacturing and processing of wood products, ammunition, and frozen foods may account for the high percentage of assemblers in the Other occupational category.

The occupational category distribution and job mix may be explained to a small extent by unintentional miscoding of the job title by the researcher, or by incomplete information from respondents. Survey respondents gave their present job title and a short description of their present job to enable the researcher to code jobs by occupational category. The researcher strived for accuracy and consistency; in the majority of cases the job and occupation were clear.

The uneven distribution may be explained to a larger extent by the full-time employed women who chose to respond. The questionnaire required time and thought to complete and was returned more frequently by educators, secretaries, office managers, and nurses, women who might be expected to keep detailed expenditure records or be detail

oriented. The non-respondents may have represented those occupational categories (Clerical, Sales, and Other) for which the sample included less than the percentages expected.

Demographic Characteristics

Marital Status. Most survey respondents were married.

Professional-Technical and Sales occupational category respondents reported a slightly higher percentage of married respondents than did the respondents of the other three occupational categories. However, chi-square analysis did not indicate a significant difference in marital status among the occupational categories. The percentage of respondents "married" was expected, since nationally half of all wives are working and only 11% of the women in the work force are separated, widowed, divorced, or never-married (U.S. Dept., BLS, 1983b:24).

Age. Over half (58.3%) of the total survey respondents were between 25 and 44 years of age. Similar age response patterns were observed in each of the five occupational categories, with slight variation reported by Managerial-Administrative and Clerical occupational category respondents. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance did not indicate a significant difference in age among the occupational categories.

The age distribution of respondents was expected, since median age of women in the labor force nationally is 34 years and the age range with the highest percentage of women labor force participants is 25 to 44 years (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:4). However, the proportion of study respondents 25 to 44 years of age was higher than

would be expected, since nationally this age group accounts for about one-fourth of working women (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1983b:2).

Presence in the Home of Children 18 Years of Age and Under. Half of the total survey respondents reported having children in the home 18 years of age and under, a higher proportion than was expected. Nationally 38% of working women report having children in the home 18 years of age and under (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:29). Professional-Technical occupational category had the highest proportion of respondents with children in the home 18 years of age and under, followed by the Other and Clerical occupational categories. The proportion of Managerial-Administrative and Sales occupational category respondents with children in the home 18 years of age and under was in agreement with the national average of 38%. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance did not indicate a significant difference in presence of children in the home 18 years of age and under among occupational categories.

The smaller percentage of Managerial-Administrative and Sales occupational category respondents reporting children in the home 18 years of age and under may be explained by the age of respondents. Respondents in both of these occupational categories tended to be older, age 55 to 65; therefore, their children would tend to be older than 18 years of age.

About the same percentage of total survey respondents reported children in three of the age categories: "6 to 10 years" (35.1%), "13 to 15 years" (33.6%), and "16 to 18 years" (32.1%). Fewer respondents

reported children in the youngest age category, "5 years and under" (29.4%) and in the middle age category, "11 to 12 years" (20.6%).

A higher proportion of full-time employed women reporting children 5 years of age and under was expected since nationally 34% of full-time employed women report children in this age group. A smaller proportion of survey respondents was expected to report children 6 to 12 years of age, since nationally 44% of full-time employed women report children in this age group. A small proportion of survey respondents was expected to report children 13 to 18 years of age, since nationally 22% of full-time employed women report children in this age group (U.S. Dept. of Labor, BLS, 1980:29).

Numbers of children in the home 18 years of age and under reported in each age category by occupational category respondents may be reflective of the ages of respondents and educational level attained. A higher proportion of Professional-Technical respondents than all other occupational category respondents reported children in the youngest age groups, "5 years and under" and "6 to 10 years." Women employed in professional-technical occupations may tend to postpone marriage and have a family later in life when careers are established and education complete.

Managerial-Administrative, Sales, and Other occupational categories reported higher proportions of respondents with children in the older age groups, "13 to 15 years" and "16 to 18 years." Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents tended to be older. Sales and Other occupational category respondents tended to be younger with older children. This may be explained in part by age

of respondents and educational level attained. Respondents in these occupational categories completed fewer years of education and may have married at a younger age and not postponed childbearing until a career was established.

Educational Level. The educational level attained by total survey respondents was higher than expected for women employed full-time. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance indicated a significant difference in educational level attained among the occupational categories.

The highest educational level attained by over one-third (43.2%) of the total survey respondents was the "some college or associate degree" level; a higher level than expected since nationally only 17.8% of full-time employed women attained this educational level. About the same percentage of total survey respondents reported at the "bachelor's degree" or above level (26.6%) as reported at the "high school graduate" level (25.9%). Nationally, slightly more full-time employed women (27.5%) reported at the "bachelor's degree" or above level, and most (44.6%) reported at the "high school graduate" level. Fewer than expected total survey respondents (4.3%) reported at the "grade school, some high school" educational level; nationally 22% of full-time employed women reported attaining this educational level (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:43).

The highest educational level attained by participants within all occupational categories was higher than the national average. As might be expected, the highest educational level attained was reported by Professional-Technical occupational category respondents. However,

more Professional-Technical occupational category respondents (76.2%) than expected reported at the "bachelor's degree" or above level. Nationally, 61% of women employed in professional-technical occupations reported at the "bachelor's degree" or above level (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:45).

As expected, Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reported attaining a slightly lower educational level than the Professional-Technical respondents. However, Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reported attaining a higher educational level than expected. Over half (52.8%) of Managerial-Administrative respondents reported attaining "some college" and 22.6% reported attaining the "bachelor's degree" or above level. Nationally, 23% of women employed in Managerial-Administrative jobs reported "some college" and 24% reported attaining the "bachelor's degree" or above level (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:45).

Sales occupational category respondents reported attaining a lower educational level than either Professional-Technical or Managerial-Administrative respondents; however, Sales respondents reported attaining a higher educational level than expected, compared to national statistics for educational levels of women employed in sales occupations. Over half (54.6%) of Sales respondents reported "some college," compared to 22% nationally. About the same percentage of Sales respondents reported attaining a "bachelor's degree" (9.1%) as expected (9% nationally). Fewer Sales respondents

(4.5%) reported less than a high school education than expected (22% nationally) (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:45).

Clerical occupational category respondents reported attaining an educational level slightly lower than that reported attained by Sales respondents and considerably lower than reported attained by Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative respondents. However, Clerical respondents reported attaining a higher educational level than expected. Half (50.6%) of Clerical respondents reported completing "some college," and 6.5% reported attaining a "bachelor's degree" or above. Nationally, 23% of women employed in clerical jobs attained some college and 7% attained a bachelor's degree. Only 3.9% of the Clerical respondents reported attaining some high school and 39% reported attaining a high school diploma, compared to 10% and 50% nationally (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:45).

The Other occupational category respondents reported the lowest educational level attained of the five occupational categories; however, the educational level attained was still above the expected national average for women employed in other occupational category jobs. About the same number of Other occupational category respondents (43.2%) reported at the "some college, associate degree" level as reported at the "high school graduate" level (40.9%). Nationally, 11% of the women employed in other occupational categories reported at the "some college, associate degree" level, and 43% reported at the "high school graduate" level (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:45).

The higher than expected educational level of the total survey respondents may be reflective of the job mix within the occupational categories. The survey respondents included higher than average percentages of teachers, nurses, office managers, and medical technicians.

The educational level of survey respondents may also be reflective of the types of employment and educational opportunities available in the geographic area from which the sample was drawn. The state college, community college, vocational school, and business school all offer continuing education courses designed to meet the needs of local employees and the local job market. In addition to local educational opportunities, two major universities are located within commuting distance.

Another, more important explanation for the high level of education attained by survey respondents may be the respondents themselves. Employed women with a higher than average education might be more inclined to participate in research studies. Non-respondents may have represented a lower educational level.

Years of Employment at Present Job. Over one-fourth (29.7%) of the total survey respondents reported more years of employment at their present jobs (6-10 years) than was expected. According to national data, one-third of employed women (32.5%) spend 1 year or less at the same job, 13.6% spend 1 to 2 years at the same job, and 16.4% spend 5 to 10 years at the same job. The median number of years on current job for employed women is 2.6 years (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:92). Slightly more total survey respondents (26.6%) reported

2 to 5 years on the present job, compared to 21.8% nationwide. About the same percentage of total survey respondents reported 16 to 20 years at present job (8.9%) and 21 years and over at the present job (6.2%) as was expected. National data indicate 10.9% of employed women spent 10 to 20 years on current job and 4.7% spend over 20 years on current job (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:92).

Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance did not indicate a significant difference in years of employment at present job among occupational categories. The Professional-Technical occupational category differed from the other occupational categories by reporting more respondents with 11 to 15 years of employment at the same job (22.2%) and fewer with 2 to 5 years of employment at the same job (20.6%). More Professional-Technical respondents (8.0%) reported 21 and more years of employment at the same job than did each of the other occupational categories except Clerical.

Managerial-Administrative respondents reported fewer years at present job than did Professional-Technical respondents. Most Managerial-Administrative respondents (30.2%) reported 2 to 5 years of employment at present job. In comparison with the other occupational category respondents, fewer Managerial-Administrative respondents reported less than 2 years of employment at present job and fewer reported 21 and more years at present job.

More Professional-Technical (12.7%) and Managerial-Administrative (17.0%) respondents reported 16 to 20 years of employment at present job than did respondents of the other three occupational categories.

Sales, Clerical, and Other occupational category respondents reported fewer years of employment at present job than did Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents. This may reflect a level of job dissatisfaction related to the nature of the specific jobs. Women employed in these occupational categories may view their employment as a job rather than as a career.

The higher than average years of employment at present job reported by the total survey respondents might reflect the higher level of education, older age, and the job mix of most respondents.

Total Years of Employment. Most total survey respondents (78.7%) reported working a total of 11 or more years. Similar employment patterns were reported by all occupational categories. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance did not indicate a significant difference in total years of employment among occupational categories. Most Managerial-Administrative and Sales respondents reported working a total of 21 or more years. Most Professional-Technical respondents reported working a total of 11 to 15 years, with slightly fewer working 21 years or more.

Total years of employment reported by survey respondents may be reflective of age. Most survey respondents were between 25 and 44 years of age. Fewer years of total employment might have been expected since most survey respondents reported higher than expected educational levels. Fewer years of total employment might have been expected since half of the survey respondents reported children in the home under 18 years of age; however, studies indicate women work out

of economic necessity in addition to personal achievement and satisfaction (Darling, 1975; Epstein, 1970; Lazer & Smallwood, 1977; Scanozi, 1977).

Total years of employment might also be explained by the job mix of survey respondents. Teachers and nurses might experience more consistent labor force activity and job stability than women employed in other jobs.

Annual Income from Job Before Taxes. Annual job income before taxes reported by total survey respondents was higher than expected. Median income of women employed full-time was \$9,500 in 1978 (U.S. Dept. Labor, BLS, 1980:52). Most total survey respondents (83.9%) reported annual job income before taxes of \$10,000 and above. Only 16.1% of total survey respondents reported job incomes of less than \$10,000. Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance indicated a significant difference in job income before taxes among occupational categories.

Annual job income before taxes reported by most (63.5%) of the Professional-Technical respondents was \$20,000 or above; higher than expected. The median earnings of women employed full-time in professional-technical occupations in 1982 was \$18,300 (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986).

Annual job income before taxes reported by almost half of the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents was \$20,000 or above. Job incomes were higher than expected; the median earnings of women employed full-time in managerial-administrative

occupations was \$17,518 in 1982 (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986).

Annual job income before taxes reported by over half (61.9%) of the Sales occupational category respondents was \$14,999 or less. The median earnings of women employed full-time in sales occupations was \$11,250 in 1982 (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986), about the same earnings as reported by over one-fourth (28.6%) of the Sales occupational category respondents.

Annual job income before taxes reported by slightly less than half (46.7%) of the Clerical occupational category respondents was \$10,000 to \$14,999; median earnings of women employed full-time in clerical occupations was \$12,920 in 1982 (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986).

Annual job income before taxes reported by over one-third (39.5%) of the Other occupational category respondents was \$10,000 to \$14,999, a higher than expected income. Median earnings of women employed full-time in Other occupational categories ranged from \$7,776 to \$9,080 in 1982 (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986).

The overall higher than expected job incomes of the survey respondents, women employed full-time, may be explained by their reported higher than expected educational levels, longer than expected job history, and the jobs held by the respondents. Another explanation may be that women with very low job incomes might not respond to the survey question requesting annual job income (four non-responses) or might not have completed the survey.

Total Family Income Before Taxes

Total family income before taxes as reported by 248 survey respondents (11 non-respondents) was about at the level expected. Mean dual-earner family income for 1985 was \$39,999 if both husband and wife worked full-time, year round (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986). Most of the survey respondents reported being married; however, the survey did not request information about the number of earners who contributed to the total family income reported. In 1985, 63% of married couple families were dual-earners (U.S. Dept. Commerce, Bureau of Census, 1986).

About the same number of survey respondents reported total family income before taxes higher than the expected mean range as reported total family income before taxes lower than the expected mean range.

Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance indicated a significant difference in total family income among occupational categories. Professional-Technical occupational category respondents reported total family income at levels higher than the expected mean for dual-earner families. Over half of the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents reported total family income at \$40,000 or above. About one-fourth of the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents reported total family income at \$29,999 or below; lower than the expected mean.

Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reported total family income at levels lower than reported by Professional-Technical occupational category respondents. However, Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reported

total family incomes at a level higher than the expected mean for dual-earner families. More Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reported total family incomes at \$40,000 or higher than reported total family incomes at \$20,000 or below.

Sales occupational category respondents reported total family income at levels lower than reported by Professional-Technical or Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents. Over one-third of Sales respondents reported total income at the expected mean level for dual-earner families. One-third of Sales respondents reported total family income at \$29,000 or below, lower than the expected mean; and slightly more than one-fourth of the Sales respondents reported total family income of \$40,000 or higher, levels above the expected mean.

Clerical occupational category respondents reported total family income at levels lower than for total family income of the Sales, Professional-Technical, or Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents. Over half of the Clerical respondents reported total family income at levels below the expected mean for dual-earner families. Slightly more than one-fourth of the Clerical respondents reported total family income at the expected mean level for dual-earner families; less than one-fourth of the Clerical respondents reported total family income above the expected mean level for dual-earner families.

The Other occupational category respondents reported total family income at levels lower than the other occupational categories. Over half of the Other occupational category respondents reported total

family incomes below the expected mean income for dual-earner families; less than one-fourth reported total family income at levels above the expected mean for dual-earner families. More Other occupational category respondents reported total income at less than \$20,000 than did the respondents in the other four occupational categories.

Higher than expected total family income might be explained by the higher than expected educational levels, higher than expected total years of employment, and higher than expected annual job income reported by the survey respondents. Most total survey respondents answered the survey question requesting total family income. Those respondents who did not indicate total family income might have been representative of lower incomes. Working women with lower total family incomes might not have participated in the study.

Wardrobe Expenditures

Total Work Wardrobe Expenditure Inventory. Survey respondents reported an average work wardrobe expenditure for the survey year of \$886; expenditures ranged from \$11 to \$5,925. This represents a higher expenditure than the reported 1985 Consumer Price Index per capita expenditure of \$617; however, one might expect work wardrobe expenditures of women employed full-time to be greater. From 1984 to 1985, clothing prices increased 4.5%; however, women's clothing prices increased 8.5% during the same period of time, and suits and separates/sportswear, garments that one would expect to be staple items in a woman's work wardrobe, increased in price 24% and 13.6%, respectively (Courtless, 1986:17).

One-way analysis of variance indicated a significant difference in total work wardrobe expenditures among occupational categories. Tukey's test indicated significant differences in total work wardrobe expenditures between the Professional-Technical occupational category and the Other occupational category and between the Managerial-Administrative occupational category and the Other occupational category. Differences in annual mean work wardrobe expenditures were expected; however, the researcher expected the differences to be greater, with Professional-Technical respondents reporting the largest mean work wardrobe expenditure, followed by Managerial-Administrative, Sales, Clerical, and Other occupational categories. Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents accounted for the highest average wardrobe expenditure (\$1,019), followed by Professional-Technical respondents (\$967), Sales respondents (\$943), Clerical respondents (\$912), and Other occupational category respondents (\$535). These data lend support to the popular theory that employees do not dress better than their supervisors.

The mean work wardrobe expenditures by occupational category respondents tended to be higher than work wardrobe expenditures reported by Lipka (1977), Tweeten (1980), and Taylor (1983). They reported annual work wardrobe expenditures of \$432, \$500 and less, and \$192 to \$600, respectively (\$466, \$526 and less, and \$198 to \$617, in constant 1985 dollars) (U.S. Dept. Ag., 1978, 1981, 1984). Associated Merchandizing Corporation (1979) reported annual work wardrobe expenditures of women to be \$1,700 (\$1,834 in constant 1985 dollars)

(U.S. Dept. Ag., 1980), slightly higher than reported by most survey respondents in this study. Annual work wardrobe expenditures reported by occupational category respondents in this study confirm the expenditures reported by Rabolt (1984). The largest proportion of middle-management career women in Rabolt's study reported work wardrobe expenditures ranging from \$500 to \$999 (\$524 to \$1,055 in constant 1985 dollars) (U.S. Dept. Ag., 1985).

Differences among the four white-collar occupational categories were about the same. This was in agreement with Hovermale (1962), who reported that the professional and clerical women employed full-time in her study reported similar clothing expenditures, with professional women purchasing at the upper expenditure range. Greater mean expenditure differences might have been expected among the four white-collar occupational categories since the literature reviewed indicated that clothing expenditures increase as income, educational level, and occupational level increase (Dardis, Derrick & Lehfeld, 1981; Erickson, 1968; Flint, 1973; Galbraith, 1966; Hovermale, 1962; Ryan, 1966; Schaninger & Allen, 1981; Wagner, 1982).

The mean work wardrobe expenditure was considerably lower for the Other occupational category (\$535) than each of the other four occupational categories. The lower Other occupational category mean wardrobe expenditure was expected. Studies indicate clothing expenditures are influenced by educational level, income, occupation, and family size. The Other occupational category respondents reported lower educational levels, lower incomes, and more children per respondent than did respondents of the other occupational categories.

Dardis, Derrick and Lehfeld (1981) reported that blue-collar workers spent from 14% to 18% less for clothing than did white-collar workers. Research indicates that working women with children may spend less for clothing than do working women without children (Brew, O'Leary & Dean, 1956; Erickson, 1968).

Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory Expenditures. The largest percentage, about half, of the work wardrobe expenditure reported by each occupational category was for the outerwear wardrobe inventory subcategory. The smallest percentage, less than 10%, of the work wardrobe expenditure reported by each of the occupational categories except the Other category was for the protective outerwear wardrobe inventory subcategory. The Other occupational category spent less for accessories than for protective outerwear. The percentage of work wardrobe expenditure for footwear, lingerie, and accessories was about the same, 10% to 20%, for each occupational category. The percentage of the work wardrobe expenditure for each of the wardrobe inventory subcategories was expected and confirmed the findings of Gilmore (1939), Hovermale (1962), Lipka (1977), and Monroe and Pennell (1939).

Average Wardrobe Inventory Subcategory Expenditures. Almost all occupational category respondents reported expenditures for outerwear (96.9%), footwear (97.3%), and lingerie (98.8%). Fewer respondents reported expenditures for accessories (87.3) and protective outerwear (72.6%).

The researcher expected fewer respondents to report expenditures for protective outerwear since protective outerwear usually represents

a larger per item expenditure than items representative of the other wardrobe categories of clothing. Protective outerwear garments may not be purchased annually, since the expected wear life for coats is 3 to 4 years, as reported by the International Fabricare Institute (Consumer Affairs Update, 1986). Other studies indicate the "saturation of demand" for subcategories of clothing other than outerwear is met with fewer garments (Stone & Rowe, 1957; Wagner, 1982). Accessories might be considered by some respondents to be less important than clothing items and, therefore, purchased less frequently or purchased only if other clothing needs are met. The respondents employed as nurses and in jobs representing the Other occupational category might not have purchased accessories for work wardrobes.

The expected wear life of clothing representative of the outerwear wardrobe subcategory ranged from 2 to 4 years, so one might expect most working women to make a purchase in this wardrobe category. The expected wear life for lingerie is 1 to 2 years, so it was expected that most working women would make at least one purchase of lingerie for the work wardrobe. Outerwear, footwear, and lingerie usually represent a smaller per item expenditure than does protective outerwear, so one would expect at least one annual purchase for the work wardrobe. The "saturation of demand" level for outerwear usually requires more garments since the range of choices is great (Stone & Rowe, 1957; Wagner, 1982; Winakor, 1969).

The mean expenditures of study respondents for wardrobe subcategories was reflective of the occupational category respondents'

work wardrobe expenditure patterns. However, greater differences in mean expenditures among occupational categories were expected. Professional-Technical occupational category respondents were expected to account for the highest mean expenditures for wardrobe subcategories, followed by Managerial-Administrative, Sales, Clerical, and the Other occupational category respondents.

The mean expenditure for protective outerwear by respondents was smaller than the mean expenditure for the other wardrobe subcategories by each occupational category except the Other category. The mean accessories expenditure by the Other occupational category respondents was less than the mean expenditure for protective outerwear. ANOVA did not indicate a significant difference among occupational categories for protective outerwear expenditures.

ANOVA indicated a significant difference among occupational categories for outerwear expenditures; however, the post hoc Tukey's test did not indicate a significant difference between any two occupational categories. The mean expenditure for outerwear by the Other occupational category respondents was about 43% of the highest mean expenditure for outerwear (by the Managerial-Administrative category respondents). The mean expenditure for outerwear by Sales and Professional-Technical occupational category respondents was considerably higher than the mean expenditure by the Clerical occupational category respondents. Respondents of each occupational category reported purchasing about the same number of outerwear garments, with the Other occupational category respondents purchasing fewer.

The mean expenditure for footwear by the respondents of each of the occupational categories was smaller than the mean expenditure for outerwear, more than the mean expenditure for protective outerwear, and about the same as the mean expenditure for lingerie and accessories. ANOVA indicated a significant difference among occupational categories for footwear expenditure. The post hoc Tukey's test indicated a significant difference between the Managerial-Administrative occupational category and the Other occupational category. The lowest mean footwear expenditure (by the Other occupational category) was about 56% of the highest mean footwear expenditure (by Managerial-Administrative respondents). Occupational category respondents reported purchasing about the same number of footwear items, ranging from three to five, with the Other occupational category reporting the lowest mean number purchased.

The mean expenditure for lingerie by each of the occupational categories was about the same as the mean expenditure for footwear and accessories. ANOVA did not indicate a significant difference in mean lingerie expenditures among occupational categories.

The mean expenditure for accessories by each of the occupational categories varied slightly. ANOVA did not indicate a significant difference in mean accessories expenditures among the occupational categories.

Average Expenditure per Item. The per item protective outerwear expenditure was larger than for the other wardrobe inventory subcategories, as expected. However, the per item protective outerwear expenditures were about the same for all occupational

categories except the Other occupational category. The per item expenditure by the Other occupational category respondents was about one-third less. Studies related to clothing expenditures of women indicate that as income increases, the cost per item also increases. Per item expenditures more reflective of job status and income were expected (Dardis, Derrick & Lehfeld, 1982; Schaninger & Allen, 1981). However, about the same unit price paid by Professional-Technical and Clerical respondents in this study agree with Hovermale's findings (1962).

The per item expenditure for outerwear was about half the per item expenditure for protective outerwear, and slightly less than the per item expenditure for footwear. The per item expenditure for outerwear was about the same for each of the occupational categories, with the exception of the Other occupational category. The Other occupational category accounted for the smallest per item outerwear expenditure, about one-fourth less than the per item outerwear expenditures by the other occupational categories. Professional-Technical occupational category respondents accounted for the largest per item outerwear expenditure, followed by Managerial-Administrative respondents, Sales respondents, and Clerical respondents. The researcher expected the Other occupational category respondents to report the smallest per item outerwear expenditure; however, greater differences among the other occupational categories were expected.

The per item footwear expenditure was slightly more than the per item outerwear expenditure. The same per item footwear expenditure

was about the same for each occupational category. Greater differences in per item expenditures among occupational categories were expected. The need for sturdy, more expensive shoes may be part of the uniform requirement for those women employed as nurses or in the Other occupational category.

The per item lingerie expenditure was about the same for each of the occupational categories. The amount reported varied by one dollar.

The per item accessories expenditure was about the same for each of the occupational categories except the Other occupational category. The per item accessories expenditure by the Other occupational category was about one-third to one-half the amount spent by the other occupational categories. Greater differences in per item accessories expenditures were expected, to reflect the differences in income among the occupational categories.

Wardrobe Care Expenditures. About half of the survey respondents reported annual work wardrobe dry-cleaning expenditures under \$25. About one-fourth of the survey respondents reported spending from \$25 to \$50, and one-fourth reported spending \$51 or more annually for dry cleaning of the work wardrobe. ANOVA indicated significant differences in estimated dry-cleaning expenditures among occupational categories. About three-fourths of the Other occupational category respondents reported spending under \$25 annually for dry cleaning of the work wardrobe. Sales, Clerical, and Other occupational category respondents tended to spend less than \$25 annually for dry cleaning work wardrobes, while Professional-Technical

and Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reported higher annual expenditures for dry cleaning.

Most of the survey respondents reported work wardrobe alteration and repair expenditures to be under \$25 annually. ANOVA did not indicate a significant difference in alteration and repair expenditure among occupational categories.

The work wardrobe care expenditures reported by study respondents confirm the findings of Lipka (1977), who reported that the professional and clerical working women in her study spent a "minimal" amount for dry cleaning and expenditures for alteration and repair averaged less than \$5 per respondent. Erickson (1968) reported that the average family in her study reported an average expenditure of \$59 for clothing upkeep. Wagner (1982) reported that expenditures for clothing-related services were significantly higher among families with non-working wives than among families with working wives.

Greater expenditures for dry cleaning and alteration/repair of the work wardrobe were expected by the researcher for Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative respondents, who might tend to purchase more garments requiring special care. However, a high proportion of the Professional-Technical respondents were nurses who reported wearing uniforms for work, or non-college teachers, who might tend to wear easy-care work clothing in the classroom.

Work Wardrobe Expenditure Influences

Work Wardrobe Expenditure Changes. Two-thirds of the Sales occupational category respondents and over half of the Other

occupational category respondents reported spending about the same for work wardrobes during the survey year as during the previous year. About one-fourth of the Professional-Technical, Managerial-Administrative, and Other occupational categories each reported spending more than usual for work wardrobes. More Sales and Clerical respondents reported spending "less than usual" than reported spending "more than usual." Chi-square analysis did not indicate significant differences among occupational categories in amount spent for work wardrobes during the survey year compared to the previous year.

Reasons for spending "more than usual" or "less than usual" were not statistically analyzed; however, reasons most often reported by the occupational categories were similar. "Other" and "weight change" were cited frequently as reasons for spending more or spending less. "New job" or "job promotion" were often cited as reason for spending more; "unforeseen financial emergency" was cited frequently for spending less. About half of the Other occupational category respondents who indicated spending "less than usual" reported "unforeseen financial emergency" as the reason. During the survey year, about six months prior to collection of data, one of the largest area employers of Other occupational category women as well as men announced a six-month closure of the plant for repair and maintenance. Because "change in family status," meaning change in family size, was not defined by the researcher, survey respondents may have indicated "other" when reporting change of family size as a reason. Respondents were not asked to explain what the "other" reasons were

for spending more or less. Respondents in each of the occupational categories except the Other category wrote in response to the open-ended question that they spent less than one might expect or less than usual because they shopped at sales, yard sales, or better used-clothing consignment shops.

Adequate Wardrobe Size. Most survey respondents reported their work wardrobes were adequate in size. More Professional-Technical and Sales respondents than the other occupational category respondents indicated their work wardrobes were inadequate. Chi-square analysis did not indicate significant differences in wardrobe adequacy and inadequacy among occupational categories.

Responses by respondents who considered their work wardrobes to be inadequate were not statistically analyzed. About two-thirds of the respondents who considered their work wardrobes to be inadequate reported "not enough variety" as the reason. Garments "don't fit" or "other" were cited as reasons for an inadequate work wardrobe by about one-fourth of the respondents. Respondents were not asked to explain what the "other" reasons were. One might expect that respondents with larger incomes, such as Professional-Technical respondents, would have larger wardrobes with considerable variety. However, nurses comprised a considerable proportion of the Professional-Technical occupational category, and wearing a work uniform might mean a lack of variety and personal clothing expression of those respondents. Sales respondents might lack variety due to lower incomes.

Expected Wear Life of Work Wardrobe Garments. Most survey respondents reported wearing work wardrobe garments for "2 to

3 years" or for "4 to 5 years." Considerably fewer respondents reported wearing work wardrobe garments "6 years or more," and very few respondents reported wearing work wardrobe garments for "1 year or less." Chi-square analysis indicated a significant difference in expected wear life of work wardrobe garments among occupational categories. As expected, Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative respondents tended to wear work wardrobe garments for more years than the Sales and Clerical respondents. Although over half of the Other occupational category respondents reported wearing work wardrobe garments for "2 to 3 years," a larger percentage of Other respondents than other occupational category respondents reported wearing their work wardrobes "1 year or less." Higher incomes of the Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative respondents, and the nature of clothing suitable for occupational dress, might tend to indicate the length of continued "wear life" of work wardrobe garments. One expects higher quality clothing requiring a larger initial expenditure worn by women in professional-technical or managerial-administrative occupations might wear longer. The strain of job demands on clothing and the care of clothing worn by the Other respondents would indicate a shorter wear life (Consumer Affairs Update, 1986; Winakor, 1969).

Work Uniform Requirement. Most survey respondents reported they never wear a uniform for work; however, about one-fifth indicated they wear a work uniform "most of the time." Chi-square analysis indicated a significant difference in work uniform requirement among

occupational categories. As expected, more Other occupational category respondents, almost half, than any of the other occupational category respondents reported wearing a work uniform "most of the time." About one-fifth of the Professional-Technical respondents reported wearing a work uniform "most of the time," which was expected because of the number of nurses in the Professional-Technical occupational category. As expected, fewer Managerial-Administrative and Sales respondents indicated wearing a work uniform "most of the time."

Most respondents who reported wearing a work uniform "most of the time," indicated they purchased their own uniform. Over one-third of the survey respondents who wore a work uniform "most of the time" reported their uniform was provided by their employer. Very few respondents indicated they received a uniform allowance. Method of uniform acquisition was not statistically analyzed. More Sales respondents who wore work uniforms "most of the time" indicated their uniforms were provided by their employer than indicated they purchased their own uniforms. The Other occupational category respondents indicated purchasing their own uniform was more common than the employer providing the uniform.

Factors Influencing Purchase of the Work Wardrobe. Very little difference in mean scores and ranking of eleven purchasing factors to their importance in making work wardrobe purchasing decisions were found among the five occupational categories. Statistical analysis was not conducted. Two purchasing factors, "feels comfortable" and "fits well," were ranked first and second by each occupational

category. Five factors were ranked next, with slight variation among occupational categories: "I like it," "easy care," "in a price range I can afford," "quality construction and fabric," and "good color on me." The four factors ranked lower in importance, with slight variation among occupational categories, were: "meets employer expectation," "expresses my individuality," "fashionable garment," and "similar to what co-workers are wearing."

Greater variation in importance of the identified purchasing factors was expected among the occupational categories, especially for the *Other* occupational category. However, the review of literature reported conflicting findings with regard to evaluative criteria and values influencing the purchase of work wardrobe garments.

CHAPTER 6

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to examine and compare work wardrobe expenditures of women employed full-time in five occupational categories: professional and technical; managerial and administrative; sales; clerical; and other (craft, operatives, transport equipment operatives, service). The objectives of this study of women employed full-time in the five selected occupational categories were: to examine the work wardrobe expenditures; to examine the following selected demographic characteristics: marital status, age, presence in the home of children 18 years of age and under, years of formal education, years employed at present job, total years of employment, personal income from job before taxes, total family income before taxes; to compare work wardrobe expenditures with selected demographic characteristics; and to examine the following work wardrobe expenditure influences: work wardrobe expenditure changes, wardrobe adequacy, expected wear life of work wardrobe garments, work uniform requirement, and factors influencing the purchase of work wardrobe.

Procedure

A questionnaire was designed by the researcher to obtain annual work wardrobe expenditures, selected demographic characteristics, wardrobe expenditure influences, and occupation of survey respondents. The questionnaire included an itemized list of wardrobe apparel and

accessory items representative of the types of clothing full-time employed women might wear for work and work-related activities. The wardrobe items were grouped by subcategory as follows: protective outerwear (Q1-Q5), outerwear (Q6-Q16), footwear (Q17-Q21), lingerie (Q22-Q28), and accessories (Q29-Q37). Respondents were asked to indicate the total number of each item purchased during the survey year and the total price paid. Survey respondents were asked to estimate annual expenditures for dry cleaning and for alteration and repair of clothing worn primarily for work and work-related activities.

The second section of the questionnaire included questions related to work wardrobe expenditure influences: if the work wardrobe expenditure reported for the survey year was about the same, more than usual, or less than usual; reasons for spending more than usual; reasons for spending less than usual, if a uniform was worn for work: the method of uniform acquisition; if the work wardrobe included an adequate or an inadequate number of garments: reasons for an inadequate number of work wardrobe garments; the expected wear life of items in the work wardrobe; the level of importance of eleven identified factors influencing the purchase of work wardrobe items.

The third section of the questionnaire included questions related to the demographic characteristics of interest to the study: marital status, age, presence of children in the home 18 years of age and under, years of formal education, years employed at present job, total years of employment, personal income from job before taxes, and total

family income before taxes. The last two questions requested job title and a short description of job responsibilities.

Following pretesting of the survey instrument, the mail questionnaire was sent to 825 women randomly selected from the city directory for neighboring cities Lewiston, Idaho and Clarkston, Washington, who had been employed full-time during the previous year and who agreed by introductory phone call to participate in the study. Data from a total of 259 returned, usable questionnaires were included in this study.

The SPSSX Batch System, a comprehensive social science statistical software package, was used for managing, analyzing, and displaying the data. The level of significance was set at .05 for this study. One-way analysis of variance was run for each of the six dependent variables to indicate differences by occupational category: total wardrobe expenditures, protective outerwear expenditures, outerwear expenditures, footwear expenditures, lingerie expenditures, and accessories expenditures. The post hoc Tukey's test was conducted. One-way analysis of variance was also run for dry-cleaning expenditures and for alteration/repair expenditures. The Kruskal-Wallis One-Way Analysis of Variance test of ranks was used to indicate differences among occupational categories of the selected demographic characteristics with the exception of marital status, which was analyzed using the chi-square test statistic. Multiple Classification Analysis was used to determine if occupation influenced wardrobe expenditures, after controlling for the influence of significant demographic variables. The Scheffe's test was conducted,

using adjusted means to reduce the probability of a Type I error. The chi-square test statistic was calculated to examine differences of expenditure influences by occupational category where adequate responses justified statistical analysis.

Results and Conclusions

The survey sample of 259 full-time employed women included an uneven distribution of respondents among the five occupational categories as follows: 24.3% Professional-Technical, 20.5% Managerial-Administrative, 8.5% Sales, 29.7% Clerical, and 17% Other.

Demographic Characteristics

Hypothesis 2. There are no differences for the following selected demographic characteristics among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) marital status, (b) age, (c) presence in the home of children 18 years of age and under, (d) years of formal education, (e) years employed at present job, (f) total years of employment, (g) personal income from job before taxes, and (h) total family income before taxes.

Most survey respondents were married. Significant differences in marital status among occupational categories were not found.

Therefore, null hypothesis 2a was retained.

Over half of the survey respondents were between 25 and 44 years of age. About one-fourth of the survey respondents were 45 to 54 years of age. Managerial-Administrative and Clerical occupational category respondents tended to be older than the other occupational category respondents. Significant differences in age among occupational categories were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2b was retained.

About half of the survey respondents reported children in the home 18 years of age and under. Fewer Managerial-Administrative and

Sales occupational category respondents reported children in the home age 18 and under than did the other occupational categories.

Significant differences among occupational categories in presence in the home of children age 18 and under were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2c was retained.

Over one-third of the survey respondents reported their highest level of education as completing some college or an associate degree. Over one-fourth of the survey respondents reported their highest educational level was a bachelor's degree or above, and about one-fourth of the survey respondents reported only completing high school. Significant differences in educational level were found among occupational categories. Therefore, null hypothesis 2d was rejected. Professional-Technical occupational category respondents reported a slightly higher educational level than did the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents. Sales occupational category respondents reported attaining a lower educational level than Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents; however, their educational level was higher than reported by Clerical occupational category respondents. The Other occupational category respondents reported attaining the lowest educational level of the occupational categories.

Over one-fourth of the survey respondents reported 6 to 10 years at the present job and about one-fourth of the survey respondents reported 2 to 5 years at the present job. Significant differences among occupational categories of years of employment at the present job were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2e was retained.

Most survey respondents reported total years of employment at 11 years and over. About one-fourth of the survey respondents reported total years of employment at 11 to 15 years, at 16 to 20 years, or at 21 years and over. Significant differences in total years of employment among the five occupational categories were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 2f was retained.

Over one-fourth of the survey respondents reported annual job incomes before taxes of \$10,000 to \$14,999; about one-fourth of the survey respondents reported annual job incomes of \$15,000 to \$19,999; and over one-fourth of the survey respondents reported annual job incomes of \$20,000 and above. A significant difference in annual job income before taxes was found among occupational categories. Therefore, null hypothesis 2g was rejected.

Most Professional-Technical occupational category respondents reported annual job incomes of \$20,000 and above. Most Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents reported annual job incomes between \$15,000 and \$24,000, slightly lower than reported by Professional-Technical respondents. Over half of the Sales occupational category respondents reported annual job incomes at \$14,999 and below, with one-third reporting annual job incomes of less than \$10,000. Clerical occupational category respondents reported annual job incomes at slightly higher levels than did Sales respondents, with over two-thirds reporting annual job incomes between \$10,000 and \$19,999. The Other occupational category respondents reported the lowest annual job incomes of the occupational categories

studied. Over two-thirds of the Other occupational category respondents reported annual job incomes of \$14,999 and below.

Most survey respondents reported total family income before taxes of \$20,000 to \$59,999. A significant difference in total family income before taxes was found among occupational categories. Therefore, null hypothesis 2h was rejected. Professional-Technical respondents reported higher total family incomes than did the other occupational categories. Over one-half of the Professional-Technical respondents reported total family incomes of \$40,000 and above. Managerial-Administrative respondents reported slightly lower total family incomes, with less than half reporting total family incomes at \$40,000 and above. Over half of the Managerial-Administrative respondents reported total family incomes between \$30,000 and \$59,999.

Over two-thirds of the Sales occupational category respondents reported total family incomes between \$20,000 and \$39,999, and slightly less than one-fourth of the Sales respondents reported total family incomes between \$40,000 and \$59,999. Fewer Sales respondents than respondents from the other occupational categories reported total family income less than \$20,000. Clerical respondents reported lower total family incomes than did Sales, Managerial-Administrative, or Professional-Technical occupational category respondents. Over half of the Sales respondents reported total family incomes of \$29,000 and below, and over one-third reported total family incomes from \$20,000 to \$29,999; however, over one-third reported total family incomes from \$30,000 to \$59,999.

The Other occupational category respondents reported the lowest total family income of the occupational categories. About one-fourth of the Other respondents reported total incomes of less than \$20,000, from \$20,000 to \$29,999, or \$30,000 to \$39,999.

Wardrobe Expenditures

Hypothesis 1. There are no differences in the following work wardrobe expenditures for one year among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) total work wardrobe expenditures, (b) work wardrobe expenditures for protective outerwear, (c) work wardrobe expenditures for outerwear, (d) work wardrobe expenditures for footwear, (e) work wardrobe expenditures for lingerie, (f) work wardrobe expenditures for accessories, (g) dry-cleaning expenditures of the work wardrobe, and (h) alteration and repair expenditures of the work wardrobe.

The average total work wardrobe expenditure by occupational category respondents for the survey year (1985) was \$886; average total work wardrobe expenditures ranged from \$11 to \$5,925.

Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents accounted for the highest average wardrobe expenditure (\$1,019), followed by Professional-Technical respondents (\$967), Sales respondents (\$943), Clerical respondents (\$912), and Other respondents (\$535).

Significant differences in total work wardrobe expenditures were found between both the Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative occupational categories and the Other occupational category.

Therefore, null hypothesis 1a was rejected.

Even though the Professional-Technical occupational category respondents accounted for the most education (57.1% reported graduate work or graduate degree) and the highest job income before taxes (63.5% earned \$20,000 or more), the Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents accounted for the highest mean

expenditure for total work wardrobe (\$1,019). Perhaps there is a relationship between occupations with authority and the purchase of clothing to express authority.

The greatest differences in total work wardrobe expenditures were between the Other occupational category and each of the other four occupational categories. The differences appear to be between "white-collar" and "blue-collar" occupations rather than among various "white-collar" occupations.

Survey respondents reported spending about half of the total work wardrobe expenditure on outerwear, about 14% on footwear, about 14% on lingerie, about 12% on accessories and about 8% on protective outerwear. The percentage of total work wardrobe expenditure for each wardrobe subcategory varied slightly by occupational category.

Almost all occupational category respondents reported expenditures for outerwear, footwear, and lingerie. Slightly fewer respondents reported expenditures for accessories and protective outerwear.

The mean expenditure for protective outerwear by survey respondents was \$103, ranging from \$74 (Other respondents) to \$115 (Professional-Technical respondents). Significant differences in protective outerwear expenditures by occupational category were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 1b was retained.

The mean expenditure for outerwear by survey respondents was \$460, ranging from \$236 (Other respondents) to \$544 (Managerial-Administrative respondents). The post hoc Tukey's test did not indicate significant differences in protective outerwear

expenditures between any two occupational categories. Therefore, null hypothesis 1c was retained.

The mean expenditure for footwear by survey respondents was \$132, ranging from \$89 (Other respondents) to \$157 (Managerial-Administrative respondents). A significant difference for footwear expenditure was found between the Managerial-Administrative and Other occupational categories. Therefore, null hypothesis 1d was rejected. The significant difference in footwear expenditures between the Managerial-Administrative and Other occupational categories may be reflective of persons in authority positions purchasing more expensive footwear and persons in service positions or positions where they are less visible to the public purchasing less expensive footwear. The Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents accounted for the highest mean expenditure for outwear, as well as for all items of work wardrobe. Their purchase of more expensive footwear would appear to complete their work wardrobe appearance.

The mean expenditure for lingerie by survey respondents was \$128, ranging from \$107 (Sales respondents) to \$147 (Managerial-Administrative respondents). Significant differences in lingerie expenditures among occupational categories were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 1e was retained. Lingerie was the only wardrobe category in which the Other occupational category respondents did not account for the lowest average expenditure. The Other occupational category respondents spent more on bras, panties, hose, and socks. Lingerie may be clothing items which the Other

respondents purchase new. Lingerie items generally wear out and would be less available in used clothing stores. Also they are items not usually constructed at home. When a uniform is required to be worn for work, basic lingerie items may become more important as items of clothing over which the individual has a choice. Some of the 25% Other occupational category respondents who responded to the open-ended question commented that they spent very little on their work wardrobes because of uniform requirements. While they may spend less on work wardrobes in general, they do spend money on basic lingerie.

The mean expenditure for accessories by survey respondents was \$127, ranging from \$50 (Other respondents) to \$154 (Clerical respondents). Significant differences among occupational categories for accessories expenditures were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 1f was retained.

The average per item expenditures for work wardrobe subcategories were computed. The average per item expenditure for protective outerwear was \$58, ranging from \$39 (the Other occupational category respondents) to \$67 (Sales occupational category respondents). The average per item expenditure for outerwear was \$26, ranging from \$18 (Other occupational category respondents) to \$31 (Professional-Technical occupational category respondents). The average per item expenditure for footwear was \$32, ranging from \$29 (Other occupational category respondents) to \$35 (Managerial-Administrative occupational category respondents). The average per item expenditure for lingerie was \$4. The mean per item

expenditure for lingerie of each occupational category was either \$3 or \$4. The average per item expenditure for accessories was \$14, ranging from \$8 (Other occupational category respondents) to \$16 (Professional-Technical occupational category respondents).

About half of the survey respondents reported annual work wardrobe dry-cleaning expenditures to be under \$25. About one-fourth of the survey respondents reported spending from \$25 to \$50, and one-fourth reported spending \$51 or more. Significant differences in annual dry-cleaning expenditures were found among occupational categories. Therefore, null hypothesis 1g was rejected. Most of the Other occupational category respondents reported spending under \$25 annually for dry cleaning of the work wardrobe. Sales and Clerical occupational category respondents tend to report spending less than \$25 annually for dry cleaning work wardrobes. Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative respondents reported higher annual expenditures for dry cleaning of work wardrobes.

Most survey respondents reported the annual work wardrobe alteration and repair expenditures to be under \$25. Significant differences in alteration and repair expenditures among occupational categories were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 1h was retained.

Hypothesis 3. There are no relationships between work wardrobe expenditures for one year of women employed full-time in five occupational categories and selected demographic characteristics: (a) marital status, (b) age, (c) presence in the home of children 18 years of age and under, (d) years of formal education, (e) years employed at present job, (f) total years of employment, (g) personal income from job before taxes, and (h) total family income before taxes.

A relationship was found between expenditures and selected demographic characteristics. Therefore, null hypothesis 3 was rejected. After controlling for the expenditure influence of selected demographic characteristics, significant differences in total work wardrobe expenditures were not found among occupational categories.

Wardrobe Expenditure Influence

Hypothesis 4. There are no differences for the following wardrobe expenditure influences among women employed full-time in five occupational categories: (a) wardrobe expenditure change, (b) wardrobe adequacy, (c) expected wear life of work wardrobe garments, (d) work uniform requirement, and (e) factors influencing purchase of work wardrobe.

Over half of the survey respondents reported work wardrobe expenditures for the survey year were about the same as usual. Slightly fewer than one-fourth of the survey respondents reported spending more than usual and about the same reported spending less than usual for work wardrobes during the survey year. Significant differences among occupational categories were not found. Therefore, null hypothesis 4a was retained. Reasons for spending more than usual or less than usual were not statistically analyzed; however, reasons most often cited for spending more or less than usual were "weight change" and "other." "Unforeseen financial emergency" was frequently cited as a reason for spending less than usual.

Most survey respondents indicated their work wardrobes included an adequate number of garments. More Professional-Technical and Sales respondents than the other occupational category respondents indicated their work wardrobes were inadequate. Significant differences in wardrobe adequacy or inadequacy among occupational categories were not

found. Therefore, null hypothesis 4b was retained. Reasons respondents considered their work wardrobes to be inadequate in size were not statistically analyzed; however, most respondents who considered their work wardrobes to be inadequate in size cited "not enough variety" as the major reason, followed by "garments don't fit" and "other."

Most survey respondents reported wearing work wardrobe garments for "2 to 3 years" or for "4 to 5 years." Significant differences in expected wear life of work wardrobe garments were found among occupational categories. Therefore, null hypothesis 4c was rejected. Professional-Technical and Managerial-Administrative respondents tended to wear work wardrobe garments longer than did the Sales and Clerical occupational category respondents. The Other occupational category respondents tended to report fewer years wear life of work wardrobe garments, which may be because they have fewer garments (or uniforms) and these receive harder wear and more frequent care.

Most survey respondents reported they did not wear a uniform for work; however, about one-fifth of the survey respondents reported wearing a work uniform most of the time. Significant differences were found among occupational categories in wearing a uniform for work. Therefore, null hypothesis 4d was rejected. About half of the Other occupational category respondents reported wearing a uniform for work most of the time, which may be an important factor in explaining why this category had the lowest work wardrobe expenditure and the lowest expenditure in each wardrobe subcategory except lingerie. About one-fifth of the

Professional-Technical respondents reported wearing a uniform for work most of the time. Most respondents who reported wearing a uniform for work most of the time indicated they purchased their own uniform. Over one-third of the respondents who wore a uniform for work most of the time reported their uniform was provided by the employer.

Differences among occupational categories of level of importance of eleven purchasing factors when making work wardrobe purchasing decisions were not found. Statistical analysis was not conducted. Therefore, hypothesis 4e was retained. Two factors, "feels comfortable" and "fits well" were ranked first and second by each of the occupational categories. Five factors were ranked next, with slight variation among occupational categories: "I like it," "easy care," "in a price range I can afford," "quality construction and fabric," "good color on me." The same four factors were ranked last by each occupational category, with slight variation: "meets employer expectations," "expresses my individuality," "fashionable garment," and "similar to what co-workers are wearing."

Recommendations

For Use of the Present Study

The goal of this study was to examine and compare work wardrobe expenditure data and expenditure influences of women employed full-time in five occupational categories. The results of this study will be useful to educators and organizations to assist women who are planning to enter the work force or who are currently employed, to

evaluate work wardrobe expenditures and to identify realistic work-related expenses. Although significant differences between occupational categories were not found for total work wardrobe expenditure, the data are useful in budget preparation.

The results of this study are useful in the development of small business marketing strategies to meet the work wardrobe needs of employed women. Wardrobe expenditure data should be used by businesses to guide their buying and stocking of merchandise to meet the clothing needs of working women.

The results of this study may be used by extension agents for inclusion in wardrobe management publications and programs for employed women and women considering entry into the work force. The writer plans to include study results in "Strategies for Working Women," a University of Idaho Extension newsletter series authored by the writer for employed women who live and work in North Central Idaho.

For Improvement of the Study

A larger sample to include at least 100 respondents in each occupational category as designed would have increased the potential for adequate responses to statistically analyze more of the survey questions. A more equal distribution of respondents in each of the five occupational categories would have strengthened the study results.

To save researcher time, publication and postage costs, several employers might have been contacted and women employees identified for random selection of a stratified sample to meet occupational category

quotas. Distribution of the questionnaire could be made through company communication systems.

To strengthen results of the present study, it would have been useful to know the number of earners who contributed to the total family income.

It would have been useful to know the reasons meant by respondents who indicated "other" for spending more than usual, for spending less than usual, and for inadequate work wardrobes. There was a blank with a request to "specify," but the respondents did not use it. From the comments to the open-ended question, additional reasons could be included.

An additional question to determine if respondents considered their job a "career" or "just a job" might have been useful in relating wardrobe expenditures to expenditure influences. In addition, questions asking about formal or informal dress codes on the job and respondent's clothing interest level might have been useful in explaining wardrobe expenditures.

The survey question asking the level of importance of eleven identified purchasing factors might have been designed to include four response levels, to force respondents to make more discriminate judgements. The factors might have been grouped into "comfort factors," "aesthetic factors," "economic factors," "social/political factors" and respondents asked to rank from most important to least important within groups as well as among groups.

For Further Research

The present study might be replicated with additional expenditure data requested about the wardrobe for "off work" hours. What percentage of the total wardrobe expenditure is spent for work wardrobe items and what percentage is spent for casual and at home wear?

Additional studies might focus on the perceived importance of the work wardrobe and job success; the influence of formal and informal dress codes on work wardrobe expenditures; and the influence of clothing interest on work wardrobe expenditures.

Additional studies might focus on the concerns with ready-to-wear identified by the present study respondents, including quality, cost, availability, clothing for special sizes. Future studies might investigate the needs, satisfactions and dissatisfactions of working women with regard to their work wardrobes.

Methods of work wardrobe item discard and the increased use of used clothing consignment shops and clothing resale shops might be investigated. How might these shops better meet the special needs of working women clientele?

Clothing care needs of working women might be investigated. Why did present study respondents indicate such a small annual clothing care expenditure? What are the special needs and problems identified by employed women with regard to care of work wardrobes?

Present study respondents indicated an inadequate work wardrobe due to "not enough variety." Work wardrobe planning and management might be investigated.

REFERENCES

- Altpeter, B. K. 1963. An investigation of consumer behavior in clothing purchases as related to clothing values. Unpublished master's thesis, Cornell University, 1963.
- Andrews, F., J. N. Morgan, J. A. Songuest, & L. Klem. 1973. Multiple classification analysis: A report on computer program for multiple regression using categorical predictors. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Institute for Social Research.
- Associated Merchandising Corporation, Research Division. 1979. Women who work.
- Bantos, R. 1977. The moving target: The impact of women's employment on consumer behavior. Journal of Marketing 41(31):31-37.
- Bantos, R. 1982. The moving target: What every marketer should know about women. New York: The Free Press.
- Barth, E. A. T., & W. B. Watson. 1967. Social stratification and the family in mass society. Social Forces 45(3):392-402.
- Basil, D. C. 1972. Women in management. New York: Dunellen.
- Blackwell, R. D., & A. S. Hilliker. 1978. Clothing decision: A decision process analysis of focused group interview. In Advances in consumer research, ed. H. K. Hunt, 743-749. Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research.
- Blalock, H. M., Jr. 1979. Social statistics. Revised ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bonaker, D. L. 1970. A study of fashion interest and clothing selection motives. Master's thesis, Indiana University.
- Brew, M. L., R. R. O'Leary, & L. Dean. 1956. Family clothing inventories and purchases with an analysis to show factors affecting consumption. Information Bulletin No. 148. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Britton, V. 1974. USDA clothing budgets: Annual costs. Family Economics Review (Summer):3-7.
- Bruning, J. L., & B. L. Kintz. 1977. Computational handbook of statistics. 2nd ed. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- Bruskins Associates. 1978. Apparel quality--Menswear. Daily News Record, August 20, pp. 11, 28.

- Caudle, A. H. 1962. Financial management practices of employed and non-employed wives. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Florida State University.
- Celanese Fibers Marketing Company. 1979. Working woman 1980-1985: An emerging market. New York: Author.
- Childrens Defense Fund. 1984. Employed parents and their children: A data book. Washington, DC.
- Chun, H. 1987. Differences between fashion innovators and non-fashion innovators in their clothing disposal practices. Unpublished master's thesis, Oregon State University.
- Consumer Affairs Update. 1986. Fashion vs. utility: A scorecard.
- Courtless, J. C. 1986. Recent trends in clothing and textiles. Family Economic Review 2:17-26.
- Damhorst, M. L. 1982. The impact of formality and similarity of attire on observers' description of interpersonal events. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 1981). Dissertation Abstracts International 42, 8128615.
- Dardis, R., F. Derrick, & A. Lehfeld. 1981. Clothing demand in the United States: A cross-Section analysis. Home Economics Research Journal (December):212-222.
- Darling, M. 1975. The role of women in the economy. Paris: Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development.
- Davis, H. L., and B. P. Rigaux. 1974. Perception of marital roles in decision process. Journal of Consumer Research 1:51-61.
- Dearborn, G. V. 1918-1919. The psychology of clothes. The Psychological Monographs 26:45-70.
- Dillman, D. A. 1978. Mail and telephone surveys: The total design method. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Dillon, L. S. 1980. Business dress for women corporate professionals. Home Economics Research Journal 9:124-129
- Douglas, S. P. 1976. Cross-national comparisons and consumer stereotypes: A case study of working and non-working wives in the United States and France. Journal of Consumer Research 3:19-129
- Duncan, O. D. 1961. A socioeconomic index for all occupations. In Occupations and social status, ed. Albert J. Reiss, Jr., and others. New York: The Free Press.

- Dyer, E. 1923. Textile fabrics. New York: Houghton Mifflin.
- Engle, J. F., D. T. Kollat, & R. D. Blackwell. 1973. Consumer behavior. 2nd ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Epstein, C. F. 1970. Women's place. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ericksen, M. K. B. 1983. Clothing behavior of working women related to self-image/clothing image congruents and achievement motivation. Unpublished dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Erickson, A. 1968. Clothing the urban American family: How much for whom? Monthly Labor Review 91(1):14-19.
- Feather, B. L., & D. S. Whiston. 1987. Dressing for women's roles: But which role? The Reporter (Fall):10-13.
- Flaten, L. J. 1983. Clothing interest among women of "baby boom" and "pre baby boom" age groups. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Flint, M. E. S. 1973. Clothing expenditures as related to socio-economic status and other selected family characteristics. Dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.
- Foght, B. M., & G. Winakor. 1967. Collecting clothing consumption data: A comparison of two methods. Journal of Home Economics 59(10):788-793.
- Form, W. H., & G. P. Stone. 1955. The social significance of clothing in occupational life. Technical Bulletin No. 247. Michigan State University Agricultural Station.
- Fortenberry, R. A. 1976. Fashion preferences and fashion buying practices of a Selected Group of Professional White Women. Unpublished master's thesis, Louisiana State University.
- Foster, A., M. Abdel-Ghany, & C. E. Ferguson. 1981. Wives employment--Its influence on major family expenditures. Journal of Consumer Studies and Home Economics 5:115-124.
- Galbraith, R. L. 1966. Consumer buying habits. American Dyestuff Reporter 55(5):41-42.
- Gilmore, D. E. 1939. Clothing expenditures of a group of business and professional women. Unpublished master's thesis, Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science.

- Gurel, L. M., & E. M. Deemer. 1975. Construct validity of Creekmore's clothing questionnaire. Home Economics Research Journal 4(1):42-47.
- Hall, K. B. 1955. A study of some of the factors that contribute to satisfactions and dissatisfactions in the clothing of ninety-two low-income families. Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University.
- Hayghe, H. 1986. Research summaries: Rise in mothers labor force activity. Monthly Labor Review 109(2):43-45.
- Henry, J. C. 1972. Clothing expenditures and their relation to selected socioeconomic variables: A study of the women of Centre County, Pennsylvania. Unpublished master's thesis, Pennsylvania State University.
- Horridge, P., & L. Richards. 1984. Relationship of fashion awareness and clothing economic practices. Home Economics Research Journal 13(2):138-152.
- Hovermale, R. L. 1962. Spending patterns of single women with emphasis on clothing. Unpublished doctoral thesis, Ohio State University.
- Idaho Department of Employment. 1980 (Nov.). Idaho working women: A special labor force report.
- Jenkins, M. C., & L. E. Dickey. 1976. Consumer types based on evaluative criteria underlying clothing decisions. Home Economic Research Journal 4(3):150-162.
- Kelley, E., D. Blouin, R. Glee, S. Sureat, & L. Arledge. 1982. Career appearance: Perceptions of university students and recruiters who visit their campuses. Home Economics Research Journal 10(3):253-263.
- Kiechel, W. 1983. The managerial dress code. Fortune, April 4, pp. 193-196.
- Kim, J., & F. J. Kohout. 1975. Analysis of variance and covariance subprograms ANOVA and ONE WAY. In SPSS: Statistical package for the social sciences (2nd ed.), 409-419. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Kundel, C. 1976. Clothing practices and preferences of blue-collar workers and their families. Home Economics Research Journal 4:225-234.
- Lapitsky, M., & Smith, C. M. 1981. Impact of clothing on impression of personal characteristics and writing ability. Home Economics Research Journal 9:327-335.

- Lazer, W., and J. E. Smallwood. 1977. The changing demographics of women. Journal of Marketing 41(3):14-30.
- Lewiston-Clarkston (Idaho) city directory. 1985. Loveland, CO: Johnson Publishing Co.
- Lipka, D. A. 1977. Business and professional women: Their self-esteem and its relation to clothing interest and clothing expenditures. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tennessee.
- Macovsky, S. J. 1976. Suiting up for the executive suite. Money, May 5, pp. 52-56.
- Malabre, A. L. 1978. As their ranks swell, women holding jobs reshape U.S. society. The Wall Street Journal, August 31.
- McCall, S. H. 1977. Meet the workwife. Journal of Marketing 41 (July):55-65.
- McDonough, C. S. 1983. Consumers' preferences for aesthetic and performance attributes in selected clothing categories. Thesis, Louisiana State University.
- Mendenhall, L. 1974. Statistics: A tool for social science. Duxbury Press.
- Monroe, D., & M. Pennell. 1939. Analysis of 58 account books kept by professional women 1937. CM 767. U.S. Department of Agriculture.
- Morganosky, M. 1984. Aesthetic and utilitarian qualities of clothing: Use of a multidimensional clothing value model. Home Economics Research Journal, 13(1):12-20.
- Norusis, M. J. 1983. Introductory statistics guide SPSSX. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Oppenheim, I. 1965. The family as consumers. New York: Macmillan.
- Ozawa, M. N. 1976. Women at work. Social Work 21:455.
- Parnelius, A. P. 1975. Emerging sex-role attitudes expectations and strains among college women. Journal of Marriage and the Family 37:146-153.
- Pederson, E. L. 1984. The ecological alternatives: An option for the future of textiles and clothing. Speech presented at the American Home Economics Association, June 25.

- Rabolt, N. J. 1984. Career-oriented women's dress: Input, influence, and mediating forces. Dissertation, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.
- Reische, D. 1972. Women and society. New York: H. W. Wilson.
- Robertson, T. S. 1971. Innovative behavior and communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Rosencranz, M. L. 1949. A study of women's interest in clothing. Journal of Home Economics 41 (October):460-462.
- Rosencranz, M. L. 1962. Clothing symbolism. Journal of Home Economics 54:18-22.
- Russell, J. 1982. Factors influencing the selection of apparel worn to work by women in the Dallas-Fort Worth metroplex. Unpublished master's thesis, North Texas State University, Denton.
- Ryan, M. S. 1966. Clothing: A study in human behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Saltford, N. C., & L. A. Roy. 1981. Family clothing consumption: Comparison of two methods for collecting data. Home Economics Research Journal 10(2):203-211.
- Sampson, J. M., M. M. Dunsing, & J. L. Halstrom. 1975. Employment status of the wife-mother: Psychological, social, and socioeconomic influences. Home Economics Research Journal 3(4):266-279.
- Scanzoni, J. 1977. Changing sex roles and emerging directions in family decision making. Journal of Consumer Research 4(3):185-188.
- Schaninger, C. M., & C. T. Allen. 1981. Wife's occupational status as a consumer behavior construct. Journal of Consumer Research 8:189-195.
- Scruggs, B. 1977. Clothing attitudes, consumer use practices and appeal of fashion features for never married women who work. ACPTC Proceedings, 110-111.
- Shampane, M. 1973. A total look for business. The Office 78 (December):60, 62, 64.
- Smith, S. L. 1982. Garment quality evaluations as a predictor of consumer sales. Unpublished master's thesis, Auburn University.
- Solomon, M. R. 1986. Dress for effect. Psychology Today 20(4):20-28.

- Solomon, M. R., & S. P. Douglas. 1983. The power of pinstripes. Savvy (March):59-62.
- Sproles, G. B., & L. V. Geistfeld. 1978. Issues in analyzing consumer satisfaction/dissatisfaction with clothing and textiles. In Advances in Consumer Research, ed. H. K. Hunt, 383-391. Ann Arbor: Association for Consumer Research.
- Stemm, F. A. E. 1980. Clothing attitudes and evaluation criteria used by employed women differing in feminine role orientation and work orientation: Emphasis on single again adult. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University). Dissertation Abstracts International 41, 148-B.
- Stone, R., & D. A. Rowe. 1957. The market demand for durable goods. Econometrica 25:423-443.
- Tate, M., & O. Glisson. 1961. Family clothing. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Taylor, K. A. 1983. The influences on the clothing buying practices of adolescents versus young career women. Thesis, Texas Women's University, Denton.
- Tweeten, B. J. 1980. An analysis of the clothing interest levels and purchasing styles of employed and non-employed women. Unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Nebraska, Lincoln.
- Troelstrup, A. W. 1974. The consumer in American society. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Turecamo, D. 1982. The return of the corporate dress code. Supervision 44(1):14-15.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Ag Research Service. 1978. Family Economics Review, Winter:35
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Ag Research Service. 1980. Family Economics Review, Winter-Spring:51.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Ag Research Service. 1981. Family Economics Review, No. 4:38.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Ag Research Service. 1984. Family Economics Review, No. 4:27.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Ag Research Service. 1985. Family Economics Review, No. 4:28.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1980. Classified index of occupations and industries.

- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census. 1986. Earnings in 1983 of married-couple families, by characteristics of husbands and wives. Current Population Reports, Series P-60, No. 153.
- U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1986. Statistical abstracts of the United States. 106th ed.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1980. Perspectives on working women: A databook. Bulletin 2080.
- U.S. Department of Labor. 1969. Handbook on Woman Workers. Women's Bureau Bulletin #294.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1982. Occupational outlook handbook 1980-81.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1983. Employment and earnings. (a)
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1983. Women at work: A chartbook. Bulletin 2168. (b)
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1985. Consumer expenditure survey 1980-1981. Bulletin 2225.
- U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics. 1987. Occupational outlook handbook.
- Van Syckle, C. 1951. Practices followed by consumers in buying "large expenditure" items of clothing, furniture, and equipment. Technical Bulletin 224. Michigan State College Agricultural Experiment Station.
- Wagner, J. 1982. Family clothing consumption: A cross-sectional comparison of family life cycle and family composition. Dissertation, Kansas State University.
- Weil, M. W. 1961. An analysis of the factors influencing married women's actual or planned work participation. American Sociological Review 26:91-96.
- Williams, M. G. 1977. The new executive women. Radnor, PA: Chilton Book Company.
- Winakor, G. 1966. New bases suggested for clothing budget standards. Journal of Home Economics 58:283-285.
- Winakor, G. 1969. The process of clothing consumption. Journal of Home Economics 61(8):629-634.
- Yankelovich, D. 1981. New rules in American life: Searching for self-fulfillment in a world turned upside down. Psychology Today, (April):35-91.

APPENDICES

Appendix A
Questionnaire Cover Letter

Dear Respondent:

Thank you for participating in this study in which a cross-section of Idaho-Washington women are being asked to indicate their annual clothing expenditures for clothing worn primarily to work and work-related activities. As explained in our initial phone conversation, participants in this study are limited to women who were employed full-time, 35 hours or more per week, for 40 or more weeks, January through December, 1985.

Your name was randomly selected from listings in the Lewiston-Clarkson City Directory. In order that the results of this study accurately represent the clothing expenditures of working Idaho-Washington women, it is important that your questionnaire be completed by you and returned. The information you provide will help us better understand the clothing needs of working women, and will assist women entering the job market plan their clothing expenditures based on survey data of women in similar types of employment.

You may be assured that your responses will be kept confidential. Your responses will be tabulated as part of the entire sample, not as one respondent. Please complete all of the questions.

A stamped, self-addressed envelope is enclosed for your convenience. I would appreciate receiving your complete as soon as possible.

You will note that the return envelope is numbered. This is only to provide a means by which reminder notices may be sent, if necessary, without further imposing upon others who have already returned their questionnaires.

If you have any questions, I would be most happy to answer them. Please write or call. My mailing address is 826 B Preston Avenue, Lewiston, Idaho 83501; phone 746-7491, after 6 p.m.

Your cooperation in this research project is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ruth E. Van Slyke
Graduate Student
Research Coordinator

Ardis W. Koester, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Research Advisor

Appendix B

Questionnaire

CLOTHING EXPENDITURE INVENTORY

Column I. Listed are items of clothing you may have acquired by purchasing during the past year. The items listed are representative of the types of clothing women might wear primarily to work and work-related activities.

Column II.

- A. Indicate the number of clothing items in your wardrobe which are worn primarily for work and work-related activities that you acquired by purchasing during January through December 1985. Include items you purchased ready-to-wear, items home sewn or custom sewn.
- B. Indicate the total spent per item type. Estimate if you can't remember the exact amount.

Do not leave blank spaces. If you cannot respond to an item, please indicate with a zero (0).

I. Clothing Item	II. Acquired by Purchasing January-December 1985 (ready-to-wear, home sewn, custom sewn)	
	A. Number of Items	B. Total Cost
<u>Protective Outerwear</u>		
1. Coats, winter	_____	_____
2. Coats, all weather	_____	_____
3. Jackets, Parkas	_____	_____
4. Capes	_____	_____
5. Other, specify _____	_____	_____
<u>Outerwear</u>		
6. Uniforms	_____	_____
7. Suits, jacket/matching skirt or pants	_____	_____
8. Jackets	_____	_____
9. Vests	_____	_____
10. Slacks, Jeans, Culottes	_____	_____
11. Skirts	_____	_____
12. Blouses	_____	_____
13. Knit Tops, T-shirts, Pullover Sweaters	_____	_____
14. Sweaters	_____	_____
15. Dresses	_____	_____
16. Other, specify _____	_____	_____

I. Clothing Item	II. Acquired by Purchasing January-December 1985 (ready-to-wear, home sewn, custom sewn)	
	A. Number of Items	B. Total Cost
<u>Footwear</u>		
17. Shoes, uniform	_____	_____
18. Shoes, dress	_____	_____
19. Shoes, casual	_____	_____
20. Boots	_____	_____
21. Other, specify _____	_____	_____
<u>Lingerie</u>		
22. Hose	_____	_____
23. Socks	_____	_____
24. Slips	_____	_____
25. Camisoles	_____	_____
26. Bras	_____	_____
27. Panties	_____	_____
28. Other, specify _____	_____	_____
<u>Accessories</u>		
29. Umbrellas	_____	_____
30. Hats	_____	_____
31. Gloves	_____	_____
32. Handbags	_____	_____
33. Briefcases	_____	_____
34. Belts	_____	_____
35. Scarves	_____	_____
36. Jewelry	_____	_____
37. Other, specify _____	_____	_____

38. Is the amount you spent January 1985 through December 1985 for your wardrobe: (circle one number)
- 1 More than you usually spend per year (go to 38a)
 - 2 Less than you usually spend per year (go to 38b)
 - 3 About the same as you usually spend per year (go to 39)
- 38a. If you spent more for your work wardrobe during 1985 than during the previous year, indicate why. (circle all numbers that apply)
- 1 New job
 - 2 Job promotion
 - 3 Weight change
 - 4 Change in family status
 - 5 Purchased maternity wardrobe
 - 6 Other
-
- 38b. If you spent less for your work wardrobe during 1985 than during the previous year, indicate why. (circle all numbers that apply)
- 1 Weight change
 - 2 Change in family status
 - 3 Maternity wardrobe
 - 4 Anticipated retirement
 - 5 Unforeseen financial expenses
 - 6 Other
-
39. Please estimate how much you spent during the last year, January through December 1985, for dry-cleaning of your clothing worn primarily for work and work-related activities. (circle one number)
- 1 Under \$25
 - 2 \$25-\$50
 - 3 \$51-\$75
 - 4 \$76-100
 - 5 Over \$100
40. Please estimate how much you spent during the last year, January through December 1985, for alterations and repairs of your clothing worn primarily for work and work-related activities. (circle one number)
- 1 Under \$25
 - 2 \$25-50
 - 3 \$51-\$75
 - 4 \$76-\$100
 - 5 Over \$100

41. Did you wear a uniform for work during 1985? (circle one number)

- 1 Most of the time (go to 41a)
- 2 Sometimes (go to 42)
- 3 Never (go to 42)

41a. If you answered "yes" to question 41, please indicate how you acquired your work uniforms. (circle all numbers that apply)

- 1 Purchase my own uniforms
- 2 Rented my uniforms
- 3 Uniforms provided by employer
- 4 Received uniform allowance from employer
- 5 Other _____

42. How important is each of the following factors to you when you purchase clothing for yourself to be worn primarily for work. Rate each factor as 1-"very important," 2-"important," or 3-"little or no importance." (circle the appropriate number for each factor)

	<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Important</u>	<u>Little or no</u> <u>Importance</u>
a. Fits well	1	2	3
b. Feels comfortable	1	2	3
c. In price range I can afford . . .	1	2	3
d. I like it	1	2	3
e. Easy to care for	1	2	3
f. Good color for me	1	2	3
g. Quality, construction, and fabric	1	2	3
h. Expresses my individuality . . .	1	2	3
i. Fashionable garment	1	2	3
j. Similar to what co-workers are wearing	1	2	3
k. Meets employer expectations . . .	1	2	3

43. Do you consider your current work wardrobe to include: (circle one number)

- 1 Adequate number of garments (go to 44)
- 2 Inadequate number of garments (go to 43a)

43a. If you answered "inadequate" to question 43, indicate why your work wardrobe is inadequate. (circle all numbers that apply)

- 1 Garments don't fit
- 2 Garments not in fashion
- 3 Not enough variety
- 4 Garments need repair
- 5 Other _____

44. What is the average number of years you continue to wear most of the garments for work which are in your wardrobe? (circle one number)

- 1 1 year or less
- 2 2-3 years
- 3 4-5 years
- 4 6 or more years

45. What is your current status? (circle one number)

- 1 Single, never married
- 2 Married
- 3 Widowed
- 4 Divorced
- 5 Separated

46. What is your age category? (circle one number)

- 1 18-24 years of age
- 2 25-34 years of age
- 3 35-44 years of age
- 4 45-54 years of age
- 5 55-65 years of age
- 6 66 years of age and over

47. Do you have children living at home, 18 years of age or under? (circle one number)

- 1 Yes (go to 47a)
- 2 No (continue with 48)

47a. If you answered "yes" to question 47, indicate the number of children living at home in each age category.

Number of children 5 years of age and under _____
 Number of children 6-10 years of age _____
 Number of children 11-12 years of age _____
 Number of children 13-15 years of age _____
 Number of children 16-18 years of age _____

48. How far did you go in school? (circle one number)

- 1 Grade school only
- 2 Some high school
- 3 High school graduate
- 4 Some college
- 5 Associate degree
- 6 Bachelor's degree
- 7 Some graduate work
- 8 Advanced degree

49. How many years have you been employed at your present job? (circle one number)

- 1 Less than 2 years
- 2 2-5 years
- 3 6-10 years
- 4 11-15 years
- 5 16-20 years
- 6 21 years and over

50. How many years have you been employed (total)? (circle one number)

- 1 Less than 2 years
- 2 2-5 years
- 3 6-10 years
- 4 11-15 years
- 5 16-20 years
- 6 21 years and over

51. What was your 1985 annual income (before taxes) from your job?
(circle one number)

- 1 Under \$6,000
- 2 \$ 6,000 - \$10,000
- 3 \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 4 \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 5 \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 6 \$25,001 - \$30,000
- 7 \$30,001 - \$35,000
- 8 \$35,001 - \$40,000
- 9 Over \$40,000

52. What was the total annual income (before taxes) of your household during 1985? (circle one number)

- 1 Under \$10,000
- 2 \$10,001 - \$15,000
- 3 \$15,001 - \$20,000
- 4 \$20,001 - \$25,000
- 5 \$25,001 - \$30,000
- 6 \$30,001 - \$35,000
- 7 \$35,001 - \$40,000
- 8 \$40,001 - \$50,000
- 9 \$50,001 - \$60,000
- 10 \$60,001 - \$70,000
- 11 \$70,001 - \$80,000
- 12 Over \$80,000

53. What is your present job title? _____

54. Describe your present job. What do you do on the job?

Is there anything else you would like to tell us about your clothing expenditures for work? If so, please use the back page for that purpose.

Your contribution to this study is appreciated. If you would like a summary of results, please print your name and address on the back of the return envelope. Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed, stamped envelope which is enclosed. Thank you.

Appendix C

Criteria for Instrument Evaluation
by Professional Panel

Research Purpose:

To study the clothing expenditures and wardrobe inventories of full-time employed working women in five occupational categories in order to make budget recommendations based on survey data for women in similar occupational categories.

Objectives:

To determine the clothing expenditures, wardrobe inventories, and selected demographic characteristics of five occupational categories of employed women.

To determine the relationship between clothing expenditures and wardrobe inventories of five occupational categories of working women.

To determine the relationship of clothing expenditures and wardrobe inventories to selected demographic characteristics, including: length of employment, age, age and number of children, marital status, wage earner income, and total family income.

Occupational categories identified in this study:

1. Professional-Technical
2. Managerial-Administrative
3. Sales
4. Clerical
5. Other

Sample limited to full-time working women. Employed 35 or more hours per week for 40 or more weeks during 1985.

1. Evaluate items Q1 through Q59 in terms of usefulness, appropriateness, and validity. Make comments directly on questionnaire.
2. Are directions concise, easily understood, and interpreted the same by all respondents?
3. Does wardrobe list include all items necessary to meet needs of all occupational groups?
4. Does each question 50-59 have an answer that applies to each respondent?
5. Is the appearance and format of the questionnaire appropriate?

Appendix D

Criteria for Instrument Evaluation
by Pretest Respondents

Telephone interview by researcher following return of questionnaire:

1. Were instructions for completing the questionnaire clear?
Explain.
2. Were the questions easily understood? Explain and give examples.
3. Was there an adequate response for each question?
If not, explain.
4. How much time was required to complete the questionnaire? Was
time required a problem?
5. Did you need to refer to expenditure records? Rental of
uniforms?
6. Did you need to refer to your actual wardrobe?
7. Any other problems or comments?

Appendix E
Phone Interview Format

HELLO THIS IS RUTH VAN SLYKE WITH THE COLLEGE OF HOME ECONOMICS AT OREGON STATE UNIVERSITY. DURING THE NEXT TWO WEEKS I WILL BE CONDUCTING A STUDY OF EMPLOYED WOMEN IN THE LEWISTON-CLARKSTON AREA IN REGARD TO THEIR CLOTHING EXPENSES AND WARDROBES FOR WORK. YOUR NAME WAS RANDOMLY SELECTED FROM THE LEWISTON-CLARKSTON CITY DIRECTORY. I WOULD LIKE TO MAIL YOU A QUESTIONNAIRE WHICH YOU COULD COMPLETE AT HOME DURING YOUR LEISURE. WITH THE QUESTIONNAIRE, A SELF-ADDRESSED STAMPED ENVELOPE WILL BE INCLUDED IN WHICH YOU COULD RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE TO ME.

WERE YOU EMPLOYED FULL-TIME DURING 1985. 35 OR MORE HOURS PER WEEK FOR AT LEAST 40 WEEKS.

WOULD YOU BE INTERESTED IN PARTICIPATING IN OUR SURVEY? YOUR RESPONSE WILL BE KEPT CONFIDENTIAL.

WITHIN THE NEXT TWO WEEKS YOU WILL BE RECEIVING THE QUESTIONNAIRE. ONCE YOU HAVE RECEIVED THE QUESTIONNAIRE, I WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR RETURN AS SOON AS POSSIBLE.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION AND HELP. GOODBYE.

Appendix F

One-week Follow-up Postcard

Last week a questionnaire was mailed to you asking you to indicate your annual clothing expenditures and the size of your wardrobe worn for work. Your name is part of a random sample of Lewiston, Idaho and Clarkston, Washington working women.

If you have already returned the questionnaire to me, please accept my sincere thanks. If not, please do so today. Because the questionnaire has been sent to only a representative sample of women, it is extremely important that your response be included in the study if the results are to be accurate.

If by some chance you did not receive the questionnaire, or if it has been misplaced, please contact me in Lewiston at 746-7491 after 6 p.m. Another copy will be mailed to you immediately.

Sincerely,

Ruth E. Van Slyke
Research Coordinator

Appendix G
Three-week Follow-up Letter

Dear Respondent:

My records indicate that you have not yet returned your completed questionnaire for the Lewiston-Clarkston area research project on clothing expenditures of working women.

Your response is an essential part of the randomly drawn sample; accuracy of the study depends upon your cooperation. There is no way to substitute for your answers.

May I reassure you that the statements are strictly confidential. Your responses are tabulated as part of the entire sample, not as one respondent.

Won't you please take a few minutes now to complete the survey? A replacement copy of the questionnaire is attached for your convenience. Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed envelope as soon as possible.

If there are any questions concerning the survey, please write or call. My mailing address is 826 B Preston Avenue, Lewiston, Idaho 83501; Phone 746-7491 after 6 p.m.

I shall look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Ruth E. Van Slyke
Graduate Student
Research Coordinator

Ardis W. Koester, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
Research Advisor

Appendix H

Instrument Coding Instructions

Variable	Question No.	Variable Name	Variable Label
1	1	COATSWI#	#
2	1	COATSWI\$	\$
3	2	COATSAW#	#
4	2	COATSAW\$	\$
5	3	JACPARK#	#
6	3	JACPARK\$	\$
7	4	CAPES#	#
8	4	CAPES\$	\$
9	5	PROTOTH#	#
10	5	PROTOTH\$	\$
11	6	UNIFORM#	#
12	6	UNIFORM\$	\$
13	7	SUITS#	#
14	7	SUIT\$	\$
15	8	JACKET#	#
16	8	JACKET\$	\$
17	9	VESTS#	#
18	9	VEST\$	\$
19	10	SLAJEAC#	#
20	10	SLAJEAC\$	\$
21	11	SKIRTS#	#
22	11	SKIRTS\$	\$
23	12	BLOUSES#	#
24	12	BLOUSES\$	\$
25	13	KNITTOP#	#
26	13	KNITTOP\$	\$
27	14	SWEATER#	#
28	14	SWEATER\$	\$
29	15	DRESSES#	#
30	15	DRESSES\$	\$
31	16	OUTEROT#	#
32	16	OUTEROT\$	\$
33	17	SHOEUNI#	#
34	17	SHOEUNI\$	\$
35	18	SHOEDRE#	#
36	18	SHOEDRE\$	\$
37	19	SHOECAS#	#
38	19	SHOECAS\$	\$
39	20	BOOTS#	#
40	20	BOOTS\$	\$
41	21	FOTWROT#	#
42	21	FOTWROT\$	\$
43	22	HOSE#	#
44	22	HOSE\$	\$

Variable	Question No.	Variable Name	Variable Label
45	23	SOCK#	#
46	23	SOCK\$	\$
47	24	SLIP#	#
48	24	SLIP\$	\$
49	25	CAMISOL#	#
50	25	CAMISOL\$	\$
51	26	BRA#	#
52	26	BRA\$	\$
53	27	PANTIE#	#
54	27	PANTIE\$	\$
55	28	LINGOTH#	#
56	28	LINGOTH\$	\$
57	29	UMBRELL#	#
58	29	UMBRELL\$	\$
59	30	HAT#	#
60	30	HAT\$	\$
61	31	GLOVE#	#
62	31	GLOVE\$	\$
63	32	HANDBAG#	#
64	33	HANDBAG\$	\$
65	34	BRIEFCA#	#
66	34	BRIEFCA\$	\$
67	35	BELT#	#
68	35	BELT\$	\$
69	35	SCARVE#	#
70	35	SCARVE\$	\$
71	36	JEWELR#	#
72	36	JEWELR\$	\$
73	37	ACCOTHR#	#
74	37	ACCOTHR\$	\$
75	38	AMTSPT	1 MORE 2 SAME 3 LESS
76	38a1	SMNEWJOB	1
77	38a2	SMJOBPRO	1
78	38a3	SMWTCHG	1
79	38a4	SMCHGFAM	1
80	38a5	SMMATER	1
81	38a6	SMOTHR	1
82	38b1	SLWTCHG	1
83	38b2	SLCHGFAM	1
84	38b3	SLMATER	1
85	38b4	SLRET	1
86	38b5	SLFINEXP	1
87	38b6	SLOTTHR	1
88	39	DRYCLEAN	1 UNDER \$25 2 \$25-50 3 \$51-75 4 \$76-100 5 OVER \$100

Variable	Question No.	Variable Name	Variable Label
89	40	ALTERREP	1 UNDER \$25 2 \$25-50 3 \$51-75 4 \$76-100 5 OVER \$100
90	41	UNIFORM	1 MOST OF TIME 2 SOMETIMES 3 NEVER
91	41a1	UNIFPUR	1
92	41a2	UNIRENT	1
93	41a3	UNIPROV	1
94	41a4	UNIALOW	1
95	41a5	UNIOTHR	1
96	42a	FIT	3 VERY IMPORTANT 2 IMPORTANT 1 LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
97	42b	COMFORT	3 VERY IMPORTANT 2 IMPORTANT 1 LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
98	42c	AFFORD	3 VERY IMPORTANT 2 IMPORTANT 1 LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
99	42d	LIKE	3 VERY IMPORTANT 2 IMPORTANT 1 LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
100	42e	CARE	3 VERY IMPORTANT 2 IMPORTANT 1 LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
101	42f	COLOR	3 VERY IMPORTANT 2 IMPORTANT 1 LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
102	42g	QUALITY	3 VERY IMPORTANT 2 IMPORTANT 1 LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
103	42h	INDIVID	3 VERY IMPORTANT 2 IMPORTANT 1 LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
104	42i	FASHION	3 VERY IMPORTANT 2 IMPORTANT 1 LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
105	42j	COWORKER	3 VERY IMPORTANT 2 IMPORTANT 1 LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
106	42k	EMPLEXP	3 VERY IMPORTANT 2 IMPORTANT 1 LITTLE OR NO IMPORTANCE
107	43	ADEQUATE	1 ADEQUATE # 2 INADEQUATE #

Variable	Question No.	Variable Name	Variable Label
108	43a1	INADFIT	1
109	43a2	INADFASH	1
110	43a3	INADVAR	1
111	43a4	INADREPR	1
112	43a5	INADOTHR	1
113	44	YEARWEAR	1 1 OR LESS 2 2-3 YEARS 3 4-5 YEARS 4 6 OR MORE YEARS
114	45	MARITSTA	1 SINGLE, NEVER MARRIED 2 MARRIED 3 WIDOWED 4 DIVORCED 5 SEPARATED
115	46	AGE	1 18-24 YRS 2 25-34 YRS 3 35-44 YRS 4 45-54 YRS 5 55-65 YRS 6 66 YRS OVER
116	47	CHILDHOM	1 YES 2 NO
117	47a1	5-UNDAGE	#
118	47a2	6-10AGE	#
119	47a3	11-12AGE	#
120	47a4	13-15AGE	#
121	47a5	16-18AGE	#
122	48	EDUC	1 GRADE SCH 2 SOME H.S. 3 H.S. GRAD 4 SOME COLLEGE 5 ASSOC. DEGREE 6 BACH. DEGREE 7 SOME GRAD WK 8 ADV. DEGREE
123	49	PRESEMP	1 LESS 2 YRS 2 2-5 YRS 3 6-10 YRS 4 11-15 YRS 5 16-20 YRS 6 21 YRS OVER
124	50	TOTEMPL	1 LESS 2 YRS 2 2-5 YRS 3 6-10 YRS 4 11-15 YRS 5 16-20 YRS 6 21 YRS OVER

Variable	Question No.	Variable Name	Variable Label
125	51	JOBINCOM	1 UNDER \$6,000 2 \$6000-10000 3 \$10001-15000 4 \$15001-20000 5 \$20001-25000 6 \$25001-30000 7 \$30001-35000 8 \$35001-40000 9 \$40001 OVER
126	52	TOTINCOM	1 UNDER \$10000 2 \$10001-15000 3 \$15001-20000 4 \$20001-25000 5 \$25001-30000 6 \$30001-35000 7 \$35001-40000 8 \$40001-50000 9 \$50001-60000 10 \$60001-70000 11 \$70001-80000 12 OVER \$8000
127	53	OCCUPCAT	1 PROF-TECH 2 MANAG-ADMIN 3 SALES 4 CLERICAL 5 OTHER
128	54	JOBS	1 COMPUTER SPEC, PROG 2 ENGINEERS 3 SYSTEMS ANALYS 4 PERSONNEL, LABOR REL 5 PHYSICIANS, DENTISTS 6 CHIROPRACTORS 7 PHARMACISTS 8 NURSES, DIETICIANS 9 HEALTH TECHNOL & TECH 10 SOCIAL WORKERS 11 TEACHERS, COLLEGE 12 TEACHERS, OTHER THAN COLLEGE 13 ENGIN & SCIENCE TECH 14 GRANT WRITING PLANNER 15 RESOURCE PLANNER 16 CONTROLLERS 17 BANK OFFICERS, FINANCIAL MGRS 18 HEALTH ADMIN 19 MANAGERS BLDG 20 OFFICE MANAGERS 21 PUBLIC ADMIN 22 FOOD SERVICE MGRS
		Occ. Cat. 1 - Jobs 1-15	
		Occ. Cat. 2 - Jobs 16-25	
		Occ. Cat. 3 - Jobs 26-31	
		Occ. Cat. 4 - Jobs 32-46	
		Occ. Cat. 5 - Jobs 47-56	

Variable	Question No.	Variable Name	Variable Label
			23 SALES MGRS, DEPT HEADS
			24 SCHOOL ADMIN
			25 FEED LOT MGR
			26 SALES REP
			27 INSURANCE AGENTS, BROKERS
			28 REAL ESTATE AGENTS
			29 STOCK BOND SLSM
			30 SALES CLERK
			31 TRAVEL AGENT
			32 BANK TELLERS
			33 BILLING CLERKS
			34 BOOKKEEPERS
			35 CASHIERS
			36 MAIL CARRIERS
			37 TELEPHONE OPERATORS
			38 INSUR ADJ, EX, INV
			39 LIBRARY ASSIST
			40 OFFICE MACHINE OPER
			41 PAYROLL CLERK
			42 RECEPTIONIST
			43 SEC
			44 TEACHER AIDE
			45 TYPISTS
			46 SHIP RECEIV, STOCK
			47 ASSEMBLERS
			48 FOOD OPERATIVES
			49 FOOD SERVICE
			50 DENT, DR, OPT, LPN ASSIST
			51 HAIRDRESSERS
			52 CUSTODIANS
			53 CHILDCARE WKS
			54 POLICE
			55 GARDENER
			56 VET ASST

Appendix I

Occupational Listings for Coding Occupations

CATEGORY I. PROFESSIONAL, TECHNICAL

Accountants
Architects
Computer Specialists
Engineers
Farm Management Advisors
Foresters and Conservationists
Home Management Advisors
Lawyers and Judges
Librarians, Archivists, Curators
Mathematical Specialists
Life and Physical Scientists
Operations and Systems Analysts
Personnel and Labor Relations Workers
Physicians, Dentists
Chiropractors
Optometrists
Pharmacists
Veterinarians
Nurses, Dieticians, Therapists
Health Technologists and Technicians
Religious Workers
Social Scientists
Social and Recreation Workers
Teachers, College and University
Teachers, Except College and University
Engineering and Science Technicians
Airplane Pilots, Air Traffic Controllers
Writers, Artists, Entertainers
Research Workers

CATEGORY II. MANAGERS AND ADMINISTRATORS

Assessors, Controllers, Treasurers, Local Public Administration
Bank Officers and Financial Managers
Buyers and Shippers, Farm Products
Buyers and Shippers, Wholesale and Retail
Funeral Directors
Health Administrators
Managers and Superintendents of Buildings
Office Managers
Public Administrators
Postmasters and Mail Superintendents
Food Service Managers
Sales Managers, Department Heads
School Administrators

CATEGORY III. SALES WORKERS

Advertising Agents and Salesmen
 Auctioneers
 Demonstrators
 Hucksters and Peddlers
 Insurance Agents, Brokers, Underwriters
 Real Estate Agents and Brokers
 Stock and Bond Salesmen
 Sales Clerks

CATEGORY IV. CLERICAL WORKERS

Bank Tellers
 Billing Clerks
 Bookkeepers
 Cashiers
 Clerical Assistants
 Counter Clerks
 Dispatchers
 File Clerks
 Insurance Adjusters, Examiners, Investigators
 Library attendants
 Messengers
 Meter Readers
 Office Machine Operators
 Payroll Clerks
 Receptionists
 Secretaries
 Teacher Aides
 Ticket, Station, Express Agents
 Typists

CATEGORY V. OTHER, including Craftsmen, Operatives, Transport
Equipment Operatives, and Service Workers

Craft: Carpenter; Mechanic; Printer; Baker; Decorators and
 Window Dressers; Tailors; Upholsterers
 Operatives: Assemblers; Bottling and Canning Operatives;
 Clothing Ironers and Pressers; Dressmakers; Laundry
 and Dry Cleaning; Sewers and Stitchers
 Transport Equipment Operatives: Bus Drivers; Delivery Men;
 Taxicab Drivers; Truck Drivers
 Service: Private Household Food Service; Health Service,
 Dental Assistants, Practical Nurses; Personal Service;
 Dishwashers, Waiters, Waitresses; Cleaning Service
 Workers; Airline Stewardesses; Childcare Workers;
 Protective Service, Firemen, Policemen, Guards, Watchmen

Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Census, Alphabetical
 Index of Industries and Occupations, 1980, pp. X-XIV.

Appendix J

Wardrobe Expenditure Inventories for Total Sample
and Each of the Five Occupational Categories

Table 46
Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for Total Sample

	Total Purchased <u>n</u>	Total Expenditure \$	Average Cost per Item \$	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u> (%)*
Protective Outerwear				
Coats, Winter	125	10,023	80.18	110 (42)
Coats, All-Weather	84	4,797	57.11	74 (29)
Jackets, Parkas	98	3,711	37.87	83 (32)
Capes	3	100	33.33	3 (1)
Other	20	666	33.30	13 (5)
Subtotal	330	19,297	58.48	188 (73)
Outerwear				
Uniforms	99	2,745	27.73	29 (11)
Suits, etc.	216	17,517	81.10	103 (40)
Jackets	138	5,441	39.43	84 (32)
Vests	140	3,065	21.89	60 (23)
Slacks, Jeans	908	20,676	22.77	213 (82)
Skirts	283	6,410	22.65	109 (42)
Blouses	1,104	21,226	19.23	210 (81)
Knit Tops	759	13,440	17.71	167 (64)
Sweaters	346	8,616	24.90	133 (51)
Dresses	387	14,960	38.66	145 (56)
Other	53	1,295	24.43	17 (7)
Subtotal	4,433	115,391	26.03	251 (97)
Footwear				
Shoes, Uniform	86	3,076	35.77	49 (19)
Shoes, Dress	436	13,740	31.51	171 (66)
Shoes, Casual	379	9,607	25.35	185 (71)
Boots	117	6,592	56.34	98 (38)
Other	17	324	19.06	11 (4)
Subtotal	1,035	33,339	32.21	252 (97)
Lingerie				
Hose	5,730	14,307	2.50	220 (85)
Socks	977	2,208	2.26	140 (54)
Slips	136	1,864	13.71	92 (36)
Camisoles	81	1,053	13.00	57 (22)
Bras	672	8,159	12.14	215 (83)
Panties	1,518	4,724	3.11	209 (81)
Other	45	412	9.16	8 (3)
Subtotal	8,966	32,727	3.65	256 (99)
Accessories				
Umbrellas	24	278	11.58	22 (8)
Hats	44	743	16.89	26 (10)
Gloves	153	2,016	13.18	108 (42)
Handbags	317	6,136	19.36	180 (69)
Briefcases	15	542	36.13	14 (5)
Belts	214	1,616	7.55	85 (33)
Scarves	88	662	7.52	33 (13)
Jewelry	1,153	15,139	13.13	153 (59)
Other	40	1,531	38.28	15 (6)
Subtotal	2,048	28,663	14.00	226 (87)
Total	17,005	229,417		

*Percentage of total respondents (n = 259).

Table 47
Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for
Professional-Technical Occupational Category

	Total Purchased <u>n</u>	Total Expenditure \$	Average Cost per Item \$	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u> (%)*
Protective Outerwear				
Coats, Winter	32	2,845	88.91	28 (44)
Coats, All-Weather	20	1,325	66.25	18 (29)
Jackets, Parkas	25	842	33.68	19 (30)
Capes	-	-	-	-
Other	6	415	69.17	4 (6)
Subtotal	83	5,427	65.39	47 (75)
Outerwear				
Uniforms	23	737	32.04	9 (14)
Suits, etc.	57	6,031	105.81	28 (44)
Jackets	38	1,551	40.82	22 (35)
Vests	45	1,131	25.13	19 (30)
Slacks, Jeans	197	5,003	25.40	50 (79)
Skirts	78	1,975	25.32	32 (51)
Blouses	240	5,177	21.57	52 (83)
Knit Tops	181	3,604	19.91	41 (65)
Sweaters	69	1,870	27.10	36 (57)
Dresses	82	3,859	47.06	40 (63)
Other	24	702	29.25	7 (11)
Subtotal	1,034	31,640	30.60	61 (97)
Footwear				
Shoes, Uniform	17	669	51.46	13 (21)
Shoes, Dress	107	3,668	34.28	46 (73)
Shoes, Casual	92	2,442	26.54	49 (78)
Boots	23	1,284	55.83	19 (30)
Other	4	85	21.25	2 (3)
Subtotal	243	8,148	33.53	62 (98)
Lingerie				
Hose	1,284	3,212	2.50	60 (95)
Socks	204	491	2.41	38 (60)
Slips	27	389	14.41	23 (37)
Camisoles	23	272	11.83	14 (22)
Bras	153	1,859	12.15	54 (86)
Panties	336	1,119	3.33	50 (79)
Other	5	87	17.40	2 (3)
Subtotal	2,032	7,429	3.66	63 (100)
Accessories				
Umorellas	5	46	9.20	5 (8)
Hats	21	289	13.76	11 (17)
Gloves	46	621	13.50	31 (49)
Handbags	75	1,768	23.57	46 (73)
Briefcases	5	159	31.80	4 (6)
Belts	56	441	7.88	22 (35)
Scarves	18	157	8.72	7 (11)
Jewelry	296	4,430	14.98	43 (68)
Other	8	350	43.75	6 (10)
Subtotal	530	8,261	15.59	54 (86)
Totals	3,922	60,905		

*Percentage of occupational category respondents (n = 63).

Table 48
Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for
Managerial-Administrative Occupational Category

	Total Purchased <u>n</u>	Total Expenditure \$	Average Cost per Item \$	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u> (%) [*]
Protective Outerwear				
Coats, Winter	28	2,222	28.00	24 (45)
Coats, All-Weather	20	1,240	62.00	17 (32)
Jackets, Parkas	13	621	47.77	13 (25)
Capes	1	6	6.00	1 (2)
Other	2	60	30.00	2 (4)
Subtotal	64	4,149	64.83	39 (74)
Outerwear				
Uniforms	22	712	32.36	6 (11)
Suits, etc.	64	5,770	90.16	28 (53)
Jackets	26	938	36.08	17 (32)
Vests	36	651	18.08	15 (28)
Slacks, Jeans	206	4,480	21.75	43 (81)
Skirts	65	1,783	27.43	29 (55)
Blouses	270	5,303	19.64	47 (89)
Knit Tops	127	2,683	21.13	33 (62)
Sweaters	69	1,592	23.07	27 (51)
Dresses	97	4,350	44.85	38 (72)
Other	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	982	28,262	28.78	52 (98)
Footwear				
Shoes, Uniform	16	747	46.69	8 (15)
Shoes, Dress	121	3,931	32.49	44 (83)
Shoes, Casual	69	1,649	23.90	35 (66)
Boots	27	1,819	67.37	25 (47)
Other	2	20	10.00	2 (4)
Subtotal	235	8,166	34.75	52 (98)
Lingerie				
Hose	1,589	3,823	2.41	49 (92)
Socks	180	318	1.77	25 (47)
Slips	40	532	13.30	27 (51)
Camisoles	17	178	10.47	15 (28)
Bras	126	1,602	12.71	43 (81)
Panties	281	981	3.49	41 (77)
Other	7	200	28.57	3 (6)
Subtotal	2,240	7,634	3.41	52 (98)
Accessories				
Umbrellas	3	26	8.67	3 (6)
Hats	8	289	36.13	4 (8)
Gloves	34	443	13.03	26 (49)
Handbags	72	1,323	18.38	41 (77)
Briefcases	5	205	41.00	5 (9)
Belts	42	368	8.76	22 (42)
Scarves	18	154	8.56	8 (15)
Jewelry	214	2,904	13.57	36 (68)
Other	13	71	5.46	4 (8)
Subtotal	409	5,783	14.14	50 (94)
Totals	3,930	53,994		

*Percentage of occupational category respondents (n = 53).

Table 49

Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for Sales Occupational Category

	Total Purchased <u>n</u>	Total Expenditure \$	Average Cost per Item \$	Respondents Reporting* <u>n</u> (%)
Protective Outerwear				
Coats, Winter	9	803	89.22	8 (36)
Coats, All-Weather	6	446	74.33	6 (27)
Jackets, Parkas	7	206	29.43	6 (27)
Capes	1	85	85.00	1 (5)
Other	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	23	1,540	66.96	14 (64)
Outerwear				
Uniforms	4	80	20.00	1 (5)
Suits, etc.	20	1,925	96.25	12 (55)
Jackets	21	1,093	52.05	11 (50)
Vests	15	267	17.80	6 (27)
Slacks, Jeans	66	1,321	20.02	20 (91)
Skirts	48	840	17.50	10 (45)
Blouses	101	1,962	19.43	19 (86)
Knit Tops	57	983	17.25	17 (77)
Sweaters	32	860	26.88	9 (41)
Dresses	60	2,019	35.15	14 (64)
Other	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	424	11,350	26.77	22 (100)
Footwear				
Shoes, Uniform	1	45	45.00	1 (5)
Shoes, Dress	47	1,362	28.98	16 (73)
Shoes, Casual	35	930	26.67	16 (73)
Boots	11	562	51.09	10 (45)
Other	6	130	21.67	4 (18)
Subtotal	100	3,029	30.29	21 (95)
Lingerie				
Hose	297	928	3.12	18 (82)
Socks	68	174	2.56	13 (59)
Slips	15	218	14.53	11 (50)
Camisoles	5	69	13.80	4 (18)
Bras	46	563	12.24	18 (82)
Panties	138	409	2.96	19 (86)
Other	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	569	2,361	4.15	22 (100)
Accessories				
Umbrellas	1	10	10.00	1 (5)
Hats	3	47	15.67	2 (9)
Gloves	9	161	17.89	6 (27)
Handbags	31	580	18.71	17 (77)
Briefcases	2	105	52.50	2 (9)
Belts	19	164	8.63	6 (27)
Scarves	8	84	10.50	3 (14)
Jewelry	88	1,320	15.00	12 (55)
Other	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	161	2,471	15.35	20 (91)
Totals	1,277	20,751		

*Percentage of occupational category respondents (n = 22).

Table 50
Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for
Clerical Occupational Category

	Total Purchased <u>n</u>	Total Expenditure \$	Average Cost per Item \$	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u> (%) [*]
Protective Outerwear				
Coats, Winter	30	2,566	85.53	26 (34)
Coats, All-Weather	28	1,417	50.61	25 (32)
Jackets, Parkas	31	1,529	49.32	28 (36)
Capes	1	9	9.00	1 (1)
Other	3	75	25.00	3 (4)
Subtotal	93	5,596	60.17	53 (69)
Outerwear				
Uniforms	14	365	26.07	3 (4)
Suits, etc.	65	3,605	55.46	32 (42)
Jackets	41	1,459	35.59	26 (34)
Vests	38	939	24.71	17 (22)
Slacks, Jeans	281	6,863	24.42	68 (88)
Skirts	85	1,655	19.47	33 (43)
Blouses	329	6,211	18.88	64 (83)
Knit Tops	288	4,945	17.17	54 (70)
Sweaters	135	3,438	25.47	47 (61)
Dresses	131	4,146	31.65	44 (57)
Other	16	373	23.31	5 (6)
Subtotal	1,423	33,999	23.89	76 (99)
Footwear				
Shoes, Uniform	8	310	38.75	3 (4)
Shoes, Dress	142	4,246	29.90	55 (71)
Shoes, Casual	129	3,312	25.67	60 (78)
Boots	40	2,209	55.23	31 (40)
Other	2	14	7.00	1 (1)
Subtotal	321	10,091	31.44	73 (95)
Lingerie				
Hose	2,056	4,657	2.27	67 (87)
Socks	250	587	2.35	37 (48)
Slips	47	644	13.70	26 (34)
Camisoles	31	466	15.03	21 (27)
Bras	198	2,299	11.61	65 (84)
Panties	448	1,308	2.92	63 (82)
Other	33	125	3.79	3 (4)
Subtotal	3,063	10,086	3.29	76 (99)
Accessories				
Umbrellas	12	154	12.83	10 (13)
Hats	7	84	12.00	6 (8)
Gloves	32	498	15.56	26 (34)
Handbags	94	1,800	19.15	55 (71)
Briefcases	3	73	24.33	3 (4)
Belts	79	519	6.57	26 (34)
Scarves	28	210	7.50	10 (13)
Jewelry	470	6,044	12.86	48 (62)
Other	18	1,065	59.17	4 (5)
Subtotal	743	10,447	14.06	68 (88)
Totals	5,643	70,219		

*Percentage of occupational category respondents (n = 77).

Table 51

Wardrobe Inventory Expenditures for Other Occupational Category

	Total Purchased <u>n</u>	Total Expenditure \$	Average Cost per Item \$	Respondents Reporting <u>n</u> (%)*
Protective Outerwear				
Coats, Winter	26	1,587	61.04	24 (55)
Coats, All-Weather	10	369	36.90	8 (18)
Jackets, Parkas	22	513	23.32	17 (39)
Capes	-	-	-	-
Other	9	116	12.89	4 (9)
Subtotal	67	2,585	38.58	35 (80)
Outerwear				
Uniforms	36	851	23.64	10 (23)
Suits, etc.	10	186	18.60	3 (7)
Jackets	12	400	33.33	8 (18)
Vests	6	77	12.83	3 (7)
Slacks, Jeans	158	3,009	19.04	32 (73)
Skirts	7	157	22.43	5 (11)
Blouses	164	2,573	15.69	28 (64)
Knit Tops	106	1,225	11.56	22 (50)
Sweaters	41	856	20.88	14 (32)
Dresses	17	586	34.47	9 (20)
Other	13	220	16.92	5 (11)
Subtotal	570	10,140	17.79	40 (91)
Footwear				
Shoes, Uniform	44	1,305	29.66	24 (55)
Shoes, Dress	19	533	28.05	10 (23)
Shoes, Casual	54	1,274	23.59	25 (57)
Boots	16	718	44.88	13 (30)
Other	3	75	25.00	2 (5)
Subtotal	136	3,905	28.71	44 (100)
Lingerie				
Hose	504	1,687	3.35	26 (59)
Socks	275	638	2.32	27 (61)
Slips	7	81	11.57	5 (11)
Camisoles	5	68	13.60	3 (7)
Bras	149	1,836	12.32	35 (80)
Panties	315	907	2.88	36 (82)
Other	-	-	-	-
Subtotal	1,255	5,217	4.16	43 (98)
Accessories				
Umbrellas	3	42	14.00	3 (7)
Hats	5	34	6.80	3 (7)
Gloves	32	293	9.16	19 (43)
Handbags	45	665	14.78	21 (48)
Briefcases	-	-	-	-
Belts	18	124	6.89	9 (20)
Scarves	16	57	3.56	5 (11)
Jewelry	85	441	5.19	14 (32)
Other	1	45	45.00	1 (2)
Subtotal	205	1,701	8.30	34 (77)
Totals	2,233	23,548		

*Percentage of occupational category respondents (n = 44).