

EVALUATION OF CLOTHING EXPENDITURES AND PRACTICES OF  
SELECTED LOW-INCOME FARM FAMILIES OF SOUTHEAST MISSOURI

by

WILHELMINA KATHRYN WENDELL

B. S., Southeast Missouri State Teachers College,  
Cape Girardeau, 1939

---

A THESIS

submitted in partial fulfillment of the

requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Department of Clothing and Textiles

KANSAS STATE COLLEGE  
OF AGRICULTURE AND APPLIED SCIENCE

1944

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	3
REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	5
<b>Minimum Adequate Clothing Budgets for Independent     Low-Income Families.....</b>	6
<b>Minimum Adequate Clothing Budgets for Dependent     Low-Income Families.....</b>	8
Percentage of Family Income Spent for Clothing.....	12
Construction of Clothing at Home.....	12
Buying Practices.....	15
Attitudes Toward Clothing.....	16
PROCEDURE.....	16
FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION.....	18
Family Composition, Personnel and Financial Status....	18
Expenditures for Clothing.....	21
Construction of Clothing at Home.....	30
Purchase of Clothing.....	37
Care of Clothing.....	40
Attitudes Toward Clothing.....	48
SUMMARY.....	53
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	56
LITERATURE CITED.....	57
APPENDIX.....	59

## INTRODUCTION

Rural families comprise an important segment of the population of this country. According to the 1940 census report 43.5 per cent of the population of the United States was rural. With more than 57 million persons in this group, it is of particular importance to learn something about how their clothing problems are met and what they consider essential clothing needs.

Results of studies of the reactions of people to dress show that farm families are more clothes-conscious than they were a generation ago. Formerly the family's social life and activities were centered in the community in which it lived. Due to this isolation change of fashion was of minor importance. The family's social standing was more likely to be measured by ownership of property than by "conspicuous consumption." But with improved communication and transportation greater interest was developed in clothing by rural people.

Rural families in the lowest third of the income group have problems different from the average rural family. Clothing of necessity has held a less important place than food and shelter. The expenditures for dress have been largely for durable, warm work clothing. To stretch the amount allowed for clothing so that everyone in the family could be warmly clad in winter and presentable the year around for school, church, and other gatherings is considered a real achievement for the homemaker. During the last depression it was recognized by the federal government that with assistance and supervision many of these families could be

raised to a higher living level, and as a result be able to contribute more to the nation's welfare. The Farm Security Administration was therefore set up. It gave assistance with credit and with supervision in farm and home management.

Administrators of the Farm Security program felt that clothing was an important factor in the family's growth and well-being. It was considered that the family's wardrobe should be sufficient in kind and amount to protect health, provide for a desirable standard of cleanliness, and to conform to the customs of the cultural group to which the family belonged. In addition to the function of protection of the body, clothing was recognized to be one of the most universal means of self-expression. It is of special interest during adolescence and youth. Even young children may suffer keen humiliation if dressed differently from or more poorly than those with whom they associate at school and at play.

Sound budget planning must be based not only on a recognition of family needs but also on a thorough understanding of family income and other resources. It also calls for managerial skill in using these resources. Skill in sewing has meant much in the successful solution of the problem. The ability to mend and patch so that garments would last and to remodel old clothing has meant clothing thrift. That many women have successfully met the task of clothing their family with small incomes is apparent.

Clothing expenditures vary due to the size of the family, the age of family members, sex, geographical location and the social influences of the community. Clothing needs also vary due to the fact that the purchasing habits, care given clothing, and

individual differences of the person affect the wearing qualities of any garment. If part of the clothes are made at home or if some article can be handed down from one member to another, the expenditure for an individual will be reduced. A much larger percentage of the cash income is usually needed for clothing for farm families than for industrial workers as among farm families, household production, especially of food, is much greater than for urban families.

Interest is often expressed in essential clothing needs as they are met by low income farm families. Information on these needs would be of value to supervising officials of various agricultural agencies and to farm families when formulating their yearly budget. This study was undertaken to determine the clothing expenditures for 1943 of the members of selected families keeping accounts with the Farm Security Administration in Southeast Missouri to determine what percentage of the family's cash income was spent for clothing; to evaluate home practices with regard to clothing expenditures; and to gain information as to whether these families believe they are adequately clothed.

#### REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The interest shown in recent years in clothing expenditures and practices at various income levels has led to numerous studies. Those that bear directly on this investigation may be classified as those dealing with minimum adequate budgets for independent and for dependent low-income families, the percentage of total income used for clothing the family, the construction of

clothing at home, and studies related to individual reactions to clothes and personal appearance.

Minimum Adequate Clothing Budgets for  
Independent Low Income Families

The information available on the clothing expenditures of independent low-income rural families is meager. Sloop (15) in a study of 50 farm families of Kansas, participating in the Farm Security Administration program, found clothing expenditures ranging from \$11.66 to \$175.00 per family with a mean of \$67.88 and a median of \$63.69. The average size of these farm families was 4.1. The net money income ranged from \$290.57 to \$3,574.00 with a mean of \$1,002.20 and a median of \$931.62. In this survey it was found that the average clothing cost for men was \$32.00. The boy 14 years and over spent \$39.36. For the boy five to 13 years old \$16.16 was needed. The cost of clothing for the pre-school boy of two to four years of age was \$10.44. The amount needed for the housewife was \$21.44. Girls 14 years and over averaged \$22.60. The grade school girl of five to 13 years spent \$17.22. The clothing cost of the preschool child of two to four years was \$14.77 and \$26.04 was needed to clothe the infant. From this report it will be noted that replacement for boys 14 years and older exceeded all others and that girls 14 years and older exceeded women's clothing but was less than that for boys.

In each of 13 types of farming sections surveyed in 1935-36 in the Consumer Purchases Study (4) outlays for additions to wardrobes averaged about \$100.00 or less per family at the income

level of \$1000.00 to \$1249.00. Incomes of \$2500.00 were reached before the amount spent per family for clothing was \$200.00. Even at this level three-fourths of the families ranged between \$128.00 and \$183.00. In the \$250.00 to \$499.00 income class three-fourths of the clothing expenditures ranged from \$31.00 to \$60.00 per family. According to the classification in this study there were 13 million families in the lower third whose incomes were under \$780.00. On the average \$47.00 or \$16.00 per person were spent on clothing during the year by this lower third of the families. The average clothing expense for the middle third amounted to \$102.00 for the year or \$32.00 per person.

In the preliminary report of the Kansas Farm Management Association, Gunselman (6) showed that family spending patterns vary with differences in the ages of family members as well as with the size of the family. In this report the families were divided into four classifications based on family size and age of children. This report was concerned with the income and expenditures of 164 Kansas farm families in 1943. These families belonged to the higher income level for rural families. Their farms varied in size from 119 acres to 2,383 acres with an average size of 624 acres. Thirty per cent of the families rented all their land and 45 per cent of the farms owned carried a mortgage. The study reported \$198.00 as the average amount expended per family for the annual clothing budget. Type I with a family of two averaged \$114.00; Type II with an average sized family of 3.48 needed \$178.00; Type III with a family of 4.29 spent \$214.00; Type IV whose average size family was 3.86 used \$285.00. The families

were also grouped according to net income. In the lower group with a net farm income of \$1947.00 and a family size of 3.49, the cost for clothing was \$152.00 per family. The author stated that clothing expenditures tended to increase with the size of the family and also with the increase in the size of the income. The average clothing expenditure for wives amounted to \$65.00 whereas for the husbands it was \$54.00.

That higher income and capital were reflected more in women's clothing expenditures than in men's was reported by Blackmore (1) in her study of 200 farm families. She also stated that the amounts spent on the eldest daughters were more affected by change of income than amounts spent for other family members. Homemakers from 20 to 29 years of age spent more for clothing than other members of the family.

In a survey of clothing expenditures of Kansas farm families White (18) stated that as income decreased the wives reduced their expenditures for clothing and the proportion spent on children increased. Changes of income, size of family, and age of children affected wives' clothing costs more than the husbands'.

#### Minimum Adequate Clothing Budgets for Dependent Low-Income Families

Clothing budgets formulated by social agencies varied widely in amounts allowed the recipients. Geographical location seemed to affect the cost of clothing. Of those budgets reviewed it was found that the states east of the Mississippi river gave higher allowances than did the states to the west of it.

A clothing budget prepared by the Family Welfare Division of the Council of Social Agencies in 1942 (5) was intended as a guide for social workers in estimating clothing costs of families residing in the District of Columbia. It was based on a standard that provided for adequate clothing to allow for changes, for comfort in all seasons, and for cleaning and laundering. Clothing similar in type and quality was priced in several department stores commonly patronized by persons with a minimum amount to spend. Those garments which would give the most service for the least cost, not always the cheapest, were included. This study allowed \$49.97 for an elderly man and \$44.67 for an elderly woman. For a man doing manual labor an allowance of \$67.15 was made, whereas \$70.90 was allowed for the woman at home. The high school boy and boys over 16 years gainfully employed were allowed \$77.76. For the high school girl over 16 years and the girl gainfully employed an allowance of \$95.62 was made. Boys from 13 to 15 years old were allowed \$52.09 and girls of the same age were allowed \$60.88. The 10 to 12 year old boys were allowed \$48.15 and the girls \$51.99. For the seven to nine year boys an allowance of \$44.88 was given, whereas \$40.93 was allowed for the girls. The preschool boy of four to six years was allowed \$42.42 and the girls \$38.77. The child one and one-half to three years was allowed \$36.16 and the infant from birth to one and one-half years was allowed \$18.46.

The public agencies of the midwest have recently revised their clothing lists to fit the rise in prices. The Kansas cloth-

ing budgets (13) now in use quoted the following costs: for an aged incapacitated man, \$31.60; for a man or boy doing manual labor, \$51.07; for boys 14 to 18 years, \$50.45; for boys eight to 14 years, \$37.20; for boys four to eight years, \$25.36; and for boys one to four years, \$23.57. An allowance of \$31.68 was made for the aged woman, \$53.32 for the housewife, \$52.87 for girls 14 to 18, \$37.97 for girls eight to 14, \$22.53 for girls four to eight, \$21.63 for girls one to four and \$25.65 for an infant from birth to one year.

Prices quoted in the Standard Clothing Budgets of Missouri (14) were revised as of March 1944 after making a survey of prices in various sections of Missouri. The clothing prices used represent garments necessary to maintain a minimum supply of decent clothing. The same amount, \$12.00, was allowed for an invalid or semi-invalid man or woman. The amount allowed for a man engaged in clerical work was \$70.00 and for a woman \$84.00. For the woman or girl engaged in factory or domestic work, \$57.60 was allowed; for the man engaged in manual labor, \$58.25; for the housewife, \$34.10; for unemployed girls from 12 to 18, \$39.35; for unemployed boys from 12 to 21, \$36.00; girls and boys from six to 11, \$29.00; children from two to five, \$20.30; and infants under two, \$12.00.

It will be noted that Missouri's clothing budgets, with the exception of allowances made for a man or boy doing manual labor, were much lower than her neighboring state, Kansas.

In cooperation with a committee of Extension clothing special-

ists in the eastern states Hall (7) prepared an estimate based on 1932 prices to be used as a guide for farm family clothing costs. These prices were based on a \$150.00 clothing budget for families of five members. Due to the fact that estimates were made at prewar prices, individual allowances were much lower than those of the New York Budget Council (12) for use of Family Agencies in New York City, based on prices in 1943. In all cases, with the exception of the preschool child, the allowances in this study had increased more than 40 per cent. Amounts allowed in Hall's budgets were \$32.49 for the mother; \$38.95 for the father; \$39.94 for girls 15 to 18 years old; \$31.80 for boys 15 to 18 years; \$30.35 for boys 12 to 14 years; \$27.02 for girls 12 to 14 years; \$24.29 for boys six to 11 years; \$22.89 for girls six to 11; \$21.43 for boys one to five years; and \$31.30 for girls one to five years. The results of this study indicated that the success of this spending plan was dependent upon good care and repair of garments, wise buying and home sewing.

The clothing budget prepared by the Heller Committee (8) in 1942 attempted to set up a standard which would preserve the health and efficiency of a dependent family and enable its children to grow up among their neighbors without being stigmatized and at the same time stay within the limits that a welfare agency might be expected to provide. The investigators admitted that the clothing allowance necessitated a considerable degree of shabbiness. According to their budget an employed man was allowed \$48.97, an unemployed man, \$31.28; a housewife, \$44.32; \$83.48 for employed boys from 18 to 20, with \$109.71 for employed girls of

this age; \$51.37 for boys 14 to 17 and \$54.59 for girls; \$48.38 for boys 12 to 14 and \$42.47 for the girls. The boy nine to 11 was allowed \$38.46 and the girl, \$32.54. For the boys six to eight an allowance of \$31.94 was made and \$27.79 for the girls. The child three to five was given \$21.78 and the child one to two, \$19.48.

#### Percentage of Family Income Spent for Clothing

Studies that have been made of clothing expenditures indicate that as income increases the percentage spent for clothing decreases. Of the 50 billion dollar income of 1935-36, the Consumer Purchases Study showed that five and one-fourth billions or 8.9 per cent was spent for clothing (4). For the Pennsylvania-Ohio group in the income class of \$250.00 to \$499.00 it was found that 11.5 per cent of the income was needed for clothing; in the income class of \$1250.00 to \$1499.00 seven and one-half per cent was spent.

The 1940 report of Income, Family Size and Economics Levels of the Family by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (11) showed that the percentage spent for clothing ranged from 9.4 per cent in the group of expenditures that were less than \$200.00 to 11.6 per cent in the group of expenditures that were \$1200.00 and over.

#### Construction of Clothing at Home

Although investigators in their reports recognize the values of home sewing only a few detailed studies of these practices have been made. The Consumer Purchases Study (4) reported that farm

families owned more sewing machines and did more home sewing than did small city families. The garments made most often at home were for women and younger girls and boys. More cotton yard goods were purchased for women and girls at the upper than at the middle income levels. It was found that 48 per cent of the farm families bought material for home sewing and that only two per cent hired their sewing done.

Jelks (9) in a study of clothing practices among 679 Farm Security families of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi found that 78 per cent of the white families owned sewing machines and 66 per cent of the Negro families. Among the white families, 97 per cent of the mothers made a portion of the families' clothing. Only 29 per cent of the daughters helped with the family sewing. The reason given for this small percentage was that most of the daughters were too young to help. Among the Negro families, 98 per cent of the mothers sewed for their families and 25 per cent of the daughters helped with the clothing construction. House dresses, better dresses and underwear were made by one-fifth of the families. More house dresses than better dresses were made at home and more of both kinds were made for women than for girls. One-sixth of the families "sometimes" made better dresses, house dresses and underwear. The sewing done at home most often for men and boys was the making of work shirts. Four per cent of the families stated that they always made infant wear at home.

Nine per cent was the highest percentage mentioned for any class of garments "never" made at home. Those listed most often were underwear, coats, gowns, and pajamas.

The study of clothing practices of 250 farm and village women in Kansas made by Burtis (2) showed that about 85 per cent of the women sewed for their families. In the farm group 84.6 per cent of the women sewed for themselves and 65.6 per cent never hired any clothing made. Among girls over 14 years of age, 61 per cent frequently helped with the family's clothing construction. In order of frequency, clothing was constructed most often for pre-school, grade school, high school, and adults. A markedly higher percentage of farm women with low incomes made cotton dresses, women's and girls' slips and night clothes than did village women of the same income group. The garments most often listed as "always" made at home were aprons, cotton dresses, night clothes, skirts, slips for women and girls, blouses and better dresses.

The garments most often listed as "never" made at home were boys' and girls' underwear. Cotton and rayon fabrics were used more often than wool or silk. When buying yard goods the housewife's most important considerations were color fastness, thread count, shrinkage and durability. The author also stated that more than 50 per cent of the families remodeled clothing for children. Linn (10) in a study of clothing practices of 200 4-H girls in Kansas found that all the families owned a sewing machine, although the girls listed more ready-made garments than home-made ones, they stated that they were choosing the clothing project in order that they could learn to sew. Approximately one-fourth of the girls made wool and rayon dresses and over 25 per cent made cotton and linen dresses. Slips were made by 32 per cent of the girls and coats by three per cent or less in each age group.

## Buying Practices

Jelks (9) reported that 93 per cent of the mothers selected the yard goods and clothing, in a study of the practices of clients of the Farm Security Administration in southern states. In 18 per cent of the families the fathers selected the material and in 11 per cent of the families the daughters chose the yard goods and clothing.

A little over one-third of the clothing worn by selected high school girls of Kansas City was homemade according to Smith (16). The reasons for wearing homemade clothing by these girls, listed in the order of their importance, were difficulties in being fitted with ready-made garments and inability to obtain the right size or color, or could not afford the ones that did fit.

In Burtis' (2) study the reasons given for buying ready-made clothing were lack of time for home construction, better style, hard to fit, did not like to sew, and thought it was cheaper.

Those homemakers in Jelks' (9) study who purchased most of their clothing said they did not have time to sew, did not like to sew, patterns and materials were not always available, and that they considered some ready-made garments more durable and attractive than home constructed. Those families who made most of the families' clothing stated that they could obtain more becoming styles, a better fit and a better quality of material for the amount of money spent. Also they could use the material on hand.

## Attitudes Toward Clothing

Individual differences in taste and judgment in the selection of garments usually influence the wearer's attitude toward clothing. In the low-income farm group, reported on by Sloop (15), there seemed to be considerable uniformity in their attitudes toward clothing. Ninety-two per cent indicated that expensive clothing was not necessary for good appearance. That a well-chosen inexpensive coat will be appropriate for any occasion was the opinion of 84 per cent of the families. That hats were needed for dress occasions was expressed by 62 per cent. Slightly over 50 per cent believed that a new dress each season was necessary for style. Ninety per cent indicated that color of fabric was important. Only 33 per cent felt that ready-made clothing fit better than homemade. All of the families agreed that ill-fitting garments made the wearers uncomfortable and that clean clothing contributed to one's well-being. Ninety per cent felt that girls enjoyed wearing print dresses to school, and 86 per cent felt that sweaters and skirts were imperative for certain seasons. It was expressed by 96 per cent that overalls were acceptable for grade school and 78 per cent thought they were suitable for high school. Only four per cent of the 50 families stated that they did not have sufficient clothing for warmth.

### PROCEDURE

The cooperation of 50 farm families keeping accounts with the Farm Security Administration was secured for this study. The

homes of these families were distributed throughout the Ozark region of Southeast Missouri. Washington, Iron, St. Francois, St. Genevieve and Carter counties were represented.

A schedule designated as Form I (Appendix) was prepared for recording the clothing expenditures made in 1943 for the various family members. This form was patterned after one which had been used in Missouri by Home Management Supervisors of the Farm Security Administration when helping clients to plan yearly clothing budgets. Space was allowed for tabulating gifts of clothing. Those filling in the form were asked to place a value on these gifts and underline those which were necessary garments and would have been purchased. Schedules identified as Forms II and III (Appendix) were formulated to obtain information on home practices and reactions to present wardrobes. Schedule II provided space for recording the family income, amount spent for family living, and the amount spent for farm expenses, excluding the payment of debts. It was expected that part of the information needed would be taken from the family's Farm and Home Record Book.

The schedules were checked for clarity by presenting them to a Home Management Supervisor and to a trial group of homemakers. Modifications found necessary were made. The schedules accompanied by a letter of explanation and a stamped envelope for return were then mailed to the cooperating families. The data obtained were tabulated and analyzed. Only 45 schedules were filled out completely enough for use.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

## Family Composition, Personnel and Financial Situation

The 45 farm families cooperating in this study lived in the Ozark region of Southeast Missouri, which included six counties: Washington, Iron, St. Francois, St. Genevieve, Carter and Butler. Sixty-six per cent of the families lived in Washington County.

There were 216 persons in the 45 families, and with one exception, all were complete families with father and mother. The report included a total of 66 boys and 61 girls. Thirty-nine of the families had children at home, leaving only six families of two adult members, an average of 4.8 members per family. The average size of these families was larger than that of the typical American family of four members as given in the Consumer Purchases Study (4). This finding supports the trend found in the study (4) that farm families were larger than the average size family of America. The fact that 37 of the families had children at home indicates that the majority of homemakers were still actively engaged in the difficult problem of clothing their families.

Table 1. The size of families represented in the 45 farm families participating in the study.

Size of Family	No. of Families
2 member families	7
3 " "	8
4 " "	5
5 " "	8
6 " "	6
7 " "	6
8 " "	5

According to Table 1, the size of the families ranged from two to eight members. It is interesting to note that there were practically the same number of families in each size group, or seven families in the two-member group; eight in the three-member group; five in the four-member group; eight in the five-member group; six in the six-member group; six in the seven-member group; and five in the eight-member group.

In the group of 45 rural families who participated in this study, there were 44 husbands and 45 wives of varying ages (Table 2). The oldest husband was 63 years of age and the youngest, 25.

Table 2. The family personnel at various age levels of the 45 families of Southeast Missouri participating in this study.

Classification of family members	No. of persons	Age			
		High	Low	Mean	Median
Fathers	44	63	25	42.8	43
Boys 16 or over	13	19	16	16.9	17
" 14-15	11	15	14	14.6	15
" 11-13	11	13	11	12.2	12
" 6-10	18	9	6	7.5	7-8
" 3-5	6	5	3	3.8	3-4
Mothers	45	56	23	39.3	39
Girls 16 or over	4	17	16	16.8	17
" 14-15	11	15	14	14.5	15
" 11-13	11	13	11	11.5	11
" 6-10	19	10	6	7.7	8
" 3-5	10	5	3	3.9	4
Children from birth to 2 yr.	13	2	-	-	-

The mean age for the group was 42.8 years. The oldest wife was 56 years of age and the youngest, 23 years. The mean age for this group was 39.3 years.

The daughters and sons were grouped according to age. The

older group of boys ranged in age from 16 years to 19 years with a mean age of 16.9 and a median of 17 years. There were 13 persons in this group. In the older group of girls there were four persons whose ages ranged from a high of 17 to a low of 16 years with a mean of 16.8 years. There were 11 sons and 11 daughters in the age group of 14 to 15 years. The mean age for the boys was 14.6 years whereas the mean age of the girls was 14.5. In the rapidly growing group, aged 11 to 13 years, there were 11 boys and 11 girls. The mean for the boys was 12.2 years and for the girls, 11.5 years. In the lower grade-school group whose ages ranged from six to 10 years there were 18 boys and 19 girls whose mean age was 7.5 years and 7.7 years, respectively. The preschool group of three to five years included six boys and 10 girls. The mean age of the boys was 3.8 years, the girls 3.9 years. There were 13 children under three years of age.

Table 3. The financial status of 45 farm families of Southeast Missouri who had participated in the Farm Security Program.

No. of families reporting*		High	Low	Mean
32	Cash income	\$2205.92	\$200.00	\$1027.00
27	Amount used for family living	860.00	100.00	361.89
24	Amount used for farm expense	1003.81	23.00	407.43
37	Amount of farm security loan	1543.84	68.00	771.00

\*Complete information was not given by all families.

The cash income of the 32 families reporting this item varied from \$200.00 to \$2205.92 with a mean of \$1027.00 as shown in Table 3. The greatest cash expenditure for family living was \$860.00 and the lowest was \$100.00 with a mean of \$361.89. The cash farm expenditure was slightly higher than family living. The highest was \$1003.81; the lowest was \$23.00 and the mean \$407.43. Thirty-seven of these families had active loans from the Farm Security Administration. These loans ranged from \$68.00 to \$1543.84 per family with a mean of \$771.00 per family.

Table 4. Classification of cash income of 45 farm families of Southeast Missouri.

Income group	Families	
	No.	%
\$200-\$800	15	33.3
801- 1000	4	8.9
1001- 1500	9	20.0
1501- 2500	5	11.1
No income indicated	12	26.7

The families were classified into four income groups as shown in Table 4. One-third of the families fell into the income group of \$200 to \$800. Slightly less than one-tenth had incomes ranging from \$801.00 to \$1000.00. One-fifth of the families fell into the income group of \$1001.00 to \$1500.00, whereas slightly over one-tenth fell into the income group of \$1501.00 to \$2500.00.

#### Expenditures for Clothing

Many factors influence the clothing requirements of the individual. Standards of the family and community are important considerations. The quantity and quality of garments may be limited

by the family's income. A person's work or activities, as well as the care given to the clothing, also may affect the length of wear.

In this study it was found that the average amount spent for clothing by families differed appreciably. As shown in Table 5 the highest cash expenditure per family was \$480.00, the lowest, \$19.65, with a mean of \$155.97. The clothing cost per individual ranged from \$144.20 to no expenditure with a mean of \$32.49. The percentage of cash income used for clothing ranged from a high of 45.6 per cent to a low of 6.5 per cent with a mean of 18.5 per cent.

Table 5. A summary of the cash expenditures for clothing of 45 Southeast Missouri farm families showing family expenditures in relation to individual expenditures and percentage of cash income used for clothing.

Expenditures for Clothing	: High	: Low	: Mean
Clothing expenditure per family	:\$480.00	:\$19.65	:\$155.97
Clothing cost per individual	: 144.20	: 0.00	32.49
Percentage of cash income used for clothing	: 45.6	: 6.5	: 18.5

Sloop (15), in a study of the clothing expenditures of 50 farm families of Kansas, participating in the Farm Security program, reported a cash expenditure of \$11.66 to \$175.00 with an average of \$67.88. Although the average size of the Missouri families was almost one member larger this would not account for the wide difference in expenditures. Geographical factors of the Missouri region might influence the serviceability of clothing.

Gunselman (6) in the 1943 report on 164 Kansas Farm Manage-

ment Association families of a higher income level showed \$198.00 cash expenditure per family with the family size one member less.

The purchases of clothing by these farm families were supplemented by gifts as shown in Table 6. Slightly over 44 per cent of the families received gift clothing. The value of this supplementary clothing according to the reports of the families was \$1171.39 or an average of \$26.62 per family. This amount was 15.4 per cent of the total clothing expenditures. According to Tiffany (17) the 551 farm families in Vermont received gift clothing to the value of \$3.50 per person, \$12.00 per family, or 14.3 per cent of the total value of clothing obtained during the year. This investigation was made in 1935-36. It is interesting to note that in both studies the relationship of gift clothing to the total value was practically the same.

The value of clothing for those families receiving gifts was higher at all age levels, with the exception of boys and girls three to five years old, than for those families not receiving any gifts of clothing. The comparison between the value of clothing for these two groups is interesting. For girls 11 to 13 years old, the value of clothing for those receiving supplements was more than twice as much as for those not receiving any. The value of clothing for both boys and girls 14 to 15 years of age was almost doubled in value when gift clothing was received. The value of clothing for both boys and girls of 16 years and over was increased by one-third or more.

In the age groups the highest percentage of gifts was re-

Table 6. The value of clothing of 45 farm families of Southeast Missouri.

	Purchased wholly from cash income			Cash purchases supplemented by gifts			of clothing			Gifts of necessary clothing			Other gift clothing			Cash expenditures and necessary gifts			Total value of clothing					
	Expenditures			Cash expenditures																				
	No.:	%	High	Low	Mean	No.:	%	High	Low	Mean	No.	High	Low	Mean	No.:	High	Low	Mean	High	Low	Mean	High	Low	Mean
Father	29	65.0	\$95.50	\$15.75	\$45.64	15	34.0	\$70.75	\$18.63	\$37.34	10	\$19.00	\$ 1.00	\$ 8.00	12	\$11.00	\$ .75	\$ 5.14	\$73.50	\$22.25	\$47.21	\$84.50	\$20.63	\$46.78
Boy 16 & over	4	30.8	73.98	24.45	45.34	9	69.2	139.70	16.25	59.98	4	15.05	1.69	5.96	9	25.00	1.50	7.22	144.20	48.54	74.69	145.70	19.23	69.84
Boy 14-15	6	60.0	63.67	18.54	32.57	4	40.0	106.65	21.20	53.49	2	6.50	6.00	6.25	4	5.00	1.50	3.25	112.65	39.04	75.85	114.15	26.20	59.86
Boy 11-13	8	80.0	46.25	18.85	31.36	2	20.0	39.60	26.10	32.85	2	15.00	2.00	8.50		None			54.60	28.10	41.35	54.60	28.10	41.35
Boy 6-10	11	38.9	82.73	9.83	23.91	7	61.1	48.40	3.30	21.75	3	4.00	1.65	3.05	7	17.98	0.50	7.02	48.40	7.30	23.06	48.90	18.70	30.08
Boy 3- 5	9	90.0	64.50	4.70	19.81	1	10.0	6.42	6.42	6.42	0	-	-	-	1	9.42	9.42	9.42	6.42	6.42	6.42	9.42	9.42	9.42
Mother	20	44.5	102.70	10.55	36.25	24	55.5	131.95	5.54	31.47	16	32.00	0.60	11.00	17	71.16	0.76	13.38	131.95	6.27	38.80	134.95	6.27	48.28
Girl 16 over	2	66.6	43.80	28.54	36.17	1	33.3	56.73	56.73	56.73	1	5.25	5.25	5.25	1	3.00	3.00	3.00	61.98	61.98	61.98	64.98	64.98	64.98
Girl 14-15	7	63.6	68.64	18.20	38.54	4	36.4	51.34	15.88	29.43	4	20.00	1.75	11.41	4	67.10	1.50	33.89	55.24	17.63	40.84	70.09	19.13	74.73
Girl 11-13	5	45.5	38.82	13.02	19.68	6	54.5	49.86	11.84	32.20	3	10.00	0.80	6.58	6	30.00	0.60	10.29	49.86	13.59	35.49	58.36	15.09	45.78
Girl 6-10	9	50.0	34.38	8.16	21.42	9	50.5	36.88	8.60	22.47	4	6.00	0.75	2.94	7	4.50	0.20	1.58	36.88	9.35	23.77	41.38	10.35	25.00
Girl 3- 5	2	22.2	30.20	22.01	26.10	7	77.8	32.23	10.36	19.95	2	5.25	4.89	5.07	6	3.50	0.10	1.80	36.47	10.36	7.12	36.47	10.46	22.93
Child birth - 2	5	55.6	22.60	6.10	14.96	4	44.4	31.47	7.65	16.55	4	6.00	2.96	4.37	1	10.60	10.60	10.60	34.43	13.39	20.91	45.03	13.39	23.56

\* One family not included due to insufficient information on value of gift clothing

ceived by the three to five year old girl. Following in order of their importance were: boys 16 years and older, 69.2 per cent; boys six to 10 years, 61.1 per cent; mothers, 55.5 per cent; girls 11 to 13 years, 54.5 per cent; girls six to 10 years, 50.5 per cent; children from birth to two years, 44.4 per cent; boys 14 to 15 years, 40 per cent; girls 14 to 15 years, 36.4 per cent; fathers, 34 per cent; girls 16 years and over, 33.3 per cent; boys 11 to 13 years, 20 per cent, and boys three to five, 10 per cent.

Girls 14 to 15 years and mothers ranked first in the value of necessary gift clothing received with an average per person of slightly over \$11.00. For other gift clothing girls 14 to 15 years ranked first with an average of \$33.89 per girl; boys 11 to 13 years did not receive any.

When the total value of clothing, both cash purchases and gifts, was considered, the pattern for various age levels made some changes in arrangement. Girls 14 to 15 years ranked highest with \$74.73, followed by boys 16 years and over with \$69.84. Girls 16 years and over averaged \$64.98; boys 14 to 15 years, \$59.86; mothers, \$48.28; fathers, \$46.78; girls 11 to 13 years, \$45.78; boys 11 to 13 years, \$41.35; boys six to 10 years, \$30.08; girls six to 10 years, \$25.00; children from birth to two years, \$23.56; and girls three to five years, \$22.93.

When the family purchased the entire supply of clothing the following ranking was found: fathers the largest expenditure, then boys 16 years and over, girls 14 to 15 years, mothers, girls 16 years and over, boys 14 to 15 years, boys 11 to 13 years,

girls three to five years, boys six to 10 years, girls six to 10 years, boys three to five, girls 11 to 13 years and children from birth to two years.

Table 7. The value of clothing purchased plus the necessary gift clothing of 45 families of Southeast Missouri in 1943 at various age levels.

Family members	:No. of : :persons:	Expenditures		
		High	Low	Mean
Father	: 44	:\$ 95.50:	\$ 6.99:	\$43.81
Boys 16 and over	: 13	: 144.20:	18.54:	59.01
" 14 to 15	: 11	: 112.65:	0.00:	38.14
" 11 " 13	: 11	: 54.60:	3.00:	30.60
" 6 " 10	: 18	: 48.40:	7.30:	24.19
" 3 " 5	: 6	: 64.50:	0.00:	23.35
Mother	: 45	: 131.95:	6.29:	36.93
Girls 16 and over	: 4	: 61.98:	28.54:	44.80
" 14 to 15	: 11	: 68.64:	18.20:	38.80
" 11 " 13	: 11	: 49.86:	13.02:	28.38
" 6 " 10	: 19	: 36.88:	0.00:	21.41
" 3 " 5	: 10	: 36.47:	10.36:	21.88
Children from birth to 2	: 13	: 34.43:	5.45:	14.33
	:	:	:	:

According to the expenditures reported by these 45 families of Southeast Missouri the amounts shown in Table 7 were needed to clothe the family members. The expenditures for fathers ranged from \$6.99 to \$95.50 with a mean of \$43.81; boys 16 and over from \$18.54 to \$144.20 with a mean of \$59.01; boys 14 to 15 years from no expenditures to \$112.65 with a mean of \$38.14; boys 11 to 13 years from \$3.00 to \$54.60 with a mean of \$30.60; boys six to 10 years from \$7.30 to \$48.40 with a mean of \$24.19; boys three to five from no expenditures to \$64.50 with a mean of \$23.35. Expenditures for mothers ranged from \$6.29 to \$131.95 with a mean of \$36.93; girls 16 years and older \$28.54 to \$61.98 with a mean of \$44.80; girls 14 to 15 years from \$18.20 to \$68.64 with a mean of

\$38.80; girls 11 to 13 years from \$13.02 to \$49.86 with a mean of \$28.38; girls six to 10 years from no expenditures to \$36.88 with a mean of \$21.41; girls three to five from \$10.36 to \$36.47 with a mean of \$21.88; children from birth to two years from \$5.45 to \$34.43.

According to these findings the boy 16 years and older required a larger cash expenditure for clothing than any other member of the family. Several factors may be responsible. The boy may be attending high school and may require more and better quality of clothing. His social life is broadening therefore dress becomes more important. Due to the present war parents are granting special dispensations to sons of this age. Girls 16 years and over ranked second in amount needed. The average amount required by fathers was somewhat larger than that for mothers. There seemed to be a close relationship between the expenditures for boys and girls in all age groups. Expenditures for boys were slightly higher than for girls.

The relation of expenditures for clothing to cash income, family size and supplementary gifts for the 45 farm families in Southeast Missouri is shown in Table 8. These findings seem to indicate that the size of family reflected little on the amount spent for clothing; that in similar sized families clothing expenditures increased as income increased; and that as income increased for families of every size the percentage spent for clothing did not decrease consistently, although it tended to do so. Expenditures for mothers seemed to increase in the ages above the mean. Family size seemed to have but little influence on this higher expenditure.

**Table 8. Expenditures for clothing cash income, family size, and supplementary gifts for 45 families of Southeast Missouri arranged in order of increasing family expenditures.**

Family size	Expenditures	Gifts of clothing	Income	% of cash income spent for clothing	Expenditure per individual
6	\$ 19.65	*	\$309.83	6.8	\$ 3.27
4	61.70	\$ 15.00			15.43
2	62.70	1.00			31.35
2	65.45	2.00	300.00	21.1	32.73
2	67.07		600.00	11.3	33.54
4	67.50	.60	480.00	14.0	16.88
3	71.83	None	925.00	7.7	23.94
5	76.37	15.77	200.00	38.1	15.29
4	83.07	None			20.77
3	92.77	None			30.92
7	92.91	None	650.00	14.3	13.27
3	93.73	10.00	232.00	40.4	31.24
5	99.53	69.61	440.00	22.6	19.91
3	106.59	10.75	700.00	15.2	35.53
5	107.23	11.50	200.00	13.4	21.45
6	108.78	19.50	1200.00	9.1	18.13
3	110.15	31.51	1175.00	9.3	36.71
3	118.32	29.50	1363.30	8.7	39.44
2	123.99	18.90	1000.00	12.4	61.45
4	126.66	None	785.30	16.5	31.67
2	132.05	None	1135.00	11.6	66.02
3	134.00	None	350.00	38.4	
3	136.19	25.00	2000.00	6.8	
5	140.33	None			
5	144.55	49.50	800.00	18.7	
2	145.55	None			
5	147.24	None			
7	156.83	None			
6	161.19	1.36	1196.00	13.5	
8	162.64	39.70	1450.00	11.2	
2	163.38	None	1200.00	13.6	
6	166.26	None			
8	174.20	20.00	2205.00	7.9	
7	186.37	306.80			
6	193.88	67.00	1550.00	12.5	
5	196.36	79.00			
7	205.99	160.21	871.00	23.6	
5	228.01	44.00	600.00	30.8	
8	248.53	None			
5	263.72	11.75	1000.00	26.4	
8	314.77	17.00	1863.17	16.7	
7	319.31	None	1500.00	21.2	
7	324.51	None	800.00	45.6	
4	334.10	3.00	1500.00	22.3	
6	480.00	49.90	1660.00	28.9	
		Means			
4.9	158.00	24.35	1027.00	18.7	

However, expenditures for fathers tended to be higher in the smaller families.

Table 9 presents for comparison the money allowances for clothing of families cooperating in this study, expenditures of certain groups of independent families, and allowances made by several welfare agencies for dependent families. The average amounts spent annually for clothing by Farm Security families of Missouri were slightly higher than those reported by Sloop (15) for Farm Security families of Kansas with the exception of boys 14 years and over and of children from birth to two years of age.

There was a marked increase in the clothing expenditures of this group when compared with the findings of Consumer Purchases Study (4) in 1935-36, with the exception of boys 14 to 15 years. The higher cost of clothing for the Missouri group may be explained by the increase of prices since 1935. According to a letter sent out by the United States Department of Labor<sup>1</sup> on the percentage change in cost of specified articles of clothing by wage earners and low-salaried workers in large cities of the United States from September, 1939, to December, 1942, the following rise in prices was given: men's cotton work trousers, 37.6 per cent; overalls, 47.2 per cent; work shirts, 51.2 per cent; men's work shoes, 31.6 per cent; wool suits, 31.4 per cent; percale wash dresses, 63.2 per cent; panties, 24.2 per cent; women's shoes, 13.9 per cent; and women's heavy plain coats, 12.4 per cent. These are the articles most frequently purchased by low-

---

<sup>1</sup>United States Department of Labor. Letter. Cost of living. January 29, 1943.

Table 9. Comparison of low-cost clothing budgets.

Individuals	: Allowances based on expenditures :			: Allowances made by welfare agencies :		
	: Sloops (15): Consumer Fur-:	: Kans. F.S.A.: chases study :	: Missouri : Heller Com.:	: Social : San Francisco:	: Security (14): (8) 1943 :	: Council of Social Agencies Washington, D.C. (5) 1943 :
	: Present : study :	: families : -1943 :	: (4) : 1935-36 :			
Fathers	\$43.81	\$32.00	\$29.00	\$58.25	\$48.97	\$67.15
Boys 16 & over	59.01				83.48	77.76
Boys 14-15	38.14	39.36	37.00	36.00	54.59	52.09
Boys 11-13	30.60	16.16	19.00	29.00	42.47	48.15
Boys 6-10	24.19				35.20	44.88
Boys 3- 5	23.35	10.44	12.00	20.30	21.78	42.42
Mothers	37.02	21.44	32.00	34.10	44.32	70.90
Girls 16 & over	44.80				51.37	95.62
Girls 14-15	39.25	22.60	28.00	57.60	54.59	60.88
Girls 11-13	28.38				42.47	51.99
Girls 6-10	21.41	17.22	18.00	29.00	30.14	40.93
Girls 3- 5	21.88	14.77	11.00	20.30	21.78	38.77
Child, birth to 2	14.33	26.04	7.00	12.00	19.48	27.31

income farm families. It will be noted that they have increased in price from one-eighth to approximately two-thirds since 1939.

The mean amounts spent annually for clothing by the family members of this study were comparable to the mean allowances made by the Missouri Social Security for dependent families. Social Security when conducting its survey on rise in prices in rural areas included the counties in which 71.1 per cent of the families of this study lived.

Allowances for what was termed a "minimum adequate" budget for use in social agencies in Washington, D. C., in 1943 were considerably greater than expenditures reported in the present study. Likewise, the amounts in the Heller budgets for dependent families in San Francisco exceeded those of the group in this study.

Differences in amounts may be accounted for by variation in occupation, age, climate, size of family, health, activities and availability of goods. Because of the number of unknown factors affecting these figures, no definite conclusion in regard to adequate amounts can be made unless a specific group be designated.

#### Construction of Clothing at Home

One universal factor influencing economy is the advantage that the family has when some member can sew. This skill enables the family to have more clothes at less expense and aids in keeping the clothing on hand in better condition. Heller (8) found that better quality and workmanship may be obtained at the same price for the budgets set up for girls in the committee's 1943 report if the garments are made at home.

The Farm Security Administration program considered a sewing machine as a necessary part of every family's household equipment if there children in the family.

Therefore, it is not surprising to find that 43 of the 45 families cooperating in this study owned a sewing machine. Jelks (9), in a study of clothing practices of Farm Security families in Arkansas, Louisiana and Mississippi, found that 76 per cent of the white and 66 per cent of the Negro families owned a sewing machine. Burtis (2) in a study of 189 farm families in Kansas, stated that 95 per cent owned this important piece of equipment.

That 43 of the 45 homemakers sewed for their families is shown in Table 10. Only 4.4 per cent did not construct any of their clothing. The employment of a dressmaker was not a common practice among these families as only 11.4 per cent "sometimes" hired sewing done. That sewing was "never" hired done was reported by 84.1 per cent. In a study of 189 farm families (Burtis, (2) found 84.6 per cent of the homemakers sewing for the family and 19 per cent frequently hiring clothing made.

Only 10 homemakers gave any reason for not sewing at home. Three reported that they could buy ready-made clothing just as cheaply. Two stated they did not sew well. The other reasons given for limited sewing were: lack of time, did not like the fit of homemade garments, poor health, and the children were all teenage boys.

Since the amount of home construction of clothing may be influenced by the number of girls and their age distribution, these factors were taken into consideration. It was noted that a number

Table 10. Factors affecting and extent to which home sewing is done in 45 farm homes of Southeast Missouri.

	Families reporting	
	No.	Per cent
Families owning sewing machines	43	95.6
Home sewing		
Sewing for family	43	95.6
Not sewing for family	2	4.4
Dressmaker employed "sometimes"	5	11.4
Dressmaker employed "never"	38	84.1
Participation of 21 families with girls 11 yrs. and over in sewing for self or family		
"Often"	6	28.6
Sometimes	13	61.9
Never	2	9.5
Age group for which sewing was most frequently done		
Preschool	20	45.5
Grade school	24	54.5
High school	3	6.8
Adults	17	38.6
Remodeling old garments		
Made over for children	35	79.5
Dresses	34	77.3
Coats	19	43.2
Pants	13	29.5

of 11 year old daughters were reported as helping with the family's sewing. In this study there were 21 families with daughters 11 years of age and older. It was reported that 28.6 per cent "often" helped with the construction of clothing for self and family, that 61.9 per cent "sometimes" helped and only 9.5 per cent "never" helped. There were only three families with girls in 4-H clubs which would seem to indicate that the girls were being instructed by their mothers or in school courses.

Among this group more sewing was done for grade school chil-

dren than for any other age group, as shown in Table 11. Ranking second was the preschool child; followed by adults, with the high school children ranking last. This placing was different from that given by Burtis (2) which reported the preschool child as ranking first, then adults with the grade school child placing third. In both studies only a small percentage sewed for the high school group.

Table 11. Practices reported by 45 farm families of Southeast Missouri in the selection of materials for home sewing.

Practices	No. persons reporting	Per cent
Persons selecting materials		
Materials for use of mother		
Selected by mother	41	93.2
"    " daughter	2	4.4
"    " both	2	4.4
Materials for use of daughter		
Selected by mother	22	68.7
"    " daughter	7	22.6
"    " both	3	9.7
Materials most used for home sewing		
Cotton	43	95.6
Rayon	5	11.4
Wool	1	2.3
Specific qualities looked for when buying fabrics		
Color fastness	34	77.3
Price	24	52.3
Shrinkage	19	43.2
Closeness of weave	18	40.9
Brand	5	11.4

The ability to remodel one's apparel and make over clothing for other members of the family is considered clothing thrift. Thirty-five or 79.5 per cent of the families reported making over

old clothing for children. The daughters seemed to benefit most from this practice, as 77.3 per cent said they made over dresses. Coats were made over by 43.2 per cent of the families and men's trousers by 29.5 per cent.

Selection of Material. The responsibility for selecting the material for home sewing was most often taken over by the mothers as shown in Table 11. In 93.2 per cent of the cases the mother selected the material for herself and in 68.7 per cent of the cases she selected the material for her daughter. Of the 32 families with daughters, 22.6 per cent of these daughters selected their own material. In 4.4 per cent of the cases they selected the material for the mother. The daughter helped with the selection of her own material 9.7 per cent of the time.

Fabrics Used and Qualities Desired. In the quantity of fabrics of various fibers used in home construction, cotton far exceeded any other, as illustrated in Table 11. This is in agreement with the findings of the Consumer Purchases Study (4) and of Burtis (2). A small amount of rayon was used in the construction of better dresses. Only one family purchased wool material for home construction. This may be due to the high cost of this material and to the fact that these families received considerable gift clothing and remodeled many coats and suits.

Five terms were used in naming qualities looked for when buying yard goods. Four of these terms were considered significant by the homemaker. "Color fastness" placed first with 77.3 per cent. This was followed by "price" with 52.3 per cent. With only a small amount of money available for clothing it can be readily

understood why these two factors ranked highest. "Shrinkage" and "closeness of weave" were the next two qualities most desired. Probably due to lack of information and informative labeling only 11.4 per cent considered the brand name.

Table 12. Frequency with which certain garment types were made at home as reported by 45 farm families of Southeast Missouri.

Garment type	Families reporting					
	Often		Sometimes		Never	
	No. : %	No. : %	No. : %	No. : %	No. : %	
Aprons	41	90.9	2	4.5	1	2.3
House dresses	35	79.5	5	11.1	2	4.5
Women's slips	32	72.7	5	11.1	5	11.1
Night clothes	31	70.3	7	13.6	2	4.5
Girls' slips	25	56.8	3	4.5	9	20.5
School dresses	23	51.1	4	6.8	14	31.1
Women's panties	23	51.1	8	17.8	13	29.5
Skirts	21	46.7	12	26.7	10	22.9
Blouses	20	45.5	14	31.1	8	17.8
Girls' panties	20	45.5	6	13.3	13	28.9
Baby garments	13	28.9	4	8.9	23	51.1
Sheets	12	26.7	12	26.7	16	35.6
Better dresses	11	24.4	12	26.7	13	28.9
Coats	6	13.3	16	35.6	18	40.0
Bra., women's	5	11.1	12	26.7	21	46.7
Underwear, boys'	4	8.9	12	26.7	23	51.1
Underwear, men's	4	8.9	8	17.8	30	66.7
Sweaters	2	4.5	2	4.5	36	80.0

Frequency with Which Certain Garments Were Made at Home. It is apparent from the results presented in Table 12 that those garments most often reported as "often" made at home were aprons, house dresses, women's slips, night clothes, girls' slips, school dresses, and women's panties. It will be noted that from 51.1 to 90.9 per cent of the women participating frequently constructed these garments at home. That aprons ranked highest was probably due to the fact that they can be made from small quantities

of material, flour or feed sacks, and from old garments. That better quality house dresses may be had at a lower cost if constructed at home was often expressed by homemakers and may be the reason why the construction of this garment ranked second with almost 80 per cent. About 50 per cent of the reports showed that school dresses, skirts, blouses and women's and girls' panties were "often" made at home.

The garment most often reported as "sometimes" made at home was coats. This agrees with the findings of Burtis (2). In more than one-fourth of the cases blouses, skirts, shirts, girls' panties, and women's brassieres were "sometimes" made at home. The report of the practice of constructing better dresses was almost equally divided among "often", "sometimes" and "never". Another garment closely following this ranking was men's shirts. In answer to the question, "Which garments do you never make at home" sweaters led the other garment types with 79.5 per cent. This practice is time consuming, therefore the active farm woman may not find it practical. Other garments most often listed as never made at home were men's and boys' underwear, baby garments, women's brassieres and coats. The fact that only 13 or 29 per cent of the families had children two years of age or under may account for slightly over 50 per cent "never" making baby garments.

These findings were very similar to those of Jelks (9) who reported more house dresses than better dresses being made at home and that more of both kinds were made for women than for girls. This author also stated that a very small percentage made infants' wear and women's and girls' coats. Blackmore (1) found that one-

half or more of the aprons, work dresses, slips, night wear and cotton dresses were made at home. According to Burtis (2) a markedly higher percentage of farm women with low incomes made cotton dresses, women's slips, night clothes and girls' slips than village women of the same income class. The investigator also stated that garments most often listed as "always" made at home were aprons, cotton dresses, night clothes, skirts, women's slips, blouses, girls' slips and better dresses.

### Purchase of Clothing

Certain factors relating to the purchase of ready-made clothing were considered in this study. The place of purchase, reasons for buying ready-made, and practices when buying were included.

Place of Purchase. That most of the purchases were made at the local stores is reflected in Table 13. Eight of the 12 types of garments listed were more often purchased locally than by mail order or in a larger town. Three of the remaining were purchased more frequently from mail order houses than in larger towns. Over 60 per cent of the families purchased yard goods, overalls, work shirts, and shoes locally. Other garments more frequently purchased locally were hose, undergarments, hats and house dresses. The purchase of children's clothing was equally divided between local stores and mail order, with only a small percentage being purchased in larger towns. The mail order house was preferred for the buying of sweaters, better dresses and suits, with slightly over 40 per cent using this source. The frequency of

purchasing the 12 types of articles from mail order houses was practically the same. This preference ranged from 24 per cent to 43 per cent of the families. The purchases most often made in larger towns were better dresses and hats. These purchasing practices were similar to those reported by other investigators. Coles (3) in the study of practices of Missouri homemakers found that 42 per cent of small town buyers most frequently purchased ready-made dresses from mail order houses whereas this study showed 43 per cent. She also stated that buyers generally patronized local stores in the purchase of yard goods. The garments usually purchased locally according to Burtis' (2) study were underwear, hose, hats, dresses, and yard goods. A majority of the 4-H girls in Linn's (10) study purchased yard goods from local stores.

Table 13. Number and percentage of the 45 Southeast Missouri farm families reporting purchases of garments in local stores, by mail order houses, and in larger stores.

Articles	:Local stores		: Mail order		: Larger stores	
	: No.	:	: No.	:	: No.	:
	:families:	%	:families:	%	:families:	%
Suits	8	18.1	18	40.0	8	18.2
Better dresses	5	11.1	19	43.2	12	26.7
House dresses	13	28.9	11	24.7	4	9.1
Sweaters	9	20.5	19	43.2	6	13.6
Hats	14	31.8	13	28.9	11	24.7
Shoes	27	60.0	12	26.7	9	20.5
Hose	25	56.8	12	26.7	6	13.6
Undergarments	21	47.7	13	28.9	4	6.8
Yard goods	29	64.4	13	28.9	3	6.8
Overalls	27	60.0	14	31.1	5	11.4
Work shirts	27	60.0	15	34.1	5	11.4
Children's clothing	15	34.1	15	34.1	6	13.6

Reasons for Buying Ready-to-Wear Dresses. As a large propor-

tion of the families made their better dresses this question did not apply to the group as a whole. It was stated that better dresses were "always" purchased by 28.9 per cent and "sometimes" by 26.7 per cent of the group. The most important reason given was "better style". Others, in order of their frequency, were: lack of time for home construction, believed they saved money, did not like to sew, hard to fit, lack of skill, material hard to get, poor health, and for unusual occasions as weddings and funerals. Again this agrees with Burtis' (2) study only that the two principal reasons were given in reverse order.

Table 14. Buying practices for ready-made garments by 45 farm families of Southeast Missouri.

Buying of clothing	:Families reporting	
	: No.	: %
When bought		
When needed	27	60.0
When cash is available	22	48.9
End of season sale	4	8.9
First of season	2	4.4
Reasons for buying ready-made garments		
Like style better	11	24.7
Lack of time	8	18.2
Save money	6	13.6
Do not like to sew	3	6.8
Hard to fit	2	4.5
Lack of skill	2	4.5
For unusual occasions	1	2.3

It is shown in Table 14 that 60 per cent of the families purchased clothing when needed, and 48.9 per cent when cash was available. About one-tenth of the families took advantage of end-of-the-season sales, whereas 4.4 per cent purchased at the first of the season. It may be assumed that these families are

not influenced as much by fashion as by need and availability of funds.

### Care of Clothing

It is recognized that proper care will lengthen the life of garments. Certain practices such as laundering, dry cleaning and storage were considered important to this investigation.

Laundering. Two-thirds of the 45 Missouri homemakers used the tub and washboard in doing the laundry. Only a small percentage lived where electricity was available, therefore only 6.7 per cent reported the use of this power. The gas motor washer, an important piece of labor-saving equipment, ranked second in use, with 27.2 per cent. The hand washer was used by 11.3 per cent of the families. Only one family ever hired laundering done.

Practices in Laundering. The boiling of white clothes seemed to be a prevalent practice among this group as 75.6 per cent reported that they "always" boiled white clothes. Eleven per cent "sometimes" boiled these clothes whereas 13.3 per cent "never" did.

The most important utensil used for boiling was the iron kettle placed on an outside fire. This method was used by 53.3 per cent. A lard can was used by 22.8 per cent of the families for boiling the clothes. Only 15.8 per cent used a regular wash boiler. Farm families have many uses for the large iron kettle which may account for its prevalent use in laundering. The lard can may be used on a small stove and can be purchased at the local store for a small price perhaps accounting for its frequent

use. The kitchen stove was used by 45.5 per cent of the families for boiling clothes. The practice of hanging the laundry outside to dry the year round was reported by 91.1 per cent of the families. In 20.5 per cent of the homes there was a laundry room for storing the laundry equipment. The farm's smoke-house was most frequently used as a place of storage. One-fifth of the families stored washing equipment on the back porch. Four families did not have any storage place and the equipment was left outside.

Dry Cleaning. Such garments as coats, suits, and better dresses may be cleaned more satisfactorily by dry cleaning than by laundering. Slightly over half of the homemakers reported that they "often" dry cleaned garments. Five per cent followed this practice occasionally, whereas 35.6 per cent "never" tried to do their own dry cleaning. The fluid used most often was white gasoline as shown in Table 15. Other fluids used were naphtha, energene, dry cleaner and "cleaner's gas." These findings closely follow those of Burtis (2) who reported 57 per cent of the women doing their own dry cleaning and that the fluid used was some brand of gasoline. The most common reason given for not doing their own dry cleaning was a lack of knowledge as to how it should be done. The articles most often sent to the commercial cleaner were coats, suits, pants, and better dresses. Approximately 30 per cent of the families sent the above named garments to the cleaner. These were usually taken by the family when making a trip to town. Other methods of transportation used were: by the mail carrier, by bus, by children in high school and sent

Table 15. Methods and practices of laundering and dry cleaning reported by 45 Southeast Missouri farm families.

	<u>No.</u>	<u>Per cent</u>
<b>Power used in laundering</b>		
Tub and board	30	66.7
Gas motor washer	12	27.2
Hand washer	5	11.3
Electric washer	3	6.7
Hired done	1	2.2
<b>Practices in laundering</b>		
<b>Boiling of white clothes</b>		
Always	34	75.6
Sometimes	5	11.1
Never	6	13.3
<b>Utensil used for boiling</b>		
Iron kettle	27	53.3
Lard can	10	22.8
Wash boiler	7	15.8
Wash tub	2	4.4
Granite canner	1	2.2
<b>Place of boiling</b>		
Outside open fire	24	53.3
Kitchen stove	20	45.5
Stove in laundry house	1	2.3
<b>Outside drying of clothes in winter</b>		
Always	41	91.1
Sometimes	4	8.9
<b>Storage of equipment</b>		
Smokehouse	12	27.3
Laundry house	9	20.5
Back porch	9	20.5
House	5	11.4
Basement	4	9.1
Outside	4	9.1
Brooder house	1	2.3
<b>Dry cleaning done by family</b>		
Often	23	51.1
Occasionally	5	11.1
Never	15	35.6
<b>Fluid used</b>		
Naphtha	1	2.3
White gasoline	12	27.3
Energene	1	2.3
Dry cleaner	1	2.3
Cleaners gas	1	2.3
Brush with warm water	1	2.3

Table 15 (Concl.).

	No.	Per cent
Articles sent to commercial cleaner		
Dresses	12	27.3
Coats	14	31.8
Suits and trousers	13	29.5
Reasons for not dry cleaning		
Do not know how	6	13.6
Very little to be done	2	4.5
Do not have time	1	2.3
Too dangerous	1	2.3
Rather trust work of experienced person	2	4.5

to children living in a city. The distance which the articles had to be taken ranged from five to 30 miles. The average of the distances reported was 13 miles, not including those sent to St. Louis.

Storage of Clothing. Clothes closets and hangers were considered important factors in helping to care for clothes. Thirty-one of the families stated the house provided closets whereas 12 families did not have this storage space. All families reported the ownership of hangers.

Table 16. Moth preventive used by 45 farm families of Southeast Missouri and their effectiveness as evaluated by these homemakers.

Preventive	: Claims of effectiveness							
	Women using:		Always		Part of the time		No reply	
	No. :	% :	No. :	% :	No. :	% :	No. :	% :
Mothballs	29	64.4	13	44.8	5	17.2	12	41.4
Moth flakes	3	6.8	3	100.0	-	-	-	-
Fly spray	2	4.5	2	100.0	-	-	-	-
Cedar chest	2	4.5	2	100.0	-	-	-	-
Turpentine	1	2.3	-	-	1	100.0	-	-
Air garments	1	2.3	1	100.0	-	-	-	-
Cellophane bags	1	2.3	1	100.0	-	-	-	-

Thirty-four families designated that some precaution was

taken to protect stored garments from destruction by moths. The preventive most frequently used as shown in Table 16 was moth balls. This method was used by 64.4 per cent of the 45 homemakers. However, this method was reported as not always effective. Of this number 44.8 per cent found it always effective, 17.2 per cent not always effective, and 41.4 per cent gave no reply as to its effectiveness. Three families used "moth flakes" and found them very satisfactory. Other methods used which the homemakers claimed were always effective were: fly spray, storage in a cedar chest, cleaning and airing, and placing garments in cellophane bags. When asked to indicate information which would help homemakers take better care of clothing, 22.9 per cent mentioned moth control. This seems to show that the moth problem has not been satisfactorily met in many homes.

Care of Shoes. The purchase of shoes was one of the most expensive items on the clothing budget. This can be readily understood by those familiar with the region where these families lived. The land was very rough and rocky. It was considered desirable to include in this study consideration of the care and repair of this article of clothing.

Measures to prolong the life of shoes were being taken by these Missouri families (see Table 17). Shoes were kept well polished or oiled by 93.3 per cent of the families. All but one family wore repaired shoes. Of this number 15.6 per cent of the families did their own repair, with 22.2 per cent doing it part of the time. Sixty per cent of the families reporting shoe repair had it done by some skilled worker. It is recognized that

Table 17. Care and repair of shoes as reported by 45 farm families of Southeast Missouri.

Practices	Families reporting					
					Part time	
	Yes:	%	No	%	No.	%
Kept well polished or oiled	42	93.3	2	4.4	1	2.2
Shoes repaired	44	97.8	1	2.2	0	
Repaired at home	7	15.6	28	62.2	10	22.2
Every member had galoshes	28	62.2	17	37.8		

the use of galoshes prolongs the life of shoes. Slightly over 60 per cent of the families reported every member having this article. In answer to the question, "Which members got along without galoshes?" the following information was given: eight mothers were without this shoe protection and the small children in the family ranked next. Three families reported that all members did without, two that all the children did without, two that older sons did without, two that high school girls did without and one case in which the husband did without.

#### Desired Improvements and Assistance in Caring for Clothes.

Specific ways which the homemakers felt would aid in taking care of clothing in the home are recorded in Table 18. More and better storage space and better cooperation of the family members seemed to be most desired. More closet space was desired by 42.2 per cent, closets located where needed by 18.2 per cent, better arrangement of the closets by 9.1 per cent, more rods and shelves by 13.6 per cent. From these statements it is apparent that the homes of these low-income farm families do not provide

adequate closet space for proper care of clothing. That the problem of moth control has not been satisfactorily met by these families was indicated by the desire of 34.1 per cent for better storage for winter garments. The need for more clothes hangers was checked by 11.4 per cent. Almost 30 per cent of the homemakers felt a need for more drawer space. Although 41 families checked the possession of an ironing board, 15.9 per cent stated a "good" ironing board was needed. Four families did not own an ironing board. A blanket on the kitchen table was used as a substitute which makes the task of ironing outer garments quite difficult. That more cooperation of family members would aid the housewives in the care of the family's clothing was stated by 38.6 per cent.

Table 18. Indicated desired improvements for taking care of clothing in the home as reported by 45 Southeast Missouri farm families.

Desired improvements	Homemakers	
	No.	%
More closet space	19	42.2
Cooperation of family members	17	38.6
Better storage of winter garments	15	34.1
More drawer space	13	29.5
Closets located where needed	8	18.2
Good ironing board	7	15.9
Rods and shelves	6	13.6
More clothes hangers	5	11.4
Better arrangement of closets	4	9.1

There were a number of problems relating to clothing construction and care with which these 45 homemakers desired assistance as shown in Table 19. It will be recalled in the

Table 19. Problems related to the construction and care of clothing on which the homemakers of 45 farm families in Southeast Missouri desired assistance.

Type of information desired	Homemakers	
	No.	%
<b>Construction problems</b>		
Construction of buttonholes	14	31.8
Alteration of patterns	11	24.5
Remodel clothing	11	24.5
How to apply trimming	9	20.5
Adjust sewing machine	9	20.5
Fitting of garments	8	18.2
Buying information	4	9.1
Use of sewing machine attachments	1	2.3
<b>Information desired</b>		
Stain removal	14	31.8
Dry-cleaning	14	31.8
Moth control	10	22.9
Clothing plan	4	9.1
Storage	3	6.8
Garment repair	2	4.5

reasons for not sewing that the lack of skill ranked second. The construction problem which seemed to be most difficult was the making of neat buttonholes. About one-third desired assistance with this problem. Approximately one-fourth of the homemakers designated they would like instruction on alteration of patterns and the remodeling of old clothing. The remodeling and making over of old clothing was a common practice among these families. To do this well requires skill and ingenuity, therefore it is not surprising that these women desired information concerning these skills. About one-fifth of the families stated they would like help in adjusting the sewing machine, in applying trimming neatly, and fitting garments properly. A need was felt by only about one-tenth of the homemakers for buying information, which might suggest that the clothing purchased was giving ex-

pected or satisfactory service. One mother wanted assistance in using the sewing machine attachments. She felt that this skill would be a time saver in sewing for her family of small children.

That these homemakers seem very conscious that proper care of clothing could insure more service with greater satisfaction is reflected by their desire for certain information designated in Table 19. Home dry cleaning, and how to remove stains headed the list with 31.8 per cent of the families desiring information on processes to use. They had stated as the principal reason for not doing home dry cleaning that they did not understand how to do it, therefore they would rather rely upon the work of an experienced person. Only one person recognized the danger of the practice. That moths were presenting a problem seemed evident as 22.9 per cent would like information on effective methods of control. In the group, 9.1 per cent stated a desire for information on how to make clothing plans for their families. This seems to indicate that families are accepting the advisability of long time planning as beneficial to their welfare. The majority of the families reported that they did not find mending difficult but that there was a lack of time and there were more important things to do. However, 4.5 per cent felt the need of additional skill in garment repair.

#### Attitudes Toward Clothing

The contention that clothing may contribute to the physical and mental well-being of the individual is generally recognized.

Clothes, then, should contribute to a sense of security; they should fit the wearer and the occasion. It is obvious that clothes-consciousness should be avoided. The feeling of satisfaction with one's clothing doubtlessly contributes to one's happiness, personal ability, and efficiency.

Replies to questions in regard to attitudes and satisfactions contributed by the clothing of this group of Missouri farm families are recorded in Table 20. It is interesting to note that all reported that expensive clothes are unnecessary for a good appearance. Whether a man needed a three-piece suit for dress-up occasions was not so generally agreed upon. Forty per cent thought it was necessary, whereas 51.1 per cent did not. A small percentage qualified their answers by saying that the appropriateness of dress would be determined by the occasion. It was expressed by 91.1 per cent that with careful choosing an inexpensive coat that will fit any occasion can be purchased. Opinions varied as to whether a new dress-up dress was needed each season for women and girls in order to keep in style. It was not considered necessary by 46.7 per cent, whereas 37.8 per cent deemed it essential. Hats for dress-up occasions were reported necessary by 58.9 per cent of the group. These findings, with the exception of the attitude toward a new dress-up dress each season, agreed with those of Sloop (15) who reported that 92 per cent felt that expensive clothes were not necessary for good appearance; that 84 per cent believed an inexpensive coat could be purchased to fit any occasion; and that 62 per cent considered hats necessary for dress-up occasions. A much larger percentage of the Kansas farm group

Table 20. Clothing attitudes as reported by 45 Southeast Missouri families showing the number and percentage of affirmative, negative, and qualified answers.

Questions	Answers					
	Yes		No		Qualified	
	No.:	%	No.:	%	No.:	%
Does putting clothes on hangers help to keep them good looking?	45	100.0	-	-	-	-
Do you feel more dressed up in a ready-made dress than in a homemade dress if they are made of the same material?	7	15.7	33	73.3		
Do you think a person should have expensive clothes to look well dressed?			45	100.0		
Does a man need a three piece suit for dress up?	18	40.0	23	51.1	3	6.6
When you are dressed up in clean clothes does it make you feel "like a different person"?	43	95.6				
Does everyone in your family have enough clothes to keep warm?	41	91.1	2	4.4		
By choosing carefully can a person find an inexpensive coat that will look well for any occasion?	41	91.1	1	2.2		
Do you give much attention to the color of the material when choosing clothes for a particular member of the family?	37	82.2	3	6.6		
Will a garment that does not fit make the wearer feel uncomfortable?	43	95.6	0			
Do you think ready made clothes fit better than home made ones?	9	20.0	23	51.1	12	26.7
Can the usefulness of a garment be extended by careful mending and patching?	41	91.1	3	6.6		
Do members of your family need hats for dress up occasions?	26	58.9	11	24.4	1	2.2
Does a woman or a girl need a new dress up dress each season if she keeps in style?	17	37.8	21	46.7	1	2.2
Could members of your family get along with fewer clothes than they now have and yet be warmly dressed and have enough to attend work, school and church?	6	13.3	37	82.2		
Do girls enjoy wearing print dresses to grade school?	34	75.6	2	4.4	1	2.2
Do girls enjoy wearing print dresses to high school?	18	40.0	12	26.7	3	6.6
Are skirts and sweaters necessary for school wear?	28	62.2	11	24.4	3	6.6
Are overalls satisfactory for boys to wear to grade school?	41	91.1	0			
Are overalls satisfactory for boys to wear to high school?	13	28.9	19	42.2	2	4.4
Does a girl look more dressed up in a well fitting cotton print dress than in an old sweater and skirt?	36	80.0	4	8.9		

felt a dress-up dress was needed each season for style.

It was agreed by three-fourths of the group that the wearing of print dresses was enjoyed by grade school children. This attitude was reflected for high school girls by 40 per cent of the group. Slightly over one-fourth of the group felt that high school girls did not enjoy wearing print dresses to school. Sweaters and skirts were considered essential for school girls by 62.2 per cent of the group, whereas one-fourth felt they were not essential.

Overalls for wear in grade school was considered acceptable by the 41 families answering the question. But overalls for high school boys did not meet with favor as only 28.9 per cent considered them satisfactory. Several mothers commented that the size and location of the school would be the determining factor.

All agreed that an ill-fitting garment made the wearer uncomfortable. Approximately three-fourths of the group considered a home constructed dress, if made of the same type and quality of material, as desirable as one ready-made. Slightly over one-half of the group believed that ready-made dresses did not fit better than home constructed, and 26.7 per cent qualified their answers by suggesting that the price of the article and the skill of the seamstress might be determining factors. A well-fitted cotton dress was considered more attractive than an ill-shapen sweater and skirt. The findings of Sloop (15) are very similar. There is a more favorable reaction to home constructed garments by the Missouri group than that of Kansas.

All agreed that putting clothes on hangers helped to retain

their good appearance. That careful mending and patching extended the usefulness of garments was reported by 91.1 per cent.

The choice of color for individual members of the family was important to 82.2 per cent of the homemakers.

According to the entire group clean clothes contributed to a sense of well-being.

Every family reporting indicated that each member had sufficient clothing for warmth. It was interesting to note that 13.3 per cent stated that members of their families could get along with fewer clothes and yet be warmly dressed and have enough for work, school, and church.

In order to further investigate satisfactions with present wardrobes a question on participation of these families in community activities was asked. The belief that one must feel that he belongs to the community in which he lives in order to be happy, content and successful is generally accepted. In this group, according to reported answers, 20 mothers attended church, clubs or lodges regularly; 14 attended sometimes, or a total of 34 mothers took some active part in community activities. Eleven fathers attended church, clubs and lodges regularly; 15 sometimes; making a total of 26 fathers entering active community life. Children of 13 families attended church and clubs regularly; 13 sometimes; making a total of 26 families whose children all participated in some community activity aside from those sponsored by the schools attended. Ten families did not reply to this question. Several commented that their non-participation was due to the family's isolation. The nearest church was from eight to 15 miles

and a woman's club did not exist in the community.

The replies received from this group seem to indicate that they were satisfied with their clothing. Although some felt they could use more, their wardrobes were extensive enough for comfort, health, and activity in community life.

#### SUMMARY

A study was made of the clothing expenditures for 1943 of members of selected families keeping accounts with the Farm Security Administration in Southeast Missouri.

The families participating in this study consisted of 216 persons with a mean of 4.8 per family. All were complete families with the exception of one. Of these families, 39 had children at home, and six either had no children or none at home.

The total cash income per family for the year 1943 varied from \$200.00 to \$2,205.92 with a mean of \$1,027.00. One-third of the families had cash incomes of \$800.00 or below. Thirty-seven of the families had an active Federal government loan of between \$68.00 and \$1,543.84 with a mean of \$771.00.

The annual cash expenditure for clothing per family varied from \$19.65 to \$480.00 with a mean of \$155.97. The clothing costs per person ranged from no expenditure to \$144.20 with a mean of \$32.49. The percentage of cash income used for clothing the family members varied from 6.5 to 45.6 per cent, with an average of 18.5 per cent.

The highest clothing costs were for boys 16 years and older, with girls of this age ranking second. The lowest expenditure

was for children from birth to two years. There seemed to be a close relation between the expenditures for boys and girls of the various age groups. Expenditures for boys were slightly higher than for girls. The amount spent for clothing for fathers was higher than that for mothers.

The purchases of clothing for these farm families were supplemented with gifts. The mean value of clothing received as gifts was \$26.62 per family. Clothing for girls 14 to 15 years ranked highest in value of gift clothing received. The value of clothing for those families receiving gifts was higher at all age levels, with the exception of girls and boys three to five, than for those families not receiving gifts of clothing.

The relation of expenditures for clothing to cash income seemed to indicate that the size of family had little effect on the amount spent for clothing; that in similar sized families clothing expenditures increased as income increased; and that as income increased for families of every size, the percentage spent for clothing tended to decrease but not consistently. Expenditures for the older mothers were greater than for the younger ones regardless of family size. However, expenditures for fathers tended to be higher in the smaller families.

Home construction of clothing was an important practice among these families. Of the 45 families 95.6 per cent owned sewing machines; this same percentage of the homemakers sewed for their families; and 90.5 per cent of the girls 11 years of age and older helped with family clothing construction. The age groups for which the most sewing was done, in order of frequency,

were grade school, preschool, adults and high school.

The responsibility for selecting material for home construction was generally assumed by the mother. Cotton material was most often used. Colorfastness and price were the factors considered most important when purchasing clothing.

Garments most often listed as "always" made at home were: aprons, house dresses, school dresses, and women's and girls' slips and night clothes. Those most often listed as "never" made at home were: sweaters, men's and boys' underwear, coats, better dresses, shirts and baby garments.

Ready-made clothing was usually purchased when needed and when money was available. The local store was the place of purchase most often indicated.

The laundering of clothes was done in the home by the majority of families. About one-half of the families often dry-cleaned garments at home. Some type of moth preventive was used by approximately three-fourths of the families.

Most of the homemakers indicated that they desired assistance on construction problems and in care of clothing.

As a whole the families regarded their wardrobes as satisfactory--extensive enough for comfort, health and activities in community life.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Appreciation is expressed to Professor Alpha Latzke, major instructor and head of the department, for her time and effort in directing this problem; and to the 45 families who cooperated in this study.

## LITERATURE CITED

- (1) Blackmore, Beulah.

Clothing purchased by farm families in Tompkins County, New York. Cornell Univ. Expt. Sta. Bul. 615. 44 p. 1927.

- (2) Burtis, Margaret Kirby.

The clothing practices of 250 farm and village women of Kansas. Unpublished thesis. Kansas State College of Agr. and App. Sci. 64 p. 1943.

- (3) Coles, Jessie V.

Consumers demand in Missouri for selected articles of clothing. Univ. of Missouri Expt. Sta. Bul. 300. 58 p. 1939.

- (4) Consumer Purchases Study.

Family expenditures for clothing. Farm Series U. S. Dept. Agr. Misc. Pub. 428. 386 p. 1936.

- (5) Council of Social Agencies, Washington, D. C.

Minimum adequate budget guide. Family Welfare Division. 63 p. 1942.

- (6) Gunselman, Myrtle A.

The cost of living in 164 Kansas farm management association families as it relates to the farm income. Preliminary Report. Agr. Expt. Sta. Kansas State College of Agr. and App. Sci. 15 p. 1943.

- (7) Hall, Florence.

\$150 clothing budgets for a farm family of five members. Ext. Services. U. S. Dept. Agr. Washington, D. C. 6 p. 1932.

- (8) Heller Committee for Research in Social Economics.

Clothing and house furnishings allowances. Univ. of California. 49 p. 1942.

- (9) Jelks, Vivian Freddie.

A survey of clothing practices of clients of the Farm Security Administration in the states of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. Unpublished thesis. Univ. of Alabama. 65 p. 1940.

(10) Linn, Alice.

A study of the clothing practices of a selected group of 4-H girls in Kansas. Unpublished thesis. Kansas State College of Agr. and App. Sci. 80 p. 1939.

(11) Monthly Labor Review. U. S. Bur. Labor Statis.

Income, family size, and the economic level of the family. Jan. 1940.

(12) New York Budget Council.

Budget standards for family agencies in New York City. 51 p. 1944.

(13) State Department of Social Welfare. Topeka, Kansas.

Clothing requirements of individual. 15 p. 1943.

(14) State Social Security Commission of Missouri.

Factual Information. Jefferson City. 30 p. 1944.

(15) Sloop, Frieda A.

Clothing budgets for low income families in rural Kansas. Unpublished thesis. Kansas State College of Agr. and App. Sci. 63 p. 1944.

(16) Smith, Daphyne Vivian.

The activities of a selected group of high school girls with reference to clothing. Unpublished thesis. Kansas State College of Agr. and App. Sci. 72 p. 1937.

(17) Tiffany, Margaret E.

Clothing consumption of 299 village and 551 farm families in Vermont. Univ. of Vermont. Agr. Expt. Sta. Buâ. 451. 48 p. 1939.

(18) White, Leola Jane.

A study of clothing expenditures of 100 Kansas farm families. Unpublished thesis. Kansas State College of Agr. and App. Sci. 59 p. 1930.

**APPENDIX**

Manhattan, Kansas  
March 21, 1944

Dear Mr. and Mrs.

At the beginning of each year when you work out your family budget there always comes the question as to how much money will be needed for clothing the family. Then you sit down with paper and pencil and begin trying to estimate the needs of each member of the family.

Did you ever sit down at the end of the year with your paper and pencil and figure out what was actually purchased for each member of your family and the total cost? This information might be valuable to you when planning for another year and I am sure it would be of value to the home management supervisors of Missouri when they help new families plan their clothing budgets.

This is a day when we are all trying to help each other. I am sure that you are more than willing to do your part.

I am asking fifty farm families to list on the enclosed blanks the clothing they purchased for each member of the family for 1943. If you have entered all clothing purchased in your record book it will not take very long to fill in the blanks. Be sure to include all the garments you made from the nice flour and feed sacks we get now. If you have not kept a record of all purchases you might ask the older children to make you a list of all the new clothing they got during 1943. Then you should check over their lists carefully to make sure that they have not forgotten a few articles.

I would also like to make a study of clothing practices among farm families so please fill in the answers to the enclosed questions. These will help me in planning work for my girls at school.

I am attending school at the present time and will use the material in a course I am taking. So will you please fill in the blanks and return them to me by April 7th? You will find a self-addressed, stamped envelope enclosed.

## CLOTHING COSTS

Directions for filling out the blanks on the amount of clothing purchased during 1943 for the different members of the family.

1. Include all members of your family that were at home all or part of the year of 1943. Give age of person at the top of the space provided, then follow with the clothing purchased.

2. Under number place the number of items purchased as; 1, 2, 3, etc. Under cost place the total price of all the items purchased. That is if you bought 2 dresses and each cost \$1.50 your entry would be 2 dresses, cost \$3.00. List only garments bought during 1943.

3. If you have purchased some garment that does not appear on this list please write it in. List all clothing received from outside sources, as gifts at the bottom of the sheet in the space so labeled.

4. When listing articles you have made from flour or feed sacks put a check (x) beside them. To figure the cost of such articles of clothing allow the following price for each sack used:

1 white flour sack	5¢	1 white feed sack	10¢
1 colored flour sack	10¢	1 colored feed sack	20¢

5. When making clothing please add to the cost such things as buttons, snaps, trimmings, elastic, etc. if they have to be purchased. Do not include the pattern in the cost. For example the cost of a dress would be figured this way:

3 yds. print at 25¢ a yard	\$ .75
1 card buttons	.10
bias tape	.10
thread	.05
Total cost of dress	\$1.00

Show only the total cost on the clothing sheet.

Here is a sample showing how to fill in the clothing cost sheets for the different member of the family.

Clothing	Wife		Daughter		Grandmother		Daughter	
	Age	45	Age	15	Age	70	Age	4
	No.	Total Cost	No.	Total Cost	No.	Total Cost	No.	Total Cost
Hat (summer)	1	1.50	1	1.25				
Galoshes	1	1.00			1	1.00		
Dresses (print)	1x 2	.60 2.00	2 x 1	.80 1.00	2 x 1	.80 .75	4 x 2	1.00 .80
Dresses (rayon)	1	2.80	1	2.00				
Slips (cotton)	2 x 1	.40 .60	1	.60	2 x 1	.30 .60	4 x	.40

If a relative such as an aunt or a grandparent lives with you and you purchase the clothing please include this in the clothing record.



Clothing	No.	Total Cost	No.	Total Cost	No.	Total Cost	No.	Total Cost
Shoes (work)								
Shoes (dress)								
Boots								
Rubber boots								
Overshoes								
Rubbers								
Socks (work)								
Socks (dress)								
House slippers								
Handkerchiefs								
Belts								
Suspenders								
Garters								
Scarfs								
Billfold or pocketbook								
Gloves (work)								
Gloves (dress)								
Shoe repair								
Pressing								
Dry cleaning								

List all clothing received as gifts and estimate cost or value. If you had not received these as gifts would you have purchased similar goods? If so, draw a line under all you would have purchased.

--	--	--	--





List all clothing received as gifts and estimate the cost or value. If you had not received these as gifts would you have purchased similar goods? Please draw a line under all articles you would have purchased.

Clothing	No.	Total Cost	No.	Total Cost	No.	Total Cost	No.	Total Cost

Baby's Wardrobe for 1943  
Child from Birth to 2 yrs.

Clothing	No.	Total Cost	No.	Total Cost	No.	Total Cost
Blanket (heavy)			Diapers			
Blanket (light)			Bibs			
Baby bunting			Socks			
Coat			Dresses			
Cap			Slips			
Shoes			Night gowns			
Bootees			Shirts			
Stockings			Bands			
Play suits			Sweaters			
Mittens						

Form II

FAMILY CLOTHING PRACTICES

Part A.

Please draw a line under the right answer or answers.

Examples.

1. Do you sew for your family? Yes - No
2. You make your own dresses because  
It is cheaper.  
The dress fits better.  
You do not have a store near by that sells ready made dresses.  
You cannot always find the color you want in ready made dresses.

1. Is there a sewing machine in your home? Yes - No
2. Do you sew for your family? Yes - No
3. If you do not, what are your main reasons?  
You do not have time.  
You do not like the way home made garments fit.  
You cannot please the children.  
You can buy ready made clothing just as cheaply.  
You do not sew well.  
Other reasons.
4. Do your daughters help with the sewing? Often - Sometimes - Never
5. Which age group do you sew for most? Pre-school - Grade school - High school - Adults
6. Who usually selects the dress material for the mother? Mother - Daughter
7. Who usually selects the dress material for the daughter? Mother - Daughter
8. Do you hire sewing done? Often - Sometimes - Never

9. Which materials do you use most in home sewing? Cotton - Rayon - Woolens
10. What do you look for when buying goods? Color fastness - Shrinkage - Closeness of weave - Brand name - Price
11. Are there any of the clothing problems listed below on which you would like help?
- How to change a pattern to make it fit.
  - How to make the garment fit nicely.
  - How to apply trimming to make it look neat.
  - How to make neat button holes.
  - How to adjust the sewing machine.
  - How to buy wisely.
  - How to make over.
  - Others.

12. Are these garments made in the home?
- |                    |                           |
|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Better dresses     | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| House dresses      | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| School dresses     | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Sweaters           | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Aprons             | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Night clothes      | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Skirts             | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Blouses            | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Shirts             | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Coats              | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Mens underwear     | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Boy's underwear    | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Slips-women        | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Slips - girls      | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Brassieres - women | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Brassieres - girls | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Pants (women)      | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Pants (girls)      | Often - Sometimes - Never |
| Baby garments      | Often - Sometimes - Never |

13. Where do you buy the following articles most often?
- |                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| Suits               | local store-mail order house-larger town |
| Better dresses      | local store-mail order house-larger town |
| House dresses       | local store-mail order house-larger town |
| Sweaters            | local store-mail order house-larger town |
| Hats                | local store-mail order house-larger town |
| Shoes               | local store-mail order house-larger town |
| Hose                | local store-mail order house-larger town |
| Undergarments       | local store-mail order house-larger town |
| Yard goods          | local store-mail order house-larger town |
| Overalls            | local store-mail order house-larger town |
| Work shirts         | local store-mail order house-larger town |
| Children's clothing | local store-mail order house-larger town |

14. For which reasons do you buy ready made dresses?  
You like the style better.  
You do not have time to make them.  
You do not like to sew.  
You are hard to fit.  
You believe you save money.  
Other reasons.
15. When you buy ready made garments which practices do you follow?  
Buy at the first of the season.  
Buy at the end of the season sales.  
Wait until you need them.  
Buy when there is cash available.  
Other reasons.
16. Do you make over clothing for children? Yes - No
17. If you do not have younger children what do you do with your old clothing?  
Throw it away.  
Remodel it.  
Give it to mothers of large families.  
Give it to charities.  
Use it for rugs.  
Other uses.
18. Is mending difficult for you? Yes - No
19. Which of the following reasons makes it most difficult for you to do your mending?  
You do not like to.  
You do not have the time.  
You use the time doing things which you think are more important.  
You cannot mend well.  
Other reasons.
20. Do you do your own dry cleaning? Yes - No
21. Do you have any clothes closets in your home? Yes - No
22. Do you have clothes hangers for your clothes? Yes - No

23. Do you have an ironing board? Yes - No
24. Which do you think would help you most in taking better care of your clothing?  
More closet space.  
Better arrangement of the closet.  
Rods and shelves.  
Closets located where you need them.  
More drawer space.  
Better storage space for winter garments.  
More clothes hangers.  
A good ironing board.  
Cooperation of the family members.
25. In caring for your family's clothing what problems would you like help with?  
Garment repair.  
Moth control  
Stain removal.  
Clothing plans.  
Home dry cleaning.  
Storage.
26. Your laundering is done by:  
Electric washer.  
Hand washer.  
Tub and board.  
Hiring it done.
27. Do you boil your white clothes when you wash them? Yes - No
28. What do you boil them in?  
Wash boiler.  
Lard can.  
Iron kettle.  
Others.
29. Do you usually boil them on the kitchen stove or a stove in the laundry house? Outdoors?
30. Do you hang your clothes outside to dry during the winter?  
Yes - No
31. Do you try to keep your shoes well oiled or polished? Yes - No
32. Do you have your shoes repaired? Yes - No
33. Are shoes repaired at home? Yes - No
34. Does every member of your family have a warm coat? Yes - No

35. Does every member of your family have galoshes or rubbers?  
Yes - No

Part B

Please write in the answer to the following questions.

1. What method of moth prevention do you use? Is it satisfactory?
2. What fluids do you use for dry cleaning?
3. If you do not do your own dry cleaning, why?
4. If you have dry cleaning done, how far does it have to be taken? How are they taken? What articles?
5. What old garments have you made over during the year?
6. Where do you store or keep your laundry equipment?
7. Which members of your family get along without a warm coat?
8. Which members get along without galoshes?

Our total cash income from Jan. 1, 1943 to Jan. 1, 1944 was \$\_\_\_\_\_. We spent \$\_\_\_\_\_ for family living. We spent \$\_\_\_\_\_ for farm expenses. (Do not include in farm expense the amount paid on money you have borrowed.)

Total cash income will include all money taken in from the sale of live stock, chickens, milk, cream, butter, eggs, and of wages for work and of money received from relatives.

Form III

Write yes or no in the blank before the question.

1. Does putting clothes on hangers help to keep them good looking?
2. Do you feel more dressed up in a ready made dress than in a home made dress if they are made of the same material?
3. Do you think a person should have expensive clothes to look well dressed?
4. Does a man need a three piece suit for dress up?
5. When you are dressed up in clean clothes does it make you feel "like a different person"?
6. Does everyone in your family have enough clothes to keep warm?
7. By choosing carefully can a person find an inexpensive coat that will look well for any occasion?
8. Do you give much attention to the color of the material when choosing clothes for a particular member of the family?
9. Will a garment that does not fit make the wearer feel uncomfortable?
10. Do you think ready made clothes fit better than home made ones?
11. Can the usefulness of a garment be extended by careful mending and patching?
12. Do members of your family need hats for dress up occasions?
13. Does a woman or a girl need a new dress up dress each season if she keeps in style?
14. Could members of your family get along with fewer clothes than they now have and yet be warmly dressed and have enough to attend work, school and church?
15. Do girls enjoy wearing print dresses to grade school?
16. Do girls enjoy wearing print dresses to high school?
17. Are skirts and sweaters necessary for school wear?
18. Are overalls satisfactory for boys to wear to grade school?
19. Are overalls satisfactory for boys to wear to high school?
20. Do you think ready made clothes fit better than home made ones?
21. Does a girl look more dressed up in a well fitting cotton print dress than in an old sweater and skirt?

Please write in the answer to the following question.

To what organizations such as church, lodge, women's clubs, 4-H Club, etc. do the members of your family belong. Write after the name of the organization whether you attend often - sometimes - never.

Husband

Wife

Children