DIMENSIONS OF CLOTHING INTEREST:

A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY

by

Elsje Susanna Toerien

Thesis submitted to the Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Clothing and Textiles

APPROVED:

L. M. Gurel, Chairman

M. H. Marshall

B. E. Densmore

R. H. Lytton

July, 1987

Blacksburg, Virginia

DIMENSIONS OF CLOTHING INTEREST:

A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY

by

Elsje Susanna Toerien

(ABSTRACT)

The purpose of this research was to determine and compare the dimensions of clothing interest between Afrikaans female clothing and textile students at The University of Pretoria and female clothing and textile students at Virginia Tech. An additional objective was to test the validity of the measuring instrument by factor analysis.

Dimensions of clothing interest for the two groups were measured with the Gurel-Creekmore Clothing Interest Questionnaire, as revised and shortened by Borsari in 1978. T-tests indicated that the group mean scores differed significantly for three of the five dimensions. The Virginia Tech sample had a higher score on the interest and the self-concept dimensions while the Pretoria sample had a higher mean score on the modesty dimension. The factor structure for the American group was very similar to that established by Borsari in 1978 but differences existed for the structure of the South African group.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My sincere appreciation is extended to Dr. Lois Gurel, thesis director and program advisor, for her guidance and support throughout this research. Appreciation is also extended to my other committee members, Dr. M. H. Marshall, Dr. B. Densmore, and Dr. R. Lytton for their advice and guidance. Many thanks to Don Mercante, Statistical Consulting Center, for his help with the data analysis.

A special word of thanks to Dr. Priscilla Botha, Department of Home Economics and Dietetics, The University of Pretoria, for gathering the South African data, and to my employer, Vista University, Pretoria, for allowing me a year's study leave. Also to my children, Ina and Pieter, many thanks for their help, understanding and support throughout my years of graduate study. A very special note of thanks to my husband, Willem, for his help in duplicating and mailing the South African questionnaires and opscan sheets, his continued support through letters and telephone calls, and for enabling me to spend the year in the United States of America.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

There are certain observable differences between the clothing behavior of female students at the University of Pretoria, South Africa and that of their counterparts at Virginia Tech. The dress of the South African students appears to be more formal and dressy. The American students seem to favor more comfortable apparel, and will allow clothing styles that would be considered immodest by the Pretoria students.

The question can be asked whether these observable differences are due merely to differences in fashion, or to differences in the basic attitudes and interests with respect to clothing between the two groups. According to Ryan (1966) clothing attitudes and interests are related to general and clothing values, and these in turn can be attributed partly to a person's cultural background. Cultural differences could, therefore contribute to differences in dress.

The majority of students at the University of Pretoria are Afrikaners. The Afrikaner is on the average strongly Calvinistic and conservative. One South African is quoted as having said "the greatest

sin an Afrikaner can commit is to be a nonconformist" (Hopkinson, 1969, p. 79). Temko (1987) remarked that, partly due to the tradition of Calvinism, even the more liberal young Afrikaner is basically conservative and authoritarian. The American culture in general is more liberal, and even more so among American college students.

A comparison of clothing interests between the two groups would demonstrate whether clothing behavior reflects cultural differences. The purpose of this research was to determine and compare the dimensions of clothing interest of Afrikaans female clothing and textile students at the University of Pretoria and female clothing and textile students at Virginia Tech.

One problem with comparing these two groups is that most tests were developed and used with American populations. An instrument that has demonstrated validity for certain specified American populations need not be valid for other Western cultures. According to Kerlinger (1973) factor analysis may be the best way to test construct validity. By factor analyzing the responses for both South African and American groups, construct validity can be tested. South African research in the social psychology of clothing has, in the past, drawn heavily from instruments and research

findings from the United States, without any real certainty that this information could be generalized to South African situations. The results of this study could, therefore also be an aid to South African researchers.

CHAPTER 11

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

A review of the literature related to this study was divided into the following sections:

(1) Development of the clothing interest scale.

(2) Factors that could explain the differences in overt clothing behavior.

(3) Previous cross-cultural studies.

Development of the Clothing Interest Scale

The aim of Creekmore's study for her doctoral degree was to construct a framework within which clothing behavior, as related to needs and values, could be studied. She believed that "conscious and unconscious concern for values and striving for satisfaction of needs were . . . related to clothing interests and behaviors" (Creekmore, 1963, p. 2).

Creekmore selected 14 types of clothing behavior. Eight of these were based on the value types as described in the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey test for general values. Allport (1961) only differentiated among six value types, namely the theoretical,

economic, social, aesthetic, political, and religious, but Creekmore (1963) added an exploratory and a sensuous value. Allport indicated that a sensuous value should be included.

Creekmore labeled these clothing behaviors altruism (social value type), appearance (aesthetic value type), status symbol (political value type), management of clothing (economic value type), theoretic aspects (theoretical value type), symbolic meaning (religious value type), tactual aspects, and experimentation. To these she added six general clothing behaviors, namely conformity, clothing construction, fashion, modesty, no concern, and clothing used as a tool.

In order to measure these clothing behaviors she developed a scale that was "camouflaged under the name of Clothing Interest Inventory" (Creekmore, 1963, p. 144). This scale consisted of 130 statements, seven to ten statements on each of the 14 behaviors.

After analyzing the results of Creekmore's research, Brady (1963) revised the scale, refining it to nine subscales (or behaviors) with ten items in each. The nine subscales were: experimental use of clothing, construction, concern for appearance, management, symbolic meaning of clothing, fashion,

conformity, modesty, and comfort. Brady tested the revised scale with a sample of undergraduate students. Item-total correlations of the results indicated that each behavior was internally consistent.

In 1968 Creekmore and five graduate students developed a scale that measured "eight specific aspects of clothing" (Creekmore, 1971, p. 96). The eight variables were aesthetic, approval, attention, comfort, dependence, interest, management, and modesty. The instrument was entitled Importance of Clothing. Creekmore remarked that "A high score indicated frequent occurrence of the behavior being measured" (p. 97).

The eight variables were defined as follows:

Aesthetic: Use of clothing to achieve a pleasing or beautiful appearance.

Approval: Use of clothing to attain a feeling of belonging or approval of others; usually indicates conformity to group norms.

Attention: Seeking of prestige and status through use of clothing; may be either socially approved or disapproved.

Comfort: Use of clothing to achieve comfort whether this relates to temperature, physical response to textures, or tightness or looseness of garments.

Dependence: Sensitivity to the influence of clothing feelings (sense of well being, general good feeling, or changing of moods).

Interest: Willingness to give attention, investigate, manipulate, or experiment with clothing.

Management: Thoughtful and careful use of time, money, and energy in planning, buying and using clothing; thus an economic aspect.

Modesty: Preference for inconspicuous clothing, quite conservative in color, fit, design, and body exposure.
(Creekmore, 1971, pp. 96-97)

The last statement in each of the eight subscales measured the subject's "searching for understanding of self and others relative to the behavior." Responses to these statements could be totaled to give a ninth variable titled theoretic concern. This clothing interest scale is to date the best known and most often used clothing behavior measure. It is relatively free of time and fashion constraints, and is the only clothing interest questionnaire that has been used on South African groups. Reliability coeficients for the different subscales were calculated by Fetterman and ranged from .46 to .81. The Interest, Dependence, Attention, Approval, and Modesty scales were found to have satisfactory reliability coefficients, while Managenent, Comfort, and Aesthetic were below the acceptable level (Creekmore, 1971).

With the aim of establishing construct validity,

Gurel (1974) factor analyzed the results of 500 Virginia Tech students' responses to Creekmore's 1968 clothing measure. Gurel referred to it as a clothing interest scale and sought to determine the "dimensions underlying the clothing behavior that might be labeled 'importance of' or 'interest in' clothing" (Gurel, 1974, p. 36). She defined clothing interest as:

> . . . . the attitudes and beliefs about clothing, the knowledge of and attention paid to clothing, the concern and curiosity a person has about his own clothing and that of others. This interest may be manifested by an individual's practices in regard to clothing himself -- the amount of time, energy, and money he is willing to spend on clothing; the degree to which he uses clothing in an experimental manner; and his awareness of fashion and what is new. (p. 36)

The results of Gurel's study demonstrated claims for reliability, as well as construct validity, of the Creekmore scale. The reliability of the item assignments was indicated by a significant relationship ($p < .001$) between each factor and the loadings of the factor items. Two of the previous subscales, namely aesthetics and management, were found to form one new factor. Gurel renamed the different factors, but did not revise any of the statements.

Creekmore Subscale Titles	Gurel Factor Titles
aesthetics	personal appearance
modesty	modesty
interest	experimentation
comfort	comfort
attention	fashion interest
management	personal appearance
approval	conformity
psychological dependence	self-concept
theoretical	psychological awareness

(Gurel, 1974, p. 124)

In 1978, Borsari analyzed and revised the Creekmore questionnaire. Statements that were unclear or needed rewording due to outdated terminology were changed; attention was also given to ageism and sexism. She factor analyzed the responses of 395 students. The constructs identified by factor analysis provided evidence of construct validity. The results indicated five strong factors and one weak one. The factors were named interest, conformity, psychological awareness, self-concept, and modesty. The one weak factor was not named. It contained only four statements, two that could be related to a comfort value and two to an

economic value. She suggested that those four statements be eliminated. Items with factor loadings under .350 or with low correlation coefficients were eliminated. Reliability coeficients for the five retained factors ranged from .626 to .880.

The final revised scale consisted of 57 statements and was titled the Gurel-Creekmore Clothing Interest Questionnaire. As far as could be ascertained by the researcher, this revised scale has never been used. Both Gurel (1974) and Borsari (1978) refer to the subscales on the Importance of Clothing questionnaire as dimensions.

While the 1968 Creekmore instrument contained nine subscales, Gurel and Borsari differentiated between eight and five dimensions respectively. Each researcher renamed some of the dimensions, although they often purported the same concept. Definitions of the different dimensions as utilized by Creekmore, Gurel, and Borsari are contained in Appendix A.

Gurel and Gurel attempted to ". . . clarify the conceptual and semantic confusion surrounding the nature and measurement of clothing interest" (1979, p. 281). They indicated that clothing interest is made up of at least five dimensions, namely Concern with Personal Appearance, Use of Clothing as Enhancement of

Security, Use of Clothing as Enhancement of Individuality, Experimenting with Appearance, and Heightened Awareness of Clothes. Modesty, conformity, and attention to comfort should rather be considered as personality characteristics that can be expressed in clothing behavior.

No evidence could be found that the complete Creekmore's 1968 clothing interest scale has recently been used with college student populations. In 1982 Shopland attempted to "further the development of an instrument by replicating a previous study by L. M. Gurel" with 516 students in Columbia, Missouri (p. 21). In order to avoid a set response style by the subjects, she rewrote 30% of the statements in a negative form. Her study can, therefore not be seen as a replication of Gurel's work. Twenty-eight items were assigned to eight factors. The negative format of the items appeared to influence the students' responses. The nine items in the largest factor were all in a negative form. The rest of the negative statements were eliminated because of low or complex loadings.

The most recent study was that of Botha (1983). She compared the clothing interest, self-concept, and satisfaction with personal appearance of female students at The University of Pretoria, and concluded

that, for her subjects at least, ". . . some aspects of their clothing behavior lie at a deeper level . . . and might be part of the self-concept" (1986, p. 56).

Factors that Could Explain the Differences in Overt Clothing Behavior

Two factors that could possibly explain the differences in overt clothing behavior between the two groups are the Calvinistic conservative nature of the Afrikaner, and the existance of a dress code for campus wear.

Calvinistic Conservatism

Statements concerning the Calvinistic, conservative, and authoritarian character of the average Afrikaner are plentiful. Hopkinson (1969) used the expression "Bulwarks of conservatism in the modern world"(p. 79). Moodie (1975) stated that South Africa is becoming more "traditionally authoritarian" than before (p. 293). De Klerk (1975) said that in order to understand and study the Afrikaner, Calvinism must be used as key.

In a recent survey among students, Gagiano, a professor in political science at the University of

Stellenbosch (considered to be the most liberal of the Afrikaner universities), found that "despite an increasingly open discussion of new political alternatives, a fundamental conservatism remains" (Temko, 1987, p. 15). Heyns (1979) stated that the Afrikaner philosophy of life is Calvinistic and strongly traditional in nature. This Calvinistic perspective has had a very strong influence on the Afrikaner. This explains the conservative society of the Afrikaner, and the strong emphasis placed on religion, morality and modesty (De Klerk, 1979). According to De Villiers, even the young Afrikaner is very conservative (Retief, 1970).

Booyens (1971) has also remarked on the Calvinistic philosophy of life of the Afrikaner and on his "sticky" conservatism. He considered the Afrikaner as being individualistic. This appears to be in contrast with the findings of Botha and Bosch (1986). Measuring clothing conformity and individualism among female students at the University of Pretoria, they found the students' clothing behavior to be more conservative-conforming than individualistic, and remarked that this might be a reflection of the general conservative-conforming character of Afrikaans-speaking female students. Could the Afrikaner be

individualistic and yet conforming in clothing behavior? Perhaps the answer lies in a remark by Viljoen (1974), who stated that although the Afrikaner is extremely individualistic, he considers the restrictions placed on him by his society to be of greater importance. Baron and Byrne (1987) distinguished between conforming because of a desire to be liked, that is altering your behavior to meet the expectations of others, to be accepted by the group, or because of a desire to be right. The Creekmore Importance of Clothing questionnaire tends to measure an individual's wish to be accepted by friends, e.g. the desire to be liked, whereas the Afrikaner's conforming behavior could flow out of a strong conviction that what is right, should be done. As opposed to this, Kassarjian (1971) is of the opinion that groups of tradition-directed people are seldom found in the United States.

Several studies have linked conservatism to clothing behavior. Levin and Black (1970) found that conservative attitudes among college students correlated positively with a more conservative appearance. Individuals who were social-change oriented in their attitudes and beliefs were more likely to accept liberal modes in clothing. It would seem that

"both personal appearance and social attitudes can be regarded as dimensions of a fundamental orientation to social change" (p. 114).

Kness and Densmore (1976) found that students who were conservative in their beliefs were conservative dressers. They were more concerned with clothing and clothing was more important to them as symbols of status. Using a group of Mormon college women as subjects, Christiansen and Kernaleguen (1971) suggested that religious orthodoxy is positively linked to conservative-modest clothing selection.

In a cross-cultural study among women from the United States, French Canada, English Canada, and the Netherlands, Tigert, King and Ring (1980) found that the Americans were least interested in fashion and most likely to shop for low prices and convenience. It was not clear how this affected their general clothing interest and behavior. It might indicate that Americans are less likely to use clothing as a way of boosting their self-esteem, but more likely to conform simply because it is an easier way out.

Dress code

Observed clothing behavior, but also clothing attitudes, could and will be influenced by a dress code

that is enforced in any situation. The regulations of the University of Pretoria specify that when on campus, students should at all times be neatly and suitably dressed. While attending classes male students must wear a shirt (not a T-Shirt), hemmed trousers or hemmed shorts, stockings, and neat footwear. Female students must wear a dress, skirt, or hemmed trousers with a blouse or sweater. Shorts may be worn provided they are knee-length. Sandals or shoes must be worn. The university blazer may not be worn with denim jeans (University of Pretoria, 1987). In contrast, Virginia Tech does not have a dress code (B. Eaton, Student Affairs, personal communication, July 9, 1987).

Previous Cross-cultural Studies

No previous research using the 1968 Creekmore Importance of Clothing questionnaire to compare the clothing interests of two Western cultures could be found, but a number of researchers have explored differences in related areas of clothing behavior, such as attitudes and values. The results of such studies could bring us to a better understanding of American clothing behavior, in comparison to those of other cultures.

Schrank, Sugawara and Kim (1982) compared American and Korean women on fashion leadership characteristics. They mentioned that data collection was not completely controllable because of long distances and cultural differences, and that "adequate control of variables is virtually impossible" (1982, p. 236). They still believe, however, that it was worth undertaking cross-cultural research.

Their sample consisted of 94 Korean and 67 American women. The Korean women were mostly home economics students (Kim & Schrank, 1982), while the American respondents were from a variety of disciplines. The Korean group had a stronger positive correlation between attitudes towards change and both fashion innovativeness and fashion opinion leadership. Cultural conditions could have been responsible for this difference. Adoption of new Western fashions represented a more significant change for the Korean than for the American student.

In another cross-cultural study Hao (1971) explored the relationship between clothing behaviors and general values for a Chinese and an American group. The samples consisted of 30 single female students in each group. She used the Clothing Interest Inventory developed by Creekmore (1963) and revised by Dickey in

1967 to measure clothing behaviors. The two groups differed in the emphasis placed on clothing behaviors. Modesty was found to be the most important clothing behavior for Chinese women, but the least important for the American group. Kim (1970) found similar results among Korean students.

In 1984 Chang compared clothing interest and job satisfaction of Korean high school teachers. She used the 1968 Creekmore questionnaire, and , as did previous researchers, found modesty to be the most important aspect of clothing interest for Korean subjects.

In a comparative cross-cultural analysis of fashion involvement, Tigert, King and Ring (1980) surveyed large random samples of consumers in four cultures, English Canadian, French Canadian, United States and the Netherlands. Each sample consisted of between 1000 and 3000 respondents. This study differed from the previous ones not only in that different Western cultures were examined, but also in that the respondents were not students, but women from all consumer segments.

Significant differences were found between the U.S. women and the other groups. A third of the American respondents had little or no interest in new women's fashions. The English Canadians considered

"value for money" to be very important while the Americans placed more emphasis on store location and low prices. Quality and good service were more important than value to the Dutch consumers. Across female occupation segments, working women were found to be more fashion aware, more interested in new fashion and less concerned with low prices than housewives. Since the life style and interests of the average student differs from that of women in general, the results of this study might not be directly applicable to students. The American student's clothing interest could differ from that of the average consumer in this research.

Another study comparing Western cultures was that of Conrad (1973). She investigated clothing values and their relation to personality factors and selected demographic variables for French and Canadian university women. The two groups were found to differ slightly in the hierarchy of their clothing values. The rank order for clothing values for the two groups, from most to least important, were:

> English Canadian: sensuous, aesthetic, economic, exploratory, theoretical, social, political, and religious
>
> French Canadian: aesthetic, sensuous, economic, exploratory, theoretical, social, religious, and political.

MacKay (1967) compared a group of 40 Puerto Rican and 40 American students. She found that the American group more frequently used casual clothes than the Puerto Ricans, but that the latter attached more importance to the use of clothing as a status symbol. There were also differences in perceived family goals. A knowledge of politics and current events as well as being active in politics were more important to the Americans while Puerto Ricans had higher mean scores on religious activities, on community participation, on the selection of prestige variables, and on conformity.

In her study of clothing values and general values of Philippine and American female college students, Mendoza (1965) found that value patterns differed in the two cultures. The American respondents considered the aesthetic value to be the highest for both clothing and general values, while the Philippine subjects ranked the religious value as the highest among the general values and the sensuous value the highest among the clothing values.

Chen (1970) investigated the clothing attitudes of 110 Taiwanese female students and 100 female students from The Pennsylvania State University. Research results indicated that the Chinese group were

more conforming and conservative in clothing. They also favored the use of casual clothing and new styles less than their American counterparts. The Chinese group considered the degree to which the body was exposed in the measure as being more immodest than what the American group did.

Summary

The review of literature was divided into three sections, (1) the development of the Importance of Clothing questionnaire, (2) factors that could cause the differences in observed clothing behavior between the South African and American group, and (3) previous cross-cultural research on clothing interest and related aspects of clothing behavior.

Factor analysis of scores obtained by both Gurel (1974) and Borsari (1978) indicated that clothing interest behavior can be divided into different dimensions. There is no reason to believe that this will not be the case for this study.

Gurel (1974) and Borsari (1978) found significant relationships between the dimensions as identified by factor analysis and the empirically derived constructs developed by Creekmore. Although

Botha (1983) did not factor analyze the results of her research with South African students, significant differences were found in the strength of the subscales developed by Creekmore, and there has been no indication that these subscales will be any different for South Africans.

Differences in the strength or importance of the dimensions can be expected. The review of literature indicated that certain character traits such as Calvinism and conservatism can be attributed to the Afrikaner. Significant correlations have also been found between these attributes and clothing behavior. Therefore the South African group can be expected to have higher scores for those dimensions of clothing behavior normally associated with conservatism, such as conformity and modesty.

CHAPTER 111

STATEMENT OF THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

Purpose

The purpose of this research was to determine and compare the dimensions of clothing interest between Afrikaans female clothing and textile students at the University of Pretoria and female clothing and textile students at Virginia Tech. The construct validity of the measuring instrument was also determined.

Objectives

1) To compare the two groups on each dimension of clothing interest.

2) To test the validity of the measuring instrument by factor analysis of the responses, split by group.

Hypothesis

There will be differences between the two groups on the dimensions of clothing interest.

Subhypotheses

1 There will be a difference between the two groups on the interest dimension.

2 There will be a difference between the two groups on the conformity dimension.

3 There will be a difference between the two groups on the psychological awareness dimension.

4 There will be a difference between the two groups on the self-concept dimension.

5 There will be a difference between the two groups on the modesty dimension.

The subhypotheses were tested in the null form.

Assumptions

Differences in dimension strength between the two groups will be due to basic cultural differences and not to sampling differences.

There will not be major differences between the two groups in interpreting the statements.

The strength of different dimensions of clothing interest behavior can be measured with a Likert-type scale.

Limitations

Generalizations to other populations cannot be made. The results will only apply to the particular groups. The sample is one of convenience and is not randomly chosen.

A Likert-type scale has certain limitations inherent in its nature. No claim can be made as to how much stronger one dimension is than another.

Theoretical definitions

Clothing interest:

> "The attitudes and beliefs about clothing, the knowledge of and attention paid to clothing, the concern and curiosity a person has about his own clothing and that of others" (Gurel, 1974, p. 36)

Dimensions of clothing interest:

> Subscales or factors of clothing interest, such as general clothing interest, modesty, conformity, the use of clothing to support the self-concept, and psychological awareness of the effects of clothing on others.

Afrikaners:

A clearly distinctive white South African group with Afrikaans as their primary language.

CHAPTER IV

PROCEDURE

The procedure followed for this study was divided into the following sections:

(1) The instrument.

(2) The sample.

(3) Data collection.

(4) Statistical analysis.

The Instrument

Dimensions of clothing interest for the two groups were measured with Creekmore's Importance of Clothing questionnaire, as shortened and revised by Borsari. The revised instrument, titled the Gurel-Creekmore Clothing Interest Questionnaire consists of 57 statements, each answered on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Together the statements form five different dimensions: interest, modesty, conformity, self-concept, and psychological awareness. Item assignment to dimensions is contained in Table 1. The sequence of statements on the questionnaire was randomly determined.

Table 1

Item Assignment to Dimensions: Gurel-Creekmore Clothing Interest Questionnaire

Dimensions:					
Interest	Conformity	Modesty	Self-concept	Psych. Awareness	
5	10	8	6	11	
9	12	15	7	33	
17	14	19	13	43	
18	30	23	16	45	
21	41	31	20	51	
22	46	40	38		
24	48	60	47		
25	56		49		
26	59		55		
27			57		
28			61		
29					
32					
34					
35					
36					
37					
38					
39					
42					
44					
52					
53					
54					
58					
25	9	7	11	5	=57

A person's score for any particular dimension was the total of all her responses on the Likert-scale for statements concerning that dimension, divided by the number of statements for that dimension on the total scale. Demographic information concerning the respondent's academic year and age were obtained in order to describe the samples, while information on sex and primary language was used as criteria for the admissibility of data. The students recorded their responses on an answer sheet that could be read directly by an optical scanner. (Appendix B.)

The South African group received their cover letter and questionnaire in Afrikaans. (Appendix C). For most of the statements the Afrikaans wording were the same used by Botha in her 1983 study. Minor changes were made by the researcher. The Afrikaans version is a direct translation and it is unlikely that any difference in meaning could have been conveyed. As the Importance of Clothing questionnaire had been used previously with both an American and South African college group, a pretest was not considered necessary.

The Sample

The questionnaire was given to all female clothing and textile undergraduate students during spring quarter at Virginia Tech and first semester at the University of Pretoria. Only responses received from students with Afrikaans as their primary language were admitted for the South African group. The respondents were limited to clothing and textile students in an attempt to eliminate intervening variables by making the two groups as homogeneous as possible.

Data Collection

Most of the Virginia Tech students were taking at least one course in the Department of Clothing and Textiles during spring quarter, and cover letters, questionnaires, and optical scanner answer sheets were distributed to them by the various instructors. The answer sheets were returned either directly to the researcher or by way of campus mail. Freshmen not taking any clothing and textile course, but residing in a university dormitory, were reached through campus mail. Questionnaires, cover letters, answer sheets and

stamped addressed envelopes were sent to 11 students who could not be contacted by any of the previous two methods. As an incentive, participation in a $10 lottery was promised to each student responding within two weeks.

Due to the use of the semester system at the University of Pretoria, and a far more rigid program of study, all the South African clothing and textile majors were taking courses within the department. Distribution of questionnaires and answer sheets were done by lecturers during class time, coordinated by a professor in socio-psychology of clothing at the University of Pretoria. As class attendance is compulsory at The University of Pretoria, a lottery incentive was not considered necessary for a good response.

Statistical Analysis

The students rated each statement in the questionnaire according to the following scale:

Almost always, very few exceptions	5
Usually, majority of the time	4
Sometimes	3
Seldom, not very often	2
Almost never, very few exceptions	1

The data were read by an optical scanner and

transferred to the university's main-frame computer. Statement 10 was in the reversed form and was rescored after recording of the data. Frequency distributions were determined for the demographic data.

The main purpose of this research was to compare the strength of the different dimensions of clothing interest between the two groups. Independent t-tests were done to determine if the differences between the sample means were statistically significant. The level of significance was set at the .05 level.

A second objective was to determine the dimensions of clothing interest for each group by factor analyzing the responses of this study, and then to compare the dimensions of the two groups with each other, and also with the factors extracted by previous researchers. These comparisons were done by inspection and not by statistical methods. The factors were identified with the varimax rotated principal components analysis.

In addition to the above, Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated (separately for each group) to determine possible relationships between the dimensions.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The results are based on 119 American and 120 South African questionnaires, and are discussed under the following headings: (1) description of the sample; (2) comparison of groups on dimension strength; (3) correlations between different dimensions; and (4) factor analysis of responses.

Description of the Sample

The population for this research consisted of all the female undergraduate clothing and textile majors at Virginia Tech and at The University of Pretoria. A total of 169 questionnaires were distributed to the American group. Of these 120 were returned, but only 119 (70.4 percent) could be used as one response was incomplete.

Of the 136 questionnaires handed out to students at The University of Pretoria, 128 were returned, and 120 (88.2 percent) could be used. One was incomplete, and seven did not have Afrikaans as their primary language.

The Virginia Tech sample was made up of freshman, sophomores, juniors and seniors, while the South African sample consisted only of first, second and third year students. No responses were received from fourth year students. This is representative of undergraduate South African students as most bachelor's degrees takes only three years to complete. (Table 2). As a result of this, the largest number of South African respondents fall into a younger age group than the American students. (Table 3).

Comparison of Groups on Dimension Strengths

Independent t-tests were done to determine the differences in strength of the five dimensions as described by Borsari (1978). These were interest, conformity, modesty, self-concept, and psychological awareness. The results of these test are presented in Table 4.

Interest

This dimension combines items from a number of variables included in previous versions of the questionnaire. These were variables such as aesthetics, appearance, experimentation with clothing,

Table 2

Demographic data: Academic year

Group	Academic year	Number of students	Percentages
Virginia Tech	Freshman	23	19.3
	Sophomore	25	21.0
	Junior	35	29.4
	Senior	36	30.3
	TOTAL	119	100.0
Pretoria	First year	58	48.3
	Second year	44	36.7
	Third year	18	15.0
	TOTAL	120	100.0

Table 3

Demographic data: Age

Group	Age	Number of students	Percentages
Virginia Tech	17-18 years	8	6.7
	19-20 years	55	46.2
	21-22 years	52	43.7
	23-24 years	4	3.4
	TOTAL	119	100.0
Pretoria	17-18 years	32	26.7
	19-20 years	78	65.0
	21-22 years	10	8.3
	TOTAL	120	100.0

Table 4

Mean Scores for Dimensions of Clothing Interest and t-Values and Two-tailed Probabilities for Differences between Means

Dimension	Virginia Tech Mean	Pretoria Mean	t-value	Two-tail. prob.
Interest	3.74	3.48	3.91	0.000*
Conformity	2.58	2.54	0.42	0.677
Modesty	2.85	3.14	3.29	0.001*
Self-concept	3.67	3.43	3.91	0.000*
Psych. Awareness	3.10	3.08	0.20	0.844

* significant at the .001 level

fashion interest, management, dependence, and attention. It measures general interest in clothing.

The mean for the American group was 3.74 (sd= 0.50), and for the South African group 3.48 (sd= 0.52). (Table 4). The Virginia Tech sample therefore had a higher general interest in clothing, significant at the .001 level. This was the dimension with the highest mean score for both groups, which is perhaps understandable considering that both the populations consisted of students with clothing and textiles as a major. Both Creekmore (1963) and Gurel (1974) found aesthetics and management (grouped together as one factor, appearance, by Gurel) to be the most important aspects of clothing interest. Lapitsky (1961) compared the clothing values of students and teachers, and found that the aesthetic value had the highest mean score for both groups. Aesthetics was also a very important value for a group of South African high school students (Toerien, 1986).

Conformity

This dimension was labeled approval in the 1968 Creekmore questionnaire and was defined as "the use of clothing to attain a feeling of belonging or approval of others; usually indicates conformity to group

norms" (1971, p. 96). The group mean for the Virginia Tech sample was 2.58 (sd= 0.6) and that of the Pretoria sample 2.54 (sd= 0.64). (Table 4). The difference between the two cultures was not statistically significant. It was also the least important dimension of clothing interest for both groups. This corresponds with the research results of Gurel who found conformity to be "exceedingly unimportant" (1974, p. 110).

Background information on the conservative nature of the Afrikaner could lead to the belief that the Pretoria group would be significantly more conforming. There are three possible reasons why this was not found to be the case. One is that the Americans are far more conforming than anticipated, another that the South Africans are not as conforming as often pictured, but the best possible explanation lies in the fact that conformity is a multifaceted phenomena. This is supported by the factor analysis results which are still to be discussed. Despite extensive research by social psychologists and clothing specialists, much is still unexplained. Gurel and Gurel (1979) suggested that conformity should be seen as a personality characteristic that finds expression in clothing behavior, rather than a dimension of clothing interest. People conform for various reasons,

and group acceptance or approval (the dimension measured by this instrument) is only one of them. According to Baron and Byrne (1987), individuals can also conform because they believe it is the right thing to do. Group loyalty and solidarity are very strong among Afrikaners. The Afrikaans student might not perceive a need to conform in order to be accepted by the group. She conforms because she believes it is the right thing to do.

Modesty

This dimension measures "preference for inconspicuous clothing, quite conservative in color, fit, design, and body exposure" (Creekmore, 1971, p. 97), and has remained virtually unchanged since the first questionnaire. The group mean for the Americans was 2.85 (sd= 0.62) while that for the South Africans was 3.14 (sd= 0.72). (Table 4). This difference is significant at the .001 level.

It would, therefore seem that the more modest appearance of dress observable on the University of Pretoria campus is not only due to differences in fashion, but to cultural differences, of which the inherent Calvinistic conservative nature of the Afrikaner could be the most important. Previous

studies have also reported modesty in dress to be unimportant to American college students (Gurel, 1974; & Hao, 1971), while either modesty or a religious value were very important to the cultures with which they were compared (Chang, 1984; Hao, 1971; Kim, 1970; MacKay, 1967; and Mendoza, 1965.)

Self-concept

This dimension suggests "a use of clothing or dependence upon clothing for self-confidence, security, and self-esteem" (Gurel, 1974, p. 100). The mean self-concept score for the American group was 3.67 (sd= 0.51) and 3.43 (sd= 0.47) for the Afrikaans group. (Table 4). The difference was statistically significant at the .001 level. Self-concept was second in importance for both groups. The higher score among the American students could be due to the extreme emphasis placed on clothing and "dress for success" in modern society, greatly aided by the mass media, particularly television. In contrast, television broadcasting started only 10 years ago in South Africa and is still very limited in the number of channels and broadcasting time. It could, therefore, not be expected to have the influence on its viewers that American television has.

Psychological Awareness

The dimension of psychological awareness, labeled "theoretical" by Creekmore, measures an individual's psychological or theoretical interest in the clothing behavior of self and others. The mean for the Virginia Tech group was 3.10 (sd= 0.74) and for the Pretoria group 3.08 (sd= 0.77). (Table 4). The difference was not significant. As both groups were made up of students with clothing and textiles as a major, similar degrees of theoretical interest in clothing behavior are understandable.
of theoretical interest in clothing behavior are understandable.

Correlations Between Different Dimensions

Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated in order to determine relationships between dimensions. Due to the relatively large sample sizes (119 and 120), a number of the relationships were significant at the .001 level, but for the Virginia Tech group only two and for the Pretoria group only three relationships can be considered to be of moderate strength. Between twenty-five and forty percent of the variance in one dimension could be associated with the variance in the

other dimension. This does not necessarily imply causation between the dimensions.

For the South African respondents interest was correlated with self-concept (r=.64) and with psychological awareness (r=.50) while self-concept also correlated with psychological awareness (r=.53). Self-concept also correlated with both interest (r=.57) and psychological awareness (r=.58) for the American group. (Table 5).

Factor Analysis of Responses

The responses obtained in the individual items were factor analyzed in order to determine if clothing interest divides into the same dimensions or constructs for both groups, and if these dimensions are congruent with factors extracted by previous researchers. The first step in factor analysis is to compute a correlation matrix for all variables. In order to extract common factors between variables, the correlations between them should not be too small. The second step is to determine the number of factors that need to be extracted in order to best represent the data. Often only factors that have an eigenvalue of more than one are included.

Table 5

Pearson Correlation Coefficients

	Conformity	Modesty	Self-concept	Psych. Awareness
Virginia Tech				
Interest	.1156	.2192	.5703	.4073
	p= .108	p= .009	p= .000	p= .000
Conformity		.2817	.2365	.2641
		p= .001	p= .005	p= .002
Modesty			.2404	.4427
			p= .005	p= .000
Self-concept				.5765
				p= .000
Pretoria				
Interest	.1355	.4031	.6355	.5010
	p= .070	p= .000	p= .000	p= .000
Conformity		.3369	.3245	.3633
		p= .000	p= .000	p= .000
Modesty			.4141	.4198
			p= .000	p= .000
Self-concept				.5277
				p= .000

Inspection of the eigenvalues computed for the data at hand showed that both groups had seventeen factors with an eigenvalue of more than 1.0. Since the goal of factor analysis is to identify a relatively small number of factors, using seventeen would have defeated the purpose. As six factors had eigenvalues of more than 2.0, this number were extracted and, using the varimax method, rotated to optimal orthogonal structure. This did not prove satisfactory: a number of items had equally weak loadings on all the factors. On a five factor extraction matrix, both groups had one factor with five unrelated items. It was decided that a four factor matrix would be most suitable for both sets of data.

As the purpose of this research was not to revise the instrument, an item was assigned to the factor for which it had the highest loading, even if it was relatively low. If an item loaded on two factors with near equal strength, it was assigned to the factor that logically fitted it best.

The factor matrix for the Virginia Tech respondents was very similar to that computed for a student group by Borsari in 1978. The rotated factor matrix for Virginia Tech is presented in Appendix D. The highest factor loading for each item is contained

in Table 6 and the item assignment to factors in Table 7.

Factor one contained 21 of the 25 interest items plus 2 self-concept items, numbers 6 and 38. Item 6 was classified as experimental by Gurel and interest by Creekmore, while item 38 was self-concept for Gurel and dependence for Creekmore. This factor also contained one conformity item but with a very low negative loading of -.243.

The second factor contained all five psychological awareness items, eight self-concept items and four interest items. Most of the self-concept and two of the interest items dealt with feelings or emotions. Their grouping together with the psychological awareness statements is understandable.

The third factor contained seven of the nine conformity item plus one self-concept item. This was item 13: I wear different clothes to impress people which, depending on how the term different is interpreted, could be conforming in character.

The last factor contained all seven of the modesty and one conforming item. This statement was: I would rather miss something than wear clothes that are not appropriate, and, depending on the interpretation of the word appropriate, it could represent modesty.

Table 6

Highest Factor Loadings: Virginia Tech

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
5		.632		
6	.456			
7		.381		
8				.522
9	.719			
10			.421	
11		.394		
12			.532	
13			.356	
14	-.243			
15				.665
16		.525		
17		.420		
18	.517			
19				.611
20		.627		
21	.424			
22	.561			

Table 6 (continued)

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
23				.435
24	.583			
25		.409		
26	.617			
27	.487			
28	.426			
29	.573			
30			.757	
31				.393
32	.619			
33		.476		
34	.429			
35	.346			
36	.471			
37	.671			
38	.419			
39	.528			
40				.680
41			.631	

Table 6 (continued)

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
42	.305			
43		.371		
44	.483			
45		.546		
46			.757	
47		.395		
48			.738	
49		.346		
50		.363		
51		.585		
52	.644			
53	.584			
54	.691			
55		.626		
56			.763	
57		.533		
58	.546			
59				.429
60				.524
61		.437		

Table 7

Item Assignment to Factors: Virginia Tech

Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	
6	5	10	8	
9	7	12	15	
14	11	13	19	
18	16	30	23	
21	17	41	31	
22	20	46	40	
24	25	48	59	
26	33	56	60	
27	43			
28	45			
29	47			
32	49			
34	50			
35	51			
36	55			
37	57			
38	61			
39				
42				
44				
52				
53				
54				
58				
24	17	8	8	=57

Within the limitations of this study, e.g. a small sample size for factor analysis and the homogeneity of the respondents due to common area of interest, the results for the American group support previous claims of reliability and validity of the measure. Interest, conformity and modesty formed three definite separate factors, with self-concept and psychological awareness grouped together as one factor.

A four factor matrix was also the most appropriate for the Pretoria data, but there were differences between the factor configurations of the two groups. The matrix of factor loadings for the Pretoria group is presented in Appendix E. Table 8 contains the highest factor loadings for each item, and Table 9 the item assignments per factor.

For the South African students factor one consisted of all nine conformity items, two self-concept, two interest and three modesty items. One of the two self-concept items: I wear different clothes to impress people loaded highest on the conformity factor for the Virginia Tech group as well. The other was item 61, where confusion between the concepts morale and moral could have occurred. In Afrikaans the same word is sometimes used for both concepts, its meaning depending on whether it forms a noun or an

Table 8

Highest Factor Loadings: Pretoria

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
5		.466		
6		.145		
7				.431
8	.363			
9				.414
10	.327			
11			.371	
12	.409			
13	.472			
14	.506			
15			.537	
16			.540	
17			.570	
18		.211		
19	.379			
20		.363		
21				.420
22				.545

Table 8 (continued)

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
23			.488	
24				.246
25			.577	
26		.492		
27		.540		
28		.544		
29		.594		
30	.676			
31			.247	
32		.330		
33			.548	
34		.469		
35		.545		
36		.558		
37				.549
38			.342	
39		.668		
40	.531			
41	.668			

Table 8 (continued)

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
42		.420		
43			.508	
44	.373			
45			.521	
46	.645			
47		.430		
48	.652			
49				.256
50				.286
51			.589	
52				.555
53				.661
54				.451
55		.555		
56	.685			
57		.456		
58	.463			
59	.518			
60			.294	
61	.462			

Table 9

Item Assignment to Factors: Pretoria

Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	
8	5	11	7	
10	6	15	9	
12	18	16	21	
13	20	17	22	
14	26	23	24	
19	27	25	37	
30	28	31	49	
40	29	33	50	
41	32	38	52	
44	34	43	53	
46	35	45	54	
48	36	51		
56	39	60		
58	42			
59	47			
61	55			
	57			
16	17	13	11	=57

which formed part of either an experimental or fashion interest dimension in Gurel and Creekmore's studies. They imply either change, or contain the word new. An exception is the statement I wear a raincoat or carry an umbrella to protect my clothes in rainy weather, but since the average rainfall for South Africa is very low, walking in the rain could be an unusual experience to most of these students.

Considering the conservative nature of the Afrikaner, the formation of a separate dimension concerning change or experimentation is significant. When group means for this factor were calculated and compared it was found that the Virginia Tech students had a mean of 3.70 (sd= 0.56) and the Pretoria students 3.24 (sd= 0.62). The difference was significant with a t-value of 6.01 (p= .000). This indicates that the conservative nature of the Afrikaner could have important implications even for their clothing behavior.

Although there were many similarities between the factor extractions and item assignments for the two groups, there were also differences. Appendix F presents the different subscales, factors or dimensions to which each item has been assigned in the present as well as previous studies. Despite repeated indications

of reliability and validity, extreme care must be taken when an instrument is used on a culture different from that for which it was designed, even if both were Western.

Conclusions

Objective 1

To compare the two groups on each clothing interest dimension.

Hypothesis

There will be no difference between the two groups on the dimensions of clothing interest.

Subhypotheses

1 There will be no difference between the two groups on the interest dimension.

The Virginia Tech sample had a significantly higher mean score for the interest dimension ($t=3.91$, $p= 0.000$). Subhypothesis 1 is thus rejected.

2 There will be no difference between the two groups on the conformity dimension.

The difference between the group means for the Virginia Tech sample and the University of Pretoria sample was not significant ($t=0.42$, $p= 0.677$). Subhypothesis 2 is retained.

3 There will be no difference between the two groups on the psychological awareness dimension.

The difference between the group means for the Virginia Tech sample and the University of Pretoria sample was not significant ($t=0.20$, $p= 0.844$). Subhypothesis 3 is retained.

4 There will be no difference between the two groups on the self-concept dimension.

The Virginia Tech sample had a significantly higher mean score for the self-concept dimension ($t=3.91$, $p= 0.000$). Subhypothesis 4 is thus rejected.

5 There will be no difference between the two groups on the modesty dimension.

The University of Pretoria sample had a significantly higher mean score for the modesty dimension ($t=3.29$, $p= 0.001$). Subhypothesis 5 is rejected.

The two groups that were tested differed in three of the five dimensions of clothing interest that were extracted by Borsari in 1978. In addition to these five dimensions, the strength of an experimentation dimension that was extracted for the South African group was also significantly different ($t= 6.01$, $p= 0.000$).

Objective 2

To test the validity of the measuring instrument by factor analysis of the responses, split by group.

For both the groups a four factor extraction was more suitable than the five factors extracted by Borsari. The homogeneity of the two groups as well as the relative small sample sizes of 119 and 120 with 57 item variables, could have played a role. Results of the factor analysis of the Virginia Tech responses were very similar to that in the 1978 Borsari study; 48 of the 57 items (84 percent) loaded onto the same factor as before. Previous claims of reliability and validity, particularly for American college groups are therefore supported.

For the University of Pretoria sample, 37 of the 57 items (65 percent) loaded onto the same factor as in

previous studies. Of the rest, five items formed part of the South African experimentation dimension, and another five loaded onto the same factor as those items did for the American group. The instrument is therefore valid for the South African group in as much as definite factors could be extracted, but it cannot without reservation be said that these factors are the same as for the American group. In many ways the South African factor configuration was nearer to the initial studies than to the later one. Great care must be taken when an instrument such as this is used on respondents from other cultures. Where, for instance, a statement such as I try to buy clothes with well-known labels implied a fashion interest or attention dimension to the American groups, the word well-known might have meant buying what they know, and thus conforming to preset standards for the South African respondents.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

Differences in the clothing behavior of students from different Western cultures, such as the American and South African, could be due simply to differences in fashion, but on the other hand they could also be due to cultural differences manifesting themselves in the values, attitudes, and interests of the groups. It is therefore possible that the traditionally conservative background of the Afrikaner student causes her to be more modest and conforming in dress.

A comparison of clothing interests between an American and an Afrikaner group would demonstrate whether cultural differences are reflected in clothing behavior. One problem with such a comparison is that most tests were developed and used with populations from the United States. Such instruments might not be valid for other populations. There is a need for reliable instruments that will also be valid for South African situations.

The purpose of this research was to determine and compare the strength of the dimensions of clothing interest between Afrikaans female clothing and textile

students at The University of Pretoria and female clothing and textile students at Virginia Tech. An additional objective was to test the validity of the measuring instrument by factor analysis.

The Instrument

Dimensions of clothing interest for the two groups were measured with Creekmore's Importance of Clothing questionnaire, as revised and shortened by Borsari in 1978. The revised instrument, titled the Gurel-Creekmore Clothing Interest Questionnaire consists of 57 statements, each answered on a 5-point Likert-type scale. Together the statements form five different dimensions of clothing interest: interest, modesty, conformity, self-concept, and psychological awareness. Demographic information concerning the respondent's academic year, age, primary language and sex was obtained.

The Samples

The American sample consisted of 119 female students at Virginia Tech who were registered as having clothing and textiles as their major during the

spring quarter of 1987. The South African sample consisted of 120 female clothing and textile majors registered at The University of Pretoria during the first semester of 1987. The South African sample was limited to respondents with Afrikaans as their primary language. The students were all undergraduates.

Statistical Analysis and Results

The students recorded their responses directly onto answer sheets, which were then read by an optical scanner. Frequency distributions were determined for the demographic data. Differences between the two groups in the strength of the dimensions of clothing interest were tested for significance with independent t-tests. These indicated that the group mean scores differed significantly for three of the five dimensions. The Virginia Tech sample had a higher score on the interest dimension ($t= 3.91$, $p= 0.000$) as well as the self-concept dimension ($t=3.91$, $p= 0.000$). The Pretoria sample had a higher mean score on the modesty dimension ($t=3.29$, $p= 0.001$).

The relationships between the different dimensions were also calculated. Pearson correlation coefficients indicate that correlations of moderate

strength existed between the interest, self-concept, and psychological awareness dimensions.

Factor analysis was used to test the construct validity of the questionnaire for both groups. A four factor matrix seemed to be the most appropriate. The factor structure for the American group was very similar to that established by Borsari in 1978. Self-concept and psychological awareness items were grouped together in one factor, but the modesty, conformity and interest items formed three definite separate factors. Forty-eight of the fifty-seven items loaded onto the same factor as before.

In some ways the South African structure bore a stronger resemblance to the results of earlier studies than to that of Borsari. A dimension of clothing interest that combined experimentation with clothing items and fashion interest items existed for this group. A comparison of group means indicated that the South African respondents will be far less likely to experiment with clothing or to change their clothing behavior than their American counterparts ($t = 6.00$, $p = 0.000$). This difference would have been significant at the .001 level with even as few as six respondents in total. Conformity and modesty items were also inclined to load together on one factor, indicating a

possible interlacing of these two concepts in the minds of the Pretoria students. This research showed that subtle differences could exist between different cultures in their interpretation of statements, and that measuring instruments should be thoroughly tested for validity before any sort of general conclusion could be drawn.

CHAPTER VII

SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

1 The results of this research indicated that clothing behavior measures, such as the Gurel-Creekmore Clothing Interest Questionnaire, need to be thoroughly tested with other cultural groups.

2 In South Africa, with its many diverse population groups, construct validity needs to be established before meaningful cross-cultural comparisons of clothing interests could be made.

3 The instrument as revised by Borsari contains no comfort dimension or any items that could relate to it. This aspect might be important to populations other than students and needs to be researched.

4 The conformity dimension of clothing behavior, and particularly its association with modesty for the Afrikaans group, needs to be investigated.

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1961). Pattern and growth in personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (1987). Social psychology: Understanding human interaction. (5th edition). Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.

Booyens, B. (1971). Wesenskenmerke van die Afrikaner se identiteit. SARP, 7, 43-44.

Borsari, M. L. (1978). An analysis and revision of a clothing measure. Unpublished master's thesis, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia.

Botha, P. (1983). Die verwantskap tussen selfkonsep, voorkoms en kledingbelangstelling van koshuisdamestudente aan die Universiteit van Pretoria. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.

Botha, P. (1986). Self-concept and personal appearance of late adolescents. South African Journal of Dietetics and Home Economics, 14, 53-57.

Botha, P., & Bosch, A. (1986). Kledingkonformiteit en -individualiteit by damestudente. South African Journal of Dietetics and Home Economics, 14, 87-91.

Brady, B. L. (1963). Clothing behavior: refinement of a measure and relationships with social security and insecurity for a group of college women. Unpublished master's thesis, The Pennsylvania State University.

Chang, Y. (1984). Clothing interest and job satisfaction of Korean high school teachers. Unpublished master's thesis, Oklahoma State University.

Chen, J. H. (1970). Clothing attitudes of Chinese and American college women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Christiansen, K, & Kernaleguen, A. (1971). Orthodoxy and conservatism-modesty in clothing selection. Journal of Home Economics, 63, 251-255.

Conrad, G. (1973). Clothing values and their relation to personality factors and to selected demographic variables for two groups of Canadian university women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Creekmore, A. M. (1963). Clothing behaviors and their relation to general values and basic needs. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Creekmore, A. M. (1971). Methods of measuring clothing variables. Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station Project No. 784.

De Klerk, W. A. (1975). The puritans in Africa: a story of Afrikanerdom. London: Rex Collings.

De Klerk, W. J. (1979). Die Afrikaanse lewens- en wereldbeskouing - enkele flitse. Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe, 19, 269-270.

Gurel, L. M. (1974). Dimensions of clothing interest based on factor analysis of Creekmore's 1968 clothing measure. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Gurel, L. M., & Deemer, E. M. (1975). Construct validity of Creekmore's clothing questionnaire. Home Economics Research Journal, 4, 42-47.

Gurel, L. M., & Gurel, L. (1979). Clothing interest: Conceptualization and measurement. Home Economics Research Journal, 7, 274-282.

Hao, L. F. C. (1971). A cross-cultural study: The relationship between clothing behaviors and general values. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Heyns, J. A. (1979). Die Afrikaanse lewens- en wereldbeskouing. Tydskrif vir Geesteswetenskappe, 19, 269-270.

Hopkinson, T. (1969). South Africa. New York: Time Life Books.

Kassarjian, H. H. (1971). Personality and consumer behavior: a review. Journal of Marketing Research, 8, 409-418.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston.

Kim, J. G. (1970). Selected clothing behaviors, interest in clothing, and selected clothing practices for a group of college women in Korea. (Master's thesis, University of Tennessee, Knoxville). Home Economics Research Abstracts, 1970, Clothing and Textiles, p. 55.

Kim, M., & Schrank, H. L. (1982). Fashion leadership: A two-culture study. Part 1: Fashion leadership among Korean college women. Home Economics Research Journal, 10, 227-234.

Kness, D., & Densmore, B. (1976). Dress and social-political beliefs of young male students. Adolescence, xi, 431-442.

Lapitsky, M. (1961). Clothing values and their relation to general values and to social security and insecurity. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Levin, J., & Black, H. (1970). Personal appearance as a reflection of social attitudes: Stereotype or reality? Psychological Reports, 27, 338.

MacKay, C. C. C. (1967). Clothing behavior in relation to selected cultural differences: A cross-cultural study. Unpublished master's thesis, The Pennsylvania State University.

Mendoza, A. R. (1965). Clothing values and their relation to general values: A cross-cultural study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Moodie, T. D. (1975). The rise of Afrikanerdom. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Ryan, M. S. (1966). Clothing: A study in human behavior. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Retief, M. (1970). Dr Con kyk na die ‚nuwe Afrikaner'. Die Huisgenoot, 42, 40-43.

Schrank, H. L., Sugawara, A. I., & Kim, M. (1982). Fashion leadership: A two-culture study. Part 2: Comparison of Korean and American fashion leaders. Home Economics Research Journal, 10, 235-240.

Shopland, J. S. (1982). Interest in clothing: A methodological approach. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Temko, N. (1987, February 23). For some Afrikaners, a new trek. The Christian Science Monitor pp. 1, 15.

Tigert, D. J., King, C. W., & Ring, L. (1980). Fashion involvement: A crosscultural comparative analysis. Advances in Consumer Research, 7, 17-21.

Toerien, E. S. (1986). Kledingwaardes van standerdses-en negemeisies. South African Journal of Dietetics and Home Economics, 14, 117-119.

University of Pretoria. (1987). Gids vir 1987.

Viljoen, G. van N. (1974). Die Afrikaner se antwoord op die gevare waarvoor ons staan. Handhaaf, 11, 19-23.

APPENDIX A

Dimension Definitions

The following are definitions or descriptions of the different dimensions of clothing interest, as utilized by previous researchers.

Creekmore

Aesthetic: Use of clothing to achieve a pleasing or beautiful appearance.

Approval: Use of clothing to attain a feeling of belonging or approval of others; usually indicates conformity to group norms.

Attention: Seeking of prestige and status through use of clothing; may be either socially approved or disapproved.

Comfort: Use of clothing to achieve comfort whether this relates to temperature, physical response to textures, or tightness or looseness of garments.

Dependence: Sensitivity to the influence of clothing feelings (sense of well being, general good feeling, or changing of moods).

Interest: Willingness to give attention, investigate, manipulate, or experiment with clothing.

Management: Thoughtful and careful use of time, money, and energy in planning, buying and using clothing; thus an economic aspect.

Modesty: Preference for inconspicuous clothing, quite conservative in color, fit, design, and body exposure.

Theoretic: Understanding of self and others relative to clothing behavior.

(Creekmore, 1971, pp. 96-97)

Gurel

Appearance: Concern about one's clothes as they contribute to or distract from one's appearance.

Experimentation: An experimental attitude towards dress and appearance; a willingness to try something new and different for the sheer existential enjoyment of the novel experience.

Psychological awareness: An impersonal, but heightened awareness of clothing; academic, abstracted, and impersonal.

Self-concept: The use of clothing to boost morale and to increase feelings of security and self-confidence.

Fashion interest: An interest in fashion, style, and distinctive clothes; stylish appearance and latest fashions are important.

(Gurel & Gurel, 1979, pp. 276-280)

Conformity: Use of clothing to attain a feeling of belonging or approval of others; conforming to a specific reference group's norms.

Comfort: Physiological aspects of clothing; use of clothing to achieve comfort whether this relates to temperature, physical response to textures, or tightness or looseness of garments.

(Gurel, 1974, pp. 97-100)

Modesty: Preference for inconspicuous clothing, quite conservative in color, fit, design, and body exposure.

(Creekmore, 1971, pp. 96-97)

Borsari

Interest: A general interest in clothing, combining aspects previously classified as aesthetics, appearance, management, experimentation, and fashion interest.

Psychological awareness: An impersonal, but heightened awareness of clothing; academic, abstracted, and impersonal.

Self-concept: The use of clothing to boost morale and to increase feelings of security and self-confidence.

Conformity: Use of clothing to attain a feeling of belonging or approval of others; conforming to a specific reference group's norms.

Modesty: Preference for inconspicuous clothing, quite conservative in color, fit, design, and body exposure.

APPENDIX B

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY
Department of Clothing and Textiles
Blacksburg, Virginia
May, 1987.

Dear Student,

The increase in international trade in apparel has focused the attention on the clothing tastes and interests of Americans as compared to those of people from other cultures. Unfortunately very few cross-cultural studies have been done on this subject. We would like to compare the clothing interests of Virginia Tech students with those of students in foreign countries. But for this we need your help.

We would appreciate your cooperation in completing the attached questionnaire on the Opscan sheet provided. Please remember to use a #2 pencil. There are no right or wrong answers. Please do not discuss the statements with your friends before returning the Opscan sheet. Your personal opinion is important to us.

Your reply will be treated with complete confidenciality. The Opscan sheet has an identification number for mailing purposes only. This will enable us to check your name off the mailing list AND TO ADD IT TO THE OTHERS FOR OUR LUCKY $10 DRAW! To ensure participation in our lucky draw, we must have your responses by May 22, 1987. You can return the Opscan sheet via intercampus mail to Dr. L. M. Gurel, 101 Wallace Hall or E. S. Toerien, 209 Wallace Hall. Use the envelope that you received the questionnaire in.

We would be most happy to answer any questions you might have or share the results of the study with you. The telephone number is 961-0146 (h) and 961-6770 (w).

Thank you for your assistance.
Sincerely,

Elsa Toerien
Graduate student

Dr. Lois M. Gurel
Research advisor

Questions 1 to 4: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1	Academic year:	1	freshman
		2	sophomore
		3	junior
		4	senior
		5	graduate
		6	other
2	Age:	1	17-18 years
		2	19-20 years
		3	21-22 years
		4	23-24 years
		5	25-26 years
		6	older than 26 years
3	Primary language:	1	English
		2	Other
4	Sex:	1	Female
		2	Male

Questions 5 to 61:IMPORTANCE OF CLOTHING QUESTIONNAIRE

Read the following statements and rate each according to the scale given below. Indicate your choice by blackening the corresponding numbered circle with a #2 pencil.

Scale:		
	Almost always, very few exceptions	5
	Usually, majority of the time	4
	Sometimes	3
	Seldom, not very often	2
	Almost never, very few exceptions	1

5 I try for pleasing color combinations in my clothing.

6 I try on clothes in shops just to see how I will look in them without really planning to buy.

7 I experiment with new or different hairstyles to see how I will look.

8 I hesitate to associate with people whose clothes seem to reveal to much of their body.

Scale:		
	Almost always, very few exceptions	5
	Usually, majority of the time	4
	Sometimes	3
	Seldom, not very often	2
	Almost never, very few exceptions	1

9 I try on some of the newest clothes each season to see how I look in the styles.

10 I wear what I like even though some of my friends do not approve.

11 I wonder why some clothes make me feel better than others.

12 I ask my friends what they are wearing to an event before I decide what to wear.

13 I wear different clothes to impress people.

14 I have gone places and felt uncomfortable because my clothes were not similar to others.

15 I wonder why some people wear clothes that are immodest.

16 I decide on the clothes to wear according to the mood that I'm in that day.

17 I wear "dress-up" clothes to make an ordinary occasion seem more exciting.

18 I have something to wear for any occasion that occurs.

19 I feel embarrassed when I see someone in clothes that are too tight.

20 I have more self confidence when I wear my best clothes.

21 I read magazines and newspapers to find out what is new in clothing.

22 When I buy a new garment I try many different accessories before I wear it.

23 When people are dressed unsuitably, I wonder why they are dressed that way.

Scale:

Almost always, very few exceptions	5
Usually, majority of the time	4
Sometimes	3
Seldom, not very often	2
Almost never, very few exceptions	1

24 I enjoy trying on shoes of different styles and colors.

25 I avoid wearing certain clothes which do not make me feel distinctive.

26 I try to keep my wardrobe up-to-date.

27 I like to know what is new in clothing even if my friends are uninterested and even though I would not wear it myself.

28 I am more careful with my clothing than my friends are with their clothing.

29 I look at accessories while shopping to see what I might use together.

30 When I buy a new article of clothing I try to buy something similar to what my friends are wearing.

31 I feel uncomfortable when someone forgets to close a zipper.

32 I like to be considered outstandingly welldressed by my friends.

33 I am curious as to why some people choose to wear the clothes they do.

34 I clean and store my out-of-season clothing.

35 I keep my shoes clean and neat.

36 I spend a good deal of time coordinating the colors of items in my wardrobe.

37 When new styles appear on the market, I am one of the first to buy them.

38 I get bored with wearing the same type of clothes all the time.

Scale: Almost always, very few exceptions 5
Usually, majority of the time 4
Sometimes 3
Seldom, not very often 2
Almost never, very few exceptions 1

39 I look over my wardrobe before each season so that I know what I have.

40 I feel embarrassed when I see someone in a low cut dress or blouse.

41 I get new clothes for a special occasion if the clothes I have are not the type my friends will be wearing.

42 I have a long-term plan for purchasing more expensive items of clothing.

43 I wonder what makes some clothes more comfortable than others.

44 I try to buy clothes with well-known labels.

45 I am interested in why some people choose to wear unusual clothes.

46 I try to dress like my friends so that others will know I am a part of the group.

47 I am aware of being more friendly and outgoing when I wear certain clothing.

48 I am uncomfortable when my clothes are different from all others at a party.

49 I enjoy wearing unusual clothing even though I attract attention.

50 I wear a raincoat or carry an umbrella to protect my clothes in rainy weather.

51 I try to figure out why some people look better in their clothes than others.

52 It's fun to try clothes with different accessories to see how they look.

Scale:		
	Almost always, very few exceptions	5
	Usually, majority of the time	4
	Sometimes	3
	Seldom, not very often	2
	Almost never, very few exceptions	1

53 I go some distance to find shops with fashionable clothing.

54 I carefully coordinate the accessories that I wear with my clothing.

55 Certain clothes make me feel more sure of myself.

56 I feel more a part of the group if I am dressed like my friends.

57 I feel and act differently if I am wearing my best clothes.

58 I plan and prepare clothes to wear several days in advance.

59 I would rather miss something than wear clothes that are not appropriate.

60 Unlined sheer dresses, blouses, or shirts reveal too much of the body.

61 I buy clothing to boost my morale.

APPENDIX C

VIRGINIA POLYTECHNIC INSTITUTE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

Department of Clothing and Textiles

Blacksburg, Virginia.

26 April 1987.

Geagte Student,

Ek is 'n nagraadse student in Kleding en Tekstiele. Deel van my navorsing is 'n kruis-kulturele vergelyking van kledingbelangstelling onder Amerikaanse en Suid-Afrikaanse studente. Daarvoor het ek u hulp nodig. Dit sal baie waardeer word indien u die aangehegte vraelys sal voltooi.

Die vraelys word op die blou-bedrukte vorm beantwoord. Gebruik asseblief 'n HB potlood en kleur die sirkels ooreenstemmend met u keuse heeltemal in. Moet asseblief nie 'n pen gebruik of die vorm buig of kram nie. Dit maak dit ongeskik vir verwerking deur 'n optiese leser.

Die vraelys is heeltemal annoniem. Moet ASSEBLIEF nie u naam of identiteitsnommer op die betrokke gedeeltes invul nie. Daar is geen regte of verkeerde antwoorde nie. Moet asseblief ook nie die vraelys met u vriendinne bespreek voordat u dit inhandig nie. U persoonlike mening is van belang. Antwoord asseblief al die vrae.

Baie dankie vir u samewerking.

Mev. E. S. Toerien.

DEMOGRAFIESE BESONDERHEDE

1	Akademiese jaar:	1	1ste
		2	2de
		3	3de
		4	4de
		5	nagraads
		6	ander
2	Ouderdom:	1	17-18 jaar
		2	19-20 jaar
		3	21-22 jaar
		4	23-24 jaar
		5	25-26 jaar
		6	ouer as 26 jaar
3	Huistaal:	1	Engels
		2	Afrikaans
		3	Ander
4	Geslag:	1	Vroulik
		2	Manlik

KLEDINGBELANGSTELLINGSVRAELYS

Lees die volgende stellings noukeurig. Merk die respons wat u gevoel die beste of naaste beskryf.

Amper altyd, met baie min uitsonderings	5
Gewoonlik, die meeste van die tyd	4
Somtyds	3
Selde, nie baie dikwels nie	2
Amper nooit nie, met baie min uitsonderings	1

5 Ek gee baie aandag aan harmonieuse kleursamestellings vir my klere.

6 Ek pas klere in winkels aan om vas te stel hoe ek daarin lyk sonder dat ek werklik van plan is om dit te koop.

7 Ek eksperimenteer met nuwe haarstyle om te sien hoe ek daarmee lyk.

8 Ek aarsel om met iemand wie se klere te veel van hulle liggaam ontbloot te assosieer.

Amper altyd, met baie min uitsonderings	5
Gewoonlik, die meeste van die tyd	4
Somtyds	3
Selde, nie baie dikwels nie	2
Amper nooit nie, met baie min uitsonderings	1

9 Aan die begin van elke seisoen pas ek klere van die nuutste styl aan om te sien hoe ek daarin lyk.

10 Ek dra waarvan ek hou al sou sommige van my vriendinne dit nie goedkeur nie.

11 Ek wonder waarom sekere klere my beter laat voel as ander.

12 Ek vra my vriendinne wat hulle aantrek vir 'n bepaalde geleentheid voordat ek op my eie kleredrag besluit.

13 Ek dra elke dag ander klere om mense te beindruk.

14 Ek het al per geleentheid ongemaklik gevoel omdat my klere anders as al die ander s'n was.

15 Ek wonder hoekom party mense onfatsoenlike klere dra.

16 Ek besluit op die klere wat ek dra, volgens die stemming waarin ek die dag verkeer.

17 Ek trek mooi aan om 'n gewone geleentheid meer opwindend te maak.

18 Ek het geskikte klere vir enige geleentheid wat mag opduik.

19 Ek voel verlee as ek iemand met te styfpassende klere aan sien.

20 Ek het meer selfvertroue as ek my beste klere aan het.

21 Ek lees tydskrifte en koerante om vas te stel wat die nuutste modestyle is.

22 Wanneer ek 'n nuwe kledingstuk koop, pas ek verskeie bykomstighede daarmee saam aan voordat ek dit begin dra.

23 Wanneer iemand onvanpas aangetrek is, wonder ek waarom sy so aantrek.

Amper altyd, met baie min uitsonderings	5
Gewoonlik, die meeste van die tyd	4
Somtyds	3
Selde, nie baie dikwels nie	2
Amper nooit nie, met baie min uitsonderings	1

24 Ek geniet dit om skoene van verskillende style en kleure aan te pas.

25 Ek vermy die dra van sekere klere omdat dit my nie uniek laat voel nie.

26 Ek probeer om my klerekas in pas met die nuutste mode te hou.

27 Ek wil graag weet wat die nuutste mode is al sou ek dit waarskynlik nie dra nie.

28 Ek is meer as my vriendinne besorg oor die versorging van my klere.

29 Ek kyk na bykomstighede in winkels sodat ek kan sien wat om self saam te gebruik.

30 Wanneer ek 'n nuwe kledingstuk koop probeer ek iets koop wat soortgelyk aan my vriendinne s'n is.

31 Ek voel ongemaklik wanneer iemand vergeet het om sy ritsluiter op te trek.

32 Ek hou daarvan om as 'n buitengewoon goedgeklede persoon onder my vriende bekend te wees.

33 Ek is nuuskierig waarom andere die klere dra wat hulle wel dra.

34 Ek sorg dat die klere van die afgelope seisoen skoongemaak en weggepak is.

35 Ek hou my skoene skoon en netjies.

36 Ek spandeer baie tyd om die kleure van my klere bymekaar te laat pas.

37 As 'n nuwe mode op die mark verskyn, is ek een van die eerstes wat dit aanskaf.

38 Ek raak verveeld as ek aldag dieselfde tipe klere dra.

Amper altyd, met baie min uitsonderings	5
Gewoonlik, die meeste van die tyd	4
Somtyds	3
Selde, nie baie dikwels nie	2
Amper nooit nie, met baie min uitsonderings	1

39 Aan die begin van elke seisoen gaan ek die klere in my klerekas na sodat ek weet wat ek het.

40 Ek voel verlee as ek iemand met 'n te laag gesnyde halslyn sien.

41 Ek kry nuwe klere vir 'n spesiale geleentheid as die klere wat ek het nie dieselfde tipe is as wat my vriendinne gaan dra nie.

42 Ek beplan vir 'n lang termyn wanneer ek duurder kledingstukke wil aanskaf.

43 Ek wonder waarom sekere klere gemakliker as ander is.

44 Ek probeer om klere met 'n bekende handelsmerk te koop.

45 Ek stel belang waarom sommige mense sulke ongewone klere dra.

46 Ek probeer net soos die ander in my groep aantrek sodat ander kan sien dat ons vriendinne is.

47 Ek is bewus daarvan dat ek vriendeliker en meer spontaan optree as ek sekere klere aan het.

48 Op 'n partytjie voel ek ongemaklik as my klere anders as al die ander s'n is.

49 Ek geniet dit om buitengewone klere te dra al sou ek aandag trek.

50 In reenerige weer dra ek 'n reenjas of sambreel om my klere te beskerm.

51 Ek wonder waarom sekere mense se klere hulle beter pas as ander s'n.

52 Ek geniet dit om verskillende klere en bykomstighede aan te pas om te sien hoe dit bymekaar lyk.

Amper altyd, met baie min uitsonderings	5
Gewoonlik, die meeste van die tyd	4
Somtyds	3
Selde, nie baie dikwels nie	2
Amper nooit nie, met baie min uitsonderings	1

53 Ek gaan na nabygelee stede om modieuse klere te kan koop.

54 Ek koordineer die bykomstighede wat ek met elke uitrusting dra sorgvuldig.

55 Ek voel meer seker van myself in sekere klere.

56 Ek voel meer deel van die groep as ek soos my vriendinne aangetrek is.

57 Ek voel en tree anders op as ek my beste klere aan het.

58 Ek beplan 'n paar dae vooruit watter klere ek gaan dra en maak die nodige voorbereidings daarvoor.

59 Ek sou liewers iets misloop as wat ek klere aantrek wat nie regtig vir die geleentheid geskik is nie.

60 Ongevoerde deursigtige rokke, bloese of hemde wys te veel van 'n mens se lyf.

61 Ek koop klere om my moraal te versterk.

APPENDIX D

Table 10

Matrix of Factor Loadings: Virginia Tech

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
5	-.005	.632	.149	-.103
6	.456	.138	-.072	-.133
7	.130	.381	-.089	-.105
8	-.008	-.109	.101	.522
9	.719	.208	-.160	-.131
10	.077	-.388	.421	-.196
11	.189	.394	.227	.310
12	-.033	.145	.532	-.051
13	.258	.235	.356	.144
14	-.243	.141	.052	.155
15	.038	.088	.117	.665
16	.029	.525	-.092	.016
17	.246	.420	-.049	.194
18	.517	.118	-.130	.112
19	-.080	.088	-.159	.611
20	.051	.627	.437	.029
21	.424	.345	-.123	-.083
22	.561	.060	-.050	.111

Table 10 (continued)

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
23	.336	.396	.127	.435
24	.583	.200	-.087	.053
25	.181	.409	.048	.245
26	.617	.337	.073	-.079
27	.487	.393	-.113	-.037
28	.426	.024	-.122	.397
29	.573	.228	.001	-.129
30	.051	-.130	.757	.123
31	-.100	.154	.170	.393
32	.619	.144	.185	.116
33	.158	.476	.124	.447
34	.429	.058	-.133	.060
35	.346	-.103	-.308	.274
36	.471	.024	.113	.175
37	.671	.016	.124	.074
38	.419	.221	.092	.031
39	.528	.210	.204	-.003
40	-.105	-.047	.104	.680
41	.091	.019	.631	.095

Table 10 (continued)

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
42	.305	-.070	.134	-.003
43	.110	.371	.259	.262
44	.483	-.149	.373	.247
45	.007	.546	.136	.402
46	.088	.080	.757	.190
47	.094	.395	.419	.102
48	-.102	.124	.738	.177
49	.249	.346	-.305	.088
50	.096	.363	-.011	-.129
51	.165	.585	-.008	.285
52	.644	.251	.041	-.204
53	.584	.056	.081	.095
54	.691	.185	.094	.129
55	.254	.626	.230	.126
56	.048	.105	.763	.144
57	.060	.533	.396	.054
58	.546	-.080	.203	.272
59	.234	-.008	.174	.429
60	.134	.144	.047	.524
61	.435	.437	.282	-.008

APPENDIX E

Table 11

Matrix of Factor Loadings: Pretoria

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
5	-.199	.466	.138	.256
6	-.026	.145	-.058	.101
7	-.030	.067	.149	.431
8	.363	.240	.006	.132
9	.115	.384	.061	.414
10	.327	-.060	-.376	-.140
11	.308	.210	.371	-.031
12	.409	.104	.180	-.137
13	.472	-.026	.148	-.205
14	.506	-.132	.192	-.063
15	.128	.050	.537	.224
16	-.105	.174	.540	-.104
17	.012	.123	.570	.111
18	-.113	.211	.127	.178
19	.379	-.088	-.014	.294
20	.172	.363	.079	.000
21	.022	.350	.074	.420
22	-.037	.325	.237	.545

Table 11 (continued)

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
23	.102	.066	.488	.398
24	.092	.184	.247	.246
25	-.062	.195	.577	.023
26	.301	.492	.012	.461
27	-.117	.540	.341	.028
28	.024	.544	-.012	-.002
29	-.015	.594	.023	.224
30	.676	-.137	-.190	.087
31	.227	.021	.247	.209
32	-.095	.330	.342	.164
33	.095	.033	.548	.342
34	.071	.469	.007	.102
35	.055	.545	.103	.092
36	.134	.558	.077	.335
37	.368	.010	-.025	.549
38	.072	.273	.342	.100
39	-.022	.668	.174	.226
40	.531	.070	.261	.201
41	.668	.047	.176	.004

Table 11 (continued)

Factors	1	2	3	4
Items				
42	-.170	.420	.330	-.092
43	.306	-.182	.508	.232
44	.373	-.096	.095	.344
45	.289	.140	.521	.182
46	.645	-.139	-.032	.012
47	.344	.430	.380	-.183
48	.652	.116	-.034	.027
49	.020	.090	.208	.256
50	-.066	.066	.162	.286
51	.299	.084	.589	.290
52	-.056	.320	.397	.555
53	.142	.092	.040	.661
54	.135	.427	.215	.451
55	.130	.555	.427	-.081
56	.685	.144	-.067	.045
57	.256	.456	.356	-.219
58	.463	.382	.012	.054
59	.518	.077	.110	.170
60	.156	-.138	.294	.087
61	.462	.243	.078	.239

APPENDIX F

Table 12

Dimension Assignment of Items

in Present and Previous Studies

Abbreviations:

aesth : aesthetic
appear: appearance
appr : approval
atten : attention
c/mod : conformity/modesty
comf : comfort
conf : conformity
dep : dependence
exp : experimentation
fash : fashion interest
int : interest
mgt : management
mod : modesty
psyc : psych.awareness
self : self-concept
s/psyc: self-concept/psychological awareness

(See Appendix A for previous researchers' definitions of concepts. Dimension names in Table 12 are used as defined by each particular researcher)

Item	Creekmore	Gurel	Borsari	Toerien Virginia Tech	Toerien Pretoria
5	aesth	appear	int	s/psyc	int
6	int	exp	self	int	int
7	int	exp	self	s/psyc	exp
8	mod	mod	mod	mod	c/mod
9	int	exp	int	int	exp
10	appr	mod	conf	conf	c/mod
11	psyc	psyc	psyc	s/psyc	psyc
12	appr	conf	conf	c/mod	conf
13	atten	self	self	conf	c/mod
14	appr	conf	conf	int	c/mod

Table 12 (continued)

Item	Creekmore	Gurel	Borsari	Toerien Virginia Tech	Toerien Pretoria
15	psyc	mod	mod	mod	psyc
16	dep	exp	self	s/psyc	psyc
17	dep	fash	int	s/psyc	psyc
18	mgt	appear	int	int	int
19	mod	mod	mod	mod	c/mod
20	dep	self	self	s/psyc	psyc
21	int	exp	int	int	exp
22	int	exp	int	int	exp
23	psyc	psyc	mod	mod	psyc
24	int	exp	int	int	exp
25	atten	fash	int	s/psyc	psyc
26	atten	fash	int	int	int
27	int	exp	int	int	int
28	mgt	appear	int	int	int
29	int	exp	int	int	int
30	appr	conf	conf	conf	c/mod
31	mod	mod	mod	mod	psyc
32	atten	fash	int	int	int
33	psyc	psyc	psyc	s/psyc	psyc
34	mgt	appear	int	int	int
35	aesth	appear	int	int	int

Table 12 (continued)

Item	Creekmore	Gurel	Borsari	Toerien Virginia Tech	Toerien Pretoria
36	aesth	appear	int	int	int
37	atten	fash	int	int	exp
38	dep	self	self	int	psyc
39	mgt	appear	int	int	int
40	mod	mod	mod	mod	c/mod
41	appr	conf	conf	conf	c/mod
42	mgt	appear	int	int	int
43	psyc	psyc	psyc	s/psyc	psyc
44	atten	fash	int	int	c/mod
45	psyc	psyc	psyc	s/psyc	psyc
46	appr	conf	conf	conf	c/mod
47	dep	self	self	s/psyc	int
48	appr	conf	conf	conf	c/mod
49	atten	fash	self	s/psyc	exp
50	mgt	appear	int	s/psyc	exp
51	psyc	psyc	psyc	s/psyc	psyc
52	int	exp	int	int	exp
53	atten	fash	int	int	exp
54	aesth	appear	int	int	exp
55	dep	self	self	s/psyc	int
56	appr	conf	conf	conf	c/mod

Table 12 (continued)

Item	Creekmore	Gurel	Borsari	Toerien Virginia Tech	Toerien Pretoria
58	mgt	appear	int	int	c/mod
59	appr	conf	conf	mod	c/mod
60	mod	mod	mod	mod	psyc
61	dep	self	self	s/psyc	c/mod

The vita has been removed from the scanned document