

CHAPTER 5

FINDINGS

The purpose of this study was to gather preferences of flight attendants for garment characteristics of the ideal flight attendant uniform then use those preferences as criteria to begin the design for a uniform that functions for the needs of the wearer. The results were based on data collected in January and February of 1997 from a total of 218 female flight attendants. The design data were analyzed using frequency counts, frequency distribution, cross-tabulations and independent samples chi-square test.

Wearer

The wearers were female flight attendants. All flight attendants were actively employed at the time of the study. There were no limitations on age, size, race or years of experience. The flight attendants were based in locations in the eastern part of the nation. However, they lived all over the world and commuted to their base.

The researcher was set up with a table and chairs to be used by the flight attendant while completing the questionnaire in their crew lounge at the Charlotte International Airport. Therefore the flight attendants were either based in Charlotte, NC or were passing through the crew lounge between flights or layovers. The 218 flight attendants for this research representing US Airways approached the research display and volunteered to participate in the study.

Sample

The population for this study was flight attendants. The sample consisted of 218 flight attendants who volunteered to participate in the study. The sample represented less than three percent of the flight attendants of a major US airline based in Charlotte, NC at the Charlotte International Airport.

Description of the sample

Age: The subjects ranged in age from 25 to 51. Thirty four percent ($n = 75$) of the sample were in the age range of 35 and below, 47% ($n = 102$) were in the 36 - 45 age range and 19% ($n = 41$) were in the age range of 46 and over.

Years of service: The subjects ranged in years of service from 1 to 36. Five percent ($n = 11$) of the sample were in the 5 years and below range, 79% ($n = 173$) were in the 6 to 24 range and 11% were in the 25 and over range. The subjects were actively employed, Caucasian and non-Caucasian female flight attendants.

Ethnic: Of the 218 subjects, 91% ($n = 199$) were Caucasian. The four ethnic groups of Asian ($n = 1$), African Americans ($n = 15$), American Indians ($n = 1$), and Hispanic ($n = 2$) equaled a cumulative percentage of .09% of the respondents. The typical flight attendant respondent was a Caucasian female within the 36 to 45 age range with 6 to 24 years of service.

Confirmation of the Problem

A 5 point Likert scale used to measure the flight attendant responses to the seven questions in section three of the questionnaire related to satisfaction with the current flight attendant uniform clothing. The findings indicated over 55% of the flight attendants were completely dissatisfied with their current uniform while 15% were satisfied and approximately 30% remained neutral. (see Table 11, Appendix C)

Flight Attendant Uniform Preferences

Frequency counts indicated three garments were preferred by the majority of flight attendants: 1) shirt, 2) cardigan sweater, and 3) slacks. As shown in Tables 8, 9, and 10 cross tabulations indicated preferences for individual garment characteristics and design criteria of each garment as presented below:

1. Shirt - upper body garment
 - Silhouette
 - Interior design lines
 - Fabric and color
2. Cardigan Sweater - upper body garment
 - Silhouette
 - Interior design lines
 - Fabric and color
3. Slacks - lower body garment
 - Silhouette
 - Interior design lines
 - Fabric and color

Table 8

Flight Attendant Uniform Clothing and Design Criteria Preferences

Silhouette				
Clothing	Clothing Shape (<i>n</i>) %	Clothing Length (<i>n</i>) %	Sleeve Shape (<i>n</i>) %	Sleeve Length (<i>n</i>) %
SHIRT	straight (172) 80.37	mid-hip (195) 93.30	straight (178) 84.76	short & long (148) 72.20
SLACKS	tapered (93) 48.70	ankle (182) 100.00	N/A 0 0	N/A 0 0
SWEATER	straight (131) 83.44	mid-hip (75) 47.77	straight (101) 75.94	long (120) 93.75

note: percentages are based on the total number of responses for shape or length of the individual garments.

Table 9

Flight Attendant Uniform Clothing and Design Criteria Preferences

Interior Design Lines							
Clothing	Neckline	Collar Type	Pocket Style	Pocket Placement	Closing Type	Closing Location	Waist Style
	(<i>n</i>) %	(<i>n</i>) %	(<i>n</i>) %	(<i>n</i>) %	(<i>n</i>) %	(<i>n</i>) %	(<i>n</i>) %
SHIRT	jewel (15) 55.56	convertible (69) 36.51	patch w/pen (78) 86.67	chest (87) 95.60	button (173) 100.00	center front (167) 98.24	N/A 0 0
SLACKS	N/A 0 0	N/A 0 0	in-the-seam (157) 90.75	hip (159) 91.91	zipper (176) 95.14	center front (172) 93.48	trouser (82) 45.05
SWEATER	v-neck (100) 68.49	N/A 0 0	N/A 0 0	N/A 0 0	button (104) 100.00	center front (104) 100.00	N/A 0 0

note: percentages are based on the total number of responses for each design criteria for the individual garments.

Table 10

Flight Attendant Uniform Clothing and Design Criteria Preferences

Fabric Characteristics				
Clothing	Color	Design	Care	Type
	(<i>n</i>) %	(<i>n</i>) %	(<i>n</i>) %	(<i>n</i>) %
SHIRT	white (79) 36.92	solid (184) 85.98	wash/wear (201) 93.92	polyester/cotton (174) 81.31
SLACKS	navy (92) 48.17	solid (190) 99.48	wash/wear (99) 51.83	polyester/cotton (101) 52.88
SWEATER	navy (59) 37.58	solid (156) 99.36	wash/wear (124) 78.98	polyester/cotton (76) 48.41

note: percentages are based on the total number of responses for fabric characteristics for each individual garment.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1:

There is no relationship between flight attendant age and garment characteristics.

1A. There is no relationship between age and uniform silhouette.

1B. There is no relationship between age and interior design lines.

1C. There is no relationship between age and fabric.

Sub-hypothesis 1A - Uniform silhouette:

The relationship between uniform silhouette and age was examined using four variables: 1) clothing shape, 2) clothing length, 3) sleeve shape, and 4) sleeve length. As shown in Table 1, three of the four uniform silhouette variables indicated a significant relationship with flight attendant age: clothing length χ^2 (14, N = 1043) = 38.993, $p = .0004$; sleeve shape χ^2 (6, N = 641) = 37.918, $p = .0001$; and sleeve length χ^2 (10, N = 630) = 28.984, $p = .0013$. Therefore sub-hypothesis 1A was rejected.

As shown in Table 1, a greater percentage (14.5%) of those 46 and over preferred a below the knee clothing length than the other two age groups. Additionally, those 46 and over preferred the raglan sleeve shape (21%) to a greater extent and the three quarter sleeve length (10%) more than the other two age groups. A clothing length of 1 to 3 inches above the knee was preferred by the two age groups, 35 and below (20%) and 36 - 45 (18%). However, only 9% of those 46 and over preferred an above the knee clothing length.

Sub-hypothesis 1B - Interior design lines:

The relationship between interior design lines and age was examined using seven variables: 1) pocket style, 2) pocket placement, 3) waist band, 4) collar, 5) neckline, 6) closing type, and 7) closing location. As shown in table 2, one of the seven interior design line variables indicated a significant relationship with flight attendant age: closing χ^2 (4, N = 880) = 10.397, $p = .0342$. Therefore sub-hypothesis 1B was not rejected. As shown in Table 2, a greater percentage (10%) of those 46 and over preferred a center back garment closing and side closing (10%) more than the other two age groups.

Sub-hypothesis 1C - Fabric characteristics:

The relationship between fabric characteristics and age was examined using eight variables: 1) care, 2) color, 3) type, 4) stretch, 5) weight, 6) hand, 7) surface, and 8) design. As shown in Table 3, four of the eight variables indicated a significant relationship between flight attendant age and fabric characteristics: care χ^2 (6, N = 1056) = 23.389, $p = .0007$; color χ^2 (22, N = 1054) = 100.199, $p = .0001$; type χ^2 (12, N = 1056) = 73.546, $p = .0001$; and surface χ^2 (2, N = 586) = 8.881, $p = .0118$. Therefore sub-hypothesis 1C was not rejected.

Table 1. Uniform Silhouette Preferences by Flight Attendant Age

Variable	(n) %	(n) %	(n) %	DF	χ^2	p
	←35	36-45	46→			
<i>Clothing Shape</i>	(733)	(261)	(55)	6	10.846	.0932
A-line	5.32	5.75	1.82			
Peg	11.32	11.11	1.82			
Straight	58.80	58.24	60.00			
Tailored	24.56	24.90	36.36			
<i>Clothing Length</i>	(727)	(261)	(55)	14	38.993	.0004*
Waist ¹	8.67	10.73	1.82			
Mid-Hip ¹	32.46	27.20	32.73			
Top of Thigh ¹	10.45	13.79	12.73			
Mid-Thigh ¹	5.23	2.30	7.27			
1-3" Above Knee	20.08	18.01	9.09			
Below Knee	1.65	3.45	14.55			
Mid-Calf	2.48	2.30	5.45			
Ankle	18.98	22.22	16.36			
<i>Sleeve Shape</i>	(439)	(164)	(38)	6	37.918	.0001**
Full	.91	4.27	5.26			
Raglan	3.64	.00	21.05			
Straight	79.73	83.54	60.53			
Tapered	15.72	12.20	13.16			
<i>Sleeve Length</i>	(433)	(158)	(39)	10	28.984	.0013*
Short	7.85	5.06	10.26			
Short & Long	36.26	44.94	23.08			
Three Quarter	.46	2.53	10.26			
Long	53.81	43.04	56.41			

* significant at $\mu = .05$ ¹indicates upper body garment length
** significant at $\mu = .01$

Table 2. Interior Design Line Preferences by Flight Attendant Age

Variable	(n) % ←35	(n) % 36-45	(n) % 46→	DF	χ^2	<i>p</i>
<i>Neckline</i>	(220)	(70)	(19)	8	14.906	.0610
Crew/Jewel	30.91	22.86	15.79			
V-Neck	51.36	52.86	52.63			
Scoop	11.36	7.14	21.05			
Jewel & V-Neck	3.64	11.43	.0			
<i>Collar</i>	(270)	(105)	(21)	14	9.569	.7930
Standing Band	10.00	8.57	9.52			
Convertible	17.78	20.95	14.29			
Button Down	5.56	1.90	.00			
Blazer Collar w/Lapels	31.11	28.57	38.10			
Straight	11.85	12.38	19.05			
Polo	13.33	18.10	9.52			
Turtle	7.41	7.62	9.52			
<i>Pocket Style</i>	(457)	(181)	(37)	10	17.174	.0706
Patch	8.75	6.08	18.92			
Patch w/Pen	15.54	17.13	5.41			
Cargo	5.47	2.76	8.11			
Welt	15.10	17.68	16.22			
Pocket w/Flap	2.63	.55	.00			
InSeam	52.52	55.80	51.35			
<i>Pocket Placement</i>	(457)	(181)	(38)	8	12.196	.1427
Chest	19.26	18.23	13.16			
Waist	4.16	2.21	10.53			
Mid-Hip	60.83	64.64	57.89			
Chest & Mid-Hip	9.19	12.15	7.89			
<i>Closing Type</i>	(618)	(220)	(49)	8	6.922	.5451
Button	59.22	64.09	65.31			
Snap	.32	.91	.00			
Tie	1.94	.45	2.04			
Zipper	38.35	34.55	32.65			
<i>Closing Location</i>	(612)	(219)	(49)	4	10.397	.0342*
Center Back	5.39	2.74	10.20			
Center Front	91.18	94.52	79.59			
Side	3.43	2.74	10.20			
<i>Waist Style</i>	(243)	(91)	(14)	8	11.582	.1708
Elastic Band/Rib	7.41	5.49	.00			
Trouser Style	43.62	43.96	57.14			
Bandless	3.29	.00	7.14			
Adjustable Side Tab	34.98	32.97	28.57			
Side or Back Elastic	10.70	17.58	7.14			

*significant at $\mu = .05$

Table 3. Fabric Characteristic Preferences by Flight Attendant Age.

Variable	(n) % ←-35	(n) % 36-45	(n) % 46→	DF	χ^2	<i>p</i>
<i>Care</i>	(736)	(264)	(56)	6	23.389	.0007**
Dry-Clean	20.52	23.11	42.86			
Wash/Iron	1.90	1.14	3.57			
Wash/Wear	68.34	60.61	48.21			
WW/DC	9.24	15.15	5.36			
<i>Color</i>	(734)	(264)	(56)	22	100.199	.0001**
Black	10.35	11.36	8.93			
Dark	9.54	10.61	.00			
Navy	41.14	35.98	30.36			
Red	11.99	14.77	5.36			
White	9.40	7.58	5.36			
<i>Type</i>	(736)	(264)	(56)	12	73.546	.0001**
Polyester/Cotton	60.60	62.88	28.57			
Polyester/Wool	21.88	25.00	28.57			
Cotton	10.73	5.68	8.93			
Wool	3.26	2.27	16.07			
<i>Stretch</i>	(322)	(116)	(6)	2	2.880	.2370
No	59.63	50.86	66.67			
Yes	40.37	49.14	33.33			
<i>Weight</i>	(377)	(137)	(0)	2	.017	.9918
Light	15.12	15.33	.00			
Medium	81.43	81.02	.00			
Heavy	3.45	3.65	.00			
<i>Hand</i>	(246)	(81)	(1)	4	22.46	.6906
Soft	48.37	51.85	100.00			
Medium	51.22	48.15	.00			
Stiff	.41	.00	.00			
<i>Surface</i>	(219)	(68)	(12)	2	8.881	.0118*
Smooth	99.09	100.00	83.33			
Raised	.91	.00	16.67			
<i>Design</i>	(733)	(264)	(56)	8	12.698	.1227
Print	1.36	1.89	5.36			
Solid	91.95	89.77	92.86			
Solid & Print	1.77	3.79	.00			
Solid & Stripe	2.05	2.65	.00			
Stripe	2.86	1.89	1.79			

* significant at $\mu = .05$ ** significant at $\mu = .01$

As shown in table 3, a greater percentage (42%) of those 46 and over preferred dry clean as their method of care more than the other two age groups. A greater percentage (15%) of those 36-45 indicated a preference for a wash/wear method of care more than the other two age groups. The two age groups 35 and below and 35-45 preferred the color red (12%) and (15%) as a secondary color more than the 46 and over age group. Additionally, those 46 and over had a more equal distribution of fabric type preference than either of the other two groups. Polyester/cotton blend and polyester/wool blend were both preferred by (29%) while wool fabric type was preferred by 16%. However, polyester/cotton blend fabric was preferred by the majority (62%) of the other two age groups. A raised surface fabric was requested by a higher percentage (17%) of the 46 and over age group than the other two age groups. Therefore sub-hypothesis 1C was not rejected

Summary of Hypothesis 1

Three sub-hypotheses relative to garment characteristics were created to test hypothesis 1. The findings of the sub-hypotheses indicated a significant relationship between flight attendant age and uniform silhouette only. Therefore, sub-hypothesis 1A was rejected but sub-hypotheses 1B and 1C were not rejected. Only one of the three sub-hypotheses in hypothesis 1 was not rejected which suggests there is no relationship between flight attendant age and garment characteristics. Therefore Hypothesis 1 was not rejected.

Hypothesis 2:

There is no relationship between years of service and garment characteristics

2A. There is no relationship between years of service and uniform silhouette.

2B. There is no relationship between years of service and interior design lines.

2C. There is no relationship between years of service and fabric.

Sub-hypothesis 2A - Uniform silhouette:

The relationship between uniform silhouette and years of service was examined using four variables: 1) clothing shape, 2) clothing length, 3) sleeve shape and 4) sleeve length. As shown in table 4, one of the four uniform silhouette variables indicated a significant relationship with flight attendant years of service: sleeve shape $\chi^2 (6, N= 640) = 19.678, p = .0032$. Therefore sub-hypothesis 2A was not rejected..

As shown in Table 4, a greater percentage (8%) of those with 5 years of service or less preferred a full sleeve shape. Additionally, those with 5 years of service or less preferred the tapered sleeve shape (23%) more than the other two groups. A greater percentage (7%) of those with 25 years of service and over preferred a raglan sleeve shape than the other two groups.

Table 4. Uniform Silhouette Preferences by Flight Attendant Years of Service

Variable	(n) %	(n) %	(n) %	DF	χ^2	p
	←5	6-24	25→			
<i>Clothing Shape</i>	(47)	(832)	(169)	6	8.890	.1798
A-line	8.51	5.29	4.14			
Peg	8.51	11.42	8.28			
Straight	53.19	57.09	68.05			
Tailored	29.79	26.20	19.53			
<i>Clothing Length</i>	(47)	(827)	(168)	14	15.043	.3752
Waist ¹	6.38	8.83	8.93			
Mid-Hip ¹	36.17	30.71	32.14			
Top of Thigh ¹	12.77	10.88	13.69			
Mid-Thigh ¹	.00	4.96	4.17			
1-3" Above Knee	21.28	19.83	14.29			
Below Knee	.00	2.78	3.57			
Mid-Calf	.00	2.78	2.38			
Ankle	23.40	19.23	20.83			
<i>Sleeve Shape</i>	(26)	(507)	(107)	6	19.678	.0032*
Full	7.69	1.97	.93			
Raglan	.00	2.96	7.48			
Straight	69.23	78.90	85.98			
Tapered	23.08	16.17	5.61			
<i>Sleeve Length</i>	(27)	(496)	(106)	10	14.814	.1390
Short	11.11	7.86	3.77			
Short & Long	44.44	36.90	39.62			
Three Quarter	.00	1.01	4.72			
Long	44.44	52.22	48.11			

* significant at $\mu = .05$ ¹indicates upper body garment lengths

Sub-hypothesis 2B - Interior design lines:

The relationship between uniform interior design lines and years of service was examined using seven variables: 1) pocket style, 2) pocket placement, 3) waist band, 4) collar, 5) neckline, 6) closing type, and 7) closing location. As shown in Table 5, two of the seven variables indicated a significant relationship with flight attendant years of service: Pocket style $\chi^2 (10, N= 674) = 27.795, p = .0019$ and waist style $\chi^2 (8, N = 348) = 17.350, p = .0267$. Therefore sub-hypothesis 2B was not rejected.

As shown in Table 5, a pocket with a flap was requested more by those with 5 years of service or less (8%) than either of the other two ranges. Additionally, those with 5 years of service or less indicated the highest request (71%) for the trouser style waist. A greater percentage (10%) of the 6-24 range requested the plain patch pocket more than the other two ranges. Additionally, the 6-24 range requested the elastic waist band (8%) to a greater extent. A greater percentage (22%) of those with 25 years of service and over requested the patch pocket with pen slot as well as the highest percentage (23%) request for a waist band with side or back elastic.

Sub-hypothesis 2C - Fabric characteristics:

The relationship between fabric characteristics and years of service was examined using eight variables: 1) care, 2) color, 3) type 4) stretch 5) weight 6) hand 7) surface and 8) design. As shown in Table 6, five of the eight variables indicated a significant relationship with flight attendant years of service: care $\chi^2 (6, N = 1055) = 29.966, p = .0001$; color $\chi^2 (22, N = 1053) = 45.629, p = .0022$; type $\chi^2 (12, N = 1055) = 36.584, p = .0003$; stretch $\chi^2 (2, N = 443) = 11.235, p = .0036$; and design $\chi^2 (8, N = 1052) = 23.285, p = .0030$. Therefore sub-hypothesis 2C was rejected. As shown in Table 6, a greater percentage (17%) of those with 5 years of service or less requested the color white. Additionally, those with 5 years of service or less had the lowest percentage (2%) of request for the color red. Those with 5 years of service or less were the only range who had zero request for wool fabric. Wash and wear care was requested more (68%) by the 6-24 range than any other range. Additionally, the 6-24 range had a greater percentage (10%) of request for cotton fabric. The greatest percent of request (62%) for stretch fabric was indicated by those with 25 years of service or over. Additionally, those with 25 years of service or over indicated the highest request (14%) for the color red. Seven percent of those with 25 years of service or over requested a choice of solid and print fabric.

Summary of Hypothesis 2:

Three sub-hypotheses relative to garment characteristics were created to test hypothesis 2. The findings of the sub-hypotheses indicated a significance between flight attendant years of service and fabric characteristics. Therefore sub-hypothesis 2C was rejected but sub-hypotheses 2A and 2B were not rejected. Only one of the three sub-hypotheses in hypothesis 2 was not rejected which suggest there is no relationship between flight attendant years of service and garment characteristics. Therefore hypothesis 2 was not rejected.

Table 5. Interior Design Line Preferences by Flight Attendant Years of Service

Variable	(n) %	(n) %	(n) %	DF	χ^2	<i>p</i>
	←5	6-24	25→			
<i>Neckline</i>	(8)	(243)	(57)	8	11.185	.1914
Crew/Jewel	25.00	30.86	17.54			
V-Neck	62.50	51.44	52.63			
Scoop	12.50	10.70	10.53			
Jewel & V-Neck	.00	4.12	10.53			
<i>Collar</i>	(22)	(314)	(60)	14	17.795	.2163
Standing Band	13.64	10.19	5.00			
Convertible	22.73	17.83	20.00			
Button Down	.00	5.41	.00			
Blazer Collar w/Lapels	31.82	32.17	23.33			
Straight	9.09	12.10	15.00			
Polo	13.64	13.69	18.33			
Turtle	4.55	6.37	15.00			
<i>Pocket Style</i>	(26)	(534)	(114)	10	27.795	.0019*
Patch	.00	10.11	2.63			
Patch w/Pen	11.54	14.23	21.93			
Cargo	3.85	5.62	1.75			
Welt	23.08	15.17	17.54			
Pocket w/Flap	7.69	2.06	.00			
InSeam	53.85	52.81	56.14			
<i>Pocket Placement</i>	(26)	(535)	(114)	8	10.150	.2547
Chest	15.38	18.13	21.93			
Waist	3.85	4.67	.88			
Mid-Hip	69.23	61.68	60.53			
Chest & Mid-Hip	11.54	9.35	12.28			
<i>Closing Type</i>	(45)	(712)	(129)	8	6.205	.6243
Button	57.78	60.81	61.24			
Snap	.00	.28	1.55			
Tie	.00	1.83	.78			
Zipper	42.22	36.94	36.43			
<i>Closing Location</i>	(45)	(705)	(129)	4	9.011	.0608
Center Back	.00	5.53	3.88			
Center Front	100.00	90.64	92.25			
Side	.00	3.83	3.88			
<i>Waist Style</i>	(17)	(278)	(53)	8	17.350	.0267*
Elastic Band/Rib	.00	7.91	1.89			
Trouser Style	70.59	43.53	39.62			
Bandless	.00	2.88	1.89			
Adjustable Side Tab	29.41	34.53	33.96			
Side or Back Elastic	.00	11.15	22.64			

* significant at $\mu = .05$

Table 6. Fabric Characteristic Preferences by Flight Attendant Years of Service.

Variable	(n) %	(n) %	(n) %	DF	χ^2	<i>p</i>
	←5	6-24	25→			
<i>Care</i>	(47)	(838)	(170)	6	29.966	.0001**
Dry-Clean	36.17	21.60	22.35			
Wash/Iron	2.13	2.03	.59			
Wash/Wear	42.55	68.14	57.65			
WW/DC	19.15	8.23	19.41			
<i>Color</i>	(47)	(836)	(170)	22	45.629	.0022*
Black	8.51	10.77	10.00			
Dark	8.51	8.37	14.12			
Navy	46.81	40.67	30.59			
Red	2.13	12.32	14.71			
White	17.02	8.61	7.06			
<i>Type</i>	(47)	(838)	(170)	12	36.584	.0003**
Polyester/Cotton	61.70	60.86	52.35			
Polyester/Wool	29.79	21.96	26.47			
Cotton	4.26	10.26	5.88			
Wool	.00	3.70	4.71			
<i>Stretch</i>	(17)	(370)	(56)	2	11.235	.0036*
No	70.59	60.00	37.50			
Yes	29.41	40.00	62.50			
<i>Weight</i>	(22)	(440)	(51)	4	7.012	.1353
Light	13.64	14.55	21.57			
Medium	86.36	81.36	78.43			
Heavy	.00	4.09	.00			
<i>Hand</i>	(7)	(291)	(29)	4	2.379	.6664
Soft	42.86	48.11	62.07			
Medium	57.14	51.55	37.93			
Stiff	.00	.34	.00			
<i>Surface</i>	(6)	(261)	(31)	2	4.131	.1268
Smooth	100.00	99.23	93.55			
Raised	.00	.77	6.45			
<i>Design</i>	(44)	(838)	(170)	8	23.285	.0030*
Print	2.27	2.03	.00			
Solid	90.91	92.00	88.82			
Solid & Print	2.27	1.19	7.06			
Solid & Stripe	2.27	2.03	2.35			
Stripe	2.27	2.74	1.76			

* significant at $\mu = .05$ ** significant at $\mu = .01$

Written Comments Provided by the Subjects

Flight attendants wrote in 220 comments about the uniforms. For systematization, Table 7 was created as a list of all comments made by each respondent. The comments were individually hand-sorted and the subject of each comment was highlighted by the researcher. Thus revealing the following key words or phrases: logo, shoes, socks, summer weight uniforms, winter weight uniforms, accent, style•fit•comfort, fabric, pockets, safety, accessories, and miscellaneous comments.

The most frequent comments were made about shoes and socks (27%). There was no question related to shoes on the questionnaire. Since the flight attendants felt that shoes were an important part of the uniform they stated a need for comfortable shoes with good support as a priority. There were many comments about foot problems resulting from standing and walking long hours in heels and poor quality shoes designed to meet the airline uniform requirements rather than the strenuous job requirements.

The second most frequent comment was related to company logos. At the time of this research there didn't appear to be an official airline logo that could be embroidered on the clothing. The flight attendant comments stated that a logo for identification of position and airline was desirable. A suggestion was made to embroider the flight attendant wings on clothing for identification which would eliminate the metal and enamel flight attendant wings. Flight attendants indicated discomfort in temperature changes with the current polyester/wool blend fabric. There is a desire for a lighter weight fabric for more temperate climates such as summer and the tropics. The comments revealed that flight attendants would prefer to wear short sleeves shirts and sweaters as a summer uniform instead of the uniform jacket which is often too warm inside and outside the airplane cabin. On the other hand, a warmer fabric for sweaters and shirts is needed for the winter climates.

The flight attendants requested more styles to fit the variety of body types as well as heights. Looser fitting clothing that is neither restricting nor revealing of a higher quality polyester/cotton blend fabric was desired (see Table 7, Appendix C).