The study was undertaken to investigate characteristics of consumers of used clothing and the outlets in which used clothing is sold. The investigation of consumer characteristics involved demographic factors such as sex, age, educational level, employment status, family composition, income level, user of clothing purchased, use of clothing, reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores, attitude toward used-clothing stores, and perceived fashion innovativeness. Used clothing stores were assessed with attention to price points, store atmosphere, store conveniences, and store merchandise. Relationships between consumer characteristics and patronage of used clothing outlets were also investigated.

Two questionnaires were developed for the study. An interview schedule was devised to obtain information regarding consumer characteristics. A rating sheet for stores was developed to assess store image points. Stores with higher image points were assigned type "A"; stores with lower points were assigned type "B".
Chi square analyses of data at a .05 significance level showed that two out of six null hypotheses were rejected; one hypothesis was partially rejected.

The study found that consumers of type A store differ from consumers of type B store in the sex of the consumer, user of clothing purchased, and use of clothing categories purchased. More male consumers patronized stores with overall lower store image while females patronized used clothing stores with higher store image. Consumers bought more used clothing for themselves and for work from stores with higher image points. Consumers who shopped in used clothing outlets with lower store image bought clothing for themselves, children, and others, primarily for home use.
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CONSUMERS OF USED CLOTHING

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Statement of Problem

Study of clothing expenditure by families and individuals has long been an important means in assessing economic trends in different communities (Britton, 1973:173). Clothing is ranked fourth in the average urban family's spending for daily living expenses after food, shelter, and automobile (USDL, 1967:2). Clothing expenditures account for approximately 8 to 12 percent of average individual income (USDL 1967:1).

In 1977, annual average consumer spending for clothing was about $373.00 per person (Polyzou, 1978:36). This figure represents a steady increase of $118.00 per person in expenditures for clothing from an average of $255.00 in 1970 to $373.00 per person in 1977. Part of the rise was due to falling incomes, but from 1975-76 about one-half of the increase was due to increased buying (Polyzou, 1977: 3). From 1960-76, the population of the United States showed an eight percent increase of proportion of 14-34 age groups. (USDC, 1977:10). The 14-34 age groups typically have high clothing expenditures. However, projections for 1980-1985 indicate there will be a decrease in proportion of the population age groups 14-24 years (USDC, 1977:10). Despite increases in individual clothing expenditures, the percent of
spending for clothing based on total consumption has decreased. Clothing expenditures accounted for 9.9 percent of income in 1960, and 7.8 percent of total income in 1979 (Statistical Abstracts, 1980:442).

There are several factors that have caused consumers to be especially careful in spending their income on clothing (Britton, 1975:13). These are increased prices of fuel, food, shelter, and uncertainty of rising incomes. Consumers are compensating for these economic trends and increased expenditures by altering their buying habits and attitudes in the area of clothing. Over the years, consumers' attitudes toward clothing have shifted to reflect a casual lifestyle. Active sportswear and easy mix-and-match separates, such as jeans, are used as streetwear apparel. This attitude shift reflects a relaxed feeling about clothing in general. Consumers are also purchasing a few higher priced durable garments rather than faddish items (Polyzou, 1978:35). They are buying multiseasonal, practical clothing, accessorizing more, buying less expensive items that children will outgrow, buying manufacturers' seconds, and, at the same time, demanding higher quality (Britton, 1975:13).

The change in buying habits of consumers has forced retailers and manufacturers to try to meet consumers' needs through several methods. Retailers are trying to hold down prices. Factors being stressed by retailers are home sewing of clothing and furnishing as a means to cut costs, marking down goods earlier, hiring fewer sales clerks, and selling manufacturers' seconds in sheets and towels ("Home...", 1978:11-20). Retailers stress middle to low price ranges
with emphasis on clothing that can be worn to a variety of functions. Retailers are also selling imported items because these can be manufactured less expensively overseas than domestically, and thus prices are lower ("Imports...", 1976:17-22). Though this effort has been made by retailers, general prices of clothing still rise due to increased prices of raw material, labor, and merchandising costs. Consumers still have a need to find bargains not available in ready-to-wear retail stores. Some of these consumers turn to purchasing clothing in resale clothing shops.

All across the country, resale shop businesses have doubled or tripled in number ("Secondhand Chic", 1975:52). In the past, consumers of these shops have generally been low-income consumers. Today, all income levels patronize secondhand shops to seek bargains ("These Are Strange...", 1974:82).

Consumers have also become their own recyclers of fashion. Although fashion obsolescence and changing lifestyles result in continual discarding of clothing before it is worn out completely, trends show that consumers are recycling their own clothing through garage sales, consignments in thrift shops, or renovation rather than donation to nonprofit organizations. Even those families and individuals who may be able to afford to discard clothing more frequently, due to economic well-being, have chosen these alternate routes instead of donations or discarding ("These Are Strange...", 1974:82).

Teachers and social workers who work with families and individuals need information on clothing trends and supplies of clothing for various members of the family. Acquisition of clothing through
supplemental sources such as secondhand shops can be a useful alternative to buying ready-to-wear, especially where budgeting is important. Secondhand clothing can be a means of stretching the clothing budget by acquiring more clothing for less money. This is especially helpful for low-income families. By making use of secondhand clothing, the consumer is getting additional value out of a product someone else can no longer use. Teachers and agencies counseling families and adults in management of resources may want to explore recycling combined with budgeting of resources.

Often studies of budgets by the U.S. Department of Labor Statistics identify levels of living, description of goods and services needed for different levels, and income needed to consume these goods and services. Thrift shop and secondhand shop operators may well use this information to stock merchandise needed in their communities (rural or urban) and set a price level for the merchandise (Britton, 1973:173).

The growth of used-clothing shops may have implications for teachers and planners of guidance programs in many areas of consumerism. Teachers and planners need information in order to familiarize others with shopping in secondhand stores, tips and standards that will insure best buys, and laws governing resale of clothing. This information can then be passed on to families in all phases of the life cycle. Teachers and counselors may consider including this information in discussion of career options in business and clothing. The field of merchandising, management, and entrepreneurship in
secondhand clothing sales may be a career that students may want to pursue, especially since it is an area that is expanding.

Research is needed so that educational programs may be developed to guide planning, budgeting, and purchasing of clothing. Whether reasons for purchasing used clothing are ecological, monetary, or fashion-oriented, study of acquisition of used clothing by various consumers will help to identify reasons for purchases and the outlets in which customers acquire clothing.

Several basic questions can be posed on this topic. Who are the consumers of used clothing? What are the types of outlets in which used clothing is sold? What is the relationship between consumer characteristics and the types of outlets in which purchases are made?

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of the study is to investigate characteristics of consumers of used clothing and the outlets in which used clothing is sold.
Objectives of the Study

To achieve the purpose for the research, the following objectives have been set:

1. To investigate characteristics of consumers of used-clothing stores with particular attention to the following factors:
   a) sex
   b) age
   c) educational level
   d) employment status
   e) family composition
   f) income level
   g) user of clothing purchased
   h) use of clothing
   i) reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores
   j) attitude toward used-clothing shops
   k) perceived fashion innovativeness

2. To describe various types of retail outlets that sell used clothing with particular attention to price points, store atmosphere, store conveniences, and store merchandise.

3. To investigate relationships between consumer characteristics and used clothing retail outlets in which purchases are made.
Chapter II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The review of literature encompasses five major areas of discussion. The first involves consumer clothing choice behavior and related activities. The second concerns clothing use behavior and is called clothing consumption behavior. Consumer demographic variables that affect consumption are explored in a third area. Economic trends in clothing expenditure is the fourth subject area. Last, communication behavior is discussed through consumer and commercial response to recycling of clothing.

Clothing Choice Behavior

There are certain personal and environmental factors that influence the decisions consumers make in the marketplace. Wyland (1937:173) suggests that the choices are determined by both immediate and remote factors. The immediate factors are sensory and psychic influences, while remote determinants involve economic, physical, group, and institutional variations. Hansen (1972:42) labels these two basic categories as personal factors and situational factors. Personal factors include consumer motivation, personality, attitudes, and perceptions which influence buying. Situational factors are environmental influences such as the marketplace, governmental regulations, and location. Hoyt (1938:10-14) and Nystrom (1929:52) also suggest various factors which influence consumer decisions that can be placed in these two
basic categories. Therefore, it is the combination of personal elements in a specific situation and/or the environment that influences consumers' choices in the marketplace.

Personal Factors Affecting Choice

The study of clothing choice in terms of personal variables include personality traits, consumer interest areas, and consumer motivation. The following section will discuss three personal factors influencing choice. Fashion innovativeness is a personality trait that will be discussed as a personal influence in clothing choice. Fashion interest, an important variable in clothing expenditure, will be discussed. The last area will involve consumer motivation or the reasons why people choose clothing types.

Innovativeness

Innovation studies deal with change. Interest in and study of innovation and diffusion of innovations began in the late 1930s and early 1940s as a result of changes and advancement in the technological, agricultural, and educational fields (Rogers, 1962:1,4). Research in the agricultural field dealt mainly with new farming products and practices. Technological advancement in medicines and household products created interest in innovation research. Various educational changes brought interest in studies of educational innovations in the late 1930s.

Change, however, cannot take place without the innovation, its adoption and/or diffusion by the public. For a concept, product, or
practice to be an innovation, Zaltman and Lin (1971:656) contend that it needs to be "perceived to be new by the relevant unit of adoption."

Rogers (1971) defines innovations similarly, narrowing the definition to individuals:

An innovation is an idea, practice or object perceived as new by the individual. It matters little, as far as human behavior is concerned, whether or not an idea is 'objectively' new as measured by the lapse of time since its first use or discovery... If the idea seems new and different to the individual, it is an innovation. (p.19)

It can therefore be said that an innovation is something that is perceived to be new by groups or individuals. In terms of fashion, adoption rather than diffusion is more frequently discussed. "Adoption" generally refers to an individual process while the term "diffusion" is used in terms of many people (Rogers, 1962:76).

Adoption of Innovations

Characteristics and Adoption. Rogers (1962:24) contends that there are five characteristics that affect the rate of adoption of an innovation: relative advantage, compatibility, complexity, divisibility, and communicability. Zaltman and Lin (1971:660-67) add other characteristics of innovations to Rogers' five ideas; they are: return on investment, efficiency of innovation, risk and uncertainty, terminality, ego involvement, and commitment. The multitude of characteristics and the interrelatedness of all of them exhibit the complex nature of innovations, various reasons for adoption, and differences in time for adoption.
The Adoption Process. Rogers (1962:81-6) discusses five stages in the adoption process: awareness, interest, evaluation, trial, and adoption. In the awareness stage, the individual is randomly exposed to the innovation. The innovation may or may not fulfill a need of the individual. When an individual purposefully and actively seeks information about the innovation, that individual is in the interest stage of the adoption process. In the evaluation stage, the individual mentally tries the innovation to determine whether it is advantageous enough to use. The individual uses the innovation in a limited way to test its utility in the trial stage of the adoption process. In the adoption stage of the process, the individual decides to fully use the innovation.

The Adopter Categories. Rogers (1962:171) refers to five adopter categories: innovators, early adopters, early majority, late majority, and laggards. He also identifies personal characteristics and general rate of adoption for each group.

Innovators are risk-takers. They are cosmopolitan and have finances to support their innovative behavior. They also can understand and apply difficult technical knowledge. King (1969:224) sees fashion innovators as the "earliest visual communicator of a new style."

Early adopters have the greatest respect from social peers. They are often sought out for advice by other members of their social group and serve as role models. They may be referred to as opinion leaders. Myers (1971:64) found a significant positive relationship among fashion opinion leaders, fashion leadership, and fashion adopters. Brenninkmeyer (1963:55) summarizes a fashion leader as one who
Flugel (1930) simply interprets fashion leaders as those who "...are artistically minded and dare to assert our individuality by being different..." (p.140).

Early majority members are those who take time to evaluate the new idea before adopting an innovation. Therefore, adoption is later and the time lapse between exposure and adoption is greater (Wilkening, 1950:5). They often do not hold leadership positions in their social groups.

Late majority members often need to be convinced of the benefits and uses of an innovation before adoption. They adopt an innovation after the average member of their social group.

Laggards are traditionalists who are suspicious of the new. They socialize with like members of their group and exert little influence on others. Literature on fashion identifies the latter three groups as fashion followers who are influenced to follow the trend of fashion due to feelings of inferiority, admiration, lack of interest, or ambivalence (Troxell, 1976:62). Manufacturers can observe the leaders of fashions and then mass produce for the majority of the population.

Fashion Adoption

**Fashion Adoption Theories.** There are various theories of how fashion is adopted by individuals. In the past, individuals of the upper class had the wealth to afford fashionable clothing (Flugel, 1930:149; Brenninkmeyer, 1963:64). The style was then gradually
accepted by the lower income groups. This is known as the "trickle down" theory and assumes that the lower-income groups want to imitate their level (King, 1969:231; Simmel, 1957:541).

Today, however, the middle class is the dominant group in number and their variety of lifestyles and ease of social mobility have led to other theories. The "horizontal flow" theory deals with the mass marketing approach (Troxell, 1976:57). Fashions are introduced to all groups at about the same time and can be mass produced and distributed for many income groups. Robinson (1969:376-98) discusses the horizontal flow in the following manner:

Horizontally fashions will spread outward from central loci; and vertically--the more important consideration--any given group will tend to adopt as its mentor not the highest distinguishable group but, rather, those immediately above it.

A third theory involves an "upward flow" movement which suggests that styles move upward and are eventually accepted by the upper income group. It involves low income adopters, especially young, who are assumed to adopt creative styles. Tarde (1903) recognizes this upward movement of fashions:

...if a good idea is introduced in one of these groups, it propagates itself without any difficulty until it finds itself stopped short by the group's frontiers. Fortunately, this arrest is only a slowing up. It is true that, at first, in the case of class barriers, a happy innovation which has happened to originate and make its way in a lower class, does not, during periods of hereditary aristocracy and of physiological inequality, so to speak, spread further, unless the advantage of adopting it appear [sic] plain to the higher classes; ... (p.367).

One may see a combination of the three theories working in unison with respect to various fashions in today's society. The upper
income groups may still be first to afford and wear the newest designer styles. However, one may observe the horizontal theory working, as designers extend themselves to pattern companies, furnishings, and accessory items priced in a category for mass consumption. The public may also view the upward movement working as various fashions, such as denim jeans, traditionally worn by the lower income groups and young people, have been adopted in high fashion circles.

**Fashion Adoption and Personal Characteristics.** A number of studies of innovation have been done to examine the relationship of personal characteristics, rate of adoption, the adoption process of individuals, and fashion interest. These studies can be compared with past studies relating to Rogers' personal characteristics of adopter groups.

a) Age. Rogers (1962:172) contends that many studies indicate earlier adopters are generally younger than later adopters. Varian (1972:26) supports this generalization. Her study of fashion leaders showed that the younger adopted fashion more readily. Golightly (1972:58), however, found that age was not a significant factor in fashion acceptance and awareness for men. Heitmeyer's (1972:58) study of women, 21-60 years of age, indicated that the female age group, 21-30 years, was categorized as acceptors of innovations in clothing more than any other age group.

b) Economic status. Rogers (1961:18) points out that early adopters generally have higher incomes than late adopters. Heitmeyer (1972:41) studied adult women at three income levels and found no significant relationship of income and acceptance and rejection of
innovations in clothing. Golightly (1975:33) found a positive relationship between fashion awareness and income.

c) Social status. Social status includes the term social class (education, income, wealth, material possessions) (Rogers 1961:13). Rogers found that innovators and early adopters have a higher social status than the other adopter groups. Graham (1956:91) studied the social status of adopters. He found that earlier adopters tend to have higher social status than later adopters. The findings of Rogers and Graham are not supported by Hicks (1970:53). Hicks showed that social class was not a good predictor of fashion leadership. Hiller (1971:66), Myers (1971:64), and Morton (1972:50) concluded that socioeconomic status does not play a significant part in predicting fashion innovative behavior in subjects. The results of fashion research seem to support the fashion adoption theories that suggest that fashion leadership may occur in various social groups in the downward, upward, and horizontal theories.

d) Social participation. Rogers (1961:16) and Beal and Bohlen (1957:5) found that early adopters of innovations tend to participate more actively in school, community, and agricultural organizations than do later adopter groups. Hicks (1970:53), Allen (1971:72-73), and Varian (1972:30) found socialization behavior to be influential in fashion leadership. Both Allen and Hicks found that socially active women were often early acceptors and leaders of fashion. Myers (1971:64) and Lauritsen (1972:48), in contrast, did not find social participation to be a significant factor in early adoption of new fashion ideas.
e) Education. Rogers (1961:14) and Beal and Bohlen (1957:5) found that earlier adopters of innovations tend to have a higher level of formal education than later adopter groups. Rogers (1961:14) found innovators averaged 12.51 years of education, early adopters averaged 11.77, early majority groups averaged 10.63 years of education, and late majority groups had 8.91 years of education. Laggards had an average of 8.64 years of education. Wilkening (1950:359) found that fathers' positive attitudes toward education for their sons was highly associated with fathers' acceptance of innovations in farming.

f) Other personality variables. Similar results can be found in the comparison of studies of innovators and adopters of agricultural innovations with studies of fashion adopters. Rogers (1957:267-68) found that farmers who were earlier adopters were less rigid than later adopters. Morton (1972:50) and Miller (1971:66) found that fashion innovators have lower needs for order and deference. The ability to deal with abstract stimuli is another trait of innovators, according to Rogers and Beal (1959:178t). Pasnak and Ayres (1969:701) and Morton (1972:50) found fashion innovators to have high needs for change. Pasnak and Ayres (1969:701) found a need for innovators to be experimental and found innovativeness to be related to self-acceptance. Schrank (1970:59) found innovativeness to be related to security.
Fashion Interest

Fashion, as defined by Nystrom (1928:4), is "the prevailing style at any given time." Style is defined as "a characteristic or distinctive mode or method of expression, presentation or conception in the field of some art." (Nystrom, 1928:3). When a style is accepted by the general public, it becomes fashion (Nystrom, 1928:55). Fashion can relate to specific prevailing interest in certain sports, to the arts or sciences, but it is more commonly identified in terms of clothing interests.

In the field of consumer behavior, fashion becomes important because it is often the motivating force in influencing purchase of soft goods. This is because fashion in clothing reflects an individual's economic, physical, social, and psychological attitudes of the day. As the environment and individual change, so does the fashion (Nystrom, 1928:55).

Economic Factors

Economic factors, such as consumer income, influence expenditure on clothing. As more disposable income is used for basic necessities, the amount of discretionary income becomes tight. Especially as prices in basic necessities increase, low- to middle-income families have less to spend in the discretionary areas. In relation to clothing, less money may be spent for fashion changes in clothing (Britton, Polyzou, 1968-77).
Physical Factors

Physical considerations include population size and age. Population size and growth help to determine present fashion demand and possible future demand. Population of various age groups gives retailers and manufacturers an idea of the kind of demand by age group (Troxell, 1976:19).

Technological Factors

Technological advancements and changes in agriculture, communication, manufacturing, and transportation help to speed fashion development in three ways. New machinery and methods make possible more efficient methods of production and distribution of fibers, materials, and garments (USDL, 1957:128t). Second, developments in fiber and materials have led to better tested, energy efficient, and quality products (Winkle et al., 1978:280-89). Last, the technological advancements have been in other areas beside fabrics and garments. Transportation and communication improvements have given people more options for traveling, faster communication in world affairs, so a versatile lifestyle may mean a versatile fashion change (USDL, 1957:128t).

Sociological Factors

Since fashion reflects the mood of the times, sociological changes during the last century have influenced changes in fashion demand. The increase in leisure time due to a shortened work week has produced growth in sportswear and casual apparel. Fashion for
leisure time is not only for the working class, but also for the growing number of elderly retired persons. Social and physical mobility of various groups in the United States has produced awareness of various cultural groups and encourages fashion changes. Temporary or permanent travel and ease of mobility expose individuals to new environments, and thus to fashion influences. Mobility also demands apparel that is easy care, functional, and aesthetically appealing (Troxell, 1976:22-8).

Political Factors

Various federal and state laws regarding equal rights for minorities and women have enabled women to be more independent. More women today are working and trends show that this is on the increase. Today, 42.4 percent of all women work full time. One-half of all part-time workers are women (Statistical Abstracts, 1980:399). Approximately 40 percent of women who work are single and 60 percent are married (Statistical Abstracts, 1980:402). The largest proportion of workers are married and in the 25-44 age group (Statistical Abstracts, 1980:398). It is estimated that nine out of ten women will be employed sometime during their lives. Furthermore, there will be an increased proportion of older women in the labor force. Due to high divorce rates, there is and will be an increase of working mothers who are heads of households (Britton, 1975:21).

According to the United States Department of Labor (1957:136), "the large expenditure on clothing for women in the 50's was due to and increase in proportion of women in the labor force, employed or
looking for jobs." In comparison to men of the same age and status, working women in the 1950s spent as much as one-and-one-half times more on clothing than did nonemployed women, due to differences between work role and homemaking (USDL, 1957:134). This report supports studies of working women's expenditures on clothing in the 1920s and 1930s. In the 1920s, total cost of a single woman office worker's clothing was greater than the wife or husband in every working class (Nystrom, 1929:38). In the 1930s working women ages 54-60 spent 75 percent more money for clothing than housewives of that same age group. They also spent more money on clothing than 24 to 30-year-old homemakers (USDL, 1957:135). As women in the work force increase, family incomes increase. Women's exposure to various people at work and a greater allocation of family income for women's apparel influence fashion buying.

Fashion information of the 1970s and 1980s reflect interest in the growing number of women in careers. Working Woman magazine, first published in 1979, and other women's magazines feature regular articles on dressing for success and professionalism in the job market. ("Your Image", 1979:43-52). No data on expenditure on clothing by working women were found for periods later than 1957.

Motivation

Copeland (1924) places motivation into two categories: primary motives and selective motives. Primary motive "is one which imparts to consumers the major, initial impulse to purchase the kind of article offered for sale." Selective motive is "one in which the aim
is to divert the consumer's expenditure away from other brands of the same article," (p.140).

In relation to basic motivation theories in clothing, Copeland's (1924:141) primary motives can be equated with instinctive, emotional, and rational categories. In clothing, four theories have been identified as instinctive: modesty, immodesty, protection, and aesthetics (Ryan, 1966:41-42). These four, however, have been little used in present day motivational research, due to the vastness of the topic.

Emotional drives can be identified as psychological adjustment motives. Ryan (1966:94) writes that "the concept we have of ourselves determines to a large extent the clothes which we choose. At the same time the clothing which we wear influences the way in which we perceive ourselves." Thus, psychological reasons for clothing purchase add to consumer choice in clothing. Copeland (1924) sees these psychological motives as "pride of personal appearance, pride in appearance of property, cleanliness, pleasure of recreation, and securing home comfort," (p.141).

Various psychological reasons for choosing clothing have been offered by different authors. Nystrom (1928:81) gives the following reasons:

The specific motive or factors for fashion interest and fashion changes, in addition to physical reasons for change [sic] such as occur at the end of each season, are the boredom or fatigue with the current fashion, curiosity, desire to be different or self assertion, rebellion against convention, companionship and imitation. There may be other factors in human nature promoting fashion interest, but these are sufficiently effective and inclusive upon which to build a practical theory of fashion.
Boredom or fatigue causes individuals to seek changes in fashion. This is especially true at the end of the season or after a certain style has been popular for a time. Curiosity or trying something new may find individuals experimenting with various styles (Troxell, 1976: 29). Rebellion against convention or reaction to convention also influences fashion demand. Those who do not like existing fashions may seek a new trend or style through rebellion against the traditional fashions (Nystrom, 1928:81).

Often fashion promotes a psychological feeling of assurance if an individual feels good about the clothing worn. Apparel can add to feelings of assertion, glamour, and an illusion about the self that can be uplifting (Nystrom, 1928:81). Veblen's concept of vicarious and conspicuous consumption promotes this idea. Vicarious and conspicuous consumption involve the wearing of apparel by individuals and related family members and/or property that would reflect favorable status upon the breadwinner (Veblen, 1911:75-80). This outward display is a means by which personal appearance of self and property relay status.

Dressing for companionship and imitation influences fashion choice. Certain groups of individuals may promote various modes of dress that are suitable to be a part of the group. The job or career dress codes, whether defined or ambiguous, may promote imitation in dress. Companionship of individuals in pursuing similar interests, such as skiing or dressing to please others, may promote fashion interest and demand. Brenninkmeyer (1963:54) supports this concept in terms of "competitive imitation and competitive differentiation." The competitive fashion attitudes of individuals to want to be different,
yet the need for acceptance, according to Brenninkmeyer, insures fashion success.

Rational motives for clothing may be identified in terms of specific garment characteristics, such as durability and economy. Ryan (1966:148) explains consumer motivation in clothing selection according to two strata. The first involves individual garment characteristics such as price, style, color, and fiber. The second stratum involves properties of the garment that influence satisfaction. These may include care factors, appearance, and adaptability of the garment.

Situational Factors Affecting Choice

Most attempts have been made to study consumers in light of defined choice situations. The following section will discuss consumers' purchasing behavior in various choice situations. There are four basic areas for discussion. The first involves sources of information acquired by the consumer. The second area explores factors which influence store selection. The third section will discuss purchase planning behavior. In the last area, method of payment for merchandise will be discussed.

Sources of Information

Consumers may receive information from primary sources, informal (mass and commercial sources), or personal sources. Primary information gathering involves actual examination of store product and generally occurs with more expensive items. Besides expensive items, more information gathering occurs when there is lack of knowledge about
the product or store, when confidence of consumer skills is low, or when previous satisfaction of purchase was low (Walker, 1967:39). White (1969:50) found that two-thirds of the adolescent girls studied visit two to three stores before purchasing apparel. This result is supported by Saunders (1971:34) who found that the majority of seventh grade girls went to three to four stores before purchasing apparel.

Informal (mass and commercial) sources seem most influential for shoppers in the awareness stage of a fashion item (Rogers, 1962:99). Mass media sources are television, radio, newspapers, magazines, catalogs, and telephone directories. Of these media sources, newspaper advertising and popular fashion magazines are most influential for adult men and women who are contemplating clothing purchases (Seaton, 1970:59; Snowden, 1974:25). Taylor's (1969:49) study indicated that boys prefer radio and that girls prefer fashion magazines, newspapers, and catalogs. Catalog information is especially favored by married students and employed mothers (Flottman, 1974:22).

Personal sources of information are important because it can influence behavior. Personal sources of information such as friends, family, relatives, and neighbors are important for children and adults (Hansen, 1972:185). Past research indicated that personal sources tend to be the most influential for a variety of apparel consumers, especially females. Boys and girls sampled by Taylor (1969:49) also reported friends as an important informational source. Snowden's (1974:25) study of males also revealed that personal sources such as friends, wives, and acquaintances are the most important fashion and clothing informational sources. Spear's (1970:43) investigation of
shopping practices between black and white ethnic groups showed that Negroes use family members as sources of information while Caucasians use peer groups for information. However, Rich and Jain (1968:44) found that discussion of fashion with others and observation of what others wear rated third and fourth as sources of helpful information for Cleveland women; primary and mass media sources rated first and second. In the adoption process, personal sources of information are most important in the evaluation stage (Rogers, 1962:99). The individual is mentally trying the new idea in the evaluation stage of the adoption process.

**Purchase Planning**

Purchases made can be either planned or unplanned. Unplanned purchases are impulsive and occur when the consumer becomes exposed to a product and buys it with little forethought. Planned purchasing involves a rational thought process and/or action before a purchase is made. For example, consumers may seek information, visit various stores, make lists, evaluate needs, or develop budgets.

**Planned Purchases**

Purchase planning depends on various factors. These include familiarity with the store and apparel, importance of the product, and the consumer's basic skill and confidence. Katona (1951:68-9) reported that purchase decisions on clothing, such as a sport shirt, may take less planning when the purchase is a repeated one. Therefore, the consumer will have the basic experience for that purchase
and will need a minimum of effort to acquire that product. This is especially true if the purchase made is the same brand and style. Familiarity with the stores may also expedite purchase. When the consumer becomes familiar with the merchandise and services, less time will be used in shopping. Selective patronage of the same few stores eliminates the time it may take for comparison shopping. Ferber (1955:19-21) related product importance to planning time. A minor clothing item requires little planning time, while a large expensive purchase will involve more lengthy thought and planning processes.

There is strong evidence that many consumers of clothing plan their purchases. According to results of a study, many professional Caucasian women plan their seasonal and semiannual clothing purchases (Fortenberry, 1976:35). Upper- to lower- socioeconomic class black women are likely to preplan garment purchases and comparison shop (Harps, 1976:71). Teenage boys shop with definite color, style, and preference in mind (Taylor, 1969:49).

Ferber (1955:54) studied planned purchasing of various population groups and reported the following results: upper-middle-income families plan the most, followed by upper-income families, then lower-income families. Families who purchase the most also plan the most. Families with primary wage earners in the age group of 20 to 34 years plan purchases more than those in other age groups. Families who are optimistic, whose purchasing power has increased, and who fear inflation, all plan their purchases more than groups without these characteristics.
Unplanned Purchases

Stern (1962:59-62) discusses four areas of impulse buying. Pure impulse buying results in the immediate consumption of a brand or product not previously purchased. Reminder impulse buying involves the consumer seeing a product which reminds the shopper of intention to purchase that item. A third impulse category is suggestion buying and occurs similarly to pure impulse buying; however, the consumer's length of deliberation is extended. The last category is planned impulse buying. This purchase is based on the store prices, specials, or other environmental stimuli received in the store. Store displays and promotions are highly influential because the majority of unplanned purchases are due to reminder impulse purchases (Kollatt, Willett, 1967:21-31). The willingness of consumers to purchase clothing impulsively is related to store sales stimuli (Banks, 1969:43). Reminder impulse buying is characteristic of the shopping behavior of discount store patrons. Thirty-eight percent of discount store customers questioned by Thomas (1968:40) had no purchase plans while shopping. So in-store stimuli are important for consumers in discount stores. Ferber (1955:53) reported that impulse purchases are most prevalent in clothing and auto accessories because they are not considered major household expenses.

Store Selection

Store selection is dependent on store location and store type. Store location involves the consumer's choice of shopping area and distance traveled in shopping. Discussion of store type will include
selection of stores by various groups of consumers and the influence of store image upon purchasing behavior.

Store Location

In a 1947 study of retail shopping preferences, Converse (1947) referred to the law of retail gravitation.

This law states that two competing towns attract trade from intermediate towns near the boundaries of their trading areas in direct proportion to the populations of the two towns and inversely as the squares of the distances from these towns to the intermediate towns. (p.21.)

He identified consumers' choice of shopping area in definite accordance to this law. A fifty percent line was determined by a formula. This line represented the point by which trade equally went in different directions. In the Illinois study, Converse found that consumers very seldom went over five miles beyond the line for goods.

Converse (1947:68) also found that various types of income groups produced predictable purchasing behavior: the higher the income, the more shopping trips, and the longer distance traveled. This was partially supported by a Cleveland study (Rich and Jain, 1968: 41-49). Upper-class women in Cleveland shopped less at downtown areas and neighborhoods than lower-class women.

Converse's results of the frequency of shopping trips by upper-class women were not consistent with the Cleveland study. In the Cleveland study, middle-class women shopped the most, followed by the lower class; shopping the least often were the upper-class women.

Moss (1974:19,23) found that low-income, ethnically diverse groups
shopped in localized downtown areas where buses were available means of transportation.

The type of fashion good under consideration is another criterion affecting the distance traveled in shopping. Converse (1947:23) found that distance traveled depended upon the importance of the purchase. The importance or price of the object is directly proportional to the distance people were willing to travel to shop. Converse (1947:21) also found that, in general, consumers like to purchase fashion apparel from large inventories. Large stocks provide consumers with a variety of styles, colors, and fabrics from which to choose.

Store Type

Store selection is also dependent on store type; the type of store selected is largely determined by the consumer's overall perception of image of that store. Kunkel and Berry (1968) define image in the following manner:

Image may be defined as discriminative stimuli for an action's expected reinforcement. Specifically, 'retail store image' is the total conceptualized or expected reinforcement that a person associates with shopping at a particular store. (p.22.)

Martineau (1958) further simplifies the definition of store personality or image as "the way a store is defined in a shopper's mind, partly by its functional qualities and partly by an aura of psychological attributes" (p.47). The image a consumer receives from a store comes about through experience the consumer has in that environment. The experiences are negative or positive depending on values placed on various factors of the store and its operation. Once the
consumer acquires a certain image of a store, it is maintained through reinforcement.

Kunkel and Berry (1968:26) studied images of stores and found 12 crucial components of store images. In over 3,000 consumers interviewed, 99 percent of the responses fell in these 12 areas. Consumer patronage of stores depend on the strength of these various components. The components are price, quality, assortment, fashion, locational convenience, other conveniences, services, store atmosphere, store adjustment, advertising, sales personnel, and sales.

Portis and Rich (1964:11) identified three types of appeal in the concept of store image. High-fashion stores have the strongest image. This type of store has a fine reputation in brand names of merchandise offered. The price-appeal store is best known for bargains and extra services. The third store is a broad-appeal store that is a combination of the high-fashion and price-appeal stores.

Independent and specialty stores may be considered shops with fashion appeal. These two types of stores have exclusivity and services that fashion-sensitive individuals evaluate positively (Kunkel and Berry, 1968:21-27). Snowden (1974:25) also reported a significant correlation between clothing interest and shopping in specialty stores, and a negative one between clothing interest and buying in a department store. Portis and Rich (1964:11) found that more middle-class to high-income groups with no children, living in city areas, favored high-fashion stores. Male business executives and professional black women workers identified specialty or independent stores as clothing
sources (Smith, 1974:25; Eagle, 1974:47). College males also listed specialty shops as important clothing sources (Snowden, 1974:25).

Middle- to lower-income groups, generally parents with children living at home, in a city area, preferred price-appeal stores (Rich and Portis, 1964:13). According to clothing studies by Moore (1971:53), Thomas (1968:40), and Moss (1974:23), low-income consumers and rural consumers tended to purchase their clothing largely from chain or discount stores. Doran (1967:39) suggests that many soft goods purchased in discount stores are staple in nature, while the same shoppers patronize other types of stores for better fashion items.

Middle- to lower-income groups of parents with children, who are city dwellers, preferred broad-appeal stores. Department stores are generally thought to have broad appeal and are preferred by adolescent girls (White, 1969:50; Saunders, 1971:34). Rich and Portis (1964:13) found that those with high-fashion interest shopped most at high-fashion stores, second at broad-appeal stores, and last at price-appeal stores; this was inversely true for those with low-fashion interest.

Converse (1947:69) found that lower-income groups purchased fashion goods by mail more often than high-income groups. However, Rich and Jain (1968:48) found both the upper and lower classes to be frequent consumers of mail-order clothing. Flottman (1974:22) found that marital status was another important variable in the use of in-home purchase of clothing through catalogs, especially for specific clothing items.
Method of Payment

The use of credit has altered purchasing power of consumers. Consumers use credit to increase consumption and delay or prolong payment. Funk (1967:40) reported that the use of a charge account by high-school girls resulted in two-and-one-half times more money spent for clothing in stores where charge accounts were available than in stores without credit.

Many different types of consumers use credit for the purchase of apparel. Eagle (1974:48) found that men most often used charge accounts in purchasing clothing. Similarly, Harps (1976:71) found that upper- to lower-class single black women used charge accounts regularly. White professional women were also users of regular charge accounts according to a study by Portenberry (1976:35). Tozier (1968:35) studied adolescent consumers' use of cash and credit and found that family credit users (56.2 percent) were generally upper-class college-bound students with better grades. Teenagers who had personal charge accounts (15.9 percent) belonged to more organizations, had leadership positions, and socialized more.

Ferber (1955:54) found people less likely to use bank credit for small purchases such as clothing articles. Schleede (1974:32) found that women prefer store charges rather than their individual credit. Likewise, Frankenbach (1970:51) found that employed high-income women used revolving charge accounts. Eagel (1974:48) found this to be true with male groups.
Groups least inclined to use credit include teenagers and low-income rural families (Wright, 1969:66; Frankenbach, 1970:51). This may be due to lack of accessibility to credit. Tozier (1968:35) found that teenage cash users (27.9 percent of sample researched) were least inclined to have leadership roles, were often lower-middle-class, and did not possess knowledge of credit. They were also most likely to have parents who were concerned about bills.

Summary

Fashion innovative behavior, fashion interest, and consumer motivation are personal variables that influence clothing choices. Adoption of innovations requires awareness, interest, and evaluation of the new idea by potential adopters. Adoption of new or different fashions by individuals may occur through a downward, upward, or horizontal flow. Earliest adopters are innovators, followed by early adopters, early majority, and late majority; laggards are the latest adopters of new ideas. Each adopter category has distinct characteristics. Early adopters of fashion are generally younger in age, and are socially active. Earlier adopters of fashion also have a lower need for order, tolerance of ambiguity, need for change, and experimentation. They tend to rate high in security and self acceptance. Fashion interest is affected by sociological, technological, economic, and political conditions of the times. Consumer motivation for clothing includes instinctive, psychological, and rational reasons. Instinctive reasons include modesty, immodesty, aesthetics, and protection. Psychological motivations for clothing include boredom or
fatigue, self assertion, companionship, curiosity, imitation, and rebellion against convention. Rational reasons for clothing include specific or individual garment characteristics of satisfaction such as price, style, durability, and color.

Situational factors affecting choice include sources of information, purchase-planning behavior, store selection, and method of payment. Sources of information include primary, personal, and informal information. Purchase planning may be impulsive or planned. Store selection depends on location, type of goods offered, and store image. Method of payment for clothing is generally cash or credit; however, if credit is used, a store revolving charge is preferred.

**Clothing Consumption**

The definition of consumption is closely related to the consumption process. Consumption may be defined as the use of goods and services (Wyland, 1937:9; Nystrom, 1929:34; Hoyt, 1928:4). The goods and services are offered in the marketplace and the individual uses them to the ultimate end of satisfying wants or needs. The consumption process, then, includes the means by which individuals use the goods and services.

Winakor (1969:629) defines clothing consumption as "a process with three main parts: acquisition and discard, both flows, and inventory, a stock." More specifically, a model of clothing consumption identifies (1) acquisition as the process by which individuals obtain clothing, (2) inventory as the garment already owned, and (3) discard as the disposal of the garment (Winakor, 1969:630-31). Therefore,
the clothing consumption process involves obtaining the clothing, storing it as inventory, and discarding it.

**Acquisition**

Clothing can be acquired through several sources. Regular sources include purchasing new, purchasing used, home sewing, handing down, giving, exchanging, and inheriting. Temporary means of acquisition include renting and borrowing.

**Purchasing New**

Past and current studies indicate that the largest amount of clothing acquired is purchased new (USDA, 1956:4; Britton, 1975:7). A 1950 study involving families in Minneapolis, St. Paul, Birmingham, and two counties in Minnesota showed that about 87 percent of clothing was acquired new for husbands, and wives purchased 89 percent of their clothing new. A later Des Moines, Iowa, survey in 1965-66 showed that 70 percent of new ready-to-wear clothing purchased by moderate-low-income families was purchased new. These surveys are supported by research results that indicate that the purchase of new clothing is a major source of clothing for various socioeconomic, rural/urban, age, and sex groups. Low-income rural families earning less than $6,000 a year list purchased new clothing as their main source of clothing (Orr, 1973:27). Women of low-moderate income also purchased the majority of clothing new (Krebs, 1975:38). Hobbs (1971:53) found that teenage high school girls purchased 71 percent of their
clothing ready-made while Stagg (1967:42) found that college freshmen students purchased 66.53 percent of their clothing new.

Although the largest amount of clothing acquired is purchased new, Kunz (1970:111) found that newly purchased garments can be reduced significantly when apparel is acquired through supplementary sources. These sources include giving, handing down, exchanging, purchasing used, inheriting, renting, or borrowing.

**Supplemental Sources**

The amounts of supplemental sources of clothing used by families and individuals depend largely on the characteristics of these groups. The USDA study of 1950 (USDA, 1956:4) and the Des Moines study (Britton, 1969:3) results indicated that children were the major recipients of supplemental sources of clothing, followed by female adults, while male adults received the least amount of clothing from supplemental sources.

The consumption of children's clothing is largely dependent on sex, age, number of children in the family, and income of the family (Kunz, 1970:109). Kunz's findings are supported by Russell. Russell (1972:96) found that children from low-income families receiving aid to dependent children had different factors influencing the sources of their clothing. She found age and education of the family head had an influence on the source of clothing for children. Families with more highly educated family heads used a larger variety of clothing sources, especially for clothing of young girls.
Both USDA and Des Moines studies indicated that girls received the most clothing from supplementary sources. In 1950, boys aged from two to fifteen received 33 percent of their clothing from supplementary sources while 44 percent of the girls of the same age group got clothing from similar sources (USDA, 1956:14). In 1965-66, girls from ages two to seventeen received 39 percent of their clothing from supplemental sources while boys received only 29 percent (Britton, 1969:3). Children under age two received 67 percent of their clothing from supplemental sources (Britton, 1969:3).

Adult consumption of clothing through supplemental sources is lower than that of children. In 1950, husbands acquired 13 percent of their clothing from supplemental sources while wives acquired twenty percent of their clothing by this means (USDA, 1956:4). In 1965-66, male heads of families obtained only eight percent of their clothing from supplemental sources while wives obtained 25 percent from these sources. Women heads of families acquired 26 percent of clothing from supplemental sources.

Giving and Exchanging

Both the Des Moines (Britton, 1969:3) and USDA (1956:4) studies indicated gifts as the most important supplemental source for clothing. Gifts are clothing items received from individuals outside the economic unit (USDA, 1956:4). Gifts can be newly purchased or used articles. In 1950, gifts amount to 84-99 percent of all clothing received from supplemental sources, and in 1965-66, the amount
was 22 percent (USDA, 1957:4; Britton, 1969:3). In 1965-66, 11 percent of the gifts were new and 11 percent were used (Britton, 1969:3).

Freshmen college students indicated gifts as a second source of clothing, amounting to 22.19 percent of clothing received (Stagg, 1967:42). Low-income families indicated that gift sources were one-fourth to one-third of the yearly apparel supply (Patson, 1971:42). Gifts represented about one-tenth of the total clothing for adult males and females and one-fifth of all clothing acquired for children (Patson, 1971:42).

Home Sewing

While home-sewn garments comprised the second most important supplemental clothing source in 1950, it ranked third in the 1965-66 study, indicating a downward trend in this area. Home-sewn garments were more important for women and girls in 1950 than for boys and men. The garments comprised about 10 percent of the supplemental source for girls (six percent for women), three percent for boys, and one percent for husbands (USDA, 1956:5). The articles of clothing sewn were dresses, aprons, skirts, play clothing, sport clothing, shirts, and sleepwear.

In 1965-66, home-sewn clothing comprised about two percent of the supplemental clothing acquired by families. Again, women and girls acquired the largest percentage of home-sewn garments at five percent and four percent respectively. Less than one percent of the garments home-sewn were for boys and husbands (Britton, 1975:4).
A more recent study by Heinemeyer (1968:128-29) of Des Moines families continued to support earlier results. Girls received one or more garments through home construction. Women ranked second in receiving home-sewn garments, followed by boys and men. This is further reinforced by a report of daughters who received 95 percent of all home-sewn articles (Crowder, 1972:26).

Used Clothing

According to past and current studies, the majority of used-clothing consumers are low-middle-income families. The amount of purchases are influenced by family characteristics. Low-income ethnic minorities have been known to wear used clothing more frequently. Low-income blacks in the past, for example, have been known to wear used clothing more frequently than low-income Whites in the same community. Their children, especially, were dressed almost exclusively in worn clothing (Sterner, 1943:139). Used clothing worn by adult Blacks in low-income areas also was believed to communicate humility and identify the subservient role in American life (Schwartz, 1963:225-27). Although Negro women of low socioeconomic status consider clothing more important than do white women of the same status, they continue to receive more handed-down clothing and purchase more used clothing than white women (Hunter, 1967:44).

Robertson (1968:14) studied clothing consumption patterns of a selected group of Minnesota farm migrants composed largely of Negroes and Spanish-speaking Americans. She interviewed 11 families and found that nine purchased clothing at used-clothing stores and that sometimes
more used than new clothing was purchased. This conflicts with Brewton's (1973:101) study of rural lower-class adolescents of Caucasian and Negro groups. These low-income teenagers identified no used-clothing sources. The reason for this was probably due to the age group. Adolescents tend to avoid bargains and reduced clothing items, according to studies of consumer behavior by Walton (1969:49).

There are conflicting reports on how the education of the family head affects the consumption of used clothing. Russell (1972:98) found in a study of low-income groups that the largest consumers of secondhand clothing for children were individuals whose family head had eight to nine years of formal education; this was the highest educational level group in the study.

Numbers of members in the family also affect consumption of used clothing. Large families receive more handed-down clothing, especially families where young children are present (Hobbs, 1971:53).

**Purchasing Used Clothing.** Four percent of supplemental clothing for boys and girls in 1950 was purchased secondhand (USDA, 1965:3). Wives purchased three percent used and husbands bought only one percent of their supplemental clothing used. Used-clothing items purchased by Des Moines families in 1965-66 was one percent for children, both boys and girls, three percent for women heads of family, and two percent for husbands and wives (Britton, 1969:4).

**Handed-down Used Clothing.** Ten percent or less of supplemental clothing received by boys and girls in the 1950 study was handed-down clothing (USDA, 1956:3). Husbands and wives received one and two
percent of handed-down clothing. Only three items were identified as important items of clothing handed down: galoshes, skirts, and dresses.

Handed-down clothing made up 14 percent of clothing acquired in a year by families in the 1965-66 survey (Britton, 1969:4). Infants received the largest percentage (33 percent) of handed-down clothing. Girls and boys received 14 to 20 percent. Infants and children received handed-down clothing from both inside and outside the family. Adults received considerably less handed-down clothing (six to nine percent), and items received were almost exclusively from outside the family. Play, dressy clothing, and wraps seem the most popular types of used clothing for families with children (Hickman, 1970:50).

Temporary Sources of Clothing

Renting and borrowing of clothing are temporary sources for clothing. The clothing is rented or borrowed generally for specific purposes such as costuming, pregnancy, weddings, and dances. Job-related career uniforms may also fall into this category (Winakor, 1969:631).

Inventory

The inventory part of the consumption process includes garments that individuals regularly use and those which are used occasionally for special times. Clothing is taken from storage and worn. It may then be put back into storage after care or maintenance.
Inventory data serve to report numbers and types of these garments worn by family members within a given period of time. These data are influenced largely by the age and occupation of the wearer (Brew, 1954:578). White-collar workers own and purchase more clothing than individuals who wear work clothes. Wives employed outside the house increase clothing purchasing and inventories when compared to wives who are not employed. Type of dresses or shirts and numbers owned are related to the age of the individual (USDA, 1956:4; Brew, 1954:579).

Investigations into the influence of income, race, family composition, status, and sex of the household head on garment inventory have conflicting results. Kielty (1970:54) showed through a study of consumption patterns of women in low-moderate-income families that inventory of garments is affected by sex, number of children, race, and income. There was an especially high association between inventory of garments and income. A study by Costa (1973:23) of low-income women receiving aid to dependent children showed the contrary. She found that employment, number of children, or outside activities did not greatly influence wardrobes of women in the study. Inventories of college girls from three ethnic groups of middle-income families had similarities in wardrobe quantity and content (Rogers, 1970:42). This is in contrast to Hunter's (1967:44) findings that Negro women of low socioeconomic status had greater numbers of garments when compared to white women of the same class.

Inventory data provide information on clothing supplies and garment life that can be a guideline for clothing budget preparation
by families and individuals. For example, wardrobe studies of college students and children indicated categories of garments, amounts of items, and adequacy of items (Thiel, 1968:37). These data and listings of clothing items serve as guidelines for clothing adequacy and budgeting.

Discard

The final clothing consumption process is discarding the apparel. This occurs when the individual finds that the article of clothing will no longer be used. VeVerka (1974:80) found that individuals discard garments when the use value is less than costs in maintaining it, and when the cost of disposal is not great.

Garments may be discarded for several reasons. Avery (1967:39) and Greig (1975:34) found that most garments were discarded because of wear, appearance, or fit. Pershing's (1974:23) study of faculty men from selected colleges revealed that younger faculty men's disposal of garments was due to outdated fashion, while older men disposed of garments due to wear. Pinard (1974:38-40) also studied married men in the Reno-Sparks, Nevada, area. She found that 86 percent of the men were dissatisfied with all discarded clothing items for physical factors of the garment, or fabric, and 62 percent were dissatisfied because of style or fashion.

Packard (1960) defines the type of garment disposal due to style change as "obsolescence of desirability. . . .In this situation a product that is still sound in terms of quality or performance becomes 'worn out' in our minds because a styling or other change makes
it seem less desirable" (p.69). Packard (1960:73) sees this type of disposal as a waste and a conspiracy by marketers of clothing to manipulate consumers psychologically to desire the new.

Reasons for disposal of garments are also related to individual characteristics. Pinard (1974:69-70) found that men in highly social occupations were more likely to discard garments due to fashion. Pershing (1974:23) found this also true with young college faculty men. Avery (1967:39) found that lower socioeconomic groups were more likely to discard garments due to wear than were "full professors" of colleges. Vyverberg (1972:58) found that younger women were more willing to wear damaged garments than were older women.

Often the type of occasion and extent of physical damage may dictate garment discard or activity. Home garments versus occupational garments differ in acceptable qualities (Wellan, 1966:42). Special-event garments, such as formal garments, are less acceptable for wear when damaged than are informal garments (Vyverberg, 1972:56-57). All-over damage, such as color change, is more acceptable than holes or tears.

There are several methods for discarding garments. These include donating, selling, exchanging, making over, giving away, throwing away, destroying, and recycling for other uses. However, much clothing that is no longer worn is not disposed of but put in inactive storage (Winakor, 1969:631). In the consumption process, inactive storage is a floating area between inventory (active storage) and discard. A few items in inactive storage may be readily identifiable, as they may include garments kept until a child will grow into them,
or a special sentimental garment. However, many individuals find difficulty in identifying active and inactive garments (VeVerka, 1974:81). Often both types of garments are stored together. This contributes to errors in inventories and wardrobe studies.

Summary

The clothing consumption process includes acquisition of clothing, inventory or stock of garments, and discard or disposal of garments. Most garments are purchased new; however, supplemental sources of clothing, such as gifts, home-sewn garments, and used garments, are important in inventory. Used clothing has been traditionally handed down or purchased, especially by low-income families and individuals. Of clothing handed down, infants received the largest percentage of handed-down clothing; boys and girls were the second largest recipients of used clothing; adults received the least. Percentage of purchased used clothing was greatest for adult women heads of household, followed by husband and wives, and last for children.

Inventory includes garments that are regularly or occasionally used. Size of inventory may depend on income, race, family composition, sex, and employment.

Discard of apparel occurs when the clothing will no longer be used. This is due to fashion, fit, or wear. Type of occasion and extent of dissatisfaction with garment dictates garment discard or activity.
Clothing Expenditures

Consumer Demographic Variables Affecting Expenditures

Consumer characteristics as they relate to demographic variables can be useful in studying market segmentation and product classes. Since clothing can be divided into product classes, and often fashion is sold according to product classes (children, juniors, misses, women's) and price points (budget, middle-priced, designer), it is important to consider consumer characteristics in the study of clothing purchases.

Sex and Age

Sex and age are the two most important variables in relation to size of wardrobe and amount expended on clothing per year. Clothing expenditure for individuals and families increases as children get older, reaches its height for young adults, and declines with age. For example, clothing for all females in 1960-61 averaged $179.00; for girls two to five years old the average was $74.00 per person, peaking at $255.00 per person at the age of 18 to 24 years, and decreasing to $98.00 per person for ages 65 years and older. This holds true for outerwear, accessories, and undergarments (USDL, 1967:10-149). Single women 18 to 24 years old spent the most on clothes with an average of $440.00 while wives with families were lower spenders, averaging $186.00. One-parent families with women as head of household were the lowest at $162.00 (USDL, 1967:10-149). This pattern was supported
by a report by Henry (1976:42). Henry found an inverse relationship between women's expenditures for clothing and the number of children, and husband's occupation. Elderly women are thought to spend less on clothing, due to an increase in other expenses such as food, transportation, medical care, household, and insurance (Gravois, 1976:37).

Males in 1960-61 spent somewhat less on clothing with an average of $141.00 for all males. An average of $67.00 was spent on clothing for boys of ages two to five years; the highest amount of $185.00 was spent by men at age 18 to 24 years, and declined to $77.00 for men over 65 years old. Single men spent the most on clothing, averaging $210.00 to $226.00 per year (USDL, 1967:10-149).

Expenditure for specific items of clothing also showed a relation between age and sex. Footwear expenditure for boys peaked at 12 to 17 years of age, and 16 to 17 years of age for girls. Males tended to spend more money (60 percent of clothing budget) on outerwear while women spent only 48 percent in this category. However, women spent more on underclothing and accessories (38 percent of the clothing budget) than men (25 percent) (Britton, 1968:8).

Therefore, the single female consumer, age 12 to 24 years, can be said to have the highest expenditures for clothing. The male consumer of the same age is the second in clothing expenditures. Individuals spending the least amount on clothing are the elderly, 65 years old and over, and children two to five years of age. More recent data on consumer expenditures on clothing are subdivided into farm, nonfarm rural, nonfarm urban, and are not parallel in format with the 1961 study.
Engel's law states that "with increases in income, the proportion spent for clothing tends to remain the same" (Hoyt, 1928:282). However, this was not true of the USDL 1960-61 study of clothing spending patterns of urban individuals. As income increased, percent of yearly clothing expenditures of men, women, and children generally increased (USDL, 1967:10-149). Men 25 to 64 years old had an average of .6 percent increase in clothing expenditure with a one percent increase in income. Single women consumers 25 to 64 years of age had the highest increase in percent of income spent on clothing. As income increased one percent, single women consumers' expenditures for clothing rose about one percent. Married women aged 18 to 64 with children under 18 had increases of clothing expenses at .7 percent with a one percent rise in income. Groups spending the least amount with a one percent rise in income included boys and men (.5 percent increase in clothing expenditure per year) and children under age two (.3 percent increase in clothing expenses) (Britton, 1968:11).

Increase in yearly income also influences clothing expenditures of individuals in relation to different groups. When income was $3,000-3,999 per year, women 18 to 64 years old spent the same amount for clothing as men of that age group. However, when the income was $7,500-9,999, women ages 18 to 64 spent 20 percent more for clothing than men. At all income levels, clothing expenses for children two to five years old were about one-half the amount spent by men (Britton, 1968:11). Conflicting results were reported by Hovermale (1962:3344), who researched and reported the spending patterns of single women aged 35 to
She found that the percentage of income spent on clothing decreased as income rose.

Types of garments purchased also vary with income level. Family yearly income in the $3,000-3,999 range listed a 57 percent spending on outerwear, 18 percent on footwear and 26 percent on accessories. Family income groups in the $7,500-9,000 range spent 61 percent on outerwear, less on footwear (15 percent) and less on accessory items (24 percent) than those of lower-income families (USDL, 1967:10-149). Women in the lower-income range spent 43 percent of yearly clothing expenses on outerwear, 16 percent on footwear, and 41 percent on accessory items while higher-income women spent 49 percent on outerwear, 14 percent on footwear, and 37 percent on accessory items. In general, a larger percent of income was spent on outerwear by higher-income families than lower-income families, especially for suits and trousers for men and dresses and suits for women. Lower-income men tended to spend a larger percentage of income on work and play clothing than higher-income men. Differences in occupation may be the reason for this.

**Occupation**

Brew (1954:578) identified occupational differences as a strong influential factor in annual clothing purchases. The need to dress for a job affects clothing practices, especially when men need to wear business suits to work. This was also true for wives who worked outside the home. Ryan (1966:121) reported that white-collar workers spent more on clothing and had a greater number of garments than
manual laborers, even when incomes were similar. Hovermale (1962: 3344) reported on the purchase of clerical and professional women. She found that purchases of both groups of women were similar in number of garments purchased, but not in type of garment and price paid for clothing. Professional women had a different price range with higher price limits.

Educational Level

Daub (1968:61) studied population demographic changes between 1940-1960 and the proportion of income families spent for clothing. It was found that the variable of greatest importance in influencing the changing proportion of family income spent for clothing was education. Russell's (1972:98) study of low-income families found that education of family head does have some influence on garments purchased. Family heads with six to seven years of formal education reported a larger number of handed-down clothing while those with four to five years of formal education purchased more garments ready-made for their children. Family heads with eight to nine years of formal education purchased the largest amount of second-hand garments. Eight to nine years of education was the highest level group in Russell's study.

Economic Trends in Clothing Expenditure

Trends in family and individual budget expenditures indicate that there are differences in expenditures for clothing depending on such factors as income, family composition, geographic location, and social and economic conditions of the times. The U.S. Department of
Labor survey of consumer expenditures for clothing in 1960-61 showed that $155.00 per person was spent for clothing for those living in urban areas. The highest expenditures were made by females, ages 18 to 24, who spent an average of $225.00 per person per year. Men in that same age group averaged $185.00 per person (USDL, 1967:10-149). As the dollar amount of income rose, so did clothing expenditures. Higher incomes meant an increase in expenditures for older persons, more so than for the young. The lowest increase of expenditures was that for children under two and the boys-men category for ages two to twenty-four (USDL, 1967:10-149). In 1960-61, clothing expenses in the Northeast were highest, and were lowest in the South and West.

By 1966, per capita expenditure for clothing was $205.00. In 1977, consumer expenditure for clothing averaged $373.00 per person. Reasons for this rise were due to the rise in income, price of clothing, increase in spending and an increase in the young adult population (Britton, 1966-76: Polyzou, 1978:36). However, examination of percentage of clothing expenditures over a 50-year period shows an overall decrease in percent of income spent for clothing. In 1929, the percentage of family income spent for clothing averaged 14.5 percent. By 1950, average personal consumption for clothing was 12.4 percent of income (Burke, 1968:238). By 1960, average percent of income spent on clothing was 9.9 percent and in 1965, it was 9.4 percent (Statistical Abstract, 1980:442). Clothing expenditures accounted for 7.8 percent of the total income in 1979 (Statistical Abstract, 1980:442). If the trend continues for the 1980s, a smaller percentage of average income will be spent on clothing.
Engel's law states that "with increases in income, the proportion spent for clothing tends to remain the same" (Hoyt, 1928:282). However, Hoyt (1928:331) argued that this is not true for the lower-income groups, due to the personal importance placed on clothing. Proportions of income spent on clothing increase in industrial and farm families as the income increases. Clothing consumption proportionally declines in percentage of income with the higher-income professional families. Katona and Mueller (1968) provide reasons for this inconsistency:

Sustainable income increases readily stimulate the acquisition of the more costly things people want—vacation, trips, more and better durable goods, home improvements, and the like. On the other hand stability is highly valued when it comes to things people need (pp.120-21).

So higher-income families hold back in everyday minor expenditures like clothing, whereas in the lower-income category, the basics like food and clothing are not considered sufficient. Immediate gratification is needed with the increase in income (Ferber, 1955:26). Wyland (1937: 153) also concluded that economic choices are for self interest and satisfaction. Other factors that influence purchases are prices, time to buy, and the stability of the income (Ferber and Wales, 1958:342).

Clothing and textiles outlook of prices and supplies over a ten-year period showed that apparel price levels increased at a slower rate on the Consumer Price Index than other basic commodities such as housing, food, fuel, and medical care (Britton, Polyzou, 1968-77). The price of footwear and leather accessories led the apparel group in price increases. The energy crisis and fuel cutback during the early 1970s started the trend in apparel purchases in general.
Consumers were asked to make full use of their resources and this meant not only gasoline and heating fuel, but clothing items, household items, and means to clean them. Purchases of clothing and fabric needed to be carefully planned into budgets and without using excessive fuel.

The general trend in spending from 1953 to 1968 was due to the rise in spending for services rather than for hard goods (Burke, 1968:237-9). This trend continues in the 1970s and 1980s. Housing expenditures, medical care services, and transportation expenditures are increasing. Economists also see a trend toward more spending for educational and recreational facilities. Services gain importance as more women begin to work. The U.S. Department of Labor reports that industries providing services will continue to employ more people than those providing goods. Service-producing industries show a projected growth of 20 million workers from the 1980s into the 1990s (USDL, 1980: 19). The increased number of women workers, both part-time and full-time has contributed to the change in consumption patterns through increased spending on convenience food items, more frequent eating out, emphasis on recreation and leisure, time-saving devices, and other service items (Burke, 1968:237-9).

As consumers felt pressures of increased fuel and other basic commodities in the mid 1970s, clothing retailers reported resistance to increased clothing prices. Consumers' standards and buying habits demanded quality textiles and clothing in the higher priced category. Women were accessorizing clothing already owned and buying items that could be worn for different occasions (Clothes, 1976:40; Textile World,
1974:32t). Less expensive children's clothing was purchased with the thought that children soon outgrow their apparel (Britton, 1974:75).

Summary

Sex, age, income, occupation, and education are variables which affect clothing purchases. Single females, age 12 to 24, have the highest dollar expenditures for clothing. This seems to remain true as income increases. White-collar workers generally spend more on clothing than do blue-collar workers. Education of the family head has an influence on amount of income spent on clothing and the sources by which the family acquires clothing.

Economic trends in clothing expenditures indicate per capita expenditure for clothing is increasing, but the percent of clothing expenditure in relation to total income is decreasing. This is due to the increase in prices of basic commodities such as housing, transportation, medical care, and fuel. It is also due to changes in consumption patterns from hard goods to service items.

Recycling Programs

Although many individuals and enterprises may have always been actively recycling, focus on the problem of ecology and balance of resources did not come to national attention until the early 1970s. This was due in part to the economic conditions and a growing population with a need for goods, raw materials, and land space (Mighdoll, 1971:910-13). There was concern regarding balance of resources,
depletion of natural resources, management of environment, air and water pollution, and waste. It was during this time of national concern that the term "recycling" became fashionable. In an economic sense, recycling suggests the use of a product to its utmost state at which time it is deemed unusable through breakdown (Carlsen, 1973:653). Therefore, the key to recycling is utilization of the product. In order for recycling to be an acceptable and successful endeavor, it was found that a combination of economic and technological success and favorable psychological attitudes needed to be present (Mighdoll, 1971:910-13).

**Consumer Response to Recycling**

The growing national attitude toward environmental concerns was aided in part by much publicity, neighborhood activities, and governmental support. In April, 1970, a nationally proclaimed Earth Day focused on environmental concerns and regulations. In 1970, the Resource Recovery Act was passed. It gave tax and other incentives to waste and raw materials usage (Mighdoll, 1971:910-13). In February, 1971, President Nixon's environmental message to Congress changed Federal purchasing policies to include purchase of paper products that have been recycled. This national response began a policy for many state governments in the use of recycled products (Linsay, 1971:59). Across the nation, "ecocycle" centers were being coordinated in various neighborhoods (Cross, 1973:3-4; Mock, 1978:5). These centers informed individuals of areas for deposit of bottles, cans, and paper
for reuse by industry. In this way, individuals could personally re-cycle to help a national concern.

Professionals discuss a need for changes in attitudes and life-styles from conspicuous consumption to voluntary simplicity (Elgin and Mitchell, 1977:200-26). Seaborg (1975) stresses a need to use and re-use materials indefinitely where primary or new resources are used only as back-up for those lost. He identified a need to shift to non-obsolescence through attitude changes in our society:

An entire society reusing and recycling almost all its possessions, especially after an extended era of conspicuous consumption and waste, will take a great deal of pride in a lifestyle that is extremely creative and varied and based on a new degree of human ingenuity and innovation. (Pp.22-24.)

In a Roper poll published in 1976, 51 percent of the Americans believed that a cut-back in consumption and production was necessary to conserve resources (Elgin and Mitchell, 1977:208). A Harris poll of May, 1977, found similar beliefs by Americans. Seventy-nine percent of Americans believed in the necessity of "teaching people how to live with basic essentials [rather] than reaching higher standard of living" (Elgin and Mitchell, 1977:208). An early 1975 Harris poll reported ways in which Americans would be willing to cut back on consumption. Ninety percent were willing to do away with annual fashion choices, 73 per cent were willing to wear old clothes, even if they shine, until they wear out (Elgin and Mitchell, 1977:208).

Recycling of Clothing

Recycling of clothing can mean to "reuse and renew wearable clothing to lengthen its useful life" (Koester, 1976:1). There are
several ways clothing can be recycled through individual or group effort. Each recycling program involves various resources in time, energy, and skill. Discarded clothing can be donated to charitable organizations that sponsor sales. Local bazaars and rummage sales are held to sell clothing. Larger nonprofit organizations such as the Salvation Army and Goodwill pick up clothing donated by individuals at their homes and through drop boxes located conveniently near supermarkets and shopping areas. At a large warehouse, clothing items are sorted into bins and tagged for pricing. Unusable clothing is sold to manufacturers for shredding into rags and other end uses. Some clothing is given to welfare agencies or shipped to countries outside the United States (Interview: Paul Cameron, "Business Abroad. . .", 1960:104). Donations, however, have not been popular in recent years ("These Are Strange. . .", 1974:82). One factor may be due to the change in laws since 1969 which allows donors to tax deduct the used value of the clothing rather than the new retail cost of the clothing, so individuals and families may choose other more profitable routes for disposal rather than donations. Also, increased prices of basic commodities may have families keeping clothing in an active inventory rather than discarding or purchasing new items ("The Longest. . .", 1976:40; Textile World, 1974:32t).

Consignment selling of used clothing is another option for recycling of used clothing. Individuals may bring clothing into secondhand shops. The shop owner may buy the garment outright or take it on consignment. The owner-agent gets a percentage of the sale while the garment owner gets a percentage also. There is generally a
time limit in consignment sales with a price reduction according to
time spent in the shop (Scobey, 1961:121-23; "Famous Fashions. . .");
1959:190-91). The trend in increased popularity of thrift and resale
clothing shops has also seen in the rise of flea markets and garage
sales. Individuals are able to sell their clothing directly to con-
sumers. Items are advertised informally through local papers, by word-
of-mouth, or by public bulletin boards. Sale products are often in
one room such as garage, porch, or dining area. Prices are attached
to each item; the purchaser is responsible for taking the item home.
Sales of this kind are often scheduled for a few hours to a week in
length (Scobey, 1961:121).

Non-money-making areas of clothing recycling involve gifts
and hand-me-downs. Often children are given garments outgrown by an
older child. This is a frequent form of recycling in young families.
Clothing exchanges are also ways of reusing clothing in some commun-
ities and among different families (Britton, 1975:6).

Restyling, mending, altering, or making over a garment in-
volves human and economic resources of an individual. Often a garment
can be worn by altering for improvement in fit of the garment. Cloth-
ing may also be restyled by changing part of the garment through removal
of an area such as sleeves or collar, or by addition of new parts.
One example is the popularity of decorated denims. Denims done in
rhinestones, sequins, or lined with opossum, have caught the attention
of exclusive New York boutiques. Pop art exhibits of decorated denims
of famous rock stars show that used clothing can be the basis of a
Making over a garment is most likely to involve the most time and human skill. It involves taking apart the original piece of clothing and reconstructing it to suit the individual. Old fabrics may be used for quilts, men's vests may be cut from a sports coat, or pants may be made into skirts (Koester, 1976:2).

Mending is often all a garment needs for wearability. Extensive and difficult mending can be done by professionals, while simple mending can become a creative effort. This has been popular in recent years as recycled clothes have been decorated for a fashionable craft look. Patches on jeans were once an indication of poverty, but today it is an artistic expression and even a profit-making venture for some specialty shops ("Patchwork Fashion," 1971:46-47).

Recycling also involves extending clothing use. This may require spending money. One method is to purchase accessories and small items so that fashion newness can be gained (Koester, 1976:2). Outfits can look new through recoordinating them or accessorizing them.

Commercial Response to Recycling

Industry has probably been most affected by the trend toward conservation and recycling. Much literature on commercial response to recycling has been in the area of waste disposal of paper, metals, glass, and textiles. Much of the information is beyond the scope of this study; however, general trends in clothing and textile recycling will be discussed.

Industry has been encouraged to recycle for two reasons. First, there is a real concern about energy availability and depletion of
national resources in the future. Second, manufacturers who recycle are generally aided by municipal funds, subsidies, and tax incentives (Carlsen, 1973:653-66). These two factors in combination have encouraged recycling of products.

Much current recycling of textiles has been done by the United Kingdom through carbonizing processes, exposure to ultraviolet light, electrostatic separation, by solvents, or color sorting (Bromley, 1978: 2, 5, 1). It was found that if sufficient quantities were available after processing and the quantities were not contaminated, then products such as carpet backing, synthetic foam backing, and vinyl floor covering, could be produced. The waste from low-grade substances recycled is low in cost and is discarded or incinerated. All textile recycling or reclamation is dependent on changes in fashion which in turn affect fiber content (Bromley, 1978:2, 5, 1).

Enthusiasm in research has also been noted in finding uses for synthetic textiles or textile blends. It was found that charcoal (activated carbon) used in cigarette filters, gas masks, kitchen hoods, and gas tank vents in cars, could be produced from synthetic textile fabric rags (Wilson, 1971:3-4).

Resale Clothing Shops

Recycling of garments has also become a positive endeavor for many commercial enterprises. Recycling of clothing has been done on a large scale as evidenced by used-clothing shops. Increased business in secondhand clothing is one offshoot of the economic trend toward careful spending and sentiment toward recycling. The number of resale
clothing shops has increased in different parts of the United States ("Secondhand Chic", 1975:52). Their popularity is growing as all income levels hunt for bargains ("Youth Buys. . .", 1972:19).

Secondhand-clothing shops vary in mode of operation depending on location and purpose of the shop. Garment quality also varies. In better shops, clothes look neat and displays are attractive. In others, clothing is not repaired or cleaned before sale (Interview: Paul Cameron). Some shops are run by volunteers while others are operated by owners and paid salespeople. The only similarity for all secondhand clothing shops is that they deal in clothes that have been worn at least once.

"Clothing, Used," "Clothing, Secondhand," or "Clothing Bought and Sold," are generally the categories under which shops sponsor used clothing of individuals. Boutiques also listed under this title in most telephone books may buy used clothing from individuals or estate sales and sell them at a profit ("Famous Fashions. . .", 1959:190).

Especially popular in the past 20 years are secondhand stores that sell designer-name women's clothing. These shops are generally found in large metropolitan areas such as New York, Washington, D.C., Dallas, and Los Angeles ("Famous Fashions. . .", 1959:190; Scobey, 1961:156). The sellers of the garments are generally wealthy individuals who wear only the very recent fashions, often discarding a garment after wearing it only once. The shop owners may buy the garment or put it on consignment. Garments are often in the smaller sizes and many are altered to fit the original owner. They are trendy but not the most recent fashion of the day. Prices of garments vary according
to the type of wearing apparel. Dresses may be marked down to one-third of their original prices while evening dresses may be marked down to eight percent of their original prices. The garments are then reduced in price according to time spent in the shop. The better shops do not keep the same garment for more than four months ("Famous Fashion. . .", 1959:191). The garment is then given to charity or returned to its owner.

Couture shops often have a "solde" branch that sells marked-down designer clothing worn once in style shows and for magazine photography. Often the clientele is small and garments are limited to sizes of the model ("Don't Discount. . .", 1963:62). The Cinema Glamour Shop, formerly the Screen Star Thrift Shop, specializes in marked-down designer creations as well as garments worn by celebrities in movies or television appearances (Head, 1974:26).

Other boutiques not specializing in designer garments may feature nostalgia clothing. Old-fashioned silk and lace blouses, padded-shoulder suits of the 1940s, beaded purses and other period clothing may be common items sold in these shops (Queen, 1978:4-5; Hofferber, 1978:4).

Rummage sales or bazaars are often sponsored by organizations that sell used clothing for a small profit. Bazaars, rummage sales, and nonprofit organizations generally have the purpose of financing a project or aiding the less fortunate, so prices tend to be lower (Martens, 1965:87; "Thrift Shops. . .", 1975:71). They are usually listed under "Thrift" in the telephone directory.
Consumers of Recycled Clothing

Based on literature discussed in preceding sections, two opposing forces in our society seem apparent. On one hand, changing sociological forces make it possible for individuals to become exposed to cosmopolite lifestyles through travel and freedom that the current laws provide. Technological advances make it possible for businesses to produce goods to be distributed more rapidly for consumption. At the same time individuals are encouraged to spend. Psychological and personal traits identify certain needs individuals may have that can be met through purchasing different products. New or different clothing can often help psychological adjustment when worn (Copeland, 1924:146t). The result of sociological freedoms, technological advances, and psychological needs for purchasing products encourage the consumer to focus attention on the consumption of goods. In clothing, frequent changes in styles encourage fashion obsolescence and disposal of outmoded items. Packard's (1960:73) definition of "obsolescence of desirability" in terms of waste in clothing is a reality. On the other hand, the realities of economic trends indicate that high prices for basic commodities mean less spending for discretionary products such as clothing items. National concern for "recycling" discourages waste. The growing population and energy use draws attention to the depletion of natural resources and encourages a simple lifestyle.

The two opposing forces discussed above may be combined into a satisfactory rationale for purchasing and using secondhand clothing.
Purchasing and using secondhand clothing may not only fulfill certain psychological needs to obtain something different (not necessarily new), but may also permit one to spend less money and participate in recycling at the same time. Information on consumers of used clothing and secondhand shops is, however, limited.

Shopping for used clothing, according to Margerum (1978:8) is unique because, often, shopping time is long, there are not informative labels, and there are no fitting rooms. Used-clothing consumers may enter a potentially frustrating shopping situation, yet businesses continue to grow and consumers continue to frequent secondhand shops ("These Are Strange. . .", 1974:81-2; "Secondhand Chic", 1975:52). Of 144 used-clothing consumers surveyed in the Reno-Sparks, Nevada, area Margerum found that most people shopped for clothing for work. Twenty-nine percent of 20 to 24 year olds, and 31 percent of 40 to 60 year olds, shopped with specific work clothing in mind. Forty-three percent of these people were white-collar workers and 54 percent were blue-collar workers. Teenagers listed school clothes as the reason for shopping in thrift stores. Fifty-five percent of those over 60 years old listed home clothing as the objective of their shopping in thrift shops. Many of those sampled had multiple reasons for shopping in thrift shops.

Manoushagian's (1977:47) study of Bridgeport, Texas, families reported rank-order criteria for purchase of used clothing. They are conditions of the garment, usefulness, fit, price, care of fabric, quality of garment, construction, style of fashion, and color.
Reasons for shopping in thrift stores may be many. The most obvious motive is one of economy. Clothing is generally less expensive in these shops and so thrift stores have price appeal images. Margerum's (1978:6) study of a small group of thrift shop consumers showed that "to save money" was the most frequent reason for shopping in thrift stores stated by men and women. Manoushagian's (1977:47) study of rural families showed that used clothing was seldom or never purchased due to the following reasons: alterations too involved, clothing out-of-date, clothing unsanitary, and no economic need.

However, evidence in recent articles indicates that consumers patronizing those shops are not necessarily of low income. There are consumers who have a choice to shop for new items of clothing but opt to purchase used clothing. These consumers may have other motivations than economy. Milinaire and Troy (1978:79-98) suggest this reason is "continuity with the past" and a way to wear expensive-looking clothing with a chic antique flair. They discuss the individuality of period clothing as an asset in fashion. Robinson (1961:398) identified the demand for period clothing as the "pursuit of rarity." Due to the limited supply of antique clothing, the consumer is motivated to seek out the purchase as a kind of "luxury good." An article in Women's Wear Daily also examined the popularity of antique clothing and natural fibers at an affordable price (Queen, 1978:4-5). Therefore, wearing used clothing can be a fashion innovation for some shoppers who are new to secondhand clothing.

Believers in recycling may also be motivated to shop for used clothing (Milinaire and Troy, 1978:83). National consciousness toward
recycling may be slowly persuading individuals to acquire used clothing for specific end uses and/or specific members of the family. For these individuals, used clothing may also reflect adoption of a new idea. Tarde (1903:367) suggested that an innovation originating in the lower classes does not spread further unless the higher classes can see the advantage of its adoption. Lower-income thrift-shop consumers may have shopping behavior that is being adopted more widely now, due to the economic situation and national concern for recycling.

Summary

Governmental and individual interest helped to draw national attention to concerns about the depleting of natural resources. Individual and commercial efforts to recycle or to use a product to its utmost capacity began. In the clothing area, individual efforts to recycle clothing may involve donating, direct selling, consignment selling, restyling, mending, altering, or making over a garment. Commercial enterprises may recycle clothing on a larger scale through business as secondhand shops.
Chapter III

PROCEDURE

This study was designed to investigate the characteristics of consumers of used clothing and the outlets in which used clothing is sold. Relationships between consumer characteristics and patronage of used-clothing outlets will be identified.

Objectives

The objectives of the study were:

1. To investigate characteristics of consumers of used-clothing stores with particular attention to the following factors:
   a) sex
   b) age
   c) educational level
   d) employment status
   e) family composition
   f) income level
   g) user of clothing purchased
   h) use of clothing
   i) reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores
   j) attitude toward used-clothing shops
   k) perceived fashion innovativeness
2. To describe various types of retail outlets that sell used clothing with particular attention to price points, store atmosphere, store convenience, and store merchandise.

3. To investigate relationships between consumer characteristics and patronage of used-clothing retail outlets.

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms, as defined below, will be used in the study:

**Employment status:** Employment status refers to whether persons are presently on established payrolls, either part-time established payrolls, full-time payrolls, on holiday or paid vacation payrolls, or whether persons are employed or retired (USDL, 1967:3). Definitions below were used for clarification if questions were raised during the interview.

**Fully employed persons:** Fully employed persons are those who worked as paid employees 35 hours or more in their own business or profession during the survey week but had jobs or businesses in which they were temporarily absent due to illness, bad weather, vacation, labor management dispute, or personal reasons, but who still received full pay during the survey week (USDL, 1967:2).

**Unemployed persons:** All persons who did not work during the survey week but who were available for work are classified as unemployed. Those who worked less than 15 hours per week are classified as unemployed.
Part-time employment: Part-time employed persons are those who worked as paid employees in business or professions over 15 hours a week but less than 35 hours per week.

Not in labor force: Persons not in labor force are those who are 16 years and over who are not classified as employed or unemployed because they are engaged in "home housework" or "in school" or are "unable to work due to longterm physical illness or mental illness" (USDL, 1967:2).

Retired: Persons who are retired are idle voluntarily due to age or seasonal work.

Education: Education refers to the last grade or year of formal schooling completed.

Consumer or Single Unit: A consumer or single unit represents a person generally living alone or in a household who is financially independent.

Family Unit: A family unit represents two or more persons living together who pool their incomes from a common fund for major items of expense (USDL, 1967:12).

Children in the family: Children in the family are those who were in the family unit during the past year, including those under one year of age (USDL, 1967:23).

Family type: Family type includes four variations of the family unit: 1) male and female with no children, 2) male and female with at least one child, 3) one parent with at least one child, and 4) other.
Income Level: Income level represents a person's income classification. Income classification represents total money obtained during the last survey year before taxes.

Reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores: Reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores are the respondent's motives for patronizing secondhand-clothing stores. These motives will fall in one of five categories: instinctive, emotional, rational, multiple reasons, or non-codeable reasons.

Instinctive reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores: Instinctive reasons include modesty (to cover nakedness), immodesty (to call attention to parts of the body), protection (shelter the body from the elements), and aesthetics (to decorate the body for beauty) (Ryan, 1966:41-42).

Emotional reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores: Emotional reasons include boredom and fatigue (desire to change due to constant use), curiosity (desire for new sensations, adventure), rebellion against convention (breaking out of the traditional or normal standards of dress), imitation (dress like the group in order to obtain membership in that group), companionship (dress to please in order to conform to a group), self assertion (desire to secure recognition, approval, prestige, freedom to be different). (Nystrom, 1928:72-79; Copeland, 1924:141).

Rational reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores: Rational reasons include factors independent of the respondent that can be measured through respondent's judgment of desirable attributes of the product or store. These are price, quality, assortment,
fashion, locational convenience, other conveniences (store hours),
services, sales personnel, sales, advertising, store atmosphere,
reputation for adjustments, and others (Ryan, 1966:148; Kunkel
and Berry, 1968:26).

Multiple reasons: Multiple reasons for shopping in used-clothing
stores include more than one answer given by the respondent, with
no primary or main motive identified.

User of clothing purchase: User of clothing purchase includes the
person for whom the purchase is made (self, children, spouse, or
others).

Use of clothing: Use of clothing is the occasion for which respondent
most often uses clothing (job, home, school, hobby, recreation,
social, costumes, or other).

Attitude toward used-clothing shops: Attitude toward used-clothing
shops is the respondent's indication of whether the respondent
likes to shop in used-clothing stores very much, likes to shop
in used-clothing stores, neither likes nor dislikes to shop in
used-clothing stores, dislikes shopping in used-clothing stores,
or dislikes shopping in used-clothing stores very much.

Perceived fashion innovativeness: Perceived fashion innovativeness
is the respondent's judgment of self in the rate of adoption of
in buying and wearing different clothing fashions as compared to
others. Categories for rate of adoption will include "earliest,"
"earlier than most," "about the same time," "later than most," and
"latest."
Hypotheses

The null hypotheses for this study are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There will be no difference between the consumers of type A and B stores on the following consumer demographic variables:
   a) sex
   b) age
   c) educational level
   d) employment status
   e) family composition
   f) income level

Hypothesis 2: There will be no difference between the consumers of type A and B stores in their reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores.

Hypothesis 3: There will be no difference between the consumers of type A and B stores in the use of clothing purchased.

Hypothesis 4: There will be no difference between the consumers of type A and B stores in the use of clothing purchased.

Hypothesis 5: There will be no difference between the consumers of type A and B stores in their attitudes toward used-clothing shops.

Hypothesis 6: There will be no difference between the consumers of type A and B stores in the level of perceived fashion innovativeness.
Assumptions

1. Response from consumers was honest and questions were understood by respondents.
2. Respondents were representative of all consumers of used-clothing shops in Eugene, Oregon.
3. Measures were valid and reliable.
4. Order of administration of questions was not biased; answers written were interpreted as respondents desired.

Limitations

1. Population was limited to consumers of used-clothing stores in Eugene, Oregon.
2. The results cannot be generalized beyond the sample studied.

Identification of Stores

Identification of secondhand shops for the study involved selection of the site, development of a procedure and rating to categorize stores into types, and interviewing of store managers.

Selection of Site

The city of Eugene, Oregon, encompasses 28 square miles of land and total street mileage of 316.62 miles. The trade area of Eugene extends 75 miles south, east into Central Oregon, and west to Pacific Ocean communities. The total recorded population with access to the Eugene trade center is 531,000 people (City Directory, 1979:IX). In
1975, Eugene stores received 406,590,000.00 dollars in retail sales. The Eugene area is noted as the 74th largest industrial market in the United States by Dun and Bradstreet (City Directory, 1979:IX).


Census of Population reports Eugene's median income in 1970 at $9,996.00. Forty-one percent worked 50-52 weeks and seven percent were unemployed. Twenty-three-and-two-tenths percent of Eugene's population earned $15,000.00 or more annually. Seven-and-eight-tenths percent earned less than poverty level (United States Department of Commerce, 1980:39-125).

Eugene was chosen as a site for research for several reasons: (1) It is the second-largest city in Oregon with an expanding population. Growth between 1970 and 1980 census represents a 75.6 percent increase in population. (2) The distance to be traveled is within the means of the investigator, and (3) Eugene provides the variety of stores needed for research.

Selection of Stores

A preliminary survey of used-clothing shops in Eugene, Oregon, resulted in identification of six secondhand stores. Three sell used
clothing donated by individuals, and three sell used clothing of individuals on a consignment basis.

The investigator's subjective observation of six shops showed some differences in prices, locational convenience, fashion, and store presentation. Two shops clearly had lower prices than the other four stores. All six shops are located on busy main streets. All stores had the majority of the clothing on racks and hangers.

Assessment of the variability of the clothing stores was done by an objective committee of seven high school students enrolled in advanced clothing classes. They received a rating sheet for each of the six stores on the following items: price points, store atmosphere, conveniences, and quality and assortment of merchandise. In the price points category, the raters were asked to compare the price of a selected garment to the price on the rating sheet. Store atmosphere section included questions on garment organization and display. The committee rated store conveniences in the adequacy of dressing room facilities, accessibility in shopping, and garment labeling. Store merchandise was rated for overall appearance, quality, and assortment.

Development of items on the rating sheet was based on selected store image components (Kunkel and Berry, 1968:26). Kunkel and Berry studied images of stores and found 12 crucial components for store images. The items on the rating sheet represent factors that can be scored through committee members' judgment of the store strength on various store image components.

Prior to visiting the six stores, the investigator met with the committee and discussed the procedures for use of the rating sheet.
The discussion included the following items: 1) The committee examined the rating sheet and the investigator explained procedures for responding to items on the sheet. 2) The committee was asked not to discuss or compare scores with other members of the committee. 3) The committee was asked to observe the six stores within a certain time frame and submit completed rating sheets to the investigator by a predetermined date. 4) Transportation to and from the store was provided by the investigator and a committee member. Detailed directions for the store raters are in Appendix C.

Results of independent rating scores were tabulated by the investigator. "Yes" and "higher" responses to items were scored "5". "No" and "lower" responses to items were scored "1". In the case of answers that could not be checked "yes" or "no", "higher" or "lower", the committee member checked the center line. This answer was scored "3". Stores that received a total aggregate score above the median were labeled type A; stores that received a total aggregate score below the median were labeled type B.

**Interview of Store Managers**

Managers of the six used-clothing stores received an introductory letter stating the purpose of the study, benefits of the study, and need for cooperation. Managers were then contacted by phone to set up interview times. The investigator asked the managers for a 15 to 30-minute appointment to discuss the research project. The purposes of the interview with the store managers were 1) to gain permission for the use of store facilities in the research, 2) to secure
basic information that may help the research, 3) to allow store managers to meet the investigator, 4) to acquaint the store managers with the data collection procedures and questionnaire, 5) to allow the store managers to ask questions concerning the study, and 6) to discuss the confidential nature of the research and results of the interviews.

At the beginning of the interview, the investigator summarized the purposes of the study, described the data collection procedure, and shared the contents of the questionnaire with the manager. At this point all but one manager agreed to participate in the study. The five participating store managers were then asked basic questions (Appendix B). Three basic questions concerned 1) the day of the week and times of day that had the heaviest flow of shoppers, 2) convenient times for interviewing to take place, 3) store policies that the investigator needed to consider in interviewing consumers or interpreting interview results.

Based on information from the managers, the investigator set up days for interviewing consumers and made a follow-up phone call to the managers confirming interview schedules.

Selection of Sample

The population chosen consisted of a random group of consumers of thrift shops and secondhand consignment shops located in Eugene, Oregon. Consultation with a statistician determined that approximately 250 interviews were needed. As the interview schedule and sample number allowed, the investigator interviewed every potential clothing
consumer in the store. In the case of more than one shopper in the store, the investigator chose consumers who showed intention toward purchase of merchandise as evidenced by consumers looking at various pieces of clothing, consumers having clothing merchandise in hand, and consumers standing in lines, waiting to purchase clothing items.

Development of Measures

Questions were developed to be used in the interview for study of consumers of used clothing. The instrument is an interview schedule to obtain demographic information, user of clothing purchased, use of clothing purchased, reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores, perceived fashion innovativeness, and attitude toward used-clothing shops (Appendix A). Response choices to consumer demographic information, user of clothing purchased, use of clothing purchased, perceived fashion innovativeness, and attitude toward used-clothing stores were typed on 3x5 notecards. Respondents were asked questions in the interview schedule. The response choices on the card were read by the interviewer as the respondents were shown the written choices on the notecards.

Consumer Demographic Information

General background information about the consumer was obtained through a demographic checklist in the interview schedule. Variables included sex, age, employment status, income level, education, and family composition. Governmental and individual research results indicate that these variables can have an effect on shopping behavior.
Sex and Age

Sex and age are two most important variables in relation to amount expended on clothing, according to information from the United States Department of Labor (1967:10-149). Females generally spend more on clothing, especially at ages 12 to 24 years. Males of that same age group have the second largest expenditure for clothing (USDL, 1967:10-149). Demographic information for sex of the respondent was obtained through observation:

male____ female____

The respondent was asked to identify an age grouping by answering the following question: "Please identify the letter of the age group in which you belong." Respondents were shown a notecard with the following choices:

a. below 18
b. 18-29
c. 30-39
d. 40-49
e. 50-59
f. 60-69
g. 70 and over

Employment Status

Studies by Brew (1954:578) and Ryan (1966:121) identify occupational differences as a strong influential factor in annual clothing purchases. The respondent was asked to identify employment status in
one of the categories by answering the following question: "Please identify the letter which represents your present employment status."

Respondents were shown a notecard with the following choices:

a. employed full time
b. employed part time
c. not in labor force
d. retired
e. unemployed

These categories are similar to the employment classification used in the United States Department of Labor Statistics surveys (1967: 10-149).

Educational Status

Daub (1968:30) and Russell (1972:98) indicate strong influence in family spending for secondhand garments is often affected by the educational level of the head of family. The respondent was asked to identify the category of the highest level of formal education completed by answering the following question: "What is the corresponding letter of the highest level of education you've completed?" Respondents were shown a notecard with the following choices:

a. completion of elementary school
b. completion of junior high school (9th grade)
c. completion of high school
d. completion of at least 1 year of college or junior college
e. technical, trade, or business school
f. 4-year college degree

g. completion of graduate or professional training

Family Composition

Hobbs (1971:53), McEwen (1967:47), and Hickman (1970:69) found that the number of members of the family affects consumption of used clothing. They found this especially true in families with children.

The respondent was asked to identify a consumer (single) unit status or family unit status. If the respondent belonged to a family unit, one of four family types was identified by the respondent in the following manner. The respondent was asked the following question:

"How many children do you have in your household that are supported by the family unit?" Response was classified as follows:

a. no children    d. 3 children
b. 1 child        e. 4 children
c. 2 children     f. 5 or more children

The respondent was then asked the following question: "Of what type of household does your family consist?" Respondents were shown a note-card with the following choices:

a. 2 adults, male and female, no children
b. 2 adults, male and female with one or more children
c. one parent with one or more children
d. other types

Similar categories in family typing are used by the United States Department of Labor Statistics in studies of clothing expenditure by individuals and families (1967:23).
Income Level

Statistics from the United States Department of Labor Statistics also indicate that percent of income spent on clothing varies at different economic levels (1967:3-4). Variations in spending patterns can be found in total percent of yearly income spent on clothing as well as percent of clothing budget spent for different types of garments.

The respondent identified the category that best represented the yearly income obtained before taxes by answering the following question: "Which letter describes your family's yearly earnings?" Respondents were shown a notecard with the choices listed below. The income category begins at a poverty-level figure for nonfarm consumer unit and goes up in increments of $2,000.00 (Statistical Abstract, 1978:465). Lower-income levels were used since consumers of thrift shop clothing are traditionally families at lower-income levels (Schwartz, 1963:225-27; Hunter, 1967:44; Harrison, 1968:55).

a. less than 3,000 dollars
b. $3,000-$5,000
c. $5,001-$7,000
d. $7,001-$9,000
e. $9,001-$11,000
f. $11,001-$13,000
g. $13,001-$15,000
h. $15,001-$17,000
i. over 17,000 dollars
User of Clothing Purchased

The respondent was asked to identify whether clothing purchases were most often for self, children, spouse, or others. Respondents were shown a notecard with the following choices:

- a. self
- b. children
- c. spouse
- d. others

Past research indicates that children ages two to seventeen are often recipients of used clothing (Britton, 1969:3-4). Children under two years of age often receive a majority of their clothing from supplemental sources (Britton, 1969:3).

Use of Clothing Purchase

The respondents were also asked to identify the letter corresponding to the primary clothing category of purchase (most purchased items category). Respondents were shown a notecard with the following choices:

- a. work (job)
- b. home
- c. school
- d. camping, recreation
- e. hobby, craft
- f. social occasion
- g. costume
- h. other
The checklist for use of clothing purchases in the most-purchased-items category was devised using Margerum's form as a guide (Margerum, 1978:4-5). Additional uses for clothing were listed according to information obtained through the review of literature ("Flash and Trash", 1973:106; Queen, 1978:4-5).

**Reasons for Shopping in Used Clothing Stores**

Copeland identifies the primary reasons why people purchase clothing as instinctive, emotional, and rational motives (1924:141). In clothing, four theories have been identified as instinctive: modesty, immodesty, protection, and aesthetics (Ryan, 1966:41-2). Emotional drives can be identified as psychological adjustment motives (Copeland, 1924:141). These may include boredom or fatigue, curiosity, rebellion against convention, imitation, companionship, and self assertion (Nystrom, 1928:81; Troxell, 1976:29). Rational motives may involve specific characteristics of the clothing or store. Ryan found rational strata of clothing selection in garment characteristics and properties (Ryan, 1966:166, 148). Kunkel and Berry (1968:26) studied images of stores and found that 99 percent of over 3,000 response images fell into 12 image categories. Consumer patronage of stores often depends on the strength of these various components. Rational motives may be identified using the 12 components. They are price, quality, assortment, fashion, locational convenience, other conveniences, services, store reputation on adjustment, store atmosphere, advertising, and sales personnel.
Respondents were asked to identify one main reason for shopping in used-clothing stores. The investigator wrote down the response from the shopper. An objective panel rated the reasons given according to the following categories:

**Instinctive**: modesty, immodesty, protection, aesthetics.

**Emotional**: boredom or fatigue, curiosity, rebellion against convention, imitation, companionship, self assertion.

**Rational**: price, quality, assortment, fashion, locational convenience, other conveniences, services, store atmosphere, store adjustment, advertising, sales personnel, sales.

The three main headings were used to identify reasons. The subcategories were recorded for frequency in the detailing of the responses. Multiple reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores fell into a fourth category, and responses that did not seem to fit in the four categories were coded under "others". In order to control for bias, the investigator followed the procedure outlined in Appendix D and in the section on preparation for analysis.

**Perceived Fashion Innovativeness**

Rogers (1962:188) suggests self-identification as a successful means of categorizing adopters of innovations. He recognizes that if one perceives oneself to be in a certain adopter category, one may act as such. Goodell (1967:69) also found that a successful means of identifying fashion leaders was through self-identification. Lauritsen (1972:48) found significant correlation between innovativeness and self-rating of innovativeness in a group of randomly sampled home sewers.
A single question was asked in relation to perceived fashion innovativeness. The investigator presented the respondent with a notecard showing the following scale below. The respondent was asked to answer the following question by indicating a point of the scale:

"When comparing yourself to other people you know, in general, would you say you buy and wear new or different clothing fashions?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>earliest</th>
<th>earlier than most other people you know</th>
<th>about the same time</th>
<th>later than most other people you know</th>
<th>latest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Responses were classified as one of five adopter categories. These categories represent the rate of adoption (Rogers, 1962:171):

5. earliest . . . . . . . . . innovator
4. earlier than most. . . . . early adopter
3. about the same time. . . . early majority
2. later than most. . . . . late majority
1. latest . . . . . . . . . . laggard

Attitude Toward Used-Clothing Stores

A simplified multiple-choice scale was used to collect information concerning attitude toward used-clothing stores. A single question was asked regarding likes or dislikes toward secondhand shops:

"What letter would describe your feelings toward used-clothing stores?"

Respondents were shown a notecard with the following choices:

a. I like to shop in used-clothing stores very much.

b. I like to shop in used-clothing stores.
c. I neither like nor dislike to shop in used-clothing stores.
d. I dislike shopping used-clothing shops.
e. I dislike shopping in used-clothing stores very much.

This question was chosen because it asked for a direct, and simple, opinion from the respondent. This was important as the attitude question was the first one asked in the interview.

**Collection of Data**

An interview schedule to obtain attitude toward used-clothing stores, perceived fashion innovativeness, user of clothing purchased, use of clothing, reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores, and consumer demographic information was used to interview each subject.

The shopper was approached and the investigator explained that she was a student doing a study for a class on the topic of consumers of used clothing. The investigator further indicated that the interview was confidential and the respondent might choose not to answer certain questions or stop the interview at any point. The investigator then asked if the shopper would be willing to participate. If the answer was no, the investigator thanked the shopper. If the answer was yes, the shopper was asked to respond to the questions in the interview schedule (Appendix A). The respondents were then presented with index cards listing lettered responses for identification by the shopper. The investigator then asked each question and read possible answers. Respondents' answers were recorded on an interview sheet (Appendix A). Exceptions included sex typing and reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores. Sex typing was done by observation.
Respondent's primary reason for shopping in a used-clothing store was recorded on the interview sheet verbatim.

The investigator dressed in a manner that was consistent with the student mode of dress so that responses would not be biased due to dress of the investigator.

Pretest Procedures

Pretesting of the store rating procedure, store manager interview, and questionnaire was done on a small scale at the Oregon State University Thrift Shop in Corvallis, Oregon. The thrift shop sells used men's, women's and children's clothing on a consignment basis.

Store Identification

The pretesting of the rating sheet for store type categorizing was done by several graduate students in the Clothing, Textiles, and Related Arts Department at Oregon State University. Rating was done at the O.S.U. Thrift Shop. Space was provided on the rating sheet for comments in terms of ambiguous questions and items not included on the sheet. Revision was made prior to distribution to committee members for rating in Eugene.

Interview of Store Manager

The investigator contacted the manager of the O.S.U. Thrift Shop for an interview. Questions in Appendix B were asked following the same procedure prescribed for the actual study. The investigator
made note of questions needing revision and asked for additional information that the manager saw as necessary for the study.

Questionnaire Pretest

The purposes of the questionnaire pretest were to gain experience in interviewing and to evaluate the questionnaire according to the responses from the shoppers. Data collection procedures prescribed for the study in administration of the interview were followed. Approximately 10 subjects were interviewed. The investigator noted unexpected answers, ambiguous questions, and items left blank. Revision of the questionnaire was made before sampling in Eugene.

Analysis

All responses were recorded on an interview recording sheet. With the exception of the reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores, the interview recording sheet was numerically coded for future key-punching. Nonresponse to a question was coded "0". Respondents who chose not to complete the interview received a "0" code to questions not answered.

The investigator tabulated coding from judges in the section on reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores. The following procedure was used in coding responses for reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores: 1) The investigator chose three panel members to judge responses of shoppers interviewed. The three panel members were graduate students in Clothing, Textiles, and Related Arts at Oregon State University. 2) The three panel members were provided with
written definitions of the terms used in each of the four coded categories: instinctive, emotional, rational, and multiple reasons. They were also provided with written directions for coding responses. Panel members received typed responses from subjects of each store.

3) Panel members separately judged the responses and assigned them to one of the four coded categories. Judging was done without discussion with other panel members. 4) The investigator then tabulated all coding. Results of coding were determined by the majority of panel members who indicated the same coding for a single response. In cases of varied coding, one of three steps would be taken. Judges would reassess coding of that response. Discussion with thesis advisor would determine coding, or response would not be used in the study if agreement could not be reached. Directions for judges is further detailed in Appendix D.

Scoring for the rating sheet to assess store types was discussed in the section on selection of stores. In addition to "yes" and "higher" answers assigned "5", "no", and "lower" answers scored "1", and undecided answers scored "3", the four sections of store image (price points, store atmosphere, convenience, and merchandise) received weighted scores. The following weights were assigned to give all four image sections equal importance in scoring:

- price points (one question) weighted scores: .25 per question
- convenience (four questions) .063 per question
- store atmosphere (two questions) .125 per question
- merchandise (three questions) .083 per question
Stores above the median were typed "A". Stores below the median were typed "B".

Statistical Analysis

Statistical analysis of demographic data, and use of clothing, reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores, attitude toward used-clothing stores, and innovativeness involved chi-square analysis in determining the significance of differences between consumers of type A stores and type B stores. The level of significance was .05. Cross tab chi-square analysis further determined significant differences between groups of clothing variables and demographic variables. Analysis was also done to determine significant differences between stores of the highest and lowest image points.
Chapter IV

FINDINGS

Identification of Stores

The investigator's observation of the six used-clothing stores and interviews with store managers showed some differences in staff, credit, merchandise, and policies (Appendix B). All six stores are located on busy main streets. Stores 1, 2, and 3 have merchandise for sale on consignment while stores 4, 5, and 6 have donated clothing for sale. Store 1 has volunteer staff; stores 2, 4, 5, and 6 have paid workers; store 3 is an owner-operated shop. Merchandise in stores 1, 4, 5, and 6 include an assortment of women's, men's, and children's clothing. Merchandise in store 2 includes men's and women's clothing with emphasis on contemporary and vintage styles and natural fabrics. Store 3 has an assortment of women's clothing. Policies on purchase of clothing vary. With the exception of stores 2, 3, and 6, all stores accept major credit cards. All six stores accept local checks with identification. None of the six stores will accept exchanges or issue refunds for merchandise, except in rare circumstances. Store hours vary. A summary of the general characteristics of the six used-clothing stores is shown in Table 1.

Assessment of the characteristics of six used-clothing stores was done by an objective committee of seven high school students in advanced clothing classes. They received store image rating sheets
TABLE 1

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF USED-CLOTHING SHOPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Store Number</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Merchandise</th>
<th>Credit Card</th>
<th>Refunds, Exchanges</th>
<th>Checks</th>
<th>Hours</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Busy Street</td>
<td>Volunteer</td>
<td>Men, women, children</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>M-F 10-4 M eve. 7-9 Sat. 9:30-12:30 Fall, Winter Spring only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Busy Street</td>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>Men, women, children</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>M-S 11:30-6:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Busy Street</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>M-Th 9-4 F 9-4:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Busy Street</td>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>Men, women, children</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>M-S 9:30-5:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Busy Street</td>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>Men, women, children</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>M-S 9:30-5:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Busy Street</td>
<td>Paid</td>
<td>Men, women, children</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>M-S 9:30-5:30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

for each of the six stores (Appendix C). Prior to visiting the stores, the investigator presented oral directions for the use of the rating sheet.

Results of the independent store image rating scores were tabulated. Weighted scores were assigned to each of the four sections of store image (store price, store atmosphere, conveniences, and
merchandise) so that each section would be given equal importance in scoring. Weighting system for each section of store image is explained in the section on analysis. Each image section has a possible range of 1.75-8.75, 8.75 being the highest image score possible per section. Total possible range of scores for each store is 7-35, 35 being the highest image score possible. Scores are shown in Table 2.

TABLE 2
STORE IMAGE SCORES FOR USED-CLOTHING SHOPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stores</th>
<th>Price</th>
<th>Atmosphere</th>
<th>Conveniences</th>
<th>Merchandise</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>34.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>7.94</td>
<td>8.72</td>
<td>33.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>7.68</td>
<td>7.39</td>
<td>30.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>7.97</td>
<td>29.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>7.87</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>25.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>8.39</td>
<td>24.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Stores above the median were typed "A"; stores 1, 2, and 3 received highest image points and were categorized in type "A". Stores below the median were typed "B"; stores 4, 5, and 6 were typed "B".

Managers of the six stores were contacted through letter and phone call (Appendix B). With the exception of store 5, all stores agreed to participate in the study.
Description of Respondents

The sample consisted of 227 respondents, 115 from type A stores and 112 from type B stores. Of the 115 respondents from type A stores, 40 were from store 1, 41 from store 2, and 34 were from store 3. In type B stores, 54 respondents were from store 4, and 58 were from store 6. Questions and recording sheet used in the interview can be found in Appendix A. The demographic findings are discussed below.

Sex

Fifty males and 177 females participated in the interviews. Type A stores had 10 male respondents, or 4.4 percent of the total sample and 105 female respondents, 46.3 percent of the total. Type B stores had 40 male respondents, 17.6 percent of the total, and 72 female respondents, 31.7 percent of the total sample. Distribution of respondents by sex can be found in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TABLE 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE AND SEX</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 22.5696 \text{ df = 1 } p < .001 \]
Age

The age group of the sample ranged from below 18 to 70 years of age and over. Distribution of ages can be found in Table 4. The sample consisted of the largest proportion of respondents (44.1 percent) from the 18 to 29 age bracket. Next largest age group was the 30 to 39 age group. Respondents in the below-18 age bracket, and 70 and older group had the least representatives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 to 29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 to 39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 to 49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 to 59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 69</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 3.5210 \text{ df } = 6 \text{ p } = .74$

Educational Level

The distribution of respondents by highest level of education completed is shown in Table 5. Of the 227 total sample, 87 or 37.4 percent of the respondents had at least one year of college or junior college education. The next largest percentage of the sample completed
high school. The lowest percentage of total respondents completed elementary school and ninth grade.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE AND HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION COMPLETED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Level</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary school</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ninth grade</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One year of college or</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior college</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical, trade or</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business school</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Four-year college</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate or professional</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>99.9*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 11.0856$  df = 7  p = .13

* Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

Employment Status

The distribution of respondents by employment status is shown in Table 6. Two-thirds of those participating were employed full or
part-time. Approximately one-fourth were not in the labor force or were retired.

**TABLE 6**

**DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE AND EMPLOYMENT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in labor force</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 6.9910 \quad df = 4 \quad p = .14 \]

* Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

**Family Composition**

The sample consisted of 101 single unit respondents (44.5 percent of the total sample), and 126 family unit respondents (55.5 percent of the total sample) \( \chi^2 = .3883 \quad df = 1 \quad p = .53 \).

The findings on the family unit response to number of children are shown in Table 7. The largest proportion of respondents (31 percent) had one child in their household. The second largest proportion of respondents (27.8 percent) had two children in the household. The lowest proportion of respondents had four children (6.3 percent) or five or more children (6.3 percent) in the household.
### TABLE 7

**Distribution of Family Unit Respondents by Store Type and Number of Children in the Household Supported by the Family Unit**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children</th>
<th>Store Type A</th>
<th></th>
<th>Store Type B</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 4.99 \quad df = 6 \quad p = .55 \]

*Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

Findings on the family type grouping are shown in Table 8. The majority of the respondents in the family type grouping had a male and female with one or more children living in the household (57.9 percent). Number of respondents living in two types of household situations (male and female with no children, and one parent with one or more children) were about evenly distributed.
### TABLE 8

**DISTRIBUTION OF FAMILY UNIT RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE AND FAMILY TYPE GROUPING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grouping</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adults, male &amp; female, no children</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two adults, male &amp; female, one or more children</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One parent, one or more children</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other types</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>48.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>51.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>126</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 3.19 \quad df = 4 \quad p = .53 \]

**Income Level**

The distribution of respondents by income is shown in Table 9. One-fourth of the respondents had family incomes of over $17,000 per year (25.1 percent). Over one-third had incomes of over $15,001 per year. The second largest proportion of respondents had less than $3,000 per year (12.3 percent). The lowest percentage of respondents (6.2 percent) had between $13,001 and $15,000 annually.
TABLE 9

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE
AND FAMILY'S YEARLY INCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income (Dollars)</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,000 - 5,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 7,000</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,001 - 9,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 - 11,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,001 - 13,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13,001 - 15,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,001 - 17,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 17,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>112</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 13.1146 \quad df = 9 \quad p = .15 \]

*Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

Attitude Toward Shopping in Used-Clothing Stores

Respondents' attitude toward shopping in used-clothing stores is shown in Table 10. The majority of responses (87.7 percent) indicated a favorable attitude toward shopping in used-clothing stores.
### TABLE 10

**DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE ON ATTITUDE TOWARD SHOPPING IN USED-CLOTHING STORES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to shop in them very much</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Like to shop in them</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither like nor dislike</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike shopping in them</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dislike shopping in them very</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

χ² = 7.8032  df = 4  p= .099

*Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

**User of Clothing Purchased**

Respondents' primary user of clothing purchased is shown in Table 11. Nearly three-fourths of those sample purchase used clothing for themselves. About one-fifth purchase clothing for their children.
TABLE 11
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE ON USER OF CLOTHING PURCHASED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For self</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For children</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For spouse</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For others</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 10.5382 \text{ df } = 3 \text{ p } = .015 \]

*Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

Use of Clothing Purchase

Respondents' intended use (clothing categories) of clothing purchase is shown in Table 12. The largest proportion of respondents purchase clothing for home (31.7 percent) and work (30.8 percent). School purchases are third at 14.1 percent. The lowest percentage of purchases fall in the categories for hobby/craft at 1.3 percent, and costume at 3.5 percent.
TABLE 12
DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE ON INTENDED USE OF CLOTHING PURCHASE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intended Use (Categories)</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N  Percent</td>
<td>N  Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work (job)</td>
<td>39  17.2</td>
<td>31  13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>28  12.3</td>
<td>44  19.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>23  10.1</td>
<td>9   4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camping, Recreation</td>
<td>1   .4</td>
<td>9   4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hobby, craft</td>
<td>1   .4</td>
<td>2   .9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social occasion</td>
<td>10  4.4</td>
<td>7   3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costume</td>
<td>4   1.8</td>
<td>4   1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9   4.0</td>
<td>6   2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115 50.6</td>
<td>112 49.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 18.421 \quad df = 7 \quad p = .01 \]

*Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

Perceived Fashion Innovativeness

The largest proportion of respondents sampled (43.2 percent) indicated that they buy and wear current or different clothing fashions about the same time as others. This corresponds to the early majority group in fashion adopter categories (Rogers, 1962:171). The second largest response group (27.8 percent of the total sampled) indicated adopting fashions later than most people they knew. The smallest percentage of respondents (3.1 percent) indicated that they...
were the earliest fashion adopters. Detailed findings are shown in Table 13.

**TABLE 13**

**DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE ON PERCEIVED FASHION INNOVATIVENESS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adoption Categories</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A N Percent</td>
<td>B N Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earliest (innovator)</td>
<td>3 1.3</td>
<td>4 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earlier than most (early adopter)</td>
<td>22 9.7</td>
<td>16 7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>About the same time (early majority)</td>
<td>45 19.8</td>
<td>53 23.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Later than most (late majority)</td>
<td>33 14.5</td>
<td>30 13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latest (laggard)</td>
<td>6 2.6</td>
<td>5 2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>6 2.6</td>
<td>4 1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>115 50.5</td>
<td>112 49.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.338 \ df = 5 \ p = .80 \]

**Reasons for Shopping in Used-Clothing Stores**

Respondents' answers concerning their primary reason for shopping in a used-clothing store were coded by three Clothing and Textiles graduate students at Oregon State University. They were given the directions in Appendix D, along with the responses from subjects.
Respondents' answers were coded into one of five categories: instinctive, emotional, rational, multiple, or other reasons. Instinctive reasons include modesty, immodesty, protection, and aesthetics. Emotional reasons included boredom or fatigue, curiosity, rebellion to convention, imitation, companionship, and self-assertion. Rational reasons included price, quality, assortment, fashion, locational convenience, other conveniences, services, store atmosphere, reputation on adjustment, advertising, sales personnel, and sales. Multiple reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores included two or more answers given by the respondent. Responses that did not fit in one of the four categories were coded "others."

The majority of the respondents (79.9 percent) indicated rational reasons for shopping in a used-clothing store. More specifically, price or "to save money" was the response most often given (Table 14a). Emotional reasons comprise 15.4 percent of the responses. Rebellion against convention was the most often given emotional reason for shopping in a used-clothing store (Table 14b). Curiosity or boredom were also answers indicated by respondents as emotional reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores. Of the nine answers coded "others," four responses (1.3 percent of the total sample) indicated "recycling" as the reason for shopping for secondhand clothing. Three of the recycling responses were from type B stores while one response was from type A stores.
TABLE 14

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE ON PRIMARY REASON FOR SHOPPING IN A USED-CLOTHING STORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instinctive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotional</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rational</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>multiple</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 4.8341$ df = 4  $p = .30$

*Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

TABLE 14a

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE ON RATIONAL REASONS FOR SHOPPING IN A USED-CLOTHING STORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Rational)</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>price</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>quality</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assortment</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fashion</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>total</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>47.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.
TABLE 14b

DISTRIBUTION OF RESPONDENTS BY STORE TYPE TO EMOTIONAL REASONS FOR SHOPPING IN A USED-CLOTHING STORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons (Emotional)</th>
<th>Store Type</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boredom or fatigue</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curiosity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebellion against convention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

Summary

Stores represented in type A and type B were based on results of image point ratings of five used-clothing stores. Stores with higher image scores were typed A and stores with lower scores were typed B.

The sample consisted of 227 respondents, 115 from type A stores and 112 from type B stores.

Findings of demographic data showed there were significantly more males in stores type B than A. The greatest number of consumers were between 18 to 29 years in age, and had completed at least one year of college or junior college. Most respondents work part-time or full-time. Approximately one-half of the respondents are single and one-half are in a family unit. Of the family units, most subjects live in
a household consisting of a male and female with one or more children; the majority of respondents in families have one or two children. Approximately one-third of the households have an annual income of over $15,000, and approximately one-third of the households have an annual income of less than $7,000. The majority of respondents either had the highest income level on the interview schedule or were in the lower-income levels.

Subjects interviewed indicated that they enjoy shopping in used-clothing stores. Consumers of type A and B stores differed significantly in person for whom they purchased, and in items purchased in the store. More consumers from type A stores purchased items for themselves for work while consumers from type B stores indicated purchases for children. Most used-clothing consumers adopt fashions about the same time as other people they know (early majority). The main reason given for patronizing used-clothing stores is due to money savings.

Relationships Between Clothing Variables and Demographic Variables

Data from chi-square testing between clothing variables and demographic variables showed 13 significant relationships. Chi-square probabilities of relationships between clothing and demographic variables are shown in Table 15.

In the following section, relationships between clothing variables and demographic variables are discussed.
TABLE 15

CHI-SQUARE PROBABILITIES OF RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN CLOTHING VARIABLES AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES
($\chi^2$/df)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Variables</th>
<th>Clothing Variables</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Categories of Use</th>
<th>Innovativeness</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.39/4</td>
<td>8.07/3</td>
<td>11.73/7</td>
<td>7.60/5</td>
<td>4.33/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .01*</td>
<td>p = .04*</td>
<td>p = .11</td>
<td>p = .18</td>
<td>p = .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.16/24</td>
<td>32.96/18</td>
<td>54.65/42</td>
<td>36.01/30</td>
<td>17.25/24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .30</td>
<td>p = .02*</td>
<td>p = .09</td>
<td>p = .20</td>
<td>p = .84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.88/28</td>
<td>13.78/21</td>
<td>59.85/49</td>
<td>62.64/35</td>
<td>22.68/28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .87</td>
<td>p = .88</td>
<td>p = .14</td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
<td>p = .74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.90/16</td>
<td>11.91/12</td>
<td>86.56/28</td>
<td>15.06/20</td>
<td>8.11/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .39</td>
<td>p = .45</td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
<td>p = .77</td>
<td>p = .95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Composition</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.01/4</td>
<td>46.58/3</td>
<td>18.89/7</td>
<td>6.07/5</td>
<td>7.06/4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .06</td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
<td>p = .01*</td>
<td>p = .30</td>
<td>p = .13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.81/18</td>
<td>27.56/18</td>
<td>60.83/42</td>
<td>34.10/30</td>
<td>25.61/18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .80</td>
<td>p = .07</td>
<td>p = .03*</td>
<td>p = .28</td>
<td>p = .62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Type Grouping</td>
<td></td>
<td>57.58/12</td>
<td>14.72/12</td>
<td>26.04/28</td>
<td>36.86/20</td>
<td>3.92/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
<td>p = .26</td>
<td>p = .57</td>
<td>p = .01*</td>
<td>p = .98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td>52.35/36</td>
<td>53.13/27</td>
<td>83.37/63</td>
<td>35.75/63</td>
<td>39.16/36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .04*</td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
<td>p = .04*</td>
<td>p = .84</td>
<td>p = .33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant.
Attitude Toward Used-Clothing Stores

Sex

Sex was significantly related to consumers' attitude toward used-clothing stores. More females (90 percent) had favorable attitudes toward used-clothing stores than males (78 percent).

Age

Age was independent of consumers' attitude toward used-clothing stores.

Education

Educational level was independent of consumers' attitude toward used-clothing stores.

Employment

Employment status was independent of consumers' attitude toward used-clothing stores.

Family Composition

Family composition was independent of consumers' attitude toward used-clothing stores.

Number of Children

Number of children was independent of consumers' attitude toward used-clothing stores.
Family Type Grouping

Family type grouping was significantly related to consumers' attitude toward used-clothing stores. The largest proportion of households with no children and one-parent households indicated that they "like" to shop in used-clothing stores "very much." Over 40 percent of respondents from households with male, female and no children, and one-parent households, and over one-third of households with male, female, and one or more children like to shop in used-clothing stores "very much." The majority of all family type groupings, except "other" typed households, indicated that they "like" to shop in used-clothing stores. The largest proportion of unfavorable attitude were from respondents who indicated "other" typed family groupings. Fifty percent of respondents of "other" typed households indicated that they "dis-like" shopping in used-clothing stores.

Income Level

Income was significantly related to consumers' attitude toward used-clothing stores. In general, the majority of respondents of all income levels indicated favorable attitudes toward shopping in a used-clothing store. However, the degree of favorable attitudes varied. Over three-fourths of respondents who indicated yearly incomes of $13,001 to $15,000 indicated that they liked to shop in used-clothing stores "very much." Over one-half of respondents with yearly incomes of $3,000 to $5,001 indicated they liked to shop in used-clothing stores "very much." About one-half of the following income levels
liked to shop in used-clothing stores: respondents with yearly incomes of less than $3,000, $7,001-9,000, $9,001-11,000, $11,001-13,000, $13,001-15,000, $15,001-17,000, and over $17,000. The most unfavorable attitude toward used-clothing stores (dislike very much) were from respondents with yearly incomes of less than $3,000. Respondents with yearly incomes of $11,001-13,000 and $15,001-17,000 also indicated that they dislike shopping in used-clothing stores. The largest proportion of respondents who indicated that they neither like nor dislike shopping in used-clothing stores were from the $5,001-7,000 yearly income level.

User of Clothing Purchase

Sex

Sex was significantly related to user of clothing purchase. A greater percentage of males (88 percent) than females (67.8 percent) indicated purchase of clothing for self. A larger proportion of females indicated purchase of clothing for children, spouse, and others.

Age

Age was significantly related to user of clothing purchase. Purchasing for self was greatest among the following age groups: below 18, 18 to 29, 30 to 39, 40 to 49, 50 to 59, and over 70. All respondents below 18 and in the 70-and-over age groups indicated used-clothing purchase for self. Over three-fourths of the 18 to 29 and 50 to 59 age groups indicated used-clothing purchases for self. Two-thirds of the 30 to 39 age group and over one-half of the 40 to 49 age group
indicated purchase for self. Purchase for children was greatest among the following age groups: 18 to 29, 30 to 39, and 40 to 49. About one-fourth of the 30 to 49-year-olds and one-fifth of the 18 to 29-year-olds indicated purchasing clothing for children. Purchasing for others was greatest among the following age groups: 40 to 49, 50 to 59, and 60 to 69. About one-fifth of the 40 to 49 and 50 to 59-year-olds, and over one-third of the 60 to 69-year-olds indicated used-clothing purchases for others.

Education

Education was independent of user of clothing purchase.

Employment

Employment was independent of user of clothing purchase.

Family Composition

Family composition was significantly related to user of clothing purchase. In general, the largest proportion of single respondents bought used clothing for themselves (94.1 percent). Over one-half of family respondents purchased used-clothing items for themselves and one-third purchased used-clothing items for children.

Number of Children

Number of children was independent of user of clothing purchase.
Family Type Grouping

Family type grouping was independent of user of clothing purchase.

Income Level

Income was significantly related to user of clothing purchase. Purchasing for self was greatest for all level of income groups. Over 90 percent of respondents with yearly incomes of less than $3,000 purchase clothing for themselves. Over 80 percent of respondents with the following income purchase clothing for self: $3,001-5,000, $5,001-7,000, and $9,001-11,000. About two-thirds of respondents with yearly incomes of $7,001-9,000 and $15,001-17,000 purchase clothing for themselves. Three-fourths of respondents with yearly incomes of $11,001-13,000 purchase for themselves while about one-half of respondents of yearly incomes of $13,001-15,000 and over $17,000 buy used clothing for themselves. Purchasing for children was greatest in the $13,001-15,000-yearly-income group (50 percent of purchases), followed by the $7,001-9,000-income-group (27.8 percent). About 23 percent of respondents who indicated yearly incomes of over $17,000 purchased used clothing for children. Purchasing for others was generally greatest in the upper income levels. Twenty-one percent of respondents with yearly incomes of over $17,000 and 15 percent of respondents who indicated incomes of $15,001-17,000 indicated purchases for others. Purchasing for spouse was greatest in the $11,000-13,000 and $15,001-17,000-yearly-income levels.
Use of Clothing Purchase

Sex

Sex was independent of clothing categories of purchase.

Age

Age was independent of clothing categories of purchase.

Education

Education was independent of clothing categories of purchase.

Employment

Employment was significantly related to clothing categories of purchase. Purchasing used clothing for work was greatest among respondents who indicated full-time employment. The majority of respondents who indicated full-time employment, about one-fourth of the respondents who indicated part-time work, and one-fourth of unemployed respondents purchase clothing mainly for work. Purchasing used clothing for home was greatest among respondents who indicated retirement status. Two-thirds of those retired, one-third of unemployed consumers, and one-third of respondents who work part-time indicated primary purchases for home use. Over 40 percent of respondents not in the labor force indicated purchase for home use. Purchase for school was greatest among respondents who indicated "not in the labor force." Over one-third of respondents not in the labor force indicated purchase for school items.
More respondents not in the labor force indicated purchase for camping than any other groups. Full-time and part-time working respondents and those not in the labor force shopped in used-clothing stores for hobby or craft items. A larger proportion of full- and part-time workers indicated purchase of used clothing for social occasions and costume than did other groups.

**Family Composition**

Family composition was significantly related to clothing categories of purchase. Generally, family unit respondents indicated used-clothing purchases for home use more than any other categories. About one-fifth of single unit respondents indicated home use for clothing purchases. Single-unit respondents indicated clothing purchase for work more than other categories. About one-third of family-unit respondents indicated clothing purchases for work. More single-unit respondents indicated purchases for school, social occasions, and costume than family-unit respondents.

**Number of Children**

Number of children was significantly related to clothing categories of purchase. Purchases of used clothing for work was greatest among respondents who indicated four children in the household (37.5 percent) and no children in the household (36.4 percent). Purchase of used clothing for home was greatest among respondents who indicated five children in the household (50 percent). Respondents with one to two children indicated over 40 percent of purchases for home. Over
one-third of respondents with four children, and over one-fourth of respondents with no children purchased used clothing for home. Purchase for school was greatest among respondents who indicated three children in the household (60 percent). Generally, purchases for hobby and social occasion was greatest among respondents who indicated zero to one child in the household.

Family Type Grouping

Family type grouping was independent of clothing categories of purchase.

Income Level

Income level was significantly related to clothing categories of purchase. The largest proportion of respondents from the following yearly income levels indicated purchases of clothing primarily for work: $7,001-9,000, $9,001-11,000, $15,001-17,000, and over $17,000. The largest proportion of respondents from yearly incomes of less than $3,000, $3,001-5,000, $11,001-13,000, and $13,001-15,000 purchase clothing primarily for home use. Respondents with yearly incomes of $5,001-7,000 indicated the largest proportion of clothing purchases for school. A larger proportion of respondents from yearly income levels of $5,000 and below indicated purchase of clothing for social occasion than did the higher income groups.
Perceived Fashion Innovativeness

Sex

Sex was independent of perceived fashion innovativeness.

Age

Age was independent of perceived fashion innovativeness.

Education

Education was significantly related to perceived fashion innovativeness. The largest proportion of "earliest" fashion innovators were respondents who indicated highest levels of education completed as high school and one year of college. The greatest proportion of "early" fashion innovators were respondents who indicated completion of four years of college (31.3 percent) followed by those who completed graduate or professional training (20.8 percent), then by those who completed one year of college (16.5 percent). The largest proportion of respondents who indicated buying or wearing new or different clothing items about the same time as other people they knew were those who completed technical, business, or trade school (57.1 percent) followed by subjects who completed high school (50.9 percent), then by respondents who completed one year of college (43.5 percent). The greatest proportion of late and latest fashion adopters indicated completion of graduate school. One respondent who completed elementary education indicated adoption of fashion latest (laggard).
Employment

Employment was independent of perceived fashion innovativeness.

Family Composition

Family composition was independent of perceived fashion innovativeness.

Number of Children

Number of children was independent of perceived fashion innovativeness.

Family Type Grouping

Family type grouping was significantly related to perceived fashion innovativeness. The largest proportion of "earliest" fashion innovators were from one-parent households. The largest proportion of "early" fashion adopters were from households comprised of a male, female, and no children, followed by households with a male, female, and one or more children. The largest group of respondents who indicated adopting fashions about the same time as others they knew were from one-parent households. The largest proportion of late and "latest" (laggard) fashion adopters were from households comprised of a male, female, and one or more children, and one-parent families.

Income Level

Income level was independent of perceived fashion innovativeness.
Reasons for Shopping in Used-Clothing Stores

Sex

Sex was independent of reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores.

Age

Age was independent of reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores.

Education

Education was independent of reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores.

Employment

Employment was independent of reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores.

Family Composition

Family composition was independent of reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores.

Number of Children

Number of children was independent of reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores.
Family Type Grouping

Family type grouping was independent of reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores.

Income Level

Income level was independent of reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores.

Summary

Data from chi-square testing between clothing variables and demographic variables showed 13 significant relationships. Attitude toward used-clothing store was significantly related to sex, family type grouping, and income level. User of clothing was significantly related to sex, age, family composition, and income. Clothing use categories was significantly related to employment, family composition, number of children, and income. Perceived fashion innovativeness was significantly related to education and family type grouping. Reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores was independent of all demographic variables.

Relationship Among Clothing Variables

Data from chi-square testing among clothing variables showed three significant relationships. Probabilities of relationships among clothing variables are shown in Table 16.
TABLE 16

CHI-SQUARE PROBABILITIES AMONG CLOTHING VARIABLES
($\chi^2$/df)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>User</th>
<th>Categories of Use</th>
<th>Innovativeness</th>
<th>Reasons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attitude</td>
<td>17.811/12</td>
<td>15.795/28</td>
<td>30.192/20</td>
<td>9.14/16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>p = .12</td>
<td>p = .97</td>
<td>p = .07</td>
<td>p = .90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55.50/21</td>
<td>17.79/15</td>
<td>4.99/12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
<td>p = .27</td>
<td>p = .96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categories of Use</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.97/35</td>
<td>103.62/28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p = .02*</td>
<td>p &lt; .01*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovativeness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18.18/20</td>
<td>p = .58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant.

In the following section, relationships among clothing variables are discussed.

Attitude Toward Used-Clothing Stores

User of Purchase

User of purchase was independent of attitude toward used-clothing stores.

Use of Clothing

Clothing categories was independent of attitude toward used-clothing stores.
Innovativeness

Innovativeness was independent of attitude toward used-clothing stores.

Reasons

Reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores was independent of attitude toward used-clothing stores.

User of Clothing Purchase

Use of Clothing

Clothing categories was significantly related to user of clothing. Of respondents who indicated purchase of used clothing for self, over one-third indicated its use for work or job, and over one-fourth of them indicated home use of clothing. Respondents who indicated primary purchases for self responded in greatest proportion to purchases for school, camping, hobby/craft, social occasion, costume, and others. Consumers who mainly shopped for others indicated one-third of clothing purchases for work and one-fifth for camping. Of respondents who indicated primary purchases for children, 62.8 percent indicated home use of clothing.

Perceived Fashion Innovativeness

Perceived fashion innovativeness was independent of user of clothing.
Reasons for Shopping

Reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores was independent of user of clothing.

Use of Clothing

Perceived Fashion Innovativeness

Perceived fashion innovativeness was significantly related to use of clothing. The earliest fashion adopters (innovators) comprise one-third of the respondents who primarily purchase used clothing for hobby or craft. Respondents who identified clothing for hobby use was the only group who indicated fashion adoption from the earliest (innovator group) to about the same time as others (early majority).

Of the respondents who indicated early fashion adoption (early adopters), the largest proportion purchase clothing for social occasions. Second were respondents who purchase clothing for hobby, and third were those who purchase for school clothing.

One-half of the respondents who indicated purchase of clothing for work, one-half who purchase for home use, and 70 percent of respondents who purchase camping or recreational clothing indicated adopting fashions about the same time as others (early majority).

Purchasers of clothing for home use comprise the largest proportion of respondents who indicated adopting fashion late (late majority) and latest (laggard).
Reasons for Shopping

Reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores was significantly related to clothing categories of use. Of respondents who indicated an emotional reason for shopping in used-clothing store, the largest proportion purchased clothing for work. Respondents who indicated rational reasons for shopping in a used-clothing store mainly purchased items for home use. A larger proportion of respondents who gave emotional reasons for shopping in a used-clothing store purchased clothing for school use than respondents who indicated camping, hobby, social occasion, costume, or "others" as primary purchases indicated rational reasons for shopping in a used-clothing store.

Perceived Fashion Innovativeness

Reasons for Shopping

Reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores was independent of perceived fashion innovativeness.

Summary

Data from chi-square testing among clothing variables showed three significant relationships. Use of clothing was significantly related to user of clothing, perceived fashion innovativeness, and reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores.
Chapter V

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study was to investigate characteristics of consumers of used clothing and the outlets in which used clothing are sold. Investigation of consumer characteristics involved demographic factors such as sex, age, educational level, employment status, income level, and family composition. Consumers' attitudes toward used-clothing stores, reasons for shopping in them, perceived fashion innovativeness, user of clothing purchases, and use categories were also investigated. Retail outlets that sell used clothing were assessed with attention to price of clothing sold, store atmosphere, store conveniences, and store merchandise. Lastly, it was the purpose of this study to investigate the relationship between consumer characteristics and patronage of used-clothing outlets.

Two questionnaires were developed for this study. An interview schedule was devised to obtain information regarding consumer characteristics. A rating sheet for stores was developed to assess store image points. Stores with higher image points were assigned type "A", stores with lower points were assigned type "B".

Sample in the study consisted of 227 randomly chosen consumers of used-clothing outlets located in Eugene, Oregon. One-hundred-and-fifteen interviews were done in type A stores and 112 interviews were taken in type B stores.

Chi-square analysis of data showed that two out of six null hypotheses were rejected; one hypothesis was partially rejected.
There was no evidence to support rejection of three hypotheses. The level of significance was .05. In the following section, relationships between type A stores and type B stores are discussed regarding the null hypotheses.

Hypothesis I: There will be no difference between the consumers of stores A and B on the following consumer demographic variables:

A. Sex

A significant difference was found between type A store and type B store. \( \chi^2 = 22.5696, \text{df} = 1, p = 0 \). There were significantly more men in type B store than type A store. The null hypothesis was rejected.

B. Age

No significant difference was found between type A store and type B store in age groups \( \chi^2 = 3.5210, \text{df} = 6, p = .74 \). The null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

C. Employment Status

Chi-square analysis showed no significant difference between type A store and type B store in employment status \( \chi^2 = 6.9910, \text{df} = 4, p = .14 \). The null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

D. Educational Level

Comparison of type A store and type B store showed no significant difference in educational level \( \chi^2 = 11.0856, \text{df} = 7, p = .13 \). The null hypothesis failed to be rejected.
E. Family Composition

Three tests involving family unit and single unit, number of children, and family type grouping, showed no significant differences between type A store and type B store. For family unit versus single unit, $\chi^2 = .3883$, df = 1, p = .53. For number of children in the family, $\chi^2 = 4.99$, df = 6, p = .55. For family type grouping, $\chi^2 = 3.19$, df = 4, p = .53. In all three tests, the null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

F. Income Level

No significant difference was found between consumers of type A store and type B store as to yearly family income ($\chi^2 = 13.1146$, df = 9, p = .15). The null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Hypothesis 2: There will be no difference between consumers of stores A and B in their reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores.

No significant difference was found between consumers of type A store and type B store as to their reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores ($\chi^2 = 4.834$, df = 4, p = .30). The null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Hypothesis 3: There will be no difference between the consumers of stores A and B in the user of clothing purchased.

User of clothing purchase was significantly different in stores A and B regarding purchases for self, children, spouse, and others ($\chi^2 = 10.5382$, df = 3, p = .01). Although consumers of type A stores and type B stores purchase clothing mainly for themselves, more store B consumers purchased clothing for children and others. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.
Hypothesis 4: There will be no difference between the consumers of type A and B stores in the use of clothing purchased.

Use of clothing regarding clothing categories was significantly different in stores A and B ($\chi^2 = 18.4212$, df = 7, p = .01). A larger number of consumers from type B stores indicated home use of clothing while type A store consumers indicated work as the primary category for clothing purchases. Therefore, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis 5: There will be no difference between the consumers of stores A and B in the level of perceived fashion innovativeness.

No significant difference was found between consumers of stores A and B in the level of perceived fashion innovativeness ($\chi^2 = 2.3378$, df = 5, p = .80). The null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

Hypothesis 6: There will be no difference between the consumers of stores A and B in their attitudes toward used-clothing stores.

No significant relationship was found between stores A and B in consumers' attitudes toward used-clothing stores ($\chi^2 = 7.8032$, df = 4, p = .099). The null hypothesis failed to be rejected.

It can be concluded that a significant relationship exists between sex of the consumer and types of used-clothing outlets patronized. More male consumers patronized stores with overall lower prices, atmosphere, conveniences, and merchandise assortment and quality, while a significantly larger number of females patronized used-clothing stores with higher store image. It can be further concluded that the user of purchase is linked to store type. Consumers bought more used
clothing for themselves and for work from stores with high store image points. Consumers who shopped in used-clothing outlets with lower store image bought clothing for themselves, children, and others, primarily for home use.
Chapter VI

DISCUSSION

Demographic Variables and Clothing Purchase

Similarities and differences of past studies to the present findings concerning demographic variables will be discussed in this section. Some basic similarities of Department of Labor information on clothing expenditures and used-clothing purchases exist. United States Department of Labor studies showed single women 18 to 24 years of age spend the most on clothing (USDL, 1967:10-149). Data in this study indicated that the majority of patrons of used-clothing stores were females. The largest proportion of consumers were 18 to 29 years of age. The largest proportion of consumers were in family units.

Low- to middle-income families have been traditionally users of secondhand clothing (Sterner, 1943:139; Schwartz, 1963:225-27; Hunter, 1967:44). Over one-third of the respondents in this study indicated incomes of $7,000 or less. Department of Commerce figures show Eugene's median income at $9,996 in 1970 (USDC, 1980:39-125). The largest proportion of respondents in the study indicated yearly incomes of over $17,000. A little over one-third of the respondents indicated yearly incomes over $15,000. Department of Commerce figures show less than one-fourth of Eugene's population earning more than $15,000 annually in 1970 (USDC, 1980:39-125). Positive trends toward recycling may have produced acceptance of used-clothing purchases by higher- as well as lower-income groups.
Hobbs (1971:53) found that larger families, especially those with more children, used secondhand clothing more than smaller families. The findings in this study were different. The majority of respondents who belonged to family units indicated one or two children. Multiple changes in attitude over time may be responsible for the differences found. Family units are generally smaller today than in the past.

Purchasing Behavior Motivation

In a 1978 study of used-clothing consumers in the Reno-Sparks, Nevada, area, Margerum found that most people shopped for clothing for work. However, this study showed about the same proportion of consumers shopped for work as for home. Consumers who shopped for home use of clothing was .9 percent greater than those who shopped for work clothing. The data indicated, however, that more consumers bought clothing for themselves for work from stores with high image points. Consumers who shopped in stores with lower image points bought clothing for themselves and children, primarily for home use.

Despite suggestions of fashion motivation for antique clothing (Troy and Milinaire, 1978:79-98), or a national consciousness toward recycling, the primary motivation for shopping in a used-clothing store is still one of economy. Over 75 percent of consumers indicated a rational reason for shopping secondhand and over 85 percent of rationally motivated consumers indicated "price" as that reason. Recycling responses were 1.3 percent of the total sample. Margerum (1978:6) also found that "to save money" was the primary reason given by most used-clothing consumers in the Reno-Sparks, Nevada, area.
Patronage of used-clothing stores with high and low store image can be linked to certain consumer characteristics. Testing between type A stores (high image points) and type B stores (low image points) showed significant relationships to sex, user of clothing purchase, and use categories of clothing purchase. Generally more males patronized used-clothing stores with low image points in price, conveniences, atmosphere, and merchandise. Although not significantly different, data indicate that a larger proportion of consumers of the high image store were employed full time, had higher family income, and were generally older than consumers of the lower image stores.

Perceived Fashion Innovativeness

Findings of significant relationships between perceived fashion innovativeness and clothing categories and among innovativeness and store type A support past studies of fashion adoption's link to personal characteristics. Significant data linking perceived fashion innovativeness to clothing categories showed that respondents who indicated primary purchase of clothing for hobby or craft and social occasions were the early adopters of fashion. Respondents who purchased clothing for home use were later or the latest adopters of fashion. This confirms studies by Hicks (1970:53) and Allen (1971:72-73). Hicks and Allen identified the more socially active as early adopters of fashion. Hiller (1971:66) and Morton's (1972:50) finding that fashion innovators' need for change and Pasnak and Ayres' (1969:70) finding that
innovators' need for experimenting may be related to this study in two areas. One area may be in clothing categories. The largest proportion of innovators indicated primary purchases in used-clothing stores for hobby or craft. Used clothing for hobby or craft may be thought of as "different" or artistic expression ("Flash. . .", 1973: 106; "Patchwork. . .", 1971:46-7). This idea of being "different" is part of Roger's (1971:19) definition of an innovation. The second area may be in the characteristics of store 2. Store 2 was the only used-clothing shop that advertised "vintage" styles in clothing. Consumers who frequented store 2 may have done so due to its reputation for merchandise (Converse, 1947:68; Portis and Rich, 1964:11; Kunkel and Berry, 1968:27). Robinson (1961:398) identified demand for period clothing as the "pursuit of rarity" and therefore vintage wear could be thought of as a fashion innovation to some shoppers.

This study also partially supports Roger's (1961:14) and Beal and Bohlen's (1957:5) theory that earlier adopters have higher levels of formal education than later adopter groups. It was found that respondents who completed high school, one year of college, or junior college, and four years of college, adopted fashions earlier than those who indicated less education. However, these three educational level respondents were generally earlier adopters of fashions than consumers who indicated completion of graduate or professional training.
Chapter VII

RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to gain information about consumers who purchased used clothing and various types of retail outlets that sell used clothing.

A profile of the used-clothing consumer may aid teachers, extension personnel, and social workers who help families and students in the area of clothing expenditures and budgeting. Used clothing is a means to acquire more clothing for less money and is an option that cannot be overlooked in today's economy. Information about various types of used-clothing outlets may be valuable to teachers, counselors, consumers, and entrepreneurs. Teachers and consumers may familiarize themselves and others with shopping in secondhand stores to insure best buys. Counselors, entrepreneurs, and students may become familiar with used-clothing outlets as an area that is expanding. The field of merchandising or management of secondhand clothing sales, or entrepreneurship in a thrift shop are career options.

There are five basic suggestions that can be made regarding the study: 1) The present study can be improved by having all stores with merchandise for men, women, and children. 2) Since a large proportion of respondents indicated yearly income levels above $17,000, showing more income categories above $17,000 would be valuable. 3) Improvement of the perceived fashion innovativeness question is needed. The definition of innovation can mean new or "different." "Different" types of clothing worn is difficult to judge in comparison to others, using
the words "earliest," "early," "about the same time," "later," or "latest." 4) A new system for dividing shops into high and low image stores may produce different findings. Each of the four image categories (price, merchandise, atmosphere, and conveniences) may be explored independently. 5) In addition to the employment status groups of full-time, part-time, retired, not in labor force, and unemployed status, student status may be identified.

Further use of questionnaires and procedures are possible. A comparison of consumers of general used-clothing stores and all stores advertising "vintage"-type used clothing with regard to consumers and store image would be valuable. A study involving specific types of used clothing for work or home wear may be investigated.

Subsequent analyses may include 1) differences between the highest and lowest image stores (1 and 6), 2) analysis among type A stores, and 3) analysis between type B stores.
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APPENDICES
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Attitude Toward Used-Clothing Shops

What letter would describe your feelings toward used-clothing stores?

a. I like to shop in used-clothing stores very much.
b. I like to shop to used-clothing stores.
c. I neither like nor dislike to shop in used-clothing stores.
d. I dislike shopping in used-clothing stores.
e. I dislike shopping in used-clothing stores very much.

Perceived Fashion Innovativeness

Please tell me the answer on the card that best expresses your feelings about the following question: When comparing yourself to other people you know, in general, would you say you buy and wear new or different clothing fashions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>earliest</th>
<th>earliest than</th>
<th>about the</th>
<th>later than</th>
<th>latest most</th>
<th>same time</th>
<th>most</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

User of Clothing Purchase

Are most of your clothing purchases in used-clothing stores for yourself, children, spouse, or others?

a. self
b. children
c. spouse
d. others

Use of Clothing Purchase

Please indicate the letter corresponding to the clothing category that you most often purchase when shopping in a used-clothing store.

a. for work (job)
b. home
c. school
d. camping, recreation
Reasons for Shopping in Used-Clothing Stores

What is your primary reason you have for shopping in a used-clothing store? (A second reason may be identified also.)

1. 
2. 

Demographic Data

1. Sex:   Male  Female

2. Age:  Please identify the letter of the age group to which you belong.

   a. Below 18  
   b. 18-29     
   c. 30-39   
   d. 40-49
   e. 50-59
   f. 60-69
   g. 70 and over

3. Employment Status:  Please identify the letter which represents your present employment status.

   a. Employed full time
   b. Employed part time
   c. Not in labor force
   d. Retired
   e. Unemployed

4. Educational Status:  What is the corresponding letter of the highest level of formal education you've completed?

   a. Completion of elementary school
   b. Completion of junior high (9th grade)
   c. Completion of high school
   d. Completion of at least one year of college or junior college
   e. Technical, trade or business school
   f. Four-year college
   g. Completion of graduate or professional training
5. Family Composition: What is your present family status:

a. consumer (single unit)       b. family unit

How many children do you have in your household that are supported by the family unit?

a. no children      d. 3 children
b. 1 child          e. 4 children
c. 2 children        f. 5 or more children

Of what type of household does your family consist?

a. Two adults; male and female, no children
b. Two adults, male and female with one or more children
c. One parent with one or more children
d. Other types

6. Income Level: Which corresponding letter describes your family's yearly earnings?

a. Less than $3,000 dollars
b. $3,000-$5,000
c. $5,001-$7,000
d. $7,001-$9,000
e. $9,001-$11,000
f. $11,001-$13,000
g. $13,001-$15,000
h. $15,001-$17,000
i. Over $17,000
APPENDIX A

INTERVIEW RECORDING SHEET

Subject #_____

Store #_____

4. a______ b______ c______ d______ e______ f______ g_____
   5
   4
   3
   2
   1
   0

5. ________ ________ ________ ________ ________ ________
   10. a______ b______ c______ d______ e______ f______ g______
    11. a______ b______ c______ d______ e______ f______ g______
    12. a______ b______ c______ d______ e______ f______ g______
    13. ________ ________ ________ ________ ________ ________
    14. a______ b______ c______ d______ e______ f______ g______
    15. a______ b______ c______ d______ e______ f______ g______
    16. a______ b______ c______ d______ e______ f______ g______

8. a.
   b.

9. ________ ________
APPENDIX B

STORE MANAGER INTERVIEW

Thank you for allowing me to talk with you concerning my research. First of all, the purpose of my study is to secure information about consumers of used-clothing stores.

This is the procedure I intend to follow...

This is the questionnaire that will be used...

The information that I receive will be anonymous but the aggregate results of the study can be used to facilitate understanding of thrift-shop consumers and their buying habits.

For this purpose, I would like your permission to interview customers in your store. (At this point, discussion or questions may take place.)

In order to set up interviewing schedules, I need to get some basic information concerning the store.

1. Are there store policies I should know about that may affect who shops here? For example, some stores will not accept checks, or have policies regarding returns, sales refunds, or use of credit. Could you familiarize me with some of your policies?

2. What day of the week and times have a heavy flow of shoppers?

3. What are convenient times for interviewing to take place?

Thank you for your cooperation. I will be contacting you soon with interview schedules.
APPENDIX C

DIRECTIONS FOR STORE RATERS

Thank you for volunteering to help me with the store rating. I appreciate your time. The purpose of the rating sheets for stores is a means by which you will be assessing six used-clothing stores on certain store image points.

There are four parts to the rating sheet: price, store atmosphere, conveniences and merchandise. Each part has questions that you will be answering to the best of your ability, independently and without discussion with other raters. The questions can be answered by indicating a check mark in the "yes" or "no" column. Please read the directions silently while I read them aloud. (Refer to rating sheets for stores.)

Price points. . . . You will choose just one of the four articles of clothing listed below the heading "price points." In case of clothing in the stores having an equal price as listed, place a check mark in the center line separating the "yes" and "no" columns. Are there any questions regarding the directions and procedure under price points?

Store atmosphere. . .

Store conveniences. . . (Investigator reads questions

Store merchandise. . . under sections.)

At the end of the rating session, you will return the sheet to me no later than _____________. Check over each sheet to be sure all questions are answered and the names of the stores are filled in.
# APPENDIX C

## RATING SHEET FOR STORES

Name of Store:

Price Points: Select one of the articles of clothing from the list below and similar pieces of clothing in the secondhand store. Comparing the prices of the merchandise to the prices below, is the price of the merchandise in the store lower or higher than that of the scale below?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Shirt, man's cotton blend, long sleeve, pointed collar, button-down front</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Slacks, ladies' polyester, zip front</td>
<td>$2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Sweater, men's synthetic cardigan type</td>
<td>$3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Rain coat, women's lined, light weight</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Store Atmosphere:

1. In general, would you say that garment display is organized in some manner as to type of garment (coats, slacks) sizes, or cost?

2. Are various garments emphasized in a display that focuses your attention on particular pieces of merchandise or clothing?

Store Conveniences:

1. In general, do dressing-room facilities seem adequate for trying on garments: Consider space, lighting, mirror, privacy.

2. Are there aisle spaces and room to walk so that multiple customers may have access to shopping for various garments?

3. Are most garments labeled for size?

4. Are most garments labeled for price?

Store Merchandise:

1. Do most garments appear clean and pressed?

2. Do most garments seem to be in overall good condition in fabric and construction quality and need a minimum of repairs?

3. Does there seem to be a good assortment of a particular type of merchandise from which to choose (e.g., shirts, dresses)?
APPENDIX D

DIRECTIONS FOR JUDGES

Below you will find the definitions for "reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores."

Reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores: Reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores are the respondent's motives for patronizing secondhand clothing stores. These motives will fall in one of five categories: instinctive, emotional, rational, multiple reasons, or noncodeable reasons.

Instinctive reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores: Instinctive reasons include modesty (to cover nakedness), immodesty (to call attention to parts of the body), protection (shelter the body from elements), and aesthetics (to decorate the body for beauty). (Ryan, 1966:41-42.)

Emotional reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores: Emotional motives include boredom and fatigue (desire to change due to constant use), curiosity (desire for new sensations, adventure), rebellion against convention (breaking out of the traditional or normal standards of dress), imitation (dress like the group in order to obtain membership in that group), companionship (dress to please in order to conform to a group), self-assertion (desire to secure recognition, approval, prestige, freedom to be different). (Nystrom, 1928:72-79; Cope-land, 1924:141.)

Rational reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores: Rational reasons include factors independent of the respondent that can be measured through respondent's judgment of desirable attributes of the product or store. These are price, quality, assortment, fashion, locational conveniences, other conveniences (store hours), services, sales personnel, sales, advertising, store atmosphere, reputation for adjustments, and others. (Ryan, 1966:148; Kunkel and Berry, 1968:26.)

Multiple reasons: Multiple reasons for shopping in used-clothing stores include more than one answer given by the respondent whereby a primary or main motive is not given.
The following coding will be assigned to the categories:

1.0 Instinctive
   1.1 Modesty
   1.2 Immodesty
   1.3 Protection
   1.4 Aesthetics

3.0 Rational
   3.1 Price
   3.2 Quality
   3.3 Assortment
   3.4 Fashion
   3.5 Locational convenience

4.0 Multiple

2.0 Emotional
   2.1 Boredom or fatigue
   2.2 Curiosity
   2.3 Rebellion against convention
   2.4 Imitation
   2.5 Companionship
   2.6 Self-assertion

5.0 Others

Below are the primary reasons and secondary (if any) reasons received from the respondents. Please assign them subcategory codes if responses fall in code 1.0, 2.0, or 3.0. Please assign them 4.0 if multiple answers are received, or 5.0 if the answers do not seem to fit any of the first four categories. Assign the codings that best fit the definitions on page 1, without discussion of coding with other judges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>code</th>
<th>Store #</th>
<th>Subject #</th>
<th>Primary reason</th>
<th>Secondary reason</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A #1</td>
<td></td>
<td>(primary reason)</td>
<td>(secondary reason)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A #2 (primary reason), etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thank you. Please submit this sheet to Susan Richardson no later than ________________________.