

THE JUNIOR APPAREL CONSUMER:

An ethnographic and case study approach examining the current junior wear client

A dissertation

Presented to

The Faculty of the Graduate School

at the University of Missouri

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Doctorate of Philosophy

By

JAIME LYNN MESTRES

Dr. Laurel Wilson and Dr. Lynn M. Boorady

Dissertation Supervisors

MAY 2012

© Copyright by Jaime Lynn Mestres 2012

All Rights Reserved

The undersigned, appointed by the dean of the Graduate School,

have examined the dissertation entitled

THE JUNIOR APPAREL CONSUMER:

An ethnographic and case study approach examining the current junior wear client

Presented by Jaime Lynn Mestres

A candidate for the degree of

Doctorate of Philosophy

And hereby certify that, in their opinion, it is worthy of acceptance.

Professor Laurel Wilson

Professor Lynn M. Boorady

Professor Pamela Norum

Professor Mary Shenk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my sincerest gratitude to Dr. Laurel Wilson and Dr. Lynn Boorady for their continued support and guidance throughout the entire research project. Their consistent encouragement propelled me to continue making strides in completing this research. They have influenced and molded me into the person I am today. Their continued involvement and interest has made me a better researcher, instructor, and person.

Dr. Mary Shenk continuously made time to meet with me and discuss the method to ensure that my research was methodically sound. I now have a sound understanding of ethnographic research methods and I appreciate all of her guidance and support. I would also like to thank Dr. Pamela Norum for providing support and suggestions throughout this research process.

While pursuing my academic degree, I was blessed to work with so many wonderful people and would like to especially thank Dr. Kitty Dickerson. She has always been very supportive of me completing this degree and it has meant the world to me. I am very grateful to have her in my life.

Completing my graduate degrees was not possible without the encouragement and support of my husband, Nick. You are amazing and I greatly appreciate all the sacrifices you have made. To my kids, Jack and Lily, I love you and you make every day an adventure. I would also like to extend a thank you to my parents. Thank you for believing in me and your undivided love. I am truly blessed to have such a supportive family. Finally, I would like to thank my friends their encouragement throughout my entire graduate program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
ABSTRACT.....	vi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	2
Current Demographics of the Female Population and Expenditures	
History of the Target Market of Junior Wear	
History of the Junior Sizing System	
Consumer Behavior Research	
Brand and Product Relationships	
3. METHOD.....	24
Research Objective	
Direct Observations	
Product-Brand Price Matrix	
Junior Size Measurements	
Limitations	
Summary	
4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	32
Direct Observations	

Qualitative Perceptions and Observations	
Product-Brand Price Matrix	
Junior Size Measurements	
Summary	
5. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	51
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	55
APPENDIX I.....	61
APPENDIX II.....	64
VITA.....	66

LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Illustration of Bust, Waist, and Hip Measurement of the Junior Size 11 Garment Throughout Time.....	17-19
2. Individual Characteristics.....	34
3. Percentage of Females, Age Ranges for Females and Ethnicities by Zip Code Area of Each Store Where Direct Observations were Conducted.....	35
4. Behaviors in Junior Section.....	36
5. Behaviors by Age Range.....	38
6. National Brand Product-Brand Price Matrix.....	43-45
7. Private Label Brand Product-Brand Price Matrix.....	46-47
8. The Current Junior Sizing in the United States (in inches).....	48-50

ABSTRACT

This study focused on the current junior wear client at a specific retailer to determine if a new marketing strategy, design of garments, and adjustments of junior size measurements should be implemented. The objectives of the study were, (1) to analyze junior products offered (2) to observe and document who is shopping in the junior section, (3) to compare who is shopping to the product offerings and size measurements, and (4) to compare the perceived characteristics of the defined junior wear consumer discussed in the review of literature to data collected. The results illustrate that the current junior wear client is not restricted by age, height, or body shape. The current sizing strategy does not restrict who shops in the junior section and the product offerings appeal to females of all ages. The implications show a need for retail companies to capitalize on their junior size strategies and to market junior clothing to females of all ages.

INTRODUCTION

Since the inception of the junior size category in the early 20th century industry members have debated if ‘junior is a size, not an age’ or ‘junior is an age, not a size’. This has led to confusion in the apparel industry as well as confusion for consumers. The Oxford English Dictionary (2012) defines junior as, “Designating something intended for children or young people; also applied to a product, device, etc., that is smaller than the normal size” (Oxford University Press, 2012, Junior).

This research focuses on the current junior wear client by observing consumers shopping in the junior wear section of a Midwestern department store, examining product offerings in the junior wear department, and analyzing the junior size measurements. The results clarify individual consumer characteristics of females shopping in the junior wear section compared to the current product offerings and size measurements. The objectives of this study were:

1. To analyze products offered in the junior wear department;
2. To observe and document who is shopping in the junior section;
3. To compare who is shopping in the junior wear section to the product offerings and size measurements; and
4. To compare the perceived characteristics of the defined junior wear consumer discussed in the review of literature to the data collected.

The results of this study determine that a new marketing strategy, design of garments, and retail companies capitalizing of their junior size strategies should be implemented to match the diverse range of shoppers noted in the observational portion of the study.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Since the inception of the junior size category for females in the 1910s, the apparel industry has debated the definition of the term junior, the sizing of junior garments, and the target market for junior sized garments. The purpose of this research is to determine if the product offerings, perceived junior characteristics, and definition of junior are consistent with the consumers actually shopping in the junior wear department of a specific Midwestern retailer. In this section, literature relevant to the junior sizing system, the definition of the term junior and demographic information concerning female apparel expenditures will be discussed.

Current Demographics of the Female Population and Expenditures

In the United States, there has been a population increase over the past decade of 9.7%, from 281.4 million people to a little over 308 million (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). The 2010 census reported that of the 308 million people living in the United States, 50.8% were females. The median age of females was 38.5. Females between the ages of 10-19 accounted for 13.27%, those between ages 20-29 years of age accounted for 13.40%, females age 30-39 accounted for 12.81%, females between age of 40-49 account for 14.01%, those between the age of 50-59 account for 13.70%, and those over the age 60 accounted for 20.16% of the female population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). Since 2010, all age ranges have shown an increase, except for females between the ages of 10-14, 30-44, and 75-79 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011). The ratio of males to females varies across the four regions of the United States (Northeast, South, Midwest, and West);

however, all regions in the country show more females than males (U.S. Census Bureau, 2011).

For the year ended December 31, 2009, the annual consumer expenditures per consumer unit¹ was \$49,067 and of this, \$1,725² was spent on apparel and services (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). In 2010, the annual consumer expenditure per consumer unit decreased by 2.0% and apparel and services decreased by 1.4% from 2009 (U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2011). During 2009, the apparel and services expenditures were comprised of men and boys, women and girls, footwear, and other apparel products and services in the amount of \$383, \$678, \$323, and \$249, respectively (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010). Per this data, female apparel expenditures account for 44% more than males.

The Cotton Lifestyle Monitor collects data monthly to gauge attitudes and behaviors regarding apparel and home furnishing. Their research shows that females monthly spend more time shopping for clothing than males. Females spend one hour and 47 minutes each shopping trip (Cotton Incorporated, 2011) and they shop in stores twice a month (Cotton Incorporated, 2011). Females plan only 66% of their apparel purchases (Cotton Incorporated, 2011) and 68% of them shop for clothing on sale (Cotton Incorporated, 2011).

Females purchase most of their clothing at chain stores (25%), mass merchants (21%), specialty stores (15%), other (14%), department stores (11%), off-price stores (9%), and internet (5%) (Cotton Incorporated, 2011). Female apparel choices are

¹ “Consumer units include families, single persons living alone or sharing a household with others but who are financially independent, or two or more persons living together who share expenses” (Economic News Release, Bureau of Labor Statistics, September 27, 2011).

² Per the US Census Bureau this number includes additional items that were not listed separately

influenced the most by friends (42%) (Cotton Incorporated, 2010). They are also influenced by magazines (29%), relatives (21%), celebrities (5%), and colleagues (3%) (Cotton Incorporated, 2010).

History of the Target Market of Junior Wear

In 1926, *Women's Wear (Daily)*³ had a junior wear section that was designated for girls ages 13 to 17; this age designation was listed on the header of this section until September 1926. At this time junior clothing was considered an extension of the juvenile size category. However, the debate over the target market along with the size measurements used to produce this apparel was widely discussed in *Women's Wear Daily (WWD)*. At this time, junior wear was beginning to emerge as its own classification separate from the infant's and children's apparel (Mestres, 2008).

From 1926-1930, there was much debate over the term "junior" although no unanimous decision was made on either the target market, or the sizing system. However, several ideas emerged,

some industry members believed that the junior size category was meant for a growing girl and concentrated on this as the promotional focus. These members believed that this apparel should be separated from its prior childish classification because growing girls do not want to be classified as such due to their developmental changes. Some industry members believed that the junior size category was specifically for the high school and college girl and it should be promoted as such. This idea held true in that businesses developed college shops in their stores to sell junior apparel. Other members believed that this apparel was for females of all ages who fit into this slight, slender figure and were in accordance with the junior image, young and playful (Mestres, 2008, p. 41-42).

In an article from August 28, 1941 in *Women Wear Daily*, the junior figure was discussed as having "hips, curves, and she usually has a firm, high bustline" (Junior,

³ *Women's Wear Daily* was established in 1910, when it was called *Women's Wear*. It was not until 1927 that the name became *Women's Wear Daily*.

1941, p. 4 & 5). This article also states that “she is not the easiest figure to fit, because you have to work with a boney structure as there is no loose flesh” (Junior, 1941, p. 4 & 5). Other descriptions of the junior figure are mentioned such as full hips, thighs, and a protruding stomach and/or derriere (Junior, 1941). Several articles in 1941 describe the junior figure as “firm flesh, typically of youth. It is not fully developed and it is immature” (Know the measurements of the primary and secondary basic figure types, 1941, p. 7). “It is not necessarily a young figure, although proportions are that of an immature one. The bust is high and small. The waist is also small and high, giving the greatest length from waist to underbust. The hips are narrow and not fully developed” (Know Your Customer, Figure Out Her Figure, 1941, p. 4). At this time, junior wear was designated for the girl of “school or college age, too young for misses’ sizes and too old for children’s- or an older woman who is too old for the usual girl’s dress and too small for regular sizes” (Junior figure, 1942, p. 8 Section 2).

In 1950, *WWD* published an article indicating three different types of females that fit into the junior classification; teenagers 13-16 years old, 16-20 years old, and females into their 40s (How to recognize a junior, 1950). There were differences in proportion from small breasts, small waist, and large hips compared to waist, but firm and slender to more fully developed bustline or a few pounds around the waist, but still small and firm (How to recognize a junior, September 14, 1950). A diagram in *WWD* listed dress measurements for special sizes. In this diagram, measurements and a description of junior, petite, half-size, woman, and tall are given. Junior is described as “shorter waist, high bust, lean diaphragm, average arms and hips, varies in height, has a young firm figure” (Dress measurements in a diagram of special sizes, 1952, p. 21). The dress trade

classified the junior as a “size, not an age” (It’s a size, not an age, 1952, p. 13). This article goes on to discuss that originally the junior was for a young girl; however, this concept changed to incorporate any female that fits the youthful figure type (It’s a size, not an age, 1952).

Several articles found in the *Women’s Wear Daily* June 1, 1955 issue clarify “what is a junior?” in the eyes of the California market (p. 37). Retailers and buyers stated that junior “is more a type than a size, more an ‘attitude towards clothes’ than age” (What is a junior?, 1955, p. 37). Even though manufacturers and stylists size junior wear differently, a specific body proportion, not disclosed, was utilized when producing this type of apparel (What is a junior?, 1955). The next article listed four junior customer types: young matron or college girl, high school girl, woman who can’t wear misses’ apparel, and the misses’ customer who is looking for a particular style that fits well (Ahern, 1955). In the coat and suit department, junior was categorized by three components; age (18-60), figure proportions (each company uses different proportions), and size (5 to 15) (Morrison, 1955).

Gebbia’s (1955) book, *Modern Method of Women’s & Children’s Garment Design*, listed women’s and children’s measurement charts. In this book 13 junior measurements were listed⁴ for size 9-17 garments. Gebbia (1955) described the junior figure as “young, short and petite. Shoulders are narrower than the average size miss. Bust is higher and waist is shorter” (p. 14). Chatov (1956) wrote an article for *Women’s Wear Daily* regarding the different types of junior customers. She suggested that the young junior customer that shops with her mother is considered a junior in age and size,

⁴ Gebbia does not mention whether the measurements listed were based on a previous study.

whereas the young matron is considered a “ ‘size, not an age’ ” (‘It’s a size, not an age’ but still...The junior has a split personality, 1956, p. 37).

In 1959 there was a lot of discussion about the differences between the sub-teen, young junior, and true junior. One young junior designer, Gloria Sachs, classified the true junior as “career girl, college student or young mother” (Meyer, 1959, p. 5). A diagram listed the sub-teen as a size 6-14, young junior sizes 3-7 and true junior in sizes 5-11. The true junior was curvier in bust and waist than that of the young junior or sub-teen (Putting the young junior in her place, 1959).

Apparel industry members in Milwaukee considered juniors mainly a size, not an age and carried multiple types of junior apparel in a different price ranges- budget, moderate, and better (Big store junior centers cater to size, not age, 1959). There was much confusion over the junior customer in Chicago. Some stores felt that it was a size, not an age and others promoted juniors as an age, not a size and yet most sections carried the same sizes, 5-15 (Chicago high schoolers beeline to junior section, 1959; Chicago stores show wide diversity on teen-juniors, 1959). In New York, junior designers defined their customers as “young career women, young matrons, Junior League type college girls and sophisticated teenagers who fit best into junior sizes” (Young designers air views, 1960, p. 31). Chatov (1960) stated that the “age span theoretically is 17-35, but designers have seen much older women wearing their creations ill-advisedly” (p. 31). St. Louis manufacturers sold junior apparel to both an age and size which was youthful and sophisticated (Bangert, 1960).

Kunick (1967) stated, “Although the Junior Miss sizes are intended for girls from the age of 16 upwards, this is only a general guide. Age is not a reliable predictor of size

and a girl of 15 can sometimes be more mature than one who is three years her senior” (p. 10). Salomon (1976) divided sizes into four figure types; miss, junior, petite, women’s. Junior was considered for the “shorter smaller proportioned young women” (p. 23). It was also mentioned that fashion forward clothes were produced more in junior wear than other figure types and were geared towards more forward thinking consumers regardless of age (Salomon, 1976).

ASTM International (1995) had a 55 plus, females over the age of 55, junior category based on a study in which almost 13% of participants were classified as juniors from the ASTM 5586-95 measurements. A 2004 study by Newcomb and Istook indicated a 55-plus junior classification for women over the age 55 with a smaller, slighter frame fits into the original 1920s description of junior wear.

In 2008, ASTM described the “young adult female junior figure type” as “younger, not fully developed, with a higher waistline than other women’s size ranges” (www.astm.org). In 2010, Beer wrote a designer’s guide book specifically for junior (sizes 5-13) and children’s apparel. She described the target market of junior apparel as “teenagers, and that is where the design team has to be focused. The sizing of teen clothing has little to do with age. Teenagers develop at different rates, and sometimes different parts of their bodies develop at different rates. They might stay one size for a time, go through a growth spurt, and then require a completely different size and style” (p. 25).

A detailed discussion of not only the term “junior” and the target market of junior wear, but also the figure type has been conducted by apparel industry members since 1926. Junior was described as a classification for not only a female in between children’s

and misses' sizes, but also for females with a slender figure. One term used to describe the junior customer throughout this time was "youthful". The junior figure was consistently described as having firm flesh, a high bust, and defined waist which could fit females of a variety of ages today. Over this same time frame, the sizing system and measurements changed significantly for the junior classification. Currently, junior wear is produced in sizes 1-19⁵ and junior plus sizes to accommodate larger females that do not fit in traditional junior sizes, but still want to wear a certain style of clothing. Although ASTM publishes a sizing system for junior wear, not all designers, manufacturers, and retailers use this sizing system.

History of the Junior Sizing System

Scholarly articles, industry publications, and my previous research that focused on historic *Women's Wear Daily* articles (Mestres, 2008) illustrates confusion with size measurements of junior apparel. The *WWD* December 3, 1928 article *Complete Size Figures for Juvenile Wear Trade Issued*, listed actual junior size measurements in odd sizes 11-17⁶⁻⁷ and misses size measurements in even sizes compiled by the "Style Research Bureau of the United Women's Wear League of America" (p. 11). The measurements show a bust-waist drop⁸ of 6 inches in both junior and misses sized garments. However, the waist-hip drop of the junior sizes was 10 inches versus 8.5 inches in missy sizes. Based on this set of measurements, it appears that junior garments were sized for a curvier figure during the late 1920s.

⁵ Some apparel companies also utilize the size 0.

⁶ The junior size category is produced in odd sizes. For example, sizes 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19.

⁷ The 1920s junior sizes are odd numbers 11-17.

⁸ Drop is defined as the difference in bust to waist and waist to hip measurement. The drop provides overall shape to a garment.

The December 26, 1928 article *Move to Adopt Standard Measurements Called Forward Step by Junior Trade* and the article *Dress Patterns Submitted for MFRS.* 'Approval' from February 25, 1929, the Department of Commerce Bureau of Standards in Washington D.C. proposed standard dress pattern measurements. These measurements would eliminate the size 11 garment.

In November 1929, to accommodate changing silhouettes, the Style Research Bureau of the United Women's Wear League of America adopted new measurements for the junior, athletic junior and junior dresses (Size charts revised for new styles, 1929). Along with the addition of these new junior classifications, size 19 measurements were added to the athletic juniors. The drop measurements for each of these junior sub-classifications vary. The junior dresses have a bust-waist drop of 7 inches and a waist-hip drop of either an 11 or 10.5 inches depending on the size. The junior athletics have a bust-waist drop of 5.5 inches and waist-hip of either an 11 or 10.5 inches. The regular junior garments have a bust-waist drop of 6 inches and waist-hip of 11 inches. Regardless of classification, the new junior wear measurements remain aimed for the curvy figure.

In April 1930, Saks Fifth Avenue adopted size measurements in conjunction with the Style Research Bureau of the United Women's Wear League of America due to new style changes (Saks-5th Ave. effects new junior sizes, 1930). The bust, waist and hip measurements are listed for size 11, 13, 15, 17, and 19 garments and four types of length classifications. The drop measurements between the bust and waist are 5.5 inches and waist-hip are 8.5 inches. These drop measurements illustrate a less curvy figure than the previous drop measurements.

On February 24, 1939 the National Bureau of Standards, which was part of the Department of Commerce “issued ‘suggested size classifications and corresponding measurements’ ” for ladies, misses, juniors, and girls apparel (Bureau of Standards Issues New Size Measurements Table, 1939, p. 24). The junior sizes listed are 11, 13, 15, and 17. The drop between bust and waist for a size 11 garment is 3.5 inches and goes up an inch for every size. For example, the bust-waist drop for a size 13 garment is 4.5 inches. The waist-hip drop is 6.5 inches at size 11 and goes up an inch for every size. For example, the size 13 garment has a waist-hip drop of 7.5 inches.

St. Louis manufacturers produced many junior wear brands and were known for junior wear dresses (Mestres, 2004). In 1941, Washington University School of Design published the bust, waist, and hip measurements for junior garments 9, 11, 13, 15, 17 that were used by leading junior wear designers and manufacturers in St. Louis (Basic measurements for junior dresses in St. Louis report). The drops in these charts were 6 inches between bust and waist and 8 inches between waist and hips for the size 9 garment and went up an inch for each drop per size.

The Bureau of Home Economics in 1939 conducted a study obtaining body measurements from 133,807 American boys and girls. From this study a new sizing system was proposed based on stature and hip rather than on age designations (O’Brien & Girshick, September 1939). O’Brien, Girshick, Myer, and Hunt (1941) continued the study to obtain body measurements for a new standard system. If the standards proposed were adopted, finding the appropriate clothing for children ages 4 to 17 would have been based on height and hip measurements. Different types of garments would have had different tolerances based on garment styles (O’Brien, Girshick, Myer, and Hunt, 1941).

In 1944, the National Bureau of Standards released commercial standards for CS 13-44 listing dress pattern measurements for both misses and junior garments (National Bureau of Standards, 1944). The junior and misses' sizing have different bust, waist, and hip measurements for each corresponding size and yet the drop measurements between these sizing classifications are the same with the exception of the misses' size 12 and junior size 11. All other sizes have a bust-waist drop of 6 inches and waist to hip of 9 inches. The junior measurements listed by the Bureau of Standards in 1944 are smaller than those listed in 1930.

In 1958, the Department of Commerce released updated body measurements for patterns and apparel for women. There were three separate junior size charts: regular, petite, and tall. In regular juniors, the sizes 7 and 19 measurements were added; therefore sizes listed were from 7-19. In junior petite, the size range included sizes 9-15 and junior tall 9-17 (Office of Technical Services, 1958). The number of measurements listed for each size classification was far more than previous charts which mainly included bust, waist and hip. This allowed more detailed information for patterns makers; however, it created more work for them due to the addition of sub-classifications within junior apparel. The drop measurements between junior and misses are similar. For example, the size 7 junior garment has a bust-waist drop of 8 and waist-hip drop of 9.5. The size 8 misses garment has a bust-waist drop of 7.5 and waist-hip drop of 9.

Stature has been discussed in several government studies in relation to junior measurements and system proposals. Kunick (1967) stated that the "greatest height [is] reached in early 20s (based off examination of Clothing Council's report)" and that "women are getting taller" (Kunick, 1967, p. 3). He believed

the provision for stature in Junior Miss sizes [could] be dealt with in two ways. The first method, can be an extension of the system laid down for small-busted women in two height groups of 5 ft. 1 in. and 5 ft. 4 in. The second could use an extension of children's sizes which end at the age 15. This method would require an increase in girth as well as stature. This is the general practice in the trade and is the one which is adopted here. Junior Miss sizes are made in one bust fitting, nomenclature for this group is simple; the hip size is all that is required. But to avoid any confusion with Women's sizes. Junior miss should be designated in odd numbers, i.e. 33, 35, 37, 39 and 41 hip girths" (Kunick, 1967, p. 10).

Kunick mentioned that stature slows by the age 17. He also discussed the difference in junior and misses' sizing. He claimed "the main difference between the measurements of Junior Miss and Women's sizes, is that the waist measurement is about 1 in. (inch) smaller and the neck to bust is shorter by about $\frac{3}{4}$ in. (inch)" (Kunick, 1967 p. 10).

Rohr (1968 revised ed.) published, *Women's and Misses' Garment Design*, that contained body measurement charts for junior, misses' and women's sizes. There were 16 measurements listed for each classification and size, including the standard bust, waist and hip measurements along with how to take the measurements. The measurements displayed in the chart, "have been complied in accordance with those used in the ready-to-wear trade" (Rohr, 1968 revised ed., p. 1). The drop measurements for all three classifications and across all sizes were a bust-waist drop of 8 and waist-hip drop of 10 inches.

In 1971, the National Bureau of Standards compiled new body measurements for the sizing of women's patterns and apparel, PS 42-70. The new junior measurements included the addition of the sizes 3 and 5 in regular juniors and the elimination of the size 19 garment. They also listed junior petite sizes from 3-15. The bust-waist drop measurement for junior is 9.5 inches and for misses is 9 inches. The waist-hip drop for junior is 11.5 inches and misses is 11 inches. These size measurements are larger than

those of 1958, especially in bust and hip measurements (National Bureau of Standards, 1971; Ashdown (ed.), 2007).

In 1984, Kunick published another book entitled *Modern Sizing and Pattern Making for Women's and Children's Garments*, which examined the historical perspective of sizing and apparel making along with current information. In this book, he discussed F. R. Morris who published the first book on the subject prior to World War I. Morris listed the measurements for junior miss sizes in 1932, in even numbers 12-20⁹, which was a different sizing strategy than other sources. Kunick listed 43 body measurements for each size listed in his junior miss chart for garments sized 7-17, which was loosely based on the 1971 US Department of Commerce chart (Kunick, 1984).

Goldsberry, Shim, and Reich (1996) conducted a study that measured 6,652 women ages 55 and older. These measurements were compared to the 1971 PS 42-70 data compiled by the US Department of Commerce, National Bureau of Standards for junior petite, junior, misses, misses petite, misses tall, women, and half-sizes. The subjects were classified into each of the female sizing categories. The results of this study showed a difference in female body measurements in 1996 versus those used in 1971; therefore, current females can be classified into a number of female size categories including into junior sizing (Goldsberry, Shim, & Reich, 1996; Ashdown, 2007).

⁹ F.R. Morris does list the junior miss sizes as 12-20 in his *Ladies' Garment Cutting and Making* textbook. He does not list misses sizes nor measurements. He lists girls shorts, woman's and small women's shorts, trousers, and juvenile costume size measurements. (Morris, F.R., 194?)(there is no specific year in 1940 listed)

In 2004, Newcomb and Istook proposed revising the U.S. sizing standards because they claimed it is hard for consumers to find clothes that fit. Size USA¹⁰ and ASTM (American Society for Testing and Materials) data was analyzed for juniors, misses, and over 55 women. The results of this study showed that the ASTM measurements currently used do not meet the body shape needs for junior and misses size categories in the United States. They proposed revising the standards based on Size USA data. (Newcomb & Istook, 2004; Ashdown (ed.), 2007)

ASTM (D6829) published size measurements for junior wear sizes 0-19 in 2008. These size measurements are larger per individual size than the standards from previous years (ASTM, 2008). The drop for these junior sizes is 8 inches and 10 inches, which is consistent with the drop measurements on Rohr's chart from 1968 (revised ed.).

In 2010, Beer published *Designer's Guide to Girl's and Junior's Apparel*, which included information on aspects of designing, manufacturing, and merchandising this line along with age and lifestyle assumptions. In this book, the junior sizes range from 1-13 and claim to fit a female with a defined bust, waist, and hips. In recent years, plus sized junior sizes have also been marketed. The junior plus sizes are graded up to fit the plus sized juniors but the youthful styling is consistent with the regular junior styles (Beer, 2010).

Kuykendall (2010) conducted a study to determine whether the sizes fit the intended population, ages 13-17, for junior apparel. She compared the 2008 ASTM measurements to that of 81 teenage girls who self-identified as wearing junior sized

¹⁰ Size USA is a sizing study conducted by [TC]2 in 2002/2003 which collected current size measurements of adult consumers.






clothing. Girls between the ages of 13-17 were selected because the term junior as defined by ASTM are assumed to be the female teenage market. The findings from her study illustrate that the ASTM measurements do not fit this population. None of the participants had all three bust, waist, and hip measurements listed by ASTM within a single size even when taking into account one inch tolerance for each measurement.

In 1926, junior wear was produced in sizes 11-17. Over time additional sizes were added and by 2010 sizes 0-13 were produced. Today not only are regular junior sizes produced, but also plus sized juniors up to a size 25. Along with the addition of new junior sizes, the measurements of junior sizes have fluctuated over time (Table 1). At first junior wear was produced for a curvier figure than misses' wear; however, the drops between juniors sizes and misses' sizes eventually became similar.

Table 1

Illustration of bust, waist, and hip measurement of the junior size 11 garment

throughout time

Date	Bust	Waist	Hip	Image
1928	31	25	35	
1929 ^a	31	25	36	
1929 ^b	31	24	35	
1930	32	26.5	35	
1932*	33	26	36	

1939	29	25.5	32
1941	32	25	34
1944	29	24.5	32
1958	33.5	24.5	35
1968	31	23	33
1971	34.5	25	36.5
2008	37	29	39



Note.

1928- Move to adopt standard measurements called forward step by junior trade. (1928, Decemeber 26). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 3, p. 7.

1929^a- "In-between girl" said to demand special designing consideration. (1929, February 7). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 4, p. 15.

1929^b- Size charts revised for new styles. (1929, November 19). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 3, p. 25.

1930- Saks-5th ave. effects new junior sizes. (1930, April 1). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 3, p. 31.

1932- Kunick, P. (F.C.I.). (1984). *Modern sizing and pattern making for women's and children's garments: A scientific study in pattern construction and a standard textbook for clothing industry*. Philip Kunick Publications, London.

1939- Bureau of standards issues new size measurements table. (1939, February 24). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 24.

1941- Basic measurements for junior dresses in St. Louis report. (1941, December 17). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 22.

1944- National Bureau of Standards. (1944). *Dress patterns, 4th edition: Commercial standard CS13-44*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

1958- Office of Technical Services. (1958). *Body measurements for the sizing of women's patterns and apparel: Commercial standard CS215-58*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

1968- Rohr, M. (1968 revised ed.) *Women's and misses' garment design*. Rohr Publishing Company: Waterford, Connecticut.

1971- National Bureau of Standards. (1971). *Body measurements for the sizing of women's patterns and apparel PS 42-70*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

2008- ASTM International. (2008). *ASTM D 10.1520/D6829-02 (2008) Standard tables of body measurements for juniors, sizes 0 to 19*. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM International. Retrieved on October 15, 2010 from www.astm.org.

* F.R. Morris does list the junior miss sizes as 12-20 in his Ladies' Garment Cutting and Making textbook. He does not list misses sizes nor measurements. He lists girls shorts, woman's and small women's shorts, trousers, and juvenile costume size measurements (Morris, F.R., 194?).

Consumer Behavior Research

Consumer behavior is the "study of the processes involved when individuals or groups select, purchase, use, or dispose of products, services, ideas, or experiences to satisfy needs and desires" (Solomon & Rabolt, 2009). This study examines the shopping behaviors of junior wear consumers and identifies individual characteristics of each

consumer to determine if the consumer shopping is the focus of the product offerings and size measurements used in the junior wear department.

The process of consumer behavior includes prepurchase, purchase, and post purchase decisions. During this process, consumers play a number of roles in the marketplace; purchaser, user, influencer, and many times play more than one role at one time (Solomon & Rabolt, 2009). The pioneer of field research in the consumer culture environment is Paco Underhill, founder and CEO of Envirosell Inc. Underhill's anthropological approach examines consumers in their element to determine what factors impact the shopping experience and make suggestions to improve the environment. The premise of his research includes teams that track consumers during their shopping experience. He tracks everything from the individual characteristics of each consumer to actual behaviors. For example, his team watches to see what consumers touch, pick up, take, purchase, and abort items that were picked up. Today, Underhill's business can be described as the 'science of shopping' (Underhill, 2009, p. 26).

Smith and Fisher (2006) used Underhill's approach to market research as a guide in teaching retail observational methods. Students in a marketing research course utilized field notes and video footage similar to Underhill's process as their data collection processes to gather rich information on consumer experience in retail environments. This application was successful in providing hands on experience in market research including data collection processes and analysis of data.

Pettinger (2005) researched customer service from the sales associate and consumer perspective. In Pettinger's study, ethnography was used to get a complete picture of customer service from different perspectives using a combination of techniques

including shopper observation, worker observation, and interviews. Pettinger's (2005) shopper observation study included visiting retail stores regularly to collect variables on how many people were working and their tasks, as well as demographic characteristics of gender, ethnicity, class, and age. During her visits as a customer to retail establishments she requested workers to assist with her various consumer needs (Pettinger, 2005). This approach provided a multiple perspective view on retail work.

DeNora and Belcher (2000) examined the influence of music on consumers in retail establishments. This research that examined the influence of music on the consumer was challenging because music is invisible and is not easy to assess visually. The researchers collected 50 hours of in-store observations posing as shoppers and wired for sound, shadowing four shoppers that agreed to tape record their experiences. They also conducted exit interviews with 150 respondents outside the retail establishments, interviewed shop managers and assistants, and conducted in-depth interviews in four major cities with 52 women of all ages to understand the role music plays in their day-to-day lives (DeNora & Belcher, 2000). The mixture of data collection methods and amount of data collected provided a more holistic view about music's influence on consumers and impact of music on consumer behavior.

Both Pettinger (2005) and DeNora and Belcher (2000) used participant observation and interviews to gather data that examined their respective research topic from different perspectives. This multi-faceted approach allowed the researchers to create a complete picture of their studies. These research articles provided examples on the variety of data collection methods used in ethnographic retail studies versus the observational consumer focused research by Underhill.

Brand and Product Relationships

Brands can differentiate themselves from others in the marketplace by product performance or non-product related means (symbolic, emotional, and intangible differences). Branding is defined as a “product that adds other dimensions that differentiate it in some way from other products designed to satisfy the same need” (Keller, 2003, p. 4). Companies utilize brand strategies to differentiate their products from others in the marketplace as well as others within the same company to meet the needs of a variety of consumers. In order for businesses to analyze the products offered in their stores, or a specific department within their store, a brand-product matrix is implemented.

The brand-product matrix is a “geographical representation of all the brands and products sold by a firm” (Keller, 2003, p. 521). The matrix grid illustrates all of the brands in rows and the products in columns to determine the brand-product and product-brand relationships. The product-brand matrix is a useful tool showing the breadth and depth of product assortments of all brands, both national and private label, carried by a company.

National brands are brands that are sold on the national, or possibly a more regional level, and are carried by more than one retail company. These brands are well known in the marketplace, so consumers know what to expect and can procure this brand at a number of retailers. To some consumers national brands are positive and to others they are negative. The down side to national brands is that retailers typically earn a lower profit from the national brands compared to private labels that are brands designed and marketed by a specific retailer. Private labels are exclusive to a specific retailer.

Private label brands tend to be more profitable because the retailer manages all aspects of the design, sourcing, and marketing of the brand. This reduces the amount of outside involvement in getting the product offerings produced. Carrying private label brands creates a connection with the consumer. The consumer knows that only that retailer carries their brand, thus developing loyal consumers. The down side to producing private label brands is the financial risk associated with producing these products. The retailer will incur financial distress if a product is a flop in the market.

METHODOLOGY

A combination of ethnography, “the process of discovering and describing a culture” (McCurdy, Spradley, & Shandy, 2005, p. 9) and case study components guided this research project. An instrumental case study is defined as “a type of case study with the focus on a specific issue rather than on the case itself” (Creswell, 2007, p. 245). This research design was used because it focuses on a particular cultural group: American females that wear junior apparel. This topic was also chosen because this research examines a particular issue: whether the consumers shopping in the junior wear department fit the current junior size category as defined by literature discussing the junior wear industry and if the product offerings are appropriate for this group of consumers.

Research Objective

The purpose of this study was to understand who is purchasing clothing at a retail stores junior wear department compared to the current junior size category and products sold in the junior wear section. The study was designed to get a clearer understanding of the junior apparel customer. The research objectives of the study were:

1. To analyze products offered in the junior wear department;
2. To observe and document who is shopping in the junior section;
3. To compare who is shopping in the junior wear section to the product offerings and size measurements; and
4. To compare the perceived characteristics of the defined junior wear consumer discussed in the review of literature to the data collected.

The results of this study should determine if a new marketing strategy, design of garments, and sizing should be considered.

This study was conducted in three phases. The first phase of this study was direct observational research. Direct observational research is defined as “watching people and recording their behavior on the spot” (Bernard, 2006, p. 413). An ethogram, which is discussed below, was used to ensure all pertinent information related to consumer behavior was collected from each individual observed. Individual consumer characteristics were also collected on each participant. The second phase was an analysis of the product-brand matrix along with product price points used in the junior wear department. Lastly, a table was used to compare the current junior size measurements to the observational data collected.

Direct Observations

The retailer whose stores were the location of the observations for the research selected has been in business since the early 20th century and focuses on providing everyday values to consumers. This company targets middle class American consumers with their breadth of assortment and affordable products. This company was chosen as the targeted company to complete this study due to results of a consumer questionnaire collected in conjunction with another study that resulted in a thesis titled *The Anthropometrics of Junior Sizing: Does the Size Fit the Population?* (Kuykendall, 2010).¹¹ About 16% of participants mentioned they purchased junior apparel from this

¹¹ The consumer questionnaire was based on research objectives of three separate researchers related to the female teen population. Questions were developed to include demographic information, body image, lifestyle, purchase behavior questions, and attitudes towards apparel. Each of the purchase behavior questions is focused to

retailer and represented the most frequently cited department store mentioned in the study. Other stores mentioned in this study included several other department stores, discount retailers, and specialty stores.

An ethogram, a “list of behaviors, for a specific species being studied” (Bernard, 2006, p. 414), was developed to ensure that the same behaviors were collected from each individual shopping in the junior wear section (Appendix II). The categories that consumers will be classified into are: scan, pick-up, inspect, and take. Scan is defined as consumers who visually scan racks/shelves in the junior wear section. Pick-up is defined as consumers who pick up a junior apparel item. Consumers who touch items without picking them up were classified as inspect. If a consumer picks up item and takes it to a different area, they were classified as take. After a consumer takes an item, they will then be classified into one or more of the following categories: purchase, try on, and/or take item to another section. Finally, if discussions are overheard regarding fit, sizing, and/or design details, the information will be noted. The ethogram consisted of abbreviations for discussions, along with shopping and purchase behaviors.

determine when, where, and why consumers shop (Appendix I). Females between the ages of 13-17 who self-identified as wearing junior sizes comprised the population for the consumer questionnaire. The sampling method used in this study for the consumer questionnaire was stratified sampling. Flyers were created and posted at local businesses to attract participants. E-mails were also sent to contacts of the researchers in order to gain more participants. Lastly, snowball sampling from participants brought in additional subjects. The goal was to collect twenty participants in each of the following ages; thirteen, fourteen, fifteen, sixteen, and seventeen. The sample was restricted to females between the ages of 13-17 in a Midwestern city with a major University presence who were willing to complete the questionnaire and be body scanned. Participants had to self-identify that they wore junior sizes. Compensation for completing both parts of the study was twenty dollars. The total number of respondents surveyed was 81 females. A total of 18 thirteen year olds, 20 fourteen year olds, 20 fifteen year olds, 14 sixteen year olds, and 9 seventeen year olds participated in the study.

A guidebook was also utilized to collect individual subject characteristics of body shape, height, age, and ethnicity (Appendix II). Connell, Ulrich, Brannon, Alexander, and Presley (2006) conducted a study that developed a set of nine scales to evaluate female body shape from body scans. Their findings condensed the Douty five figure body build into four; slender, average, full, and heavy (Connell, Ulrich, Brannon, Alexander, and Presley, 2006). This revised set of body builds was used as the guideline to classify body shape of females shopping in the junior wear department.

Height was classified as petite, regular or tall. Petite was defined as short (under 5'2"), regular as medium height (5'2" to 5'7") and tall as above average in height (5'8" and above). Ethnicity categories that classified consumers were Caucasian, Black, Asian, Hispanic, Native American, and other.

There were 7 age ranges used to classify consumers. They were 10-17, 18-22, 23-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, and over 60. The first age range of 10-17 was developed to classify females that were in either high school or middle school. The second range of 18-22 would classify females in college and 23-29 as females right out of college who can be referred to as young professionals. These age ranges are smaller but are necessary because the needs of females in high school or younger versus those in college or out of college are different due to events, activities, and work. I grouped females 18-22 because of previous research that discussed junior wear for the college girl. The next couple of age ranges 30-39, 40-49, and 50-59 were selected because just as the younger age ranges were chosen because of life stage these ranges were also selected because of the differences in events, activity and work status. Finally the over 60 age group was

determined because these females, especially ones over 65, are categorized as older adults.

All consumers shopping in a specific company's junior wear department made up the direct observational population of the study. A convenience sampling approach was used to gain access to the junior wear departments in multiple stores of the same retailer to conduct direct observations.

Direct observational data was collected in a four Midwestern locations of this company in a major metropolitan city and suburban area over a two week period, beginning December 26, 2011. The data was collected in two strip mall stores and two mall locations. Data was collected at various times, including days, evenings, and weekends. The time of the study, after the major gift giving holidays, was selected to get a large sample in a small amount of time since people are exchanging gift items and redeeming their gift cards.

Females were tracked only if they appeared to be shopping for themselves. For example, if two females were both shopping the section they were both participants. If a family of four was shopping and only the daughter was shopping, then she was the only individual tracked.

This data was collected through several different methods. The first method utilized a stroller and small post-its that included abbreviations of the expected characteristics and behaviors so that relevant characteristics could be circled unobtrusively. Each subject had their own post-it notes and several subjects were watched at any given time. The second method to record data was to text the information to myself using a cell phone. Standard abbreviations were used and texted for each

subject, this allowed for several consumers to be watched at a time. To keep the consumers straight when texting this information, the use of their age range, ethnicity, and who they were shopping with was included. The last method in which data was collected involved the notes function on my cell phone to list the ethogram and individual characteristics abbreviations. Just like texting, the use of age range, ethnicity, and if the subject was shopping with someone else, was used to identify each participant since several were watched at a time. Since observations were conducted in the junior wear section at the same company, but in multiple locations, this study was considered multi-site.

The direct observational data was coded and entered into an Excel spreadsheet. The coded data was analyzed for frequencies and descriptive statistics. This information was compared and contrasted to the brands, products, and current junior size measurements.

Product-Brand Price Matrix

The product-brand matrix is a “geographical representation of all the brands and products sold by the firm” (Keller, 2003, p. 521). The product-brand matrix was developed to understand the brands and products sold in this specific junior wear department. An addition to the product-brand matrix, price information was used to determine the price relationship of the brands and products carried. Since this study examines who is shopping in a specific company’s junior wear department, the junior wear brands and products of this company were analyzed using a product-brand price matrix.

An electronic examination of the brands, products, and prices of junior apparel was synthesized into a product-brand price matrix (Appendix II). A detailed examination of each brand, the products offered in that brand along with the prices for products in each brand was listed in detail in the product-brand price table. Each brand was either labeled 'brand' for national brand or 'private label brand' and identified by a letter. The company's junior wear brands and products provided information for comparison of the direct observational data.

Junior Size Measurements

A table, taken from Kuykendall 2010, illustrated the junior size measurements at a variety of retailers, along with the ASTM measurements. The junior wear measurements were compared to the direct observational data.

Limitations

There are several limitations of this study. First, the observational portion of the study was conducted in one major metropolitan city and the surrounding suburban areas. While this provides a broader range of consumers compared to a small local area, a broader scope utilizing a number of cities throughout the country would be more beneficial to determine the junior wear client across the nation. The second limitation of this study is that consumers were tracked for five minutes or less depending on their actions. The subjects were also not typically followed out of the junior wear section. A more focused study following a consumer through their entire shopping experience would provide further insight into their shopping behaviors. The final limitation is the examination of junior products offering. The examination of these offerings was strictly through the company's website, thus additional items, number of brands, or number of

product offerings in each brand may vary compared to the products that each store carries.

Summary

The definition of the current junior consumer is one of confusion so this study explores this question through a combination of ethnography and instrumental case study. Data was collected from direct observations in the junior wear section at a number of mid-western locations of a retailer, product-brand price strategies, and current junior size measurements. The use of different types and sources of data provide a more holistic view of the current junior industry.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data for this study consisted of direct observations at four locations of a department store in Midwestern metropolitan and surrounding suburban areas, product-brand price strategy used by this company, and an examination of the current junior size strategies. There were 50 direct observations of consumers shopping in each of the four store locations for a total of 200 observations. The first section describes the aggregate results of the direct observations both qualitatively and quantitatively, the product-brand price strategy, and, lastly, a table illustrates the current junior size strategies.

Direct Observations

A profile of the 200 observations, summarized in Table 2, indicated that approximately 22% of the participants were between the ages of 10-17, ten percent between the ages of 18-22, 16% between the ages of 24-29, 16.5% in their thirties, 14.5% in their forties, 8% in their fifties, and 12.5% percent over sixty. The participants were predominantly Caucasians (90%). The observations comprised of females in all three height categories, petite (32.5%), regular (56.5%), and tall (11.0)¹². The body build of the respondents concluded that 59% were of average body frame, 21.5% were slender, 17.5% were full, and the remainder were classified as heavy.

The percentage of females in each zip code in which direct observations took place as well as females by age range and ethnicity are illustrated in Table 3. All stores in which observations occurred were predominately Caucasian zip codes which explains

¹² Appendix II contains the direct observation instrument including a definition of how people were classified by height, body build, age, and ethnicity. The instrument defines the store behaviors by consumers.

why 90% of shoppers were Caucasian. When compared, the age range percentages indicated by the U.S. Census Bureau for each zip code are different than the ranges found in this study. The first age range that had significant difference per the observational data was 50-59 which indicated 8% whereas the census data was over 8% for all zip codes except one. The observational data age range of 23-29 contained 16% of shoppers. This is larger than the number, 12.6-14%, reported in the 25-34 age range as indicated by the census. Ten percent of shoppers were categorized in to the 18-22 age range and the zip codes in which the observations took place contained less than 10%. Shoppers that were classified in to the 10-17 age range were 22.5%, which is at the lower end of the range for females under the age of 18, 23.5-30.7%, in each zip code.

Table 2

Individual Characteristics

	Age range	Frequency (n=200)	Percent
	10–17	45	22.5%
	18–22	20	10.0%
	23–29	32	16.0%
	30–39	33	16.5%
	40–49	29	14.5%
	50–59	16	8.0%
	over 60	25	12.5%
	Ethnicity		
	Caucasian	180	90.0%
	African American	10	5.0%
	Asian	3	1.5%
	Hispanic	4	2.0%
	Other	3	1.5%
	Height		
	Petite	65	32.5%
	Regular	113	56.5%
	Tall	22	11.0%
	Body Frame		
	Slender	43	21.5%
	Average	118	59.0%
	Full	35	17.5%
	Heavy	4	2.0%

Table 3

Percentage of Females, Age Ranges for Females and Ethnicities by Zip Code Area of Each Store Where Direct Observations Were Conducted

	Zip Code 1	Zip Code 2	Zip Code 3	Zip Code 4
Population	43,360	70,828	38,090	41,383
Females	51.0%	51.0%	53.0%	50.0%
Age Range				
Under 18	30.7%	23.7%	23.5%	27.2%
18-24	6.3%	7.7%	7.7%	8.5%
25-34	12.6%	12.7%	13.5%	14.0%
35-44	18.2%	13.8%	12.1%	19.3%
45-54	14.8%	17.2%	14.0%	15.3%
55-64	8.3%	12.9%	13.3%	7.8%
65 and over	9.2%	12.0%	16.0%	8.0%
Ethnicity				
Caucasian	89.1%	91.9%	86.2%	97.0%
African American	3.9%	3.6%	8.0%	0.7%
Asian	4.2%	1.7%	1.9%	0.8%
Hispanic	2.6%	2.4%	3.1%	1.2%
Other	0.8%	0.7%	1.3%	0.3%

Note. All information is from the U.S. Census Bureau FactFinder. All information is from the 2010 census report.

During my observations, discussions on design details, fit, and sizing were not overheard. Music playing in the department and the large amount of traffic at one time may be possible reasons for this absence of discussions. In addition, maintaining distance from the consumers so that they did not recognize the data collection process may also

have played a role in the lack of focus on discussion regarding size, fit, and design details.

The behaviors of consumers shopping in the junior wear department are summarized in Table 4. There were a total of 93 consumers (46.5%) that took junior clothing and of the consumers that took items, 13 left with nothing, 21 purchased, 51 tried on the apparel, and 55 went to another section with the junior apparel item(s). 59% of consumers left the junior wear section with nothing. It is important to note that consumers could be classified into more than one of the following categories: purchase, try on, go to another section with junior items, or leave with nothing. All junior wear sections had fitting rooms except for one, which had a transaction kiosk. It was easier to track consumers that tried on items in three stores versus the one store in which it was easier to see if consumers purchased items.

Table 4

Behaviors in Junior Section

Behaviors	Frequency (n=200)	Percent
Scan	33	16.5%
Pick up	36	18.0%
Inspect	38	19.0%
Take	93	46.5%
Leave with nothing	118	59%
Behavior after Take *	Frequency (n=93)	Percent
Purchase	21	22.6%
Try on	51	54.8%
Take another section	57	61.3%

Note. * Each person observed may be listed into more than one category

The behaviors of consumers shopping in the junior wear department, broken down by age, are summarized in Table 5. In the first four age classifications, consumers purchased apparel items. This means that anyone over the age of forty did not purchase junior apparel in that area of the store; however, consumers in those age ranges tried on apparel and took items to other sections. Another significant finding is that consumers in all age ranges tried on apparel and left the junior wear section with items.¹³ The diverse age range of consumers trying on garments, taking garments out of the junior wear section, and purchasing junior apparel is consistent with previous research examining the junior wear industry in the late 1920s which states, “junior is a size, not an age” (Mestres, 2008).

¹³ Consumers were observed for five minutes if they were in the junior wear section for an extended period of time. They were not followed out of the section, but the transaction kiosk area was monitored especially if someone who was in the section was spotted in that vicinity. This could account for the fact that no one over the age of forty bought apparel. In two of the stores it was easier to determine if consumers purchased.

Table 5

Behaviors by Age Range

Age range	Behaviors			
	Scan	Pick Up	Inspect	Take
10–17 (45)*	0	4	12	29
18–22 (20)	3	2	6	9
23–29 (32)	5	7	5	15
30–39 (33)	4	6	5	18
40–49 (29)	7	8	4	10
50–59 (16)	5	3	3	5
over 60 (25)	9	6	3	7

Behaviors after Take**

Age range	Behaviors after Take**		
	Purchase	Try On	Take to Another Section
10–17 (45)	11	20	11
18–22 (20)	1	6	7
23–29 (32)	4	6	9
30–39 (33)	5	8	11
40–49 (29)	0	5	10
50–59 (16)	0	2	5
over 60 (25)	0	4	4

Note. * The parenthesis illustrates how many consumers were classified into that particular age range

**Each person observed may be listed into more than one category

Qualitative Perceptions and Observations

Females of all ages shopped in the junior wear section during the holiday season beginning right after Christmas until mid-January. The females shopping tended to scan, inspect, pick-up, and take sale items as well as jeans. Since females of all ages were

tracked in this section one could conclude that “junior is a size, not an age” versus “junior is an age, not a size.”

While tracking consumers, documentation was collected if the individual was shopping with others. This was useful when tracking more than one consumer at a time. Of the 200 consumers tracked, 76 (38%) were shopping with at least one other person. Thirty-four of the 45 females aged 10-17 (75.5%) were shopping with at least one other person and most (25) were shopping with their mother. Thirteen of the 20 females in the 18-22 age range (65%) were shopping with another person; mom, sister, grandma, or friend. Ten of 32 females classified in the 23-29 age range (31.3%) shopped with at least one other person; mom, son/daughter, friend, or significant other. Females in their thirties (21.2%), forties (13.8%), fifties (18.8%), and those over 60 (20%) also shopped with at least one other person; however, they did not shop as often with others as the 10-17, 18-22, and 23-29 age range. One could assume that females in the older age ranges are not as influenced by others as are those in the younger age ranges.

Almost all shoppers tracked in the junior wear section examined (scanned, inspected, picked-up, or took) the sales racks. Each store had their sales racks set up differently. Some (zip code 1 and 3) had several long racks in one specific area in the junior wear section, compared to having sales racks intertwined with regular merchandise displays throughout the junior wear section (zip code 2 and 4). Since this study took place during the three weeks following Christmas; this explains the reason that sales racks were examined more frequently over regular priced merchandise. Sale items consisted mainly of sweaters, pants, blouses, jackets, jeans, and coats. All of these items, except coats that were merchandised on their own racks, were mixed together on the sale

racks separated by size; however, since the items were mixed together and heavily shopped, the racks were typically unorganized.

Over half of the consumers that took items tried them on, and typically, the items consisted of sale items. For example, two ladies, in their 60s, were picking up sweaters from the sale racks in the junior wear section. One of them would try them on over their clothes, look in the mirror located in the section, and then ask the opinion of the other woman. Neither of them left with any items out of the junior wear section and headed to another department in the store. Another example is a female classified in the 10-17 age range who was shopping with her mom, dad, and siblings. She and her mom shopped the sales racks, tried on items, and then left the section with several junior tops.

Another item that consumers frequently examined was jeans. Jeans were located on tables as well as racks in all the junior wear sections. The junior wear section in the selected stores had a large assortment of jeans. People of all ages inspected and tried on jeans. For example, a mother in her late 30s and her daughter around 10 spent almost an hour in the junior wear section. Although I did not track people more than five minutes, this consumer went back and forth from the jeans table to the fitting room many times. I had to move around this junior wear section in order not to be detected by this consumer who shopped for a long time trying to find the right jean. Another store had two girls in their teens holding up jeans off the tables and racks. Neither of these consumers actually tried on the jeans; however they picked them up and held them up to their bodies.

All stores had several coat racks that were examined due to the time of year the study was conducted. Females of all ages examined coats. For example, a woman over the age of 70 was shopping with her two granddaughters (presumed). The woman was

short and average size. Her granddaughters were assisting her in picking out a coat. The woman did not take a coat from the junior wear section; however, she and her granddaughters closely inspected and picked-up several coats.

Product-Brand Price Matrix

The product-brand price matrix was used to determine the products and price ranges offered to consumers shopping in the junior wear department. Tables 6 and 7 summarize the findings. The junior wear department offers casual tops and bottoms, as well as skirts in the product offerings. There was a wide selection of jeans, from fashion forward to basic styles, carried in this section. The casual attire and jeans were priced at less than thirty dollars. There was a good assortment of more professional tops, blazers, jackets, and pants that ranged from ten dollars to fifty dollars. Although formal dresses made up the product assortment that cost over fifty dollars, casual dresses, and some formal dresses, were found at a lower price point.

There are 32 national junior brands and eight private label brands at this particular retailer. The number of product offerings in the private label merchandise is greater than the national brands; however, there were no formal dresses in the private label merchandise. National brands represent a wide selection of formal dresses and suit separates. Private label merchandise included swimwear and undergarments whereas the national brands current product offerings do not include swimwear and are very limited in the undergarment offerings.

The product offerings in the junior wear department provided a wide variety of merchandise that catered to females of all ages. Jeans are worn by females of all ages. Dresses and formal dresses are also worn by females of all ages; however, formal dresses

are more often utilized by females between the ages of 10-22 due to dances in middle school, high school, and college. The junior apparel offerings included suit separates, which are primarily used by females 22 and over. The other apparel items, such as casual clothing, can be used by females of all ages.

Table 6

National Brand Product-Brand Price Matrix

Brands	Price Ranges				
	over \$50	\$30-49	\$20-29	\$10-19	Under \$9
Brand A				Jeans	
Brand B		Dresses	Dresses	Dresses	Dresses
Brand C	Dresses				
Brand D		Suit Separates; Dresses	Shirts and Tops; Blazers and Jackets; Suit Separates; Skirts; Pants	Blazers and Jackets; Suit Separates; Skirts; Sweaters	
Brand E	Formal Dresses	Dresses; Formal Dresses	Dresses; Formal dresses		
Brand F			Pants		
Brand G					Sleepwear
Brand H				Casual Tanks and Tops	
Brand I			Shirts and Tops	Shirts and Tops	
Brand J			Shirts and Tops; Casual Dresses	Shirts and Tops	

Brand K				Jeggings ¹⁴	
Brand L					Tanks
Brand M				Shirts and Tops; Outerwear; Pants	
Brand N			Hoodies		Hoodies
Brand O	Formal Dresses	Formal Dresses			
Brand P	Formal Dresses				
Brand Q	Formal Dresses	Formal Dresses	Casual Dresses	Casual Dresses	Casual Dresses
Brand R	Formal Dresses				
Brand S					Undergarments
Brand T	Formal Dresses	Formal dresses		Casual Dresses	Casual Dresses
Brand U				Dresses; Shirts and Tops	Dresses Shirts and Tops
Brand V				Casual Shirts	Casual Shirts

¹⁴ Jeggings are leggings that look like jeans.

Brand W				Casual Shirts and Tops; Casual Jackets	Casual Shirts
Brand X			Blouses	Blouses	
Brand Y	Formal Dresses	Formal Dresses	Formal Dresses; Casual Dresses	Casual Dresses	
Brand Z			Pants		
Brand AA	Formal Dresses	Formal Dresses			
Brand AB			Pants; Cropped Pants	Pants; Cropped Pants	
Brand AC			Jean Shorts	Jeans	
Brand AD				Jeans	
Brand AE				Blouses	Tops
Brand AF		Dresses; Suit Separates; Blazers	Shirts and Blouses; Suit Separates; Pants; Skirts	Shirts and Blouses; Suit Separates	

Table 7

Private Label Brand Product-Brand Price Matrix

Brands	Price Ranges				
	over \$50	\$30-49	\$20-29	\$10-19	Under \$9
Private Label A		Swimwear	Swimwear; Casual Shirts and Tops; Jeans; Outerwear; Pants	Swimwear and Cover Ups; Casual Shirts and Tops; Shorts; Capris; Cropped Pants; Sweaters; Outerwear; Underwear	Swimwear and Cover Ups; Sweaters; Outerwear; Sleepwear; Casual Shirts and Tops; Dresses
Private Label B		Blazers and Jackets	Shirts and Tops; Blazers and Jackets; Pants; Skirts; Capris; Cropped Pants	Shirts and Tops; Pants; Suit Separates	
Private Label C				Jeans; Shorts	Jeans
Private Label D			Jeans; Jeggings; Sweaters; Shorts	Shirts and Tops; Jeans; Jeggings; Sweaters; Casual Dresses	Shorts; Leggings; Casual Dresses
Private Label E			Undergarments		Undergarments

Private Label F	Casual Dresses	Shirts and Tops; Casual Dresses; Pants; Shorts; Blazers and Jackets	Shirts and Tops; Casual Dresses; Pants; Sweaters; Skirts; Jeans	Shirts and Tops; Pants
Private Label G		Jean Shorts	Jeans	
Private Label H	Jeans	Jeans	Jeans	

Junior Size Measurements

Table 8, was taken directly from Kuykendall (2010) and illustrates the bust, waist and hip measurements for junior sizes 0-19 (p. 35-36). The table compares ASTM measurements versus four company size measurements for Target, JC Penney, Urban Outfitters, and Hollister. Overall, the bust, waist and hip measurements are within a half-inch to an inch of the ASTM measurements listed for each size.

Since the inception of the junior size category, the junior size measurements have fluctuated. Since 1928, the bust, waist, and hip measurements of junior sizes have fluctuated. The junior size 11 has ranged from 29 inches to 37 inches in bust, 23 inches to 29 inches in waist, and 32 inches to 39 inches in hip. The size variations over time illustrate the issue with the current measurement system. This also causes confusion for consumers because not only have the measurements fluctuated but each company develops their own sizing standard for each size (Table 8). Retail companies are not required to follow ASTM measurements, therefore, manufacturers use sizing to differentiate their product.

Table 8

The Current Junior Sizing in the United States (in inches)

Size 0					
	ASTM D6829*	Target	JC Penney	U.O.**	Hollister
Bust	30.5		30-30.5		
Waist	22.5		22-22.5		23-24
Hip	32.5		32.5-33		33.5-34
Size 1					
	ASTM D6829	Target	JC Penney	U.O.	Hollister
Bust	31.5	31.5	31-31.5	32.5-33	
Waist	23.5	24	23-23.5	24.5-25	24-25
Hip	33.5	34	33.5-34	34.5-35	34.5-35
Size 3					
	ASTM D6829	Target	JC Penney	U.O.	Hollister
Bust	32.5	32.5	32-32.5	33.5-34	
Waist	24.5	25	24-24.5	25.5-26	25-26
Hip	34.5	35	34.5-35	35.5-36	35.5-36
Size 5					
	ASTM D6829	Target	JC Penney	U.O.	Hollister
Bust	33.5	33.5	33-33.5	34.5-35	
Waist	25.5	26	25-25.5	26.5-27	26-27
Hip	35.5	36	35.5-36	36.5-37	36.5-37
Size 7					
	ASTM D6829	Target	JC Penney	U.O.	Hollister
Bust	34.5	34.5	34-34.5	35.5-36	
Waist	26.5	27	26-26.5	27.5-28	27-28
Hip	36.5	37	36.5-37	37.5-38	37.5-38
Size 9					
	ASTM D6829	Target	JC Penney	U.O.	Hollister
Bust	35.5	35.5	35-35.5	36.5-37	
Waist	27.5	28	27-27.5	28.5-29	
Hip	37.5	38	37.5-38	38.5-39	

Bust Waist Hip	Size 11				
	ASTM D6829	Target	JC Penney	U.O.	Hollister
	37	37	36-37	38-38.5	
	29	29.5	28-29	30-30.5	29-30
	39	39.5	38.5-39.5	40-40.5	39.5-40
Bust Waist Hip	Size 13				
	ASTM D6829	Target	JC Penney	U.O.	Hollister
	38.5	38.5	37.5-38.5		
	30.5	31	29.5-30.5		
	40.5	41	40-41		
Bust Waist Hip	Size 15				
	ASTM D6829	Target	JC Penney	U.O.	Hollister
	40	40	39-40		
	32	32.5	31-32		
	42	42.5	41.5-42.5		
Bust Waist Hip	Size 17				
	ASTM D6829	Target	JC Penney	U.O.	Hollister
	41.5	41.5	40.5-41.5		
	33.5	34	32.5-33.5		
	43.5	44	43-44		
Bust Waist Hip	Size 19				
	ASTM D6829	Target	JC Penney	U.O.	Hollister
	43	43	42-43.5		
	35	35.5	34-35.5		
	45	45.5	44.5-46		
Bust Waist Hip	Size 21				
	ASTM D6829	Target	JC Penney	U.O.	Hollister
			44-45.5		
			36-37.5		
		46.5-48			

Note.

From Kuykendall, A. (2010). *The anthropometrics of junior sizing: Does the size fit the population?*

Unpublished master's thesis, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri, p. 35-36.

*ASTM D6829 is the designation for the young adult junior figure type, sizes 0 to 19 (ASTM International, 2008).

**U.O. - Urban Outfitters

Summary

The results of the observational portion of this study indicate that junior wear can be considered a size not an age, which corroborates previous research that discussed the target market of junior wear and sizing strategies from 1926-1930. The results found that industry members in the late 1920s did not have a unanimous decision on the target market but some industry members believed that junior wear could be targeted to the growing girl, the college girl, and females of all ages who were youthful in figure and life (Mestres, 2008). The findings of this research support that belief since females of all ages shop in the junior wear section, searching for product offerings to meet their individual needs and product offerings in the junior wear section interest females of all ages. This particular retailer carried a large breadth and depth of assortment, from jeans and casual clothing to suit separates and formal dresses. Products offered in the junior wear section are carried in both private label and national brands, although the number of items in the private label category is greater than national branded apparel. The junior sizing results illustrate that not only have measurements changed over time, but each company utilizes its own sizing strategy, which potentially creates confusion for consumers.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The junior size category has been a topic of discussion since the early 20th century. During the late 1920s the debate over the term junior and target market of this category was frequently discussed in *WWD*. By the early 1930s, industry members still did not have a unanimous decision of exactly who was the target consumer of junior apparel; however, they did determine that it was produced for females that were developing, in high school, in college, as well as those females who were youthful (at heart or age) and slender (Mestres, 2008). Throughout the remaining part of the twentieth century this debate kept resurfacing in the industry and a resolution was not determined. By the twenty-first century many industry members focused on junior as a sizing category for a teenager or sub-teen, they did this through designing garments in this size range that included youthful colors and style details.

This study focused on the current junior wear client to determine if a new marketing strategy, design of garments, and adjustments of junior size measurements should be implemented. The objectives of the study were, (1) to analyze products offered in the junior wear department, (2) to observe and document who is shopping in the junior section, (3) to compare who is shopping in the junior wear section to the product offerings and size measurements, and (4) to compare the perceived characteristics of the defined junior wear consumer discussed in the review of literature to the data collected.

The breadth and depth of product assortments carried by the subject retailer in junior wear is extensive. Product offerings include both casual and formal wear dresses, suit separates, jeans, shorts, tops, pants, blouses, shorts, jean shorts, swimwear, and

undergarments. The product offerings are produced in both national and private label brands as well as in variety for each category. The merchandise offered appears to appeal to a broad range of females in all of the age groups. For example, suit separates can appeal to females 22 or older, formal dresses generally appeal to females in their teens and early 20s, while jeans and more casual clothing interest females of all ages. Although, I cannot conclude why females shop in junior wear departments over other size categories, I can assume fit or style is important.

Females of all ages shopped in the junior wear section (Table 2). The majority of consumers were Caucasian and either regular (average) height or petite. Females were typically classified into the slender and average body shape; however, some were classified as full or heavy. It is important to note that non-slender and non-youthful females shopped in the junior wear section. Almost half (46.5%) the consumers who were tracked took items and these were typically sale items. Sale items were frequently taken due to time of year (after Christmas).

Along with the debate about the junior target market, the junior size measurements have changed over time. The bust, waist, and hip measurements have, over time, ranged by several inches thus adding to the confusion regarding not only the target market but the correct size for individuals. Along with fluctuating measurements, retail and manufacturing companies do not adhere to a sizing standard, thus creating consumer frustration on which size and which retailer will fit their particular body shape.

The results of this study illustrate that the current junior wear client is not restricted by age. Females of all ages shop for junior sized product. One cannot conclude why consumers shop in the junior wear department; however, the product

offerings appeal to females of all ages. Product offerings range from casual clothing to suit separates that target consumers in different life stages. Based on direct observations, sizing does not restrict who shops in the junior wear section. Females of all body shapes and heights were tracked in the junior wear section.

The implications of this study show a need for retail companies to capitalize on their junior size strategies. This would create opportunities for retailer to create a connection with their consumers based on size and fit. This could create more consumer loyalty especially if the brand they prefer is a private label over a national brand. The next implication of this study is to market junior clothing to females of all ages who fit and prefer the styling of this size category rather than considering age as the defining factor for junior wear. This would target a broader range of female consumers, thus resulting in a better chance of selling more products and resulting in higher profits. This finding is consistent with my previous research which concluded that ‘junior was a size, not an age’ based on industry discussions from the late 1920s.

Future observational research is needed to examine the entire junior wear market throughout the country, as well as speaking with industry members who design, produce, and sell junior apparel. Finally, a comprehensive body scanning study is needed to examine the current size of females of all ages, but particularly under age 18¹⁵, to have conclusive information to adjust current size measurements. A future perceptual study could allude to why females shop in the junior size category, as well as individual

¹⁵ Size USA is a sizing study conducted by [TC]2 in 2002/2003 which collected current size measurements of adult consumers over the age of 18.

perceptions of the term junior, the intended target market, and items carried in the section.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahern, J. (1955, June 1). Dresses, sportswear. *Women's Wear Daily*, section 1, p. 37.
- Ashdown, S.P. (ed.). (2007). *Sizing in clothing: Developing effective sizing systems for ready-to-wear clothing*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press LLC.
- ASTM International. (1995). *ASTM D5586-95(1995) Standard tables of body measurements for women aged 55 and older (all figure types)*. [brochure]. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM International.
- ASTM International. (2008). *ASTM D 10.1520/D6829-02 (2008) Standard tables of body measurements for juniors, sizes 0 to 19*. West Conshohocken, PA: ASTM International. Retrieved on October 15, 2010 from www.astm.org.
- Bangert, P. (1960, August 23). Famous-Barr's junior shop geared to a size and age. *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 38.
- Basic measurements for junior dresses in St. Louis report. (1941, December 17). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 22.
- Beer, R. (2010). *Designer's guide to girls' junior apparel*. New York: Fairchild Publications, Inc.
- Bernard, H.R. (2006). *Research methods in anthropology: qualitative and quantitative approaches* (4th ed.). New York: AltaMira Press.
- Big store junior center cater to size, not age. (1959, July 1). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 60.
- Bureau of standards issues new size measurements table. (1939, February 24). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 24.
- Chatov, L. (1956, October 2). 'It's a size, not an age!' but still...The junior has a split personality. *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 37.
- Chatov, L. (1960, August 9). Looking towards holiday-resort...Young designers air views. *Women's Wear Daily*, pp. 31 & 33.
- Chicago high schoolers beeline to junior section. (1959, may 20). *Women's Wear Daily*, pp. 31-32.
- Complete size figures for juvenile wear trade issued. (1928, December 3). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 3, p. 11.

Connell, L.J., Ulrich, P.V., Brannon, E.L., Alexander, M., & Presley, A.B. (2006). Body shape assessment scale: Instrument developed for analyzing female figures. *Clothing and Textile Research Journal*, 24(2), pp. 80-95.

Cotton Incorporated's Lifestyle Monitor^a. (Jan-June 2011). How many times per month do consumers shop for clothing in stores?. Retrieved on January 16, 2012 from <http://lifestylemonitor.cottoninc.com/LSM-Fast-Facts/027-Consumer-Monthly-Shopping-in-Clothing-Stores/?category=shopping&sort=consumer&mainSection=fastFacts¤tw=11>

Cotton Incorporated's Lifestyle Monitor^b. (Jan-June 2011). How much time do consumers spend shopping for clothing in stores each month?. Retrieved on January 16, 2012 from <http://lifestylemonitor.cottoninc.com/LSM-Fast-Facts/028-Time-Consumers-Spend-Clothes-Shopping/?category=shopping&sort=consumer&mainSection=fastFacts¤tRow=12>.

Cotton Incorporated's Lifestyle Monitor^c. (Jan-June 2011). Percent of men and women who plan their clothing purchases. Retrieved on January 16, 2012 from <http://lifestylemonitor.cottoninc.com/LSM-Fast-Facts/026-Percentage-Men-Women-Plan-Clothing-Purchases/?category=shopping&sort=consumer&mainSection=fastFacts¤tRow=10>.

Cotton Incorporated's Lifestyle Monitor^d. (Jan-June 2011). Percent of men and women who shop for clothing on sale. Retrieved on January 16, 2012 from <http://lifestylemonitor.cottoninc.com/LSM-Fast-Facts/024-Men-Women-Who-Shop-for-Clothing-on-Sale/?category=shopping&sort=consumer&mainSection=fastFacts¤tRow=8>.

Cotton Incorporated's Lifestyle Monitor^e. (2010). What sources of recommendation or endorsement are most likely to influence women to buy new apparel?. Retrieved on January 16, 2012 from <http://lifestylemonitor.cottoninc.com/LSM-Fast-Facts/053-Sources-Influence-Women-Purchase-New-Apparel/?category=fashion&sort=consumer&mainSection=fastFacts¤tw=1>.

Cotton Incorporated's Lifestyle Monitor^f. (Jan-June 2011). Where do men and women purchase most of their clothing?. Retrieved on January 16, 2012 from <http://lifestylemonitor.cottoninc.com/LSM-Fast-Facts/022-Where-Men-Women-PurchaseClothing/?category=shopping&sort=consumer&mainSection=fastFacts¤tRow=6>.

- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.
- DeNora, T. & Belcher, S. (2000). 'When you're trying something on you picture yourself in place where they are playing this kind of music'-Musically sponsored agency in the British clothing retail sector. The Editorial Board of *The Sociological Review*, pp. 80-101.
- Dimensions of length and sweep. (1942, April 8). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 2, p. 67.
- Dress measurements in diagram of special sizes. (1952, July 22). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 21.
- Dress patterns submitted for Mfrs. approval. (1929, February 25). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 3, p. 12.
- Economic News Release, Bureau of Labor Statistics (September 27, 2011). Retrieved on March 27, 2012 from <http://www.bls.gov/news.release/cesan.htm>.
- Gebbia, A. S. (1955). *Modern method of women's & children's garment design*. Modes Apparel Co. Chicago, IL.
- Goldsberry, E., Shim, S., & Reich, N. (1996). Women 55 years and older: Part I. current body measurements as contrasted to the PS 42-70 data. *Clothing and Textile Research Journal*, 14 (2), pp. 108-120.
- How to recognize a junior. (1950, September 14). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 2, p. 7.
- "In-between girl" said to demand special designing consideration. (1929, February 7). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 4, p. 15.
- It's a size, not an age. (1952, July 22). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 13.
- Junior. (1941, August 28). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 2, pp. 4-5.
- Junior figure. (1942, March 19). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 2, p. 8.
- Keller, K.L. (2003). *Strategic brand management: Building, measuring, and managing brand equity*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Know the measurements of the primary and secondary basic figure types. (1941, March 13). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 2, p. 24.

- Know your customer, figure out her figure. (1941, October 7). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 2, p. 4.
- Kunick, P. (F.C.I.). (1984). *Modern sizing and pattern making for women's and children's garments: A scientific study in pattern construction and a standard textbook for clothing industry*. Philip Kunick Publications, London.
- Kunick, P. (F.C.I.). (1967). *Sizing, Pattern Construction and Grading for Women's and Children's Garments; A treatise and standard textbook for all who are engaged in the production and distribution of women's and children's garments*. Philip Kunick, LTD.: London.
- Kuykendall, A. (2010). *The anthropometrics of junior sizing: Does the size fit the population?* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Missouri, Columbia, Missouri.
- Mash, J. (1959, May 27). Chicago stores show wide diversity on teen-juniors. *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 36.
- McCurdy, D.W., Spradley, J.P., & Shandy, D.J. (2005). *The cultural experience: Ethnography in complex society* (2nd ed.). Long Grove, IL: Waveland Press, Inc.
- Mestres, J. & Clark, Priscilla. (2004, October). The rise and fall of the St. Louis junior market. Paper presented at the Costume Society of America Region III conference, St. Louis, MO.
- Mestres, J. (2008). The development of the junior wear industry 1926-1930. Unpublished Master's Thesis, University of Missouri.
- Meyer, P. (1959, April 16). Young designer throws in her lot with new crop of 'young juniors'. *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 5.
- Morris, F.R. (194?) *Ladies' garment cutting and making* (third edition). The New Era Publishing Co. LTD.: London.
- Morrison, L. (1955, June 1). Junior departments growing. *Women's Wear Daily*, section 1, p. 36.
- Move to adopt standard measurements called forward step by junior trade. (1928, December 26). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 3, p. 7.
- National Bureau of Standards. (1971). *Body measurements for the sizing of women's patterns and apparel PS 42-70*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.

- National Bureau of Standards. (1944). *Dress patterns, 4th edition: Commercial standard CS13-44*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Newcomb, B., & Istook, C. (2004, Summer). A case for the revision of the U.S. sizing standards. *Journal of Textile and Apparel, Technology and Management*, 4 (10), pp. 1-6.
- O'Brien, R., & Girshick, M.A. (1939, September). *Children's body measurements for sizing garments and patterns: A proposed standard system based on height and girth of hips*. United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Home Economics, Miscellaneous Publication 365.
- O'Brien, R., Girshick, M.A., & Hunt, E.P. (1941). *Body measurements of American boys and girls for garment and pattern construction: A comprehensive report of measuring procedures and statistical analysis of data on 147,000 American children*. United States Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Home Economics, Miscellaneous Publication 366.
- Office of Technical Services. (1958). *Body measurements for the sizing of women's patterns and apparel: Commercial standard CS215-58*. Washington, DC: Government Printing Office.
- Oxford University Press. (2012). *Oxford English Dictionary: Junior*. Retrieved February 29, 2012, from <http://www.oed.com/view/Entry/102082?redirectedFrom=junior#eid>
- Pettinger, L. (2005). Representing shop work: A dual ethnography. *Qualitative Research*, 5, pp. 347-364.
- Putting the young junior in her place. (1959, May 20). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 32.
- Rohr, M. (1968 revised ed.) *Women's and misses' garment design*. Rohr Publishing Company: Waterford, Connecticut.
- Saks-5th ave. effects new junior sizes. (1930, April 1). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 3, p. 31.
- Salomon, R. K. (1976). *Fashion design for moderns* (2nd ed.). Fairchild Publications, Inc. New York.
- Smith, S., & Fisher, D. (2006). You can observe a lot by just watching: using videography in a retail setting to teach observational research methods. *Marketing Educational Review*, 16 (1), pp. 75-78.

- Solomon, M.R., & Rabolt, N.J. (2009). *Consumer behavior in fashion*. Pearson Prentice Hall: Upper Saddle River, New Jersey.
- Size charts revised for new styles. (1929, November 19). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 3, p. 25.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2011). Age and sex composition: 2010. U.S. Department of Commerce: Economics and Statistics Administration. Retrieved January 3, 2012 from <http://www.census.gov/prod/cen2010/briefs/c2010br-03.pdf>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). Age groups and sex: 2000. American Fact Finder. Retrieved March 30, 2012 from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). Age groups and sex: 2010. American Fact Finder. Retrieved March 30, 2012 from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). Hispanic or Latino by type: 2000. American Fact Finder. Retrieved March 30, 2012 from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). Hispanic or Latino by type: 2010. American Fact Finder. Retrieved March 30, 2012 from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). Income, expenditures, poverty, and wealth. Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2012. Retrieved January 3, 2012 from <http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/12statab/income.pdf>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). Race alone or in combination: 2000. American Fact Finder. Retrieved March 30, 2012 from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2012). Race alone or in combination: 2010. American Fact Finder. Retrieved March 30, 2012 from <http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml>
- Underhill, P. (2009). *Why we buy: The science of shopping*. Simon & Schuster: New York.
- What is a junior?. (1955, June 1). *Women's Wear Daily*, section 1, p. 37.
- Young designers air views. (1960, August 9). *Women's Wear Daily*, p. 31.

APPENDIX I

Questions for Consumer Questionnaire (previously collected data)

1. What is your **birth month and year** ? _____ month _____ year
2. What is your primary **ethnic** group?
____ White (non-Hispanic)
____ African American
____ Hispanic
____ Asian
____ Other
3. What is your **height**? _____ feet _____ inches
4. Approximately, how much do you **weigh**? _____ pounds
5. For my **age and body type**, I am probably...
____ quite a bit overweight
____ a little over weight
____ about the right weight
____ underweight
6. Which of the following sentences describes your **lifestyle** best?
____ I live a very active, physical lifestyle
____ I 'm about as active as most other people
____ I 'm a little less active than other people
____ I'm much less active than other people
7. Do you **live with your mom**? _____ yes _____ no
8. If yes, what is the **last grade of school** that your mom has finished? (check one)
____ less than high school
____ high school
____ some college or technical school
____ college graduate
____ some or completed graduate school
9. Does your mom work **outside the home**? ____ yes ____ no

10. If yes, what does she **do for a job**?

11. What school do you attend? _____

12. Considering all the types of clothing you wear, please select the **words that best describe the size you wear.**

- _____ Junior (sizes 1-17 odd numbers)
- _____ Junior Plus (sizes 19-27 odd numbers)
- _____ Petite
- _____ Missy
- _____ Women's
- _____ Tall

13. I purchase **apparel** from (please rank your top three choices, 1= purchases frequently, 3= purchases less frequently)

- _____ Department stores (Dillard's, Macy's, etc.)
- _____ Specialty stores (Hollister, Aeropostale, Forever 21, etc.)
- _____ Off Price stores (TJ Maxx, Marshall's, etc.)
- _____ Discount stores (Target, Walmart, etc.)
- _____ Second hand stores (Goodwill, Maude V, Blackberry Exchange)
- _____ Other

14. Please list the **top 3 stores** that you purchase apparel from.

15. What **time of day** do you shop?

- _____ Morning
- _____ Afternoon
- _____ Early Evening
- _____ Evening

16. I **wear apparel because...**

- _____ I feel fashionable.
- _____ It is what the other kids are wearing.
- _____ I like to be ahead of the crowd.
- _____ I want to fit in.

17. Please complete the following statement. My **apparel** reflects my overall **personality** because.....

18. Please complete the following statement. If you could give apparel **retailers/manufacturers advice on clothing** it would be

APPENDIX II

Direct Observation Instrument

Ethogram

Scan	sc	Consumer scans garment racks/shelves in junior section
Pick up	pick	Consumer picks up garments off racks/shelves in junior section
Inspect	in	Consumer touches or examines garments without picking up

Take	take	Take item out of section
Purchase	pur	Consumer purchases junior garments
Try on	to	Consumer takes junior garments into the fitting rooms
Section	sec	Go to another section

Leave	lev	Leave junior section with no items
-------	-----	------------------------------------

Fit	fit	Overhear conversation on fit of junior garments
Sizing	sz	Overhear conversation on sizing of junior garments
Design Details	dd	Overhear conversation on design details of junior garments

Individual Consumer Characteristics

Petite	pet	Consumer is petite, short
Regular	reg	Consumer is medium height, regular
Tall	tall	Consumer is above average in height, tall

Slender Frame	sm	Consumer has a slender frame/build
Average Frame	med	Consumer has a average frame/build
Full Frame	lrg	Consumer has a full frame/build
Heavy Frame	hvy	Consumer has a heavy frame/build

Age	range written	Determined based on my perceived age of the consumer
-----	---------------	--

Ethnicity	written	Determined based on my perceived ethnicity of the consumer
-----------	---------	--

Age ranges: 10-17, 18-22, 23-29, 30-39, 40-49, 50-59, over 60

Ethnicity: white, black, asian, hispanic, native american, other

Product-Brand Price Matrix

Brands	Price Ranges				
	over \$50	\$30-49	\$20-29	\$10-19	Under \$9
	Products per brand and price				

VITA

Jaime Mestres was born in Saint Louis, Missouri in 1979. She received the following degrees: Bachelor of Science in Fashion Merchandising from Fontbonne University in May 2004; M.S. in Textile and Apparel Management from the University of Missouri in December 2008; and Ph.D. in Human Environmental Sciences with an emphasis in Textile and Apparel Management in May 2012. Jaime is married to Nicholas James Mestres of Saint Louis, Missouri, and is the mother of Jackson Hugh Mestres and Lily Rene Mestres.