

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

ScholarWorks@UARK

Apparel Merchandising and Product
Development Undergraduate Honors Theses

Apparel Merchandising and Product
Development

5-2022

Exploring Women's Sizing Chart: A view into PsychoSizing

Patience Billingsley

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/ampduht>



Part of the [Family and Consumer Sciences Commons](#), [Fashion Business Commons](#), [Fashion Design Commons](#), [Service Learning Commons](#), and the [Women's Studies Commons](#)

Citation

Billingsley, P. (2022). Exploring Women's Sizing Chart: A view into PsychoSizing. *Apparel Merchandising and Product Development Undergraduate Honors Theses* Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/ampduht/24>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Apparel Merchandising and Product Development at ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Apparel Merchandising and Product Development Undergraduate Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact scholar@uark.edu.

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville
ScholarWorks@UARK

Apparel Merchandising and Product Development
Undergraduate Honors Theses

4/2022

Exploring Women's Sizing Chart: A view into PsychoSizing

Patience Billingsley

Psycho sizing in women's apparel: A comparison of sizing charts from 2 major retailers

Patience Billingsley

Mentor: Dr. Laurie Apple, PhD

University of Arkansas

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	pg 4
<i>Background and Need</i>	pg 4
<i>Problem Statement</i>	pg 5
<i>Research Objectives</i>	pg 6
Literature Review.....	pg 6
<i>Sizing Variances</i>	pg 8
<i>Vanity Sizing</i>	pg 9
<i>Body Image</i>	pg 10
<i>Data Collection</i>	pg 11
Methodology.....	pg 11
Results.....	pg 13
<i>Limitations</i>	pg 24
Conclusions and Discussion.....	pg 24
References.....	pg 26

Abstract

The apparel industry lacks a universal sizing system and has created tactics to group consumers under a few generic sizes. The inconsistency in sizing has led to a struggle of consumers trying to find pieces of clothing that are not only their size but fit their measurements as well. An analysis of the sizing charts of 5 different women's clothing private labels ranging from sizes 0-16 within two major department stores was assessed. The sizing charts within each individual store were evaluated, and then compared to one another. After calculating the sizing differences, an average of both store A and store B were used to differentiate the sizing inconsistencies.

The purpose of this study was to closely look at the discrepancies in a numeric sizing system between five private labels of women's clothing brands within two department stores. Sizes 0-16 were the focus, and plus sizes were not included at this time. Shopping for clothes can be difficult, especially when one is unsure of what their true size is. Someone could wear a size 12 comfortably in one brand, but a size 12 could be too big in another brand. The inconsistency in sizing can alter how one views themselves making them think that they are bigger or smaller than what they really are.

Keyword: sizing system, apparel fit, psychosizing

Introduction

Background and Need

Globally, customers as a whole contribute more than one trillion dollars in the apparel market (Smith 2022). The average person in a year spends more than \$500 a year on clothing, and these numbers are predicted to rise rapidly. Customers purchase clothing based on a necessity or for wants such as a special occasion or leisurewear. Even with a vast variety of clothing and retailers, customers still struggle to find clothing that fits their measurements; however, this is due to the fact that the apparel industry lacks a universal sizing chart. Not having a standard sizing system causes sizing inconsistencies to develop from retailer to retailer.

The use of vanity sizing, changing the measurements of a garment to boost customers' confidence, has affected the body image of customers (Alexander, Connell, & Presley, 2005). Even though the average person spends almost \$2,000 a year on apparel, only a few items will fit a person properly. Mislabeling clothing (vanity sizing) as a larger size can create a negative outlook on consumers' body image. The variance in sizes causes customers to view themselves differently in each retailer's garments, and creates the possibility of affecting the way consumers view themselves.

Problem Statement

Vanity sizing alters consumers' body image to become positive or negative. Needing to go up a size larger in clothing weakens a customer's self-esteem (Hoegg, 2013). Many customers fall into categories where it's a struggle to find clothes where the shape of them fits perfectly. For some, there is a negative connotation with needing a larger size. A large size usually has been associated with weight gain. This makes customers believe that they need to make certain body modifications or exercise to reduce their weight. Having to make all these changes to fit into a

smaller size hurts the confidence of the consumer (Kim, 2008). For instance, one brand of jeans could run small and make a customer feel as if they are smaller, while another could make them feel as if they are bigger than what they are. This is not the case at all for some since it is a universal sizing issue. Customer's sizing fluctuates because they are unaware of their true size due to the false reality they are given when purchasing clothes.

The purpose of this study was to examine and analyze the differences of five different sizing charts of women's clothing private label brands in two separate department stores. This was attained through identifying five private label brands of the department store that specializes in women's business professional clothing. The sizing comparisons for sizes 0-16 were compared to determine an average number of the sizing variations.

Research Objectives

This study had three main objectives that will be followed. The first objective was to identify five private label brands within two different retail stores. Both stores must have similar aesthetics and carry women's business professional clothing. This included pant suits, dresses, and skirts. Next the sizing charts for the private labels within store A and store B were compared. Each private label's sizing chart was assessed individually to determine the differences within their respective stores. The last objective compared the sizing differences between the two stores and took an average of both stores to analyze.

Literature Review

Exploring how the inconsistency of sizing in stores affects customers' body image has piqued the interest of many researchers and raised questions about the sizing system in the apparel industry. Different forms of measurement charts, and vanity sizing have been examined through various sources of technology to take a new approach at viewing size and body image

(Song and Ashdown 144). The body cathexis that one has of themselves can be influenced by several factors outside of the sizing scale as well. This can include factors such as socioeconomic status, one's culture, race, and their age (Chattaraman and Rudd, 2006). When one does not have the necessary funds to buy new clothing, they most likely end up with apparel that they have outgrown or must wear items that do not fit properly. If a customer wears clothing that does not compliment their body, this could lead to lower body image.

Apparel not only affects one's physical appearance but plays a major role in their aesthetic (Chattaraman and Rudd, 2006). In society, there is the idea of what the "ideal" body type looks like. Some people try to change their aesthetic to try to fit into these standards. This led to them wearing clothing that is not only uncomfortable to the consumer but sometimes forced them to purchase items that are outside of their budget but are trendy. Aesthetics of clothing are one of the main reasons why a consumer might or might not buy something if it lowers their self-esteem. For example, if a pair of pants makes a consumer look bigger there are less likely to buy that item.

Additionally, the fit preference consumers give themselves puts the pressure on them to fall into the different body shapes that society has constructed and given an either positive or negative connotation to each one. According to Daniel Clay (2005), the older an adolescent girl becomes, the lower both her body image and self-esteem grows (Clay, 2005). This is due to the result of an unrealistic body image established by the apparel industry. Younger girls are easily influenced and feel more pressured to meet these standards. Not only does this lower their body cathexis but can lead to more self-esteem issues that develop even more over time.

Self-reported body size and shape helps retailers better understand their consumers and how to effectively cater to their individual needs. Unfortunately, self-reliance is not always

accurate because customers do not have valid measures of knowing their true size in each brand (Song and Ashdown, 2013). Customers might view themselves as bigger or smaller than what they are. The perception that a customer has of their body can affect how a company creates their sizing system. Due to the perception that consumers have of themselves, this can negatively alter the sizing system for a retailer.

Sizing Variances

The apparel industry includes a wide range of garments and companies; however, there is not a universal sizing standard that all companies follow. Through extensive research it is discovered that over the course of history, sizing has never been consistent in clothing (Clifford, 2011). Customers do not have the opportunity to select or purchase the same size across every retailer they shop with. Like a game, customers have to guess and estimate their size hoping to be correct in the end.

A direct issue of sizing variances is because the United States has not updated their sizing standard since 1970 (Ingraham, 2021). As shown in figure 1, measurements from the 1950's indicated that a size 10 had a bust of 28.5", waist 24", and hip 31.5". Those same measurements would be a size 6 today. Sizes such as 00 were not accommodated for. The sizing system only included those that had a low socio-economic status and mostly white women. Within the past 50 years, the introduction of new technologies and recognition of larger sizes has made the American sizing chart inaccurate. Body shapes, attitudes, and the fit of certain garments have changed over time. As the world continues to grow and change, so do the people in it. Following a sizing trend over three decades old does not relate to the shape of the people today. Because of this, retailers have begun to make their own sizing decisions based on the measurements of their fit models and garments (Gupta, and Gangadhar, 2004). The guides of each retailer are based on

their own judgment, creating their own sizing chart. Some retailers carry brands that are not their own, meaning they too have established a completely different way of measuring their clothing. Not having a set sizing system has created tactics such as vanity sizing in apparel. Vanity sizing has played an important role in retailers' personal sizing.

Vanity Sizing

Vanity sizing, also known as psycho sizing, involves the act of purposefully mislabeling an item, to make customers feel better about themselves (Alexander, Connell, & Presley, 2005). Labeling a pair of jeans that are a 14, but making customers believe that they can still fit into a size 12 is deceiving. Vanity sizing has added to the inconsistency in sizing, and affected the way that customers see themselves in different companies' clothing (Hoegg, 2013). Customers might avoid certain brands because they know that their sizes run smaller or larger than what they actually are and lessens their self-esteem in a particular brand. This can lead to one creating a negative view with that brand in mind.

Women's clothing has been researched to understand how the clothing can positively or negatively affect customers' attitudes about themselves (Guy & Banim, 2000). The sizing variances can help boost confidence, but also weaken it if a customer must go up a size. Vanity sizing immensely impacts customers' body image. When clothing is too tight, it sometimes will showcase areas of a woman's body in a negative light. On the other hand, clothing that is too loose hides a woman's figure and potentially swallows her up. Both sides of the spectrum have the potential to be unflattering.

When consumers are familiar with a specific brand and that brand consistently follows sizing charts that relate to their target market, brand loyalty between the retailer and the customer is produced. Businesses catering to the needs of their target market allows customers to become

familiar with them and establish a strong brand awareness (Prasetia, Wawan, and Hidayat, 2021). Brand awareness not only makes customers aware of a particular brand but makes them become more likely to stay loyal to that brand. Customers can shop at a particular location with the confidence that they will find at least one item of clothing that fits their specific body measurements.

Body Image

The fit of a garment is directly related to the customer's own perception of their body. When surveying customers on how they identified different garments, customers felt more comfortable in clothes that fit their measurements compared to clothing that did not (Kim, 2008). Consumers explained that clothing that was too tight showcased certain areas negatively. Those who fall into the women's plus size category not only face clothing dissatisfaction but have a limited range of resources to find clothes that fit.

Research shows that teen girls, especially, have to spend more money out of pocket due to the rarity of finding clothing (Romeo, 2013). Researcher Eonyou Shin explored customers' overall opinion of fit. Regarding overall fit and aesthetics, most customers were satisfied with their garments (Shin, 2014). Issues with sizing differences, price, and functional fit differed between genders. Several researchers have realized the problems with fit and have turned to technology to help fix these issues. For instance, certain brands of leggings promise that anyone who wears their garment will give the illusion of a bigger bottom (etc.) when in reality the customer looks the same and a change in their size has not changed.

Data Collection

To collect data, five clothing brands were selected from two retailers. The sizing charts were analyzed for the bust, waist, and hip measurements within the store's private label brands

and between the stores. The measurement charts for each brand were analyzed using mathematical equations to find the exact sizing differences between each measurement chart.

Methodology

This study examined the sizing inconsistencies between two major department stores and five of their private labels. The measurement charts from each retailer were compared to their respective stores and then to each other to gather an average number of the sizing differences. The research included a closer look at the sizing variances that occur in the apparel industry.

The conflicting sizing issues within each retailer led to many underlying conditions in their measurement charts. Women's business professional clothing brands were assessed for this study, with sizes 0-16 being the focus. In store A, five private labels (1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, 5A) who carried women's business professional clothing were selected at random. From those brands, the measurement charts of each were obtained and compared against each other. Each size across all five brands were examined to create an average number to give an estimate of a particular size that one might wear at that specific store. For store B, the same procedures were followed (1B, 2B, 3B, 4B, 5B).

When the three labels (private labels 1A, 2A, and 3A) with the same numeric sizing were compared to one of the two outlier private labels (private labels #A and 5A), multiple results were received. The differences between labels 1A and 2A were assessed against label 4A first. Private label 4A starts their sizing with a size 6 being the smallest size (a small) and a size 16 as the largest (a large). From the previous findings, the other brands within retailer A either started with an extra extra small or a small and went up to an extra-large. The sizing differences between the two were found by analyzing the variances from each size and calculating the difference. For example, the sizing differences of a small/medium in the private labels that were the same was

37.5 inches while a small in private label 4A was 34.5. This made the difference between the two -3 inches. The average number for the bust differences was -3.33 inches. The average number between private label A4 and the private labels 1A-3A (with the same measurements) was -1.75 inches for the waist and -1.46 inches for the hip. *Only six numbers were accounted for in the average number since label 4A only has six measurements.*

The second private label outlier in Store A (private label 5A) was compared to label 3A, where similar results appeared. The average number of inch differences for the bust was -1.56. The average number for the bust was smaller between label 5A's comparison to labels 1A-2A than label 4A's comparison because they both had the same number of size categories, whereas private label 4A started their sizing at a size 6. It is important to note that the measurement for both labels in this comparison had the same number for their size 0 which was 33 inches. The average number for the waist was -2.39 inches and -.84 inches.

In store B, all five of their private labels had the exact same measurements for the bust, waist, and hip. The sizing ranged from a double zero being the smallest size (xxs) and a 16 being the largest size (xl) indicating, there were no sizing differences between any of the private labels in store B. The sizing consistency within store B allows customers to shop for their size more accurately because their size within the store does not vary from brand to brand.

Private labels 1A-3A, 4A, and 5A from Store A were then compared to the one sizing chart from Store B. Between labels 1A and Store B, both brands have two separate size categories for an extra small; however, in Store B, there is one category more than private label 1A to accommodate for their extra extra small (which is a size zero). The average number for the different bust sizes between the two was -1.89 inches, and the waist was -1.78 inches. Sizes 6, 8, and 10 were the same number for both sizing charts for the hip. This makes the average number

of the differences for the hip -1.54 inches. Private labels 1A-3A overall were closer in size to Store B.

Within Private label 4A and Store B, the results of the sizing differences followed as expected. Because private label 4A's sizing chart has their small start at size 6, only 6 numbers were compared. Of those numbers, the sizing discrepancy for the bust was -1 inch for each size. The difference for the waist was -.58 inches and -2.5 inches for the hip.

Lastly, private label 5A and all five private labels from Store B were compared. The bust, waist, and hip numeric discrepancy between all three had a consistent difference within each category. The average number for the bust from private label 5A and Store B was -.5 inches. The average number was also -.5 inches for the waist as well. The hip had an average of -1.5 inches.

Results

Within each retailer, both stores were examined internally to evaluate the sizing differences between their own private labels. Measurements for both stores were taken in inches. Store A had three private labels that have identical sizing charts for the bust, waist, and the hip. Of the three brands that had the same measurements, their sizing from small to largest had a minor difference. Private labels 1A and 2A used small, medium, etc. labels to categorize their sizes; however, private label 1A had sizes ranging from extra extra small to a large being the biggest size. Label 2A did not account for an extra extra small, but had sizes ranging from extra small to extra large. Unlike this label, private brand 1A did not have an extra large category. Private label 3A labeled their sizes with numeric size categories only. Private labels 1A and 3A sized their clothing with an size 0 being labeled as an extra small, sizes 2 and 4 a small, 6 and 8 were a medium, 10 and 12 were larges, and sizes 14 and 16 were marked as an extra large.

Private brand 1A labeled a size 0 an extra extra small, sizes 2 and 4 an extra small, 6 and 8 a small, 10 and 12 a medium, and sizes 14 and 16 a large.

Limitations

Because only women's business professional clothing was assessed for this research, the sizing charts for other styles of clothing could change future results. For instance, if women's activewear was the focal point, there is the possibility that Store B could have sizing charts that differ from each other. Another limitation includes only studying sizes 0-16. Since plus sizes were excluded from this study, some results could have been skewed.

Conclusions

Calculating the sizing inconsistencies within two department stores and their private labels established a variety of results. In Store A, three of the five private labels had the same numeric sizing charts but had a discrepancy within what the size would be labeled. For example, a 33 inch bust would be marked as a size 0 in each brand but categorized as an extra small in private label 1A, an extra small in private label 2A, but remain as a size 0 in private label 3A. The other two brands (4A and 5A) in Store A had measurement charts that differed from each other. Label 4A had higher average numbers when compared to the other three brands than label 5A. Store A had inconsistent sizing charts that vary from brand to brand. This can be a result of the use of different pattern sizes being used within each private label.

Store B had measurement charts that were identical within each brand for the bust, waist, and hip.. Because of this, there was no need to find any discrepancies in any of the private labels. When Store B was compared to any of the private labels in Store A, most of the results were a consistent number. Store B scaled their sizing in increments of .5, which resulted in average numbers being intervals of .5 as well. Additionally, they were more size inclusive. Store B

included extra sizes such as an extra extra small (00), when Store A did not have sizes that small for many of their sizing charts. These small sizes could be a result of the size of their consumer or what they are wanting and wearing. This also could be that Store A has not updated their sizing system, while Store B could be using new measurement scaling.

Future research can include a closer analysis of the fit of clothing and its effect on women's body image. To conduct this, women can be asked a series of questions about their body image through a survey and find their accurate size using three dimensional (3D) body scanning technology. They can be shown sizing charts of private labels from both Store A and Store B. From there, they can be asked which sizing chart would help improve their body image and which would they be more willing to wear. These same women can try on clothing from each brand in their marked size to see how much the sizing discrepancies affects the way they feel in a certain brand. Pinpointing the discrepancies can help determine which stores consumers are more likely to shop at based on a store's sizing chart. This will not only help create a more consistent sizing system in stores, but an overall shopping experience for customers.

The use of grading in sizing can be meticulously examined in the future as well. The pattern that one department store uses for their clothing could lay out the foundation for how their private labels determine how to create sizing charts. This could open up more research to conclude how often stores are updating their sizing system. Later, studies can be done to compare how closely the grading scale for one department is to another one. From there, studies can inspect not only the manufacturing process for an individual department store, but also the sizing differences between an original sample size to what that size is now labeled as.

References

- Calogero, R. M., Herbozo, S., & Thompson, J. K. (2009). Complimentary weightism: The potential costs of appearance-related commentary for women's self-objectification. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 33(1), 120-132.
- Chattaraman, Veena, and Nancy Ann Rudd. "Preferences for Aesthetic Attributes in Clothing as a Function of Body Image, Body Cathexis and Body Size." *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, vol. 24, no. 1, 2006, pp. 46–61., <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887302x0602400104>.
- Clay, Daniel & Vignoles, Vivian & Dittmar, Helga. (2005). Body Image and Self-Esteem Among Adolescent Girls: Testing the Influence of Sociocultural Factors. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 15. 451 - 477. 10.1111/j.1532-7795.2005.00107.x.
- Clifford, S. (2011, Apr 25). One size fits nobody: Seeking a steady 4 or a 10: [Business/Financial desk]. *New York Times* Retrieved from <http://0-search.proquest.com.library.uark.edu/docview/863114007?accountid=8361>
- Common Objective. "Volume and Consumption: How Much Does the World Buy?" *Common Objective*, Common Objective, 14 May 2018, <https://www.commonobjective.co/article/volume-and-consumption-how-much-does-the-world-buy>.
- Grant R. Tomkinson, Linda G. Shaw, Quantification of the postural and technical errors in asymptomatic adults using direct 3D whole body scan measurements of standing posture, *Gait & Posture*, Volume 37, Issue 2, 2013, Pages 172-177

- Gupta, D., & Gangadhar, B. R. (2004). COMMUNICATIONS: A statistical model for developing body size charts for garments. *International Journal of Clothing Science and Technology*, 16(5), 458-469.
- Ingraham, Christopher. "The Absurdity of Women's Clothing Sizes, in One Chart." *The Washington Post*, WP Company, 25 Nov. 2021, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2015/08/11/the-absurdity-of-womens-clothing-sizes-in-one-chart/>.
- Kim, H. (2008). *The impact of body image self-discrepancy on body dissatisfaction, fashion involvement, concerns with fit and size of garments, and loyalty intentions in online apparel shopping* (Order No. 3316247). Available from ProQuest Central. (193669516).
- Leong, I., Jing-Jing, F., & Ming-June Tsai. (2013). A feature-based anthropometry for garment industry. *International Journal of Clothing Science and Technology*, 25(1), 6-23. Doi:
- Miell, S. L. (2018). *Enabling the digital fashion consumer through gamified fit and sizing experience technologies* (Order No. 10836851). Available from ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Global: Science & Technology. (2116891232).
- Prasetia, Wawan, and Anas Hidayat. "Influence of Brand Awareness, Brand Association, Perceived Quality, and Brand Loyalty on Purchase Intention." *Archives of Business Research*, vol. 9, no. 12, 2021, pp. 132–144., <https://doi.org/10.14738/abr.912.11374>.
- Romeo, L. D. (2013). *Exploration of plus-size female teens' apparel fit and sizing in the united states* (Order No. 3610698). Available from ProQuest Central. (1500551800).

Shin, E. (2014). *Exploring consumers' fit perceptions and satisfaction with apparel fit in general* (Order No. AAI1540128). Available from Sociological Abstracts. (1531934520; 201426516).

Smith, P. "Topic: Apparel Market Worldwide." *Statista*, 3 Mar. 2022, https://www.statista.com/topics/5091/apparel-market-worldwide/#topicHeader__wrapper.

Song, Hwa Kyung, and Susan P. Ashdown. "Female Apparel Consumers' Understanding of Body Size and Shape." *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, vol. 31, no. 3, 2013, pp. 143–156., <https://doi.org/10.1177/0887302x13493127>.

Tables and Figures

Pattern Size		10	12	14	16	18	20	40	42	44	46	
WOMEN'S and MISSES' SIZES	Bust	28½	30	32	34	36	38	40	42	44	46	INS.
	Waistline	24	25	26	28	30	32	34	36	38½	41	"
	Hip	31½	33	35	37	39	41	43	45	47	49	"
	Center Back from Socket Bone to Waist	15⅞	16	16¼	16½	16¾	17	17⅛	17¼	17⅜	17½	"
	Across Back	12⅝	13	13½	14	14½	15	15½	16	16½	17	"
	Arm Girth	9⅝	10	10½	11	11½	12	13	13½	14	14½	"
	Underarm Length	17	17¼	17½	17¾	18	18¼	18¼	18¼	18¼	18¼	"

Figure 1. Vintage 1950s Sewing: Pattern Measurement Chart for Women from Pintucks

	SIZE	BUST	WAIST	HIPS
xxs	0	33	26.5	35.5
xs	2	34.5	28	37
xs	4	36	29.5	38.5
s	6	37.5	31	40
s	8	38.5	32	41
m	10	40	33.5	41.5
m	12	41.5	35	42
l	14	43	36.5	42.75
l	16	44.5	38	43.5

Table 1. Women's sizing chart from store A. Private label 1A.

	SIZE	BUST	WAIST	HIPS
xxs	0	31.5	25	36
xs	0	32.5	26	37
xs	2	33.5	27	38
s	4	34.5	28	39
s	6	35.5	29	40
m	8	36.5	30	41
m	10	37.5	31	42
l	12	39	32.5	43.5
l	14	40.5	34	35
xl	16	42	35.5	46.5

Women's sizing chart from store B. Private label 1B.

	SIZE	BUST	WAIST	HIPS
xs	0	33	26.5	35.5
s	2	34.5	28	37
s	4	36	29.5	38.5
m	6	37.5	31	40
m	8	38.5	32	41
l	10	40	33.5	41.5
l	12	41.5	35	42
xl	14	43	36.5	42.75
xl	16	44.5	38	43.5

Table 2. Private label 2A. Size chart with the same numeric measurements, but letter sizing differences from Private labels 1A and 3A.

SIZE	BUST	WAIST	HIPS
0	33	26.5	35.5
2	34.5	28	37
4	36	29.5	38.5
6	37.5	31	40
8	38.5	32	41
10	40	33.5	41.5
12	41.5	35	42
14	43	36.5	42.75
16	44.5	38	43.5

Table 3. Private label 3A size with same numeric measurements but does not use letter sizing.

BUST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE (1A)	PRIVATE LABEL 1A	SIZE (2A)	PRIVATE LABEL 2A	SIZE (4A)	PRIVATE LABEL 4A	RESULTS
xxs (0)	33	xs (0)	33			
xs (2)	34.5	s (2)	34.5			
xs (4)	36	s (4)	36			
s (6)	37.5	m (6)	37.5	s (6)	34.5	-3
s (8)	38.5	m (8)	38.5	s (8)	35.5	-3
m (10)	40	l (10)	40	m (10)	36.5	-3.5
m (12)	41.5	l (12)	41.5	m (12)	38	-3.5
l (14)	43	xl (14)	43	l (14)	39.5	-3.5
l (16)	44.5	xl (16)	44.5	l (16)	41	-3.5

Table 4. Bust comparison chart for private labels 1A, 2A, and 4A.

WAIST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 1A		PRIVATE LABEL 2A		PRIVATE LABEL 4A	RESULTS	
xxs (0)	26.5		xs (0)	26.5			
xs (2)	28		s (2)	28			
xs (4)	29.5		s (4)	29.5			
s (6)	31		m (6)	31	s (6)	29.5	-1.5
s (8)	32		m (8)	32	s (8)	30.5	-1.5
m (10)	33.5		l (10)	33.5	m (10)	31.5	-2
m (12)	35		l (12)	35	m (12)	33	-2
l (14)	36.5		xl (14)	36.5	l (14)	34.5	-2
l (16)	38		xl (16)	38	l (16)	36.5	-1.5

Table 5. Waist comparison chart for private labels 1A, 2A, and 4A .

HIP SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 1A		PRIVATE LABEL 2A		PRIVATE LABEL 4A	RESULTS	
xxs (0)	35.5		xs (0)	35.5			
xs (2)	37		s (2)	37			
xs (4)	38.5		s (4)	38.5			
s (6)	40		m (6)	40	s (6)	37.5	-2.5
s (8)	41		m (8)	41	s (8)	38.5	-2.5
m (10)	41.5		l (10)	41.5	m (10)	39.5	-2
m (12)	42		l (12)	42	m (12)	41	-1
l (14)	42.75		xl (14)	42.75	l (14)	42.5	-0.25
l (16)	43.5		xl (16)	43.5	l (16)	44	-0.5

Table 6. Hip comparison chart for private labels 1A, 2A, and 4A .

BUST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE (3A)	PRIVATE LABEL 3A	SIZE (5A)	PRIVATE LABEL 5A	RESULTS
0	33	xs (0)	33	
2	34.5	xs (2)	34	-0.5
4	36	s (4)	35	-1
6	37.5	s (6)	36	-1.5
8	38.5	m (8)	37	-1.5
10	40	m (10)	38	-2
12	41.5	l (12)	39.5	-2
14	43	l (14)	41	-2
16	44.5	xl (16)	42.5	-2

Table 7. Bust comparison chart for private labels 3A and 5A.

WAIST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 3A		PRIVATE LABEL 5A	RESULTS
0	26.5	xs (0)	25.5	-1
2	28	xs (2)	26.5	-1.5
4	29.5	s (4)	27.5	-2
6	31	s (6)	28.5	-2.5
8	32	m (8)	29.5	-2.5
10	33.5	m (10)	30.5	-3
12	35	l (12)	32	-3
14	36.5	l (14)	33.5	-3
16	38	xl (16)	35	-3

Table 8. Waist comparison chart for private labels 3A and 5A.

HIP SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 3A		PRIVATE LABEL 5A	RESULTS
0	35.5	xs (0)	35.5	
2	37	xs (2)	36.5	-0.5
4	38.5	s (4)	37.5	-1
6	40	s (6)	38.5	-1.5
8	41	m (8)	39.5	-1.5
10	42	m (10)	40.5	-1.5
12	42.5	l (12)	42	-0.5
14	42.75	l (14)	43.5	-0.75
16	43.5	xl (16)	45	-1.5

Table 9. Hip comparison chart for private labels 3A and 5A.

BUST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 1B	PRIVATE LABEL 2B	PRIVATE LABEL 3B	PRIVATE LABEL 4B	PRIVATE LABEL 5B
xxs (00)	31.5	31.5	31.5	31.5	31.5
xs (0)	32.5	32.5	32.5	32.5	32.5
xs (2)	33.5	33.5	33.5	33.5	33.5
s (4)	34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5	34.5
s (6)	35.5	35.5	35.5	35.5	35.5
m (8)	36.5	36.5	36.5	36.5	36.5
m (10)	37.5	37.5	37.5	37.5	37.5
l (12)	39	39	39	39	39
l (14)	40.5	40.5	40.5	40.5	40.5
xl (16)	42	xl (16) 42	xl (16) 42	xl (16) 42	xl (16) 42

Table 10. Bust comparison chart for all 5 private labels in Store B.

WAIST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVAT E LABEL 1B	PRIVAT E LABEL 2B	PRIVAT E LABEL 3B	PRIVAT E LABEL 4B	PRIVAT E LABEL 5B
xxs (00)	25	25	25	25	25
xs (0)	26	26	26	26	26
xs (2)	27	27	27	27	27
s (4)	28	28	28	28	28
s (6)	29	29	29	29	29
m (8)	30	30	30	30	30
m (10)	31	31	31	31	31
l (12)	32.5	32.5	32.5	32.5	32.5
l (14)	34	34	34	34	34
xl (16)	35.5	35.5	35.5	35.5	35.5

*Table 11. Waist comparison chart for all 5 private labels in Store B.***HIP SIZE (in inches)**

SIZE	PRIVAT E LABEL 1B	PRIVAT E LABEL 2B	PRIVAT E LABEL 3B	PRIVAT E LABEL 4B	PRIVAT E LABEL 5B
xxs (00)	36	36	36	36	36
xs (0)	37	37	37	37	37
xs (2)	38	38	38	38	38
s (4)	39	39	39	39	39
s (6)	40	40	40	40	40
m (8)	41	41	41	41	41
m (10)	42	42	42	42	42
l (12)	43.5	43.5	43.5	43.5	43.5
l (14)	35	35	35	35	35
xl (16)	46.5	46.5	46.5	46.5	46.5

Table 12. Hip comparison chart for all 5 private labels in Store B.

BUST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 1A	PRIVATE LABEL 2A	PRIVATE LABEL 3A	STORE B	RESULTS
				xxs (00) 31.5	
XXS 0	33	xs (0) 33	0 33	xs (0) 32.5	-0.5
XS 2	34.5	s (2) 34.5	2 34.5	xs (2) 33.5	-1
XS4	36	s (4) 36	4 36	s (4) 34.5	-1.5
S 6	37.5	m (6) 37.5	6 37.5	s (6) 35.5	-2
S 8	38.5	m (8) 38.5	8 38.5	m (8) 36.5	-2
M 10	40	l (10) 40	10 40	m (10) 37.5	-2.5
M 12	41.5	l (12) 41.5	12 41.5	l (12) 39	-2.5
L 14	43	xl (14) 43	14 43	l (14) 40.5	-2.5
L 16	44.5	xl (16) 44.5	16 44.5	xl (16) 42	-2.5

Table 13. Bust comparison chart for private labels 1A-3A in Store A and all 5 private labels in Store B.

WAIST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 1A	PRIVATE LABEL 2A	PRIVATE LABEL 3A	STORE B	RESULTS
				xxs (00) 25	
XXS 0	26.5	xs (0) 26.5	0 26.5	xs (0) 26	-0.5
XS 2	28	s (2) 28	2 28	xs (2) 27	-1
XS4	29.5	s (4) 29.5	4 29.5	s (4) 28	-0.5
S 6	31	m (6) 31	6 31	s (6) 29	-2
S 8	32	m (8) 32	8 32	m (8) 30	-2
M 10	33.5	l (10) 33.5	10 33.5	m (10) 31	-2.5
M 12	35	l (12) 35	12 35	l (12) 32.5	-2.5
L 14	36.5	xl (14) 36.5	14 36.5	l (14) 34	-2.5
L 16	38	xl (16) 38	16 38	xl (16) 35.5	-2.5

Table 14. Waist comparison chart for private labels 1A-3A in Store A and all 5 private labels in Store B.

HIP SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 1A	PRIVATE LABEL 2A	PRIVATE LABEL 3A	STORE B	RESULTS
				xxs (00) 36	
XXS 0	35.5	xs (0) 35.5	0 35.5	xs (0) 37	-1.5
XS 2	37	s (2) 37	2 37	xs (2) 38	-1
XS4	38.5	s (4) 38.5	4 38.5	s (4) 39	-0.5
S 6	40	m (6) 40	6 40	s (6) 40	
S 8	41	m (8) 41	8 41	m (8) 41	
M 10	41.5	l (10) 41.5	10 42	m (10) 42	
M 12	42	l (12) 42	12 42.5	l (12) 43.5	-1
L 14	42.75	xl (14) 42.75	14 42.75	l (14) 45	-2.25
L 16	43.5	xl (16) 43.5	16 43.5	xl (16) 46.5	-3

Table 15. Hip comparison chart for private labels 1A-3A in Store A and all 5 private labels in Store B. Sizes 6, 8, and 10 had the same measurements for all 4 brands.

BUST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 4A	STORE B	RESULTS
		xxs (00) 31.5	
		xs (0) 32.5	
		xs (2) 33.5	
		s (4) 34.5	
s (6)	34.5	s (6) 35.5	-1
s (8)	35.5	m (8) 36.5	-1
m (10)	36.5	m (10) 37.5	-1
m (12)	38	l (12) 39	-1
l (14)	39.5	l (14) 40.5	-1
l (16)	41	xl (16) 42	-1

Table 16. Bust comparison chart for private label 4A and all 5 private labels in Store B.

WAIST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 4A		STORE B	RESULTS
		xxs (00)	25	
		xs (0)	26	
		xs (2)	27	
		s (4)	28	
s (6)	29.5	s (6)	29	-0.5
s (8)	30.5	m (8)	30	-0.5
m (10)	31.5	m (10)	31	-0.5
m (12)	33	l (12)	32.5	-0.5
l (14)	34.5	l (14)	34	-0.5
l (16)	36.5	xl (16)	35.5	-1

Table 17. Waist comparison chart for private label 4A and all 5 private labels in Store B.

HIP SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 4A		STORE B	RESULTS
		xxs (00)	36	
		xs (0)	37	
		xs (2)	38	
		s (4)	39	
s (6)	37.5	s (6)	40	-2.5
s (8)	38.5	m (8)	41	-2.5
m (10)	39.5	m (10)	42	-2.5
m (12)	41	l (12)	43.5	-2.5
l (14)	42.5	l (14)	45	-2.5
l (16)	44	xl (16)	46.5	-2.5

Table 18. Hip comparison chart for private label 4A and all 5 private labels in Store B

BUST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 5A		STORE B	RESULTS
		xxs (00)	31.5	
xs (0)	33	xs (0)	32.5	-0.5
xs (2)	34	xs (2)	33.5	-0.5
s (4)	35	s (4)	34.5	-0.5
s (6)	36	s (6)	35.5	-0.5
m (8)	37	m (8)	36.5	-0.5
m (10)	38	m (10)	37.5	-0.5
l (12)	39.5	l (12)	39	-0.5
l (14)	41	l (14)	40.5	-0.5
xl (16)	42.5	xl (16)	42	-0.5

Table 19. Bust comparison chart for private label 5A and all 5 private labels in Store B.

WAIST SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 5A		STORE B	RESULTS
		xxs (00)	25	
xs (0)	25.5	xs (0)	26	-0.5
xs (2)	26.5	xs (2)	27	-0.5
s (4)	27.5	s (4)	28	-0.5
s (6)	28.5	s (6)	29	-0.5
m (8)	29.5	m (8)	30	-0.5
m (10)	30.5	m (10)	31	-0.5
l (12)	32	l (12)	32.5	-0.5
l (14)	33.5	l (14)	34	-0.5
xl (16)	35	xl (16)	35.5	-0.5

Table 20. Waist comparison chart for private label 5A and all 5 private labels in Store B.

HIP SIZE (in inches)

SIZE	PRIVATE LABEL 5A		STORE B	RESULTS
		xxs (00)	36	
xs (0)	35.5	xs (0)	37	-1.5
xs (2)	36.5	xs (2)	38	-1.5
s (4)	37.5	s (4)	39	-1.5
s (6)	38.5	s (6)	40	-1.5
m (8)	39.5	m (8)	41	-1.5
m (10)	40.5	m (10)	42	-1.5
l (12)	42	l (12)	43.5	-1.5
l (14)	43.5	l (14)	45	-1.5
xl (16)	45	xl (16)	46.5	-1.5

Table 21. Waist comparison chart for private label 5A and all 5 private labels in Store B.