



Field : Fashion Design

Type : Research Article

Received: 06.02.2016 - *Accepted*:25.04.2016

Does the Attire and Style of Job Applicant Affect the Interviewer Perception?¹

Saliha AĞAÇ

Gazi University, Art & Design Faculty, Fashion Design Department, Gölbaşı, Ankara, TURKEY

Email: asaliha@gazi.edu.tr, agacsaliha@gmail.com

Abstract

Next to primary factors directly affecting success in a professional work environment, there are numerous secondary factors which also contribute. External appearance, demeanour, manner of speech, body language are among them. In one's mind only several minutes are sufficient to form an "image" of a person newly met. This period is filled with bidirectional messages involving appearance, posture and interaction. Appearance holds an important position within these first few minutes and may create an effect as much as 55% or more. The basic objective of this study is to determine how interviewers perceive the job applicants using differing attire types. This research is based on relevant studies and survey data obtained from 1232 women and man administrator in private(695) and public(537) sector active in Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir, the most populous cities of Turkiye. The Survey Method was used in our research. Due to richness of women's attire in comparison to men's, our study is limited to the women's clothing styles. To avoid the effect of clothing color and facial expressions, the survey models were designed as drawings. Each model was accompanied by 28 adjectives. Survey participant administrators were requested to contemplate the attire types, consider their perceptions and describe the applicants according to adjectives provided. The data obtained were transferred to SPSS software package and incorporated to cross-tables formulated according to the sector types of interviewer administrators. The χ^2 relationship analyses were used to measure the statistical correlation between business sector variables in the perception of clothing types. The study exhibited that attire types influenced the perception of individuals, and the differences in perception were the result of individuals' gender, business sectors, opinions, life styles, and world perspectives.

Keywords: Types of clothes, job applicant, individual image.

¹ This article was presented in the 5th International Science, Culture and Sport Conference, which was held in Kazakhstan from 13th to the 15th of April, 2016.



İş Başvurusunda Bireyin Algılanmasında Giysi Türleri ve Modellerinin Etkisi Var mıdır?

Öz

Profesyonel bir çalışma ortamında, başarıyı doğrudan etkileyen faktörlerin yanında, dolaylı yollardan etkileyen birçok yan faktör de bulunmaktadır. İş yaşamında dış görünüş, beden dili, konuşma şekli gibi birçok faktör etki yaratmaktadır. Yeni karşılaşılan bir insanın kafasında bir “imaj” oluşturmak için sadece bir kaç dakikaya ihtiyaç duyulmaktadır. Bu süre içinde fiziksel özellikler, duruş, giyilen kıyafet karşı tarafa bazı mesajlar yollamaktadır. Bu bir kaç dakika içinde, dış görüntü çok önemli bir yer tutmakta ve yüzde 55 oranında bir etki yaratmaktadır. Bu araştırmada temel amaç farklı giysi türlerini kullanan bireylerin, iş başvurularını değerlendiren yöneticiler tarafından nasıl algılandığını belirlemektir. Araştırmanın materyalini, Türkiye'nin en fazla nüfus yoğunluğuna sahip İstanbul, Ankara ve İzmir illerinde faaliyet gösteren özel(695) ve kamu(537) kuruluşlarında çalışan 1232 kadın ve erkek yöneticiden anket yardımıyla elde edilen veriler ve ilgili kaynaklar oluşturmaktadır. Araştırmada Tarama Yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Araştırma kadın giysilerinin, erkek giysilerine oranla daha fazla çeşitlilik göstermesi nedeniyle kadın giysi türleri ile sınırlandırılmıştır. Giysinin renginin ve yüz ifadesinin algılamayı etkilememesi için modeller sadece çizgi olarak tasarlanmıştır. Her modelin yanına 28 adet sıfat verilmiştir. Araştırmaya katılan yöneticilerden giysi tarzlarına bir süre bakarak, bu giysi kullanıcılarını nasıl algıladıklarını düşünmeleri ve verilen sıfatlarla tanımlamaları istenmiştir. Elde edilen sonuçlar SPSS istatistik paket programına aktarılarak, yöneticilerin cinsiyetlerine ve çalıştıkları sektör tipine göre oluşturulan çapraz tablolara aktarılmıştır. Giysi türlerinin algılanmasında cinsiyet ve çalışılan sektör değişkenleri arasında istatistiksel ilişkinin ölçümü için c^2 ilişki analizi kullanılmıştır. Araştırmada, giysi türlerinin bireyleri algılamada etkili olduğu: giysi türlerinin algılanmasında oluşan farklılıkların bireylerin cinsiyetleri, çalıştıkları sektör, görüşleri, yaşam tarzları, dünyaya bakış açılarının farklı olmasından kaynaklandığı sonucuna ulaşılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Giysi türleri, iş başvurusu, bireysel imaj



Introduction

Communication is the process whereby individuals exchange messages, thoughts and feelings consciously or unconsciously. First impressions are always distinguishing and critical. Humans initially form impressions by looking at the external appearance of others (Altınöz ve Suvari, 2000: 26). Instantaneous valuations based on the first perceptions at an initial meeting are defined as the primacy effect (Dincer, 1998: 10). Some communication experts defend the opinion that “one enters a context with appearance and be judged later by personality”. Molloy (1977) suggests that “a woman needs drive, ambition, intelligence, and education to move up the executive ladder. Without those qualities the best clothing in the world won’t do anything for her. But even with them, if she doesn’t have the right clothing, she won’t get ahead”, and emphasizes the importance of attire. One of the important and fundamental prerequisites of image, the attire is indicative of self-awareness and a leading condition of positive effect. Psychologists think that external image represents the inner person (Pakkan, 2002).

In a professional work environment, there are numerous influential side-factors in addition to preliminary factors which affect success directly. Among these, personal appearance and attire selection is an important element of silent communication. Image conveys messages to the person opposite like jests and mimics, and these complement the judgement being formed subconsciously (Dincer, 1998: 6). Attire conveys messages nearly as strongly as the words and body language. Selected attire style reflects individual’s taste and contextual psychology as well the importance the person attaches to those present. A person’s attire must fit the space and time (Kabadayı, 2011; Finance Higher Training Directorate, Ministry of Finance, 2007)

In professional life, many factors such as personal appearance, body-language, speech mannerisms create effects. A person attending a job interview or business meeting is evaluated primarily by his/her attire, behaviour and grooming (Altınöz & Suvari, 2000: 26; McDaniel & Pardon, 2000). Generally, three points are effective in selecting an attire appropriate to the work. These are: Services provided or products sold by the employee, and the cultural criteria established according to the image adopted by clients or institutions receiving the service (Dincer, 1998: 18).

Only few minutes are needed to form an ‘image’ in the mind of a person newly met. In these few minutes, the appearance holds a very significant place and creates an effect of 55%. Voice is rated at 38%, and the ‘content’ effect is only 7% (Sampson, 1995; Erdemli, 2004). Zunin’s work titled “Contact : the first four minutes” (1992) indicates this duration as four minutes, and that in such a short period the relationship’s foundation is laid. In these four minutes persons are either distanced apart or decide to pursue a closer relationship.

Especially during the ‘silent moment’ intervals among the participants in job interviews when individuals measure the other or the environment with glances, the impression had plays a role in acceptance or refusal. In other words, in these moments called “silent communication”, important positive and negative data is exchanged among the participants, and the impact of such data persists for an extended period. According to some studies, 90% of the humans form judgements on the basis of initial perceptions of the first few minutes using their impressions of attire, physical attributes, body-language, etc. (Dincer, 1998: 6). Hence, one of the very first things to be done for creation of positive image is supporting an attire appropriate for the job.



In Bateman and Mawby (2004) study titled “First impressions count: interviewer appearance and information effects in stated preferences”, the researchers examined the attire and education level of persons collecting donations for an environmental cause and found that largest sums were collected by those with formal attires and higher education. In the same study, it was also observed that even with much higher education, those with casual appearance collected 40% less as compared to those with formal appearance, and thus significance of attire was demonstrated.

This study aims to exhibit the ‘silent communication element attire’ perceptions of human-resource administrators in the public and private sector organizations of Turkiye.

Materials and Method

Research material consists of data obtained from 1232 administrators of both genders surveyed at public and private sector in dense population centers of İstanbul, Ankara and İzmir, in addition to other subject related reference studies.

Objective of this study is to determine how job applicants using various attires are perceived by administrators evaluating them. Screening method is used for this purpose. The survey prepared for data collection has been tested first on 78 managers of both genders in Ankara through six female attires and personal attributions assigned by 47 individuals. The results of this study have been presented for discussion at an international conference. On the basis of evaluation by conference participants, continuation of the study was decided. Based on suggestions provided, findings and statistical analyses the survey was reformed. Attributions not signified by the sampling and not found meaningful in any model were removed and the numbers of adjectives attributed were reduced to 28. Additionally, although appearing similar, to measure whether small changes were effective on perceiving of individuals, the number of models was raised to 8.

In sampling selection, using the simple coincidental sampling technique, interested persons were asked to participate in the survey on volunteer basis. The finalized survey, including 8 models for understanding the target sample in terms of their definitions of attire attributes, and containing demographic questions, was applied to 1232 administrators (private sector, 695; public sector, 537) from both genders and functioning in most populous cities of Turkiye, namely Istanbul, Ankara and Izmir.

Attire is very important for leaving a positive impression in job interviews. Whatever the personal style, the preference of formal attire is generally considered appropriate. Suits, cloth trousers or knee-high skirt and plain colour blouse is amongst the suggested attires for job interviews. Additionally, skirt and blouse worn is cautioned not to be a model very assertive or pretentious.

Study is limited to women’s attires due to richness of selection as compared to men. In order to neutralize the models in terms of attire color and facial expression for prevention of impact on perceptions, models were designed as drawings. Model designs were developed according to general rules governing work environments (Figure 1).



Figure 1. Attire Models For Study Survey

Each model was assigned 28 attributional adjectives. Participating administrators were asked to examine the styles for a period, consider their perceptions and point out the adjectives best defining their impressions. Data obtained were transferred to SPSS statistical software package, and cross-tables were created on the basis of sector type(public, private) in which administrators functioned.

For measurement of statistical relationship between the variables of distribution according to sector and attire adjective attribution definitions, χ^2 relationship analysis was used. For relationship testing the hypotheses were structured as follows:

H⁰ = There is no statistical relationship between the variables of sample sectoral distribution and attributional adjective definitions.

H¹ = There is a statistical relationship between the variables of sample sectoral distribution and attributional adjective definitions.

For hypothesis acceptance or rejection, the probability value was assessed at the meaningfulness level $P < 0,05$ and only those found meaningful were included in this text.



Findings

In this section the findings based on survey collected data is presented.

Table 1. Demographic Findings

		Gender		Men		TOTAL		χ^2	P
		Women		S	%	S	%		
Sector		S	%	S	%	S	%		
Public Sector	Doctorate	16	7,0	30	9,8	46	8,6	4,398	0,623
	Master's Degree	44	19,1	67	21,8	111	20,7		
	Bachelor's Degree	113	49,1	134	43,6	247	46,0		
	College	19	8,3	25	8,1	44	8,2		
	High School	30	13,0	35	11,4	65	12,1		
	Secondary School	3	1,3	9	2,9	12	2,2		
	Primary School	5	2,2	7	2,3	12	2,2		
	SUBTOTAL	230	100,0	307	100,0	537	100,0		
Private Sector	Doctorate	6	2,6	26	5,7	32	4,6	126,254	0,000
	Master's Degree	6	2,6	61	13,3	67	9,6		
	Bachelor's Degree	127	54,0	122	26,5	249	35,8		
	College	21	8,9	75	16,3	96	13,8		
	High School	14	6,0	122	26,5	136	19,6		
	Secondary School	18	7,7	33	7,2	51	7,3		
	Primary School	43	18,3	21	4,6	64	9,2		
	SUBTOTAL	235	100,0	460	100,0	695	100,0		
TOTAL		465	37,7	767	62,3	1232	100,0		

When the demographic findings for survey participant administrators in Table 1 are examined, it is seen that 37.7% are women and 62.3% are men and for both sectors as well as gender, most clustering in terms of education is at the Bachelor's Degree level. As an incidental observation, it should be noted that this also indicates a rise in women's status in the work life.



According to the Chi Square (χ^2) test done to determine whether a meaningful intra-sectoral relationship existed between the educational levels of men and women, the results indicated a statistically meaningful relationship in the private sector ($\chi^2=126,254$, $P=0,000$).

Table 2. Rates of Concurrence with Attires Reflecting Personality

Sector		Gender		Women		Men		TOTAL		χ^2	P
		S	%	S	%	S	%				
Public Sector	Reflects	137	59,6	185	60,3	322	60,0	2,698	0,260		
	Partially reflects	83	36,1	99	32,2	182	33,9				
	Does not reflect	10	4,3	23	7,5	33	6,1				
	SUBTOTAL	230	100,0	307	100,0	537	100,0				
Private Sector	Reflects	102	43,4	255	55,4	357	51,4	23,945	0,000		
	Partially reflects	77	32,8	158	34,3	235	33,8				
	Does not reflect	56	23,8	47	10,2	103	14,8				
	SUBTOTAL	235	100,0	460	100,0	695	100,0				
TOTAL		465	37,7	767	62,3	1232	100,0				

When the Table 2 containing participant responses to the question whether “Attire styles reflect personality?” is examined, highest concurrence was indicated both in terms of gender and the sector involved.

According to sectoral women and men membership, when opinions whether or not attire styles of individuals reflect personality was examined with Chi Square (χ^2) test, a statistically meaningful relationship was identified among the survey participants from the private sector ($\chi^2=23,945$, $P=0,000$).



Table 3. Model Attribute Definitions Per Sector Considered

Attribute	SECTORS															
	Public								Private							
	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8	M1	M2	M3	M4	M5	M6	M7	M8
Choices	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Open Minded	27,6	20,7	17,1	23,8	18,8	12,7	17,5	14,7	30,5	26,3	17,4	25,9	17,8	10,1	15,1	15,5
Intelligent	26,6	22,0	11,2	22,0	31,5	16,0	19,0	18,1	26,6	34,5	14,0	17,7	39,4	18,3	25,6	20,7
Active	5,9	25,9	25,0	20,7	24,0	14,5	26,4	20,5	33,4	27,9	29,9	24,0	27,9	17,1	29,4	26,2
Unusual	7,1	6,7	26,1	16,4	5,2	14,7	9,3	15,8	3,2	4,3	16,4	12,4	3,7	9,8	6,3	8,9
Serious	24,6	30,5	7,8	19,0	46,0	18,6	16,4	11,5	26,3	40,9	9,8	16,3	52,9	20,9	32,1	16,4
Enthusiastic	14,7	11,0	21,0	17,3	9,9	11,0	18,6	15,1	17,6	14,2	30,9	20,0	8,6	12,7	16,8	20,1
Hard working	19,9	22,3	11,5	19,4	35,2	17,3	21,0	15,8	27,3	30,8	17,1	14,7	38,1	22,0	28,8	26,5
Attractive	42,6	24,0	7,6	44,1	19,2	10,4	15,3	11,9	41,0	31,7	10,9	53,7	21,4	8,8	18,1	11,9
Demoded	6,3	8,2	21,8	7,6	5,0	26,6	11,2	20,9	6,8	5,3	18,4	12,1	5,2	32,9	7,2	16,8
Careful	22,0	22,3	9,7	13,2	31,3	15,3	18,8	14,7	22,4	23,6	12,8	14,4	31,5	19,1	21,9	18,1
Emotional	8,8	8,4	8,8	13,2	9,3	14,5	11,7	14,0	9,9	6,8	8,8	14,8	6,6	13,8	9,6	10,1
Orderly	40,8	35,6	12,5	23,8	44,5	27,0	23,6	20,9	33,2	34,1	16,1	23,9	41,6	31,7	31,4	28,2
Disorderly	2,0	2,8	26,6	1,3	2,4	11,5	12,5	13,6	1,9	2,4	25,2	5,8	1,7	10,9	7,5	12,4
Energetic	18,2	17,7	24,6	18,2	15,6	12,3	20,5	20,9	16,5	13,4	31,8	21,6	12,4	9,9	23,0	18,7
Reliable	9,9	11,2	5,4	10,8	21,0	11,4	9,7	7,1	9,9	14,5	6,8	10,5	19,6	13,1	12,1	8,8
Decisive	26,6	24,6	11,4	26,1	32,6	16,6	17,1	17,3	25,9	30,8	13,8	22,6	34,2	19,7	26,3	20,1
Self-confident	45,4	32,0	19,0	36,3	36,3	14,7	24,0	20,3	39,7	38,7	22,6	37,0	32,2	16,1	28,8	24,6
Modern	41,3	36,1	21,6	39,5	33,7	18,1	30,2	24,6	39,3	39,7	22,4	38,4	37,0	16,0	33,4	25,2
Cheerful	10,8	11,4	21,0	15,3	10,4	11,7	17,1	18,6	14,2	12,8	25,6	19,1	8,5	10,2	16,0	16,3
Mature	20,5	24,0	12,7	17,5	25,9	17,3	14,9	11,7	20,1	22,7	8,8	17,4	23,3	21,9	13,5	15,5
Planned	26,8	28,3	7,8	20,3	37,1	17,9	19,0	14,5	23,2	25,3	11,1	16,3	35,0	23,5	18,0	16,5
Calm	16,8	16,0	11,9	13,4	20,5	25,9	14,2	14,2	13,2	14,0	10,2	12,5	18,7	24,6	15,5	16,5



Respectful	21,8	22,3	9,7	14,7	31,7	17,7	16,4	14,0	21,3	19,9	7,8	13,4	23,5	20,7	17,7	15,8
Sympathetic	18,4	16,4	25,5	20,5	13,8	16,2	17,5	21,8	16,4	15,7	23,6	17,6	11,8	11,9	16,8	17,1
Responsible	24,4	24,2	9,9	17,5	33,7	17,3	14,7	14,9	22,9	25,5	9,1	16,1	31,8	18,0	23,7	18,6
Lazy	1,5	2,8	16,8	4,5	2,6	7,3	7,3	11,2	1,3	2,0	16,1	4,9	2,2	6,6	5,3	9,6
Creative	20,1	16,2	14,7	22,3	16,0	13,8	16,4	15,8	13,8	17,6	17,8	18,8	17,0	11,5	17,3	13,5
Helpful	9,1	10,6	8,2	9,5	12,3	9,7	10,8	11,9	9,8	9,1	7,6	6,8	12,1	12,4	11,2	9,6

When Table 3 attributional adjective findings are examined according to the survey models presented to the participants, the results are seen as:

Model 1: Significant clusterings are in the **Public Sector** as self-confident (45,4%), attractive (42,6%), modern (41,3%), orderly (40,8%) options, whereas in the **Private Sector** clusterings were attractive (41,0%), self-confident (39,7%), modern (39,3%), active (33,4%), orderly (33,2%);

Model 2: Significant clusterings are in the **Public Sector** as modern (36,1%), orderly (35,6%), self-confident (32,0%), serious (30,5%), planned (28,3%) whereas in the **Private Sector** clusterings were serious (40,9%), modern (39,7%), self-confident (38,7%), intelligent (34,5%), orderly (34,1%), attractive (31,7%), hard-worker (30,8%), decisive (30,8%);

Model 3: Significant clusterings are in the **Public Sector** as disorderly(26,6%), unusual(26,1%), sympathetic (25,5%), active (25,0%), energetic (24,6%), demoded (21,8%), modern (21,6%), cheerful (21,0%), enthusiastic whereas in the **Private Sector** clusterings were enthusiastic (30,9%), energetic (31,8%), active (29,9%), cheerful (25,6%), disorderly (25,2%), symphatetic (23,6%), self-confident(22,6%), modern (22,4%);

Model 4: Significant clusterings are in the **Public Sector** as attractive (44,1%), modern (39,5%), self-confident(36,3%), decisive (26,1%), open minded(23,8%), orderly (23,8%), creative (22,3%), intelligent (22,0%) whereas in the **Private Sector** attractive (53,7%), modern (38,4%), self-confident (37,0%), open-minded (25,9%), active (24,0%), orderly (23,9%), decisive (22,6%), energetic (21,6%);

Model 5: Significant clusterings are in the **Public Sector** as serious(46,0%), orderly (44,5%), planned (37,1%), self-confident (36,3%), hard-working (35,2%), modern (33,7%), responsible (33,7%), decisive (32,6%), intelligent (41,6%), careful (31,3%) whereas in the Private Sector serious (52,9%), orderly (44,5%), intelligent (39,4%), hard working (38,1%), modern (37,0%), planned (35,0%), decisive (34,2%), self-confident (32,2%), responsible (31,8%), careful (31,5%);

Model 6: Significant clusterings are in the **Public Sector** as orderly (27,0%), demoded (26,6%), planned (37,1%), calm (25,9%) whereas in **Private Sector** demoded (32,9%), orderly (31,7%), calm (24,6%), hard working (22,0%), mature (21,9%), respectful (20,7%);

Model 7: Significant clusterings are in the **Public Sector** as modern (30,2%), active (26,4%), self-confident (24,0%), modern (33,4%), orderly (21,0%), energetic (20,5%) whereas in **Private Sector** demoded (32,9%), serious (32,1%), orderly (31,4%), active (29,4%),



hardworking (28,8%), self-confident (28,8%), decisive (26,3%), intelligent (25,6%), responsible (23,7%), energetic (23,0%);

Model 8: Significant clusterings are in the **Public Sector** as modern (24,6%), sympathetic (21,8%), demoded (20,9%), orderly (20,9%), energetic (20,9%), active (20,5%), self-confident (20,3%) whereas in **Private Sector** orderly (28,2%), hard-working (26,5%), active (26,2%), modern (25,2%), self-confident (24,6%), intelligent (20,7%), enthusiastic (20,1%), decisive (20,1%).

Table 3 When attributes are evaluated according to ratios

Model 1 of both sectors as **Open Minded;**

Model 5 of both sectors as **Intelligent;**

Model 7 of both sectors and Model 1 of private sector as **Active;**

Model 3 of both sectors as **Unusual;**

Model 5 of both sectors as **Serious;**

Model 3 of both sectors as **Enthusiastic;**

Model 5 of both sectors as **Hardworking;**

Model 4 of both sectors as **Attractive;**

Model 6 of both sectors as **Demoded;**

Model 5 of both sectors as **Careful;**

Model 6 of public sector and Model 4 of private sector as **Emotional;**

Model 5 of both sectors as **Orderly;**

Model 3 of both sectors as **Disorderly;**

Model 3 of both sectors as **Energetic;**

Model 5 of both sectors as **Reliable;**

Model 5 of both sectors as **Decisive;**

Model 1 of both sectors as **Self-Confident;**

Model 1 of public sector and Model 2 of private sector as **Modern;**

Model 3 of both sectors as **Cheerful;**

Model 5 of both sectors as **Mature;**

Model 5 of both sectors as **Planned;**

Model 6 of both sectors as **Calm;**

Model 5 of both sectors as **Respectful;**

Model 3 of both sectors as **Sympathetic;**

Model 5 of both sectors as **Responsible;**

Model 3 of both sectors as **Lazy;**

Model 4 of both sectors as **Creative;**



Model 8 of public sector and Model 6 of private sector as **Helpful**;

According to the results of Chi Square test done to determine whether according to both sectors the model evaluations exhibit a statistically meaningful relationship, a statistically meaningful relationship has been identified between the Public and Private sectors:

Model 1: Active (P=0,004), unusual (P=0,002), hardworking (P=0,003), orderly (P=0,006), self-confident (P=0,044), creative (P=0,003);

Model 2: Open minded (P=0,021), intelligent (P=0,000), serious (P=0,000), hardworking(P=0,001), attractive (P=0,003), demoded (P=0,044), energetic (P=0,037), decisive (P=0,016), self-confident(P=0,015);

Model 3: Unusual (P=0,000), enthusiastic (P=0,000), hardworking (P=0,006), attractive(P=0,050), energetic (P=0,005), mature (P=0,027);

Model 4: Unusual (P=0,045), hardworking(P=0,029), attractive(P=0,001), demoded (P=0,010);

Model 5: Intelligent (P=0,004), serious(P=0,016), respectful (P=0,001);

Model 6: unusual (P=0,008), hardworking(P=0,041), demoded (P=0,017), mature (P=0,047), planned (P=0,017), sympathetic (P=0,032);

Model 7: Intelligent (P=0,006), serious (P=0,000), hardworking(P=0,002), demoded (P=0,015), orderly (P=0,003), disorderly (P=0,003), decisive (P=0,000), responsible (P=0,000);

Model 8: Active (P=0,020), unusual (P=0,000), serious (P=0,016), enthusiastic (P=0,022), hardworking(P=0,000), emotional (P=0,035), orderly (P=0,003), sympathetic (P=0,039).

Conclusions

As indicated by Zunin's (1992), the term 'image' in the context of our study relates primarily to what a person perceives and feels about individuals opposite. While a positive image can be a key to success, its negative form may disable career and advancement options available.

Whatever the social status may be, women attending their grooming and attire will be perceived to some extent as being respectful to those with whom they have business relationships. As in many areas, dressing also have unwritten rules. The 'lack of respect' perception caused by improper attire will reflect to themselves and will create 'image' questions. Therefore all persons in the professional environments should be attentive to the general rules of attire, style, clothing cohesiveness, colour and textile characteristics, cleanliness and clothing maintenance, accessories, and the image they present in its entirety. An individual's appropriate attire for the work environment will indeed contribute to the career success. It should be remembered that the attire must be in harmony with the inner world as well as the requirements of work environment.

According to Molloy (1977) and Mather (1996) the style adopted has direct effect on the perceptions of 'personal reliability' and 'pleasantness'. In Thourlby's book (1995) on attire styles it is stated that "...when you enter a room filled with people who had never seen you before or know you, these persons will make at least 10 deductions about you just by looking at your attire. These are: individuality and personality, economic status, level of education,



reliability, social position, cultural heritage, level of success, charisma, manners, and your character in terms of social and ethical values. Success depends on the positiveness of your evaluations done. Hence, a direct relationship exists between the observed attire effective in first-impressions and creation of a positive image.”

In this study conducted on the basis of attributional adjectives to define the perceptions generated by various attire forms, once again it was confirmed that indeed attires affect how individuals are seen by others. This research has shown that public and private sector human resource administrators surveyed have indicated that they perceived **Model 5** types as intelligent, serious, hard working, careful, orderly, reliable, decisive, mature, planned, respectful and responsible. In contrast, the same survey participant administrators perceived the **Model 3** types as unusual, enthusiastic, disorderly, energetic, cheerful, sympathetic and lazy. While the administrators found **Model 1** types as open minded, active, self-confident and modern, they defined **Model 6** types as demoded, emotional, calm and helpful, and **Model 4** as attractive, emotional and creative.

Model 5 was identified as possessing the attributes sought for professional environments and it contained 11 of the 28 adjectives. This suggests Model 5 as the most positive image preferable for job applicants.

In the range from extremely formal to informal attires of women, suits and conservative style are ranked first (Sampson, 1995). The attire form in Model 5 is similar and this may also explain its leadership in this survey.

Lines are formed on an attire by combination of various stitching types. The human eye follows the most prominent line in a model. Lines are also used to attract attention to certain sections.

While vertical lines express formalness, respectability and maturity, horizontal lines are known to awaken feelings of calm, softness and peacefulness. Furthermore, vertical lines add height and horizontal lines shorten appearance. Width of the lines and the distance between them also affect perception. Curved lines are perceived as attractive (Altınöz and Suvari, 2000: 56). The vertical lines of Model 5 appear to have affected the perception of survey participants. Similarly, the Model 4 with curved lines appear to have been perceived as attractive.

Differences in attire perceptions arise from variations among personal opinions, gender, life styles, the society in which they live, and world outlook. Humans do wear clothing of some type during their entire life-times and the concept of dressing as well as the interpretation of perceptions varies. For correct interpretation of the dressing concept and its correct use, the following may be proposed:

- Image must not precede the message.
- Appearance should fit personality.
- Plainness leaves the most impact.
- Excessive hair styles, colour, accessories and make-up should be avoided.
- Dress appropriately for the work, position and objectives.
- Individuals must first recognize their body forms and know the appropriate types of dressing styles.



- Use of everything considered fashion does not put modernity in the forefront, rather it will appear as done-up. To prevent this individuals must find in advance those which suit them best and dress accordingly.
- Too revealing or unusual attires are perceived as unreliable and not preferred by human resource administrators. Such attires must be avoided.
- Do not wear casual or fantasy attire when going to a job interview.
- Always dress according to the venue and time.

REFERENCES

- Altınöz, M. ve Suvari, N.A. (2000) . *Büro Ortamında Görünüm ve Davranışsal Bütünlük*, Yargı Kitap ve Yayınevi, Ankara.
- Bateman, I.J. & Mawby, J. (2004). First Impressions Count: Interviewer Appearance and Information Effects in Stated Preference Studies. *Ecological Economics*, 49: 47– 55
- Dinçer, M.K. (1998). *Kişisel İmaj*. ALFA Basım Yayım Dağıtım, İstanbul.
- Erdemli, N. (2004). Kişisel İmaj Dışarıdan Nasıl Okunuyor?. www.kadinvizyon.com
<http://www.kigem.com/content.asp?bodyID=1694>
- Kabadayı, S. (2011). *İmajınızı Nasıl Alırsınız? İçten Dışa Kişisel İmaj Yönetimi*. İş ve Yönetim Serisi 43, Elma Yayınevi.
- Maliye Yüksek Eğitim Merkezi Başkanlığı Toplam Kalite Yönetimi Uygulama ve Ödül yönergesi. (2007) Ankara,
http://www.ardahandefterdarligi.gov.tr/dosyalar/toplam_kalite_yonetimi.pdf
- Mather D. (1996). *Imageworks for Women*, HarperCollins Publishers Ltd.
- McDaniel, B.Y. and Pardon, C.C.(2000). *Image Consulting fort he 21st Century*, Published by Academy of Fashion & Image, USA.
- Molloy, J. T. (1977). *The Woman's Dress for Success Book*. New York, N.Y: Warner Books.
- Sampson, E. (1995). İmaj Faktörü. Çeviren: Hakan İlgün, Rota Yayın Tanıtım, İstanbul.
- Pakkan, Ş. (2002). İmajınızı Nasıl Yenilersiniz?, *Milliyet Gazetesi*.
<http://www.kigem.com/content.asp?bodyID=1690>
- Thourlby, W. (1995). *You Are What You Wear (Business and casual style in a 'clicks and mortar' world)*. Forbes/Wittenburg & Brown.
- Zunin, L. & Zunin, N. (1992). *Contact: The First Four Minutes*. New York : Ballantine Books.