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Abstract

In the western world, questions pertaining to modesty such as how much skin can one reveal or not reveal are being asked since it is seen heavily in the media and celebrity culture. As a function of dress, modesty is concerned with the concealing of oneself and the body (Flugel, 1930). This function has an impact on body image especially since most women experience normative discontent or a regular dissatisfaction with their appearance (Rodin, Silberstein, & Striegel-Moore, 1984). Researchers have actively been looking for ways to relieve poor body image, which include ways religious identity improves body satisfaction (Boyatzis, Kline, & Backof, 2007; Mahoney et al., 2005).

The purpose of this study was to determine the impact of Christian identity on modesty and how modesty in many forms influenced body image. Using the social identity theory approach, Christian identity was conceptualized as a group identity, which had norms including modesty and beliefs about the body (Hogg & Reid, 2006; Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Terry & Hogg, 1996). These norms influenced definitions of modesty, which has been conceptualized in multiple ways including concealment, respect, purity, and humility (Andrews, 2011; Hahner & Varda, 2012). Body image and appearance has linkages to self-objectification(Fallon, 1990; McKinley & Hyde, 1996a). Through connecting these concepts of Christian identity, modesty, and body image, a model was developed.
An online survey (n=428) with snowball sampling of Christian adult women was conducted to measure these concepts. It was hypothesized that Christian identity through religious orientation would positively impact modesty, which would then positively impact body image. Confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling was used to determine the validity and significant pathways of the model. It was found that the social aspect of extrinsic religious orientation impacted several types of modesty including contextual and esteem modesty. Religious beliefs about the body and personal values such as prayer positively influenced religious or respect driven modesty. These types of modesty had an effect on body image such as appearance evaluation and body surveillance.

These findings suggested when rooted in Christian identity, modesty functioned as a filter and armor. When the social identity is highlighted, modesty filters out what is important when monitoring the body and evaluating appearance. When personal values and beliefs about the body are emphasized, modesty is armor or a defense against negative body messages. Recommendations for future research include investigating modesty and body shame as well as studying the impact of modesty on social media presentation.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Currently, news outlets and social media, such as Instagram and Snapchat, in the Western world, report on the overexposure of celebrities and common people alike. The news often highlights revealing outfits and nude photos and videos from major events and social media platform posts. The major dialogue that underlies these discussions in the news is modesty and immodesty. These conversations show that modesty is still relevant today whether the discussion is about concealing or revealing the body. Body image can be impacted by how an individual presents herself publicly. Does modesty or lack thereof improve body image or does it harm how individuals feel about their appearance? Also, in America, a predominantly Christian nation, does Christian identity affect modesty and body image?

Problem Statement

In a world where most women deal with normative discontent or dissatisfaction with their body and appearance, researchers have actively sought ways to understand how people’s body image develops and is maintained (Fallon, 1990; Homan & Boyatzis, 2010; Rodin et al., 1984; Rudd & Lennon, 1994; Tiggemann & Andrew, 2012b). However, only some work has been done to actively find ways to improve or bolster
people’s body image. Body image is the perception and evaluation one has of his or her body and appearance. Body image is complex and a poor body image can affect many aspects of one’s life including eating habits, self-esteem, physical fitness, anxiety, and dress. Therefore, it is vital that researchers explore all avenues that can enhance positive body image so people can live a fuller and more content life. Exploring how religion affects body image may serve as a way to improve body image and lead to a more content life. Body image also is influenced by social identity and group memberships (Rudd & Lennon, 1994). Religion exists as a form of social identity because it is a group with a certain set of beliefs, values, and norms. As an attitude towards the body, modesty, which is defined as concealing certain areas of the body and a group norm, has ties to appearance and body image as well (Storm, 1987). Modesty could be a major factor in how religiosity interacts with body image. Therefore, using the social identity approach, it was deemed vital to examine the influence of religious identity on modesty, body image, and dress.

In particular, a Christian identity in which one believes in God and can have a relationship with God through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, may also have a connection to body image. Research has shown that belief in God and a sanctified or holistic view of the body promotes a healthier body image and protects against some dangerous health related behaviors such as smoking, drug abuse, and alcohol abuse (Boyatzis et al., 2007; Jacobson, 2014; Mahoney et al., 2005; Zhang, 2013). This finding pointed to connections between the internalization of a Christian identity, body image, and modesty.
Purpose of the study

The purpose of the research was to investigate how Christian identity for women impacted modesty norms, appearance and connections to body image. Through an online survey of adult Christian women, the importance of Christian identity was explored as well as how these women constructed and evaluated their appearance. Very little research had been conducted on Christian women in terms of dress, identity, and body image. Little research had been done on modest dressing and its meaning as well except in healthcare and qualitative settings (Andrews, 2011; Dareng et al., 2015; Lee & Vang, 2015). Though multifaceted, modesty in dress and appearance was rooted in religion and influenced body image both positively and negatively. It was possible that modesty functions as a screen or defense with body image. Therefore, this research intended to elaborate on past studies in terms of Christian identity and explore its relationship with dress and appearance. Since appearance is often the first chance to communicate oneself to others, it is highly important in the construction of identity. As Goffman (1959) said, appearance is a vital part of one’s “identity kit”; thus portrayed important pieces of oneself to others. Religion is a part of one’s identity kit; thus is a role one depicts in many contexts in life. This role meant that identity was visually portrayed in one’s appearance and one’s mental image of oneself. The salience and commitment level of religious identity impacted its power over appearance and body image. Through social identity theory, religiosity, and objectification theory, religious identity, body image, and modesty was investigated.

One of the goals of this research was to first understand Christian identity and its
relationship to modesty as a group norm. It aimed to identify the relationships between body image, Christian identity, and modesty. Through classifying these relationships, this research aimed to bolster the developing literature on religion and body image. This study also intended to reach the middle or average group of self-identified Christian women, rather than those in the extreme sects of Christianity. The average Christian women in America from adulthood to old age and her views on identity, body image, and appearance have not been thoroughly examined in the literature. Gaining access to this information has the potential to help women who were experiencing similar situations with their body image and religious identity.

**Significance of the study**

The value for this type of research is to begin a discussion within the academic community and the Christian community about religion, modesty, and body image. This research added to the academic literature of body image with a different perspective of religion relating to appearance and another aspect of the complex nature of the concept of body image. A long-term goal is using the information and analysis gained from this line of research to develop workshops that will be taken into the Christian community in order to educate them about these topics that are not frequently discussed. The goal of such workshops should be to teach women to identify where they are in their Christian identity and how that identity is related to their body image and how modesty was influential factor in this development. The information should be implemented to promote a healthier, more holistic, and positive body image among women. In essence, the
objective of the study was to bring together Christianity and its impact on modesty and body image to an audience beyond the academic world that will benefit from the knowledge gained.

**Definition of Terms**

Social identity theory: an individual’s self concept or identity based on their group membership. A theoretical perspective used to discuss intergroup conflict, discrimination, prejudice, normative behaviors, stereotyping, and conformity (Hogg, Abrams, Otten, & Hinkle, 2004; Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986)

Religiosity: religiousness and all activities related to religion dedication

Religious orientation: motivations for expressing religiosity (Allport & Ross, 1967)

Sanctification: process of becoming sacred or having a divine character or significance (Pargament & Mahoney, 2005)

Christianity: belief in one God and that Jesus is the Son of God, a savior of humanity and messiah (Christ) that was prophesized about in the Old Testament of the Holy Bible

Modesty: behavior or appearance that is aimed to prevent indecency or inappropriateness; i.e. humility, body concealment, sexual purity, respect

Immodesty: revealing parts of the body that are considered improper or showing a too high opinion of oneself

Body image: the mental picture one holds of one’s body (Fallon, 1990)

Self-objectification: turning the body into an object to be evaluated (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; McKinley & Hyde, 1996a)

Body surveillance: self-surveillance or looking at one’s body as an outside observer
would see it. (McKinley & Hyde, 1996b)

Appearance evaluation: how one is satisfied with their looks and measures their attractiveness (Cash, 2000)

Appearance orientation: investment in one’s appearance (Cash, 2000)
Chapter 2: Literature Review

In this section, social identity theory forms the foundation for the study. Religious identity through religious orientation and sanctification is discussed. Modesty and its multiple meanings are examined. Body image and self-objectification conclude the review.

Identity and social identity theory

Identity is the way individuals define themselves. It can be through roles, performances, groups, or categories (Hogg, 2006; Stryker, 1980; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Identity is a complex and organized set of multiple identities and roles that have expectations attached to them. However, the difference between identity and roles is that identity is an internal concept and roles are external performances (Stryker & Burke, 2000). An identity is a main building block of the self-concept and roles come forth from the identity. It is the expectations of the roles that drive behavior. For example, holding a Christian identity usually indicates that a person believes he or she is a child of God, has faith that Jesus of the Bible is divine, and spends an eternity in heaven. One of the roles that could be associated with a Christian identity is being a church member. Expectations of a church member could be regularly attending a church service, giving money to the church, and being involved in a Bible study group.

A main way to conceptualize identity is through social identity theory. Social
identity theory bases one’s identity on group membership (Tajfel, 1981; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This theory explains group processes, intergroup conflict, and construction of the self-concept (Tajfel & Turner, 1986; Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Because one does not exist in a social vacuum, group membership is incredibly important. One forms the definition of him/her self based upon the social groups he or she is belongs to which is context dependent. People become a part of an in-group and if they identify strongly with the group, they will do everything possible to defend the group in order to maintain or increase self-esteem. Social identities are created in order to help people define their place in society and give value to the individual (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Social identity theory makes assumptions about personal identity. It asserts that self-image is composed of both a social identity and a personal identity. Personal identity can be defined as anything that is not a part of the group membership or group members. Personal identity refers to personal achievements or recognition as well. Social identity theory also assumes that personal identity is context dependent and references the self in terms of comparing to others in their group(Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This theory aims to understand how people define themselves and operate within their social groups.

**Religion as social identity**

One way people can identify themselves is through practice of religion. Religion today has many definitions. Sernett (1978) states “religion… serves as a unifying principle, helping people define a sense of group identity according to the nuances of
social behavior.” This view suggests that religion serves a social identity purpose and gives people a group membership. Religion can also provide people with a sense of worth and provide comfort in this identity. It gives individuals another social category to fit into if religion is important to them. Another way to define religion is a “search for significance in ways related to the sacred” (Pargament, 1997, p. 34). This definition points to people searching for something of value and something to be set apart or sacred. It also points to a goal directed activity and perhaps a more personal search rather than specifically a group activity. Both of these definitions inform the nature of religious identity. Religious identity can be seen as a social identity and personal identity that informs people how to behave and that enables a search for their own significance.

Within the social identity framework is self-categorization. Self categorization helps individuals place themselves into groups which make up one’s identity (Turner et al., 1987). Groups form an archetype of the ideal member. Specific groups or categories have a prototype of how the ideal group member thinks and acts (Terry & Hogg, 1996). This prototype can be likened to a stereotype that the group creates for itself and people self-stereotype into this category when the identity is salient. It is the set of attributes associated with a group and the ideal group member (Hogg, 2006). These expectations and characteristics shape what to do in situations. When the group membership is salient, a person will act in accordance with prototype (Abrams, Wetherell, Cochrane, Hogg, & Turner, 1990). Self-categorization also helps in understanding group norms because the prototype sets a certain code of conduct to follow. With Christian groups, an ideal member attends church services, is involved in church activities such as Bible study,
serves the church or the community in some capacity, and has personal time for prayer and a relationship to God. In Christianity, the sacred text of the Bible serves as the standard for beliefs, values, and behavior.

Religiosity refers to religiousness, and all activities related to religion dedication. Religiosity can be measured in multiple ways, such as religious orientation and religious sanctification (Allport & Ross, 1967; Francis, 2007; Mahoney et al., 2005). Religious orientation, a distal or more distant measure of religiousness and sanctification, a proximal or more closely experienced, measure of religiousness will be reviewed herein (Mahoney et al., 1999). Religious orientation and sanctification will provide differing, but complementary, views of religiosity.

**Religious Orientation.** Religious orientation provides a framework to identify how people view and use religion. Through the lens of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, one sees the distinction between extrinsically religious orientation and intrinsic religious orientation. Extrinsic orientated people use religion to serve other motives (Allport & Ross, 1967), such as a means to finding friends, status, and comfort. Allport and Ross (1967, p. 434) state theologically, “the extrinsic type turns to God, but without turning away from self.” This attitude implies that religion is an aspect of one’s life, together with many other aspects, but not the foundation upon which everything else is built. It also suggests that the extrinsically oriented reflect an attitude toward religion as something that provides comfort and social support, but not a master motivation (Donahue, 1985). Extrinsic orientation has several parts to it, one being an aspect of the identity (compartmentalization), another being a part of the social environment (social
support), and the last part referring to religion as an external source of relief and protection (personal support). The intrinsically oriented person, by contrast, lives out their religion. Religion is the master motive in this instance (Allport & Ross, 1967). Other needs are not met before this motive, but are fashioned around this motive. For intrinsically motivated people, their religion is the foundation of their life and worldview (Donahue, 1985). Religion is a daily experience instead of a small aspect of their lives. The intrinsically oriented also tend to self-stereotype in their religious group, meaning they act more in accordance with the prototypical group member (Burris & Jackson, 2000).

In terms of identity, personal identity has been linked to intrinsic orientation and extrinsic orientation has been linked to social identity (Tiliopoulos & McVittie, 2010). A four part typology was asserted (Allport & Ross, 1967). People can be high on both intrinsic and extrinsic orientation and one might consider these people to be highly religious. People who are only high in intrinsic are called “pure intrinsics” and have a deeply personal experience (Allport & Ross, 1967). Those people who rank high on extrinsic orientation and low on intrinsic orientation are the “pure extrinsically oriented.” People who are low on both extrinsic and intrinsic orientation are anti-religious (Allport & Ross, 1967). With respect to Christianity, examining religious orientation provides insight into why individuals are associated with this particular religion and how invested they are in the religion. Religious orientation determines how important religion is as a social identity and how it is used. It also can suggest whether the prototype of the ideal
Religious orientation and well-being. Religious orientation as a form of religiosity, has been linked to well being. Specifically, intrinsic orientation has been linked positively to well being, both psychologically and spiritually (Blaine & Crocker, 1995; Milevsky & Levitt, 2004; Williamson & Sandage, 2009). Religiosity as a form of social identity has also been linked to greater life satisfaction and well-being. This means that people who highly identify with the group are more likely to conform to the group but also have better health and satisfaction (Hayward & Elliott, 2009, 2011). Extrinsic religious orientation usually has the inverse effect on well being. People that are extrinsically oriented tend to perceive less social support in their lives and tend to have poorer well being (Doane, 2014). Religious orientation is multidimensional, but reflects how people relate to religion and how that relationship can change during a lifetime.

Sanctification

Sanctification is another important aspect of religiosity. Sanctification refers to making something sacred or conferring divine characteristics. Pargament and Mahoney (2005) posit that people invest energy into what is sacred and will do almost anything to preserve it. They also state that the perceived “sacred aspects of life” will bring about emotions of gratitude and awe among believers, as well as serve as an influential resource to navigate the highs and lows of life (Pargament & Mahoney, 2005, p. 180). Since religion is a pathway to finding significance, the sacred is the defining characteristic that sets religion apart from other pathways in living. The sacred means to be holy or to be
set apart. The sacred can be an object, event, role, people, or experience (Pargament & Mahoney, 2005). The process of making something sacred, or sanctification, is important because it references interpretation of holiness and prescribes certain attitudes and behavior toward the sacred. Sanctification is important because it can influence how one perceives their own body. Since sanctification is the process of making something holy, then it refers to something that is held in high esteem and is respected. If the body is an entity to be revered or respected, then it can be considered to be something sacred, known as sanctification of the body. With Christianity, the Bible specifically references the physical body as a temple and something that is made holy, thus taking on sacred qualities. The Bible states, “Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy Spirit within you, whom you have from God? You are not your own, for you were bought with a price. So glorify God in your body” (1 Corinthians 6:19-20 English Standard Version) and “I appeal to you therefore, brothers, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship” (Romans 12:1 ESV). These descriptions of the body in the Bible imply that the spirit of God, or the Holy Spirit, dwells within the body thus your body becomes a temple and a place that is holy and sacred. Because the body is a temple, offering it as a sacrifice is an act of worship or adoration of God. This attitude and belief toward the body can affect how the physical body is treated. In terms of social identity, this type of attitude toward the body offers a proscriptive and descriptive ways of thinking and acting toward the body. These verses can set a standard or a prototype of responding to the physical body; thus, Christians as a group believe that the body is a temple and is sacred. This view
should influence how Christians act toward their bodies on an individual level.

Religious orientation and sanctification of the body serve as measurements of how much religion impacts the person through their attitudes and beliefs. These concepts also give insight to how much Christian social identity is a part of their daily lives. Next, modesty in terms of dress and appearance will be discussed.

Modesty

Modesty in terms of dress is often a concept and decision one makes so quickly when getting dressed in the morning that the thought of not concealing the body does not happen. Modesty is often an inherent decision. In Western society, the norm is to wear some sort of clothes to cover the body, which is a type of modesty. However, modesty is a complex subject as people have multiple definitions. Theoretically modesty can reference humility, respect, sexual purity, protection, innocence, social control, or body concealment (Andrews, 2011; Block, 2011; Shalit, 1999). Others may say that modesty is about attention—whether one draws attention towards oneself or away from the self (Bommarito, 2013). Modesty in research tends to focus on the humility and attention aspect of modesty if it is quantified. This definition fits well with the functions of dress, which include modesty and immodesty (Roach-Higgins & Eicher, 1992). Modesty in dress means a type of body concealment concerning the erogenous zones (zones of the body with sexual significance), which are context and culture dependent. Immodesty reveals parts of the body that are considered “inappropriate” or imbued with sexual significance depending upon the cultural context (Goffman, 1963). It has been suggested that modesty and immodesty are socially learned and a habit, since modesty is not
Instinctual (Goldman & Goldman, 1981; Kaiser, 1985; Storm, 1987). Modesty can also show control over one’s body and sexualized features while immodesty may promote sexual urges (Flugel, 1930). Modesty is a concept that can touch many aspects of life such as how one speaks about oneself and how one interacts with and dresses his or her body. In this study, modesty will be considered with regard to the body, appearance and religion.

Another aspect of Christianity and the body is the issue of modesty in dress. Among some Christian sects, modesty is believed to be a strict dress code for women (i.e., Mennonites, and Catholic nuns, (Arthur, 1997; Michelman, 1997)); however, the issue of modesty is much more complex and not agreed upon by all Christian believers (Harms, 2013). This issue of modesty may be construed as guidelines for dressing or a symbol of the Christian faith, yet modesty has not been thoroughly examined. Bryant (2006) briefly discussed how modesty is referenced in evangelical circles or in Christian sects that strongly stress the authority of the Bible. On one side of the argument, modest dressing is perceived to be important for women so they do not cause men to lust after them due to clothing choice. This view implies that women are somewhat responsible for keeping men from lusting after them. On the other side of the argument, women can be called to dress modestly for themselves in terms of self-respect and deepening their relationship with God (Bryant, 2006).

Modesty, in clothing choice, has been studied with respect to feminism and for religions other than mainstream Christianity. Block (2011) discussed ultra-orthodox Jewish women and their choice of wearing a dark cape. Strict orthodox women believe
in the value of modesty and do cover their bodies. The fashion of wearing a cape covering their shoulders increases their feelings of modesty, displayed their higher spiritual level, and their social status (Block, 2011). This behavior revealed that modesty might be complex and have multiple meanings for women. Andrews (2011) also showed that women have different reasons for being modest and hold different meanings attached to modesty. The Jewish women interviewed displayed maturity-based modesty, esteem-based modesty, and religion-based modesty (Andrews, 2011, 2014). These different types of modesty relayed the meanings attached to them. Maturity-based modesty represented a preference for modesty due to age or life stage. It also related to the context or the social situation that was driving modesty. Religion or culturally based modesty referred to women preferring modest dressing for religious purposes. This type of modesty was driven by respect, pride, and protection of the body. Esteem-based modesty represented women who related modesty to vulnerability and protecting the body. With ultra-Orthodox teenagers in Israel, Taragin-Zeller (2014) found that these teenagers were using modesty as a means to show their devotion to God, rather than as a culturally dictated practice. Siraj (2011) interviewed Muslim women in Scotland about their preferences toward the Hijab or the headscarf and female modesty. Though some women chose to wear the hijab, others did not wear the hijab. These Muslim women felt that modesty in dress was important due to their religious beliefs, but the hijab may not be apart of that practice (Siraj, 2011). Also, with Muslim women, modesty in dress relates to sexual obedience and connects it to their religion and their husbands (Khoei, Whelan, & Cohen, 2008). Concealing the body to everyone except intimates can show respect for
the body and preserves the body for their spouses. This attitude can also show respect for
God in terms of protecting what is sacred. These studies showed that religion, dress, and
modesty are related and are evident depending on group beliefs.

**Modesty and attitudes toward women.** In terms of feminism, modesty is a
debated issue. Some say that women should dress however they want in a backlash
against the patriarchal culture and that strict clothing modesty hurts women’s
independence, especially with the religious fundamentalists (Heywood & Dworkin, 2003;
Wilson, 2000). Modesty has been cited as a form of social control to survey women’s
bodies and sexuality (King, 2009; Shaw, 2008). The issue that feminists have is that
women seemingly have no choice in how they dress their bodies or how their bodies are
viewed. They contend that women are oppressed by men and society and do not have the
autonomy to choose their lifestyle. They believe that Western civilizations are under the
patriarchy or a system where males dominate society, government, families, and other
organization and gain privilege from those positions. Feminists believe that women
should be viewed and treated as equals in society (Wolf, 1991) Religion also tends to
dictate certain views over bodies, sexuality, and gender roles, which often come from a
patriarchal interpretation (van Schalkwyk, 2002). The patriarchal ties to modesty uncovers
why feminists take offense to modesty and want women to have equal rights and
autonomy. The right to dress however one pleases or revealing one’s body can show
liberation from the patriarchy.

Others have recommended that women choose to dress modestly as an individual
choice and for empowerment (Shalit, 1999; Wilson, 2000). Shalit (1999) also prescribes
women to take back their modesty as a type of protection. This view implies that there is freedom in protection and less anxiety concerning dress if one is modestly dressed. Swami, Miah, Noorani, and Taylor (2014) studied Muslim women and how they view the hijab. The hijab provides some protection from internalizing beauty ideals above the value of high intrinsic religious orientation. This stance suggests that wearing hijab as an act of modesty was a choice but also bolstered women’s positive view of their body. Hahner and Varda (2012) elaborate on the meaning of modesty from the feminist and non-feminist view in hopes of bringing the seemingly opposing views together. They stress that modesty can be a feminist stance for some and an oppressive stance for others, but it is still a choice that women can make depending on their culture and that it does not have to be political (Hahner & Varda, 2012). The different views on modesty suggest that it can have multiple meanings based on religion, age, politics, and personal aesthetics.

Another way to conceptualize modesty with appearance is to consider social identity and views of group norms. Norms are shared thoughts, feelings, and behavior among a group or society (Hogg & Reid, 2006). Since groups create a group prototype, set of norms would be created that deem what are acceptable thoughts, attitudes, beliefs, and actions for group members. Norms are communicated through how people act and talk about behavior and beliefs. Norms are enforced through how people respond to one’s speech or actions. There are different types of norms as well. Collective and perceived norms help provide the code of conduct for people to follow. Collective norms are broader and apply to a whole society where as perceived norms are construed on the individual level (Lapinski & Rimal, 2005). Modesty has been conceptualized as a
feminine norm in the drawing attention to themselves (Mahalik et al., 2005). In this way, modesty could be construed as a norm in Christianity. As a collective norm, modesty in dress and appearance is expected among believers and practitioners. It communicates that women are not to attract too much attention to their bodies and there should be an attitude of value and respect for the body. High value of modesty could also communicate that religion is important because it is a collective norm of Christianity. However, modesty is also a perceived norm. Modesty is so complex that it must be construed on the individual level. Women will follow the norm of modesty and interpret it individually when it comes to appearance and the occasion. This reaction would account for the differing views of modesty within a group.

To put modesty of appearance norm into the American Christian context, here are a few examples. If a woman wears a dress that covers her cleavage in an American church, she may receive complements from others, thus following the modesty norms. However if a woman dresses in a low cut top revealing cleavage during a church service, she may receive some disapproving glances from others. This example reveals that the woman is not following the set of modesty norms and the disapproving glances are her consequence. Norms are important for people who highly identify with the group (Terry & Hogg, 1996). The highly religious identifiers tend to want to conform to the group prototype and therefore the norms (Hayward & Elliott, 2009, 2011). These are people who want to fit in with the group and choose to believe what the group believes. In terms of Christianity, this could mean that the highly religiously oriented and committed will see modesty as important to conform to the prototype. They use their belief system to
determine what modesty is and how they will use it in their daily lives.

To connect religiosity and modesty, some people see modesty as a part of their religion. Muslim women have been known to see modesty as a part of their devotion to God and religion (Siraj, 2011). Jewish teenagers have also been found to embrace modesty as a factor in their devotion to God (Taragin-Zeller, 2014). Andrews (2011) interviewed Jewish and found that the most conservative women (Orthodox) practiced modesty which was religiously driven. Bryant (2006) discussed the connection to modest dressing and how it was an important practice in Christian organizations in her ethnographic research. Based on these connections of monotheistic religions to modesty practices, these types of links could be applied to Christianity. Therefore, the following hypotheses are proposed:

**Hypothesis 1.** High intrinsic religious orientation is positively related to views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views)

**Hypothesis 2.** Extrinsic religious orientation is related to views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views).

A: Compartmentalization is negatively related to views of modesty

B: Social support is positively related to views of modesty.

C: Personal support is positively related to views of modesty

**Hypothesis 3.** High sanctification of the body is positively related to views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views). (sanctification= operationalized as manifestation of God in the body)

These hypotheses show the linkages between religious orientation, sanctification
of the body, and one’s view of modesty. Next, body image and its relation to religion will be discussed in depth.

**Body Image and the body**

All people have their personal body image. Body image is defined as the mental picture one holds of one’s body (Fallon, 1990). This definition includes the perceptions one has of his or her size, shape, weight, body parts, and beauty. The mental picture can be positive or negative. Most women deal with normative discontent meaning that they have a certain level of dissatisfaction toward their body (Rodin et al., 1984). Normative discontent refers to the concept that women are finding fault with the aesthetics of their bodies such as weight, facial features, etc. All perceptions and attitudes about body image direct appearance management behaviors (Rudd & Lennon, 1994; Rudd & Lennon, 2000). Negative body image can lead to disturbances such as eating disorders, shame, anxiety, body dysmorphic disorder, depression, and perhaps even death (Cattarin & Thompson, 1994; Gilbert & Thompson, 1996; Phillips, 2005; Pope, Gruber, Choi, Olivardia, & Phillips, 1997; Rosen, 2001).

One’s body image develops over time. It can be influenced through the media, cultural ideals, family, friends, and religious beliefs (Nasser, 1988; Pike & Rodin, 1991; Thompson et al., 1999). In Western culture, the media perpetuates the thin female body ideal. This ideal can be damaging and result in low self esteem and body dissatisfaction especially if women believe and internalize that thinness is the only standard of beauty (Balcetis, Cole, Chelberg, & Alicke, 2013; Rudd & Lennon, 1994). Often times, the way
that parents view themselves and how one’s friends scrutinize their bodies affects how a
person determines their body image, i.e. learning body dissatisfaction (Lev-Ari,
Baumgarten-Katz, & Zohar, 2014; Pike & Rodin, 1991). Body image is complex and
influenced by many concepts and beliefs, one of which is how the physical body is
viewed in relation to personhood.

**Views of the body in culture and theology.** One’s mental image of their body is
influenced through perceptions, media images, and also beliefs about the body in general.
There are two different approaches to viewing the body, that of dualism and that of
holism. Dualism reflects a view that the physical body is separate from personhood, the
mind, or the soul (Hall, 2010; Jacobson, 2014). Dualism refers to the body being distinct
from the mind; therefore, they are two separate parts. The physical body is meant to
function on an individualistic level, suggesting that one can do whatever one wants to
with the body. It is something to be disciplined and controlled. It can be used for
indulgence in food, physical activity, sex, etc. The body can also be viewed as a
commodity that is bought and sold for someone’s pleasure (Hall, 2010). However, the
consequences of indulgence and viewing the body as a commodity are rarely connected
to the concept of dualism. Objectification and self-objectification are a consequence of
this view of the body. When the body is separate from personhood, then the body can be
viewed as an object. Objectification has negative consequences that are discussed in a
following section (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; Fredrickson, Roberts, Noll, Quinn, &
Twenge, 1998). Self- monitoring and increased awareness of the body, which are
symptoms of self-objectification, lead to shame, dissatisfaction and disconnection from
the self (Green et al., 2012; Tylka & Sabik, 2010).

The other way to perceive the body is that of holism, which means to see the physical body and personhood, mind or soul as deeply connected to each other. This holistic view of the body means that the body is functional and relational to other people (Hall, 2010). Some scholars in Christian theology have seen this as a sanctified view of the body. This view states that the body is holy, has value, and is a temple (Jacobson, 2014; Mahoney et al., 2005). Holy bodies are ones that are connected to God and exist to reflect the attributes of God (Cox & Moon, 2002; Hall, 2010). The relational and holistic perspective points to the issue that people are not just individuals and they are not objects. This perspective reflects a more purposeful and positive view of the body.

The Rudd and Lennon (1994) model of body aesthetics examines the body from a holistic perspective. It is theoretically based in social identity and social comparison. This model takes the cultural created appearance ideal and compares that to the person and their constructed appearance. This process includes social comparison and the opinions of others as appreciators or evaluators of the constructed appearance. If the constructed appearance is close to the cultural ideal then, self-esteem and self-image are increased. If it is not, then the person must cope through working harder to match the ideal, rejecting the ideal, or changing the ideal. This model incorporates multiple aspects of body image such as cultural ideals, social comparison, and coping mechanisms and tackles the body in its totality as both a physical aesthetic and as an entity connected strongly to self-image.

With the Rudd and Lennon (1994) model, the social comparison process is used
to explain why the cultural ideal is important and why it is implemented. People compare themselves to others often and they compare to the ideals so they can see where they measure. This leads to self-esteem building or depleting. Modesty and sanctification of the body could be included in this process. Sanctification of the body posits that the body is a temple and it is holy (Mahoney et al., 2005). This could mean that the sanctified body perspective is an ideal that people could strive for. Modesty in dress in the case of the sanctification of the body could also be used as a standard in which people compare. In some communities, dressing modestly is a guideline and a standard that people uphold otherwise people will gossip and make assumptions about a person if modesty is not implemented (Arthur, 1997). In the next section, the consequences of a holistic perspective will be discussed further in light of health and body image.

**Religion, health, and body image.** In the past decade, interest in religion and appearance has increased (Boyatzis et al., 2007; Boyatzis & Quinlan, 2008; Grenfell, 2006; Homan & Boyatzis, 2009; Isherwood, 2010; Jacobson, 2014; Zhang, 2013). This includes a focus on health, body image, and modesty in relation to Judeo-Christian faith. Mahoney et al. (2005) surveyed over 250 college students about sanctified beliefs of the body and how those beliefs affected health patterns. Sanctified beliefs about the body include thinking that the body is sacred, holy, and a temple of God. The authors found that beliefs in God and a sanctified view of the body promoted better health patterns, meaning college students engaged in less alcoholic drinking, or drug use, and more exercise and better eating habits. In this sample, a sanctified view of the body provided self-protective behaviors. Boyatzis et al. (2007) conducted an experimental design testing
the effect of religious affirmations on body image. The experiment had three conditions: the religious condition contained theistic based body affirmations, the second condition had spiritual based body affirmations but no references to God, and the third and control condition had participants read statements about events around the university. The participants that read theistic and Christian based affirmations compared to the secular body affirmation condition and control condition actually had a significant increase in their body esteem after viewing pictures of thin ideal models they were shown (Boyatzis et al., 2007). This study provides evidence that the effect of Christian and theistic based affirmations of the body do promote a healthier body image.

Homan and Boyatzis (2009) found that higher religiosity predicted higher body satisfaction in older adults (mean was 74 years old). Jacobson (2014) surveyed women about Christian attitudes toward the body and how they predict body satisfaction. Dualistic views of body, meaning the soul and body are considered to be separate, were negatively related to body satisfaction. A sanctified view of the body predicted body satisfaction and was negatively correlated to objectification (monitoring the body as an object) (Jacobson, 2014; Jacobson, Hall, & Anderson, 2013). Homan and Boyatzis (2010) measured religiosity through attachment to God and its impact on eating disorder symptomology. This attachment to God bond can provide comfort, security, and confidence if it is secure and stable (Homan & Boyatzis, 2010). Secure attachment to God reduced the eating disorder risk factors such internalization of a thin body ideal and body dissatisfaction. Thus, secure attachment to God provided a protective element against eating disorder symptomology. Attachment to God also reduces the negative
effect of viewing thin ideal media (Homan, 2012). Homan and Cavanaugh (2013) studied the impact of attachment to God in relation to positive body image. They found that secure attachment to God contributed to explaining more positive body image and increased well-being than a less secure relationship to God. In sum, these studies reveal that there is a link between Christianity, theistic beliefs, and a positive or healthier body image. However, most of these studies use religious commitment, attachment to God, and sanctification as the only measures of religiosity. Also, most of these studies measure body image through body satisfaction, or a general satisfaction with various parts of the body, while there are other ways to measure body image that may be more thorough and meaningful. Concepts such as appearance evaluation and appearance orientation, which measure how a person actually feels about their body and how invested they are in their appearance, may be better ways of judging body image (Cash, 2000). These studies point to the idea that the social identity of being Christian impacts how one feels about their body.

In addition, a set of norms, such as modesty could also impact how one reacts to their own body. Swami et al. (2014) found evidence to suggest that Muslim women wearing the hijab for religious and modesty purposes had better body image than Muslim women that did not wear it. The hijab was a protective factor for body image above the religious effect. Torres-Mcgehee, Monsma, Dompier, and Washburn (2012) investigated cheerleaders, their clothing styles and eating disorder risk. They discovered the flyers (those who do twists and turns in the air) and those wearing more revealing cheerleading uniform, which exposes the midriff, had a higher risk for eating disorders. This suggests
that cheerleaders who dressed less modestly were more at risk for poor body image. Frith and Gleeson (2008) conducted research on clothing practices of women and how they used these practices to manage body distress. Evidence suggested that women used clothing to conceal parts of their body they did not like and revealed the parts that they liked. Concealing and revealing the body also known as modesty is a part of managing body image or how one feels about their body. These research studies suggested that modesty and body image have a relationship; thus the next set of hypotheses are formed: 

*Hypothesis 4*. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) are related to body image.

A: Views of modesty are positively related to appearance orientation.

B: Views of modesty are positively related to appearance evaluation.

*Hypothesis 5*. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) positively affect the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and body image.

A: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and appearance orientation.

B: Views of modesty positively affect on the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and appearance evaluation.

*Hypothesis 6*. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) affect the relationship between extrinsic religious orientation and body image.

A: Views of modesty negatively affect the relationship between compartmentalization and appearance orientation.
B: Views of modesty negatively affect the relationship between compartmentalization and appearance evaluation.

C: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between social support and appearance orientation.

D: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between social support and appearance evaluation.

E: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between personal support and appearance orientation.

F: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between personal support and appearance evaluation.

Hypothesis 7. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) affect the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and body image.

A: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and appearance orientation.

B: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and appearance evaluation.

Next, objectification, and self-objectification will be discussed in the ways they relate to body image and appearance.

Objectification and self-objectification theory

This theory from Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) posits that females in particular take on an observer’s view of their body and internalize the message that their body is an
object, or set of parts, to be viewed or consumed by others. Objectification theory has its roots in feminist theory and psychology. In feminist theory, the male heterosexual gaze looks at women and turns them into sex objects (Mulvey, 1975). Because men tend to look at women as sex objects, women may then take on this perspective and see their own bodies as an object instead of a part of a whole person, referred to as self-objectification. The objectifying gaze does not have to be sexual in nature, but it does refer to making the body separate from personhood and its use for others needs or wants. The objectifying gaze is perpetuated through people and the media (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; McKinley & Hyde, 1996a). Once women transfer this perspective to themselves, objectifying oneself can have consequences such as shame, body monitoring, eating disorders, and mental health issues. Psychological processes help explain how this self view leads to shame and anxiety (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Objectification theory assumes that sexual objectification occurs all the time. It also assumes that in cultures where the female form is objectified, self-objectification occurs in all women at some point in their lives.

Self-objectification specifically refers to oneself turning the body into an object to be evaluated (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997; McKinley & Hyde, 1996a). Due to the socialization of being objectified by others, women over time may look at themselves as objects and separate their bodies from their personhood. Doing so results in a type of objectified body consciousness where personal appearance is important and monitored more frequently. This body monitoring or body surveillance can become a habit and habit produces expectations. Body monitoring may lead to expectations as to how others
will treat the person (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Self-objectification may occur because physical attractiveness can give certain privileges to people, especially to women who are often associated with less privilege. Wealth, status, and social power are often given to people who are physically beautiful (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Trait self-objectification describes which body attributes are more important and may include height, thinness, muscularity, and certain facial characteristics. Trait self-objectification can also be variable in both women and men, though it occurs more readily in women (Fredrickson et al., 1998). For some people, self-objectification of the body is stable through most contexts, whether it is high or low, and for others it becomes accessible only in certain instances (Fredrickson et al., 1998). These instances are equated with individual differences in the varying degrees of self-objectification. Self-objectification contributes to people finding their self worth in the evaluation of their bodies.

Fredrickson and Roberts (1997) predicted that certain feelings are the result of sexual objectification. Shame, anxiety, high motivational states and awareness of internal body states are all consequences explained through objectification theory. Shame is the negative emotion that occurs from comparing oneself to the cultural ideal and failing to measure up to the standard (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). This shame can be recurrent, persistent, and hard to relieve because people are constantly bombarded with cultural ideals. Especially in relationship to cultural body ideals, shame can persist because the body does not change overnight to fit the body ideal. Objectification leads to shame because one sees his or her body as an object, which should measure up to the ideal, but
most often, does not, resulting in feelings of shame or guilt.

Anxiety is linked to objectification because it represents fears that are associated with being treated like an object. Anxiety is the anticipation of a threat or a frightening situation. In this instance, women can have appearance anxiety and safety anxiety (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Since the female body is objectified in Western culture, women are anxious about what they wear as they consider if it invites attention or not. Also they are aware of their situation, meaning that if others objectify them, they anticipate having to protect themselves if they are physically or emotionally attacked. This links women to body surveillance and being aware of their surroundings.

Predictions about high motivational states are important to the theory as well. These motivation states are representative of when a person loses their self-consciousness and truly lives unhindered by worry (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Self-objectification makes people more aware of their bodies, which increases self-consciousness and body surveillance. These aspects may hinder people from focusing on any tasks at hand or perhaps performing to their best ability, as was seen in the Fredrickson et al (1998) study in which inducing state self objectification resulted in poorer performance on a math test than the control condition.

Objectification theory also makes predictions about the awareness of internal states such as hunger, thirst or exhaustion. Since women are constantly monitoring their external appearance which consumes their cognitive resources, they have fewer resources for their internal body states (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). The result is that they pay less attention to their internal body cues and can suppress them, which could be harmful.
Overall the combination of shame, anxiety, muted internal body cues, and fewer peak motivational states mean that people are less attuned to their lived experiences.

Also, self-objectification or objectified body consciousness which is rooted in feminist theory, deals with views of women (McKinley & Hyde, 1996b). Therefore, attitudes toward women will impact self-objectification. If women are seen from the strict patriarchal view, then their “value” as individuals is less than that of men and their personhood is reduced. This means that women can be objectified. This belief has been related to attitudes toward domestic violence and rape (Gengler & Lee, 2001; Jankowski, Johnson, Holtz Damron, & Smischney, 2011). If seeing women as less than a person or of less value than men carries over, this belief could lead to surveying the body negatively.

Tiggemann and Andrew (2012a) studied the role of clothing in objectification theory. They compared the feelings women had when dressed in a bathing suit and in a sweater and jeans. Women in the bathing suits experienced more self-objectification through negative mood, shame, and body dissatisfaction. This finding confirms the predictions of objectification theory and extends it to include the role of clothing. When revealing more of their body, self-objectification can take place among women because they are monitoring how their body appears. Frith and Gleeson (2008) also found that how women feel each day plays a role in the clothing they wear. For instance, if a woman is feeling “fat,” she will wear less revealing or looser clothing and if she feels “thin” she may wear more revealing clothing. Wearing flattering and modest clothing may help women manage their body image and self-objectify less. This suggests that
modesty and body surveillance or monitoring are connected. Therefore, dressing modestly depending on the motivation may allow women to feel more comfortable with their bodies, the clothes they wear, and self objectify or monitor their bodies less. In relation to religious identity and modesty, the following hypotheses are posited:

*Hypothesis 8.* Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) are positively related to body surveillance.

*Hypothesis 9.* Body surveillance is related to body image.

A. Body surveillance is positively related to appearance orientation.

B. Body surveillance is negatively related to appearance evaluation.

*Hypothesis 10.* Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) positively affect the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and body surveillance.

*Hypothesis 11.* Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) affect the relationship between extrinsic religious orientation and body surveillance.

A: Views of modesty negatively affect the relationship between compartmentalization and body surveillance.

B: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between social support and body surveillance.

C: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between personal support and body surveillance.

*Hypothesis 12.* Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based
views) positively affect the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and body surveillance.

*Hypothesis 13*. Body surveillance affects the relationship between views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) and body image

A: Body surveillance positively affects the relationship between modesty and appearance orientation.

B: Body surveillance negatively affects the relationship between modesty and appearance evaluation.

**Summary of conceptual model**

Taken as a whole, studying religiosity, body image and modesty together is not something that has been previously investigated. Relationships have been previously established between religiosity and body satisfaction and well-being. Thus, this study will investigate relationships between religious orientation and sanctification of the body (manifestation of God in the body) in terms of proximal (far) and distal (near) religious measurements to potentially yield new results. Modesty can be religiously related. Hotly debated in popular press and blogs, modesty is complex, difficult to define, and often culturally related (Harms, 2013; Seifert, 2010). It is a topic that needs more research in order to understand it better. With respect to body image and religiosity, body satisfaction and eating disorder inventories have been the major ways to study this connection. Therefore, a better way to understand how women think about their bodies may be through assessing appearance orientation and appearance evaluation, rather than
examining how satisfied they are with specific areas of their bodies as reported in previous studies. Self-objectification in terms of body surveillance is another measure that will be used to assess how women see their bodies in terms of appearance versus function. Also, testing how modesty is related to the concepts of body image and self-objectification will be helpful. Overall, using the social identity approach, this study aims to connect Christian identity to modesty norms and in turn to its impact on body image.
Figure 2.1. Conceptual model

*ERO-C: Extrinsic Religious orientation-Compartmentalization; ERO-S: Social support; ERO-P: Personal support; IRO: Intrinsic religious orientation; MGB: Manifestation of God in the Body; EM: Esteem based Modesty; RM: Religious based Modesty; MM: Maturity based Modesty; BS: Body surveillance; AO: Appearance Orientation; AE: Appearance Evaluation

The model proposes that religiosity in terms of extrinsic orientation, intrinsic orientation and manifestation of God in the body effects modesty which impacts body image. Low body consciousness relates to lower appearance orientation and higher appearance evaluation. Listed below is a summary of the hypothesis proposed by the model.
Summary of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. High intrinsic religious orientation is positively related to views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views).

Hypothesis 2. Extrinsic religious orientation is related to views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views).

A: Compartmentalization is negatively related to views of modesty
B: Social support is positively related to views of modesty.
C: Personal support is positively related to views of modesty

Hypothesis 4. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) are related to body image.

A: Views of modesty are positively related to appearance orientation.
B: Views of modesty are positively related to appearance evaluation.

Hypothesis 5. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) positively affect the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and body image.

A: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and appearance orientation.
B: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and appearance evaluation.

Hypothesis 6. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) affect the relationship between extrinsic religious orientation and body image.

A: Views of modesty negatively affect the relationship between
compartmentalization and appearance orientation

B: Views of modesty negatively affect the relationship between compartmentalization and appearance evaluation.

C: Views of modesty positively affects the relationship between social support and appearance orientation

D: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between social support and appearance evaluation.

E: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between personal support and appearance orientation.

F: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between personal support and appearance evaluation.

Hypothesis 7. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) affect the relationship between manifestation of god in the body and body image.

A: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and appearance orientation.

B: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and appearance evaluation.

Hypothesis 8. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) are positively related to body surveillance.

Hypothesis 9. Body surveillance is related to body image.

A. Body surveillance is positively related to appearance orientation.

B. Body surveillance is negatively related to appearance evaluation.
Hypothesis 10. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) positively affect the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and body surveillance.

Hypothesis 11. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) affect the relationship between extrinsic religious orientation and body surveillance.

A: Views of modesty negatively affect the relationship between compartmentalization and body surveillance.

B: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between social support and body surveillance.

C: Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between personal support and body surveillance.

Hypothesis 12. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) positively affect the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and body surveillance.

Hypothesis 13. Body surveillance affects the relationship between views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) and body image

A: Body surveillance positively affects the relationship between modesty and appearance orientation.

B: Body surveillance negatively affects the relationship between modesty and appearance evaluation.
Chapter 3: Method

In this research design, quantitative instruments will be implemented. An online-based survey will have a mix of quantitative measurement scales and demographic questions to test hypotheses.

Sample

The participants will all be women of various ages from 18 to over 60. The goal of the research is to reach adult women of all ages and ethnicities. The survey should reach women of various Christian denominations to add some variance in perspectives and allow any woman to complete the survey if she chooses. The survey will be distributed to various geographic regions in the United States in order gain a variety of perspectives as well. The target sample size will be around 400 women. This target sample size will hopefully garner internal validity for the quantitative scales. The participants will be recruited through the Internet and contacts the researcher has through her access from church participation. Promotion of the survey will be through Facebook groups and email contacts. Thus the design uses convenience and snowball sampling and will be effective in locating women who self identify as Christian in Ohio, Kentucky, Georgia, and Florida.
Instruments

Instrumentation will focus on measuring religious orientation, religious perspectives on the body, modesty appearance orientation, appearance evaluation, and body surveillance. The following instruments will provide data to answer each of the research hypotheses. See Appendix 3 for the full survey instrument.

New Indices of Religious Orientation. This instrument measures the areas of religious orientation (extrinsic and intrinsic.) This specific instrument was developed by Francis (2007) and was proposed as an improvement over the Religious Life Inventory (C. Daniel Batson & Patricia A. Schoenrade, 1991; C.D. Batson & P.A. Schoenrade, 1991; Batson, Schoenrade, & Ventis, 1993). This 18-item measurement is weighted equally among the two orientation constructs, with nine items per an orientation. Each construct has specific concept that are tested. For instance, extrinsic orientation has three concepts with three questions in each concept. Extrinsic orientation includes concepts of compartmentalization, social support and personal support as its concepts that make up the construct. Intrinsic orientation includes concepts of integration, public religion, and personal religion. The alpha levels measuring reliability of the sub scales are above .84 in the full form of the scale. The items are measured using a five-point Likert scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Manifestation of God in the Body. This scale was developed by Mahoney et al (2005) to measure the degree to which participants see their bodies as sanctified or sacred. This scale supports a view of the body opposite from dualism. It is theistic based
and strongly represents a Judeo-Christian perspective. The 12 item scale has a reliability of $\alpha = .98$. It has statements such as “my body is created in God’s image” and “God is present in my body.” It is measured through a seven point Likert scale with 1 representing “strongly disagree” and 7 “strongly agree.” This scale has been shown to be related to self protective health behaviors such as less drug use, less alcohol consumption, and not smoking (Mahoney et al., 2005). The scores range from 12-84 with a total score average score of 55 (Mahoney et al., 2005). The scores are averaged over the total scale and the higher scores mean the person believes in a higher manifestation of God in the body. This scale is used as measure of sanctification.

**Multidimensional Body-Self Relation Questionnaire- Appearance Orientation.** The MBSRQ comprises 10 subscales that measure different aspects of body image. Two of these are salient to this study. The Appearance Orientation subscale (Cash, 2000) measures how invested people are in their appearance through statements about appearance related thoughts. The MBSRQ has been used extensively in the body image literature. The 12-item subscale uses statements such as “before going out in public, I notice how I look” and “before going out, I usually spend a lot of time getting ready.” It uses a 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1= “definitely disagree” to a 5= “definitely agree.” The reliability of this scale is $\alpha = .85$. The range of scores is between 12 and 60.

**Multidimensional Body-Self Relation Questionnaire- Appearance Evaluation.** The next MBSRQ subscale is Appearance Evaluation. This scale measures appearance satisfaction and one’s evaluation of appearance. It has 7 items and uses the
same Likert scale as the Appearance Orientation subscale. It includes statements, such as “I like my looks just the way they are” and “I like the way my clothes fit me.” The reliability of this scale is $\alpha = .88$. The range of scores is between 7 and 35.

**Objectified Body Consciousness Scale: Body Surveillance.** This measurement was designed to gauge how people objectify their bodies in accordance with feminist theory (McKinley & Hyde, 1996b). This subscale of the instrument measures how a person objectively watches their body and appearance like an outside observer, which is in line with self-objectification. The eight item scale uses a 6-point scale ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Statements included in the scale include “I think more about how my body feels than how my body looks” and “I often worry about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look good.” The reliability of this scale is $\alpha = .89$.

**Your Views of Modesty Scale.** Andrews (2014) developed a modesty scale for Jewish women. This scale will be modified to fit the Christian sample of women. The original scale included 25 questions on a five point Likert scale of strongly disagree to strongly agree. The scores ranged from 25 (not modest) to 125 (highly modest). In Andrews (2014) study, the mean was around 70. Items included “I think modesty is having respect for myself”, “I am uncomfortable when I am physically exposed, not wearing clothes, “and “I abide by cultural rules about female physical contact with males other than my husband.” The internal reliability of the entire scale was $\alpha = .92$. The scale is divided into subscales and constructs that measure esteem-based modesty.
religious-based modesty, and maturity-based modesty. However, some of the questions used in the scale are specific to conservative Jewish women and their health care and will not be included in this study. The number of questions used for this study is 18 items. Questions that were not used included “When I am in public, I am most comfortable covering my head with a wig, scarf, or hat,” and “I believe men and women should be kept divided in public places, unless they are married.”

**Demographic Variables.** The demographic variables used included age and ethnicity, religious denomination, and level of education. There is a possibility that age will affect the results. One of the first questions asked in the survey is gender in order to ensure that only women are responding. Religious denomination will be asked to determine the range of Christian denominations, which may impact the results. Education level will also be indicated because views could possibly be more or less strongly held with more education.

**Data Analysis**

The data generated from the survey will be analyzed using SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences). Structural equation modeling will be used to evaluate the model as a whole with AMOS SPSS add on. Confirmatory factor analysis will be used to test the latent constructs of religiosity, modesty and body image. These latent constructs are broken down into the latent variables of extrinsic religious orientation-compartmentalization, social support, and personal support, intrinsic religious orientation, manifestation of God in the body, maturity-based modesty, religious-based modesty,
esteem-based modesty, body surveillance, appearance orientation and appearance evaluation.
Chapter 4: Results

For this study, the survey instrument underwent institutional review board assessment successfully and was granted an exempt status. After this approval, the survey was distributed online in October 2015. The data from the survey was entered into a statistical software program (Statistical Package for Social Sciences, Version 22.0) and analyzed in two stages. In the first stage, the data were cleaned and descriptive statistics were run. In the second stage, confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling were run on the conceptual model using the AMOS SPSS add on.

Preliminary Data Analyses

The survey through a snowballing sampling technique yielded responses from 428 women. The survey was distributed through personal email contacts, personal Facebook pages, Facebook religious groups, and a personal Instagram post. The technique proved successful in attaining enough responses quickly. People did take the survey and posted the survey link to their personal pages or through group pages. After two weeks of access, 637 people started the survey but only 428 were complete and usable. Though the survey was meant for women, 9 men attempted to take the survey and their responses were discarded.

Sample Characteristics. The demographic characteristics of the sample were
analyzed using descriptive statistics especially frequencies in SPSS. 95.3% of the sample identified as white ethnicity. 58.1% of participants were ages 18-30. 21% of women were in their 30s and 21% were age 40 and above including some women in their 60s and 70s. Regarding religious affiliation, the two largest groups identified as non-denominational Christians (35%) and Baptist (27%). Almost all Christian denominations had some representation, seen in Table 4.1. As for their location, 36 states were represented, with the largest representation of 23% residing in Ohio, 13.6% in Georgia, 12.7% in Kentucky, and 7.4% in Texas. Also, 86% of the sample attended church at least twice a month. As for education, 40.4% had a bachelor’s degree, 35.5% had a graduate or professional degree, and 15.2% had some college education. See Table 4.1 for full demographic descriptive statistics.

### Table 4.1. Sample Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age range (N= 427)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-39</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-69</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Table 4.1. Continued

**Ethnicity (N=426)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>95.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Education Level (N=428)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s Degree</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate/ Professional Degree</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Church Attendance (twice a month) (N= 428)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Religious Denomination (N=428)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Denomination</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adventist</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assembly of God</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist (any)</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Christ</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Episcopal</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran (any)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist (any)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mormon/LDS</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Non Denominational</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentecostal/foursquare</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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State of Residence ($N=426$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Scale Descriptives. The scales used in the survey were included in their full form as originally developed. However, some of the scales items were cut from the analysis after a factor analysis was done on each of the scales. The questions dropped from the analysis due to their low and inadequate factor loadings are in Table 4.2. The scales with the remaining items are discussed henceforth.

Table 4.2. Dropped questions from analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items deleted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRO 4. I allow almost nothing to prevent me from going to church on Sundays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRO5. I go to church because it helps me to feel close to God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRO6. The church is most important to me as a place to share fellowship with other Christians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRO9. I often read books about prayer and the spiritual life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB2. My body is created in God’s image</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB3. My body is a gift from God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM2. I think of myself as more reserved than most people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM4. I don’t like to be the center of attention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM6. I do not like to draw attention to myself sexually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM7. I am more comfortable being with others who are similar to me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM 8. When I hear foul language and discussions about private matters such as sexual activity, it makes me feel uncomfortable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM1. I am uncomfortable wearing sleeveless clothes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM1. I think modesty is related to body image.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS2. I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether they look good on me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS3. I think more about how my body feels than how my body looks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS8. I am more concerned with what my body can do than how it looks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO6. I use very few grooming products</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO7. I am self conscious if my grooming isn’t right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO8. I usually wear whatever is handy without caring how it looks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO9. I am always trying to improve my physical appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO10. I don’t care what people think about my appearance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO11. I take special care with my hair grooming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO12. I never think about my appearance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*IRO=intrinsic religious orientation; MGB= manifestation of God in the Body; EM=esteem-based modesty; RM= religious-based modesty; MM=maturity-based modesty; BS= body surveillance; AO= appearance orientation
**Extrinsic religious orientation.** Extrinsic Religious orientation breaks down into three factors: compartmentalization, social support, and personal support. All questions were kept for the analysis and there were 3 items per subscale. The item mean for compartmentalization (ERO-C) was 1.85. This score suggested that the compartmentalization factor for extrinsic religious orientation is low for the sample, meaning that women did not compartmentalize Christianity in their lives. For social support (ERO-S), the item mean was 2.6. This average means that the sample slightly disagreed with going to church for social reasons, but their opinions leaned toward neutral. As for personal support (ERO-P), the item mean was 3.3. The finding suggested that the sample was somewhat neutral toward prayer as offering comfort and relief. The reliabilities for the subscales are listed in table 4.3.

**Intrinsic Religious Orientation.** This scale of Intrinsic religious orientation (IRO) was trimmed from 9 to 5 questions. Instead of the three original factors that were used in other studies, IRO fit well into one factor. This could have occurred because three of the four dropped questions were considered to be one of the three factors and the remaining two questions of third other factor were highly correlated with the concept that religion or a relationship with God was central to life. The mean of the remaining items was 4.3 on a Likert scale from 1 to 5. The item range was from 4.2 to 4.4. This average suggested that intrinsic religious orientation was high and the sample agreed with the idea that their religious beliefs are a master motivation for their lives. Reliability for the scale is listed in Table 4.3.

**Manifestation of God in the Body.** The scale of Manifestation of God in the Body
(MGB) fits into one factor and 2 questions were removed from the analysis. The item mean was 5.9 on a Likert scale of 1 to 7. The item range was 5.5 to 6.2. This result suggested that that the sample agreed with the statements that God lives and works through their bodies. The reliability of the scale is listed in Table 4.3.

**Views of Modesty.** Views of modesty are broken down into three factors of esteem-based modesty, religious-based modesty, and maturity-based modesty. Three questions made up the esteem based subscale. Esteem-based modesty (EM) has an item mean of 2.9 with a range of 2.6 to 3.5 on a Likert scale of 1 to 5. The average suggested that the sample was somewhat neutral toward the feeling of vulnerability or powerlessness when undressed. With religious-based modesty (RM) was composed of five questions. The mean was 3.3 with a range of 2.8 to 3.9. This finding suggested that the participants were somewhat neutral in their beliefs that modesty is about pride and respect for themselves. Maturity-based modesty (MM) was a two-question construct. The mean was 3.1 with a range of 3 to 3.2. This result also suggested that participants were neutral toward the idea that modesty is based on situation or context. The subscale reliabilities are listed in Table 4.3.

**Body surveillance.** Body surveillance (BS) was a scale that included five of the original eight questions. The mean of these items was 4.2 with a range of 3.7 to 4.7 on a Likert scale of 1 to 7. The average suggested that the sample of women somewhat agreed that they surveyed their bodies and appearance more often. The scale reliability is listed in Table 4.3.

**Appearance Orientation.** The scale of appearance orientation (AO) was trimmed
from twelve questions to five questions. The mean of these items was 3.4 with a range of 2.6 to 4.2 on a 1-5 Likert scale. This finding suggested that women in the sample were somewhat neutral toward how invested they were in their appearance. The scale reliability is listed in Table 4.3.

**Appearance Evaluation.** Appearance Evaluation (AE) was a scale composed of seven questions. The items mean was 3.1 with a range of 2.5 to 3.8 on a 1-5 Likert scale. This result suggested that the participants held a somewhat neutral evaluation of their appearance. The scale reliability is listed on Table 4.3.

**Table 4.3. Scale reliabilities and means**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Scale item mean</th>
<th>Scale Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Number of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERO-C</td>
<td>0.731</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO-S</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO-P</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.34</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRO</td>
<td>0.858</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>10.41</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>0.696</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM</td>
<td>0.784</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>0.859</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>0.843</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO</td>
<td>0.767</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE</td>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ERO-C: Extrinsic Religious orientation-Compartmentalization; ERO-S: Social support; ERO-P: Personal support; IRO: Intrinsic religious orientation; MGB: Manifestation of God in the Body; EM: Esteem based-Modesty; RM: Religious-based Modesty; MM: Maturity-based Modesty; BS: Body surveillance; AO: Appearance Orientation; AE: Appearance Evaluation*
Confirmatory Factor Analysis

The first step with structural equation modeling was a confirmatory factor analysis that allowed the latent constructs to correlate with each other. Based on the set of fit indices we can conclude that data fit the measurement model well. The Goodness of Fit index (GFI), the Comparative Fit index (CFI) and the Root Mean Standardized Error of Approximation (RMSEA) with their guidelines for good fit are listed in Table 4.4 (Hooper, Coughlan, & Mullen, 2008; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Sivo, Xitao, Witta, & Willse, 2006). The fit of the measurement model is listed in Table 4.5. The fit statistics for this measurement model indicated very good fit based on the RMSEA and a moderate fit on the GFI and the CFI. This showed that the model was psychometrically sound and the model could go forward to test the structural path. The factor analysis for the latent constructs is listed in Table 4.6.

Table 4.4. Guidelines for model fit indices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit indices</th>
<th>Guideline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of fit index (GFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Goodness of Fit index (AGFI)</td>
<td>&gt;.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>≥.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)</td>
<td>&lt;.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.5. Fit for Confirmatory Factor Analysis model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit indices</th>
<th>Model fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>.835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.037</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6. Factor Analysis of items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>ERO-C</th>
<th>ERO-S</th>
<th>ERO-P</th>
<th>IRO</th>
<th>MGB</th>
<th>EM</th>
<th>RM</th>
<th>MM</th>
<th>BS</th>
<th>AO</th>
<th>AE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ERO1</td>
<td>.876</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO2</td>
<td>.870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO3</td>
<td>.634</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO4</td>
<td></td>
<td>.812</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO5</td>
<td></td>
<td>.805</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO6</td>
<td></td>
<td>.811</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.734</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.829</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERO9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.713</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRO1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.821</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRO2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRO3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.786</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRO7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.755</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRO8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.798</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 4.6. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MGB1</th>
<th>.723</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MGB4</td>
<td>.799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB5</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB6</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB7</td>
<td>.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB8</td>
<td>.766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB9</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB10</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB11</td>
<td>.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MGB12</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM1</td>
<td>.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM3</td>
<td>.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM5</td>
<td>.817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM2</td>
<td>.739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM3</td>
<td>.764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM4</td>
<td>.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM5</td>
<td>.806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM6</td>
<td>.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM2</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM3</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS1</td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS4</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS5</td>
<td>.808</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS6</td>
<td>.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS7</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO1</td>
<td>.733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO2</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO3</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO4</td>
<td>.732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO5</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE1</td>
<td>.815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE2</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE3</td>
<td>.735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE4</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE5</td>
<td>.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE6</td>
<td>.789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE7</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ERO-C: Extrinsic Religious orientation-Compartmentalization; ERO-S: Social support; ERO-P: Personal support; IRO: Intrinsic religious orientation; MGB: Manifestation of God in the Body; EM: Esteem-based Modesty; RM: Religious-based Modesty; MM: Maturity-based Modesty; BS: Body surveillance; AO: Appearance Orientation; AE: Appearance Evaluation*
Construct validity was also tested in another way. The convergent and discriminant validity of the confirmatory factor analysis was tested as shown in Table 4.7. This analysis shows that the items for each construct were correlated to each other in reality (convergent validity) and that the other items in differing constructs did not relate to each other (discriminant validity). With these measures, there was a concern with the composite reliability of extrinsic religious orientation-personal support (ERO-P) because it was less than 0.7. There was also a concern with the average variance extracted (AVE) for the constructs appearance orientation (AO), extrinsic religious orientation –personal support (ERO-P), esteem-based modesty (EM) and religious-based modesty of the convergent validity because these were less than 0.5.

Modification indices. In order to make the model fit a little better, modification indices were used. This modification occurred when error terms of the items or latent constructs covaried significantly. The items IRO7 and IRO8 covaried because they both described a relationship with God. In Manifestation of God in the Body (MGB) items, several of the items covaried with each other (1, 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12). All of these statements had to do with God residing in the body or God working through the Body; thus, it was logical that these items were strongly related. Some of these items also related to items outside of their constructs. MGB 9 (God lives through my body) was related to religious-based modesty 2 (People view me as modest because of the image I portray). This finding could be related because people tend to equate conservative religion with more modesty and if people believe that God lives through their body, they
will portray a more modest image. MGB 9 was also related to body surveillance 6 (I often worry about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look good.). Beliefs about God living through one’s body did make people aware of the clothes they put on their body. All of the error terms for the three types of modesty related to each other. This correlation was logical since all of the modesty should relate because they measured different aspects of the same concept. Religious-based modesty 3 (I believe modesty is the essence of who I am) and RM6 (I think modesty is protective because it helps guard my personal space) were related. This outcome could have been because people connect protection of personal space to their essence, which could need protecting. Religious-based modesty 4 (I think modesty is about pride in ourselves) and RM 5 (I think modesty is having respect for yourself) were related, which is a logical since respect and pride tend to be closely related to each other. With appearance evaluation, items 4 (I am physically unattractive) and 5 (Most people would consider me good looking) were related. These statements are almost reciprocals of each other so their relationship was plausible. Body surveillance 1 (I rarely think about how I look) and appearance orientation 1 (Before going out in public, I always notice how I look) were also related. This association is plausible since they are both measuring if people think about their appearance. Body surveillance 5 (During the day, I think about how I look many times) and appearance orientation 3 (I check my appearance in the mirror whenever I can) covaried with each other. This overlap could have occurred because both of these questions measured a preoccupation with appearance.
Table 4.7. Convergent and Discriminant Validity

| CR | AVE | MSV | ASV | ERO | ERO | ERO | ERO | MGB | EM | RM | MM | BS | AO | AE |
|----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|----|
| AO | .774 | .407 | .457 | .050 | .638 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| EROC | .763 | .529 | .712 | .166 | .027 | .728 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| ERO | .781 | .547 | .180 | .084 | .320 | .739 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| ERO | .667 | .404 | .180 | .036 | .198 | .424 | .636 |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| IRO | .860 | .536 | .712 | .164 | .051 | .844 | .226 | .052 | .732 |     |     |     |     |     |     |
| MGB | .939 | .609 | .640 | .148 | .052 | .737 | .146 | .050 | .800 | .781 |     |     |     |     |     |
| EM | .722 | .475 | .304 | .064 | .025 | .193 | .161 | .003 | .196 | .205 | .689 |     |     |     |     |
| RM | .796 | .445 | .304 | .008 | .003 | .405 | .173 | .398 | .450 | .51 | .667 |     |     |     |     |
| MM | .864 | .761 | .607 | .047 | .085 | .239 | .308 | .241 | .174 | .132 | .228 | .873 |     |     |     |
| BS | .840 | .514 | .457 | .055 | .676 | .042 | .079 | .129 | .034 | .110 | .041 | .104 | .717 |     |     |
| AE | .882 | .517 | .126 | .030 | .004 | .039 | .214 | .105 | .021 | .107 | .355 | .208 | .204 | .719 |     |
Model fit

After the confirmatory factor analysis showed that the items and latent constructs were an acceptable fit, the hypothesized structured model was tested using the maximum likelihood method. An original model was tested; however, based on modification indices as discussed above, new correlations were introduced to improve model fit. With the modifications, the model fit was acceptable. The fit indices of the model are seen in Table 4.8. The structure of the model is in Figure 4.1.

Table 4.8. Model fit for the measurement model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit indices</th>
<th>Model fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GFI</td>
<td>.854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGFI</td>
<td>.834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>.938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>.037 (.034, .040)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi square</td>
<td>1846.041 (df=1167, p=.000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 4.1. Measurement model
Hypotheses

**Hypothesis 1.** The first hypothesis explored the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and views of modesty. It was hypothesized to be a positive relationship; however, none of the pathways towards religious based, esteem based, or maturity based modesty were significant. Estimates for all hypothesized pathways were listed in Table 4.9. This finding suggested that intrinsic religious orientation does not have a relationship with modesty or there is not enough evidence to support the claim; thus, hypothesis 1 was not supported.

**Hypothesis 2.** The second hypothesis examined the relationship between extrinsic religious orientation and views of modesty. Some of these relationships were found to be significant; thus, the hypothesis was partially supported.

**2A.** It was hypothesized that the compartmentalization component of extrinsic religious orientation was negatively related to views of modesty (esteem-based, religious-based, and maturity-based). No pathways from compartmentalization to these types of modesty were significant. The estimates for these pathways are listed in Table 4.9. These results suggested that there is not enough evidence to support a relationship between compartmentalization and modesty or perhaps there is no relationship between the two.

**2B.** It was hypothesized that extrinsic religious orientation-social support would be positively related to views of modesty. Social support was not positively related to esteem-based modesty; however, the relationship was significant. Social support (going to church for social reasons) was negatively related to esteem-based modesty ($\beta=-.122,$
This outcome suggested that social support negatively effects modesty driven by vulnerability (esteem-based modesty). It was also hypothesized that social support would be positively related to religious-based modesty; however, no significant relationship existed, suggesting there is not enough evidence to support the claim. Social support did have a positive significant relationship with maturity-based modesty; thus, supporting the hypothesis ($\beta = .248$, $p=.002$). This result implied socially based religious orientation has a small positive impact on context or maturity-based modesty. This claim provided evidence that the social support aspect of extrinsic religious orientation does have a small impact on modesty in the maturity-based and esteem-based views. The social support aspect of religiosity gives a situational context for modesty, which is why it impacted maturity and esteem based modesty. Table 4.9 listed the estimates for the pathways.

2C. Personal support was hypothesized to have a positive relationship with views of modesty. There was no significant relationship between personal support and esteem-based modesty. There was a significant relationship between personal support and religious-based modesty. It was slightly positive ($\beta = .271$, $p=.000$). This proposed that personal support, which refers to way people use prayer does make a positive impact on religious based modesty. Personal support was not significantly related to maturity-based modesty. This overall hypothesis was only partially supported. The connection of personal support, which measured if prayer provided comfort and relief, to modesty that provided protection and respect (religious-based modesty) is logical because comfort and relief make way for a protective factor. The pathway estimates were listed in Table 4.9

**Hypothesis 3.** Hypothesis three proposed that manifestation of God in the body
(beliefs about God residing in the body or using the body) was positively related to views of modesty (esteem-based, religious-based, and maturity-based). The hypothesis was partially supported. Manifestation of God in the body was not significantly related to esteem-based modesty. Manifestation of God in the body was related to religious-based modesty. It had a small significant positive relationship ($\beta = .219, p = .000$). This implied that beliefs about God being manifested in the body have a positive influence on modesty driven by the beliefs of pride, protection and respect. Manifestation of God in the body was not significantly related to maturity-based modesty. Estimates for the pathways are listed in Table 4.9.

**Hypothesis 4.** Hypothesis 4 stated that views of modesty were related to body image variables. The hypothesis was partially supported.

4A. Specifically, it was proposed that modesty was positively related to appearance orientation or investment in appearance. Esteem-based modesty, religious-based modesty, and maturity-based modesty did not have significant relationships with appearance orientation. The estimates for these pathways are listed in Table 4.9. This hypothesis was not supported. This could have occurred because body surveillance was a mediating factor in that relationship.

4B. It was hypothesized that modesty was positively related to appearance evaluation or how critically one evaluates her own body. Esteem based modesty had a significant relationship with appearance evaluation; however, it was negative ($\beta = -.530, p = .000$). This result suggested that modesty based on vulnerability had a negative influence on appearance evaluation. Religious-based modesty had a positive and
significant relationship with appearance evaluation (\( \beta = .223, p = .013 \)). This slight positive relationship implied that modesty driven by pride and respect for self influenced the way women evaluate their appearance. Maturity-based modesty also had a significant and positive relationship with appearance evaluation (\( \beta = .144, p = .000 \)). This slightly positive relationship suggested that higher agreement with context-driven modesty (maturity-based modesty) increases or betters appearance evaluation; thus, the hypothesis was partially supported.

**Hypothesis 5.** Hypothesis five posited that views of modesty influenced the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and body image. This hypothesis was not supported.

5A. It was suggested that modesty (esteem-based, religious-based, and maturity-based) positively affected the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and appearance orientation. Since intrinsic religious orientation was not significantly related to any of the modesty types, the hypothesis was not supported. See Table 4.9 for estimates.

5B. It was also suggested that modesty (esteem-based, religious-based, and maturity-based) positively affected the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and appearance evaluation. Again, since intrinsic religious orientation was not significantly to any of the modesty types, the hypothesis was not supported.

**Hypothesis 6.** Hypothesis six suggested that modesty (esteem-based, religious-based, and maturity-based) affected the relationship between extrinsic religious orientation and body image constructs. This hypothesis was partially supported, for parts
D and F only.

6A. It was suggested that modesty (esteem-based, religious-based, and maturity-based) negatively affected the relationship between compartmentalization and appearance orientation. Since compartmentalization was not significantly related to any of the modesty types, the hypothesis was not supported.

6B. It was also suggested that views of modesty (esteem-based, religious-based, and maturity-based) negatively affected the relationship between compartmentalization and appearance evaluation. Again, since compartmentalization was significantly to any of the modesty types, the hypothesis was not supported.

6C. It was posited that views of modesty positively affected the relationship between social support and appearance orientation. Though social support had a significant positive relationship with maturity-based modesty and a significant negative relationship with esteem based modesty, none of the modesty types had a significant relationship with appearance orientation. Thus the effect did not occur in these pathways and the hypothesis was not supported. See Table 4.9 for estimates.

6D. Views of modesty positively affected the relationship between social support and appearance evaluation. This hypothesis was partially supported. Social support has a negative relationship with esteem -based modesty and esteem-based modesty had a negative relationship with appearance evaluation. This finding supported a relationship. This relationship implied that higher social support orientation negatively impacts or lowers the vulnerability component of modesty, which increases (due to inverse relationship) the appearance evaluation. Social support was not significantly related to
religious-based modesty; thus, a full effect did not occur. Social support did have a positive relationship with maturity-based modesty and maturity-based modesty also had a positive relationship with appearance evaluation. Then, esteem-based modesty did positively affect the relationship between social support and appearance evaluation. This outcome suggested that context-based modesty strengthened the relationship between high social support orientation and high appearance evaluation. See Table 4.9 for estimates.

**6E.** It was hypothesized that views of modesty positively affected the relationship between personal support and appearance orientation. Personal support was related to religious based modesty but not with the other two modesty types; however, none of the modesty types are significantly related to appearance orientation. No effect occurred and the hypothesis was not supported. See Table 4.9 for estimates.

**6F.** It was posited that views of modesty positively affected the relationship between personal support and appearance evaluation. This hypothesis was partially supported. Personal support has a positive relationship with religious-based modesty but not with the other types of modesty. Religious-based modesty also has a positive relationship with appearance evaluation. This finding provided evidence that religious-based modesty positively affected the relationship between personal support and appearance evaluation. Modesty based on pride and respect strengthened the relationship between personal or prayer supported religious orientation and how women evaluate their appearance; thus this pathway partially supported the hypothesis. See Table 4.9 for estimates.
**Hypothesis 7.** Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) affected the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and body image. This central hypothesis was partially supported.

7A. It was proposed that views of modesty positively affected the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and appearance orientation. Manifestation of God in the body was positively related to religious-based modesty but to the other two modesty types. None of the modesty types were directly and significantly related to appearance orientation; thus, the hypothesized effect pathway was not supported. See Table 4.9 for estimates.

7B. It was also proposed that views of modesty positively affected the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and appearance evaluation. Manifestation of God in the body has a significant positive relationship with religious-based modesty. Religious-based modesty also has a positive significant relationship with appearance evaluation; thus, religious-based modesty did positively affect the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and appearance evaluation. This finding suggested that modesty based on pride and respect for one self strengthens the relationship between beliefs about God manifesting in the body and how people evaluate their appearance. The other pathways between other types of modesty with manifestation of God in the body and appearance evaluation were not significant. Overall these pathways were not supported, but the central hypothesis was partially supported through religious-based modesty.

**Hypothesis 8.** Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views)
based views) are positively related to body surveillance. This hypothesis was partially supported. Esteem-based modesty was positively related to body surveillance (β = .190, p = .022). The amount of vulnerability or esteem-based modesty women feel does impact how they monitor their bodies. Religious-based modesty was not significantly related to body surveillance. See Table 4.9 for estimates. Maturity-based modesty was positively related to body surveillance (β = .075, p = .038). Maturity- or context-based modesty had a small impact on how bodies are monitored.

**Hypothesis 9.** Body surveillance was related to body image. This hypothesis was supported.

9A. Body surveillance was positively related to appearance orientation. This hypothesis was supported (β = .516, p = .000) since the relationship was significant. This result provided evidence that the more women monitor their bodies the more they are oriented towards their appearance.

9B. It was also hypothesized that body surveillance was negatively related to appearance evaluation. This hypothesis was supported since the relationship was significant and negative (β = -.203, p = .002). This finding suggested that the more women monitor their bodies, the lower their evaluation of their appearance.

**Hypothesis 10.** It was posited that views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) positively affected the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and body surveillance. Though esteem-based modesty and maturity-based modesty were positively related to body surveillance, the hypothesis could not be supported. Intrinsic religious orientation was not related to any of the types of modesty,
which nullifies the effect. See Table 4.9 for estimates.

**Hypothesis 11.** Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) affected the relationship between extrinsic religious orientation and body surveillance. This central hypothesis was partially supported.

**11A.** It was hypothesized that views of modesty negatively affected the relationship between compartmentalization and body surveillance. This hypothesis was not supported. Compartmentalization was not significantly related to any of the types of modesty; thus, there was not enough evidence to support this relationship. See Table 4.9 for estimates.

**11B.** It was proposed that views of modesty positively affected the relationship between social support and body surveillance. This outcome was partially supported. Social support had a negative relationship with esteem-based modesty and esteem-based modesty had a positive relationship with body surveillance; thus, a relationship did exist. The more social support based orientation one has, the fewer feelings of vulnerability-based modesty exist which led to less body surveillance. Social support was not related to religious based modesty but was positively related to maturity-based modesty. Maturity-based modesty was positively related to body surveillance; thus, a positive relationship between social support, maturity-modesty and body surveillance existed. This link suggested that context-based modesty strengthened the relationship between social support and body surveillance. This finding meant that the social based religious orientation is context dependent and impacts how much body monitoring occurs. See Table 4.9 for estimates.
It was proposed that views of modesty positively affected the relationship between personal support and body surveillance. Personal support was positively related to religious-based modesty but not significantly related to esteem-based or maturity-based modesty. Religious-based modesty was not significantly related to body surveillance; thus, the hypothesis was not supported. See Table 4.9 for estimates.

Hypothesis 12. It was hypothesized that views of modesty positively affected the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and body surveillance. Manifestation of God is the body was positively related to religious-based modesty but not to esteem-based or maturity-based modesty. Religious-based modesty was not significantly related to body surveillance; thus, the relationship could not be confirmed and the hypothesis was not supported. See Table 4.9 for estimates.

Hypothesis 13. Body surveillance affects the relationship between views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based views) and body image. This hypothesis was supported.

13A. It was hypothesized that body surveillance positively affected the relationship between views of modesty and appearance orientation. Esteem-based modesty was positively related to body surveillance and body surveillance was positively related to appearance orientation. Also, the relationship between esteem-based modesty and appearance orientation was not significant. This relationship supported the full pathway between these constructs. This finding suggested that the relationship between esteem-based modesty or vulnerability-based modesty and how invested in appearance people is explained through body surveillance or how people monitor their bodies.
Religious-based modesty was not related to body surveillance, thus a relationship did not occur. Maturity-based modesty was positively related to body surveillance and body surveillance was positively related to appearance orientation. Also, the relationship between maturity-based modesty and appearance orientation was not significant; thus, it could be posited that the relationship between maturity- or context-based modesty and appearance orientation is explained through body surveillance. See Table 4.9 for estimates. This hypothesis was partially supported.

**13B.** It was also hypothesized that body surveillance negatively affected the relationship of modesty and appearance evaluation. This hypothesis was partially supported. Esteem-based modesty had a positive relationship with body surveillance and body surveillance had a negative relationship with appearance evaluation. This link supported negative effect, however, esteem-based modesty had a significant negative relationship with appearance evaluation, thus body surveillance partially affected this relationship. This outcome suggested that body surveillance explained some of the relationship between esteem-based modesty and appearance evaluation. The finding connection could mean that increased vulnerability-based modesty increased body surveillance, which lowered appearance evaluation. Religious-based modesty was not related to body surveillance thus no effect occurred. Maturity-based modesty was positively related to body surveillance and body surveillance was negatively related to appearance evaluation. This relationship proposed that higher context-based modesty increased body surveillance and increased body surveillance explained the lower appearance evaluation. See Table 4.9 for estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>C.R.</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EM--IRO</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.214</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM--IRO</td>
<td>-.140</td>
<td>.195</td>
<td>-.715</td>
<td>.475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM--IRO</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>-.072</td>
<td>.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM--MGB</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>1.095</td>
<td>.273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM--MGB</td>
<td>.219</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>3.446</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM--MGB</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.107</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>.689</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM--ERO-C</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM--ERO-C</td>
<td>-.339</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>-1.861</td>
<td>.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM--ERO-C</td>
<td>.345</td>
<td>.307</td>
<td>1.124</td>
<td>.261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM--ERO-S</td>
<td>-.122</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>-2.305</td>
<td>.021*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM--ERO-S</td>
<td>-.068</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>-1.456</td>
<td>.145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM--ERO-S</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>3.069</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM--ERO-P</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>.315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RM--ERO-P</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>3.744</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM--ERO-P</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>1.758</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS--EM</td>
<td>.190</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>2.291</td>
<td>.022*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS--RM</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>-1.208</td>
<td>.227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS--MM</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td>2.072</td>
<td>.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO--BS</td>
<td>.516</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>9.323</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE--BS</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-3.025</td>
<td>.002*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO--EM</td>
<td>-.091</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>-1.700</td>
<td>.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO--RM</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>1.546</td>
<td>.122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AO--MM</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.431</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE--EM</td>
<td>-.530</td>
<td>.108</td>
<td>-4.933</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE--RM</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>2.497</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AE--MM</td>
<td>.144</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>3.408</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.10. Summary of hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Confirmed?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1. High intrinsic religious orientation is positively related to views of modesty</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2. Extrinsic religious orientation is related to views of modesty.</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A. Compartmentalization is negatively related to views of modesty</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B. Social support is positively related to views of modesty.</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C. Personal support is positively related to views of modesty</td>
<td>Yes- partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3. Manifestation of God in the body is positively related to views of modesty</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4. Views of modesty are related to body image.</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A. Views of modesty are positively related to appearance orientation.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B. Views of modesty is positively related to appearance evaluation</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5. Views of modesty affected the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and body image.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5A. Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and appearance orientation.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5B. Views of mouldy positively affect the relationship between intrinsic religious orientation and appearance evaluation.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6. Views of modesty affect the relationship between extrinsic religious orientation and body image.</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6A. Views of modesty negatively affect the relationship between compartmentalization and appearance orientation.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6B. Views of mouldy negatively affect the relationship between compartmentalization and appearance evaluation.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6C. Views of mouldy positively affect the relationship between social support and appearance orientation.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D. Views of mouldy positively affect the relationship between social support and appearance evaluation.</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E. Views of mouldy positively affect the relationship between personal support and appearance orientation.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6F. Views of mouldy positively affect the relationship between personal support and appearance evaluation.</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7. Views of modesty affect the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and body image.</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7A. Views of mouldy positively affect the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and appearance orientation.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7B. Views of mouldy positively affect the relationship between manifestation of God in the body and appearance evaluation.</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 4.10. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H8. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>views) are positively related to body surveillance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9. Body surveillance is related to body image.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9A. Body surveillance is positively related to appearance orientation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9B. Body surveillance is positively related to appearance orientation.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10. Views of modesty (religious-based, esteem-based, and maturity-based</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>views) positively affect the relationship between intrinsic religious</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation and body surveillance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H11. Views of modesty affect the relationship between extrinsic religious</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>orientation and body surveillance.</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11A. Views of modesty negatively affect the relationship between</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>compartmentalization and body surveillance.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11B. Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between social</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support and body surveillance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11C. Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between personal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support and body surveillance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H12. Views of modesty positively affect the relationship between</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manifestation of God in the body and body surveillance.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H13. Body surveillance affects the relationship between views of modesty</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and body image</td>
<td>Yes-partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13A. Body surveillance positively affects the relationship between</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>views of modesty and appearance orientation.</td>
<td>partial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13B. Body surveillance negatively affects the relationship between</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>views of modesty and appearance evaluation.</td>
<td>partial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary of model pathways

To summarize the pathways that actually worked, see Figure 4.2 for a visual representation. Overall, the constructs of extrinsic religious orientation-compartmentalization and intrinsic religious orientation did not relate to any other constructs. Beginning with extrinsic religious orientation- social support, that variable was positively related to maturity-based modesty, which positively related to body
surveillance and appearance evaluation. This outcome provided evidence that the social reasons for being apart of a religion lead to situational based modesty (maturity modesty) which directly increased body monitoring and appearance evaluation; however, when maturity-based modesty was indirectly working through body monitoring or surveillance, appearance evaluation decreased. Maturity-based modesty also had an indirect positive relationship with appearance orientation through body surveillance. This result suggested that social support influences situational modesty (maturity), which increases the awareness of the body (body surveillance), which leads to people being more invested in how they appear (appearance orientation). Extrinsic religious orientation- social support also had a negative indirect relationship with appearance evaluation through esteem-based modesty. This finding proposed the idea that more social based religion decreased feelings of vulnerability when one is undressed (esteem modesty), which increased appearance evaluation. Esteem-based modesty also had an indirect relationship with appearance orientation and appearance evaluation through body surveillance. This result suggested that body surveillance is a filter for these constructs. The more that people monitor their bodies, the more invested they are in the appearance (appearance orientation) yet they become more critical of their appearance (appearance evaluation). Extrinsic religious orientation-personal support was directly positively related to religious based modesty. The more invested people are in prayer (personal support), the more they have feelings of respect and pride towards modesty and are protective of their personal space (religious-based modesty). This outcome also confirmed an indirect positive relationship with appearance evaluation by way of religious-based modesty.
Manifestation of God in the body was directly related to religious-based modesty, which also allowed for an indirect positive relationship with appearance evaluation. This finding suggested that beliefs about the God manifesting himself in the human body led to modesty being respect and pride based which lead to better appearance evaluation.

These major significant pathways provided evidence that this model of religiosity, modesty, and body image was valid and some major conclusions can be drawn from this model. First, some aspects of religiosity were important when discussing modesty and body image. The social aspects of religious orientations and beliefs about God and the body were deemed important with regard to views of modesty. Modesty was influenced by religious beliefs. This model supported the idea that modesty is a major factor when discussing dress and body image. Modesty was composed of different aspects but each one had its place and was significant in some way towards body surveillance, appearance evaluation and appearance orientation. This major findings of the model suggested that modesty acts as a filter and armor when examining body image. Discussion of these conclusions will be expanded upon in chapter five.
Figure 4.2. Model Pathways of Significance

Chapter Five: Discussion

In this study, the relationships of religiosity, modesty and body image were explored. Several conclusions will be drawn from the results of the hypotheses including discussion of the types of religiosity that did not relate, how social identity was a firm foundation for the study, types of modesty and how they related to each other and body image, implications for the research and recommendations for future research.

Through this research, two major implications can be made. Through religious identity, two major functions of modesty were seen. First, modesty acted as a filter for how one views themselves and their appearance. The other was that modesty was protective, like a piece of armor that was rooted in religious values. To return to the purpose of this research, the social aspect of religiosity and the values of prayer and values about the body impacted one’s views of modesty, which influenced body image for the better. The principle findings of this study were that only certain types of religiosity impacted modesty and that modesty acts as a filter for how one views their appearance. In other terms, the social identity of Christian women in this study managed the esteem- and maturity-based modesty. The values based in Christianity concerning prayer and the body influenced religious (protective) modesty. These findings provided evidence that modesty was rooted in social construction and personal values. Though
seemingly inherent, modesty, in its many forms, acted as a sieve for which people view their bodies and other’s appearances.

**Modesty as a filter**

*The modesty filter through religious social identity.* Through the social support aspect of extrinsic religiosity, the social groups of Christian women influenced modesty. One reason people go to church is to have community and develop friendships. This community becomes a point of reference for what is accepted in behavior and dress, or in other terms, social norms. From this vantage point, individuals then decide if they are going to follow social norms and if they will dress and behave similarly to their group. Social identity theory states that the group that is most important to an individual will become central to their identity and the person will choose to follow that group’s norms. In this particular sample of women, Christian religiosity was important. It was core to their identity and they attended church on a regular basis. Though the women in the sample were much more intrinsically motivated in their religious orientation, the social component of extrinsic orientation had a small but mighty influence on certain types of modesty.

In this study, the social support aspect of extrinsic religious orientation was connected to esteem-based and maturity-based modesty. With esteem-based modesty, which measured if women felt powerless when undressed (a type of vulnerability), social support had a negative influence. This relationship suggested that the social aspects of religion and going to church are important and are related to modesty. Social support is not the main reason that people follow a religion or have a relationship with God, but it
still has influence. This view suggested a strong connection to social identity theory. If people believe that Christianity or a relationship with God is central to their identity, then they will join groups that value that identity. With groups come norms or values and behaviors that are accepted and followed. Social norms in a church setting are important and people follow them. People want to be accepted in the church they attend and will be guided by norms in order to do that; thus, modesty norms in appearance are going to be imitated. Women modify what their peers consider appropriate in dress and what their peers look down upon as well. Understanding these modesty norms can give women a sense of power so they do not have to feel vulnerable. Perhaps in church women feel safer, and thus, esteem-based modesty decreases, giving women more power.

Social support had a positive influence on maturity-based modesty. This means that the influence of attending church and being a part of that community puts the members into certain situations. Maturity-based modesty is based on the context of the situation- its setting, the people in that same place, the casualness or fanciness of the building or event. These are the determinants of the context. With modesty, these results provide evidence that modesty is context driven. Modesty can change with awareness of the situation and knowing what behavior or attire is appropriate for that situation. This concept is rooted in social norms. Again, knowing the audience of a situation is a determining factor for constructing one’s appearance. In the social psychology of dress, context for dress is discussed as it is a filter for determining what people wear or how they adorn themselves (Kaiser, 1993). It is no surprise that modesty is context driven as well. Modesty looks different at home than it does at a fancy cocktail party or from what
women wear at work. Context of a situation gives indicators of how to dress- what types of clothing are appropriate/accepted, how tightly fitted the garments can be, how much of the body should be covered, what type of accessories are accepted, and how much makeup can be worn, etc. Once women have their contextual dress indicators, they can compare how they dress to others. Their appearance evaluation and self-esteem fluctuate based on how they compare with others and how much worth they put on the comparison. An extension of the research could be the addition of social comparison theory because religious identity and group norms proved to be important. This finding means that being a part of the group is important and people will compare themselves to others to make sure that they stay a member of the group. People have a need to evaluate their opinions and abilities (Festinger, 1954). Social comparison acts as a measuring stick for how well individuals compare to their group’s standards. Adding in this theory to social identity provides a foundation for why individuals compare themselves to others and social identity theory covers why groups compare to other groups. According to Rudd and Lennon’s (1994) model, a cultural ideal is the basis for creating and examining one’s appearance. This cultural ideal could be based on society’s views; however, in this case, religious group norms proved to be a factor in the in the creation of the appearance ideal. These religious group norms include the social support aspect, the sanctified body aspect, and modesty. After discussing the particular types of modesty that relate to religious social identity, modesty as a filter for appearance will be discussed next.

The complexity of the modesty filter. In light of social identity, modesty was one of those constructs that people think they know about, but was complex and
multilayered. Modesty and immodesty are main functions of dress and appearance; thus, it is fundamental to the field of fashion and retail research. This study quantified modesty with Christian women based on previous research with Orthodox Jewish women. More than just quantifying this construct, this study revealed that in relation to religiosity and body image, modesty acted like a filter. Religiosity sourced the beliefs and values for identity while modesty filtered out what was important for body image creation. Different types of modesty determined how individuals filtered their perceptions of body image. Through the lens of esteem or vulnerability modesty, people could feel powerless when they were undressed, which then caused them to feel negatively about their appearance. If they felt that modesty was about respecting themselves or having pride for themselves, then this view increased positive feelings about appearance attractiveness. If women feel that maturity or situations impact what they wear and concern for modesty is involved in this choice, then appearance evaluation also increased in the findings.

Modesty can be something that clarifies what is important when dressing for an event or social activity. Internally, women ask themselves “what clothing looks ‘respectable’ on my body considering my social group and the event I am going to?” They also consider: “Am I comfortable in this outfit?” “Do I feel exposed or vulnerable in this dress?”, and “Do I feel powerful or powerless in this ensemble?” These are the questions that one’s filter of modesty answers.

Therefore, based on the results of this study, it is concluded that one’s definition or filter of modesty will look different for everyone because beliefs or value systems,
body shapes and life experiences form their definitions of modesty. The sieve of modesty also shaped how one thinks about others. When a woman sees another woman and evaluates her appearance, that thought process will be sifted through her definition of modesty. If this woman believes that showing several inches of cleavage is immodest, then the woman with this type of cleavage will be judged through this definition of modesty. The women judging could make assumptions about the other women that might be untrue. This is where “slut shaming,” (criticizing women for real or presumed sexual activity), based in appearance could occur. This is where people need to be aware that modesty is one filter that individuals use to process information about appearance. Strong religious identity with religious group ties provides a base from which the modesty filter can be formed.

**Modesty filter and body image.** After the modesty filter was formed, body image was evaluated. Modesty based in vulnerability (esteem-based) had a negative relationship with appearance evaluation among the women. Thus, one can conclude that when women feel powerless when exposed, they likely to be more critical of their appearance. They will not feel safe enough to have a positive evaluation of their bodies. Maturity-based modesty had a positive direct effect on appearance evaluation among the sample. Situational based modesty increased women’s evaluation of themselves. Therefore it appears that modesty gives women an awareness of their bodies that can be both positive and negative.

This effect was mitigated through body surveillance. Esteem-based modesty and maturity-based modesty were related to body surveillance. Body surveillance assessed
how much women monitored their bodies—whether they were concerned with how they looked and if they thought about their appearance a lot. It makes sense that modesty based on the feeling of powerlessness when exposed (esteem-based modesty) would impact how women monitor their bodies. When one feels powerless when exposed, more monitoring would occur which leads to a negative evaluation of the body. Also when one is aware of the situation or context with regard to modesty (maturity modesty), body monitoring will increase a little which could lead to a lower appearance evaluation. Body surveillance acted like a mediating factor that had a negative effect on appearance evaluation, though maturity modesty actually increased appearance evaluation overall. Thus, an awareness of the context and appropriate dress for that situation aids appearance evaluation.

However, anytime body surveillance entered the picture in this study, it caused women to be aware of their bodies in a negative way. Constantly monitoring one’s body is known to take up mental resources that could be used for other activities (Fredrickson & Roberts, 1997). Instead of living in the moment and relishing it, people become concerned with how their clothes look or comparing their looks to others. Body surveillance can cause individuals to be more oriented towards appearance in general, but think of themselves as less attractive or appealing.

Modesty as Armor

Values and modesty. Modesty was also driven by values in this study. Religious identity provided a base for personal values of prayer and beliefs about God
and the body. Extrinsic religious orientation—personal support, which measured the importance of prayer for comfort and relief, showed that prayer was somewhat important and became a respected practice. This aspect of religious orientation was related to religious-based modesty. Religious-based modesty really measured if people found respect and pride in their bodies through modesty in appearance. This observation showed that there was a link between prayer, comfort, and respect. Therefore, the more individuals exercised prayer to give them comfort, the more modesty in appearance is based from a sense of pride and respect for the body. If modesty gives a woman more respect for her body, then her appearance evaluation increases, which was seen in the results. Prayer is something that will likely increase this view.

Manifestation of God in the Body measured if women believed that God lived in their bodies, if their bodies were temples of God, and if God used their bodies to do God’s will. This scale measured the concept of sanctification of the body or holding the body as sacred or valuable. The sample of women scored high in body sanctification; thus, women strongly agreed with these statements. These beliefs about God and their bodies transitioned into the women valuing their bodies because God manifested Himself within them and used them to do His will. Therefore, if God dwells in one’s body, then the way one treats her body could change for the better. The body becomes sacred, full of worth, and something of value. These beliefs about the body signify that modesty, which increases respect and pride for the body is important.

Again, values drove this particular view of modesty. Beliefs about God in relation to the body and prayer as personal support gave credibility to religious-based
modesty. The idea that modesty can protect the body and give a sense of pride and respect were based in a belief that the body was sacred and prayer gave relief, which would lower anxiety.

**The modesty shield.** Modesty functioned as armor. Whether it protected the actual body or the body image, modesty emerged as a guard to protect women from some negative thinking. Through the values of Christianity, religious-based modesty was shown to increase appearance evaluation. Since religious based modesty was about protecting personal space, respecting oneself and having pride, it revealed a shield that can be implemented. When modesty was implemented as a way to respect the body and oneself, it bolstered positive feelings about the body. Modesty could be seen as protective.

Modesty could be conceptualized as a shield or guardian for what is appropriate in dress or for knowing what women feel comfortable with in appearance. It was no coincidence that modesty in other cultures was used to protect people such as the burka for women in strict Islamic cultures. Modesty “armor” took many forms in appearance because it was culturally constructed. Historically, modesty was a social construction that was formed in different ways across many cultures based on beliefs, values, climate, and group norms. In tropical climates and tribal cultures, less clothing was needed. Both men and women were bare chested and it was not considered immodest or sexually motivated. In Western countries, this example would be considered immodest, especially for women. Historically, modesty meant different things to different cultures and people of different belief systems.
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It is also important to note that modesty is a function of dress and operates on another function of dress similarly to physical protection, adornment, or status. Adornment of the body and dressing for physical protection also looks different from culture to culture or varying climates (Flugel, 1930). Modesty has a protective element to it because it gives respect to the body and improved self-evaluation.

**Modesty shield and body image.** In this study, the direct connection of beliefs about the body and religious-based modesty also linked to one aspect of body image, that of appearance evaluation. These beliefs that God or the Spirit of God dwelling in people increased modesty, but also had this indirect effect on how women evaluated their appearance. These attitudes indirectly exerted a positive influence on appearance evaluation. This finding is a new contribution to the growing literature on religion and body image. Sanctification has already been linked to body satisfaction, but appearance evaluation took the analysis a step further (Jacobson et al., 2013; Mahoney et al., 2005). Body satisfaction measured which areas of the body (stomach, face, arms, thighs, etc.) one is satisfied with. On the other hand, appearance evaluation measured if people liked their overall appearance and felt attractive. It captured more of an overall feeling about one’s appearance as opposed to satisfaction with specific parts of the body. Sometimes the general feeling of attractiveness or unattractiveness is a more powerful indicator of how one really feels about their appearance and body than satisfaction with specific body parts. Overall based on the findings, the shield of modesty bolsters the general feelings women have about their appearance.
Compartmentalization and intrinsic religious orientation as non-starters for modesty

Some of the religiosity concepts did not relate to modesty at all. Compartmentalization, a type of extrinsic religious orientation was not related to anything. This construct measured if people put Christian religion in a box or compartmentalized their religion, meaning that if they measured high, religion was an aspect of their lives, but not the main motivation. The sample in the study measured low in this construct, meaning, they did not compartmentalize their religion. This finding suggested that these women treated religion as a major component in their lives. However, compartmentalization did not relate to modesty, a finding that was not expected. Negative relationships were expected, but overall how people use religion revealed that views of modesty just did not relate to each other. This non-relationship could mean these concepts are just not connected because religion served as an important factor and leading motivation in these women’s lives.

Intrinsic religious orientation was also not connected to modesty. It was thought that it would have a positive influence on modesty but it did not contribute. First, the sample measured high on this construct, revealing that these women were “pure intrinsics” since extrinsic religious orientation was low (Allport & Ross, 1967). These women practiced Christianity as a fundamental motivation for their lives, serving as a foundation for identity. However, modesty was not related to the women categorized as intrinsics. The intrinsic construct measured religion as a prevailing motivation in life and if deepening a relationship with God was important. This construct suggested that
people do not put these ideas of religion as a central motivation and modesty together. Therefore, intrinsic religious orientation and modesty are completely separate constructs in the minds of women. The internal aspects of religion do not overlap with views of modesty. A relationship with God is not impacted with how modest or immodest in appearance one is. Instead, views of modesty come from other aspects of religiosity such as social support and manifestation of God in the body.

The beginnings of Christianity and Christian religious orientation were recorded in the Holy Bible, the fundamental text of Christianity. With respect to writings on modesty, clothes were not needed when Adam and Eve were created ("Adam and his wife were both naked, and they felt no shame", Genesis 2:25, NIV). They had a relationship with God in the Garden of Eden before the fall of man and did not feel immodest. After they sinned against God by eating fruit from a tree that God specifically told them not to eat from, they became aware of their nudity and fashioned clothes out of leaves to cover themselves. When God called to them, Adam said, “I heard you in the garden, and I was afraid because I was naked; so I hid.” (Genesis 3:10, NIV). Adam and Eve felt shame and had a desire to hide their bodies, thus experiencing immodesty for the first time. God was angry and more consequences occurred to Adam and Eve, but God also had mercy for them and created better clothes for them. “The LORD God made garments of skin for Adam and his wife and clothed them.” (Genesis 3:21, NIV). This passage from the Bible revealed that in accordance with Christian theology and philosophy, clothes were created for people but were not needed in the beginning. This couple did not feel shame or immodesty in their naked bodies. After they disobeyed God, everything changed. They
felt immodest with each other and before God and felt a need to cover themselves. This awareness of their bodies only came after they sinned. Seeing this, God fashioned animal skins for them, providing better coverings and they did not feel shame.

Modesty and immodesty are main functions of clothing but they serve as a way to reduce or eliminate shame of our bodies (Flugel, 1930; Goldman & Goldman, 1981; Roach-Higgins & Eicher, 1992). The Bible offers up evidence to the origins of clothing and some of its functions. This incidence also showed that the purely intrinsic relationship with God did not have anything to do with modesty. Modesty was rooted in other areas of religiosity such as social support and beliefs about the body as discussed in above sections.

**Methodological implications**

**Expanding the modesty scale.** A strength of the modesty scale was that it conceptualized modesty in more than one way. Modesty has been studied qualitatively and as a feminine norm for gaining attention but was only seen in multiple ways with Andrews (2014) scale (Lewis, 2015; Mahalik et al., 2005; Sobh, Belk, & Gressel, 2012).

After conducting this study, one problem arose that was related to the modesty scale itself. The scale was originally intended for Orthodox Jewish women, which accounted for the conservativeness of the questions asked. Some of the questions were originally not included in the survey because they were not relevant to the Christian sample. Once the data was collected and analyzed, it became apparent that more questions had to be excluded because they were not in line with the factors conceptualized. The factors
themselves (esteem-based, religious-based, and maturity-based modesty) need more definition to separate into more distinct areas of modesty.

Esteem-based modesty should represent modesty that appeals to self worth. Instead it was conceptualized more as vulnerability based considering the questions asked that were relevant in the analysis. These questions concerned if individuals felt powerless or uncomfortable when undressed, especially if they were in front of others. The main focus to these questions represented vulnerability in being exposed in clothes and without clothes. This group of three questions should be called vulnerability-based modesty. Some other questions in this esteem category related to humility (“I don’t like to be the center of attention”; “I think of myself as more reserved than most people”) or were based in sexuality (“I do not like to draw attention to myself sexually”; “When I hear foul language and discussions about private matters such as sexual activity, it makes me feel uncomfortable”). The fact that these questions did not make it to the final analysis stage indicated that these questions represent some other type of modesty- not esteem or vulnerability.

A similar occurrence happened with both religious and maturity based modesty. With religious-based modesty, one question was dropped because it did not relate to the other five questions. Also, religious-based modesty may not be the correct term to use with this factor. In the original publication using this scale, the questions that grouped together in this category also signified a cultural component for Orthodox Jewish women (Andrews, 2011, 2014). With the sample of Christian women who came from several different states and different life stages, “religious” modesty was still high but perhaps
modesty looks slightly different in this sample than among orthodox Jewish women. The questions proposed in this factor of religious-based modesty all related to protecting and respecting one’s image or essence through modesty. This idea expressed that modesty has a protective function. These statements about protection, respect, pride, and image may be better related to the concepts of esteem and value. Perhaps “Religious” based modesty may be better known as esteem-based modesty.

With maturity-based modesty, it seemed misnamed as well. Two of the three questions related to situational or context driven modesty rather than maturity. The other question was dropped because it related to body image, which has nothing to do with context. A better name for this modesty would be situational modesty because it recognizes that modesty can be based on the event or the people one is around to determine how one should dress or appear. The concept that modesty can be based on maturity is valid. Modesty will most likely change as one ages. It should be tested; however, there were no questions that directly related to the idea that modesty changes over a life cycle. Questions should be created to measure the idea that modesty changes with age.

Also, with the modesty scale, the questions themselves could be improved upon. Some were real views of modesty (I think modesty is about pride in ourselves) while others denoted affect or a feeling towards a behavior (I am uncomfortable when I am physically exposed, not wearing clothes). The wording among all questions could be clearer or more similar in structure to each other. Another way to accomplish this is to make sure that the questions in each modesty factor are structured similarly, meaning the
questions are worded in such a way that they measure the same construct in the same
direction and sentence structure, to measure the related concept. More questions could be
added to elaborate on other areas of modesty. Items related to context modesty should be
added, as well as questions for life cycle modesty and modesty concerning sexuality.
Modesty directly related towards appearance or the body could be explored as well.
Questions specifically asking if women are comfortable wearing skintight clothes or
revealing cleavage may add to the literature on modesty. The point of adding questions
and testing them would be to broaden the scope of the scale to develop a better
understanding of modesty. It would also expand the applicability of the scale to a
broader audience. An improved scale made for a wider audience would be beneficial for
the study of dress and appearance.

**Nonlinear relationship.** Studying modesty and body image through the lens of
religious identity showed that that these concepts are all connected. However, what does
this relationship look like without religious identity in the model? It could be suggested
that the relationship is nonlinear and perhaps even u-shaped. Some women may prefer
more modesty, which increases their body image while others may prefer less modesty as
something that gives them body confidence. Therefore, the relationship would be u-
shaped depending on the population. This possible nonlinear relationship should be
considered further.

**Practical Implications**

These findings regarding religiosity, different forms of modesty, and body image
have uses beyond the confines of academia. When about 95% of women experience
normative discontent with their bodies, that reality is a problem that can be relieved. Normative discontent, self-objectification, and poor body image lead to shame and poor self-esteem (Fallon, 1990; Lennon, Lillethun, & Buckland, 1999; McKinley & Hyde, 1996b; Rodin et al., 1984; Rudd & Lennon, 2000). The adult women in this study had a neutral appearance evaluation, which revealed that Christian identity helped this evaluation but also showed there is room for improvement. This finding uncovered that the information and implications of the study can be taken into Christian communities to better body image and increase self-esteem.

Within the Christian community, body image and modesty are not given much thought or the thought given is related to sexuality and sexual abstinence. The problem with this reality is that modesty based in sexuality is only one part of the picture when there are several aspects to modesty and body image. Almost all women struggle with their body image and what modesty means, which indicates that Christian women young and old could benefit from gaining information about body image and discussing modesty in all its forms. In Christian circles, modesty is expected of individuals but not defined. With teenagers and young adults, modesty is a norm they are supposed to follow, but the rationale of dressing modestly is left out of the discussion and traditional gender role bias is heavily included in many conversations of the topic. Modesty discussions in churches tend to focus on women and what they can do to dress modestly and how men can avert their gaze from women if a woman is considered to be dressed immodestly. Bringing these new findings to the talk could produce new depth and understanding of the topic. Since modesty is multifaceted, these different types of
modes can generate improved appearance evaluation. With regard to body image, these types of conversations could bring to light issues with disordered eating, self-mutilation, depression, anxiety, promiscuity, and body dysmorphia. The result of these dialogues brings wholeness to body image and better health to mind and body. The avenues of sharing this information could be at sessions at a church’s women’s conference, at a forum for teenagers or a small group study.

Outside of church settings, discussing modesty and body image could still be beneficial to women. Everyone has a sense of modesty; however, it depends on how they define modesty. The implications of this information could be applied to regional or national organizations that support people with body image issues because modesty can be protective. Some of the religious based beliefs such as manifestation of God in the body, which measured if people believed that God was present in their body or if He used their bodies to do His will, were shown to influence and lead to better body image. These types of beliefs could be effective even if people have a low orientation to religion because these beliefs are not dependent on how people use religion. Discussing these beliefs with teenagers and adults and its influence on modesty and body image could offer a way to cope with poor body image.

Limitations

Limitations of this research focused on the sampling method. An online survey was able to reach a multitude of different women across the United States through the snowball sampling. However, a truly randomized sampling measure was not used. This
sampling method limited the external validity, but still provided useful information, as
the survey was somewhat exploratory in nature. Also, the survey was not able to reach
all types of Christian denominations; therefore, it was not completely representative of all
Christian identities. This was also seen in the ethnicities represented as the sample was
94% Caucasian. A better cross section of Caucasian, African American and Asian
American and Hispanic would be useful for the next study. However, a strength of the
study was that it reached a highly intrinsically religious sample of women. Some of the
scales could have been better measures of religious orientation and body image. The new
indices of religion scales were chosen for their conciseness (Francis, 2007). Moving
forward with this research may include choosing a different religious orientation scale.
With body image, the appearance evaluation worked well; however the appearance
orientation scale did not since many questions were dropped. Other aspects of body
image that should be studied potentially include sociocultural attitudes towards
appearance and social physique anxiety (Thompson, van den Berg, Roehrig, Guarda, &
Heinberg, 2004). Finally, this research could be expanded to include men to understand
how they view modesty and if religious identity impacts it.

Recommendations for Future Research

Modesty and shame. Now that a modesty scale exists and has been somewhat
validated, other areas of body image in relation to modesty can be explored. Since the
link to body surveillance was significant, examining body shame could be advantageous.
One aspect of self-objectification was determined to be relevant, so investigating the
other aspects should be considered. Since modesty proved to be a filter for body image,
what happens to shame? Does modesty reduce body shame or do religious orientation and manifestation of God in the body reduce body shame? Or are all of these constructs interrelated? These are avenues to be explored. Research on the possible connection of modesty and shame could also explore some of the determinants of body shame. There is a possible connection to cultural norms, belief systems, and social norms in the creation of body shame. Modesty could be a moderating factor in this type of model.

**Modesty and the selfie generation.**

With the rise of social media in western culture, people can be more exposed than ever. Individuals become famous through social media, such as You Tube, Instagram, Vine and Snapchat. These are platforms on which people post curated versions of themselves online (Hogan, 2010). To achieve “likes” or followers online, individuals try to take the perfect picture or video of himself or herself or an object. There is a certain level of exposure of oneself and body in this type of media. Modesty has a strong connection to concealing while immodesty relates to revealing. Many people post “selfies” on social media to gain the attention of others and to get affirmation of their appearance and lifestyle. These postings can garner plenty of personal exposure and possibly exposure of the body. Display on this level could be damaging or it could raise self-esteem.

Sometimes, this type of exposure is unwanted or occurs without permission of the person who is the object of the photo or video. The effects of this “selfie” trend have been seen in the short term, but have not been studied for its long-term consequences. In relation to modesty, the younger generation (millenials and younger) are the first to adopt this level
of attention, yet we do not know if that exposure is actually beneficial, harmful, or neutral. Many young adults use social media and overexpose their lives and bodies for the consumption of friends and strangers alike. The question that needs to be asked is if modesty is passé. Do younger people see it as irrelevant? Or do they believe in contextual modesty or immodesty especially online?

There may come a time when people want to be less exposed and cover up their lives and bodies online. Traditionally, trends have a way of going to the other end of the spectrum in time. In this age of overexposure online, people may eventually feel that this lifestyle leads to extreme narcissism and personal emptiness. The affirmation given online may not amount to much if face-to-face relationships are given more weight even though they are difficult to maintain. In this study, modesty did measure if participants liked to be the center of attention and if they were perceived as reserved. These items could garner great information about modesty and exposure; however, the questions were dropped from the analysis because they were not related enough to vulnerability and powerlessness (esteem-based modesty). With more questions added about concealment and exposure in modesty, this idea of concealing the body and self could be explored further, especially in relation to online presence and social media.

Overall, this study presented connections between Christian religious identity, types of modesty, and body image. Modesty, though inherent in everyone, was found to function as a filter when religious social identity was present. Modesty acted as a shield or armor when values based in religious identity were present. Both of these functions of modesty bolstered evaluation of how one feels about her appearance. However, this
research still raises questions about other types of modesty not tested, male modesty, other aspects of body image including shame and the influence of social media on modesty.
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Appendix B: Consent Form

Welcome to this survey!

Dear Participant,

Thank you for participating in this survey.

The purpose of this research study is to gather information about adult Christian women, attitudes toward modesty, and body image (feelings about the body). Your feedback will be helpful in measuring the relationships between these concepts. The bigger picture of this research is to provide a deeper understanding of how religion impacts one's body image in order to help others develop a more positive body image.

I do not anticipate any risk or inconvenience will be involved in taking this survey. Your participation is voluntary, therefore you may withdraw from this survey at any time without penalty. All information collected will be for my research and will be kept confidential. There will be no information collected that could be linked to individuals and therefore, there will be no identifiers to you in this research in the results or future publications of the results. This study has been determined exempt from IRB review.

Your feedback is very important. Please answer these questions as honestly as possible. These questions concern your religious beliefs and practices, attitudes toward modesty, and evaluation of your appearance. All questions are multiple choice. You may skip any questions that you do not want to answer. The survey should take about 20 to 30 minutes to complete.
Consent Form continued

If you have any questions about the research or wish to know the results of this study, please contact me (Chelsea Blackwell, Blackwell.114@osu.edu) or my advisor Nancy A. Rudd (Rudd.1@osu.edu).

For questions about your rights as a participant in this study or to discuss other study-related concerns or complaints with someone who is not part of the research team, you may contact Ms. Sandra Meadows in the Office of Responsible Research Practices at 1-800-678-6251 or hsconcerns@osu.edu.

Again your feedback is incredibly important for this research. By clicking the “Start” button, you are agreeing to this consent form and have read the above explanation of the study. Also, your participation is voluntary. Thanks!

Chelsea Blackwell                       Nancy Ann Rudd, PhD
Doctoral Candidate                     Professor Emeritus
Consumer Sciences                      Consumer Sciences
Department of Human Sciences           Department of Human Sciences
The Ohio State University              The Ohio State University

Please select one.

Start (I agree)
I disagree
Appendix C: Survey Instrument

Screening question:

What is your gender?
- Male (if answered then kicked to last page of survey= Thanks for taking the survey)
- Female

New Indices of Religious Orientation

Scale ranges from strongly disagree; disagree; neither disagree or agree; agree; strongly agree

ERO-compartmentalization:

1. While I believe in my religion, there are more important things in my life
2. While I am a religious person, I do not let religion influence my daily life
3. Occasionally, I compromise my religious beliefs to protect my social and economic well-being

ERO-social support

4. One reason for me going to church is that it helps to establish me in the community
5. A key reason for my interest in church is that it is a pleasant social activity
6. I go to church because it helps me to feel at home in my neighborhood

ERO-personal support

7. One reason for me praying is that it helps me to gain relief and protection
8. What prayer offers me most is comfort when sorrow or misfortune strike
9. I pray chiefly because it makes me feel better

Intrinsic orientation (IRO):
1. My religious beliefs really shape my whole approach to life
2. I try hard to carry my religion over into all my other dealings in life
3. My religious beliefs really shape the way I treat other people
4. I allow almost nothing to prevent me from going to church on Sundays
5. I go to church because it helps me to feel close to God
6. The church is most important to me as a place to share fellowship with other Christians
7. I pray at home because it helps me to be aware of God’s presence
8. I pray chiefly because it deepens my relationship with God
9. I often read books about prayer and the spiritual life

**Manifestation of God in the Body (MGB)**

Scale ranges from strongly disagree; disagree; somewhat disagree; neither disagree or agree; somewhat agree; agree; strongly agree

1. My body is a temple of God
2. My body is created in God’s image
3. My body is a gift from God
4. God is present in my body
5. God uses my body to do God’s will
6. My body is united with God
7. My body is bonded to the everlasting Spirit of God
8. A spark of the divine resides in my body
9. God lives through my body
10. God is glorified through my body
11. My body is an instrument of God
12. The power of God moves through my body.

Your Views of Modesty
Scale ranges from strongly disagree; disagree; neither disagree or agree; agree; strongly agree

Esteem based modesty (EM); Religious-based modesty (RM); Maturity-based modesty (MM)

RM1. I am uncomfortable wearing sleeveless clothes.

EM 1. In a dressing room with a female friend, I am uncomfortable being undressed in front of her.

EM 2. I think of myself as more reserved than most people.

RM 2. People view me as modest because of the image I portray.

RM 3. I believe modesty is the essence of who I am.

RM 4. I think modesty is about pride in ourselves.

RM 5. I think modesty is having respect for yourself.

RM 6. I think modesty is protective because it helps guard my personal space.

EM 3. I am uncomfortable when I am physically exposed, not wearing clothes.

EM 4. I don’t like to be the center of attention.

EM 5. I feel powerless when I am undressed.

EM 6. I do not like to draw attention to myself sexually.

EM 7. I am more comfortable being with others who are similar to me.

EM 8. When I hear foul language and discussions about private matters such as sexual activity, it makes me feel uncomfortable.

MM 1. I think modesty is related to body image.

MM 2. My modesty is based on where I am or the type of setting or environment.

MM 3. My modesty is based on who is around me.
Objectified Body Consciousness: Body Surveillance (BS)

Scale ranges from strongly disagree; disagree; somewhat disagree; somewhat agree; agree; strongly agree; not applicable

1. I rarely think about how I look
2. I think it is more important that my clothes are comfortable than whether they look good on me.
3. I think more about how my body feels than how my body looks
4. I rarely compare how I look with other people look
5. During the day, I think about how I look many times
6. I often worry about whether the clothes I am wearing make me look good.
7. I rarely worry about how I look to other people
8. I am more concerned with what my body can do than how it looks.

Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire: Appearance Orientation (AO)

Scale ranges from definitely disagree; mostly disagree; neutral; mostly agree; definitely agree

1. Before going out in public, I always notice how I look
2. I am careful to buy clothes that will make me look my best
3. I check my appearance in the mirror whenever I can
4. Before going out, I usually spend a lot of time getting ready
5. It is important that I always look good
6. I use very few grooming products
7. I am self conscious if my grooming isn’t right
8. I usually wear whatever is handy without caring how it looks
9. I am always trying to improve my physical appearance
10. I don’t care what people think about my appearance

11. I take special care with my hair grooming

12. I never think about my appearance

**Multidimensional Body-Self Relations Questionnaire: Appearance Evaluation (AE)**

Scale ranges from definitely disagree; mostly disagree; neutral; mostly agree; definitely agree

1. My body is sexually appealing

2. I dislike my physique

3. I like my looks just the way they are

4. I am physically unattractive

5. Most people would consider me good looking.

6. I like the way I look without my clothes

7. I like the way my clothes fit me

**Demographic questions:**

Do you regularly (at least 2 times a month) attend church?
- Yes
- No

Church Denomination:
Adventist; Assembly of God; Baptist (any); Catholic; Church of Christ; Episcopal; Lutheran (any); Methodist (any); Mormon/LDS; Christian Non- Denominational; Pentecostal/Foursquare; Presbyterian (any); Other

Age range:
18-30; 31-39; 40-49; 50-59; 60-69; 70 or above

Ethnicity:
White; Hispanic/Latino; American Indian or Alaska Native; Asian; Black or African American; Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander; Other

What state do you live in?
List of 50 states + D.C. and other
Education level:
High school; Some college; Associate’s degree; Bachelor’s degree; Graduate degree/professional degree