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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship of design preference in clothing to (1) aesthetic preference, (2) knowledge of clothing, and (3) two forms of motivation, self-approval and social approval, and to determine the relationship of these two motives to aesthetic preference.

Origin and Importance of the Study

The most significant, and most recent, statement of goals for the field of clothing and textiles was formulated by a working conference of leaders in the field at the University of Maryland in 1956. This meeting was the first conference on a national level devoted solely to the subject matter area of clothing and textiles. All subject matter areas had been considered at previous national meetings. Delegates to the Maryland conference focused their attention on the relation between the basic academic disciplines and the subject matter of clothing and

textiles. Five major areas within clothing and textiles were proposed. One of these was aesthetics.

The statements of goals under the area of aesthetics were: (1) to appreciate and appraise aesthetic values of clothing and textiles, and (2) to understand and apply the principles involved in achieving appropriate and becoming dress. The subject matter emphasis proposed for supporting both of these statements indicated that the concept of design - line, color, and texture - was fundamental. An elaboration of the second statement included the concept of expression (of personality through clothing).

The report of the Maryland Conference was reviewed by the clothing and textiles delegates attending the Home Economics Seminar at French Lick, Indiana, in 1961. The participants in this Seminar from all areas of home economics represented a wide sampling of levels of instruction. One outcome of this meeting for clothing and textiles was a proposed conceptual model for relating clothing to the various disciplines. The proposed model included under aesthetics the previously cited elements and principles as well as such concepts as functions, creativity, anatomical structure, and taste. Since the French Lick Seminar,

---


individual and collective efforts have been exerted to revise and refine the more inclusive concept of "aesthetics of dress." The approach to aesthetics most often used in home economics is one that is largely synonymous with design. For the most part this interpretation of aesthetics represents an adaptation of the Formalist theory. Concepts and vocabulary from this theory have been appropriated in many textbooks on clothing selection. This is evidenced in all three editions of Morton's textbook. She wrote that "we must view designs quite apart from personal preference and test them by the same criteria we would a painting or a work of sculpture. We need familiarity with design principles." The same reliance on Formalist concepts is evidenced by Hillhouse and McJimsey. The following subheadings appear in the book by McJimsey under the chapter heading, Clothing as an Art: Harmony, Design Elements, Design Principles, and Evaluating Clothes Quality.


6 Proceedings of Seminar on Concepts sponsored by the Central Region of College Teachers of Clothing and Textiles (Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, January 24-28, 1966).


Using this same approach, Horn determined, "The Ability of College Students to Apply Art Principles in Concrete and Abstract Situations and its Relation to Art Interest."\(^{11}\) This study was, in fact, an empirical test of the logical assumption that aesthetic judgment could be generalized to more specific instances of clothing and home furnishings. Her findings, however, did not support this assumption.

Empirical studies that have considered some aspect of aesthetics as a variable have been carried out, traditionally, by psychologists. A review of recent research in psychology reveals that among aesthetic theories Formalism has been less important. Generally, the research instruments used by psychologists have been keyed to empirical criteria, the opinions of experts rather than an a priori criteria.

The Formalist theory is one of many that have been propounded in aesthetics and philosophy. Other theories have provided additional modes for understanding and appreciating the visual arts. For example, an approach significantly different from Formalism has been used in two representative contemporary textbooks in art.\(^{12, 13}\) Hence, it would


seem that an alternative to Formalism might be of value in considering the aesthetic aspects of clothing.

Inasmuch as instruments, recently used in psychological research, are available, it was possible to utilize them in a new investigation of the relationship between aesthetic preference and more specific aspects of clothing preference. Since the assumption of such a relationship has provided the basis for curriculum development in clothing, a further investigation of this proposition seems warranted. The proposed investigation differed from that undertaken by Horn in several respects but most notably in the definition and measurement of the concept of aesthetics. Two other variables which logically could be presumed to be associated with preference were selected for study also. They were aspects of motivation and knowledge of clothing.

Studies of clothing preference have frequently used personality as a variable. For example, Compton, Ditty, Lapitsky, and Matthews have each supported their hypotheses through their findings.

16 Mary Lapitsky, "Clothing Values and Their Relation to General Values and to Social Security and Insecurity" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, the Pennsylvania State University, 1961).
Barron in his research on creativity also reported an association between personality and aesthetic preference.\textsuperscript{18}

Knowledge of clothing has not been used as a variable in previous investigations except within the context of interest where an affective rather than a cognitive dimension has been considered. As originally conceived for use in the present study, the knowledge of clothing variable was considered synonymous with knowledge of fashion; this interpretation was selected as the one most consistent with timely rather than timeless values. Fashion seemed to provide the most congruent definition for translating the aesthetic concept in the realm of clothing. As the study developed, it was decided that a broader definition of aesthetics in clothing would make it possible to relate the findings from this study to traditional course content and curriculum subject matter.\textsuperscript{19} Consequently, the variable was redefined with two "aesthetic" implications for clothing: Fashion, as originally proposed, and Art Principles as an adaptation of the Formalist concept for clothing and appearance. A third category, distinctly non-aesthetic, was included also; it encompassed factual information which a beginning student in clothing and textiles might be expected to have learned.

\textsuperscript{19} I am indebted to Dr. Lois Gilmore for this suggestion.
Statement of the Problem and Hypotheses

A concern for the aesthetics of dress emphasizing the elements and the principles of design can be found in textbooks and research studies in the area of clothing. There is some evidence that knowledge of the concepts of design at the general level is not related to specific instances. The lack of relationship poses a question about the traditional approach to instruction in the clothing curriculum. Consequently, this study was initiated to investigate alternative interpretations and associations with the concept of aesthetic.

The present study was designed to examine relationships between design preference in clothing, aesthetic preference, a knowledge of clothing, and motivation. Motivation was denoted by two categories: Self Approval and Social Approval. Knowledge of clothing was subdivided into three categories: Art Principles, Clothing, and Fashion.

Four hypotheses were formulated for testing these relationships:

Hypothesis I. College women with high scores on the measure of aesthetic preference will also score high on the Design Preference in Clothing Scale.

Hypothesis II. College women with scores that represent a predominance of the Self Approval motive will score higher on the measure of aesthetic preference than those with scores that represent a predominance of the Social Approval motive.
Hypothesis III. College women with scores that represent a predominance of the Self Approval motive will score higher on the Design Preference in Clothing Scale than those with scores that represent a predominance of the Social Approval motive.

Hypothesis IV. College women with high scores on the Knowledge of Clothing Test will also score high on the Design Preference in Clothing Scale.

Some of the pertinent terms in these hypotheses can be further qualified. Others have been discussed previously, for example, the selection and rationale for the subsections of the Knowledge Clothing Test. The concept of aesthetic preference, as used in this study, was an expression of the individual's perceptual choice. This is also known as aesthetic perception. The instrument chosen to measure aesthetic preference or perception, the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, was one which has been keyed to normative-empirical criteria rather than a priori criteria. Keying an instrument in this manner tends to emphasize a contemporary sort of definition for aesthetic. It was for this reason that this instrument was chosen, since a measure theoretically different from that employed by Horn in a prior investigation was sought.

The Design Preference in Clothing Scale which was developed for this investigation represents an interpretation of the methodological

\[\text{Barron, op. cit., p. 198.}\]
approach used in aesthetic preference for more specific subject matter, namely clothing. The instrument likewise was keyed to the evaluation of illustrations by experts.

The two motives of the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory have been described by the authors as follows: 'Self Approval refers to the condition in which "the individual's values are internalized and appear to be functionally autonomous"'\(^22\) while Social Approval varies "from a desire for simple acceptance (frequently expressed in conformity behavior) to a desire for expressions of admiration or other manifestations of popularity and/or prestige."\(^23\) Each of these motives may be considered to be an hypothesized process that emergizes differently certain responses, thus, making them dominant over other possible responses to the same situation.\(^24\)

**Limitations of the Study**

A number of factors limited this study. The limitation of time had to be reckoned with insofar as the applicability of time-related instruments were a concern. In effect, this aspect tended to restrict the possibility for any long-term process of instrument development or administration.


\(^{23}\) Ibid.

Since the purpose of this study was to investigate behavior relevant to instruction in clothing, the cooperation of students enrolled in courses related to clothing selection seemed both logical and desirable. The population, consequently, was restricted to those students enrolled in these courses during one term. It would have been possible to increase the sample size by including other classes or to extend the time span of the investigation so as to include a second term with the same class. However, the smaller sample was chosen since this group was the most representative for the shorter time span. When discriminating instruments are administered to a sample of this size, significant differences would be expected if these differences were typical of a class such as this.

The results from a study such as this are largely dependent upon the instruments utilized for various measurements. Ideally, the validity and reliability of each instrument would be established beyond questioning; in reality, this is rarely the case. The Barron-Welsh Art Scale, which was used for the measurement of aesthetic preference, has been frequently utilized in recent psychological research. The Behavioral Interpretation Inventory, which contains scales for Self Approval and Social Approval, was selected because it appeared to be the most valid measure among the many instruments available for assessing these aspects of motivation. The Inventory also has been used in recent psychological research
though not in conjunction with the Barron-Welsh Art Scale. The instruments for measuring design preference and clothing knowledge were of necessity developed by the investigator since no previously used instruments could be located.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The literature related to each of the variables in this study will be presented in this order: (1) aesthetics, (2) motivation, (3) knowledge, and (4) design preference in clothing.

Aesthetics

Aesthetics has, traditionally, been located within the academic discipline of philosophy. For this reason much of the theory in this field has been derived from philosophical systems. Empirical studies related to this subject have been instigated by psychologists. As a field of knowledge, aesthetics is subject to an uncommon discontinuity. Allied with this is the problem of definition:

The lack of decent boundaries for aesthetics is in large measure owing to the fact that the subject falls in no man's land. Philosophers, psychologists, historians, critics, and artists, wander at odd moments into the field. . . .

Theoretical Writings

Two significant theoretical positions in aesthetics seem relevant to this review. One is represented by several of the contemporary

---

definitions of aesthetics and is not conveniently labeled with an all-embracing title; the other is called Formalism. The latter was promulgated by two English art critics, Bell (1881-1964) and Fry (1866-1934), during the second decade of the twentieth century. They were critical of an appreciation of art which was based on meaning in the popular or narrative sense and proposed that form rather than content be the primary focus.² The physical appearance of an art object, they proposed, should be described in terms of the plastic elements and their relationships. These elements of design were designated as rhythm, mass, space, light and shade, and color.³ While Bell and Fry were concerned primarily with painting, succeeding authors and practitioners in related fields have assumed that a true theory of art could be generalized to include a wider range of phenomena. Thus, a similar set of concepts was presented by Morton⁴ in her textbook on clothing selection. The plastic elements were line, form, space, color, and texture; the principles of composition were balance, proportion and scale, rhythm, dominance, and subordination.⁵ These "Basic Art Terms Classified" had been adapted from the Report of Committee of Terminology, Federal Council of Art Education, 1929.

³Ibid., p. 34.  
⁵Ibid., p. 64.
The most widely accepted meaning of the word aesthetics today, according to Spirito, is the theory of the beautiful and of art but an earlier definition, implicit in the etymology of the word, is a theory of sentient knowledge. A truly precise definition, at this time, is impossible because of the ambiguity of the concept of art. The interpretation proposed by Munro is, perhaps, the most appropriate for this investigation, "Aesthetics today is the theoretical study of the arts and related types of behavior and experience."

Several related theories will be cited as representative of the contemporary position in aesthetics. Weitz is one of a number of present day theorists in aesthetics who has eschewed an a priori definition of art. After examining the major aesthetic theories of the past, Weitz, himself a philosopher, concluded that art must be considered as an open concept.

A concept is open if its conditions of application are emendable and corrigible; . . . . A closed concept cannot occur with empirically-descriptive and normative concepts unless we arbitrarily close them by stipulating the ranges of their uses.

---

7 Ibid.
8 Thomas Munro, "Recent Developments in Aesthetics in America," The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 23 (2,1964), 251.
10 Ibid., p. 151.
All rating systems, which in other words specify criteria a priori that have so far been proposed, Janson, an art historian, insisted fall short of being satisfactory because they assume timeless values, the stability of worth and an existence independent of time and circumstance. In the same vein Gombrich, an art theorist, has proposed that,

There really is no such thing as art. There are only artists. ... But whether there will also be art depends to no small extent on ourselves, their public.12

Despite differences in terminology Weitz, Janson, and Gombrich all have emphasized the experience of the object rather than the object as a physical entity.

Another contemporary definition that of Reid is also relevant to this interpretation. It would seem that the following excerpt presented by him could be read with equal validity and, perhaps, greater pertinency by substituting the word art for the slightly archaic term beauty:

... Beauty is a quality of objects in the perceptual world; it is therefore the product of the interaction of a physical object and the physical brain of the beholder. The contribution of both is necessary; ... . Beauty is therefore both objective and subjective: ... . The distinctive characteristic of beauty is the quality of the feelings associated with it, but these feelings are not, as we are often told, a reaction to an object, they are an integral part of the beauty which is the quality of an object.13

---

Research Studies

Research in the area of aesthetics has been sporadic and somewhat disparate. The tenuous relationship between theory in aesthetics and empirical investigations in psychology is further complicated by the allegation that theory in aesthetics cannot be tested.\(^{\text{14}}\) However, a renewed interest in this area of research is attested to by the appearance of the first chapter on "Aesthetics" in the Annual Review of Psychology for 1961.\(^{\text{15}}\) A year later Munro, the aesthete, presented a paper to the American Psychological Association.\(^{\text{16}}\) In both reviews, one by a psychologist and one by an aesthete, the authors denounced the present discontinuity between theory and research.

The empirical studies in psychology which are reviewed here have been arbitrarily limited to those published since World War II. They consist mainly of the studies by Barron and by Child. A few individual studies in psychology and clothing will be considered also.

Studies by Barron

The series of studies on creativity initiated by Barron dealt with the relation between personality and aesthetic perception.\(^{\text{17}}\) Much of this research took place under the auspices of the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research at the University of California in Berkeley. The theoretical construct in Barron's studies was based on


\(^{\text{15}}\) Pratt, op. cit., 71-92.


the concept of intolerance of ambiguity formulated by Frenkel-Brunswik. Barron has explained it as follows:

In order to remain independent in this experiment, the subject must come to terms with the troublesome fact that he is suddenly at odds with his fellows in a situation where, by ordinary standards of community of experience, he ought to be in agreement with them. Only a person who can live with complexity and contradictions and who has some confidence that order lies behind what appears to be confusion would be able to bear this kind of phenomenal discord. There is a strong temptation to resolve the confusion in a simple way, by denying the most easily denied of the contradictory facts. Order is thus achieved by a process of exclusion of phenomena and in this case at the cost of correct judgment.

Such an investigation made it necessary that some means of measuring this important dimension be found. The Welsh Figure Preference Test (WFPT) was examined for this purpose. The items in this Test are black line drawings on a white background. The designs are non-representational, content-free, and either geometric or free-form and ambiguous.

Barron selected 68 of the most discriminating figures from the 400 items in the original Welsh Figure Preference Test. This revised instrument was administered to contrasted groups, 30 artists and 30 people-in-general. This cross validation of the 68 drawings was named the Barron-Welsh Art Scale (B-WAS); it became the criterion measure of Barron's research.


Forty male graduate students responded to the B-WAS. Scores were decidedly bimodal in this distribution so as to differentiate the subjects into two contrasted groups. One group was designated "S" for simple and symmetric because these scores were like those of people-in-general. The "A" for asymmetric labeled the groups with scores like artists. The preference for asymmetry or lack of obvious balance characterized the complexity dimension of the second bi-polar factor previously determined by Welsh.

The Simplicity and Asymmetric groups, with 18 subjects in each, were compared on three dimensions: (1) Figure Preference, which represented an analysis of the preferences from the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, (2) Art Preference, which was measured by a Paintinga Preference Instrument devised by Barron, and (3) the results from the Gough Adjective Checklist. The art preferences of the Simplicity group were characterized by themes involving religion, authority, aristocracy, and tradition. Self descriptions emphasized the passive and conservative attributes of personality. The Asymmetric group exhibited a preference for the experimental, sensational, sensual, esoteric, primitive, and naive aspects of art. Adjectives which were used included: gloomy, pessimistic, bitter, dissatisfied, emotional, pleasure-seeking, unstable, cool, irritable, aloof, sarcastic, and spendthrift.

\[20\text{Ibid.}, \ p. \ 189.\]
The administration of additional instruments as well as personal interviews by members of the Institute staff were used to supplement the study of these two groups. Two of the measures employed seem pertinent to this review: the Test of Basic Good Taste and the Turney Designs.

The Basic Good Taste instrument was developed by Gerard.²¹ It was described by Barron as presenting various alternative arrangements of formal design elements among which the subject was directed to choose the most aesthetically pleasing one. Scores from this test correlated \( r = .44 \) (\( N = 18 \)) with the \( B-WAS \) scores for the complex group.

The Turney Designs, an art-in-action test, was scored on the basis of ratings made by members of the Art Department at the University of California. The correlation between the Turney Designs and scores from the \( B-WAS \) for the complex group was \( r = .40 \) (\( N = 18 \)). No indication was given of the coefficients of correlation for the Simplicity group.

Other simplicity-complexity studies

The simplicity-complexity dimension which Barron studied was explained in psychological rather than aesthetic terms. Taylor and Eisenman²² and Eisenman and Coffee²³ utilized essentially the same dimension but with different stimulus material and related it to

²¹Ibid., p. 192.
aesthetic theory rather than personality. An aesthetic theory emphasizing simplicity-complexity had been proposed in the early 1930's by Birkhoff, a mathematician turned aesthetician. His formula for assessing aesthetic quality was determined by the ratio of order to complexity: 

$$M \text{ (aesthetic measure)} = \frac{O \text{ (complexity)}}{O \text{ (order)}}$$

Eisenman and Coffee found that with art students and mathematics students as subjects the former consistently chose the more complex designs. In a study of contrasted groups comprised of a total of 20 art students, Taylor and Eisenman reported that the more creative subjects preferred complex polygons. These results led Eisenman and Coffee to refute the proposition proposed by Birkhoff which valued order more than complexity.

Munsinger and Kessen conducted a number of studies using random shapes as the stimulus material. Their findings agreed with those reported by Taylor and Eisenman and Eisenman and Coffee that art students consistently chose the more complex designs. They concluded that,

The almost linear relation between preference and number of turns suggests that the art students' past experience with patterns and shapes has changed their preference for variability from that of the unsophisticated observer. This experience can be taken as evidence that experience increases one's ability to group independent characteristics of stimuli and thereby reduce cognitive uncertainty.

---

25 Eisenman and Coffee, *op. cit.*
Rosen found that persons who are not artists (or art students) made significantly lower scores on the Barron-Welsh Art Scale than those who had been instructed.28

Studies by Child

The program of investigation which Child has reported is the most complete presentation of empirical findings related to aesthetic concepts yet available. His correlational studies are important because of the number and variety of instruments used as well as for the clarity of his research design. Some of the definitions he used follow:

Esthetic judgment, as a measured variable, is the extent to which, when a person judges the esthetic value of stimuli, his judgments correspond to the external standard of value which is being employed.

Esthetic preference, as a measured variable, is the extent to which, when a person expresses (by word or action) his relative liking or disliking of various stimuli, this relative preference for various stimuli corresponds to their esthetic value as defined by the external standard.29

Aesthetic sensitivity includes both of the above definitions.30 The external standard of value is commensurate with either the judgment of experts or a priori principles. The internal standard is an evaluation derived from the consensus of the experimental group.

30 Ibid.
Tests of aesthetic sensitivity

Child administered the Gravess Design Judgment Test and the Meier Art Judgment Test in abbreviated form along with the Bulley Test to a group of 105 male undergraduate students at Yale University. In comparing the Gravess and the Bulley Tests, Child wrote:

A first result of interest is that these two tests have very little relation to each other; the correlation between them is only .12. This is an extreme instance of the general finding that various standardized tests of aesthetic sensitivity are not very highly related to each other.\textsuperscript{32}

Child was critical of the internal consistency of the Gravess Test. Some subjects he found consistently preferred the "poorer" choices. He contended that to assert under these conditions that a low score indicated a lower level of aesthetic sensitivity must be fallacious since consistency of the response inferred that the subject was equally sensitive to the same aspects of the stimuli as the high scorer.

Eysenck\textsuperscript{33} and Granger\textsuperscript{34} in previous experiments had used consensus as the criterion of aesthetic value. Child defined this term for his studies:

\textbf{Consensus} is used in this paper to mean the common tendencies, the agreement found, in the reactions of a number of

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{31}The Bulley Test was adopted from the book, \textit{Art and Everyman} by Bulley, an English aesthetician. Margaret H. Bulley, \textit{Art and Everyman} (London: Batsford, 1951), 1.

\textsuperscript{32}Child, \textit{op. cit.}, 53.

people to a set of stimuli, with no implication that they
have arrived at agreement through interaction with each
other. In studies such as are mentioned here, the reac-
tions of subjects are obtained independently, so that the
sources of any consensus do not lie in social interaction
among subjects during the testing (nor before, generally,
except in the sense of their separate participation in a
single community and society). 35

He attempted to replicate some of Eysenck and Granger's findings in a
study using 22 Yale students as subjects. In addition to the consensus
measure, Child also used instruments which represented an external
standard of aesthetic value: the Gravens Design Judgment Test, the
Bulley Test, and Child's own Paintings Test. He summarized his findings
as follows:

Of measures of esthetic sensitivity tried here, those which
use stimuli other than works of art, and those which asses
an individual's reactions by reference to consensus of his
peers, show little or no relation to those which use works
of art and assess an individual's reactions by reference to
judgment of experts. 36

Personal preference and aesthetic sensitivity

Child reported another study in which he used two groups of 22
male students from Stanford and Yale Universities each selected without
respect to interest or competence in art. 37 Consensus within the
experimental group was determined by presenting each subject with
Child's Paintings Test which consisted of 12 sets of pictures

34 G. W. Granger, "An Experimental Study of Colour Preferences,"
Journal of General Psychology, 52 (1955), 3-20. ——, "An Experi-
mental Study of Colour Preferences," Journal of General Psychology, 52
(1955), 21-35.
35 Child, op. cit., 50.
36 Ibid., 63.
37 Irvin L. Child, "Personal Preference as an Expression of
representing such subject categories as Abstraction, Children, Distorted-Fantastic, Still life, and Religious Figures. Each set contained 60 postcard-size reproductions of paintings. The participants were instructed to sort each set of the postcards on a continuum from most liked through least liked.

At the same time a panel of 13 judges was used to establish the external criterion of aesthetic value (or key) for the paintings. Judges were of both sexes and mostly graduate students in art or art history. They were instructed to divide the pictures on the basis of aesthetic merit in a manner that otherwise duplicated the procedure used by the experimental subjects. Negative correlations among preferences for the 13 judges were rare and, furthermore, they were concentrated in the Abstract and Distorted-Fantastic sets. Among the judges there was complete agreement in six of the 12 categories of paintings as compared with the students' preferences which revealed some negative correlations for every set.

Child concluded that the ordering of a set of pictures by the preferences of a group of unselected students, generally, had very little to do with their aesthetic value.38 A comparison of the orderings between the Yale and Stanford students in each set yielded correlations between .94 and .84 except for one set which was .78. Inasmuch as individual consistency was related to aesthetic value, it was a very stable characteristic of the individual. It was a more stable characteristic than degree of agreement with consensus.

38 Ibid., 503.
Relation of personal preference and aesthetic sensitivity to personality and background

The agreement between personal preference and aesthetic value Child found was related to several of the other 12 measures administered. One of these measures was information about art rated by an interviewer. Agreement with the aesthetic criterion, judges ratings, was positively correlated with the scores on the Barron-Welsh Art Scale: .45 for the Stanford group which was significant at .05 level and .32 for the Yale group which did not reach significance. In the case of individual agreement with group preference, the agreement with consensus resulted in low and negative correlations with the Barron-Welsh Art Scale. For the both Stanford and Yale groups the relation between aesthetic preference and "Tolerance for Ambiguity and Ambivalence" which was Child’s adaptation of the California F Scale was positive. The degree of individual agreement with consensus was negatively associated with the same instrument. Concerning features of personality and background, Child concluded that,

... the results of this research suggest that agreement of personal preference with a standard of aesthetic value may be related to certain variables of intellectual approach and temperament which affect the person’s openness to the aesthetic potentialities of his environment.39

A supplementary discussion of data obtained from Child’s Painting Test was reported by Slate and Child.40 They analyzed and discussed the preferences and rejections of college men for various test items.

39Ibid., 511.
Students' preferences, they concluded, were historically and psychologically rather than aesthetically based. Individual responses were in striking agreement for color but color was less important to the subject than accuracy in representation of form. For example, Chagall was rejected and Gauguin was unpopular though preferred over Beckmann, Rouault, the later Picasso, and Leger. The researchers concluded that little change in preference, despite the changes in art, has taken place in the past 100 years.

**Relation of aesthetic measures to clothing**

Aiken found, in his study of personality and its relationship to dress, a strong but negative relationship between conformity and aesthetic value as measured by the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scales of Values (A-V-L). Conformity was the name given to the cluster which resulted from a factor analysis of responses to Aiken's Revised Clothing Opinionnaire. Statements in the Opinionnaire were derived from theoretical-type descriptions in the publications by Flugel and Hartmann, as well as the empirical findings of Barr and Silverman. Besides
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44 Estelle DeYoung Barr, "A Psychological Analysis of Fashion Motivation," *Archives of Psychology*, 26 (June, 1934), 2-100.
conformity there were four other clusters — decoration, comfort, interest, and economy. Aiken reported that the correlation between decoration and the Aesthetic Scale of the A-V-L lacked significance but the clusters decoration and interest were highly correlated \( r = .59; \ p < .05; \ N = 160 \).

An earlier study by Lapitsky of clothing values and general values confirmed her hypotheses that aesthetic values were important for the socially secure group and conformity and social approval for the insecure.\(^6\) The instruments used were the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values and a Clothing Value Scale developed by this investigator. The subjects were women, college students and teachers.

The purposes of Hoffman's investigation was to measure aesthetic sensitivity and evaluate its relationship to a number of other factors.\(^7\) After analyzing the results obtained from the short form of the Graves Design Judgment Test, in a pilot test, and finding no relation between it and the Aesthetic Scale of the Allport-Vernon-Lindzey Scale of Values, the Graves Test was rejected as a measure of aesthetic sensitivity. Instead, the Meier Art Judgment Test (MAJT) was used. This instrument consists of black and white representations of relatively timeless works of art. Each question presents a choice between the representation of the original and an altered version which was produced by disturbing some aspect of the symmetry, balance, unity, or rhythm. The correlation

---

\(^6\) Mary Lapitsky, "Clothing Values and Their Relation to General Values and to Social Security and Insecurity" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1961).

\(^7\) Adeline M. Hoffman, "Clothing Behavioral Factors for a Specific Group of Women Related to Aesthetic Sensitivity and Certain Socio-Economic and Psychological Background Factors" (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1956).
between the MAJT and the Aesthetic Scale of the A-V-L was .54 which was significant at the one per cent level.

Results from the Meier Test, connoted by the term aesthetic sensitivity, were not significantly correlated with any of the wardrobe factors. Aesthetic interest, assessed by an interview questionnaire, was significantly related to ensemble value of clothing, the use of sophisticated sources of fashion information, and to aesthetic reasons related to choice of clothing. Among the wardrobe factors, "Design quality showed a statistically significant relationship to fashion status, ensemble value of clothing, and curved lines in design classification." 48

Hoffman found that the Aesthetic Scale of the A-V-L was related to the Aesthetic Factor of the Personality Inventory which she had developed (R=.54; p<.01; N=80). The latter was also related to her measure of Interest in Clothing (R=.41; p<.02; N=80). The Aesthetic and Economics Scales of the A-V-L were negatively related (r=-.58; p<.01; N=80).

Comprehension of art principles

Horn used the Graves Design Judgment Test as one of the instruments in her research with women students at Cornell University. 49

48 Ibid., p. 200.
She found that (1) a knowledge and understanding of art principles in the abstract was not significantly related to the application of the same principles in various areas of design, and that (2) training in art principles may increase understanding of the abstraction without increasing the ability to apply the principles to concrete situations.

Jacobson had, in a much earlier study, come to a different conclusion. The stimulus material she used was made up of line drawings of historic costumes and variations of these "best" costumes that approximated the methodology of the Meier Art Judgment Test. Responses from 33 experts and 162 non-experts were analyzed; the results supported the thesis that the fundamental basis for beauty in costume was widely recognized. A finding of note was the high correlation between the choices of experts and non-experts (r=.90). The strength of this correlation was attributed to the utilization of art principles as the criteria for beauty within both groups. Jacobson concluded that the aesthetic impulse was generalized throughout the population though it varied in degree from one individual to another.

An Assessment of the Empirical Literature

No attempt was made in the previous section to relate the various and sometimes disparate findings which had been reported. Such an assessment seems necessary inasmuch as the research in aesthetics is

50 Wilhelmina E. Jacobson, "An Experimental Investigation of the Basic Aesthetic Factors in Costume Design" (University of Iowa Studies in Psychology, No. XVIII), Psychological Monographs, No. 200, 45 (1, 1933), 147-188.
not systematically related. Consequently, the purpose of this section, then, is to present a more global view of the empirical literature.

A comparison of findings from different studies is made the more difficult because of a lack of consistency in the definition of critical terms. This is, perhaps, most obvious in the use of the concept of consensus. Eysenck used agreement among his subjects as the criterion of aesthetic value. Child called this agreement the internal criterion to distinguish it from the preference of experts which was labeled the external criterion of aesthetic value. He found that the internal and external criteria were not equivalent. On the basis of these findings, consensus should not be equated with aesthetic value but each should be recognized as two distinct and, perhaps, even mutually exclusive concepts.

The aesthetic assumptions underlying the development of a particular instrument have rarely been set forth explicitly. It should be possible, however, to draw some implications from an examination of these measures. The Graves Design Judgment Test, abstract, non-representational, two-dimensional designs, is keyed to the principles of design. The Meier Art Judgment Test has famous masterpieces from the history of art rendered by line drawings as its stimulus material. One of the drawings is accurate and the other is slightly altered. The key to the instrument, obviously, is the original and, thereby, the unaltered example. Presumably, the formal principles are operative in these examples. Formalist theory emphasized form and regarded content as
simply a vehicle for form. Items in the **Graves Test** are non-representational and essentially content free. The Test of Basic Good Taste, according to the description by Barron, seems comparable to the **Graves Design Judgment Test**. Variations in the formal presentation rather than in subject matter was the critical aspect of the **Meier Art Judgment Test**.

Child found that the **GDJT** and the **MAJT** were not discriminating and not significantly correlated to complex stimulus materials, namely, his own Paintings Test. The findings reported by Horn using the **Graves Test** and her own criteria were consistent with those of Child. However, Hoffman reported a relationship between the **Meier Test** and the **Aesthetic Scale** of the Allport-Vernon-Lindsey Scale of Values. The latter, of course, is not a complex visual stimulus but a forced choice questionnaire which purports to measure personal values by means of six scales one of which is designated **Aesthetic**.

Unlike the **Graves** and **Meier Tests**, the **Barron-Welsh Art Scale** was not developed primarily as an aesthetically discriminating instrument. It was derived from empirical evidence rather than a priori principles. Essentially, the items are non-representational and frequently ambiguous; they range from simple to complex. This is not a test of good design as are the **Graves Design Judgment Test** and the **Meier Art Judgment Test**.

As indicated above, neither Child nor Horn reported a relationship between the results from the **GDJT** and their individual criterion variable, some form of complex stimuli. The correlation between the **Barron-Welsh Art Scale** and Child's Painting Test was significant for one group. The
Test of Good Taste which Barron administered was related to the B-WAS. If the latter were assumed to be a complex stimuli, then this relationship would present a contradiction to the findings of Child and Horn. In addition the correlations for the Test of Good Taste and the Turney Designs Test to the B-WAS were similar though, from the description of each instrument, it seems likely that neither was based on the same rationale.

Findings concerned with the simplicity-complexity dimension are quite consistent: the preference of art students and artists is marked by a greater degree of complexity. The relationship of this dimension to aesthetic theory could best be described as strictly empirical. That is to say, what artists prefer is designated as "aesthetic." An analysis of their stated preferences in the Barron-Welsh Art Scale revealed a predominance of asymmetry and complexity.

The dichotomy of results reported by Barron between the preferences of artists and people-in-general has been supported by similar findings from other investigators. An explanation for these findings has been sought in personality and the ability to code visual information. Barron and Welsh, as well as Eysenck, have contended that a general aesthetic factor was responsible for the "artists'" choices. The data collected by Child went beyond the personality variable and included information about the subject's knowledge of art. The latter he found strongly and significantly related to the preference for aesthetic values. Furthermore, Child found that student preferences which were more strongly related to the external criteria (judges' preferences)
were also more stable than preferences that were unrelated (or related to
group preference, that is to say, consensus).

Slate and Child found that differences in preference did not
form a generalized pattern but represented a dichotomized response to
particular items. Despite this dichotomy students more often agreed with
the experts. Slate and Child concluded that historical and psychological
criteria were predominate in student's choices. Jacobson reported on her
study with historic costumes as the stimulus material that a high degree
of agreement between experts and subjects was found. She concluded that
preference for the best designs was generalized and that the inherent
qualities of good design were more or less recognizable based as they
were on the principles of design.

The findings of Aiken that conformity and aesthetic are
antithetic are consistent with those of Child, and Slate and Child.
Both Lapitsky and Hoffman found that economic concerns were negatively
related to aesthetic values. In summary, conformity or the predominance
of economic values tends to reduce the aesthetic.

Hoffman found that no relation existed between the test of
aesthetic sensitivity (Meier Test) and the individual's wardrobe. This
would seem to be another instance of a lack of relationship between a
test of aesthetic judgment and the criterion variable such as Horn and
Child had reported. The Meier Test is made up of items that appear to
be more complex than the items in the Graves Design Judgment Test but
the anticipated relation between a complex stimulus and the Meier or
Graves Tests remains to be demonstrated.
In the study by Hoffman the Aesthetic Scale of the A-V-L was positively related to the Aesthetic Factor in her Personality Inventory and the latter was related to an interest in clothing. This finding may be compared with Aiken's wherein the clusters: Decoration and Interest, were highly correlated but neither was related to the Aesthetic Scale. Under such circumstances the definition of interest may be critical. What does interest in clothing mean?

Some important consistencies and inconsistencies among the findings from different studies have been revealed by this review. Yet, a number of vexing problems — of definition, measurement, and explanation — remain to be disclosed by future research.

**Motivation**

Behavior, it has traditionally been assumed, may be explained in terms of situational variables, one of which is social influence, or in terms of individual motivational systems, one of which is personality.

**Research Studies**

Interest in social psychology has been steadily increasing as the growing number of research studies in this area indicate. The rapid expansion of this field since World War II makes it desirable to limit such a review to empirical studies representative of the contemporary period. The discipline has developed through a consistent interplay between theory and research which has resulted in a continuing refinement in conceptualization for both areas.
Social influence and conformity

Asch in his paradigm experiment provided a methodology that gave impetus to much research in this field. The Asch experiment, now a modern classic in social psychology, was presented in the guise of an exercise in perception. The stimuli consisted of three lines of varying lengths. Each subject was asked to voice his opinion concerning the length of one of the three lines. Subjects were classified as naive or sophisticated. The latter had been instructed by the investigator to give identical, incorrect, replies in the critical trials. The naive subject invariably was placed so that his response followed that of seven to nine of the sophisticated subjects. Not all trials were so "rigged;" those that were have been designated as critical. The effect in the critical trials was one of social pressure which was developed by the consensus of the sophisticated subjects who were, in reality, confederates of the experimenter. Asch has described the two reactions under these conditions as "Independence" and "Yielding." These two response styles he attributed to as yet unidentified properties of the individual, that is, personality. Asch hypothesized, that individual immunity to distortion by group pressure is a function of the person's relation to himself and others. Independence always requires some assertion of the self; at the least it needs the ability to acknowledge a shortcoming without loss of self-respect or ability to accept criticism without feeling rejected.

52 Ibid., p. 498.
In an experiment by Luchins and Luchins the naive subject was asked to judge alone following a session of group judging. Under these conditions the naive subject gave no incorrect choices. True communications about the stimulus yielded more agreement from the subject than false communications. These investigators concluded that objective evidence was important to the subject in determining his response since subjects did not yield indiscriminately to group pressure but reacted uniquely to each set of circumstances.

Beloff was concerned with two forms of conformity, acquiescence, and conventionality. Acquiescence was defined as a dynamic, immediate process characterized by agreement with expressed group opinion while conventionality was a long term process which resulted in concurrence with cultural attitudes, mores, and norms. Beloff hypothesized that subjects who acquiesced readily in an experimental situation would be relatively conventional as compared to those who were independent or intransigent. He used instruments of his own as well as the California F scale and Eysenck's Inventory of Social Attitudes. The Eysenck instrument was used to measure political conventionality. Pictures of teapots were used as the stimuli for an aesthetic measure. An audio-electronic variation of the Asch procedure which utilized a tape recorder was used to create social pressure for the purpose of measuring acquiescence.


Results for males and females were analyzed separately. Beloff found that conformity was higher for women than for men. However, the acquiescence-conventionality relationship, while it reached significance for men in the political realm, was not similarly significant for women. The relationship of acquiescence-conventionality did reach significance for women in the aesthetic realm. Consequently, Beloff concluded that, the literature had indicated that present knowledge of conformity-personality correlates is in a confused state. The present data confirm this point. Striking sex differences again add complexity to the results. The only relationship that is found to be uniform for both sexes and is congruent with past reports is that between acquiescence and high scores on the California F Scale.55

Beloff had proposed that acquiescence was an observable aspect of conventionality. Conventionality, suggested Endler,56 and Schultz and Knapp,57 may provide a means of reducing anxiety for the purpose of achieving security. The significance of acquiescence-conventionality Beloff found was not the same for men as for women. Both conformity and the generalization of conformity were found by Allen and Crutchfield58 to be higher for women than for men. It was notably greater for material about which subjects felt less confident.

55Ibid., 103.
Social influence and social approval

Under conditions of simulated group pressure Strickland and Crowne found that yielding seemed to satisfy a need for social approval. Subjects who endorsed more socially desirable statements were more likely to yield to group pressure than those who endorsed fewer statements. In another study by Crowne and Liverant the investigators concluded that conformers were less confident than independents. Under conditions of increasing penalty for conforming and increasing reward for independence significantly more conformity was evidenced by females and yielding by males was not appreciably reduced. Thus, the investigators described the conformer as an individual with a need for approval and affection from others but with low expectancies that these can be obtained as a result of his own abilities and efforts.

Deutsch and Gerard studied social influence which they defined as either normative or informational rather than as social pressure. A further refinement in conceptualization was utilized in a study by

---


Wilson. He was concerned with two processes which had previously been described by Schroder and Hunt. They were, as follows:

1. Social accommodation — transformation of disagreement in terms of implied or potential rejection. Locus of incongruence in the area of relationship between attractive source and recipient, resolution to restore relationship.

2. Self correction — retransformation of disagreement into potential information. The essential nature of the process is exploratory behavior, information appraisal and self correction.

When differences were great, Schroder and Hunt found that subjects yielded to avoid alienation; this form of yielding was termed social accommodation. Subjects also yielded on small differences seemingly to maintain accuracy or "correct" their answers. In conjunction with this self-correction form of yielding self-evaluations were lowered uniformly whether the source-person was liked or not. Self-evaluations in the social accommodation situation were lowered by disagreement only if the source-person was liked. No change in self-evaluation took place when the subject disagreed with a person he disliked.

Wilson was concerned with testing the relationship between social accommodation or self-correction processes and two kinds of judgments: objective and normative. He found that source attractiveness was not significant for the self-correction group but the anticipated resistance

---

64 Wilson, op. cit., 187.
of this group to social influence about the objective stimulus failed to materialize. Source attractiveness was significant for the social accommodations subjects; they yielded significantly more often to liked than to disliked persons in the attitude or normative series of experiments. Subjects with considerable negative status were as resistant to social influence as the popular subjects. The subject who had established himself at odds with values favored by the group, in effect, had divorced himself from group membership. Sociometric status was related to conformity in curvilinear fashion. Maximum conformity was associated with indefinite status which decreased at both ends of the sociometric hierarchy.

Instruments to measure conformity

Despite the numerous investigations of conforming behavior, the problem of an adequate instrument for the prediction of such behavior has not been solved. Jackson and Messick, according to the review by Christie and Lindauer, declared that most existing scales and inventories are biased by both social desirability and the tendency to agree. Utilizing questions from other instruments, Goldberg and Rorer developed a questionnaire to predict social conformity. With this instrument


they were able to replicate the findings of a number of other investigators, including Asch, Barron, and Crutchfield. However, attempts to predict conformity were far from satisfactory because, "some subjects try to present a favorable impression while others are more honest."67

Another study focusing on the problem of predicting conforming behavior from standard instruments was reported by Appley and Moeller.68 They analyzed a total of 33 scales from the Edwards Personal Preference Schedule, the Gough California Psychological Inventory, and the Gordon Personal Profile. They found that only the Edwards Abasement Scale yielded a significant, but small, relationship, .33, with empirical behavior data from an Asch-type experimental situation.

Moeller and Applezweig tested the hypothesis that persons with high Social Approval and low Self Approval motivation would yield to a unanimous, but erring majority more frequently than would persons with the opposite motivational profile.69 The measures of Social Approval and Self Approval they used were determined by the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory, an instrument which they developed. The results supported their hypothesis. The observation by Moeller and Applezweig that an awareness of others was about equally characteristic for the

67 Ibid., 29.
three different groups, high Social Approval and low Self Approval, low Social Approval and high Self Approval, and high Social Approval and Self Approval corresponded to the findings reported by Wilson.

The position taken by Moeller and Applezweig in regard to conformity might best be conveyed by this quotation from their discussion:

It should be emphasized that our prediction was not based on categorization of persons as conformers and nonconformers. As we have previously indicated, we assume that conformity per se is not a trans-situational trait, but that any individual conforms or fails to conform in a given situation depending upon his motivational profile and the relevance of conformity behavior in that situation to his motives.70

If conformity is to be conceived of as a response rather than a personality trait, then aspects of both motivation and the situation need to be included as variables in research. Such an integrated approach at the theory level has been called for by a number of recent investigators.71 In Abelson's words,

To the extent that response variables are controlled by motivational systems which in turn are subject to environmental system which in turn are subject to environmental arousal, the locus of appropriate factorial investigation should shift from the individual-difference level to the environmental-situations level.72
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72 Abelson, op. cit., 245.
Instruments for implementing such an integrated theory have yet to be developed.

An Assessment of the Empirical Literature

The form of behavior which has been referred to as conformity is not a simple phenomenon. Asch found that the opinions of others could distort an individual's judgment. Luchins and Luchins experimented with a variety of situations and the responses varied accordingly. Strickland and Crowne, and Crowne and Liverant found that the motivation for social approval was of considerable importance. Apparently, social approval is somewhat more important to women than to men. The study by Beloff suggested that acquiescence is not simply a sex-linked characteristic, however, but was related to some value system not yet defined since females acquiesced in the aesthetic decisions but not in the political ones. Males responded in the opposite way. The relationship between acquiescence and conventionality which Beloff proposed is an area which deserves more investigation.

Social influence, as articulated by Deutsch and Gerard, would provide either a source of norms or information for the subject. The corresponding forms of behavior for each category were defined by Wilson as social accommodation and self-correction. Both responses were exhibited by his subjects. Social influence, however, was most effective among individuals of indefinite status. The need for social approval and a sense of indefinite status both appear to be related to some sort of other-directed orientation.
Moeller and Applezweig in their study considered Self Approval and Social Approval motives and found some relationship between each and acquiescence in an Asch-type experiment. In general the predictive value of paper and pencil inventories has been very low despite the good intercorrelation among instruments so that the findings of Moeller and Applezweig appear to be most pertinent. These investigators have insisted, however, as have a number of others, that social influence should be studied in a larger context where personality and situational variables in interaction are both assessed.

Knowledge

The field of knowledge in the broadest sense has a history which is not unlike that of aesthetics. The effect of a long period of philosophic involvement has resulted in a more extensive development of theory with comparatively less proffered by empirical investigators. Recent psychological research in learning also is marked by a diversity of theoretical approaches. No attempt in this review will be made to acknowledge every theoretical position.

Theoretical Writings

Any discussion of the subject of knowledge tends to be complicated by the fact that the terminology utilized has various and sometimes fluid meanings. Knowledge is not a singular, unitary, entity but a pluralistic ruberic as Martin has asserted:

A kind of knowledge is to be understood in terms of the following four elements: the kind or proposition that is sought; the method used to seek it; the nature of the
evidence to which appeal is made; and, finally, the relation of
the kind of knowledge (or the type of proposition sought)
to other kinds of knowledge (other kinds of propositions) by
way of "presuppositions."²³

Knowledge according to Martin's assumption is derived from propositions.
The relationship of concepts to knowledge was clarified by Veatch when
he contended that concepts are both indispensable and insufficient for
knowledge:²⁴

... to have a set concepts —... is not to have
knowledge in anything like a full and complete sense.
... Knowledge can only come in propositions, which,
unlike mere concepts, are susceptible of truth and falsity. ...²⁵

Knowledge has not always been synonymous with "proof." The term
has been used also to indicate other levels of understanding. It has
been applied to verbalizations, that is to say, abstractions as
distinguished from experience. Knowledge, differentiated from
experience, is communicable. Parker has written that both sense and
reason apprehend the same object but the act of awareness is not
transitive.²⁶ The communicable aspect of knowledge has apparently

²³William Oliver Martin, "The Structure of Knowledge in the
Social Sciences," Education and the Structure of Knowledge, Fifth Annual
Phi Delta Kappa Symposium on Educational Research (Chicago: Rand McNally
²⁴H. B. Veatch, "Proposition and Knowledge," Philosophy of Know-
ledge, eds. Roland Houde and Joseph P. Mullally (New York: J. B. Lippincott
²⁵Ibid.
²⁶F. H. Parker, "A Realistic Appraisal of Knowledge," Philosophy
of Knowledge, eds. Roland Houde and Joseph P. Mullally (New York: J. B.
provided the basic assumption for structuring the Taxonomy for the
cognitive domain edited by Bloom and others. This Taxonomy is based
on six classes of objectives ranging from simple recall of information
to the ability to judge by utilizing both analysis and synthesis.

The problem of defining knowledge for the field of clothing
has been a subject of continuing concern for the teaching faculty in
this subject matter area. While efforts at such a definition were not
actually enunciated, it seems evident that such a goal was implicit in
several endeavors. For example, the Central Region Conferences of
College Teachers of Textiles and Clothing from 1948 to 1952 reviewed
techniques for evaluating subject matter at their annual meetings.

Undoubtedly, such techniques were intended to measure knowledge. An
tempt was made by this group in 1950 to gather test items which could
be used to construct a reliable instrument for an elementary course in
clothing and textiles. According to the report the questions which the
committee received were more factual in nature than was desired. From
this comment it seems apparent that the idea of levels of knowledge was
implicit to this undertaking.

The most comprehensive attempt to structure the field of clothing
and textiles was presented in the resume of the work conference at
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77 Benjamin S. Bloom, ed., Taxonomy of Educational Objectives; the
Classification of Education Goals, by a Committee of College and University
Examiners. Handbook I: Cognitive Domain (New York: Longmans, Green,
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78 Proceedings of Conference of College Teachers of Textiles and
Clothing, Central Region, Chicago, Illinois, October 14 to 17, 1949;
October 13 to 17, 1949; October 26 to 29, 1950; October 25 to 28, 1951;
November 6 to 9, 1952. (Mimeographed.)
Maryland in 1956. The content of the field was organized under five major headings: (1) socio-psychological, (2) managerial, (3) economics, (4) aesthetic, and (5) hygienic. A second conference, with some changes in personnel, took place in 1961. The report of this meeting, however, tended to be more experientially oriented than knowledge oriented.

The same year a conference for all home economics areas was held at French Lick, Indiana. There the idea of knowledge through the conceptual approach was discussed. Since that time the attempts to explicate the knowledge of clothing have been slow but persistent. The two most recent publications are (1) "The Significance of Clothing to the Individual in Society," Proceedings of the National Clothing and Textiles Seminar, College Teachers of Clothing and Textiles, University of Nevada, Reno, Nevada, August 16-21, 1965, and (2) Proceedings of Seminar on Concepts sponsored by the Central Region of College Teachers of Clothing and Textiles, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, January 24-28, 1966.

Research Studies

A considerable interest in instruments which measure a knowledge of clothing for the purpose of pretesting and placement has been evidenced. In the past five years six master's theses, listed in the Journal of Home Economics 1956 (8, 1948), 636-639.


have been devoted to this problem. Two of them emphasized textiles and the remainder clothing construction.

The experimental studies that have utilized a knowledge of clothing as an independent variable are actually few in number. Clothing knowledge, a variable in Hoffman's study, was denoted by these areas, construction, fitting, design, and fabrics. Knowledge of clothing was related to the fitting of clothing ($R=0.33; p<0.05; N=80$). These respondents, post-college age, knew more about fabrics than any of the other categories.

Research in clothing has more often been concerned with interest, that is to say, the affective domain, as compared with knowledge, the cognitive domain. Items that test a knowledge of clothing can sometimes be found, however, in measures constructed to determine interest. For example, Rosencranz found in her study of clothing interest that the

---
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second best items for discriminating interest were knowledge types of questions. The information required to answer these questions represented one of the lower levels of knowledge, namely, recognition.

Barr, one of the first investigators of fashion motivation, used a questionnaire that included three questions about fashion or "style" as she termed it. Comparing Barr's question with Rosencranz's questions, one can see a decided difference in level of difficulty. This difference may be due to an increasing sophistication concerning research procedures and the development of measuring instruments. Rosencranz's investigation was carried out after World War II whereas Barr's data had been collected in the early 30's. Barr's questions require complete recall as well as analysis: what simple names would you give these colors? and how would you describe the meaning of these words to someone who does not know them? The total recall rather than recognition which is required by Barr's question about Paris designers would tend to make this item a difficult one.

The validity of the discriminating items in Rosencranz's interview schedule as she pointed out cannot be maintained over time. Therefore, it would be necessary to key the items to contemporary events since the passage of time invariably effects some changes. Barr's questions would require similar revisions for the same reason.

85 Ibid., 19-20.
An Assessment of the Empirical Literature

The delineation of the subject matter that constitutes a knowledge of clothing remains somewhat indistinct. This fact may, in part, explain the lack of standardized instruments for measuring knowledge in this field. However, a definition of knowledge in the broadest sense is not prerequisite to the development of instruments for measuring achievement in specific areas. The interpretation for this study subsumed (1) art principles, (2) clothing, and (3) fashion under the knowledge of clothing. None of these categories, per se, had been included in Hoffman's definition of knowledge of clothing. Nor were other instruments located for assessing these particular aspects of clothing. Consequently, it became evident that a device for measuring this interpretation of knowledge would need to be initiated by the investigator. Suggestions for individual items which could be used in the fashion section were derived from the measures of interest developed by Rosencranz and Barr.

When the concepts for an area have been identified and articulated, then levels of difficulty become an inevitable concern. This aspect of evaluation, however, was not an immediate goal for the development of an instrument to measure the knowledge of clothing.

Design Preference in Clothing

Design preference in clothing represents a particular instance of the general category of preference behavior. Preference studies by their nature have tended to be empirical and descriptive rather than theoretical.
Research Studies

Studies of preference in relation to clothing have been infrequent. Consequently, the methodology for such investigations has only begun to be developed. Cognitive variables have not been a part of previous research designs but personality has.

Preference and personality

In a study of color preferences among women college students Compton found that preference was related to personality rather than the physical attributes of the individual. The instruments that she used were her own Fabric Preference Test and Gough's California Personality Inventory.

Ditty found a relationship between the personality characteristics of masculinity and feminity and certain clothing preferences of women college students. She administered the Personal Preference Scale by Krout and Tabin to measure personality characteristics. The Clothing Preference Scale, a non-verbal instrument, was developed by the investigator. In summarizing her findings, Ditty concluded that "the significance of clothing is relational. It can serve as an aspect of self-expression or it can be effective in social adjustment." She also
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concluded that clothing functions more as a medium of self-expression for those who are socially mature and confident: "Those individuals lacking this social awareness use clothing as a means of social role adjustment." 89

Preference and aesthetic judgment

An earlier study by Jacobson of design in clothing was related to aesthetic judgment rather than personality. Her findings emphasized the similarity of preferences between experts and non-experts. For both groups apparently,

The aesthetic impulse finds satisfaction (a) in certain space relationships . . . ; (b) in balance . . . stability and equilibrium; (c) in rhythm, . . . ; (d) in emphasis when it lessens the strain of attention by attracting, fixing, directing, or holding attention. 90

Assessment of the Empirical Literature

Only one or two studies could be located that measured design preference in clothing. The findings concerning instruments and methodology are, therefore, understandably meager. The stimulus material used by both Jacobson and Ditty was visual, line drawings. Greater variation in stimuli and presentation can be found in the psychological literature though at this time comparatively little concerning the effects of visual instruments has been reported in contrast to that for verbal measures.

89 Ibid., 113.
90 Jacobson, op. cit., 182.
Summary of the Chapter

In this chapter an attempt has been made to review the literature pertinent to the variables which comprise this study. The first section, "Aesthetics," included a discussion of two different theoretical positions: Formalism and several related contemporary interpretations that emphasize perception or the "open" quality of theory in aesthetics. A number of empirical studies that have been reported since 1950 were reviewed. While the continuity between theory and research has been tenuous, the persistent clarification of concepts by succeeding researchers has been notable.

The work of Barron was characterized by the consideration of personality attributes of creative individuals. One characteristic of this sort of person was his preference for complexity as opposed to simplicity. Several other investigators have reported similar findings with different though related stimulus material. Child found that subject's preferences when they corresponded to the consensus were unrelated to the external criterion of aesthetics (opinions of experts). The difference between aesthetic preference (the external criterion) and consensus is revealed in certain specific instances rather than by a generalized variation. Slate and Child concluded that painting preference was more historically or psychologically than aesthetically motivated.

Hoffman was not able to demonstrate that a relation between aesthetic judgment and certain aspects of clothing existed. In the
realm of values related to clothing Lapitsky reported that economic values were opposed to aesthetic. Likewise, Aiken found that his conformity cluster and aesthetic values were negatively related.

Horn found that the Formalist principles though comprehended in the abstract were not relevant to concrete situations in which clothing was included. Quite the reverse findings were reported in a much earlier study by Jacobson in which the reasons given for choices were most often phrased in terms of Formalist principles.

The second section on "Social Influence and Motivation" dealt with empirical studies carried out since the initial investigation by Asch into social influence in the early 1950's. The two forms of response to social pressure Asch called independence and yielding. However, Luchins and Luchins found that by varying the Asch methodology independence did not appear to be a consistent personality trait but was instead subject to influence by a number of other variables in the situation. Strickland and Crowne concluded that yielding was associated with a need for social approval so that when Crowne and Liverant rewarded subjects for independence, the result was that conformity, not independence, increased.

The relationship between acquiescence and conformity was studied by Beloff. He found women more conforming in their responses than men but the reactions of each sex was differentiated in relation to the stimulus material: political opinions and aesthetic preferences. Essentially, this sort of differentiation was not supported by the
findings of Allen and Crutchfield. They, too, found conformity higher for women but generalized across categories rather than specific to particular categories.

Deutsch and Gerard defined social influence in two ways: informational and normative. The reaction to these two conceptualizations Schroeder and Hunt had described as Self Correction and Social Accommodation. Wilson utilized these two concepts in his research and found that maximum conformity was associated with indefinite status in a sociometric hierarchy.

Instruments which can be used to predict conformity have been, for the most part, far from satisfactory. However, Moeller and Applezweig were successful in supporting the hypothesis that persons with high Social Approval and low Self Approval scores would yield more often to a unanimous but erring majority. The scores were derived from the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory which they developed.

The section entitled "Knowledge" revealed that at the level of philosophic discourse the concept of knowledge has been rather clearly defined. However, at the subject matter level the same clarity is still exceedingly difficult to achieve. Perhaps, such a lack of systematic organization of subject matter in clothing may account for the relative neglect of knowledge as a variable in recent research designs.

The studies that comprised the last section, "Design Preference in Clothing," were few in number. Aside from the study by Ditty this area appears to have been virtually unexplored.
CHAPTER III

PROCEDURE

The following topics will be considered in this section:
(1) the selection of the sample, (2) a description of measures selected and developed, (3) the administration of these instruments, and (4) the statistical treatment of data.

Selection of the Sample

The hypotheses proposed for testing were directly related to subject matter in home economics, especially to clothing. The subjects for this study were selected from those enrolled during the spring term of 1966 in two basic clothing courses at a Midwest land-grant university. The sample was restricted in order to obtain a more homogeneous grouping by excluding students who were either freshmen or seniors. The number of participants who completed all four of the instruments which were administered was 72.

Selection and Development of Measures

The four instruments used to measure the variables in this study were: (1) the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory developed by Applezweig
and Moeller,\textsuperscript{1} (2) the Barron-Welsh Art Scale,\textsuperscript{2} (3) a Knowledge of Clothing Test, and (4) a Design Preference in Clothing Scale. The two latter instruments were developed specifically for this investigation.

The Behavioral Interpretation Inventory

The Behavioral Interpretation Inventory (BII) included two scales which seemed appropriate to the theoretical design of this investigation. These were Social Approval (Soc App) or belongingness and Self Approval (Self App) or self-realization. A definition of the two scales used appears in the Manual.\textsuperscript{3} According to the authors, Social Approval is a motive that,

\ldots may vary from a desire for simple acceptance (frequently expressed in conformity behavior) to a desire for expressions of admiration or other manifestations of popularity and/or prestige. Behavior is oriented toward getting positive, or avoiding negative reactions from others who are significant.\textsuperscript{4}

Conversely, Self Approval represents a form of behavior that is not dependent upon the approval of others. "The individual's values are internalized, appear to be functionally autonomous."\textsuperscript{5}

The Behavioral Interpretation Inventory is a paper and pencil test made up of 59 multiple choice items. Norms for men and women are

\textsuperscript{1} Mortimer H. Appley and George Moeller, The Behavioral Interpretation Inventory, 1958.
\textsuperscript{3} George Moeller and Mortimer H. Applezweig, Manual for the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory, Technical Report #2, ONR Contract Nonr 996 (02), NR 172-228 (Connecticut College, November, 1957).
\textsuperscript{4} Ibid., p. 3.
\textsuperscript{5} Ibid.
presented in the Manual. Those for women were obtained from a sample of students who were attending an eastern college in 1955. The women were primarily freshmen (N=263) and sophomores (N=102).

The validity for the Social Approval and Self Approval scales of the BII was determined in two ways. First, scores from the two scales were compared with observed behavior under conditions that simulated an Asch-type conformity situation.6

The results . . . supported the hypothesis that persons with high social-approval and low self-approval motivation would yield to the group more frequently than would persons with the opposite motivational profile and tend to verify the interpretation of the BII. . . . 7

Second, statistical correlation were determined with three other standardized measures: the Edwards Personality Preference Schedule, the Gough California Psychological Inventory, and the Gordon Personal Profile. The absence of relationships, for the most part, between these three measures and the BII appears to indicate that the BII does, in fact, measure distinct dimensions of motivation.8

Two types of reliability were determined for the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory on the basis of Most-Least scoring. One was a test of internal consistency where odd-even items were correlated. This correlation, derived from the total sample of 715 men and women, was .79 for the Soc App scale and .80 for the Self App scale. The inter-correlation between these scales was -.38. The test for reliability over time, test-retest, was carried out one month later using an earlier

---

6 See Chapter II, p. 35, for the Asch experiment.
7 Moeller and Applezweig, op. cit., pp. 35-36.
8 Ibid.
72-item version of the BII. Correlations, in this instance, were determined separately for men and women. For the latter (N=240) the coefficient of stability for Soc App was .64 and Self App .86.

Two features of the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory make it particularly desirable for use in this study. The two pertinent scales, Self Approval and Social Approval, provided a means for measuring these two aspects as a first step toward determining the relationship between motivation and aesthetic preference. Secondly, this instrument had a degree of construct validity which comparable instruments lacked.

Permission to use the instrument for this study was granted. A copy of the instrument, the Manual for the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory, and scoring keys were provided by the authors. A sufficient number of copies of the Inventory were reproduced so that it could be administered to a group of 35 students. The method chosen for scoring was the Most-Least method recommended by Moeller and Applezweig because of greater reliability than with either first choices, or the sum of the ranks.

The Barron-Welsh Art Scale

The second instrument selected for use in this study was the Barron-Welsh Art Scale (B-WAS). This is a relatively new instrument which has been used in studies of creativity and aesthetic preference by Barron and others. It, purportedly, measures aesthetic perception

---

9 See Chapter II, pp. 16-28.
which has been conceived of as a factor in personality style. The
rationale for this instrument then is psychological and not derived
from aesthetic theory.

The preference of experts constituted the criteria for keying
the Barron-Welsh Art Scale. This procedure implies that in reality a
normative, empirical, or perceptual definition of the term aesthetic
was being used. Therefore, this instrument would be theoretically related
to a concept of art such as Gombrich or Weitz had proposed. Since the
definition of the term aesthetic chosen for this study was purposefully
a non-Formalist one, the B-WAS seemed a most appropriate instrument to
administer for measuring general aesthetic preference.

The B-WAS was derived from items in a previously developed
instrument known as the Welsh Figure Preference Test (WFPT). The
latter had been developed as a non-verbal diagnostic instrument for use
by clinical psychologists but serendipidously was found to discriminate
between artists and people-in-general. Through factor analysis Welsh
was able to identify two factors which distinguished the preference of
artists from non-artists. They were acceptance-rejection and
simplicity-complexity.

Welsh's description of the original instrument is equally
appropriate to the B-WAS. He stated that the Welsh Figure Preference

---

10 Frank Barron and George S. Welsh, "Artistic Perception as a
Possible Factor in Personality Style: Its Measurement by a Figure

11 George S. Welsh, Preliminary Manual: Welsh Figure Preference
Test (Palo Alto, California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.,
1959).
Test was comparatively easy, simple for the administrator to score, and completely objective.\(^\text{12}\) It is a paper and pencil test which requires the subject to check either the box marked "L" for like or "D" for don't like. There is no time limit for completing the answer sheet. From the original 400 items in the Welsh Figure Preference Test, Barron selected 65 of the most discriminating figures and validated the revised instrument on a new sample of contrasted groups. The B-WAS was selected for administering in preference to the version designated as the Revised Art Scale because the former contained a higher proportion of negative items. This format should, therefore, reduce the influence of acquiescence in the responses of the subjects.

Norms for people-in-general were based on responses from 75 male and 75 female adults. Validity for the B-WAS may be described as criterion-related. Two contrasted groups, 30 artists and 30 people-in-general, represented the criterion. When the instrument was administered, the resulting scores sharply separated these two groups, thus, replicating the results previously obtained. The instrument had demonstrated the ability to discriminate between these two different attitudes under controlled conditions.\(^\text{13}\) The reliability of the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, determined on the basis of test-retest with a week intervening, was in the 90's. However, Welsh suggested that this figure should be interpreted with discretion.\(^\text{14}\) Responses and, thereby, scores may represent a

---

\(^{12}\) Welsh, op. cit., pp. 5-6.
\(^{13}\) Barron and Welsh, Journal of Psychology, op. cit.
\(^{14}\) Welsh, op. cit., p. 21.
function of mood or affect and, as such, are subject to change. Item
variability or lack of strong preference could also account for shifts.

Copies of the Barron-Welsh Art Scale and answer sheets for each
student were purchased from the Consulting Psychologists Press, Incorporated, in Palo Alto. The Preliminary Manual, which includes the
Welsh Figure Preference Test, also contains the information on the
Barron-Welsh Art Scale and the scoring key for that instrument.

Knowledge of Clothing Test

A measure of knowledge about clothing was required in order to
assess its relation to design preference. No previously used instrument
or standardized test appropriate for this purpose was found. Some
suggestions for discriminating questions were obtained from
Rosencranz's15 and Barr's16 studies.

The first step in the development of a paper and pencil
objective-type test was to define the areas which constituted a knowledge
of clothing for this investigation. These were: Art Principles,
Clothing, and Fashion. The Art Principles section of the Knowledge of
Clothing Test was based on an adaptation of the elements and principles
of design to clothing and appearance. The section termed Fashion was
proposed as an alternative interpretation to the above "aesthetics of
dress." The processes which have contributed to the ideals of

15Mary Lou Learch Rosencranz, "A Study of Interest in Clothing
Among Selected Groups of Married and Unmarried Women" (unpublished

16Estelle DeYoung Barr, "A Psychological Analysis of Fashion
Motivation," Archives of Psychology, 26 (1934), 1-100.
contemporary costume as well as the descriptive vocabulary associated with the phenomenon of fashion were emphasized in this approach.

The third section of the Knowledge Test was identified as Clothing. It was distinguished from the other two sections by being devoid of any obvious aesthetic implications. The subject matter for Clothing emphasized the more static aspects of descriptive vocabulary and representative concepts, whereas, Fashion focused on the dynamic aspects.

Content sources

The textbooks consulted as a basis for the items in the development of the Art Principles section of the Test were Morton and McJimsey. The subject matter in these two books is closely related but presented in greater detail by Morton. Both books included the topics of design, composition, and color. Morton's presentation of color is based on the Munsell system and McJimsey's, the Prang system. Since the students selected as subjects were expected to learn the Munsell system, items in the questionnaire were keyed to this theory.

For the Fashion section two current issues of the local Sunday newspapers were searched as were issues of Mademoiselle from May to October 1965, and also the "Fashion" articles in Life magazine from

---

January to October 1965. These sources of information were typical as well as widely read by women college students. Two additional sources consulted were: the Fall Fashion Supplement of The New York Times, August 22, 1965, and Women's Wear Daily, a trade paper, for September 1965.

The Clothing section sources were textbooks: McJimsey's Art in Clothing Selection,\textsuperscript{19} Morton's The Arts of Costume and Personal Appearance (1955 edition),\textsuperscript{20} and Chamber's Fashion Fundamentals.\textsuperscript{21} The latter has been a standard reference for clothing and retailing students for many years. In view of its publication date (1947), the contents of Fashion Fundamentals, despite its title, would be described more correctly in 1966 as a source of clothing information rather than fashion information. All three of these textbooks contained glossaries which were especially useful. The chapter on "Design in Clothing" from McJimsey also proved helpful.

Development of the instrument

The initial version of the Fashion section of the Knowledge Test was presented to a group of 31 freshmen women enrolled in a home economics orientation course in the fall of 1965 at The Ohio State University. Item analysis was used to determine the discriminating ability of the questions with the result that 57 items retained. These were concerned with

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{20} Morton, op. cit.
descriptive terms relevant to types of garments, details, and textiles. Also, there were questions concerning influences on fashion, French and American designers, and personalities from the art and entertainment world.

At this point the decision was made to broaden the base of the knowledge instrument by adding two more sections, Art Principles and Clothing. Essentially, Knowledge now included two definitions of "aesthetics of dress" as well as a non-aesthetic one.

The section of Clothing included descriptive terms for dresses, necklines, sleeves, trimmings, and accessories. Questions about textiles concerned textiles per se or their properties in reference to garment styling. The Art Principles section included questions on elements and principles as well as their application to clothing design. The number of questions on color was twice that of the remaining elements combined.

Pretest of the knowledge of clothing test

The pretest version of the Knowledge of Clothing Test contained 57 items in the Fashion section, 53 in the Clothing section, and 94 in the Art Principles section. No attempt was made to equate the three sections for difficulty or number of items. Questions were primarily objective.

The Knowledge of Clothing Test was administered to 90 freshmen women enrolled in a beginning textiles course at a large university in Texas during the third week of the spring semester in 1966. The students had completed no course work in clothing selection, textiles,
or fashion, but some may have taken a course in Applied Design. Time allowed for responding to the test was 45 minutes. Not all students were able to complete all questions in this length of time.

Fifty-five completed pretests were analyzed in order to determine the relative difficulty of each question. Items that were judged too difficult or too easy were discarded. Questions which did not differentiate high scorers from low scorers were eliminated as indiscriminating. The largest number of correct responses was found in the Art Principles section. These findings may have been influenced by the fact that some students had been registered in an applied design course. The result of combining and revising the remaining questions and fragments of questions yielded 27 items for Art Principles, 22 for Clothing, and 25 for Fashion.

The decision to have the test graded by machine necessitated a revision in the presentation of the items. Questions were rewritten so that answers could be recorded on a special answer sheet that could be scanned and scored electronically. In order that separate scores for each part could be computed, it was necessary to separate the three sections. It seemed advisable to equalize the number of items in each of the categories with an even number of questions because of the nature of the scoring and analysis. The final instrument was composed of 24 questions for each of the three parts, Art Principles, Clothing, and Fashion. Validity for the Knowledge of Clothing Test could be described as content validity since it was based on information which appeared in textbooks and periodicals.
Design Preference in Clothing Scale

The first requirement of an instrument to be used for measuring design preference in clothing was that it should be a visual, non-verbal device. All designs needed to be presented in the same medium, sketches or photographs, to reduce stimulus variation. In addition, a wide selection of illustrations was also desired. Consequently, photographs from periodicals seemed to fulfill these objectives most adequately. Black and white, as well as colored, photographs were considered if the black and white photographs represented subject matter that was white, off-white, or neutral so that the photographs were a study in value rather than a reduction or distortion of a colored garment.

Photographs of a variety of garments were collected from Vogue, Harper's Bazaar, Mademoiselle, Glamour, and The New York Times Fall Fashion Supplement. This collection of photographs included coats, suits, dresses, evening dresses, blouses, sportswear, and housecoats with more examples in some categories than others. Certain problems arose in attempting to obtain a balance of "better" and "poorer" designs in each category. Lower priced blouses, for example, were well represented whereas better blouses were difficult to locate. On the whole, examples of poor design were not as numerous as those illustrations of ordinary or better designs.

More than 80 photographs were presented to five graduate students in textiles and clothing at The Ohio State University for a preliminary evaluation in the spring of 1966. The judges were asked to indicate the "better" and "poorer" examples in each of the categories by
using criteria proposed by McJimsey. Each judge was provided with a copy in which the first two classifications, Distinctive and Classic, were to be considered as "better" and Ordinary and Poor were to be considered as "poorer." Instructions were given to consider the figure as a whole in making a judgment.

These evaluations were summarized. Items not listed as "better" or "poorer" by any judge were deleted as were items upon which the majority of judges did not agree. Categories in which only one or two items remained were discarded. The widest range of items remained in coats and dresses which were retained as the basis of the instrument.

Subsequently, six examples of dresses were added to this group since these categories appeared deficient in the area of poor design. No attempt was made to balance the number of color and black and white photographs since both were considered legitimate representations of the subject matter. All backgrounds except plain, non-inferential, kinds were cut away from the photographs. After the background was removed, the figure was mounted on a grey or a low value green construction paper and photographed. A total of 27 photographs were made into slides.

23 Arnheim has pointed out that historically form has been more important than color in art. So far as psychologists can tell at this point form and color dominance appear to be personality related attributes. See Rudolph Arnheim, Art and Visual Perception (Berkeley, University of Calif., Press, 1954), p. 273.
Evaluation by peer group and experts

The 27 slides of coats and dresses were evaluated by two different groups before the instrument was structured in its final form. A peer group was used to determine a norm of acceptability for each of the garments to be shown in the Design Preference in Clothing Scale. This group was composed of students enrolled in a class for textiles and clothing majors at the same university where the study was made. Responses from students who were male, over 22, or had more than 12 terms of college credit, were not tabulated.

These slides were shown to this peer group during a portion of one class meeting the first week in April 1966. Each member was provided with an evaluation sheet (see Appendix C) on which directions were given for recording responses to the slides. One of five categories was to be checked for each slide that was projected: (1) Most acceptable — most of my group would like very much, (2) Acceptable — many would like, (3) Questionable — some would like and some would not like, (4) Unacceptable — many would not like, and (5) Most rejected — most would not like at all. The responses of 23 peers were tabulated to determine group acceptance of each of 27 costumes.

The slides were then ordered by placing the most acceptable examples at the top of the list, followed by diminishing acceptability to complete rejection. Subsequently, slides which received less than 50 per cent of the peers' responses were rejected.

The same 27 slides were also submitted to six women judges to derive empirical definitions of good and poor design which were to be
used as the criteria for keying the Design Preference in Clothing Scale. These women were gainfully employed in vocations related to clothing or fashion. An assistant buyer of better dresses, a fashion coordinator, and a training director were employed by a downtown specialty shop. A fashion editor wrote for a large, daily newspaper in the city. The remaining two judges were university professors in textiles and clothing. All had been employed in their respective professions for at least 15 years.

Each judge was provided with a slide viewer and a brief description of the Key to the Categories for Evaluation of Clothing Design:

DISTINCTIVE: Appropriate for particular individuals or specific situations; high fashion; elegant, refined, and perfected in fabric and detail.

CLASSIC: Versatile and becoming; modified high fashion; simple but smart; some individuality in fabric or detail.

ORDINARY: Commonplace or overused; inadequate copy of a distinctive or classic design; over-emphasis or details; lack of individuality in fabric.

POOR: Silhouette poorly designed; unrelated to current fashion, over-emphasis of inharmonious details; lines, textures, colors, and ideas unrelated.

Judges were requested to voice their evaluations in terms of the Key. In a sense the Key did present a proffered criteria but completely individual and unchannelled responses would present considerable difficulty for tabulating, hence, the use of the Key. Responses were recorded by the interviewer.

24 This is an adaptation or distillation of the original categories proposed by McJimsey, op. cit., p. 202. Compare with Appendix A.
Following this, good designs (classified as Distinctive and Classic) were ordered by placing examples of unanimous agreement first, agreement of five of the judges next, and the agreement among four. Slides for which opinion was indecisive followed. Examples characterized as poor (categories of Ordinary and Poorer) were listed according to the agreement of four judges, then five, and finally, unanimous opinions. Instances of indecisive responses were thus eliminated.

As a result of culling these two lists: peer group acceptance and experts' opinions, a total of 14 items remained. An attempt was made to work out a series of pairs which could be presented for forced choice. There were five slides in the category of peers prefer-judges reject and three in peers reject-judges prefer. The method of paired comparisons was, thus, severely restricted by the number of items which could be used. Therefore, this method of presentation was abandoned.

Since the judges' opinions, judges prefer, provided the criterion for keying the instrument, examples which had been strongly endorsed, either positively or negatively, were reconsidered. Instances of agreement between peers and judges in any event were not usable but examples which had called forth only indecision among peers seemed usable if students were simply asked to check "Like" or "Don't Like" responses.

The final instrument

An adaptation of the method used for presenting the figures in the Barron-Welsh Art Scale made it possible to use more of the slides because the subject could respond both positively and negatively, "Like" or "Don't Like." This procedure then would make it possible to utilize
all 14 of the discriminating slides. Six non-discriminating slides were included in order to round out the total number of items to 20 for the Design Preference in Clothing Scale. However, only the 14 critical items were scored.

The slides for the final instrument were ordered and numbered with coats first and dresses second. The sequence was organized to keep certain style ideas in proximity but yet to give variety rather than a sense of repetition or randomness. An answer sheet (see Appendix D) was designed and duplicated for use by each respondent.

Administration of the Instruments

The Design Preference in Clothing Scale, the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, and the Knowledge of Clothing Test were administered to students enrolled in two classes, Clothing Selection and Clothing Construction, during a two-hour laboratory period the third week in May. The Design Preference in Clothing Scale was presented first. It was assumed that this procedure would prevent the effect of bias which could result if one of the instruments used to assess the independent variable were administered prior to the Design Preference in Clothing Scale. This organization proved most feasible from a mechanical standpoint, as well, since copies of the Barron-Welsh Art Scale booklet and answer sheet could be distributed with the answer sheet for the slides. In this way as soon as the projection of the slides had been completed, the students could begin on the second instrument.
Preceding the projection of the slides, students were instructed to make their selections on the basis of "Like" or "Don't Like" and to react to the total design. A 20-second exposure period for each slide apparently allowed sufficient time for viewing and responding since there was no indication by the subjects' behavior that anyone felt under pressure because of this time interval.

Each of the other three pencil and paper measures was prefaced by appropriate directions and no particular problems were encountered in the use of these instruments. When the second instrument was completed, it was exchanged for a copy of the Knowledge of Clothing Test (which remained untitled) and the answer sheet for it. The Behavioral Interpretation Inventory was administered during two scheduled lecture periods early in June. No time limit was set for completion of any instrument except the slides.

Statistical Methods of Data Interpretation

The Knowledge of Clothing Test was scored by the optical scanner of an I.B.M. 1230 which produced a deck of punched cards and a write-out of the analysis. The program which was used to analyze the responses to the Knowledge Test included formulas for split-half reliability, the Kuder-Richardson 20 and 21, an index of difficulty, and the Phi coefficient, for discriminating ability. In order that the same analysis could be made for the Design Preference in Clothing Scale, the responses from the mimeographed answer sheets were transferred to
the special score sheets for scanning by the machine. The same program was used. The Barron-Welsh Art Scale and the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory answer sheets were scored by hand.

The Pearson Product-Moment coefficient of correlation was used to compare the scores on the Design Preference in Clothing Scale with those of the Knowledge of Clothing Test and the Barron-Welsh Art Scale. The association between scores from the contrasted groups, Social Approval and Self Approval, and the Barron-Welsh Art Scale and the Design Preference in Clothing Scale was determined in the same way.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Four instruments were administered to participants in this study. They were: (1) the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory (BII) of Appley and Moeller, (2) the Barron-Welsh Art Scale (B-WAS), (3) the Knowledge of Clothing Test, and (4) the Design Preference in Clothing Scale. The results from each of the four measures are presented first, and then the relationship between scores on different instruments are considered. A discussion of the hypotheses follows and the chapter is concluded with a critical evaluation of the developed instruments.

The sample consisted of 72 young women who completed the four instruments that were administered to students in two basic clothing courses at a large, land-grant university in the Middle West. All but four of the respondents were home economics majors. The age range from 19 to 21 included all but three students who were each 22, 23, and 25 years old. The median age for the group was 20. The number of terms the students had been enrolled in college ranged from four to 11 with a median of eight terms.
Results from the Four Instruments

The Behavioral Interpretation Inventory

Scores determined by the Most-Least method for two scales of the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory from this sample ranged from +28 to -19 for Self Approval and +18 to -37 for Social Approval. The means were 7.79 (S.D.=9.91; N=72) for Self Approval and -7.31 (S.D.=10.56; N=72) for Social Approval. A comparison of the means from this sample and the norms for women are presented in Table 1. The norms for women obtained by Moeller and Applezweig were derived from a sample of first and second year students at an eastern women's college.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Means Sample</th>
<th>Means Norm</th>
<th>Standard Deviations Sample</th>
<th>Standard Deviations Norm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Soc App</td>
<td>-7.31</td>
<td>-11.52</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>9.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self App</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>10.64</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>10.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>365</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The means for Social Approval obtained from the sample in this study was higher than the norm for women while for Self Approval it was lower. The standard deviations for the sample were not markedly


2 Ibid.
different from the norms. The difference between the two scales was significant, \( r = -0.46 \) \((p < 0.01; N=72)\). The correlation for the combined norm (365 women and 350 men) between the Self Approval scale and the Social Approval scale scored by the Most-Least method was \( r = -0.38 \) \((p < 0.05; N=715)\).

The Barron-Welsh Art Scale

The distribution of scores from the Barron-Welsh Art Scale resembled a normal curve with a mean score of 32.7 \((S.D. = 12.0; N=72)\). The frequency distribution plotted as a histogram is presented in Figure 1. The class interval represents a range of five scores with the median, 32, at the center of the interval. Modes appeared at 27 where there were 12 cases and at 37 where there were 11. One class interval intervened between the two highest frequencies; there were nine cases in it. These findings may be compared to the pronounced bimodal distribution reported by Barron.\(^4\) Upon deleting the four central cases from his array, a 20 unit interval separated his all male sample into contrasted groups of 18 subjects each.

In order to compare this sample group with other studies, the distribution of scores was split at the median. Thus, the upper group had a median score of 44 and the lower group 23. The means for people-in-general according to the Manual are: 15.07 \((S.D. = 10.66; N=75)\)

\(^3\)Ibid., p. 32.

Scores from the Barron-Welsh Art Scale

Norms from Welsh Figure Preference Manual:
Mean for People-in-General = 17
Mean for Artists = 40

Fig. 1.—Distribution of Scores from the Barron-Welsh Art Scale
for men and 18.14 (S.D.=11.79; N=75) for women, while the mean for artists was considered to be around 40. The tendency toward higher means for the group in the present study was demonstrated also in the shape of the distribution; the curve was negatively skewed.

The difference between the norms for the sexes in the category of people-in-general was not great. According to Welsh, "The original females scored somewhat higher than males on the revised art scale although the difference was not significant." When a second sample of matched groups was compared on the revised Male-Female Scale, the difference in scores, 2.14, between the men and the women gave a critical ratio of 2.11 significant at about the four per cent level. The 50 cases (25 men and 25 women) scoring lowest on the art scale had a mean MF score of 8.68 while the highest 50 had a mean of 15.02; this demonstrated the high relationship between the MF key and the art key.


6Ibid., p. 9.

7The Revised Art Scale is an 86 item instrument comparable to the Barron-Welsh Art Scale but more suitable for factor analysis.

8Welsh, op. cit., p. 16.

9Ibid.

10Ibid.

There are five overlapping items on the revised MF and RA Scales. Ibid., p. 17.
The Knowledge of Clothing Test

Reliability of the measure

The reliability for the Knowledge of Clothing Test was based on three measures of internal consistency: odd-even correlation (corrected for attenuation by the Spearman-Brown prophecy formula) and the Kuder-Richardson formulas 20 and 21. The reliability coefficients are given in Table 2.

TABLE 2

| RELIABILITY COEFFICIENTS AND STANDARD ERRORS FOR THE KNOWLEDGE OF CLOTHING TEST |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Odd-Even                        | K-R 20          | K-R 21          |
| Reliability Coefficient        | .74             | .74             |
| Standard Error                  | 3.73            | 3.73            |
|                                 |                 |                 |
|                                 |                 |                 |

The differences among reliability coefficients can be explained by the fact that, the Kuder-Richardson formulas ... yield a lower reliability coefficient than would be obtained by using the other methods ... Thus, they can be thought of as providing a minimum estimate of reliability and, ... , tend to eliminate the danger of making an over estimate.11

Since internal consistency is influenced by the relationship among the parts of a measure, the correlations for the three parts of the Knowledge Test are relevant. These correlations are listed in Table 3.

TABLE 3

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION, MEANS, AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS FOR THE THREE PARTS OF THE KNOWLEDGE OF CLOTHING TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Three Sections</th>
<th>Art Principles</th>
<th>Clothing</th>
<th>Fashion</th>
<th>Design Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Art Principles</td>
<td>0.229</td>
<td>0.242*</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.454**</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.235*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* r - Significantly different from zero, p<.05.
** r - Significantly different from zero, p<.01.

Results

Scores on the Knowledge of Clothing Test, a pencil and paper test, ranged from 25 to 58. The mean score on the 72-item test was 39.7 (S.D.=7.3; N=72). The median for the test was 39.3 and the mode was 33. Very little difference was observed among the mean scores for the three sections of the Knowledge of Clothing Test. The mean scores for each of the 24-item sections was as follows: 13.1 for Art Principles (S.D.=3.12; N=72); 14.0 for Clothing (S.D.=2.8; N=72); and 12.4 for Fashion (S.D.=4.0; N=72). The highest score for any of the sections was 21 and the lowest was five. The mode for both Art Principles and Clothing was 14. There were two modes, nine and 16, in the Fashion section.
The Design Preference in Clothing Scale

Reliability of the measure

The same measures of internal consistency were used to determine the reliability of the Design Preference in Clothing Scale as had been used for the Knowledge of Clothing Test. The reliability coefficient calculated by the split-half method was .42. The results using the Kuder-Richardson formulas 20 and 21 were not commensurate with this figure. Concerning low reliability, Ferguson has written:

Reliability coefficients less than .50 are not uncommon, and coefficients of zero are perhaps not isolated curiosities. . . . Low reliability does not necessarily invalidate a technique as a device for drawing valid inferences. . . . An unreliable technique used with a small sample is, however, capable of detecting gross differences only. . . .

Results

The Design Preference in Clothing Scale was made up of slides to which subjects reacted by indicating "Like" or "Don't Like." Out of a total of 20 slides 14 were designated as critical because these examples represented the divergence of opinion between peers and judges. These 14 items were keyed to judges' opinions. Scores ranged from one to 11. The mean was 6.3 (S.D.=1.8; N=72). The median was 6.5 and the mode was seven. The frequency distribution of scores appears in Table 4.

---

TABLE 4
FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF SCORES FROM THE DESIGN PREFERENCE IN CLOTHING SCALE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Relative Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.33 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.50 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26.39 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18.06 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16.67 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11.11 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.78 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.38 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>99.98 %</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Relationship Among Measures

The Pearson Product-Moment coefficient of correlation was used to determine the relationship between the Design Preference in Clothing Scale and the Knowledge of Clothing Test and the Barron-Welsh Art Scale. The association between scores from the contrasted groups, Social Approval and Self Approval, and the Barron-Welsh Art Scale and the Design Preference in Clothing Scale, was computed in the same way.
The Behavioral Interpretation Inventory, the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, the Knowledge of Clothing Test, and the Design Preference in Clothing Scale—

The relation of the Self Approval and Social Approval scales of the BII, the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, and the Knowledge of Clothing Test to the Design Preference in Clothing Scale is shown in Table 5. Most correlations are in the predicted direction; only one is statistically significant. Not one of the low correlations between the independent variables was significant.

**TABLE 5**

**COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION FOR SCORES FROM FOUR INSTRUMENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Self App</th>
<th>Social App</th>
<th>B-WAS</th>
<th>Knowledge</th>
<th>Design Preference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BII Scales:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self App</td>
<td>- .464*</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.036</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social App</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron-Welsh Art Scale</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Clothing Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>7.79</td>
<td>-7.30</td>
<td>32.65</td>
<td>39.65,</td>
<td>6.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>9.90</td>
<td>10.56</td>
<td>11.98</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* r - Significantly different from zero, p<.01.
Relationship Between Variables for Contrasted Groups

Contrasted groups were created by sorting the scores from the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory. Subjects with scores above the mean for this sample on Self Approval, 7.79, were separated from those with scores above the mean for this sample on Social Approval, -7.30. High scorers on both scales were withdrawn. As a result, there were 21 members in the Self Approval group and 23 in the Social Approval group. The correlation between these two scales for the Self Approval group was -.31 which was not significant. Whereas, for the Social Approval group the relation between the scales, r=-.51, was significant at the .02 level of confidence.

There were no significant relationships between the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, the Knowledge of Clothing Test, the Design Preference Scale and either of these two groups. The sign of the association between the Self Approval score for the Self Approval group and the Knowledge of Clothing Test, it may be noted, was negative though the correlation coefficient fell below the level of significance. A comparison of the results obtained by using contrasted groups can be seen in Table 6.
TABLE 6

COEFFICIENTS OF CORRELATION FOR SCORES FROM FOUR INSTRUMENTS
FOR THE SELF APPROVAL AND SOCIAL APPROVAL GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>High Self Approval Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self App</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>B-WAS</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>App</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BII Scales:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self App</td>
<td>- .313</td>
<td></td>
<td>- .353</td>
<td></td>
<td>.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social App</td>
<td>( .218)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
<td></td>
<td>.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron-Welsh Art Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.099</td>
<td></td>
<td>.073</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Clothing Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>14.91</td>
<td>-17.10</td>
<td>33.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>6.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>12.36</td>
<td>7.01</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>High Social Approval Group</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self App</td>
<td>Social</td>
<td>B-WAS</td>
<td>Knowledge</td>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>App</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Preference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BII Scales:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self App</td>
<td>- .512*</td>
<td>( -.142)</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td></td>
<td>.182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social App</td>
<td>( .168)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.023</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barron-Welsh Art Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.013</td>
<td></td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Clothing Test</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means</td>
<td>-2.17</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>34.91</td>
<td>39.30</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>12.20</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>2.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N=23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* - Significantly different from zero, p < .02.
( ) - Correlation in direction opposite to prediction.
Relationship Between Findings and the Hypotheses

The results of the statistical analysis will be considered in the following section in order to evaluate the hypotheses which were formulated for this investigation.

Hypothesis I. College women with high scores on the measure of aesthetic preference will also score high on the Design Preference in Clothing Scale.

The correlation between aesthetic preference, as determined by the scores on the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, and the Design Preference in Clothing Scale was close to zero and not significantly different from zero. Hence, this hypothesis was rejected.

Hypothesis II. College women with scores that represent a predominance of the Self Approval motive will score higher on the measure of aesthetic preference than those with scores that represent a predominance of the Social Approval motive.

The relation between the score on the Self Approval scale for the group high in Self Approval and the Barron-Welsh Art Scale was -.096, which was extremely low and opposite in sign to what had been predicted. For the high Social Approval group the score on the Social Approval scale of the BII was low and positively correlated with the measure of aesthetic preference. Hence, this hypothesis was not confirmed.

Hypothesis III. College women with scores that represent a predominance of the Self Approval motive will score higher on the Design Preference in Clothing Scale than those with scores that represent a predominance of the Social Approval motive.
The preference for good design in the Design Preference in Clothing Scale when considered in reference to the Self Approval scale for the high Self Approval group was positively but not significantly related. The association for the high Social Approval group on the Social Approval scale was extremely low and negative in sign. This hypothesis was not appreciably confirmed; the correlation was in the predicted direction but was not statistically significant.

**Hypothesis IV.** College women with scores high on the Knowledge of Clothing Test will also score high on the Design Preference in Clothing Scale.

The correlation between the Knowledge of Clothing Test and the Design Preference in Clothing Scale was in the direction predicted but low and not statistically significant. When the three sections of the Knowledge of Clothing Test were analyzed separately, these relationships were not consistent. One of the sections, Fashion, was significantly related, \( r = 0.26 \) \( (p < 0.05) \) to the Design Preference in Clothing Scale. However, there was no significant confirmation of this hypothesis when the three sections of the Knowledge Test were used so that this hypothesis was rejected.

**Evaluation of Developed Instruments**

The Design Preference in Clothing Scale was essentially a first step toward the development of an instrument. As a research tool, it proved to be less than satisfactory because of its lack of discriminating
ability. This deficiency presented serious shortcomings for this investigation. As the most critical of the four instruments, the weakness of this measure apparently accounts for a substantial portion of the lack of significant findings.

A second experimental instrument devised for this investigation was the Knowledge of Clothing Test. It was necessary to begin the development of such a measure because no instrument like this could be found. The test did not include all possible areas of clothing knowledge but covered three sections, Art Principles, Clothing, and Fashion. The most discriminating section, differentiating those who scored high on the test as a whole from those who scored low, was Fashion. Half of the discriminating questions were from the Fashion section and a third of them were from the Art Principles section. The discriminating power of each item was determined by the formula for the Phi coefficient. Those items for which the Phi coefficient was .231 or greater (significant at .05 level of confidence with 70 degrees of freedom) were designated as efficient discriminators. A list of these questions from the Test with the accompanying Phi coefficient may be found in Appendix E. The Knowledge of Clothing Test, at this stage of development, appears to have some value as a discriminating instrument.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

This study was undertaken in order to investigate certain attributes of preference in the area of clothing. The research design included, as independent variables, selected aspects of motivation, knowledge, and aesthetic inclination, inasmuch as each of these might be expected to contribute to clothing preference. This area of investigation was selected since it is one of importance to the curriculum in clothing and one for which little in the way of empirical findings has been adduced.

The assumption that general aesthetic preference and more specific clothing oriented preferences are related is implicit in many discussions concerned with instruction for clothing. Furthermore, it is supposed that knowledge provides an important basis for preference. A previous study reported by Horn¹ was designed to investigate this assumption. At the general level, aesthetic was interpreted as the

principles of design. Among aesthetic theories this definition would seem most relevant to that of the Formalists. Horn did not find, with the measure she used, a relationship between the general and the specific levels. Since Horn's study, the logic of this assumption has not been contended.

The present investigation was proposed in order to test the relationship between general and specific aesthetic preferences. However, aesthetic in this case was defined in a normative-empirical manner so as to be more closely related to contemporary theories in philosophy and art. Knowledge, which has not been evaluated in association with preference, was narrowly limited for the purpose of this study. Because the findings from psychological investigations had revealed that aspects of personality were related to aesthetic preference, this conclusion was adapted as a hypothesis for this study. Two forms of motivation were considered in relation to general aesthetic preference as well as design preference in clothing. In brief, this study attempted to determine and compare some of the inherent and acquired attributes of preference for clothing design.

Four instruments were administered in this study; they were

1. the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory,
2. the Barron-Welsh Art

---


(3) a Knowledge of Clothing Test, and (4) a Design Preference in Clothing Scale. The first two instruments have been used in previous psychological research. Two of the four scales from the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory were scored; they were Social Approval and Self Approval. The Barron-Welsh Art Scale was used for assessing general aesthetic preference. This instrument, keyed as it was to the opinions of artists, seemed most consistent with the contemporary definitions of aesthetic; it is not a measure of the ability to apply the principles of design such as Horn had employed.

The Knowledge of Clothing Test and the Design Preference in Clothing Scale were developed specifically for this investigation and are in the nature of experimental measuring devices rather than refined instruments. The Knowledge of Clothing Test is a paper and pencil test based on source material in textbooks and periodicals. It contains 24 questions under each of these headings: Art Principles, Clothing, and Fashion. The form of validity for this instrument is known as content validity. The reliability, determined by tests of internal consistency, was good.

The Design Preference in Clothing Scale, made up of a series of 20 slides, 14 of which were critical, was based on face validity. The instrument was keyed to experts' opinions. The experts were professional women who had been associated with the field of clothing for more than 15 years. Two were members of the Textiles and Clothing faculty at a

large Midwestern university and four were members of the business community in the capital city where the university was located. Reliability for this instrument determined by tests of internal consistency was low.

The sample for this study was comprised of 72 women who were enrolled in two clothing classes, the first in the sequence, at The Ohio State University in the spring of 1966. The age range from 19 to 21 included all but three students who were each 22, 23, and 25 years of age. The median age for the group was 20. The number of terms in college ranged from four to 11 with a median of eight.

Scores on the two scales of the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory were consistent with the norms though the means for this sample was higher on Social Approval and lower on Self Approval. The scores ranged from -37 to +18 on the Social Approval scale with a mean of -7.31 (S.D.=10.56; N=72). On the Self Approval scale the scores ranged from -19 to +28 and the mean was 7.79 (S.D.=9.91; N=72). The relationship between the means was significant, r=-.46 (p<.01; N=72).

Contrasted groups were created by sorting the scores from the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory. Scores above the mean for each scale were retained except when both were high. As a result, there were 21 members in the Self Approval group and 23 in the Social Approval group. The relationship between the two scales was significant for the Social Approval group, only, r=-.51 (p<.01; N=23).

The distribution of scores for this sample of 72 women from the Barron-Welsh Art Scale resembled a bell curve somewhat negatively skewed
more than the bimodal distribution reported by Welsh or Barron. Scores
ranged from seven to 53 for the critical items of the 86-item Scale.
The mean was 32.7 (S.D.=12; N=72). For the purpose of obtaining
contrasted groups, which had, heretofore, been inherent in the shape
of the distribution, this array was divided at the median. The mean
scores for the upper group was 44 and for the lower group, 23. These
means in both categories are slightly higher than those reported by
Barron\(^7\) and Rosen\(^8\).

Scores on the Knowledge of Clothing Test ranged from 25 to 58.
The mean score for the 72-item Test was 39.7. The mean scores for the
three sections varied from 12.4 to 14.0. Scores for these sections,
with 24 items each, ranged from five to 20. The mode for both Art
Principles and Clothing was 14. The Fashion section had two modes:
nine and 16. The relationships among the three sections of the
Knowledge of Clothing Test were determined by the Pearson Product-Moment
correlation. The association between the Art Principles section and
Fashion, \(r=.24\), was significant at the .05 level. The correlation
between Art Principles and Clothing, \(r=.23\), was just below this level
of significance. Between Clothing and Fashion the association, \(r=.45\),
was significant at the .01 level. These correlations indicate that
the three sections of the instrument are not independent but are related
in varying degrees.

\(^7\)Barron, \textit{op cit.}, pp. 182-183.

\(^8\)John C. Rosen, "The Barron-Welsh Art Scale as a Predictor of
Originality and Level of Ability Among Artists," \textit{The Journal of Applied
Psychology}, 1955 (5, 39), 366-367.
The Design Preference in Clothing Scale consisted of 20 slides, 14 of which were critical. The latter were examples which had elicited divergent responses between the group of six experts and 23 peers. Scores on this Scale extended from one to 11. The mean was 6.35 (S.D.=1.79; N=72). More than half the scores were concentrated within the range six to eight.

The attempt to demonstrate the existence of a relationship between the measure of general aesthetic preference and design preference in clothing was not successful. To assert that such a relationship does not, thereby, exist would, however, not be accurate. The results from the Barron-Welsh Art Scale, which was used to measure general aesthetic preference, proved difficult to interpret. Whether this finding had an influence on the relationship between the two instruments is not known. At any rate, Hypothesis I: College women with high scores on the measure of aesthetic preference will also score high on the Design Preference in Clothing was not supported.

The relation of the two motives, Social Approval and Self Approval from the Behavioral Interpretation Inventory, to the scores on the Barron-Welsh Art Scale was contrary to that which had been predicted. For the high Social Approval group the score on the Social Approval scale was low and positively correlated with the measure of aesthetic preference. The relation between the score on the Self Approval scale for the group high in Self Approval was negative and very low. Neither of the motives was significantly related to the measure of general
aesthetic preference. Consequently, Hypothesis II: College women with scores that represent a dominance of the Self Approval motive will score higher on the measure of aesthetic preference than those with scores that represent a predominance of the Social Approval motive, was not confirmed.

In like manner, the relation of these two motives to the results from the Design Preference in Clothing Scale was not marked by a strong contrast. The preference for good design when considered in reference to the Self Approval scale for the high Self Approval group was positively but not significantly related. The association for the high Social Approval group on the Social Approval scale was extremely low and negative in sign. Therefore, Hypothesis III: College women with scores that represent a predominance of the Self Approval motive will score higher on the Design Preference in Clothing Scale than those with scores that represent a predominance of the Social Approval motive, was not appreciably conformed. The correlation was in the predicted direction but was not statistically significant.

The association between the Knowledge of Clothing Test and the Design Preference in Clothing Scale was in the predicted direction but low and not statistically significant. When the three sections of the Knowledge of Clothing Test were analyzed separately, these relationships were not consistent. One of the sections, Fashion, was significantly related to the Design Preference in Clothing Scale. However, there was no significant confirmation of Hypothesis IV: College women with scores high on the Knowledge of Clothing Test will also score high on the Design Preference in Clothing Scale, when the three sections of the Knowledge Test were used.
Conclusions

The following conclusions are proposed as a result of this study:

1. A relationship between general aesthetic preference and clothing design preference is not evident.

2. The two motives, self approval and social approval, are not strongly or consistently related to general aesthetic preference and design preference in clothing.

3. Knowledge is equivocally associated with design preference in clothing.

The lack of clarity and significance in the findings from this study is not unique among investigations in an area related to aesthetics. More specifically, Horn's findings, cited previously, were not inconsistent with the results of this investigation. That neither investigator found a relationship between the general and specific aesthetic levels does not thereby invalidate that assumption. The implications for instruction are such that the area remains an important one for future investigation. The logic of the hypothesis under test was unassailable but if this deduction cannot be supported by empirical findings after adequate testing, then it would appear to be necessary to rephrase the question. An alternate approach might attempt to determine the factors which intervene or inhibit the continuity of aesthetic preference from the general to the specific. Such information would be relevant to understanding the "logic" of human behavior and at the same time provide a more realistic basis for instruction.
The problem of adequate instruments at both the general and specific level is critical. The use of the Barron-Welsh Art Scale in preference to a Formalist-oriented instrument seemed justified in a second test of the relation between aesthetic preference generally and specifically. The results, from this instrument, however, proved to be difficult to interpret. The response pattern for this group of women was not like that of previous (male) samples.

Whether the ramifications of sex differences might explain the unpredicted direction of association between motivation and aesthetic preference for this sample remains a moot point. The hypothesis tested in this study was derived from Barron's findings. It is further confirmed by the significant negative correlation of Social Desirability with aesthetic preference, recently, reported by Child. The findings from the present study with a sample of 72 women are contradictory to those of Barron and Child. An explanation which Child rejected may, nevertheless, provide an interpretation for the results of this study: agreement with the judgment of experts may represent primarily the intention of making a socially desirable response. From this assumption the predicted relationship between Social Approval and the score from the Barron-Welsh Art Scale would be positive. Perhaps, this is a more plausible hypothesis for a female sample. The interpretation of

---

10Ibid., 505-506.
women's role may include a heightened awareness in aesthetic expression and a predisposition to socially desirable responses. The discussion of the Male-Female Scale for the Welsh Figure Preference Test implies that sex may be a factor which influences the score on the Revised Art Scale. This is an area which needs further clarification.

The hypothesis proposed above seems worthy of investigation from yet another point of view. An examination of the relationships for the high Social Approval group indicates that Social Approval is positively related to the results from the B-WAS but negatively related to the Design Preference in Clothing Scale. The converse is true for the sign of the relationships for the Self Approval scale of the high Self Approval group. While the correlations from this investigation are too low to be significant, this pattern of relationships would seem to warrant further investigation.

The attempt to develop an instrument which would measure design preference in clothing was in effect a first step. Relatively little research dealing with clothing preference has made use of visual instruments with the result that the weaknesses revealed in the instrument used in this study were largely unanticipated. It is now obvious that certain assumptions which were the basis for constructing this measure were erroneous. The instrument was not weak in the area of poor design where examples were less numerous but the photographs designated as good design by the experts were for the most part rejected by the students in this sample. This inadvertent finding resembles the results reported by
Slate and Child, concerning painting preference. Students preferred sentimental subject matter and rejected the examples which were esteemed by knowledgeable judges. In other words, the definition of good or of art is an area of some lack of agreement between students and experts. Slate and Child went on to identify the dimensions of preference in order to clarify where these differences in preference were located. It would appear that a kindred procedure would need to be employed in order that a better understanding of the process of preference in clothing could be achieved. This would be essential for the development of instruments in the future as well as contributing saliently to the area of instruction.

The Design Preference in Clothing Scale was structured to correspond closely to the Barron-Welsh Art Scale. Each item in the latter elicited a response which was categorized as 'Like' or 'Don't Like.' No attempt was made to define these terms. The dimensions of these categories were determined later by means of factor analysis. Because the Design Preference in Clothing Scale was purposefully developed, judges were selected and asked to rate each photograph. Each judge was given a brief set of criteria and directed to respond in terms of it. Because the subjects used like and don't like while the judges used good, a more objective sounding ruberic, it may appear that two different kinds of judgments

were being made. However, the difference between like and good is not now clear since the objectivity of good may easily be oversimplified. Further explorations of the meanings of good would seem to be a fertile field for investigation.

It would be highly desirable to improve the reliability of the Design Preference in Clothing Scale. Perhaps, different reliability measures need to be used and compared. Again, very little is known about the reliability of such "perishable" items as fashion in clothing over time. Anastasi in commenting on the now, out-of-date McAdory Art Test wrote, "In so far as aesthetic standards of 'taste' may change with the times, the periodic re-checking of scoring key and item validation is likewise desirable." The same problem was acknowledged by McWhinnie, a professor of art, when he pointed out that art and theories about art change through time with certain inevitable consequences for measuring instruments.

The Knowledge of Clothing Test was another initial effort in the development of a measure. The ideal instrument for this study would have been a standardized test for the field of clothing but such a measure was not available. The alternative of structuring the field and developing

---

evaluative measures seemed formidable. This is a task that must be undertaken for the sake of knowledge in the field of clothing but for this particular investigation it seemed expedient to limit the field. The areas included in the Test were Art Principles, Clothing, and Fashion.

On the whole the Knowledge of Clothing Test was moderately successful in discriminating those subjects who were informed from those who were not. The three parts of the Test were decidedly related to each other. The relation between Fashion and Clothing was highly significant and between Fashion and Art Principles, significant. The correlation between Clothing and Art Principles was just below the level of significance. Considering the strong interrelatedness of the three parts, it is of some moment that only one of the three sections, Fashion, was significantly associated with the Design Preference in Clothing Scale. When the three parts were combined, the association was reduced to a level below significance.

In one sense the relation between Fashion and Design Preference in Clothing should not be unexpected. The majority of judges were undoubtedly fashion-oriented. It seems likely that students high in Fashion knowledge would tend to judge in a manner similar to that of the experts. What is more perplexing is the strong relationship between Clothing and Fashion in the Test but the low association of Clothing with Design Preference. What is this knowledge of Clothing which is strongly
related to a knowledge of Fashion but not, as Fashion is, to Design Preference in Clothing? A clearer delineation of both these concepts would be most useful.

What implications can be drawn from the finding that Fashion knowledge was related to preference? Is the knowledge in this category teachable or is it acquired more effectively through personal enthusiasm or intuitional processes? Since Art Principles were not unrelated to Fashion, some attempt to determine how high scorers in Fashion knowledge utilize Art Principles might be of value.

**Recommendations**

Perhaps, the most important question to be evolved from the findings in this study concerns the theory of aesthetic preference. Namely, is the explanation of aesthetic choice for men equally valid for women? A knowledge of behavior which considered sex as an independent variable would be of considerable value for interpreting the results of a study such as this. A retesting of certain well supported hypotheses with a female sample or matched groups seems to be indicated. The need for research which includes sex as an independent variable has been acknowledged but neither empirical findings nor theory has aided greatly in a clarification of this relatively neglected aspect of behavior.

Comparatively little is known of the effect of knowledge on behavior. This should prove to be an important area of investigation. To clarify the concepts tested here might be one approach; this means that a more careful delineation of subject matter would be desirable
and at the same time a determination of the role of these concepts in behavior would be pertinent. The area of clothing is still in need of definition and a taxonomy.

It seems likely that the components of preference are interrelated and that these various patterns of relationships need to be discerned, described, and identified. Aesthetic, in reality, is only one value out of many. Nevertheless, it, too, may be interpreted in many ways. Perhaps, some consideration should be given to a "values" approach to clothing which would be supported by empirical-descriptive data relative to kinds of values, strengths of different values, and sources of values. This approach should be distinguished from the a priori approach demonstrated by the Allport-Vernon-Lindsey Scale of Values.

The results of the study reported here, far from proving the area unfruitful for research, point to the need for more, careful investigations in the future.
"Guide to Evaluation" From Art in Clothing Selection
By Harriet T. McJimsey, Page 202

The Distinctive Design
1. Is it distinctive in character and individuality?
2. Is it appropriate to specific situations and to particular individuals rather than to the average?
3. Is it high fashion?
4. Is there harmony of design?
5. Is there restraint in the use of fabric, detail, or decoration rather than emphasis on all three?
6. Is there elegance, refinement, and perfection of fabric and detail?

The Classic Design
1. Is it smart but simple?
2. Is there wide versatility of use and becomingness?
3. Is it modified high fashion?
4. Is there harmony of design?
5. Is there some individuality in either fabric or detail?
6. Are fabric and construction above-average quality?

The Ordinary Design
1. Is it a commonplace, overused fashion?
2. Is it lacking individuality in fabric or finish?
3. Is there over emphasis in details such as belts or buttons?
4. Is it somewhat skimpy in cut?
5. Are fabric and construction average to poor quality?
6. Is it inadequate copy of a distinctive or classic design?

The Poor Design
1. Are fabric and construction poor quality?
2. Is the decoration inharmonious or over done?
3. Is there a combination of impractical or inharmonious fabrics?
4. Is the silhouette poorly designed?
5. Is it unrelated to current fashion or to apparent function?
6. Are lines, textures, colors, and idea unrelated?
APPENDIX B

PEER GROUP EVALUATION SCALE
STUDENT'S OPINION OF PEER GROUP PREFERENCE IN CLOTHING

A number of slides will be projected for you to judge. Indicate your opinion by checking the most appropriate position on the scale below. Your opinion in this case represents your estimate of your peer group's preference for or acceptability of the garment shown. Your opinion, then, will represent more than just your individual likes and dislikes. (A peer group is defined as a group of equals or associates of the same age.) Following are brief descriptions of the positions on the scale:

Most acceptable — most would like very much
Acceptable — many would like
Questionable — some would like and some would not like
Unacceptable — many would not like
Most rejected — most would not like at all

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Most Acceptable</th>
<th>Questionable</th>
<th>Unacceptable</th>
<th>Most Rejected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**EXPERTS' EVALUATION OF CLOTHING DESIGN**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Distinctive</th>
<th>Classic</th>
<th>Ordinary</th>
<th>Poor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

DESIGN PREFERENCE IN CLOTHING ANSWER SHEET
Name__________________________  Course Number____
Date__________________________  Number of Quarters Completed____
Age__________________________  Number of Credit Hours at End of Last Quarter____

DESIGN PREFERENCE IN CLOTHING

Directions: Twenty slides will be shown. For each slide shown indicate whether you LIKE the item or DON'T LIKE the item. Such practical considerations, as would you buy the garment or would you wear it, are relatively unimportant. Your first spontaneous reaction is of greater value.

Record your response LIKE or DON'T LIKE for each slide by marking the appropriate box.

SAMPLE

LIKE

DON'T LIKE

START HERE

LIKE

DON'T LIKE

LIKE

DON'T LIKE

LIKE

DON'T LIKE
APPENDIX E

DISCRIMINATING ITEMS FROM THE KNOWLEDGE OF CLOTHING TEST
## DISCRIMINATING ITEMS FROM THE KNOWLEDGE OF CLOTHING TEST

Significant at the .05 Level of Confidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Test Item</th>
<th>Phi Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>A synonym for contemporary British fashion is</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Art Nouveau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Chelsea Mod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Directoire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Figured stockings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) Modernistic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>A revival of a World War II style is recognized in</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Ankle strap sandals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Art Nouveau</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Chelsea mod</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Figured stockings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) Lame</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>Though he showed no collection last fall his white dresses and boots continue to influence</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Balenciaga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Chanel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Courrèges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Dior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) St. Laurent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) St. Laurent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>An example of a dissonant scheme is</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) black and white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) lavender and navy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) navy and tangerine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) pumpkin and cream</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) raspberry and pink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>(A) Glen plaid, (B) hound's tooth,</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) tattersall, (D) heather</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Test Item</td>
<td>Phi Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74</td>
<td>A French woman as famous for her clothes as for her perfume is</td>
<td>.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Balenciaga</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Chanel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Courrèges</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Dior</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) St. Laurent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>The design of the sarong is symmetrical</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Might be true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) False</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Flannel is a particularly good choice for a tailored style because the fabric is generally firm and yet supple</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Agree with the evaluation and the reason is correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Agree with the evaluation but the reason is incorrect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Disagree with the evaluation but the reason is correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Disagree with the evaluation and the reason, also, is incorrect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>A famous name in Italian fashion is</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Luigi Barzini</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Geoffrey Beene</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Jean Louis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Emilio Pucci</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) Vidal Sassoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>(A) Mauve, (B) chantilly, (C) taupe, (D) greige</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The hemline of a full flared skirt has the effect of strengthening the vertical emphasis of the silhouette</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Might be true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) False</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Test Item</td>
<td>Phi Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>The design of the empire style is not symmetrical</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) True</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Might be true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) False</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Don't know</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Flannel is a poor choice for a tailored style because it is too bulky</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Agree with the evaluation and the reason is correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Agree with the evaluation but the reason is incorrect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Disagree with the evaluation but the reason is correct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Disagree with the evaluation and the reason, also, is incorrect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>(A) Sheath, (B) chemise, (C) shift, (D) skimmer</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>A British dress designer whose style has influenced fashion in this country is</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Geoffrey Been</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Mary Quant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Bridget Riley</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Vidal Sassoon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) Jean Shrimpton</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>(A) T-strap, (B) gilet, (C) gillie, (D) opera</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>A cloth of metallic gold or silver that was popular in the 1920's is</td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) Crepe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) Georgette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) Lamé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) Matlessé</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) Serge</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>An example of an analogous scheme is</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(A) beige and chocolate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(B) lemon and lime</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(C) raspberry and pink</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(D) royal and gold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E) shrimp and oxford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Test Item</td>
<td>Phi Coefficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 52  | The Burlington Mills trademark in textiles and wearing apparel is associated with the production of  
  (A) yarn  
  (B) many types of fabrics  
  (C) dyes  
  (D) special finishes  
  (E) ready-to-wear | .31 |
| 73  | A popular synonym for girls, today, is  
  (A) Birds  
  (B) Camp  
  (C) Chelsea mod  
  (D) Figured stockings  
  (E) Matlessé | .31 |
| 58  | (A) Chesterfield, (B) balmacaan, (C) trench coat, (D) bowler | .30 |
| 63  | (A) Gabardine, (B) hopsacking, (C) whipcord twill | .30 |
| 36  | (A) Decolleté, (B) jewel, (C) toque, (D) scoop | .29 |
| 1   | A strong vertical emphasis in costume is opposed by a brimless hat  
  (A) True  
  (B) Might be true  
  (C) False  
  (D) Don’t know | .27 |
| 62  | (A) Smocking, (B) knitting, (C) pleating quilting | .25 |
| 67  | One of the most publicized Pop artists is  
  (A) Geoffrey Beene  
  (B) Ellen Ford  
  (C) Bridget Riley  
  (D) Vidal Sassoon  
  (E) Andy Warhol | .25 |
Two American innovations, the topless bathing suit and the no-bra were contributed by
(A) Hattie Carnegie
(B) Exquisite Form
(C) Rudi Gernreich
(D) Rose Marie Reid
(E) Pauline Trigère

(A) Paisley, (B) paillets, (C) embroidery
(D) sequins

A couturier whose suits are a perennial favorite in the U.S. is
(A) Balenciaga
(B) Chanel
(C) Courrêges
(D) Dior
(E) St. Laurent

To reduce the saturation of blue-green it should be mixed with some
(A) black
(B) blue
(C) gray
(D) green
(E) red

When blue and yellow-red are mixed in equal quantity the result (theoretically) is
(A) beige
(B) black
(C) brown
(D) gray
(E) green

A monochromatic ensemble would be largely
(A) black and white
(B) dull, grayed hues
(C) neutrals
(D) one hue
(E) pastels
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Test Item</th>
<th>Phi Coefficient</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>A batik print dress trimmed with organdy is harmonious because of the contrast in texture</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(A) Agree with the evaluation and the reason seems correct  
(B) Agree with the evaluation but the reason is incorrect  
(C) Disagree with the evaluation but the reason is correct  
(D) Disagree with the evaluation and the reason is incorrect
APPENDIX F

KNOWLEDGE OF CLOTHING TEST
DIRECTIONS: Answers to the questions below should be indicated on an answer sheet which will be provided. Use only a number 2 pencil to mark the answer sheet. Remove any incorrect markings carefully and thoroughly because the answer sheet will be scanned electronically, two questions at a time. If more than one response to a question registers in the scanning process that response and the adjacent response will be rejected. Please mark the answer sheet carefully but sufficiently.

Principles of art related to clothing and appearance
Indicate your opinion for each of the following statements according to this scale:

(A) True
(B) Might be true
(C) False
(D) Don't know

1. A strong vertical emphasis in costume is opposed by a brimless hat.
2. When stockings contrast with the costume the effect of vertical emphasis is decreased.
3. The hemline of a full flared skirt has the effect of strengthening the vertical emphasis of the silhouette.
4. A line of contrast the full length of the center front will not make the figure appear wider.
5. Horizontal stripes cannot be used to create the illusion of increased height.
6. Diagonal lines create an illusion that causes the figure to look more square.
7. The design of the empire style is not symmetrical.
8. The design of the sarong is symmetrical.
9. The pinafore is an example of a symmetrical design.

Color theory according to the Munsell system
Indicate the best conclusion for each incomplete statement by marking that letter on the answer sheet.
10. The most intense hue is
   (A) blue
   (B) green
   (C) purple
   (D) red
   (E) yellow

11. The hue of lightest value is
   (A) blue
   (B) green
   (C) purple
   (D) red
   (E) yellow

12. A "color" that is not truly a hue is
   (A) beige
   (B) black
   (C) brown
   (D) gray
   (E) orange

13. To reduce the saturation of blue-green it should be mixed with some
   (A) black
   (B) blue
   (C) gray
   (D) green
   (E) red

14. When blue and yellow-red are mixed in equal quantity the result theoretically is
   (A) beige
   (B) black
   (C) brown
   (D) gray
   (E) green

15. An analogous ensemble which began with green would also include
   (A) blue
   (B) blue-green
   (C) purple
   (D) purple-blue
   (E) red

16. A monochromatic ensemble would be largely
   (A) black and white
   (B) dull, grayed hues
   (C) neutrals
   (D) one hue
   (E) pastels
17. An example of a dissonant scheme is
   (A) black and white
   (B) lavender and navy
   (C) navy and tangerine
   (D) pumpkin and cream
   (E) raspberry and pink

18. An example of a complementary scheme is
   (A) beige and chocolate
   (B) cranberry and navy
   (C) lemon and orange
   (D) mint and pink
   (E) navy and tangerine

19. An example of an analogous scheme is
   (A) beige and chocolate
   (B) lemon and lime
   (C) raspberry and pink
   (D) royal and gold
   (E) shrimp and oxford

Harmony
Each statement below begins with an evaluation that is followed by a reason
for this evaluation. Indicate your reaction to the statements by using
the following notation:

   (A) Agree with the evaluation and the reason seems correct
   (B) Agree with the evaluation but the reason is incorrect
   (C) Disagree with the evaluation but the reason is correct
   (D) Disagree with the evaluation and the reason is incorrect

20. A tweed suit and a tapestry handbag lack harmony because the combina-
    tion lacks contrast in texture.

21. A dark wool dress with a Mexican silver pin lacks harmony because of
    a contrast in value.

22. A cotton shirtwaist dress with a string of pearls are in harmony
    because of their unity in expression.

23. A batik print dress trimmed with organdy is harmonious because of
    the contrast in texture.

24. A black crepe dress and rhinestone earrings are not in harmony
    because of a contrast in texture.
NOTE: Skip the next whole row on the answer sheet. No marks should be made in the spaces from 25 to 28. The next question will be numbered 29. Check your answer sheet to be sure you are using the space that corresponds to the number of the question.

Fabric terms

Each line below contains three terms which are related. One term does not belong in the sequence. Indicate which is the odd term by marking the corresponding letter on the answer sheet.

EXAMPLE: (A) Tweed, (B) mohair, (C) cashmere, (D) camel hair
Mohair, cashmere, and camel hair are animal fiber related to wool in their properties but from animals other than the sheep. Tweed, however, is not a fiber but a fabric. Therefore, tweed is the odd term. Indicate this by marking the (A) response on the answer sheet.

29. (A) Tricot, (B) double knit, (C) taffeta, (D) jersey
30. (A) Broadcloth, (B) Avril, (C) poplin, (D) faille
31. (A) Chambray, (B) surrah, (C) shantung, (D) pongee
32. (A) Boucle, (B) filament, (C) pique, (D) ply
33. (A) Fortrel, (B) Dynel, (C) Kodel, (D) ZePel
34. (A) Scotch-guard, (B) Sta-press, (C) Sanforized, (D) Mesmerized

Terms relating to clothing—details and accessories

Each line below contains three terms which are related. One term does not belong in the sequence. Indicate which is the odd term by marking the corresponding letter on the answer sheet.

35. (A) Bouffant, (B) princess, (C) peplum, (D) shirtwaist
36. (A) Decolleté, (B) jewel, (C) toque, (D) scoop
37. (A) Worked, (B) bound, (C) loop, (D) placket
38. (A) Facing, (B) binding, (C) gusset, (D) hem
39. (A) Aigrette, (B) fedora, (C) homburg, (D) derby
40. (A) T-strap, (B) gilet, (C) gillie, (D) opera pump
41. (A) Mauve, (B) chantilly, (C) taupe, (D) greige
Fabric choice and garment style
Each statement below begins with an evaluation that is followed by a reason for this evaluation. Indicate your reaction to the statement by using the following notation:

(A) Agree with the evaluation and the reason is correct
(B) Agree with the evaluation but the reason is incorrect
(C) Disagree with the evaluation but the reason is correct
(D) Disagree with the evaluation and the reason, also, is incorrect

42. Voile is a good choice for a sheath because it is a limp, transparent fabric.

43. Voile is a rather poor choice for a sheath because it lacks texture interest.

44. Velveteen is probably a better choice for a sheath than velvet because the former tends to have a more firm hand.

45. Velvet would be a desirable choice for a draped style because of the high lights (light-reflecting quality) of the fabric.

46. Lace is a good choice for a draped style because it is not bulky.

47. Chiffon is an ideal choice for a draped style because it is heavy.

48. Flannel is a poor choice for a tailored style because it is too bulky.

49. Flannel is a particularly good choice for a tailored style because the fabric is generally firm and yet supple.

Textile and apparel production
Indicate the best conclusion for each incomplete statement by marking that letter on the answer sheet.

50. The DuPont trademark in textiles and wearing apparel is associated with the production of
(A) yarn
(B) woven fabrics
(C) knitted fabrics
(D) stockings
(E) ready-to-wear
51. The Cohoma trademark in textiles and wearing apparel is associated with the production of
   (A) yarn
   (B) woven fabrics
   (C) dyes
   (D) stockings
   (E) ready-to-wear

52. The Burlington Mills trademark in textiles and wearing apparel is associated with the production of
   (A) yarn
   (B) many types of fabrics
   (C) dyes
   (D) special finishes
   (E) ready-to-wear

NOTE: Skip the next whole row on the answer sheet. No marks should be made in the spaces from 53 to 56. The next question will be numbered 57. Check your answer sheet to be sure you are using the space that corresponds to the number of the question.

Terms relating to clothing and accessories
Each line below contains three terms which are related. One term does not belong in the sequence. Indicate which is the odd term by marking the corresponding letter on the answer sheet.

EXAMPLE: (A) Hood, (B) turban, (C) middy, (D) sombrero
Hood, turban and sombrero in the sequence above are related as forms of head coverings or hats. A middy is not a hat but a blouse style. Therefore, middy is the odd term. Indicate this by marking the "C" response on the answer sheet.

57. (A) Sheath, (B) chemise, (C) shift, (D) skimmer
58. (A) Chesterfield, (B) balmacaan, (C) trench coat, (D) bowler
59. (A) Dirndl, (B) A-line, (C) kilt, (D) cable
60. (A) Box, (B) patch, (C) inverted, (D) knife
61. (A) Paisley, (B) paillets, (C) embroidery, (D) sequins
62. (A) Smocking, (B) knitting, (C) pleating, (D) quilting
63. (A) Gabardine, (B) hopsacking, (C) whipcord, (D) twill
64. (A) Glen plaid, (B) hound's tooth, (C) tattersall, (D) heather
Influences on contemporary fashion—people and ideas
Indicate the best answer for each item by marking the corresponding letter on the answer sheet.

65. A British dress designer whose style has influenced fashion in this country is
   (A) Geoffrey Beene
   (B) Mary Quant
   (C) Bridget Riley
   (D) Vidal Sassoon
   (E) Jean Shrimpton

66. A famous name in Italian fashion is
   (A) Luigi Barzini
   (B) Geoffrey Beene
   (C) Jean Louis
   (D) Emilio Pucci
   (E) Vidal Sassoon

67. One of the most publicized Pop artists is
   (A) Geoffrey Beene
   (B) Ellen Ford
   (C) Bridget Riley
   (D) Vidal Sassoon
   (E) Andy Warhol

68. The model's model in fashion photography today is
   (A) Ellen Ford
   (B) Jean Louis
   (C) Mary Quant
   (D) Bridget Riley
   (E) Jean Shrimpton

69. A synonym for contemporary British fashion is
   (A) Art Nouveau
   (B) Chelsea Mod
   (C) Directoire
   (D) Figured stockings
   (E) Modernistic

70. An interior design style of the 1900's is known as
   (A) Art Nouveau
   (B) Chelsea Mod
   (C) Directoire
   (D) Modernistic
   (E) Op art
71. A cloth of metallic gold or silver that was popular in the 1920's is
(A) Crepe
(B) Georgette
(C) Lamé
(D) Matlessé
(E) Serge

72. A revival of a World War II style is recognized in
(A) Ankle strap sandals
(B) Art Nouveau
(C) Chelsea mod
(D) Figured stockings
(E) Lamé

73. A popular synonym for girls, today, is
(A) Birds
(B) Camp
(C) Chelsea mod
(D) Figured stockings
(E) Matlessé

Designers—French and American
Indicate the best conclusion for each incomplete statement by marking that letter on the answer sheet.

74. A French woman as famous for her clothes as for her perfume is
(A) Balenciaga
(B) Chanel
(C) Courrèges
(D) Dior
(E) St. Laurent

75. Though he showed no collection last fall his white dresses and boots continue to influence the couture
(A) Balenciaga
(B) Chanel
(C) Courrèges
(D) Dior
(E) St. Laurent

76. A couturier whose suits are a perennial favorite in the U.S. is
(A) Balenciaga
(B) Chanel
(C) Courrèges
(D) Dior
(E) St. Laurent
77. Two American innovations, the topless bathing suit and the no-bra were contributed by
   (A) Hattie Carnegie
   (B) Exquisite Form
   (C) Rudi Gernreich
   (D) Rose Marie Reid
   (E) Pauline Trigere

78. An American designer on Seventh Avenue (N.Y.C.) whose styling has been as influential in ready-to-wear as Paris is
   (A) Bill Blass
   (B) Hattie Carnegie
   (C) Norman Norell
   (D) Count Sarmi
   (E) Ben Zuckerman

79. The "master tailor" on Seventh Avenue, producing suits and coats, ready-to-wear, is
   (A) Hattie Carnegie
   (B) Mainboucher
   (C) Monte-Sano & Pruzan
   (D) Norman Norell
   (E) Ben Zuckerman

80. A designer and manufacturer on Seventh Avenue who produces flattering and luxurious looking dressy dresses and evening gowns is
   (A) Bill Blass
   (B) Mainboucher
   (C) Norman Norell
   (D) Count Sarmi
   (E) Ben Zuckerman
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