PART IV. Production/Distribution Systems: Textiles and Apparel in the Global Economy

Whether we speak of polymers, fibers, fabrics, garments or other textile end-products, we are dealing with commodities embedded within the global economy. These commodities are produced, distributed and consumed on a worldwide basis. Increasingly, the boundaries between processes of production and distribution are blurring as companies explore the avenues and advantages associated with vertical integration. Moreover, cultural boundaries distinguishing modes of consumption are becoming less determinate as textile and apparel commodities are produced, distributed and consumed on a global basis.

In this connection, it becomes increasingly important for textiles and clothing scholars to recognize the macro-level interdependencies that link and differentiate cultural understandings, as well as production, distribution, and consumption. The papers by Judith Forney and Jean Hamilton, in this section, call for a global perspective that sensitizes us to the complementarities and diversities associated with world views affecting the way individuals produce, distribute, and consume textile and apparel products. If we are to acquire insights that defy the cultural conditioning that we have come to know as "reality," we need to engage in critical and creative comparisons of world views. Such comparisons may lead us to identify not only new ways of thinking about textile/apparel commodities, but also new ways of producing, distributing, and consuming these commodities.

Gablik (1984) argues that the contemporary world is "complicated by changes without parallel" (p. 13) and calls for new "coherent organizing pictures" to evaluate what has been happening to us and to weigh the costs associated with what we are doing:

The role of criticism today, as I see it, is to engage in a fundamental reconstruction of the basic premises of our whole culture; it can be nothing less than challenging the oppressive assumptions of our secular, technocratic Western mentality. It is not just a matter of seeing things differently, but of seeing different things. Our culture expects us to be manic—to overproduce, to overconsume, and to waste—but in all this, something vital is missing: the knowledge that life can be transformed by a sacramental experience (Gablik, 1984, p. 128).

In the world of advanced capitalism, "fewer and fewer people...work at making things. More and more people work to make impressions" (Tomlinson, 1990, p. 21). Processes of exchange become increasingly relevant as a realm of interface or "site of connection...that is central to a sensible understanding of any mode of production" (Stanley, 1990, p. 10). It is precisely these processes of exchange that characterize the processes by which one product (e.g., fiber) is "consumed" at another level of production (e.g., fabric production) and, ultimately, is used by consumers in everyday life.

Laura Jolly and Donna Branson focus in their paper on processes of exchange in relation to transactions among organizational entities in the textile and apparel industries. They assess the interdependencies among producers, manufacturers, and retailers and consider textile/apparel firm managers' decisions as to whether they should make or buy their products. Part and parcel of such decision-making is the need to consider not only short-term advantages but also long-term cooperation among producers and distributors of textiles and apparel. This kind of analysis moves us beyond the realm of the commodity itself into that of exchange processes per se. Margaret Rucker expands the scope of decision-making and processes of exchange in the textile/apparel industries to the sphere of global interdependencies among producers, manufacturers, and retailers. Drawing upon the international business literature, she examines some of the critical factors influencing whether and how a firm chooses to enter foreign markets.

Soyeon Shim also deals with the interdependencies among producers, retailers and consumers on an international basis, but focuses more directly on their economic welfare in relation to textile and apparel import restrictions. Her approach addresses linkages with other disciplines (economics, in this case) rather than linkages within textiles and clothing. Yet a philosophy of
interconnectedness throughout the product chain is evident in her analysis. She examines how the impact of import restrictions on consumer welfare is often overlooked and undertheorized.

Quality-of-life concerns probably constitute an implicit theme throughout the papers in this volume. Judith Forney makes this theme explicit, as she argues that interdependence cannot be viewed as a simple exchange of commodities. Rather it is important to assess how the exchange of commodities on an international basis alter and affect the political and social stability, or the quality of life, of diverse peoples throughout the world. Forney reminds us that producers, workers, and consumers are all people, and social and ethical themes inevitably prevail as we explore the worldwide interdependence of individuals, families, and societies. She calls for a global perspective which not only celebrates human diversity but also acknowledges the social as well as the economic costs associated with production, distribution, and consumption processes.

Jean Hamilton echoes and supports the quality-of-life and global themes espoused in Forney’s paper and cautions further that we should not delude ourselves into thinking that we can easily move beyond cultural conditioning toward a global perspective. She submits that we need to look beyond the impact of imports on the U.S. textile and apparel industries and to work toward a mode of inquiry that simultaneously cuts through narrow applications and incorporates broader pictures of social reality. Thus she, like Norton (earlier, in this volume) calls for an integration of depth and breadth, approached through a lens incorporating a global perspective and eschewing ethnocentric biases.

Despite their differences in approach, collectively the papers in this section call for a cooperative spirit among producers, distributors, and consumers of textiles and apparel in the global economy. Still, we are likely to perceive a fundamental tension between industry and consumer needs, even as we recognize and clarify interdependencies. This tension parallels the split between production and consumption that processes of modernization and industrialization have promoted, especially since the nineteenth century. Rather than reinforcing this dichotomous split, recent feminist thought has promoted a view of production that incorporates consumption (and vice versa):

Production defined so as to exclude consumption as a site of intellectual and political importance consequently removes concern from exchange as the massive area of interface between production and consumption. It is this site of connection, of interface, that is central to a sensible understanding of any mode of production (Stanley, 1990, p. 10).

Textiles and clothing has tremendous potential for identifying and explaining processes of exchange as sites of interface along the many stages of the product pipeline. The competitive approach to product exchange has traditionally often emphasized goals that are short-term in nature. Increasingly, it is becoming evident that the old management mentality that may have served businesses in the past, when linear progress was the goal, no longer do so in the global economy. The profit motive itself is likely to guide the textile and apparel industries toward new mentalities that are not so linear and ethnocentric, as these industries strive to exist if not compete in the global marketplace. Textiles and clothing scholars can contribute a great deal to these new mentalities: Our ability to focus on the long-term advantages of cooperation and quality-of-life concerns for producers, workers, distributors, and consumers alike constitutes a strength that we should continue to articulate and celebrate.
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The production and marketing of textiles and apparel involves a variety of activities at all levels of the industry. The chain of activities begins with the producers of raw materials and then moves to materials production, consumer goods manufacturing, retail distribution, and finally ends with the ultimate consumer. Each link in this chain of production and marketing is dependent on some prior process and is influenced by a host of environmental variables.

Economic, technical, and international changes in the production and marketing environment have forced consideration of new philosophies and approaches by apparel and textile companies. For example, the devaluation of the U.S. dollar caused many large retailers to seek out domestic apparel in order to lessen dependence on foreign sourcing. Radical changes in the technological environment have altered how apparel is produced and distributed. Additionally, production has been streamlined via advances in electronic knitting and computer-aided design. Electronic data interchange (EDI) has emerged as a data transmission technology capable of linking the producer, manufacturer and retailer to allow sharing of data for better management at all levels in the chain from production to consumption. Governmental regulations regarding imports have changed and are subject to further change (e.g., Caribbean Basin Initiative, quotas, Canadian Free trade zones).

Cooperative linkages among producers, manufacturers, and retailers appear to be increasing especially in the domestic marketplace. In the interest of business survival, the U.S. apparel and textile industries have developed programs emphasizing interdependence and cooperation: Crafted-With-Pride, quick response, and just-in-time production. Interdependence and cooperation among the various segments of the textile and apparel industry is an essential element in all of these approaches.

The trade literature (e.g., Stores, WWD) posits that environmental influences have fostered interdependence and cooperation among members of the textile and apparel industries. We have been interested in investigating why more discussion of interdependence and cooperation is occurring. What does increased interdependence and cooperation mean for the producer, the manufacturer, the retailer, and the ultimate consumer?

This paper seeks to investigate a broad array of factors we think may be influencing members of the textile and apparel industries to seek cooperative and interdependent relationships. These factors are presented in a proposed model that draws heavily on Williamson’s (1975, 1981) transaction cost analysis (TCA) framework, Anderson and Weitz’s (1983) framework for analyzing vertical integration issues and Spekman and Strauss’ (1986) model depicting factors influencing more cooperative buyer-seller relationships. This paper, therefore, briefly explains concepts from the TCA framework and other relevant models as a prelude to the presentation of our proposed model. We conclude the paper with implications of the model and questions to foster discussion and serve as a basis for inquiry.

Relevant Background Literature

Williamson Framework

Transaction cost analysis draws on ideas from economics, organizational theory, and contract law. It has been developed principally by Oliver Williamson (1975, 1981) for the study of organizations. (See Williamson, 1981, for an overview of key concepts). The basic unit of analysis is the transaction, not the commodity. *A transaction occurs when a good or service is transferred across a technologically separable interface* (Williamson, 1981, p. 552). Transaction cost refers to the cost associated with an exchange, in terms of planning, adapting, monitoring, and the like. Transaction cost analysis uses an efficiency criterion for recurring transactions under environmental uncertainty. The
efficiency criterion is defined as the ratio of effects produced to the costs associated with producing those effects. This has appeal because it is strongly related to a firm's objectives, that is, survival and profit (Anderson & Weitz, 1983). Thus TCA focuses on efforts to economize transaction costs, and addresses the following question:

Under what conditions are transactions performed more efficiently within an organization under bureaucratic or hierarchical control, as opposed to between independent entities under market control achieved through contracting in the marketplace? (Anderson & Weitz, 1983, p. 8)

Two behavioral assumptions are vital to TCA. First, decision makers are subject to bounded rationality (i.e., subject to limited competence in formulating and solving complex problems) and are not perfectly informed. Second, at least some decision makers are self-interested and will engage in opportunistic behaviors (e.g., one partner may act in self-interest to the potential detriment of the other). Thus, information asymmetries arise. Trading partners need information to reduce risks associated with environmental uncertainty. Yet, they are not perfectly informed and not always capable of processing information as needed. Further, one partner may deliberately withhold information to secure an advantage over the other.

The importance of bounded rationality and opportunistic behavior in the buyer-seller relationship is determined by the specific context of the transaction. Williamson (1975, 1981) provides two critical dimensions for characterizing transactions: (1) asset specificity, and (2) uncertainty. Asset specificity is the most important characteristic of a transaction, and consists of investments in (a) durable assets, including site and physical assets (e.g., production facilities located next to a distribution center and specialized equipment) or (b) human assets (e.g., expert knowledge). These assets are specific to the buyer-seller relationship and are not easily transferred elsewhere. Thus, in contexts where asset specificity is substantial, both parties want to continue the exchange and to expend effort accordingly. The concept of uncertainty pertains to the marketplace and human nature. For example, prediction becomes more difficult in highly turbulent times.

Anderson and Weitz Framework

Anderson and Weitz (1983) developed a framework for analyzing conditions under which vertical integration improves marketing efficiency. Their framework, which is heavily influenced by Williamson's (1981) thinking, helps to organize a host of disparate variables and delineates conditions under which "make" or "buy" decisions are appropriate. This framework has a bias toward the market mode (i.e., "buy" rather than "make"). Control (i.e., "make" rather than "buy") is valued only when the competitive marketplace breaks down. Thus this framework predicts that if the marketplace breaks down, then a firm is likely to move toward greater control.

Anderson and Weitz provide three implications of the concepts of bounded rationality, opportunistic behavior and uncertainty. First, it is impossible to write a contract to cover every contingency. Thus, contracts provide limited control of external organizations. Second, even if a contract could be written, the assumption of opportunistic behavior suggests inability to trust a trading partner. Lastly, information asymmetry makes it difficult to monitor and enforce contracts perfectly. Hence, the stage is set for potential market failure (i.e., inefficiency of external agents as a result of reduced competition) and vertical integration as a response.

Spekman and Strauss Model

Spekman and Strauss (1986) developed a model for examining the buyer's decision process, extending Williamson's (1981) notions of transaction cost analysis by including concepts from both the political economy and resource dependency literatures. Their model is presented at the micro level rather than at the macro level as in the Williamson framework. Strategic vulnerability and anticipated transaction costs are proposed as intervening constructs that lead to a buyer's concern for long-term supplier relationships. Transaction dimensions include transaction specific investments, importance of purchase and perceived uncertainty.

Jolly/Branson Exchange Structure Selection Model

Our proposed model uses ideas elucidated by Williamson (1981), Anderson and Weitz (1983), and
Table 1. Characteristics of Jolly/Branson model components by source

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Company/Market Factors</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Market Competitiveness</td>
<td>* concept introduced but never operationalized</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>* specifies competitiveness in supplier market only</td>
<td>* specifies human assets only</td>
<td>* specifies durable and human assets</td>
<td>* expands Anderson &amp; Weitz concept to include competition in the seller market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Asset Specificity</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* specifies durable and human assets</td>
<td>* specifies human assets only</td>
<td>* specifies durable and human assets</td>
<td>* expands work of others to include financial assets as well as durable and human assets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Product Importance</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* considers economic perspective only</td>
<td>* considers economic and image importance</td>
<td>* considers economic and image importance</td>
<td>* expands Spekman &amp; Strauss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Uncertainty</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* specifies behavioral and market uncertainty</td>
<td>* operationalizes as environmental uncertainty, includes market uncertainty only</td>
<td>* specifies behavioral and market uncertainty</td>
<td>* conceptualizes in same manner as Spekman &amp; Strauss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Performance Measurability</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* considers inability to measure performance and focuses on access to input and output data</td>
<td></td>
<td>* expands Anderson &amp; Weitz to include consideration of firm’s capabilities to measure performance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Management Mentality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Strategic Vulnerability</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* perception of company risk or limited strategic options</td>
<td>* conceptualizes in same manner as Spekman &amp; Strauss (1996)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived Costs and Benefits</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* quantifies costs using an efficiency criterion</td>
<td>* considers net effectiveness</td>
<td>* considers cost of transaction only</td>
<td>* expands cost of transaction &amp; also extrinsic and intrinsic costs &amp; benefits as suggested by Frazier (1983) &amp; Dwyer et al. (1987)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of an Exchange Structure</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
<td>* component in model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>* considers market contracting, bilateral governance (relational contracts) &amp; unified governance (vertical integration)</td>
<td>* considers vertical integration only</td>
<td>* considers cooperative and long-term relationships only</td>
<td>* similar to Williamson with addition of multiple formats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Spekman and Strauss (1986). We have also been influenced by Frazier (1983) and Dwyer, Schurr and Oh (1987). We have borrowed and, in some cases, adapted concepts that seem to explain the selection of an exchange structure by organizations in the textile and apparel industries. Table 1 provides a summary of the origins of the proposed model's components. The proposed model is viewed as a means of initiating discussion on cooperative and interdependent relationships that appear to be increasing within and among the production, manufacturing and retailing sectors of the textile and apparel industries.

**Company/Market Factors**

*Market competitiveness.* The concept of market competitiveness is derived from the Anderson and Weitz (1983) model. Anderson and Weitz state that *a decline in competition in supplier markets leads directly to market failure and reduces the net effectiveness of external agents by permitting excessive opportunism* (p. 14). They propose that company-specific capabilities and significant scale economies reduce *the level of competition in the supplier market* and provide the impetus for opportunistic behavior (p. 14). They further suggest that market failure is necessary for vertical integration to be a cost-effective exchange structure.

Although Anderson and Weitz (1983) view market competitiveness exclusively in terms of the supplier marketplace, we suggest broadening market competitiveness to include the seller

---

**Figure 1. Jolly/Branson model of exchange structure selection**

The model (see Figure 1) includes six company/market factors that can influence a company's perception of its strategic vulnerability. Regardless of the perceived level of strategic vulnerability, the company must weigh costs and benefits and ultimately choose an exchange structure. The model posits four possible structures: (1) spot contracting (i.e., independent short-term contracts with external agents in the marketplace), (2) vertical integration, (3) cooperative and interdependent relationships (i.e., based on information sharing and joint long-term planning), and (4) multiple formats (i.e., a combination of these). Although this paper is primarily concerned with the third structure, all four are discussed in the following section to provide some context for our focus on cooperative and interdependent relationships.
marketplace. Thus, raw material producers are the 
supplier market for the materials producer and 
consumer goods manufacturers are the seller 
market for the materials producer. Each member of 
the textile and apparel chain must be cognizant of 
the nature of the competition that exists in the 
markets they serve (seller/customer markets) and 
in the markets that serve them (supplier markets).

Changes in the competitive nature of the 
appliance and textile marketplaces due to mergers, 
aquisitions, and consolidations have created 
larger and more powerful companies with increased 
buying power and resources. Despite these 
changes, we maintain that a competitive 
marketplace exists at each level in the apparel and 
textile industries. Yet we offer two important 
caveats in relation to this statement. First, a 
competitive supplier marketplace may not be 
available for all segments of the textile and apparel 
industries. Second, the degree of competitiveness 
does not appear to be equal at all levels in the 
chain. Generally, the further you move toward the 
retailing end of the textile and apparel chain, the 
greater the number of competing firms (U.S. 
Department of Commerce, 1987a; U.S. Department 
of Commerce, 1987b). This situation more closely 
approximates perfect competition, in the sense that 
many firms exist with small market shares and 
neither the market power nor the ability to set 
price.¹

Sheth (1981) cautions that a highly competitive 
supplier market can lead to confusion and greater 
decision effort. This idea may be pertinent for 
appliance retailers. An implication of Sheth’s 
reasoning might be that long-term relationships 
with few suppliers are desirable to reduce decision 
complexity.

In summary, we suggest that market 
competitiveness be considered from both the 
supplier’s and the seller’s perspective. Thus, a 
highly competitive seller marketplace or supplier 
market failure can lead to perceived strategic 
vulnerability.

Asset specificity. Asset specificity, according to 
Williamson (1981), refers to investments either in 
durable or human assets that are specific to the 
transaction. Durable assets might include such 
things as building sites, equipment and technology. 
Human assets might include personnel trained in 
using CAD/CAM technology or state-of-the art 
product distribution systems. These assets are 
viewed as critical to the buyer-seller relationship. 
For example, if a finishing plant is located next to a 
textile mill, the finishing plant has an asset specific 
(i.e., site and physical building) advantage over 
other finishing plants seeking business with the 
textile producer.

Another example of a durable asset might be 
technological capabilities. Suppose the 
technological capabilities of an organization in 
terms of data communication were highly 
developed. The company may have electronic data 
interchange (EDI) capabilities and thus be more 
likely to consider an exchange structure capitalizing 
on this capability. The structure chosen might be 
a cooperative, interdependent relationship and 
include a just-in-time production system. A 
relationship of this type would be difficult to 
implement without the technological capability of 
data interchange.

We concur with the notion that asset specificity 
includes durable and human assets, but we also 
propose inclusion of a financial aspect. Sheth 
(1981) points out that a company’s financial 
position may influence its decision-making process. 
He states that if a retail firm is highly profitable but 
does not have liquidity, then it is likely to lean 
toward longer term contracts with better credit 
terms (Sheth, 1981, p. 187). Thus the status of a 
firm’s financial assets may influence its selection of 
an exchange structure.

In summary, asset specificity in our model refers 
to durable, human and financial assets of the firm. 
We propose that the greater the asset specificity, 
whether it be in durable, human or financial assets, 
the greater the interest in cooperative and 
interdependent relationships.

Product importance. The importance of the 
product to the company, in terms of both 
economics and image, influences the selection of 
an exchange structure.

Economic importance. Transaction cost analysis 
(TCA) provides a basis for considering the

¹ Note that some economists describe retailing as a form of monopolistic competition: “a market supplied by a large number of sellers, 
each selling a product that is at least slightly differentiated” (Persons, Atkinson, & Rouse, 1978, p. 146).
economic importance of a product to the company. Using the TCA framework, economic importance may be determined by analyzing "the product's purchase cost to total purchases,... the degree to which production output is dependent on a particular raw material or component," and the degree to which a change in the cost of the product would adversely affect the financial position of the firm (Spekman & Strauss, 1986, p. 30). In addition, determining the product's contribution to total company sales would establish product importance.

If the product is economically important to the firm (i.e., product sales contribute substantially to company sales) then decisions related to the procurement of the product become critical. Spekman and Strauss (1986) hypothesize that buyers will have the propensity to engage in long-term planning and coordination with suppliers when the product being purchased is considered important.

**Image importance.** Image importance is derived from the way Spekman and Strauss (1986) operationalized product importance. Image importance might be determined by considering the degree to which the product impacts the company's image and the degree to which unmet product expectations would adversely impact the image of the company. Spekman and Strauss (1986) operationalized this component of product importance by asking "What would be the consequences if... the purchase proved to be less reliable and dependable than expected?" (p. 37). As in the case of the economic factors, the more important the product is to the firm's image, the more likely the firm is to seek relationships based on long-term planning and coordination.

**Uncertainty**

Organizations interact with and are influenced by environmental elements having a positive or a negative influence. Elements in the environment are predominately viewed as uncontrollable and thus foster uncertainty in organizations. Thompson and Strickland (1978) describe environmental elements as threats to organizations. They state that "environment-related threats may concern possible technological or market developments, the advent of new products or competition, recession, inflation, government, changing consumer values and life-styles, projections of natural resource depletion, unfavorable demographic shifts, or the like" (p. 50). Many of these threats could also be perceived as opportunities. But regardless of whether environmental elements pose a threat or an opportunity, they tend to be uncertain.

The "uncertainty" component of our model was derived from the Spekman and Strauss (1986) framework and parallels what they refer to as perceived uncertainty. Spekman and Strauss state that "uncertainty is inherent in market transactions" (p. 29). Uncertainty includes a behavioral dimension (i.e., the risk of opportunistic behavior by exchange partners) and market uncertainty potentially leading to information asymmetry. Spekman and Strauss propose that when transaction specific investments (asset specificity), perceived uncertainty and high product importance are present, buyer's perceptions of strategic vulnerability increase. Accordingly, buyers become more interested in long-term planning and coordination with vendors. Uncertainty, therefore, interacts with two other company/market factors (asset specificity and product importance) to influence buyers' perceptions and actions.

Anderson and Weitz (1983) also included an uncertainty component in their model. They believe that "uncertainty has a negative impact on net effectiveness in both 'make' and 'buy' situations" (p. 17). Anderson and Weitz propose that uncertainty interacts with other company factors such as company-specific capabilities to influence the choice of an exchange structure.

Uncertainty and its influence on companies has been addressed by many organizational theorists. Child (1972) notes that

the higher the environmental variability and the uncertainty consequently experienced, the more the prevailing structure of the organization should be adaptive, with roles open to continual redefinition and with co-ordination being achieved by frequent meetings and considerable lateral communication (p. 3).

Others propose that uncertainty presents more problems for a centralized system than a decentralized one (Arrow, 1974; Hayek, 1945). Still others propose that flexibility is lost when a firm vertically integrates and therefore has more difficulty dealing with uncertainty (Anderson & Weitz, 1983; Miles, 1980).
In each case, vertical integration is seen as a less viable option under conditions of uncertainty. We propose that in the presence of uncertainty, cooperative and interdependent relationships reduce the risk associated with uncertainty. In addition, we propose that when uncertainty is high, interest in cooperative and interdependent relationships will be great. We also propose that uncertainty interacts with other company-market factors to influence a company's perception of its strategic vulnerability.²

Performance measurability. This component was taken from the Anderson and Weitz (1983) model. Performance is viewed as effectiveness in realizing the goals of the firm. Anderson and Weitz suggest that performance measurement is difficult when only output measures (e.g., sales, units produced) are available. Vertical integration minimizes this problem since a company would have access to both input and output data.

None of the four exchange relationships are without performance measurement problems. Anderson and Weitz (1983) note that "difficulties in assessing performance also arise when responsibilities are shared" (p. 18). Shared responsibility occurs in all types of exchange structures. However, there may be a greater degree of shared responsibility in cooperative and interdependent relationships and in the development of spot contracts. Further, as the number of parties involved in a transaction increases, it is generally true that the ability to measure performance declines.

A cooperative and interdependent relationship could provide either a greater ability or a lessened ability to measure performance. For example, if a spirit of trust is not paramount in the relationship, input and output measures may not be available to both parties. Thus, the ability to measure performance would be lessened. On the other hand, systems (i.e., EDI) commonly found today in this type of exchange structure allow for a high degree of exchange of both input and output data and result in a greater ability to measure performance.

We believe performance measurability influences perceived strategic vulnerability, but how much is questionable. The influence of this variable on selection of an exchange structure may be somewhat dependent on existing firm capabilities. For example, one party in the exchange may make data analysis and interpretation capabilities available to parties engaging in cooperative agreements with them. So, companies with limited abilities to measure performance might seek a cooperative and interdependent relationship to take advantage of the capabilities provided by the other party in the exchange. On the other hand, if the company has these data handling capabilities it may tend to rely more on its own expertise and consider vertical integration. Alternatively, the company might consider spot contracts in the marketplace. Inclusion of this factor in the model is recommended at this time.

Management mentality. "Management mentality" is a term coined by Sheth (1981) in his merchandise buying behavior model to refer to a company's business philosophy, such as whether it is financially driven or merchandising driven. While we found the term appealing, we preferred an expanded concept and in that regard found Frazier's (1983) description of organizational and personal factors to be more compatible with our ideas.

Frazier (1983) considered organizational and personal factors in his framework and noted that "the firm's financial resources and authority structure" influence selection of an exchange structure (p. 70). In addition, the background (e.g., education, business experience) and personality (e.g., need for achievement, tolerance for uncertainty) characteristics of company decision makers were proposed to influence the selection process.

In the context of this model, we suggest that management mentality be conceptualized to include any philosophical or organizational stance taken by management and having the potential to influence decision-making. Management mentality could function in a positive or negative way toward

² Although the perceived risk literature is not reviewed for this paper, the interested reader is referred to work by Bauer (1960), McMillan (1972), and Sheth (1973) for an introduction to this literature.
developing cooperative and interdependent relationships.  

**Perceived Strategic Vulnerability**

Vulnerability is defined by Spekman and Strauss (1986) as "a psychological state in which a buyer perceives that his [or her] company is at risk or has severely limited its strategic options" (p. 31). This notion is similar to one posited in the strategic management literature. Companies constantly monitor a variety of internal and external factors as a part of the strategic management process. As opportunities or threats appear the company must assess their impact on the company. In some cases, the impacts are perceived as minimal, and no change in operation is considered by the company. In other cases, the impacts are perceived as critical and changes in operation or other company adaptations are deemed necessary.

As presented in Figure 1, the six company/market factors previously described influence an organization's perception of strategic vulnerability. Spekman and Strauss (1986) propose that "a decision maker's motivation to act is stimulated only if he [or she] feels that the company is strategically vulnerable" (p. 31).

We propose that as an organization's perception of strategic vulnerability increases, the organization is more likely to consider the costs and benefits of alternative exchange structures.

**Perceived Costs and Benefits**

Transaction cost analysis focuses on costs and on the ability to quantify the costs associated with a transaction. While we find this appealing, our thinking has been influenced by Frazier (1983) and Dwyer et al. (1987), who propose that there are both extrinsic (quantitative) and intrinsic (qualitative) factors involved when analyzing the costs and benefits of an exchange structure. Our model draws heavily on the concepts presented by Frazier (1983) and Dwyer et al. (1987) and posits that all costs associated with a transaction are not easily quantifiable.

According to Frazier (1983), perceived costs and benefits may be extrinsic as well as intrinsic:

Extrinsic rewards include increases in market share, sales volume, and profits. The amount of psychological pleasure received from entering and managing an exchange relationship as well as gaining approval and status within the industry are examples of intrinsic rewards (p. 70).

In addition, Frazier states that the firm will evaluate the "required investment in time, effort, and money associated with each alternative" (p. 70).

The Dwyer et al. (1987) model includes many of the same ideas presented by Frazier (1983) but adds that benefits of cooperative relationships might include reduced uncertainty, managed dependence, and exchange efficiency. Vlek and Stallen's (1981) emphasis on benefits is consistent with both of these views. Dwyer et al. suggest that costs may include such things as economic and psychic resources spent in conflict resolution and the "opportunity costs of foregone exchange with alternative partners" (p. 14).

Frazier (1983) notes that if an organization feels strategically vulnerable, a search for other exchange structures may occur. As described by Frazier (1983), information on costs and benefits (rewards) associated with alternative exchange structures is obtained to narrow the alternatives and to facilitate determining additional information needs.

**Selection of Exchange Structure**

The model identifies factors that may influence the selection of an exchange structure by firms in the textile and apparel industries. Six company/market factors—market competitiveness, asset specificity, product importance, uncertainty, performance measurability, and management mentality—have been described as influencing a company's perceived strategic vulnerability. Throughout the paper, we have posited the direction each factor might take if a company were to arrive at a decision to select a cooperative and

---

3. Labor characteristics (e.g., flexibility in relation to change, level of profit sharing) may also be an organizational factor for inclusion in the model. Although a focus on labor characteristics has not been previously proposed, its inclusion in the model warrants further consideration.
interdependent exchange structure. However, all of the factors (in the direction suggested) would not necessarily be operative for every organization. Thus, the decision to select a cooperative and interdependent exchange structure is not always clear-cut. Although we believe some factors are more important than others, we do not go as far as to suggest a weighting scheme. The purpose of this paper is to initiate a more global discussion of these factors and their relationships.

If a company perceives itself to be strategically vulnerable, the perceived costs and benefits of alternative exchange structures are evaluated. After evaluation of the costs and benefits of alternative exchange structures, a selection is made based on the results of this process. The exchange structure selected may be one of the following: (1) spot contracting, (2) vertical integration, (3) cooperative and interdependent relationships, or (4) multiple formats.

Three of the alternative exchange structures require long-term commitment in some form. In addition, each offers advantages and disadvantages. The alternative (vertical integration), while offering greater control and reduced risks, is costly and may limit flexibility in times of uncertainty. Cooperative and interdependent relationships provide similar benefits in terms of increased control (although not as great as vertical integration) but the costs associated with this structure are less and a company retains flexibility. Another direction we see as a possibility is that of multiple formats, which may have special appeal to larger companies who operate with multiple business units. Each business unit may go through a process of evaluating and selecting the most viable exchange structure. The result may be multiple exchange formats within the larger company.

Although this paper does not address the dynamic nature of the model, we believe that the model needs to be dynamic and allow for a change in exchange structure. In this regard, we were impressed with work by Frazier (1983) on interorganizational exchange behavior. He proposed a review process to follow implementation of an exchange structure. Feedback from the review process is filtered back to the process of initiating exchange and influences future exchange decisions. We believe that a review process could follow the selection of an exchange structure in our model. Consideration and explanation of a review process to render the model dynamic is a task for the future.

Implications

The model has presented a broad array of factors that we believe to influence the selection of an exchange structure by companies in the textile and apparel industries. We think the model can be useful as a tool for generating hypotheses and organizing empirical research findings. We point out that the model is presented at a conceptual level. As a step toward refining and critiquing the model, we offer several questions that might lead to discussion and ultimately empirical research:

- Are the variables identified in the model appropriate for each level of the industry—the materials producer, the manufacturer, the retailer?
- Are variables missing in the model that might help clarify the exchange structure selection process?
- How might the variables be operationalized?
- Can the model foster research to clarify the relationships among the variables?
- Does the model help us understand when certain structures are likely to be more profitable than others?
- Can the model help to answer questions as to why a producer, a manufacturer or a retailer would or would not enter into a cooperative and interdependent relationship?
- Can the model be developed to the point where it is useful in assessing various control issues?
- If this model does appear to be applicable to the textile and apparel industries, what does it mean in terms of preparing students for careers in the industry?

A Transaction Cost Analysis model has been suggested as a way to analyze decisions on exchange structures in the textile and apparel industries. We think this approach has real potential because of its emphasis on quantifying variables and looking at costs in order to maximize profits. We see this model as a first step and welcome discussion of these ideas.
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Transaction Cost Analysis of Producer/Manufacturer/Retailer Relationships for Textiles and Clothing: An International Perspective
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As Jolly and Branson (in this volume) have documented, the transaction cost approach developed by Williamson (e.g., 1975, 1979, 1981) can be a useful tool in understanding and predicting the development of cooperative long-term arrangements among textile producers, apparel manufacturers, and retailers. The international business literature suggests that it may be equally useful in analyzing whether and how a firm chooses to enter foreign markets. As United States textile and apparel firms struggle with flat demand and import competition in the domestic market, successful pursuit of foreign market penetration becomes increasingly desirable (cf. Bannon, 1987). However, in spite of the need to find attractive market opportunities wherever they may be, the number of firms even exploring foreign market possibilities remains low (Wood & Goolsby, 1987).

Transaction cost analysis characterizes foreign market entry decisions, just like other exchange processes, in terms of whether it would be more efficient to deal with external agents or handle functions within the firm. The default option is to deal with external agents to minimize commitment of resources to any particular exchange.

In the international trade literature, entry mode options are typically ordered in terms of amount of control they provide for a firm. Anderson and Gatignon (1986) suggest this is the case because control is the key determinant of both risk and return. Direct investment offers a high degree of control, joint ventures and franchises offer less, and most licensing arrangements offer even less. A related construct is commitment, as discussed by Klein (1986). Major levels of commitment to foreign markets range from attempts to export goods (low commitment) to direct foreign investment (high commitment).

General determinants of exchange structure decisions have been described by Jolly and Branson (in this volume) under company/market factors. Transaction cost models for foreign market entry modes use similar constructs with some variations to take into account factors that are unique or specifically important to international trade. The purpose of this paper is to present foreign market entry mode constructs, drawing largely from the thorough analysis developed by Anderson and Gatignon (1986) with modifications based on other sources, and to compare the constructs with those in the Jolly and Branson paper (in this volume). Applications to the textile, apparel, and retailing industries will be noted and suggestions for modifications in the analysis of organizational relations will be discussed.

Entry Mode Predictors

Market Competitiveness

Jolly and Branson (in this volume) present market competitiveness as a separate company/market factor. In the work of Anderson and Gatignon (1986) and other foreign market analyses (e.g., Klein, 1986), market competitiveness is discussed as part of another predictor: transaction-specific assets (see below). The reasoning is that low competition situations are most often the result of the accumulation of specialized assets in ongoing business relations.

Transaction-Specific Assets

According to Williamson (1979, 1981), this is the most important of three critical dimensions for describing transactions. As might be expected, then, this construct appears in both general and foreign market entry models. Williamson has proposed three types of specificity—human, physical, and site—but most models drop site specificity or combine it with physical specificity. Klein (1986) contends that in the international marketing context, specific human knowledge assets are generally more important than physical assets. Anderson and Gatignon (1986) propose that when specialized knowledge is required, the concern about being locked into an arrangement leads to demands for greater control. As Toynie, Arpan, Barnett, Ricks, and Shimp (1983) point out,
textile and apparel production varies from country to country in terms of level of technology but overall technology is relatively low. Also, since most new equipment is developed by equipment companies for sale to whomever can pay, new technologies diffuse rapidly. Processes are usually not highly proprietary, and the product class is neither immature nor poorly understood. Therefore, low control arrangements would be most efficient.

Distribution must also be considered; Williamson (1981) suggests that more control or forward integration occurs when the firm believes that special knowledge is needed to sell the product. This proposition could explain the increase in manufacturers moving forward into the retailing arena, both domestically and internationally. As retailers continue to cut costs through low-level staffing, it becomes more difficult to find any clerk, let alone a knowledgeable one. In fact, as pointed out by Cunniff (1988), surveys ever since the 1960s have shown stores' poor service or the lack of it to be one of the major consumer complaints. Manufacturers who work hard at developing and promoting their lines do not want to have retailers lose business for them through inadequate sales assistance. Therefore, companies are developing programs like Liz Claiborne's "Project Consumer," which uses in-store product specialists to explain the line to consumers. Manufacturers are doing this on an international as well as a national level. For example, when Japan's Wacoal Corporation launched a number of boutiques in United States department stores, these boutiques were staffed with employees trained and paid by the manufacturer.

Jolly and Branson's (in this volume) addition of financial asset specificity to the model has special importance for international trade analysis. As a number of recent articles have pointed out (e.g., Finley, 1985; Khoury, 1984), countertrade is an important means of financing international exchanges. Countertrade involves payment for some or all of the value received with goods and services instead of currency. Since goods and services are not as universally acceptable as cash, the former financial assets would tend to be relatively transaction specific and therefore to encourage more controlling structures. Heyden (1985) reported an example of countertrade that was prompted by the 3M Company's need to take profits out of China. Since Renminbi cannot be converted to other currencies on the international market, the alternative is to purchase Chinese products for export. To help with this process, 3M contacted the silk importer, S. Shamash and Sons, and formed a joint venture buying company called 3M-Shamash Ltd. As mentioned earlier, a joint venture is considered to be a moderate control/moderate commitment exchange structure.

Product Importance

Jolly and Branson (in this volume) note that both economic and image importance of a product are hypothesized to influence transaction structure decisions. Analyses of multinational trade seem to have focused mainly on the image dimension of product importance. Anderson and Gatignon (1986) cover this topic under the construct of free-riding potential. Free-riding potential refers to the opportunity for an agent to obtain benefits from a good name without bearing the costs of maintaining that good name. The proposition associated with this construct is that the higher the value of a brand name, the more control a company will want to have in entering a foreign market. Work by Horstmann and Markusen (1987) also suggests that as reputation increases in importance, so does the tendency for a firm to engage in direct investment (higher control) rather than in licensing (lower control).

Anderson and Gatignon (1986) specifically note that when standardization of product quality, style, and design are considered necessary to maintain a good reputation, a firm will seek high control. That firms will seek more control when a high quality reputation is at stake receives support from apparel industry practice in the use of contractors. Traditionally, inside shops have been more common for men's wear where there is greater concern for quality, whereas outside contractors have been more often used for women's wear where appearance is a bigger issue. Analysis of the relation between reputation and control becomes more problematic in analyzing international apparel arrangements. A garment that meets standards of aesthetically pleasing design, good fit, and even high quality in one country may fail to meet them in another. In fact, a commonly recognized business blunder in apparel manufacturing is to not adjust sizing and styling to suit the needs and norms of another culture (cf. Ricks, 1983). Under these conditions, loosely structured licensing arrangements, in which foreign agents can input their knowledge about local consumers' preferences, may be the most efficient entry mode. A proposition based on this reasoning.
would be that the greater the difference in aesthetic norms and body types between one culture and another, the more control should reside with personnel from the country where the garments will be distributed.

**Uncertainty**

This construct is another of Williamson’s (1979, 1981) critical dimensions. Anderson and Gatignon’s (1986) international trade model divides uncertainty into external uncertainty (or unpredictability of the external environment) and internal uncertainty (or inability to evaluate performance by observing output measures). This parallels the uncertainty and inability to measure performance categories of Jolly and Branson (in this volume).

**External Uncertainty.** In international operations, external uncertainty is intensified by the combination of uncertainties in two or more countries. There seems to be some consensus that with high external uncertainty, a company should sacrifice control to maintain flexibility. If undesirable political or economic changes occur in the areas where a firm has business dealings, the firm may need to disengage quickly. Anderson and Gatignon (1986) note that especially in fast-changing industries, a product may be obsolete by the time a high-control structure is in place. Based on these lines of reasoning, the combination of fast-paced fashion changes and volatile world conditions suggests that international textile and clothing agreements would tend toward the low control type, such as direct export and licensing. However, if flexibility has already been lost for other reasons, a high control structure would be more appropriate.

**Internal Uncertainty.** Internal uncertainty refers to difficulty in evaluating job performance by means of objective output measures. Internal uncertainty makes control more desirable so managers can measure inputs and make subjective judgments about performance. Managers learn to make these judgments over time in work situations in their own countries but have difficulty when they move to a new country. If there is an attempt to exert high control before managers learn what is acceptable work behavior in the new country, there is apt to be a negative effect on performance. Managers can expect to have special problems with internal uncertainty in foreign countries if the foreign culture is very different from the home culture and/or the firm has limited international experience. In this case, some intermediate level of control is recommended by Anderson and Gatignon (1986).

As might be expected, however, cases of firms with little international experience plunging into very different cultures are fairly rare. Previous studies (Davidson, 1980, 1983; Johanson & Vahlne, 1977) indicate that less experienced firms tend to enter geographically close, culturally similar countries, and involvement in any given country is apt to expand gradually.

Cultural differences become less of a problem as the number of firms from one country establish a presence in another. People become available in the foreign country who are familiar with the culture and work methods of the entering firms. The competition among qualified people allows for low control since there is easy replacement of anyone who doesn’t perform up to standards.

Textile and apparel manufacturers do not seem to be as cautious as some other types of manufacturers about entering distant markets to take advantage of low cost labor and lack of quotas. However, the entries do seem to follow a pattern. One country becomes popular for a time; then another—usually an adjacent—country does. For example, for the last two or three decades, cooperative textile and apparel arrangements have expanded primarily in Asian countries with much less activity in South America and even less in Africa. Following other firms to a country and expanding into adjacent countries allows firms to take advantage of diffusion of management skills as well as technical skills.

**Management Mentality**

Management mentality, as an explicit exchange structure predictor, is a new addition by Jolly and Branson (in this volume) to transaction cost models. However, it certainly has a logical appeal for both domestic exchange studies and research on foreign market entry modes. Business analysts have noted the impact of executives’ personal values on corporate strategies for some time (Guth & Tagiuri, 1965). As for relevance to approaches to international trade, Perlmuter (1969) has drawn a relationship between home-oriented, host-oriented and world-oriented corporate philosophy and the attitudes of the corporation’s executives.
Company Power

Although this construct has not been introduced as a predictor variable in any of the major transaction cost models, its importance may be inferred from related theory on marketing channels (cf. Kotler, 1980). For purposes of this paper, I consider power to include a company’s size, financial resources and prestige. A low level of power can restrict a company’s entry mode options since it may not have the resources for vertical integration. However, a weak position does not make a company an attractive partner to outside agents. In this case, the default option of a low control entry mode seems most likely.

In contrast, high power can open up options that did not appear to exist for other companies. An example may be found in the article by Heyden (1985). In the early 1980s, China did not allow wholly owned subsidiaries of foreign firms outside of its Special Economic Zones. However, to attract 3M, this restriction was waived. For high power companies, a high control entry mode is apt to be the more popular choice, both because the resources are available for an integrative structure and high control may be needed to protect the prestige image.

Additional Considerations

The Jolly and Branson (in this volume) model includes perceived strategic vulnerability and perceived costs and benefits as intervening variables between the initial predictors and selection of exchange structure. The entry mode literature tends to emphasize direct relationships between primary predictors and exchange structure without much discussion of intervening variables. Rather, the concern in the international articles seems to be what variables outside the framework of transaction cost analysis need to be considered to round out understanding of the development of organizational relations. As Williamson (1981) himself noted, one must consider production costs as well as transaction costs in evaluating efficiency of organizational structures. The goal is to minimize the sum of these two costs. Anderson and Gatignon (1986) go a step further in contending that especially when one is analyzing relationships at the international level, transaction cost hypotheses are incomplete without inclusion of production costs and government restrictions as well.

According to Anderson and Gatignon (1986), government restrictions should be considered as a separate class of predictor variable in that they reduce the types of structures and relationships that are feasible in a given country. Of course, governmental activities also affect production and transaction costs. Keeping current and understanding the rules and regulations of international trade are difficult tasks in any product area but especially so for textiles and apparel. Good overviews of some of the complexities and ways in which trade in textiles and apparel is subject to exceptional treatment may be found in Hester (1987) and Dickerson (1988). Some recent examples of marked changes in government restrictions on ways of conducting business include: (1) South Korea’s 1984 decision to grant automatic licensing approval to a number of apparel imports so that it was no longer virtually impossible to export garments to this country (Wightman, 1984) and (2) a series of steps since 1978 by the Chinese government to encourage joint ventures, partnership management, and wholly-owned foreign businesses (“Rules to Encourage Investment,” 1988) following a hiatus of some three decades.

It should be added that government restrictions are not inconsequential in analyzing domestic relationships. The recent wave of mergers and acquisitions in the United States highlighted problems in creating the most efficient organizational structures within the confines of United States antitrust regulations.

The caution to include production costs and government restrictions along with transaction costs to complete the analysis of organizational structures and relationships should not be taken to imply that the former two types of variables have not received any prior attention from theorists or practitioners. Rather, as Teece (1983) has noted, they are more obvious and comparatively well understood relative to transaction cost variables. When questioned about business structure decisions, many managers automatically respond in terms of production variables such as labor and transportation costs and taxes. Therefore, researchers must be especially skillful in constructing questions to tap subtle as well as obvious motivating factors. Anderson and Gatignon (1986) suggest using multiple-item measures of each predictor variable and prevailing practices regarding exchange structures in the industry as indicators of the more efficient
interdependencies. Klein (1986) adds the recommendation to measure satisfaction with the structures since firms are not always able to do what they perceive to be in their own best interests.

Conclusion

The transaction cost approach, with the addition of production costs and government restrictions as predictor variables, promises valuable insights on how the industry may develop more efficient interrelationships. As noted by Wind and Perlmutter (1977) and repeated by Anderson and Gatignon (1986), analysis of entry modes is a frontier issue in international marketing and transaction cost analysis is still being reshaped by logical considerations as well as empirical research. Therefore this is an ideal time for researchers in textiles and clothing to refine theory and improve practice by making contributions that take advantage of specialized knowledge of our industries combined with information from other disciplines on how organizations in general build efficient relationships.
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The Effects of Textile and Apparel Import Restrictions on the Economic Welfare of U.S. Producers, Retailers, and Consumers
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For nearly three decades the U.S. government has sought to control the growth of textile and apparel imports through formal treaties with other governments. Yet despite the existence since 1961 of multinational agreements designed to provide orderly growth in textile and apparel imports, U.S. imports have grown rapidly. As the growth of imports has become a major concern to U.S. textile and apparel manufacturers, several attempts have been made to impose import restrictions on textile/apparel product categories in the form of trade bills such as the Textiles and Apparel Trade Act of 1985, which was vetoed by President Reagan in 1986, and the Textiles and Apparel Trade Act of 1987.

In response to the current situation, textiles and clothing professors have questioned who we should support: producers, retailers, or consumers (Dickerson & Barry, 1980; Nordquist, 1984-85)? Although previous research has contributed to some understanding of the impact of textile/apparel imports (Dickerson & Barry, 1980; Dickerson & Hester, 1984), the need remains for an analysis of the economic impact of import restrictions. We need a logical framework to organize our thinking about the international textile/apparel economic system. In addition, we need to appreciate certain economic complexities in order to make reasoned contributions to the trade restraint debate.

The purpose of this paper is to provide a broader view on the impact of import restrictions on the economic welfare of the U.S. and a clearer understanding of the position of textile and apparel producers, retailers, and consumers. In addition, an issue of the relationship of other disciplines to textiles and clothing emerged from the ACPTC Subject Matter Clarification project. In keeping up with this issue, this paper is designed to illustrate an example of how economics as a basic discipline makes particular contributions to our discipline. More specific topics include (1) textile products as economic goods: the contributions of economic concepts and (2) textile/apparel policy: determinants and impact.

First, I discuss the current status of U.S. protectionism in textile and apparel industries. Second, the economic impact of tariffs and quotas are analyzed. Third, the differences between tariffs and quotas are discussed. Finally, I explore reasons why consumers are not represented in the trade policy decisions as much as manufacturers or importers.

The Current Status of U.S. Protectionism in Textiles and Apparel

To examine the current situation of U.S. protectionism related to textiles and apparel, it is necessary to briefly review the history of textile agreements. U.S. tariffs on textile/apparel imports have remained higher than those on other manufactured goods since the Soot-Hawley Tariff Act in 1930, reaching approximately 60% of the dutiable imports on cotton textile imports (Pincus, 1986). However, since the Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934 paved the way for reduced barriers to trade (Kwon & Kwon, 1985), the American textile and apparel industries have been subjected to rapid growth of imports. In response to disruptive trade, there were several U.S. actions to curb imports. Table 1 provides a brief summary of U.S. attempts to solve textile and apparel trade problems. The United States and Japan agreed to a five-year aggregate annual limit, entitled "Voluntary Agreement Act of 1957," on cotton textile product exports to America.

In 1961 and 1962, two broader multilateral agreements were negotiated: the Short-Term Agreement Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles (STA) and its successor, the Long-Term Arrangement Regarding International Trade in Cotton Textiles (LTA) (Nordquist, 1984-1985). Although these two agreements were mainly designed to control cotton textile imports, cotton textile product imports grew constantly.
The development and rapid growth of manufactured fiber textile products in the United States during the 1960s was paralleled by a rapid growth in U.S. imports. Accordingly, the more comprehensive Multifiber Arrangement (MFA) was negotiated in 1974. It was a multilateral agreement negotiated under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and endorsed by about fifty countries (Nordquist, 1984-1985). So far, MFA has been extended three times. In 1986, the most recent, elaborate, and comprehensive MFA (IV), was extended to deal with ramie, silk and linen—fibers not restricted by MFA III.

The MFA aims to regulate trade in textiles and apparel by allowing signatory countries to negotiate bilateral agreements between themselves and other countries. Despite the continued long-term growth in import penetration since 1974, the MFA and its system of bilateral agreements have provided the domestic textile and apparel industries with an extensive program of import protection (Samolis & Emrich, 1986). Special protection for textiles and apparel is evident from the following two instances: First, under the Generalized System of Preferences Act (GSP) of 1974, eligible articles from beneficiary developing countries were entitled to duty-free treatment. However, textile and apparel articles—major export items for many developing countries—were specifically precluded. Second, in 1985, a trade-weighted ad valorem tariff was 19 percent for textile and apparel products—almost five times higher than the 4.4 percent average for all other imported products.

Third, the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) in 1983 offered duty-free treatment for exports from the Caribbean region to the U.S. However, CBI also excluded textile and apparel products. Fourth, while tariffs on most products from Israel were eliminated immediately due to the Free Trade Arrangement with Israel, duties on most textile imports have a phased-out period extending to 1995. Lastly, the Textile Labeling Bill (as part of the Drug Price and Patent Term Act of 1984) required more labeling of imported textile and apparel goods. Such labeling may encourage consumers to discriminate imported goods from "Made-in-U.S.A." products in their purchases.

In summary, no other U.S. industry, adversely affected by competition from imports, has received this magnitude of protection from U.S. government.

The Economic Impact of Import Restrictions

The Impact of Tariffs

Historically, the most important tool of trade policy has been the tariff, a tax imposed on goods and services traded across national borders (Kwon & Kwon, 1985). Although the revenue-generating function of tariffs is relatively significant in many developing countries, the primary role of tariffs in recent times has been to protect domestic industries from foreign competition (Stern, 1987). Tariffs are applied in either one of two ways, as an ad valorem duty or as a specific tax. An ad valorem tariff is expressed as a percentage of a trade good’s dutiable value, while a specific tax is a designated amount per unit of the good’s quantity (Chacholiades, 1978).
The impact of tariffs can be analyzed within a two-country, partial equilibrium framework assuming perfectly competitive conditions. In this example, it is assumed initially that the foreign producers' import supply curve to the domestic country is perfectly elastic. That is, the foreign country is willing to supply as large a quantity as the home country wants to buy at the world price (Freeman, 1971).
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S.U.S. = Supply of the U.S.
D.U.S. = Demand of the U.S.
S(f,t) = Supply of foreign import under free trade
P(t,d) = Price under free trade
P(w) = World price
S(t,1) = Supply of foreign import under tariff
(t = $10.00 per jacket)
P(t,d) = Price under tariff

Q1 is satisfied through imports of the jackets.

Suppose that the United States imposes a tariff equal to $10.00 per jacket (an additional cost to the importers who are, in this case, retailers). To cover the cost of the tariff retailers require a higher selling price. With a $10.00-per-jacket tariff, importing retailers thus charge a price of $40.00 to domestic consumers, $10.00 of which is paid as duty to the domestic customs officials. Graphically, the foreign import supply curve shifts upward by $10.00, the amount of the specific tariff. In Figure 1, this is shown by the upward shift of the import supply curve from S(f,t) ($30.00) to S(t,d) ($40.00).

With the increase in the price of imports, U.S. domestic consumers turn to domestic supplies. They bid the domestic price upward until it just equals the price of imports—$40.00 per jacket. Thus the tariff, raises the price of competitive imports and allows domestic producers to raise their price to the new, higher level. The increase in the domestic price leads to an increase in domestic production from Q1 to Q3 and a decrease in domestic consumption from Q2 to Q4. And, the quantity of imported jackets is likely to decline from Q2-Q1 to Q4-Q3. Thus in theory, the tariff offers protection to the domestic import-competing industry since it results in both an increase in domestic production, at a higher price, and a decrease in imports.

### The Welfare Effect of Tariffs

Although we have examined the impact of tariff policy on world and domestic prices, the flow of imports, and the levels of domestic consumption and production, we still need to address the question of whether the economic welfare of the tariff-imposing country, as a whole, is improved or worsened. To analyze this effect of tariffs, the concepts of consumers' surplus and producers' surplus should be introduced.

**Consumers' Surplus.** Consumers' surplus can be formally defined as the difference between the amount consumers are willing to pay (the area under the demand curve, Area A + B + C + D + E + F + G + H + I + J) and the amount they would actually pay (the Area E + F + G + H + I; $30.00 x Q2) (see Figure 1; Kreinin, 1979). Then consumers' surplus would equal Area A + B + C + D + J.

To aid the discussion of consumers' surplus,
assume that the equilibrium price of a jacket equals $30.00. The market demand schedule indicates that some individual consumers are willing to purchase units of jacket at prices exceeding $30.00. However, under perfect competitive conditions, there is only one price for the jacket that all consumers encounter—the equilibrium price. Thus, even though there are individual consumers who are willing to pay prices greater than the equilibrium price, those consumers only have to pay the lower equilibrium price. This benefit, accruing to those consumers who would be willing to pay a higher price, is referred to as consumers' surplus.

**Producers' Surplus.** Producers' surplus is defined as the difference between the amount producers actually receive (Area E + F) and the minimum amount they would be willing to receive: the area under the supply curve—Area F (see Figure 1; Kreinin, 1979). Then producers' surplus would equal Area E.

In Figure 1, an industry supply curve of jackets is depicted with an assumed equilibrium price of $30.00 per jacket. The industry supply curve indicates that some individual firms within the industry are willing to supply a quantity of a jacket at a price less than $30.00; for example, at $20.00, the quantity that firms are willing to supply equals Q1. However, all firms operating under perfect competition receive a single price: the equilibrium price. Because the equilibrium price applies to all firms in the industry, those firms willing to supply a quantity of the good at a price less than the equilibrium price will benefit; this benefit is called producers' surplus.

**Applying Consumers’ and Producers’ Surplus to Tariff Analysis**

In the previous section, I identified the areas representing consumers' and producers' surplus. Under free trade, with an equilibrium price equal to $30.00, consumers' surplus is represented by Area A + B + C + D + J; upon the tariff-induced increase in domestic price to $40.00, consumers' surplus, then, equals the area represented by J. The reduction in consumers' surplus, then, equals the Area A + B + C + D (see Figure 1).

Producers' surplus under free trade, at a price equal to $30.00, is represented by the Area E; with the tariff-induced increase in price to $40.00, producers' surplus would equal Area A + E. Thus producers' surplus increases by the area represented by A.

As a result of the tariff policy, then, there has been a transfer of welfare within the tariff-imposing country from domestic consumers to domestic producers. Consumers now pay a higher price for a domestically produced jacket, and thus lose a portion of consumers' surplus equal to Area A + B. Domestic producers, on the other hand, now receive a higher price for their output and gain an amount of producer's surplus equal to the portion of the loss in consumer's surplus applying to domestic production; this gain is equal to Area A.

There is still another transfer of economic welfare that results from the tariff policy; this transfer is called the *revenue effect.* The total amount of tariff revenue collected by the importing country equals the per-unit tariff, $10.00, multiplied by the quantity of imports under the tariff, Q4-Q3. This is represented graphically by the area of Rectangle C in Figure 1. This increase in tariff revenue has been at the expense of a portion of consumers' surplus equal to Area C. In other words, the tariff-induced increase in the price of imports has resulted in consumers paying more for the quantity Q4-Q3 of imports; this increased expenditure is equal in value to the tariff revenue collected by the government (Area C). Thus, there is a transfer of welfare from domestic consumers to the domestic government.

Therefore, the net change in the overall welfare of the nation is equal to the difference between the loss in consumers' surplus (A + B + C + D) and the increase in producers' surplus (A) and tariff revenue (C). Since the reduction in consumers' surplus is greater than the increase in producers' surplus plus tariff revenue, the tariff-imposing nation suffers an overall loss in economic welfare equal to the areas of Triangles B and D. (See the areas highlighted in Figure 1 and Table 2.) Triangles B and D represent the *deadweight welfare loss* of tariff policy (Kreinin, 1979). Triangle B is referred to as the production loss to the economy, in that it represents the amount by which the domestic cost of producing Q1-Q3 exceeds the cost at which Q1-Q3 could have been obtained through imports under free trade. That is, more domestic resources are being devoted to the production of the jacket than is optimal. Triangle D, on the other hand, represents the consumption loss to the economy, in that some consumers who were willing to pay
more than $30.00 per jacket for the quantity Q2-Q4 under free trade, but only had to pay $30.00, are denied that benefit when the price rises to $40.00. In this case the loss to those consumers is not compensated by a gain to other sectors of the economy.

As discussed previously, the imposition of a tariff results in a redistribution of economic welfare from domestic consumers to domestic producers and to the domestic government. In addition, there is a

Table 2. Welfare effects of tariff policy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare Losses:</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in Consumer</td>
<td>A + B + C + D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Welfare Gains:</th>
<th>Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Producer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus (Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Consumers)</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Tariff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenue (Transfer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from Consumers)</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deadweight Welfare Loss (Net Loss)</th>
<th>B + D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| Production Effect | B     |
| Consumption Effect| D     |

net welfare loss since not all of the reduction in consumers’ surplus is offset by the gains to producers and to the government.

Impact of Import Quotas

Import quotas are imposed by the importing country and place an upper limit on the physical quantity of the product that may be imported during a specified time period (Kreinin, 1979). The economic effects of an import quota can be analyzed within a partial equilibrium framework as in the case of the previous tariff analysis. This situation is depicted in Figure 2, where under free trade the domestic country consumes and produces Q2 and Q1 respectively of the product (say, women’s sweaters) with the difference between consumption and production (Q2-Q1) representing the quantity of imports. The world and domestic prices are equal under free trade; suppose $30.00 per sweater as shown in Figure 2.

Assume an import quota is now imposed equal to the quantity EF, which is less than the amount imported under free trade. The imposition of the quota directly affects the supply of the commodity available to the importing country. Under free trade, the U.S. could obtain any quantity of sweaters it desired at the world price of $30.00. However, because imports are limited under the quota, the supply of the product available to the U.S. is restricted to the domestically produced output plus the quantity of imports permitted by the quota. The total supply curve (domestic plus foreign supply) can be derived by horizontally summing the quantity supplied by domestic producers at each price (represented by the domestic supply curve, S u.s.) and the quantity of imports permitted under the quota EF. The resulting total supply curve S u.s. + f, is represented by the line GHIJK in Figure 2. It should be noted that at every price the total supply curve exceeds the domestic supply curve by the distance EF—the quota quantity.

Figure 2. An example of the economic effects of a quota (Adapted from Kreinin, 1979).
Equilibrium under the quota occurs where total supply to the domestic country equals total demand; this occurs at Point J in Figure 2. Therefore, the domestic price has increased to $40.00 per sweater. At the higher domestic price, domestic consumption will decline to Q4 from Q2, while domestic production will increase to Q3 from Q1. The quantity of imports falls to Q4-Q3 from Q2-Q1, which equals the amount of the import quota EF.

What is the effect of the import quota on the domestic importers (e.g., retailers)? Suppose import licenses are issued free of charge by the government to domestic importers. The importers, having the right to purchase a designated quantity of imports from foreign producers, can do so at the world price of $30.00, because foreign producers remain willing to supply imports at that price. However, they can then turn to the domestic market and sell those imports at the higher domestic price of $40.00. That is, retailers who receive the right to import under a quota system can earn a quota profit; a quota profit is the profit accruing to domestic importers, resulting from the divergence between world and domestic prices. The amount of the quota profit is represented graphically in Figure 2 by the area of Rectangle C, which equals the difference between the world and domestic price ($40.00 - $30.00 = $10.00) multiplied by the quantity of imports permitted under the quota (EF).

Because of the increase in the domestic price under the import quota, the welfare effects of the quota, with one exception, are identical to those associated with a tariff. These effects are labeled in Figure 2, where it should be noted that the net welfare effect is negative and equal to the sum of the production and consumption losses (Triangles B and D), just as in the case of the tariff (see areas highlighted in Figure 2 and Table 3).

The difference between the two policies is that the tariff revenue collected on imports under a tariff policy is replaced by the quota profit under a quota policy. If the import quota is allocated to domestic importers by the issuance of free licenses, then the quota has the effect of redistributing economic welfare from domestic consumers to domestic producers and to holders of the import licenses. It is possible, however, that the government could itself garner a portion or even all of the quota profit, either by selling the import licenses or by auctioning them off to the domestic importers.

Under such an arrangement, the quota profit would be transferred from the importers to the domestic government (Kreinin, 1979). In practice, however, the system of selling licenses for imported goods is not widely used by governments, although a quota licensing system was proposed by a textile state congressman (Hosenball, 1986).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Welfare effects of a quota</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welfare Losses:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decrease in Consumer Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Welfare Gains:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase in Producer Surplus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer from Consumers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quota Profit for Importers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or Foreign Producers*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Transfer from Consumers)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deadweight Welfare Loss (Net Loss)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Loss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption Loss</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In the case that foreign producers are directly involved with retailing in an importing country.

In a study of the costs of quota and tariff protection of clothing in Canada, Jenkins (1980) estimated that the total cost of tariffs and quotas to consumers was $467.4 million (Canadian currency) in 1979, of which $269.1 million could be attributed to the tariffs alone. Of the total, more than half was a direct transfer to producers from consumers. Economic losses to Canada were $107.5 million from tariffs and quotas together, but only $20.9 million from the tariffs. While the tariffs transferred $269.1 million and led to economic losses of $20.9 million, the quotas transferred an additional $198.3 million at an economic cost of $86.5 million. Thus, for every Canadian dollar taken from consumers by the bilateral quotas, 21 cents went to the exporting countries, 23 cents were wasted via economic inefficiency, and only 56 cents went to the Canadian beneficiaries.

**Tariffs versus Quota: Which is More Harmful?**

The previous analysis suggested that, with the
exception of the difference between the quota profit and tariff revenue, the static economic effects of tariffs and quota are similar. However, there are several other ways in which the two types of trade measures differ. One difference (usually cited as an advantage of quotas over tariffs) is that the effect of a quota on the quantity of imports is certain (Freeman, 1971). In contrast, when a tariff rate is increased (or decreased), the exact effect of such an action on the quantity of imports cannot be precisely predicted since the response by producers and consumers to a change in price is uncertain.

A second difference is that quantitative barriers are more restrictive in a dynamic sense (Chacholiasides, 1978). The essence of a tariff is that it raises the price of imports to the domestic market, making them less competitive with domestic production. Foreign producers, however, could possibly offset the effect of this tax if they were to reduce their costs of production—say, by increasing their efficiency—which would in turn allow them to reduce their selling price and thereby increase their sales of imports. With quantitative restrictions, the quantity of imports supplied by foreign producers is strictly limited, regardless of the selling price, and thus there is little incentive for foreign producers to attempt to reduce the cost of producing imports in an effort to increase sales to the importing country. Thus, because quotas restrict imports on the basis of quantity rather than price, they discourage efficient behavior on the part of foreign producers and therefore reduce long-term competitive forces within the world market.

Economists have debated whether tariffs or quotas are more harmful to the economic welfare of the U.S. Berger (1987) introduced the argument that quotas are the most harmful and need to be replaced with tariffs so that the U.S. industry would become more competitive. The arguments are as follows: First, tariffs allow unbridled competition by all foreign comers. Countries with the lowest cost technologies can bring all of their product to market. But with quotas, U.S. prices get out of line with world prices. Another argument for tariffs is that the tariff revenues would go to the U.S. government rather than retailers (or foreign producers). This tax money could be used to assist workers in embattled industries and cut the U.S. trade deficit.

Where Does the Consumer Stand?

Tariffs and quotas alike have been harmful to domestic consumers. Clearly, consumers' interests are not as well represented as are those of manufacturers and workers in the industry. Domestic residents outside the protected sectors seem almost unaware of the harmful effects such protection may have on them.

The major reason for the lack of the representation of consumers' interests in policy making is that consumers are not as well organized as producers (T. Ozawa, personal communication, June 18, 1987). For instance, producers are organized in the form of unions and associations such as American Apparel Manufacturers Association and American Textiles Manufacturing Institute. Second, they are also geographically concentrated. For instance, textile establishments in three Southern states, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia, accounts for about 60 percent of the industry's total. This indicates that it is easier for producers to voice their interests than consumers. Since consumers are scattered, have diversified interests, and are unfamiliar with each other, they are unlikely to be informed about the cost of protection.

Third, senators and representatives are elected for regional interests, thus some are likely to become protectionist. For instance, there have been a few attempts to introduce textile quota legislation to the House and Senate. A Senator and a Congressman from South Carolina introduced the Textile and Apparel Trade Act of 1987. The textile industry is one of the major industries in South Carolina.

Finally, the ramifications of protectionism for a specific, production-oriented industry (e.g., the textile industry) are likely to be highly evident and visible. Yet the benefits, if any, for consumers are likely to be diffuse and indirect, because consumers buy so many goods produced in a variety of nations around the world.

By the same token, retailers, as major importers of textile and apparel products, have continued the debate on the direction of U.S. textile trade policy. U.S. retailers insist that while they purchase the vast majority of their goods from U.S. producers, the ability to source merchandise in the world market and to meet customer demands for quality, variety, and price are central to the industry's
health (Samolis & Emrich, 1986). Retailers suggested that the enactment of the Textiles and Apparel Act of 1987 would cause widespread layoffs in the retail industry, virtually offsetting any "gains" realized in the textile and apparel industries. They also predicted that the vast majority of states would experience net job losses, whereas only the small number of traditional textile and apparel producing states would gain from protectionist legislation. In the meantime, consumers are still not represented.

Summary and Conclusions

This paper examined the effect of textile and apparel import restrictions on the economic welfare of the U.S., drawing on economic concepts. The economic effects of tariffs and quotas were analyzed, and the concepts of consumer surplus and producer surplus were used to aid the analysis of the welfare effect. From the analysis, it was concluded that the imposition of a tariff and a quota result in: 1) a redistribution of economic welfare from domestic consumers to domestic producers, to the domestic government, or importing retailers; and 2) a net welfare loss since not all of the reduction in consumers' benefit is offset by gains to producers, government, and retailers.

Differences between tariffs and quotas were discussed. The last section presented some reasons why consumers' interests are not as well represented in policy-making as the interest of manufacturers and workers in the industry. By applying economic concepts to the textile and apparel field, this paper has attempted to provide more solid information about the current import restrictions of textile and apparel product categories, and their impact on consumers, manufacturers, importing retailers, and government.
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Increasingly complex worldwide social, political, and economic issues emphasize the need for global understanding. Underlying many of these global issues are the changes brought about by greater worldwide interdependency in areas such as resource distribution and technological development.

An issue generally encompasses multiple interconnected problems and concerns for which there is no single best resolution. Rather, there could be a variety of solutions and choices depending upon the perspective used in the analysis and evaluation of a particular issue. Because people and nations have different foci, backgrounds, and orientations, it is unrealistic to expect them to be totally neutral or objective in their understanding and evaluation of global issues. However, more unilaterally acceptable, creative resolutions might be reached when a global perspective using cross-cultural knowledge is the basis for action.

This growing cross-cultural need for mutual understanding and collaboration highlights the importance of global human learning and vision (Barer-Stein, 1987). The home economics field and its specialty areas are in a unique position to promote a global perspective because of the field's primary focus on universal human needs ("Developing a Global," 1988). Global concerns cannot be compartmentalized away from the field of home economics (Hamilton, 1986). One vision for the future of the home economics profession is a global commitment (Deacon, 1987), where home economics professionals are informed about macro-level issues and endorse action that fosters empowerment of people to deal with their own lives (Murray, 1986). The objective of this commitment, however, should not be to westernize the global community; rather, there needs to be a focus on the positive and productive aspects of all societies (Elmore, 1989). This objective and relativistic focus requires creative and critical thinking skills extending beyond the parameters of one nation or culture.

Baily and Firebaugh (1986) have recommended an integration of global concepts, as well as an international perspective into home economics courses in higher education. This recommendation specifically identifies the need to understand how cultural complexities and developments relate to various global issues influencing individual and family choices and behaviors. To some extent, this is being done. Elmore (1989) surveyed 185 U.S. institutions granting undergraduate home economics degrees and found course offerings in ten different home economics areas including some discussion of international topics. Sixty-three percent of the reporting institutions had textiles and clothing courses that incorporated international topics.

Curriculum by its very nature needs to be future-oriented. Its purpose is not so much to teach content but to prepare students for future endeavors by teaching them to think creatively and critically through the use of specific content. Much discussion about the future of the textiles and clothing field has taken place during the 1980s, and several suggestions have been made concerning the future direction of the field. It has been suggested that a focused and unified curriculum is needed to integrate textiles and clothing into a meaningful system with broad scope and application (Horn, 1984) and to examine connections among specific aspects of the field within a broader context (Hamilton, 1987). In addition, it has been recommended that this broader context might utilize an international focus (Nordquist, 1984-1985) or a global perspective (Forney, 1984; Forney, 1985a; Forney, 1986; Forney, 1987; Hamilton, in this volume; Rabolt & Forney, 1987).

The textiles and clothing field is unified through universal aspects of the human condition, i.e., producing and wearing clothing and adornment and concern with personal appearance. It focuses in a variety of ways on the production, distribution, and use of textile products. These processes and behaviors are worldwide and interdependent and reflect a wide range of global issues that relate to
human well-being as people engage in the economic, social and political acquisition and use of textiles and clothing. Thus, the textiles and clothing field has the components of a framework for globally focused curricula and research. Also, this framework is appropriate given the contemporary reality of increasing worldwide interdependence and the need to prepare students to take their place in this world. The purpose of this paper is to present a framework that links creative and critical thinking to global issues and the development of a broad-based global perspective.

What is a Global Perspective?

A global perspective moves an individual away from an ethnocentric thinking frame, in which one's own culture is viewed as dominant, toward a sensitivity to human diversity. Elsewhere in this volume Hamilton looks at the problems related to ethnocentricity and presents a strong argument for using a global perspective in the textiles and clothing field. Through a global perspective we develop an understanding of other cultures' views on shared social, political, and economic issues (Forney, 1989). Encompassing diverse foci, backgrounds, and orientations, a global perspective uses cross-cultural study to generate knowledge regarding the macro interdependency of humankind.

Four educational goals have been associated with a global perspective (Lamy, 1983) and linked to home economics (Forney, 1985b; Forney, 1989) and textiles and clothing (Forney, 1984): (1) to generate an understanding and appreciation of basic commonalities and differences across cultures; (2) to recognize global interdependence and appreciate the complex and constantly changing nature of the world's political, economic, and social systems; (3) to develop awareness of how perceptions, values, and priorities differ among various individuals, groups, organizations, and cultures; and (4) to develop analytical and evaluative skills leading to creative and critical thinking about global issues.

Implementing curricula with a global perspective requires a framework that can shape content, develop teaching strategies, and focus desired outcomes. Many educators have had little or no background using a global perspective and thus have not formed a commitment to this way of thinking. They may feel frustration due to a lack of supportive information and materials. Broad-based information drawn from multiple sources, particularly non-western sources, is often difficult to obtain. Many developing countries have few or no indigenous resources—i.e., professionals in the field, educational or governmental institutions, or media—to investigate and report on the local impact of a particular issue. Reports from many developing countries may be compiled by outsiders who may have perceptions and knowledge bases biasing their assessment of a particular issue.

Another problem related to using a global perspective in curriculum stems from the minimal amount of research conducted to test concepts and principles in non-western cultures. Also, cross-cultural research in the area of textiles and clothing, particularly research related to global issues, is extremely limited. Thus, the knowledge base needed to support a global perspective is still in the formative stage.

Definition of terms is yet another problem associated with a global perspective. A common, but incorrect, practice is to equate global with international. International refers to the mutual intercourse or reciprocity between two or more nations or peoples. It has specific application and is generally related to trade, communication, technology, consumption patterns, and resource allocation as nations and people interact and are influenced by each other.

Issues arise in international relationships as participants react to a variety of internal and external factors. Often, assessments of international relationships focus on the positive or negative aspects of the intercourse and may address the relationship from only one aspect (for example, the economic but not the social costs to a participant). Another problem may arise from analyzing the impact of the relationship as it pertains to only one participant, i.e. the United States but not its trade partner. Also, important aspects of an issue experienced by all participants might be overlooked; assumptions might be made that all participants have similar expectations from the relationship; or, assumptions are made that all participants have similar experiences upon which they draw information used in the interaction. These types of oversights and misunderstandings contribute to international discord.
Global, on the other hand, transcends international. It has the potential to apply knowledge, concepts, and principles across all societies. A global perspective encourages the investigation of interdependent internal and external factors that influence issues. Scientific inquiry, decision making, and problem solving related to global issues are initiated more aptly, and outcomes have broader application since the process is no longer bound by the notion of international reciprocity or how specific political or social entities relate to each other. From this perspective, issues are perceived as global phenomena having a unilateral worldwide impact.

Using a Global Perspective for Creative and Critical Thinking

Understanding complex global issues can be enhanced by providing an enriched environment with many options and experiences for learning. When pedagogy is based on limited knowledge frameworks, an individual can be articulate only about contexts in which that knowledge can be perceived and applied. Knowledge empowers an individual to think and reason. Creative and critical thinking processes are active, interdependent methods of generating and evaluating knowledge.

Creative thinking assesses validity and utility of information. This innovative process requires preparation, involves working at the edge of one's capacity, uses an internal locus of evaluation, involves reframing ideas, and is facilitated by free-flowing thought (Marzano et al., 1988).

Critical thinking tests assertions (Marzano et al., 1988) as they relate to the objective world and the wider social, political, and cultural issues affecting how one lives, learns, and develops (Pyros, 1986; Wesson, 1987). This assessment process clearly states the question being investigated, seeks reasons and information, uses credible sources, keeps to the original and main concern, takes a position but changes when evidence and reason indicates, is precise, and is sensitive to others' abilities and backgrounds (Ennis, 1987).

These macro thinking processes include scientific inquiry, decision making and problem solving. Scientific inquiry makes predictions about phenomena and generates new understanding. Decision making involves selecting among alternative choices and develops plans of action. Problem solving seeks attainment of goals and suggests viable alternatives.

A Global Perspective Framework

Given increased worldwide interdependence and complex global issues, there is a need for knowledge frameworks that promote creative and critical thinking in relation to world issues. Previous educational frameworks for learning knowledge may no longer be appropriate. Schwartz and Ogilvy (1979) identified seven trends in disciplinary knowledge paradigms: (1) simple to complex, (2) hierarchical to heterarchical, (3) mechanical to holographic, (4) determinante to indeterminate, (5) linear causality to mutual causality, (6) assembly to morphogenesis (that is, the possibility that a system can produce new unpredicted forms of knowledge), and (7) objective to perspective. These seven trends in knowledge paradigms support the global perspective framework that follows. This global framework includes diverse and complex knowledge; is heterarchical, holographic, and indeterminate; demonstrates mutual causality; generates new knowledge; and changes perspective.

Vertical integration in thinking is exemplified by Bloom (1956) who developed a taxonomy to identify and define educational objectives in the cognitive domain. This classification scheme places learning outcomes in hierarchical order from general or simple to specific or complex. Knowledge, understanding, and thinking skills—the basis of creative and critical thinking—are in the cognitive domain. Learning accomplished at a lower level in the hierarchy is included in each successive, more complex level. There are six major levels in the cognitive domain: (1) knowledge, (2) comprehension, (3) application, (4) analysis, (5) synthesis, and (6) evaluation.

In assessing the thinking skills associated with the four global perspective goals, there seems to be both a hierarchical and heterarchical order. The complexities of each goal varies by the level of understanding required; thus, the goals might be considered hierarchical. However, the goals are also heterarchical in that information gained at each level is interdependent with each previous level, and all levels contribute equally to a global perspective. These goals can be conceptualized and organized in the following order: (1) understand historical experiences and cultural and
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physical environments, (2) comprehend diversity, 
(3) apply universals, (4) analyze interdependence, 
(5) integrate global issues, and (6) evaluate 
predications, choices, and solutions to global 
issues.

In comparing the vertical order of Bloom’s 
taxonomy for the cognitive domain with the goals of 
a global perspective, I identified a relationship 
among cognitive levels, creative and critical thinking 
processes, and global perspective goals. This 
relationship is illustrated in the global perspective 
framework presented in Figure 1. The following 
discussion presents a rationale and example for 
each of the thinking processes contributing to the 
development of a global perspective.

Know History, Culture and Physical 
Environment

All people are influenced by their own individual 
histories as well as their cultural and physical 
environments. The parameters of one’s 
experiences and understandings undoubtedly 
influence (a) knowledge and access to knowledge 
and (b) how information is relayed and interpreted. 
Knowledge or information is the first level in the 
thinking process; it requires one to remember and 
to recall previously learned information. Knowledge 
includes concepts, principles, facts, and theories.

It is important to know our own history and 
culture and have an awareness of our environment. 
This helps us to understand where we have been 
and how we have come to the place where we are 
now. This rationale holds true as well for 
developing an understanding of other cultures. 
Hamilton (in this volume) argues that it is the 
cultural system that defines reality for humans, 
provides definition of self, and sets the rules for 
interaction in the world. In order to understand 
others, we first need to know something about their 
history, their culture and their physical environment. 
This knowledge provides the context within which 
an understanding is developed about why and how 
other people act and react to particular events and 
situations.

In the area of textiles and clothing this 
knowledge base might include factual information 
about the historical development of dress and 
adornment patterns and textile and clothing 
production and marketing. In addition, information 
might include characteristics of the physical 
environment such as available raw materials.

Besides facts about diverse people and cultures, 
 basic concepts, principles, and theories need to be 
learned. Theoretical perspectives such as symbolic 
interaction, concepts such as consumerism, and 
principles such as proportion in design are the 
basic premises upon which knowledge is tested, 
analyzed, and structured.

![Figure 1. Global perspective framework.](image)

Comprehend Diversity

Understanding the meaning of information 
enables one to translate, interpret, or estimate how 
that information impacts a people. Comprehending 
worldwide diversity relies on understanding the 
relationships or ordering of various components 
found within different structures. To understand 
inherent differences across peoples and how they
have adapted to their environment, one might look at diversity across social, economic, political, ideological, kinship, aesthetic, and communication systems. Further understanding of diverse peoples can come from an understanding of normative patterns (values and beliefs) or consumer patterns (lifestyle and levels and modes of consumption).

Comprehending diversity across people generates better understanding about why differences exist. For example, if basic knowledge included information about levels of textile fiber consumption throughout the world, then the next step would be to interpret why this consumption level varies cross-culturally. This interpretation could be developed in relation to other known facts about available resources, economic bases or social pressure to consume.

The United States is the largest per capita consumer of textile fibers in the world. In comparison, low per capita fiber consumption is the norm in most developing nations. Reasons for the global disparity in fiber consumption are varied and complex. Differences may be due to available resources, for instance, manufactured fiber production or types of natural fibers grown. In India the ratio of cotton to non-cotton fibers consumed is 90:10. Such a high reliance on an agricultural product (cotton) for textile fiber is a major societal problem as cotton competes in the agricultural context with food, a resource needed to feed the huge population. India faces a declining per capita availability of cloth due to high inflation, dislocation in the rate of growth of per capita real income, a growing population, and government restrictions placed on textile fiber and cloth production (Radhakrishnan, 1986). Why doesn't India simply convert to manufactured fibers to solve this need for more fiber? Why doesn't India build more textile manufacturing plants to produce additional cloth? Much of India's textile industry is concentrated in the decentralized sector that produces handloomed cloth often made from handspun natural fibers. The Indian government has encouraged this sector rather than the industrialized sector that produces manufactured fibers and machine-produced cloth, because the decentralized sector can employ large numbers of people using local resources to produce cloth. In addition, the industrialized sector requires large amounts of energy, which is costly and in limited supply in India. Thus, just knowing that cultures are different is not enough. Only by understanding the complex network of factors shaping a particular society is it possible to comprehend why differences exist.

**Apply Universals**

The application of knowledge (that is, rules, theories, laws, concepts, principles, and methods) requires the use of information in new and concrete situations. This is the first step in thinking creatively and critically with a global perspective. Much information included in American educational paradigms is generated from western cultures and is comprehended from a western perspective. Often this knowledge is assumed to be valid across diverse people even though it may not have been applied cross-culturally. Universals embrace commonalities across cultures and have been determined as such through a systematic application of knowledge to diverse peoples.

Basic human physiological needs of food, clothing, and shelter are examples of universals; however, the level of need given to these universals may vary by culture. For example, Maslow's (1954) human needs hierarchy moves the individual from basic physiological needs through the more complex human needs of safety, belongingness and love, self-esteem, and finally self-actualization. It would be easy to assume that this hierarchy has universal application. But in testing Maslow's needs hierarchy in the People's Republic of China, Nevis (1983) found the focus to be on social order, not individual needs, as the individual progressed through four levels: belonging, physiology, safety, and self-actualization in the service of society. Thus, although clothing is a need in both China and the United States, there is a difference in why this is so. In the United States, the individual is more apt to use clothing first to meet basic needs and secondly to reflect individualism as progress is made towards self-actualization. In China, however, group belonging is more important than even basic needs. It is only when the individual has reached the highest level of social acceptance and belonging that actualization is attained. Thus, clothing reflecting group membership and social approval may be valued more in this culture than clothing expressing individuality. An example of the importance given to clothing in China was evident during the Cultural Revolution from 1966 to 1976 when clothing expressed massive acceptance of one ideology—communism. To westerners, it may seem that concern for what one wore played little if any part in the daily life of Chinese people during this time since everyone wore similar garb, i.e., the
Mao suit or Lenin suit. However, clothing was extremely important because to deviate from the approved social and political norm for dress would jeopardize one's place within society as well as one's personal safety (N. Pan, personal communication, March 6, 1989). First to be accepted and finally to contribute to social order leads to the highest level of self-actualization in China. This may be reflected through clothing.

Analyze Interdependence

In a global perspective a wide array of interdependent factors are analyzed to determine underlying causes and effects. Analysis relies on understanding the content and structure of information and the recognition of related knowledge. Recognizing interdependence comes from extrapolating to other contexts an understanding of the complex and continual changes taking place in normative patterns, consumer patterns, and world systems.

Interdependence could be viewed simply as shared resources such as the manufacturing of textiles or apparel in one country for distribution and use in another country. However, interdependency is complex; there are many interrelated social, economic, and political costs. The twin-plant concept is used by some countries to manufacture labor-intensive apparel products at a cost lower than could be achieved with a domestic workforce. For example, apparel components made of U.S.-produced cloth are cut in the United States and sewn in maquiladora plants in Mexico. How does this process affect other aspects of Mexican and U.S. societies? What is the impact of the twin-plant arrangement on the economy of this developing country? One of the major reasons this type of manufacturing process is used is to take advantage of cheap labor. How does this affect the U.S. labor market in ways such as loss of domestic jobs? This production arrangement generally brings employment to countries where work is needed to improve the level of living. Has the standard of living increased in Mexico where these maquiladora plants are located? Is the quality of life better for U.S. consumers because apparel products can be purchased at a lower cost? How does this type of manufacturing affect other facets of Mexico's textile and apparel industries? What about other countries such as Japan, which may also be taking advantage of the twin-plant concept? How does Japan's business negotiations in Mexico affect Mexican workers and consumers in other countries? Interdependence cannot be viewed as a simple exchange of commodities; it may affect the quality of life and the political and social stability of diverse peoples.

Integrate Global Issues

Global issues touch every aspect of human life; most have a direct or indirect relationship to textiles and clothing. Integrating emerging global issues involves synthesizing information from different areas into new forms of understanding, plans of action, and viable alternatives.

Global issues reflect concerns with the quality of life of all people. The earlier example of the maquiladora plants in Mexico raises several global issues. Are the ethics used in doing business in a developing country the same as in the home country? Or, are people and resources being exploited for the betterment of nonindigenous populations?

What about the global distribution of consumer products? How does this impact people's lives? Disposable diapers are major contributors to environmental pollution. Already a major problem in the United States and Europe, what will happen when developing countries with their large birth rates also are able to afford and desire to use this type of product?

Societies are being transformed due to rapid communication and transportation and growing interdependency in the manufacture and distribution of consumer products. Westernization of non-western people is a concern as unique cultural traits are replaced with westernized patterns. Traditional dress patterns developed in response to local needs and resources. These unique patterns of dress are functional as well as aesthetic expressions of a culture. Many indigenous dress patterns are being replaced with western styles rather than being modified or redesigned to make them compatible with contemporary life. What are the ramifications of these changes in dress patterns to other traditional aspects of a culture? What will the diffusion of western products do to the consumption patterns of non-western people? What will happen to the economic bases of countries as people rely more heavily on resources that may not be locally available to meet their clothing needs?
When a global issue has been identified, it becomes necessary to develop a broad understanding of all its facets based on a knowledge of diverse peoples, their similarities and differences, and their global interdependencies. Resolution of an issue may require the generation of new information through scientific inquiry, it might call for a plan of action via a systematic decision-making approach, or it might depend on identifying viable alternatives using known information. In each case, the issue is reframed with a global perspective, and creative thought is enhanced through a broad-based understanding of diverse people.

Evaluate Outcomes

Elements of knowledge, comprehension, application, analysis, and integration, in addition to judgments based on clearly defined criteria, are used in a global perspective to assess predictions and explanations (the outcome of scientific inquiry), choices (the outcome of decision making), and solutions (the outcome of problem solving). Ethnocentric thinking is recognized as a potential bias in determining outcomes; however, this problem can be diminished by questioning the criteria used in evaluation. Is the solution equitable to all involved? Are the proposed choices possible within the cultural frameworks under consideration? Is this explanation determined by facts based in the social realities of those concerned? Is this prediction founded upon tested theory? These are all critical assessments of the proposed outcomes using a global perspective. If and when these outcomes are accepted, then they too contribute to a global perspective.

Summary

A global perspective supports the philosophy that learning needs to be relevant to the worldwide interdependence of individuals, families, and societies. Emerging global issues cannot be addressed through ethnocentric knowledge bases; rather, thinking processes are needed to assess world interdependence creatively and critically.

Understanding the relationship of human diversity to global issues is an essential part of the educational process. Knowledge is a potentially powerful agent of change; cross-cultural knowledge can contribute to world citizenship. Humankind shares a responsibility to seek mutually satisfying resolutions to global issues. The field of textiles and clothing can be a critical link in developing this global awareness and understanding through curricula, research, and philosophical statements that reflect a global perspective and seek resolutions to global issues.
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Worlds Apart: The High Price of Ethnocentricity for Clothing and Textiles and the Cultivation of a Global Perspective
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...Man, proud man, Drest in a little brief authority,
Most ignorant of what he’s most assur’d,
His glassy essence, like an angry ape,
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven
As make the angels weep.  
Shakespeare
Measure for Measure
Act II, Scene 2

Shakespeare was masterful when it came to engaging the reader in the process of connotation, i.e., in suggesting meaning that surpasses the specific context for which a passage was written. In the passage cited above "glassy," both in and out of context, can take on a variety of meanings: brittle or fragile, mirrorlike or reflecting (Singer, 1984), or transparent, revealing the essential, stripped-down character of the proud individual—the individual as an empty vessel. It is this latter interpretation of "glassy" that I explore in this paper to address the problem of ethnocentrism for an academic field in general, and for clothing and textiles in particular. A central point in this paper is as follows: Without a cultural system to define reality and an individual’s place in that reality, humans would find it difficult to perceive any reality. From birth, humans fill themselves with the reality of their own cultural system and thereby acquire a definition of self vis-à-vis the rest of the world and rules for interacting within it.

Ethnocentrism and Human Nature

The notion that cultural systems define humans’ realities is as profoundly threatening to some as it is comforting to others. This notion does not negate the importance of individual psychology and physiology in explaining individual behavior within a cultural system, but rather suggests that individual psychology apart from cultural context provides an inadequate framework for explaining or evaluating behavior. After all, "deviant" is largely a matter of cultural definition. Similarly, what one feels, i.e., visceral responses to observations and occurrences, is to a large extent directed and bounded by one’s cultural system (Geertz, 1973b).

While the extent to which one necessarily relies on one’s cultural system to order and provide meaning may be a debatable point, reliance on it to any extent quite naturally leads to some measure of ethnocentrism, that is, to the preoccupation with one’s own culture. Ethnocentrism generally operates as part of a non-conscious ideology—an assumed, unquestioned framework in which other beliefs and attitudes may be judged. Hence, one doesn’t decide to become ethnocentric; one just is. Ben and Bem (1970) illustrate the nature of such a non-conscious ideology, noting that "only a very intelligent and unparochial fish is aware that its environment is wet—how else could it be?" (p. 89). Unfortunately, to the extent that one is unaware of his/her own ethnocentrism, one is also unable to comprehend the possibilities that would await if awareness and some measure of transcendence of it were possible.

Ethnocentrism results, implicitly or explicitly, as one evaluates groups different from one’s own as inferior and often threatening. One learns to be ethnocentric. Berreman et al. (1971) explained that:

in every society, people begin to learn their own culture from the time they are born, and part of this culture is a set of standards of judgment....that guide the individual in deciding what is important and what is not, what is good and what is bad, what is moral and what is wicked (p. 34).

Ethnocentrism may be both adaptive and maladaptive. If most members of a society did not judge its fundamental structure to be important and appropriate *they would either cease to participate in these activities or be so full of psychological conflict about them that their participation would not be very useful in continuing the society as it is* (Berreman, 1971, p. 34). Ethnocentrism, therefore, contributes to the maintenance of an ongoing cultural system, for if anything is innate in humans,
it is our social construction of a shared reality and concern with minimizing threat to that construction.

On the other hand, ethnocentrism may be maladaptive when dealing in a complex world in which different cultural systems must interact. These maladaptive results of ethnocentrism are obvious as we read of conflict reported in the international news: Ethnocentrism allows one people to define another as less than fully human or deficient in some way and to proceed, whether with malevolent or philanthropic motivations, to exploit or to save them, or something in between, all the time reflecting "the complacency with which we come to accept ourselves and our rightness of reality" (Albert, p. 563).

The maladaptive results of ethnocentrism may be mediated by the notion of cultural relativity: the proposition that a particular custom or belief found in a different cultural system should be evaluated in terms of the interrelatedness of that occurrence to the system in which it is found, rather than by the standards of the outside observer's cultural system. In the extreme, however, this may result in "reverse ethnocentrism," a modern term for the kind of noble savage imagery promulgated by the Rousseauian assumption that it is we who are bad and those non-western others who are good.

A more temperate adoption of cultural relativism implies an attitude of respect toward differing cultural systems. This is a view that

excludes both strong ethnocentrism and strong xenophilia...In this interpretation, relativism has been found useful in identifying patterns of interaction in one's own cultural system,...in seeing the place of Western culture as one among many viable and legitimate alternatives, and in coming to comprehend and evaluate a particular cultural manifestation and its function, e.g., a custom, a behavior, an item of technology, or an idea, in the context of the cultural system in which it is found (Albert, 1963, p. 563).

The American World View and Mediators Against a Global Perspective

The framework of one's own cultural system, in which other beliefs and attitudes can be tested, is an example of a world view (Kearney, 1984). Geertz (1973a) described a world view as a "[people's mental] picture of the way things in sheer actuality are, their concept of nature, of self, of society. It contains their most comprehensive ideas of order" (p. 127). Hoebel and Frost (1976) explained world view by noting that "institutions, relationships, arts, and technologies vary throughout the world in manifestly observable forms, but underlying them are the existential postulates that orient a people's particular slant on life and the ways in which they organize their culture" (p. 324). On the other hand, ethos expresses a people's qualitative feeling—their emotional and moral sensing of the way things are and ought to be—their ethical system (Hoebel & Frost, 1976, p. 324). Geertz (1973a) described a people's ethos as the "moral and aesthetic style and mood; it is the underlying attitude toward themselves and their world that life reflects" (p. 127). Both world view and ethos are expressed in technology, social relations, and specific ideology throughout the cultural system (Hamilton, 1987). Geertz (cited in Lett, 1987) explained the interaction between world view and ethos by noting that people in all societies make normative judgments based on factual premises and vice versa, but that there may be no logical consistency between the two concepts. For example, while the ethos of Catholicism has changed enormously over the past several hundred years, the Catholic world view has remained essentially the same.

Hoebel and Frost's (1976) contrast of American and Hopi world views is illustrative. The Hopi perceive the world as a delicately balanced integrated system in which the individual must cooperate with others to maintain the sensitive harmony on which survival of the system depends. By contrast, the American world view is characterized by a commitment to discovering the mechanistic laws by which the universe is governed in order to manipulate and control it. This encourages an ego-centered, rather than a group-centered, view of the individual's relationship to the universe.¹

¹ See Lukes (1973) for an illuminating essay on the varying characters of individualism across Western cultures (focusing specifically on the United States in comparison to European countries).
This strong focus on ego-centered manipulation and control of the universe was critical to the development of the United States and explains much of the political and technological primacy it had assumed in the world by the end of the nineteenth century. The American world view and interacting ethos result in certain assumptions about the world that influence the configuration of our social institutions, interactions, motivations, beliefs, and behaviors. These are assumptions derived from a world view rooted in the maintenance of primacy over other political/economic systems, and they are reflected in the rhetoric of politicians and others who talk endlessly of "regaining," "reestablishing," "recommitting," and of doing so by "stamping out," "driving out," and "wiping out." Our sense of loss and threat at the demise of America's primacy in many areas of technology and influence explains the appeal of those who promise its return. It explains why we continue to assume that they had better learn about us and our language, rather than we about them and their language, and it explains why our views and our students' views of the effective universe, in all but the most abstract way, are so much more provincial and uninformed than are those of students in other industrialized countries. This insistence on accommodation to us, coupled with promises from politicians that America must never be allowed to lose its primacy in the world, illustrate some of the ways our own ethnocentric American world view and ethos mediate against any easy accommodation to a global perspective.

Marketplace Ethos in the Late Twentieth Century

The marketplace ethos that dominates the structure and functioning of most business operations is an extraordinarily powerful mediator against a global perspective. Because so much of the clothing and textile field's claim to relevancy is couched in relation to the market economy, the ethos of the American economic system has much influence on our disciplinary self-concept, justification for existence, and approach to doing our work. The American economic ethos is one that applauds the profit motive, competition, individualism, and short-run agendas and evaluations. It is not surprising that in the Garner and Buckley (1988) study, retailers judged history, languages, and nearly everything not immediately useful to immediate business operations to be of minimal value for merchandising students.

In Jolly and Branson's (in this volume) examination of channel interdependencies and prospects for cooperation among channel members, they assert the importance of "management mentality" as a factor in channel members' assessments of one another and their transactions. Indeed, management mentality is part of America's marketplace ethos. I would assert that this mentality is a threat, rather than an asset, to America's economic primacy, and has social and ethical ramifications that extend far beyond the issue of cooperation/competition in the soft goods chain. As shifts in world demographic patterns and shifts in production, labor, and trade continue to wreak havoc on the stasis the U.S. seeks to reestablish, we may discover that the marketplace ethos that was once required for America's economic growth and world prominence is the same ethos responsible for America's economic undoing in a much expanded world, where other participants have redefined roles and expectations. This operating American marketplace ethos serves to diminish opportunities for assuming more measured, longer-term approaches to systemic improvements in business operations. It promotes, instead, a short-term mind set with respect to marketplace planning and methods/criteria for evaluating success. Thus this ethos makes substantive change, except in the face of severe crisis, nearly impossible.

Academic Ethos in the Late Twentieth Century

Not surprisingly, academia's ethos in the late twentieth century (occasional bits of lip service to the contrary) tends to mirror the ethos of the marketplace. Professional schools run roughshod over any semblance of learning for its own sake. Students continue to seek higher education on the presumption that it will ensure long-term material, rather than intellectual, satisfaction; delight in learning is seen as accidental and surprising.

A similar problem exists in the area of academic scholarship and research. The operating philosophy values applied research focused on short-term results and immediate problem-solving. In fact, traditional "academic" inquiry, which by definition has little or no applied value, falls into increasing disfavor as both public and private funding sources (themselves operating with a marketplace mentality) reward scholarship consistent with the marketplace model. This same pressure influences tenure and appointment committees as faculty members must not only be
teachers and scholars; they are increasingly expected to be successful entrepreneurs, evaluated on the basis of their ability to bring money into the academy.

A Global Perspective: What It Is and Is Not

Clothing and textiles subject matter justifies our collectivity. But at times it also tends to mediate against a global perspective. Traditionally, our concern with fashion, for example, has allowed us to delude ourselves that we are globally oriented, for fashion is international in scope. A global perspective (see Forney, in this volume) is not mere concern with marketplace availability and costs in the global context. Knowledge of textile/apparel production, pounds exported, employment shifts, and the like in the international market is essential in some contexts, but such facility is in no way evidence of a global perspective. On the contrary, as illustrated elsewhere (Hamilton & Dickerson, 1990) such data often mask underlying substantive issues germane to a more comprehensive understanding. In fact, facility with figures alone can encourage ethnocentrism.

Similarly, a global perspective does not merely consist of reviewing what people in other cultures wear. Data regarding "other" people can have a seductive, exotic quality. Unfortunately, studying "other" people's dress (or anything else) without consideration for the larger contexts in which they are embedded tends to be useless if not dangerous. What is required to develop a global perspective relative to dress is the study of the phenomenon within both a theoretical framework and a cultural context.

Nor is a global perspective satisfied by concern over what is being shown in Paris, Milan, and Tokyo this season. Attention to fashion and the rise and fall from fashion of designers and of fashion forms represents an exotica that excites students with fantasies of international fashion buying. However, reciting a litany of major and minor international designers, regardless of its value in other contexts, is not a reflection of a global perspective.

By contrast, a global perspective is one "that seeks knowledge and understanding of people, nations, cultures, systems, and problems; knowledge of how the world affects us; and knowledge of how we affect the world" (Study Commission, 1987, p. 12). In the Report of the Study Commission on Global Perspectives (Study Commission, 1987), the authors addressed the need to foster a global perspective in secondary schools. But the report's potential for application to traditional content in undergraduate clothing and textiles curricula is rich, as evident when exploring the following four themes it addresses:

1. Analysis of the world as a series of interrelated systems, so as to "understand the vast interdependent nature of the world in terms of its physical, biological, economic, political, and communication and evaluative systems" (Study Commission, 1987, p. 17).

2. Perspectives on the development of modern civilization, because "without a general sense of time and place, it is difficult to understand who you are or where you are in the long train of events that make up human history. Without it, one may become a prisoner of the present and the proximate" (Study Commission, 1987, p. 18).

3. Cultural understanding that includes a "consideration of basic human rights and needs, and of the ethical responsibility of acting as the agent of a powerful mediator and power and influence over many individuals and cultural systems that have little ability to resist. (Study Commission, 1987, p. 20).

4. Preparation of citizens to make public policy, so that they may "actively engage in analytical and creative thinking at all levels, sharpening their ability to recognize concepts, problems, and issues, to define them...to analyze alternative solutions, to calculate costs and benefits, and to make responsible public choices" (Study Commission, 1987, p. 20).

Global Perspective for Clothing and Textiles: Why and How

It is important to adopt a global perspective because without it, our longevity is seriously limited (a) as a viable academic field and (b) as citizen participants in a nation state that is part of a complex world community. As an academic field,
unless we comprehend, predict, and respond to a more global definition of the future, we will die of our own irrelevancy. Global shifts and accommodations are effecting profound changes that have an impact on the textile and apparel industries as well as pedagogical and scholarly concerns in clothing and textiles. If we ignore these changes, we will soon be ignored by decision makers and policy setters in both the industry and the academy. In other words, our intellectual and academic survival depends on cultivating a global perspective.

At the present time, many of us and our students are ill-equipped to participate in a world community. It is now possible for students to graduate from 75% of all American colleges and universities without having studied European history, and less than half of all colleges and universities have a foreign language requirement for graduation, down from nearly 90% in 1966 (Bennett, 1984). It would seem that we are becoming less, rather than more, globally oriented. In Garner and Buckley’s (1988) study, retailers judged even courses on international trade to be of little value to success in retailing. Indeed, the goals of educating for a global perspective may well be antithetical to the goals of educating for the here and now of retailers’ perceived needs. On the other hand, we don’t know what retailers’ needs will be in the future, nor what form distribution will take. But change is certain. One hopes that we survive as a field longer than the myopic retailers who have never bothered to address their future needs from a global perspective.

Hence, a global perspective is not just a nice thing to have; it may be an ideology for survival. In the frontispiece to his text, Roe (1971) wrote:

"Every society depends on other societies, and with every advance in technology the interdependence increases. A nation whose citizens are generally ignorant of other peoples in the world must to that degree be impeded in achieving its own goals, for we are at the stage in human history when national affairs cannot be separated from world development. A global perspective asserts that people everywhere are relevant...In an important sense, it seeks to discover the possibilities for humankind. And it, therefore, contributes to the design of humankind’s future (Row, 1971, Frontispiece)."

A global perspective is a holistic attitude and approach to learning, analysis, and interpretation. Obtaining a global perspective necessitates conscious unlearning and new learning:

This understanding does not come naturally. These abilities and skills are ones that are learned after some degree of ethnocentrism is unlearned (Study Commission, 1987, p. 12).

Because a global perspective does not come naturally, a strategy of conscious attention to it is required. Forney (in this volume) outlines such a strategy, one with implications of enormous consequence for both teaching and scholarship in clothing and textiles. Her paper fosters an awareness of the fact that while teaching content is not so difficult, teaching critical thinking, teaching speculation, teaching others to play with ideas, and teaching others to become masterful in making connections and predicting consequences all represent a qualitative leap in what constitutes teaching; first we may have to teach ourselves. It is a leap, however, that generates a new excitement for teaching as is suggested in Gowan’s (1988) approach to teaching social imagination, "a necessary ingredient of social intelligence" (p. iv). "Imagining how events could be otherwise than they are is a hallmark of freedom and power in human beings" (p. iv). He explains:

"[It] involves us in new concepts and principles, in new ways of using our minds to grasp complexities we do not yet comprehend...to construct new social realities both locally and globally. Social imagination is not merely for the sake of academic knowledge; it must include our feelings, and it must include our acting. Thinking and feeling and acting can be integrated. And when this interaction flourishes, we remake ourselves and our world (p. iv).

We cannot assume, just because our subject matter includes international content, that a global perspective will happen by osmosis. As Berman and Miel (1983) and Forney (in this volume) have indicated, an international orientation is only a small part of a global perspective. Nor can we assume that a global perspective is acquired through the "general education" component of students’ curricula. As Rhodes (1985) has argued,
knowledge, of whatever kind, is ultimately not redemptive; people are...Courses do not give coherence. Requirements do not lead to wisdom. We shall never help our students achieve the integration of understanding that we advocate by piling on more courses or tinkering with the curriculum (p. 80).

The organization of our disciplinary specialization may work both for and against us in this venture. We are told that "students long for a coherent sense of knowledge, but the structure of most disciplines discourages it" (Rhodes, 1985, p. 80). Certainly, the multidisciplinary structure of clothing and textiles sometimes seems to fragment any sense of cohesiveness we might otherwise share. On the other hand, if the history of textiles and dress is a microcosm of the history of the world, then we have more potential for fostering a global perspective than many other disciplinary areas.

A similar argument can be made for scholarship. Faculty search and evaluation committees often look for academic expertise, a publication record, and professional connections,

...with little regard for breadth or interest and largeness of outlook. Our most gifted scholars should be encouraged to roam widely, to speak not only within but beyond their disciplines, exploring their disciplines' foundations, examining their relationships, and pursuing their implications (Rhodes, 1985, p. 80).

This is not an argument in favor of breadth versus depth, but rather in favor of depth and breadth. As scholars, we must know something intimately, but we must be able to apply the creative and critical thinking described above to its larger meaning--to cut through narrow applications to broader implications and conceptions. We must become more narrow and more broad simultaneously, and encourage each other in these processes. For just as the multidisciplinary nature of the subject matter of clothing and textiles is ideal for teaching global thinking, the same subject matter is ideal for rich scholarship that contributes to a global perspective's mindset.

Risks Worth Taking in Advancing a Global Perspective for Clothing and Textiles: Values and Politics

There are a number of risks involved in a commitment to a global perspective. The first risk relates to the danger that, by virtue of the fact that it requires so much effort, a global perspective might be reduced to a fashionable or de rigueur platitude. There are other risks, too. One is that the industry that could profit from serious attention to a global perspective is so entrenched in its marketplace ethos that we come to be viewed by it as even less, rather than more, relevant to its concerns. There is a risk that students will balk and run--that they, like the retailers in the Garner and Buckley (1988) study, will be unable to see the relevancy of a global perspective, based on a short-term concern with getting a job. On the other hand, there is the possibility that our courses and curricula will be so dynamic that students will appear from many corners of the campus to take our courses. There is a risk that scholarship undertaken with a global perspective may sometimes be the sort that makes quick data collection, speedy analysis, and timely termination impossible. In these cases, we need to understand, value, and be willing to defend our colleagues' work in the face of institutional pressures to report only quickly generated findings and secure funding for practical problems.

Finally, the biggest risk is to our own sense of stasis--not only in what we teach and how we teach it, but in what we already know and how we know it. Socializing ourselves with a global perspective suggests pushing ourselves to rethink, redefine, and reconfigure in light of what a global perspective might suggest about everything we do and think. Individually or collectively, these risks may seem overwhelming. However, the sheer fun of trying to think in new ways and explore not-yet-defined corners is wonderfully seductive. The possibilities for the future of the field, the future contribution of our students as citizens and professionals, and the future of the world generated by the cultivation of a global perspective is a future we won't want to risk losing.


Collectively, the papers in this volume raise some salient questions regarding textiles and clothing as a subject matter and an area of inquiry. Hamilton's paper (in this volume) invites a consideration of the extent to which we share a common ethos, ethical system, or qualitative feeling regarding how things are and how they ought to be when it comes to the production, distribution and consumption of textile/apparel products. Similarly, do we share a common philosophy of science and sense of purpose? Are we unified in our determination to pinpoint the interconnectedness among theory, method and practice?

The majority of the papers in this volume highlight themes of cooperation, holism, and interdependence. Quality-of-life concerns are often implicit; Forney's paper (in this volume) articulates these concerns explicitly in the context of a global perspective. Other commonalities include the need for concept clarification, metatheoretical and methodological advances, and a commitment to practice as well as to theory and research.

The papers in this section address the commonalities and differences across the papers throughout the volume and point to the issues raised in relation to theory, method and practice. Richard Nagasawa explores the issue of "critical mass" and its implications for theoretical development in textiles and clothing. He notes that the papers in this volume represent the remarkable degree of diversity in textiles and clothing subject matter. He further notes that each paper outlines a framework for study that the author finds useful in a particular subfield within textiles and clothing. Yet he argues that textiles and clothing, in a collective sense, suffers from a lack of "critical mass" in the form of facts, concepts and theories that comprise a unified knowledge system. He calls for bold conjectures and theoretical efforts; in this way, we can integrate isolated bits of knowledge into a system and develop a collective sense of critical mass.

Sharron Lennon and Leslie Davis explore methodological patterns and themes throughout the papers and conclude that the papers diverge, as well as converge, in terms of methodology. They note that a variety of disciplinary paradigms are presented by the authors in this volume. Additionally, interdisciplinary themes prevail in methodology as well as in theory. Lennon and Davis note that the commonalities among the papers may be described as follows: (a) attention to conceptualization, classification and characterization, (b) tendency toward interdisciplinary perspectives and paradigms, and (c) suggestion of future research directions.

Practice is the topic of concern in the paper by Donna Branson, Laura Jolly, and Sharon Mord. They conceptualize practice as connected with theory and research, and in this respect their ideas are similar to those of feminist scholars promoting the notion of praxis: "useful knowledge, theory and research" and "committed understanding" (Stanley, 1990, p. 12). This concept promotes an ethos of "knowledge for" in the spirit of changing the world, not merely studying it (Stanley, 1990, p. 15). Branson and her colleagues outline how each of the papers in this volume contribute to the practice of teaching, extension, and the doing of research in textiles and clothing. This paper invites us to consider how exploring new ways of seeing, knowing and experiencing textiles and clothing can be intensely practical endeavors, with implications for a wide range of applications and end uses.

With the idea of exploring the interdependencies within textiles and clothing, as well as among theory, method and practice, we encourage the readers of this volume to engage in thoughtful analyses and to promote discussions that parallel those presented in the three papers in this section. Specifically, alternative answers to the following questions might be explored:

**Theory**

- Are there common theoretical themes or issues across textiles and clothing papers within and outside of this volume? If so, what are they? If not, why not?
- What directions for theoretical development are introduced by the papers in this volume?
- What is the philosophical/historical basis for these directions?
- What are some of the logical consequences of these directions?

**Methodology**

- Do common methodological themes or approaches exist in the literature as a whole?
- If so, how do these commonalities display linkages (a) across traditional disciplinary boundaries and (b) within theory development and practice?
- To what extent do methods constitute barriers, even when conceptual bridges are developed across subdisciplinary areas in textiles and clothing?
- Alternatively, how can we encourage innovative comparisons and combinations of methods?
- How can methodological advances promote multidimensional and integrative thinking?

**Practice**

- Who are the *stakeholders* of the textiles and clothing knowledge base, i.e., who benefits from it?
- Who *should* be benefitting from it?
- How can we promote attention to practical issues in a way that acknowledges the benefits of theory and research to offer paradigms and methodologies for seeing and understanding phenomena linked to the production, distribution and consumption of textile and apparel products?

Ideally, multiplicity is embedded within the concept of theory (Malson, O'Barr, Westphal-Wihl & Wyer, 1989, p. 3). But all too often, rigidity and narrowness in the types of methods employed in research leads to the fragmentation of knowledge into *multiple discrete parcels* (Fiske, 1986, p.62). Like Nagasawa (in this volume), Campbell (1986, p. 127) notes that *critical mass* is an important requirement for sustaining a culture of knowledge.

Diversity and coherence, as noted by Norton (in this volume), need not be incompatible. Diversity, when accepted pluralistically and constructively rather than seen as a threat, can lead to a knowledge base that is *open, contingent, and humanly compelling, as opposed to that which is closed, categorical, and human-controlling* (Westkott, 1990, p. 65). Our subject matter demands a spirit of openness, contingency, and diversity, as well as theories that unite our topics of inquiry, senses of purpose, methods of exploration, and opportunities for application.

**References**


The issues raised by the contributors to this volume are all relevant and timely, for they have implications for what we study or discover. Doubtless, the papers do not exhaust the important issues; nor do they represent a cross section of the concerns that members believe are germane in the discipline. Even so, the papers represent a wide range of issues, topics, interests, and perspectives and may thus be viewed as the first step in identifying the "critical linkages" in the subject matter of textiles and clothing. What, then, are the issues that may shed some light for theoretical development in the discipline? In brief, they are issues that bear on the ontological and epistemological questions, namely: what to study and how to study it. Since the protocol of this volume includes companion papers written in response to many of the issues or topics, in this paper I take on the task of identifying the more basic issues, as I see them, that confront the discipline as regards its concern for theoretical development. First, I briefly respond to the series of questions put to me by editors of the volume. Second, I focus on what strikes me as the "underlying problem" of the papers taken together. And finally, I briefly describe four models of scientific development in the history of science and use the models to chart a strategy for theoretical development in textiles and clothing.

Questions

The three basic questions put to me are listed below:

1. Are there common theoretical themes or issues across the papers? If so, what are they? If not, why not?
2. What directions for theoretical development are introduced by the papers? What is the basis for these directions?
3. What are some of the logical consequences of these directions?

Briefly, the papers in this volume cover themes ranging from feminist theory (Michelman and Kaiser), product quality (Sieben and Norton), the "concept approach" to clothing subject matter (Hawthorne and Hutton), to the synthesis of the human ecosystem and anthropological approaches for the study of historic costume (Pedersen), transaction cost analysis (Jolly and Branson, and Rucker), to a more global perspective (Forney and Hamilton). The "common theme" here calls for the adoption of a conceptual structure adapted from related disciplines to provide a theoretical framework for textiles and clothing. Each paper outlines a framework that I believe is best suited for study in a particular subfield in the discipline. There is no problem here, for the discipline is not a closed system, and it will continue to be shaped in part by models, perspectives, methods and data from other fields. It is, however, unclear whether the authors of the papers wish to (a) describe or explain phenomena of concern by subject-matter specialists and/or (b) identify the types of conceptual structures that best serve this purpose.

The papers in this volume provide a good start on a challenging path toward theoretical development. But it is important to clarify just what we are trying to achieve and why (see Damhorst, in this volume). Clearly, an overriding goal of this volume, in the collective sense, is to articulate the linkages that connect the subject matter in textiles and clothing. The focus of individual papers in this volume is often on a particular subfield and the linkages necessary to understand it.

Many of these papers relate textiles and clothing phenomena—with which we are familiar—to models or frameworks that are unfamiliar to us. Models, diagrams and flow charts are useful devices to describe the system(s) in question but they do not necessarily describe/explain "what is." To the extent that a model "explains," it is by analogy rather than by direct explanation. Thus, if the purpose of the models proposed throughout this volume is to relate unfamiliar phenomena to that which we know and understand, then they serve a useful purpose. But it is important to understand the limitations of models as compared to theories. The concepts within models tend to be linked only
by lines. In no way can it be said that "lines" demonstrate (i.e., explain) the linkages among concepts. In contrast, linkages can be established among theoretical statements; these linkages can transform theoretical statements into a system or theory that subsumes a large number of empirical observations (or regularities). It is in this manner that scientific theories explain phenomena (Hempel, 1965; Hempel & Oppenheim, 1948).

It is theory that organizes the knowledge of a field. That is, theory shows how the various bits of knowledge within a field are interrelated or interdependent. Thus we need to develop explanatory theories to provide the linkages we seek in our subject matter.

The Problem

The papers in this volume tend to focus primarily on problems such as how X1 and X2 might be used to study Y. For example, Pedersen suggests a synthesis of human ecosystem and anthropological approaches to study historic costumes. X gives a global perspective on Y, as in Forney's paper. Or, a given model, X, can be used to look at Y, as demonstrated in the paper by Jolly and Branson. In a sense, the frameworks, perspectives and models are offered to us as "maps" to locate the important areas of our subject matter. And as maps, they show some of the linkages between textiles and clothing subject matter and other disciplines. Insofar as the objective of this volume is to identify "critical linkages" that exist between textiles/clothing and related disciplines, the contributors to this volume are on target. However, perhaps some of the papers in this volume do not go far enough in addressing the possibilities for establishing "critical linkages" within textiles and clothing.

The title of this volume, Critical Linkages in Textiles and Clothing Subject Matter, suggests that textiles and clothing as a discipline suffers from a lack of "critical mass", i.e., the facts, concepts, and theories that make up the body of its knowledge system. This is not to say that the field has nothing to show for its efforts; the problem here is the absence of some coherent body of knowledge that makes up the "knowledge mass" of the discipline—that is, the linkages that unify the various specializations in our subject matter. The solutions proposed in the papers are perhaps the most obvious, for the best way to organize or "link" the subject matter is by using some framework, perspective or model for that purpose. However, I believe that to develop "critical mass" in the discipline, we must start with a "problem" to solve, and the solution to this problem should take the form of theory or conjecture (Popper, 1976). Hence, the objective here is to develop conceptual structures (or theories) that explain empirical regularities in the subject matter of textiles and clothing.

From the point of view of this methodology, we start our investigation with problems. We always find ourselves in a certain problem situation; and we choose a problem which we hope we may be able to solve. The solution, always tentative, consists in a theory, a hypothesis, a conjecture (Popper, 1976, p. 86).

For Popper, then, progress in science takes place by making bold conjectures which are also subjected to equally bold criticisms. In other words, serious attempts are made to refute these conjectures (Popper, 1968).

Let me illustrate the strategy of addressing a problem through theory or conjecture through an example in the area of style change in clothing and appearance:

**Problem.** It is observed that clothing or appearance styles undergo more rapid change in some groups than in others. For example, clothing/appearance styles undergo change more often in adolescent than in adult groups. How might we explain this observation?

**Solution.** The postmodern condition gives rise to ambivalence in cultural ideology which strains the social identities of persons in ill-defined and uncertain statuses, in which few norms exist to guide behavior. Clothing and appearance styles are adopted to articulate the meaning(s) of these ambiguous identities, in nonlinguistic terms. Clothing/appearance styles, however, do not clarify or resolve cultural ambivalence. Accordingly, these styles undergo change in an ongoing dialectic between identity claims and clothing/appearance styles (Davis, 1985; Kaiser, Nagasawa, & Hutton, 1991).

It follows that clothing/appearance styles will change in groups most affected by the ambivalence in cultural ideology. Hence, the
greater the ambivalence, the more rapid clothing/appearance styles will undergo change. To explain the fact that adolescent clothing/appearance styles undergo more changes than do those of adults, we simply note the ambivalence in cultural ideology as regards the status of adolescents in this society. Hence, the most likely candidate for rapid changes in clothing styles would be the adolescent age group. The "theory" may also be used to explain why women's clothing/appearance styles change more often than men's, or why style changes occur frequently among individuals who are young and upwardly mobile, as compared to people who are older and more established in their careers/lifestyles. It is, then, the theory (or conjecture) that tells us what to examine or explain; observation is thus directed by some theoretical problem. It is clear that this strategy for theory construction calls for problem solving in a cumulative sense.

Four Models of Scientific Development

I shall now briefly (1) describe four models of scientific development in the history of science (Kourany, 1987) and (2) use the models to chart a strategy for theoretical development in textiles and clothing. The four models are a) cumulative, b) evolutionary, c) revolutionary, and d) gradual.

Cumulative

The cumulative model describes the process of scientific development in a cumulative way. From this view, science develops by adding new knowledge to existing knowledge in a cumulative fashion. The initial phase is one of groping for the right questions and methods. In time, facts, concepts, and theories make up the knowledge system of a field. As it gains new facts, concepts, and theories by the methods of science, progress takes place in a succession of additions. From Galileo to Kepler, to Newton and to Einstein and his general theory of relativity we observe the cumulative nature of science. It is this model that many writers point to for the social sciences to emulate (Freese, 1972; Nagasawa, Kaiser, & Hutton, 1989; Willer, 1967; Willer & Webster, 1970).

Evolutionary

In the evolutionary model, new theories replace old ones rather than adding to them as in the cumulative model. Its central concern is to negate theories in light of evidence so that new theories may take their place. The logic here is clear. Inquiry starts from an initial problem, arising from the state of affairs that previous theories have been unable to explain or solve. Often, the "problem" stems from a state in which a mass of small and unconnected facts do not fit into existing theories. Hence, new theories are invented to explain the phenomena as well as, if not better than, the old theories. Thus the new theories yield different and superior results. In this sense, the new theories are better adapted to nature (Popper, 1976). So the evolutionary model argues that progress in science occurs when it replaces its current theories with new and better (more successful) theories. The mechanism here is trial and the elimination of error by criticism (i.e., empirical tests).

Revolutionary

The revolutionary model suggests that progress in a field of science occurs when it replaces its theories, facts, methods and goals with new ones in a paradigm shift. This model has its origins in "anomalies" that create a "crisis of confidence" in the existing paradigms. That is, anomalies call for a change in paradigm—for a new paradigm that not only resolves the problem in question but also preserves the problem-solving ability of its predecessor. The change in the paradigm involves changes in the views of the scientists, their methods and goals (Kuhn, 1970). The new paradigm thus governs the new tradition of "normal science" as puzzle-solving until it undergoes a "crisis" and a new candidate emerges to replace it in a scientific revolution. Kuhn writes that scientific revolutions are here taken to be those non-cumulative developmental episodes in which an older paradigm is replaced in whole or in part by an incompatible new one (Kuhn, 1970, p. 91).

Gradualist

The gradualist model looks at scientific progress in terms of gradual changes. From this view, progress in science takes place when a scientific field replaces one or more of its theories, methods or goals with new theories, methods, or goals (Laudan, 1984). In this context, Laudan argues that theories, methods and goals function as independent elements in science. So, the change may take place in one element and not in others. For example, if the theory fails to solve a problem,
the gradualist model allows for the replacement of the theory with another one that does a better job. In this context, Laudan states:

"I propose that the rationality and progressiveness of a theory are most closely linked—not with its confirmation or its falsification—but rather with its problem-solving effectiveness" (Laudan, 1977, p. 5).

Laudan's view thus focuses on problem-solving effectiveness as the criterion for progress in science.

The Models and the Case of Textiles and Clothing

The models of how scientific fields have developed over time may be used to chart the course to develop "critical mass" in textiles and clothing. First, however, I will show how the models can be used to assess their degree of "fit" with the case of textiles and clothing. It should be noted that the models may fit some scientific fields better than others; a poor fit does not necessarily mean that there has been no progress in a given field. Moreover, scientific fields do not develop in the same way. Different models or some combination of the models may best describe different scientific fields. The choice of a model as the strategy best suited to generate "critical mass" in a discipline depends on its storehouse of knowledge.

For the most part, progress in textiles and clothing cannot be adequately captured by any of the four models. The models all assume that the scientific field in question has, within its system of knowledge, theories that yield reasonable solutions to problems that concern its members. The nature of the body of theory in textiles and clothing is unclear.

If any of the models remotely describes the progress in textiles and clothing, it is the gradualist model that characterizes the sort of progress that occurs in one component of the field, such as methods or theories. In textiles and clothing, our methods, especially the use of statistical models, have undergone change (from simple to more sophisticated statistical models), so in this sense it represents some progress. The gradualist model suggests that the changes in methods may in turn change the other two elements, goals and theories.

As empirical findings mount, they force us to consider the question of explanation. In other words, they urge us to develop theories to order and to interpret the findings. In this way, we question and begin to change our goals or objectives. The papers in this volume may be viewed as an attempt to pursue such a line of questioning and change. This direction may, in turn, result in a modification of the methods employed to develop and evaluate the theories in a critical fashion. If this is the state of the discipline today, where do we go from here?

The cumulative model describes the early groping for questions and methods that apply to the present status of textiles and clothing. Empirical cumulation is in evidence in the textiles and clothing literature (Hutton, 1984). This leads naturally to the question: How do we order the facts? We are still groping for answers to questions regarding the kinds of conceptual structures that are best suited for this purpose, as indicated by the papers in this volume. The cumulative nature of science may be either empirical or theoretical, and the cumulation of one may progress independently of the other. It is clear that the question of theoretical cumulation in textiles and clothing is basic to the issues in this volume.

Textiles and clothing does not seem to have the "critical mass" in theory or data to exhibit the patterns described in either the evolutionary or the revolutionary models. The former suggests that current ruling theories are replaced by more successful theories; the latter suggests that radical shifts in theory, facts, methods and goals take place in the field. In either case, the models describe disciplines with critical mass in facts and theories and thus relate to the more advanced sciences. Even so, the models can later be adopted to describe what may occur once the discipline achieves critical mass. Let us turn to the model best suited as a strategy to develop critical mass in textiles and clothing.

The Strategy

In science, knowledge consists of both empirical and theoretical knowledge. It is a system in which facts are explained by conceptual structures or theories. The essence of scientific inquiry is to (1) discover facts and regularities and (2) develop theories that integrate, explain and order the facts,
as well as suggest new unobserved facts. And as new facts challenge the current theories, new theories are invented to explain the findings. It is in this sense that science is cumulative. I suspect that the lack of critical mass in textiles and clothing is due, in part, to a confusion over the value of cumulative theories and the process by which they are built. It follows then that the task before us is to clarify the theory construction process and to develop theories that will integrate, order and explain empirical findings in textiles and clothing. This strategy, however, should be viewed only as the first phase in the process to develop our knowledge base in theory, methods, and practice. For once we have established "critical mass" in the form of cumulative theories, the next phase calls for the strategy described by the evolutionary model of scientific progress, i.e., for the development of theories better adapted to explain phenomena in textiles and clothing.

It is not my purpose here to discuss how theories are constructed or, for that matter, to construct a theory that exhibits cumulative properties. I simply wish to outline briefly the steps or "rules of thumb" involved in one theory construction strategy:

1. Observation
2. Empirical generalization
3. Speculative leap or tentative theory
4. Synthesis
   a. Informal synthesis (theory stated in natural language) or
   b. Formal synthesis in terms of calculus

It should be noted that the concerns related to the first and second "rules of thumb" noted above constitute the building blocks of theories. For the most part, observations (empirical findings) and generalizations exist in the textiles and clothing field. So, the building blocks for theory construction are well in place. The third step—the "speculative leap or tentative theory" rule of thumb—relates to Popper's method described earlier. Given the findings, the "problem" then calls for a solution that consists of conjecture and synthesis (rule #4) into some form of theory. In short, the strategy is to start out with a set of hypotheses (or empirical generalizations) and to invent a conceptual structure (i.e., theory) that explains or subsumes observations in concrete instances. The strategy thus serves as a useful guide to generate cumulative theories and thereby to create critical mass in textiles and clothing.

Conclusion

Even a cursory reading of the papers in this volume suggests that the field of textiles and clothing lacks critical mass, as viewed by the obvious lack of theories to integrate isolated bits of knowledge into a system. It is in this sense that theories serve as storage houses for knowledge in a discipline. It can be said that textiles and clothing seriously lacks the critical linkages that bind or unify the subfields of its subject matter. For this purpose, the task is to build conceptual structures that organize (or integrate) empirical findings and explain problems that confront us in the empirical world. In this way, we can generate the critical mass that links the subfields or specialties in textiles and clothing. It is time for us to direct our efforts toward this objective.
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Linkages in Methodological Themes: Interwoven Patterns

Sharron J. Lennon, The Ohio State University
Leslie L. Davis, Oregon State University

The intent of this chapter is to highlight some recurrent methodological themes that appear throughout this volume. The papers diverge, but also converge, in terms of methodology. We feel that it is in order to begin by defining methodology. According to Adams and Schvaneveldt (1985), research methodology "applies a systematic approach to problem solving and data collection to ensure that one has useful data, that the results can be understood by others, and that the procedure can be carried out by someone else at a later time" (p. 16). We consider methodology to be the philosophy or general underlying principles of the research process. This includes assumptions and inherent (perhaps hidden) values, limitations and resources, and consequences of the research process. We acknowledge the fact that researchers in clothing and textiles employ a variety of methods to collect and interpret data within the research process.

Basic underlying assumptions form the basis for the general principles of the research processes discussed in each chapter. These assumptions include (1) that clothing and textiles is an area worthy of study, (2) that linkages exist within the subject matter, and (3) that focusing on these linkages may offer fruitful avenues of study and research.

Although the focus of the papers was on theoretical and subject-matter linkages, several methodological themes emerged. The issue-related commonalities are discussed in this paper under the following headings: (1) conceptualization, classification, and characterization, (2) interdisciplinary perspectives and paradigms, and (3) future research directions.

Conceptualization, Classification, and Characterization

Many of the papers in this volume call for the definition or characterization of terms, the measurement of concepts, or the classification of information. In terms of methodology this is critical since any assumptions made by the researchers are based on the manner in which terms are defined and measured or information is classified. Indeed, Norton makes a strong plea for the development of an organized and systematic body of knowledge in textiles and clothing through shared ideas.

One of the strongest calls for the definition or characterization of terms comes from Rowold in her response to Pedersen. Rowold calls for clarifying the shared meaning of concepts in order to bring precision to definitions in our field and to enhance communication. Sieben's paper begins with a review of definitions of apparel quality and ultimately presents a model of the apparel evaluation process. Lamb also discusses terminology as it relates to "special needs" clothing and comments on the confusing array of terms available in the "special needs" literature. Markee and Pedersen note that the meaning associated with the term "comfort" has varied both temporally and culturally. Clearly the definition or characterization of terms is seen as important and is also seen as lacking in some areas of our field.

Related to terminology is the classification, development, and measurement of concepts. Indeed, the objective of the Markee and Pedersen paper is to analyze comfort as a concept. Sieben and Norton both focus on the conceptualization of apparel quality. The methodological theme of classification of information appears in several of the papers. For example, in their papers on methodologies for studying historic costume and classifying artifacts, Schlick and Pannabecker note the importance of classification of information. As Schlick stresses (and most would agree), classification is necessary for the identification and dating of artifacts. She proposes not only the processes by which such a classification system can be developed, but also a model for a systematic classification system. Pannabecker classifies some alternatives to the historic method as ways to study historic materials and views Schlick's classification system as one of them.

Perhaps on a more macro level is the question of defining our profession, our programs, and our
research. Frey’s paper relates an attempt to classify programs in textiles and clothing according to their missions. In her analysis, she suggests that programs in traditional (land-grant) institutions and programs in textile schools are converging in mission. In Rudd’s companion paper, she provides us with one contemporary conceptual model of the field of textiles and clothing and classifies various areas of our field within this model.

We still wrestle with the question of how to describe ourselves and how to pigeonhole our research interests. For example, one issue in developing the call for research abstracts for the 1991 Annual Meeting was what to call the areas under which we may submit our abstracts. This is not a trivial issue, since researchers trained in one root discipline may evaluate abstracts based on criteria from that root discipline, rather than using criteria that might be more appropriate for the particular abstract. This type of professional ethnocentric perspective may even be reflected in our professional journals in the manner in which our manuscripts are to be organized (see Gunn, in this volume). While the multidisciplinarity of our field contributes richness as well as diversity, it is important to build coherence into our diversity (Norton, in this volume). Perhaps this may be achieved through interdisciplinarity, which is discussed later in this paper.

One way to characterize ourselves and our profession is by first classifying knowledge with respect to clothing. Hawthorne’s and Hutton’s papers call for the classification of general clothing knowledge concepts. Hawthorne, Hutton, and Rowold all indicate the need for consistency when (1) discussing terms and concepts and (2) operationalizing variables and/or conducting research. The need for consistency appears to require some detailed attention, implying that someone or some group should develop a database of terms or a classification system for concepts. This idea merits consideration and should not be dismissed because it is unwieldy. The ability to file and retrieve information offers a means by which the field can advance.

**Interdisciplinary Perspectives and Paradigms**

The papers in this monograph suggest many interdisciplinary perspectives that offer novel approaches and new paradigms to the study of clothing and textiles. As researchers in clothing and textiles, the authors of several papers report new applications of models and methodologies from other disciplines. By doing so, new paradigms are offered. A paradigm, consisting of a set of concepts and assumptions, may be seen as a perspective for viewing the world. Therefore, a paradigm influences methodology. As researchers combine, synthesize, and integrate existing models and methodologies to the study of clothing and textiles, they provide new perspectives and thus new paradigms to the field. Paolletti (in this volume) is one who has called for more interdisciplinarity in our research.

Interdisciplinary perspectives on the relationship of gender and appearance are offered by Michelman and Kaiser. Michelman suggests using feminist theory and psychoanalytic socialization theory to illuminate the study of gender and appearance. Michelman identifies assumptions underlying feminist theory, such as (1) gender is socially constructed rather than biologically determined and (2) social learning occurs within a patriarchal framework that serves to promote the welfare of males. Kaiser agrees that feminist theorists have much to offer but encourages us to explore the diversity within feminist thought and to integrate such areas as feminist aesthetics with our knowledge of appearance, aesthetics, and social communication. In this way, we can develop new insights and methodological approaches with respect to the study of gender and personal appearance. Inherent in this approach is the notion that clothing and appearance management possess an aesthetic and creative dimension that is important and worthy of study. Both Michelman’s and Kaiser’s approaches represent interdisciplinary perspectives and offer much to be considered.

Our (Davis and Lennon) paper integrates research in social cognition with published research in the area of clothing and human behavior. The work in social cognition and the work in clothing and human behavior overlap with regards to theoretical and methodological issues. From this integration of research and perspectives, the strengths of both of these areas of study are highlighted, and needs for further research are clarified.

The interdisciplinary perspective offered by Forney and also by Hamilton is a global one, although it is not technically a new one since it has been presented elsewhere (Forney, 1984).
global perspective recognizes the potential value of human diversity and assumes that we have much to learn from other cultures. In her clever exposition on ethnocentrism, Hamilton very effectively supports the global perspective by outlining the problems that result from an ethnocentric perspective. By explaining what ethnocentrism is, the reader is led to see the value of what it is not—i.e., a global perspective.

Currently the U.S. apparel manufacturing industry is banking on our ethnocentrism in its "Made in the U.S.A." campaign. This campaign represents a cooperative linkage among domestic producers, manufacturers, and retailers. Jolly and Branson, in an attempt to investigate such linkages, present a model of exchange processes from economics as a perspective for viewing decisions in the textile/apparel industries. This perspective emphasizes the quantification of variables and the examinations of costs in order to maximize profits. The values and assumptions of capitalism are inherent in this perspective. Rucker extends this perspective to the global context of textile and apparel production and distribution.

Several authors in this volume (Gunn; Pannabecker; Schlick; Welters) note the inherent interdisciplinary nature of the study of historic textiles and costume and in the classification of historic artifacts. Schlick uses the perspectives of archaeology and instructional design to address the problem of the classification of historic textile artifacts. Some assumptions are (1) that some type of classification system is desirable in order to facilitate research and study of the artifacts, (2) that some classification systems are better than others, and (3) that a concept analysis and a task analysis are useful in developing a classification system.

Pannabecker recognizes that historic textile artifacts can be studied from a number of views and, indeed, she sees classification (as offered by Schlick) and semiotics as examples of paradigms that lend themselves to interdisciplinary study. An assumption of the semiotic approach to the study of historic artifacts is that it is possible to abstract an appearance code which generates meaning for the artifacts. As she notes, a difficulty with both classification systems and semiotics is that they require that the researcher embrace a new paradigm. This "paradigm shift" defines knowledge in the field and thus the style of research in the field. Pannabecker realizes that there may well be considerable resistance to the use of either approach.

A far-reaching paradigm offered by Pedersen for the study of historic costume is that of the human ecological framework. This framework has the human-environment interaction as a central concern. Dominant values are that the enhancement of the well-being and improvement of the condition of families are important goals of research (Bulbolz & Sonntag, 1988). An assumption of the ecological approach is that cultures are influenced by their social and physical environments. Pedersen proposes synthesizing anthropological theoretical frameworks and the human ecological framework to offer new insights to researchers studying historic forms and functions of dress.

As acknowledged by Rowold, the inherent similarities between cultural and historic studies of textile and apparel artifacts provide an obvious linkage between the two types of research. Because the human ecological framework focuses on the human-environment interaction, it also has the potential of meshing well with anthropological perspectives. Using the human ecological framework, however, requires considerable adjustment on the part of researchers and truly represents a paradigmatic change.

As we strive toward increased interdisciplinarity, we also demonstrate how our expertise can contribute to research in other fields. Welters (in this volume) suggests that costume historians apply their unique skills to research in other disciplines and offers textile science, clothing construction, and historical-cultural aspects of textiles and clothing as such areas. Damhorst (in this volume) suggests that researchers studying the social cognition of dress might conduct research that not only contributes to the understanding of dress, but also contributes to the study of social cognition in general. To the extent that we can contribute to research in other fields and publish in their journals, we will increase our visibility and credibility.

**Future Research Directions**

Several of the papers in this volume outline suggestions for research by formulating very specific models of the manner in which the variables of concern influence each other. Jolly and Branson argue that the selection of an exchange structure in the textile-apparel industry is influenced by perceived costs and benefits of that
exchange structure. However, costs and benefits, they argue, are affected by perceived strategic vulnerability. Ultimately, in this model, perceived strategic vulnerability is the result of six company-market factors. Jolly and Branson discuss each of these factors and specify how each of these factors will influence exchange structure choice. These authors clearly offer specific hypotheses for a program of research.

Rucker uses the international business literature, together with the Jolly and Branson paper, to analyze whether and how a firm might choose to enter a foreign market. Entry model predictors listed by Rucker are transaction-specific assets, product importance, uncertainty (both external and internal), management mentality, and company power. For some of the predictors (transaction-specific assets, product importance, uncertainty, and company power), the exact nature of the relationships is posited; for management mentality, simply the existence of a relationship is posited.

Although not specifically stated as hypotheses, Feather presents a conceptual framework for clothing for special needs that offers a wealth of research ideas. According to this framework an individual's personal characteristics (abilities, age, cultural values, etc.) affect perceived clothing attributes, clothing options, clothing acquisition, the acquired clothing product, and internalized acceptance. Whether these variables affect each other in a direct linear fashion is unclear, although perhaps implied by the model. It is possible that several of the variables might combine interactively to affect clothing acquisition. Although the nature of the relationships among the variables is not specified, an amazing variety of research possibilities is inherent in the framework.

Sieben presents a model of the apparel evaluation process from the perspective of the consumer. The conceptualization of apparel quality includes such factors as innate garment characteristics (fabric, design, fit, garment construction details, garment performance) as well as external forces that influence whether or not apparel meets the psychological and sociological needs of consumers. Perceived value is hypothesized to be a function of price, quality, manufacturer or retail service, function, and aesthetic appeal. The exact nature of these relationships and the relative importance of the variables are not explicit from the model. Nevertheless, the model is replete with research possibilities.

Pedersen presents a human ecological model for application in historic costume and also articulates generally how it can be used. Some general hypotheses based on this model are that influences on dress of a certain time period include (1) the natural resources for production and consumption existing during the time period, (2) the sociocultural institutions in existence and the role of dress in relation to the sociocultural institutions, and (3) community or regional leaders and their influence on garment styles. Overall, the research suggestions offered by Pedersen are very broad.

In general, all of the papers in this monograph have some sort of research implications, although they range from specific to general or implied. Not all of the research implications are for hypotheses per se, however. Indeed, Schlick, Hawthorne, and Hutton all stress the importance of classification systems that require an enormous amount of work to develop. In her appeal for the classification of clothing knowledge concepts, Hawthorne acknowledges that the classification of concepts may not be as highly valued nor as well rewarded as original research. This is certainly a problem in academia today and one that most scholars recognize. Ironically, original research is immeasurably facilitated by computerized indices and classification systems.

Conclusions

The methodological themes that emerge from the papers in this monograph include: (1) conceptualization, classification, and characterization, (2) interdisciplinary perspectives and paradigms, and (3) future research directions. In and of themselves, these commonalities in methodological issues display unique linkages across subject matter. The most visible and overriding methodological theme is the need to conceptualize, classify, and clarify definitions, terms, concepts, artifacts, and indeed, who we are and what we do. It appears that across subject matters, common definitions and information classification systems are necessary. A second commonality is the interdisciplinary nature of the methodologies synthesized and integrated into novel perspectives and paradigms. Clearly, clothing and textile researchers provide a unique contribution to the advancement of research methodology by displaying these integrative
perspectives. Through integration of research methodologies, richer data are obtained, illuminating each perspective in a way that could not have been accomplished "single-handedly." Consequently, a third common issue relating to future research directions emerges. As new perspectives evolve so do new research questions, thus furthering the knowledge base in all clothing and textiles subject matter.
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Forging Close Encounters: Practice and Theory

Donna H. Branson, Laura D. Jolly and Sharon W. Mord
Oklahoma State University

Hunt (1983) notes that for many marketing students and academicians there is the perception that theory and practice are at opposite ends of a continuum. We suspect that many textiles and clothing students and academicians may feel similarly. Comments such as "let's leave theory up to the few who enjoy that kind of thing" or "I have too much to do to be concerned with theory" can occasionally be heard from clothing and textile professionals.

This paper is directed toward examining the implications for "practice" from the papers in this volume. However, several pertinent questions must be addressed before focusing on these papers. First, what is meant by the term "practice"? Wilson and Vaines (1985, p. 348) define practice as "the process of translating knowledge into the common core of activities associated with a practical field of study." They suggest that practice has both physical and intellectual counterparts, with the physical component represented by what professionals "do" (i.e., teach, research, conduct extension programs, etc.). The intellectual counterpart of practice is referred to as the "shared meaning structures" (or knowledge base) that guide particular patterns of activities.

Secondly, what is the relationship between theory and practice? Although Hunt (1983) does not attempt to define practice, he does speak to what he calls a false dichotomy between that which is theoretical and that which is practical. He notes that although theories deal with abstract concepts and complicated relationships and are therefore hard to understand, they are very much related to the real world because they should be empirically testable.

Brown and Paolucci (1979) point out that theory and practice are not the same on a conceptual level; but for a given concrete problem, they are intertwined. Brown and Paolucci organized their discussion of the theory-practice relationship by presenting three metascientific views (analytic-empirical, interpretive, and critical) to show how each view reflects a particular perspective toward theory, practice, and the relationship between them. In other words, Brown and Paolucci are saying that the relationship between theory and practice depends on which metascientific view (or combination of views) one embraces.

A similar approach is adopted by Wilson and Vaines (1985). Figure 1 shows their framework with four proposed dimensions of practice: customary practice, instrumental practice, interactive practice and reflective practice. Each practice dimension is supported by a different knowledge base and uses a different mode of inquiry. The last column of Figure 1 states the relationship between knowledge and action. Note that it is also different for each practice dimension.

**Customary practice** refers to a host of practices that are adapted to different situations without explicit knowledge of the principles underlying these practices. At this level, practice is not analyzed prior to its occurrence, nor reflected on subsequently. Rather it is guided by tradition. Even if a research base exists to support a given practice under certain conditions, customary practices are adopted without considering or questioning the research. Examples given by Wilson and Vaines include: unquestioned use of a national food guide for identifying acceptable daily meal patterns, dress code of teachers, and kinds of language used by professionals. It should be noted that one’s background can influence awareness of research and principles that may underlie customary practices. For example, as clothing and textile professionals, we are aware of the literature on appearance management literature; this knowledge is likely to influence our understanding of prevailing codes of dress in different occupational contexts.

**Instrumental practice** is grounded in the methods of empirical investigation and the principles and laws of science. It is conceived as management in terms of applied techniques, systems analysis, behavioral modification and technology related to production and consumption of consumer goods. Theory and practice are distinct entities, in that theories are value-free, and one must be able to objectify everything. Guided
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Supporting structures of knowledge</th>
<th>Mode of inquiry</th>
<th>Purpose of practice</th>
<th>Patterns of action</th>
<th>Inducement to action</th>
<th>Relationship between knowledge and action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customary practice</strong></td>
<td>Basically atheoretical</td>
<td>Historical precedent; personal experience; conventional wisdom.</td>
<td>To solve particular and immediate problems. To become aware of professional social traditions.</td>
<td>Commonplace solutions to practical problems, professional routines and social conduct.</td>
<td>Preserving traditions, professional folklore and cultural heritage.</td>
<td>Action is guided by personal expertise based on historical cultural tradition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instrumental practice</strong></td>
<td>Empirical theories of casual explanation</td>
<td>Empirical examination of predefined problems</td>
<td>To control the social and natural environment in predefined ways To produce technically useful knowledge.</td>
<td>Predetermined systems of action; techniques directed toward intervention /prevention</td>
<td>Applying the laws and methods of science. Prediction and control of results.</td>
<td>Action is controlled by analytical data; it may be viewed as distinct from theoretical knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interactive practice</strong></td>
<td>Interpretive theory; Historical analysis</td>
<td>Analysis of experience; practical deliberation; discourse and dialectic.</td>
<td>To build a consensus of understanding directed toward the enhancement of human life.</td>
<td>Negotiation with others regarding acceptable solutions to given problems: orienting action in desired direction</td>
<td>Understanding &quot;what is&quot; in historical perspective. Acknowledging other perspectives, sharing of networks of meaning.</td>
<td>Knowledge is tied to action through interpretation and orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reflective practice</strong></td>
<td>Critical and normative theory</td>
<td>Dialectic; critical reflection reflexive examination.</td>
<td>To change the individual or social order. To build a just society for all</td>
<td>Social action directed toward long term change</td>
<td>Disclosing constraints which inhibit change, perceiving what &quot;ought to be.&quot;</td>
<td>Constant interplay between professional knowledge and the way it is translated into action.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. A theoretical framework for the examination of practice. (Source: Wilson & Vaines, 1985. Reprinted by permission.)

by positivism as a philosophy of science, home economics adopted the idea of scientific management from the time of the Lake Placid Conferences. For example, time and motion studies strongly influenced home management practices. Early child development studies and food and nutrition emphasized measurement and scientific principles. Although clothing and textiles may not have adopted this "mechanistic orientation" as completely as some other areas of home economics, there is evidence of instrumental practice in some of our prevailing methodological approaches and in some of our subdisciplinary areas such as textile technology. An example from retailing might be the use of decision rules for automatic markdowns to optimize profit.

**Interactive practice** includes communication exchange between the professional and the client. Professionals are seen as active participants in interpreting relevant knowledge based on their experience and background; therefore, value and meaning can be incorporated with knowledge to suggest solutions for particular problems. Extension and consulting are good examples of interactive practice. But how does one know if the values and/or meanings brought to bear on a problem are appropriate? For example, it is important for extension agents who recommend the use of a particular pesticide to handle a pest problem to consider (value-laden) long-term issues such as harm to the environment or to the farmer’s health.
Reflective practice includes the process of critique to bring about long-term change in individuals and society. The concept of dialectic stresses the constant interplay between knowledge and action, each continually influencing the other. The process of thinking, debating and exchanging ideas about knowledge on a continual basis is useful for growth of knowledge and for its application into action for the betterment of society. Kenny and Hannisch (1982) suggest such a dialectic approach to move between theoretical development and practice in the area of adult education. Similarly, Kaiser's paper in this volume examines the feminist philosophy of science and the notion of praxis as one that integrates theory with practice.

Thus, the common theme resounded by all of these authors is that theory and practice are complementary: One is not superior to the other; rather, each is incomplete without the other. Practice should direct theory development by helping focus attention on relevant problems. And theory should be tested and put into use by researchers, instructors, extension faculty, designers, merchandisers, buyers, and the like. The knowledge base should form the basis of program content, delivery methods, decisions made, and advice to clients. With this perspective in mind we have organized the remainder of this paper around four themes found in this volume's papers that we believe are relevant for practice. We have labeled the themes: 1) systems of defining, clarifying and organizing subject matter content, 2) indecision about identity, focus and goals, 3) narrow research focus: methodological implications, and 4) ethics. It should be noted that the themes are not mutually exclusive; that is, some papers may contain more than one theme.

Concept Development and Clarification

The need for development, clarification, and agreed-upon labeling of concepts is repeated throughout these papers. We believe that the implications for practice are very direct. This is a call to action! It is a call that everyone in our field must hear and respond to now if we are to move forward as a discipline. Each of us must recognize the importance of clearly defined concepts, and we must translate that recognition into action in our teaching, research, publishing and outreach efforts.

Hawthorne's paper sets the stage by providing a historical background of past clothing and textile concept development efforts. She notes that although progress has been slow and inconsistent, we must define the cognitive content of our field and organize our subject matter. Since Hawthorne believes that the lack of an explicit method for identifying and defining concepts has hindered progress, she suggests several methods that might be tried. She also provides two examples of disciplines that began by developing a thesaurus of indexing terms. Hutton's paper reinforces Hawthorne's comments. Hutton says we must stop coining new terms, that the practice of defining terms for each research study shows a lack of definition of concepts in the field.

A similar plea for concept development is echoed by Norton. She notes that we must take action to build coherence if we are to continue as a field. She states that having clear, agreed-upon meanings for constructs is a prerequisite for developing relational, predictive or explanatory statements.

Beyond these general statements addressing lack of clarity in definitions, some of the papers address development, clarification, and organization of specific concepts or constructs. Three papers focus on clothing comfort, two speak to apparel quality, and two address clothing for special needs. Markee and Pedersen use conceptual analysis (as Hawthorne recommends) to examine comfort as a concept. They conclude that comfort in its broadest sense should not be measured until comfort subconcepts have been satisfactorily defined and objectively determined. Paoletti's companion paper suggests that an interdisciplinary team of professionals should collaborate to develop an interdisciplinary conceptualization of clothing comfort. The Branson and Sweeney comfort paper reviews previous
Models and Frameworks

Some of the papers, while noting the absence of shared meaning for concepts and constructs, still propose models or frameworks that might be useful for various reasons. The topics of some are global in scope; others are more modest in scope. Regardless, there are substantial implications for practice in terms of research, curriculum development, program planning and building a knowledge base.

Damhorst’s five-stage research assessment framework is a good example of practice implications for research. It can be used by an individual to consider the contribution of one’s own research program, or it can be used to assess scientific progress of clothing and textiles subdisciplines or even the clothing and textiles field as a whole. Damhorst concludes that although most of our research can be classified within the first three stages, researchers must examine their findings in relation to existing theories and models and discern patterns from their data that might further theory and/or model testing or development. Damhorst gives researchers two suggestions for practice. First, conduct programmatic research and use past research as building blocks for new research. Second, be open to various research perspectives and methods. More will be said later about this second idea, which was reiterated by other authors.

The Jolly and Branson paper suggests borrowing or adapting existing models for organizing and explaining some clothing and textile phenomenon. The implications for curriculum are substantial. For example, if one accepts that the apparel, textile and merchandising industries are indeed forging cooperative relationships with each other that increasingly rely on technological advances, this suggests that curriculum content and philosophy may require considerable revamping. Many curriculum programs are set up to focus on one segment of the apparel/textile pipeline. Content deemed appropriate for that segment is taught from a traditional perspective. Application of the model to curriculum suggests first the need for a broader course content base as well as for an understanding of new technologies. Secondly, the aspects of cooperation between segments of the industry implies the need for students to adopt a new mindset—one of willingness to work together.
In general, we believe that the papers in this volume that include models or frameworks have valuable practice implications in several ways. First as already noted, the models and frameworks aid in organizing and analyzing a portion of the clothing and textiles content matter. The models permit us to examine what we "do" in relation to that content and to plan necessary adjustments. A second advantage for practice is that some of these papers demonstrate how to take models from various sources, analyze their strengths and weaknesses, and then use existing models to develop new models.

**Indecision About Identity, Focus and Goals**

The second theme that we discern in these papers is neither as obvious nor as focused as the first theme. Who are we; what is the study of clothing and textiles? What should be our mission, our focus, our course content? A number of the papers suggest that our diverse backgrounds, interests, root disciplines and academic training strongly influence our perceptions of who we are and what we are about as a field. Our diversity is seen as impeding articulation of a focus for the clothing and textiles field. Rowold suggests that our indecision about our identity and goals has hampered theory development.

The papers reflecting this theme are written from different viewpoints. Frey examines identity and mission by comparing curricula at four-year institutions within and outside of home economics colleges over time. Rudd suggests that the product is our focus. She proposes dividing clothing and textiles subject matter into product characterization and product utilization, depicted as two overlapping circles with the intersection of the two representing process (i.e., everything involved in making a product for a satisfied target market). She concludes with questions for clothing and textiles educators to consider.

Forney and Hamilton advocate adopting a global perspective in order to improve the longevity of the clothing and textile field as well as the longevity of our planet. Hamilton notes that a global perspective is more than an amenity; it is likely to be linked to economic survival. Forney reminds us that acquiring a global perspective is not easy. We believe that the implications for practice are substantial. Faculty need to be trained to think this way. Teaching materials that provide broad-based information need to be developed. A knowledge base to support the teaching effort must be developed to include the study of non-western cultures. More effort needs to be expended on teaching critical and creative thinking rather than marketplace-driven subject matter. We must examine our assumptions and recognize how they influence what and how we teach and research.

As we considered this complex theme, we thought that perhaps a two-pronged strategy might have merit for moving us forward. As an organization, ITAA could focus on theme one (systems of defining, clarifying and organizing subject matter content), and this work might help clarify the focus issue as a by-product. As a second part of the strategy, individual units could determine their focus based on faculty expertise, geographical location, societal issues and available resources. Hopefully, forward movement on both fronts might lead to a decision for either a more unified focus or for acceptance of strength through diversity.

**Narrow Research Focus: Methodological Implications**

The third theme that we see reflected in these papers is related to our second theme. That is, how we define ourselves and how we align ourselves with strongly influences our perception of both appropriate research methodology and reporting style. Rowold notes that we have emphasized quantitative research as more scholarly and legitimate than qualitative research. The implications of this practice is the subject of a number of papers within this volume. Gunn suggests that historians are forced to try to fit their work into the structure imposed by the *Clothing and Textile Research Journal* in order to be part of the clothing and textiles scientific community. In the same vein, the Pannabecker paper reviews a number of methods (in addition to the historical method) that might be appropriate for historical research. Pedersen's paper suggests using an ecological framework with an emphasis on cultural systems to study historic costume.

It appears that the frustration of the clothing and textile historians is linked to the conflict between different underlying philosophies and their corresponding modes of practice. Comparison of interactive and instrumental practice, as shown in Figure 1, illustrates the problem. Much of the
research done in the clothing and textiles area falls within the realm of instrumental practice, and textile/clothing historians' research exemplifies interactive practice. In this connection, Welters' suggestion, although addressed to historians, is appropriate for all of us to consider. She advocates focusing on the research question rather than on the methods used to answer the posed question.

Clothing and textile historians are not alone in anguishing over questions on methods. Davis and Lennon suggest that the social cognition research area could also profit from using an expansion of methodological procedures. Damhorst also advocates openness to various research approaches. We believe that there are two very important practice implications. First, develop good research questions and, second, recognize that multiple methods provide the potential for richer understanding of the phenomenon under study. The interested reader is referred to Denzin's (1970) discussion of this issue. He advocates "triangulation," or the combination of different methods, in studying a phenomenon.

Ethics

Lastly, several papers within this volume speak to the role of ethics and values in our research and curriculum efforts. Hamilton believes that the marketplace ethos favors competition, a profit motive, individualism and short-term goals. Further, the "academic ethos of the late twentieth century" mirrors this short-sighted vision. Hamilton suggests that students' desire for education to ensure material prosperity is further evidence. This operating ethos also influences the kind of research deemed important to conduct and the characteristics and responsibilities of faculty if they are to obtain tenure and promotion.

Reflection on these ideas for practice implications staggers the imagination. Not only does our ethos influence how we define ourselves as a field, plan our curricula, conduct our research, deliver our programs etc., but it also influences what we do and say as members of the academic community. We leave it to our readers to ponder the implications for themselves.

The Kaiser and Michelman papers raise different ethical issues—i.e., those related to women, fashion and advertising. Michelman asserts that clothing and textiles researchers adopt an objective, unemotional, masculine stance in conducting and reporting appearance research, with the gender-dress connection rarely made. She further noted that we teach primarily women, yet we either don't recognize or don't choose to comment on ethical issues such as women's portrayal by the media and advertisers. Kaiser notes that we have an opportunity to explore linkages of feminist methodology, epistemology and praxis with textiles and clothing subject matter. The notion of feminist praxis is particularly noteworthy because it links theory and practice for the goal of improving quality of life. This is a good example of reflective practice.

Summary

We have tried to broaden the reader's perspective on what practice is as well as to suggest practice implications for us as individuals and for our professional association. We have not tried to hide our bias, that is, that a close relationship between practice and theory is imperative for advancement of our field. Now is the time to forge close encounters between practice and theory. This will require considerable individual and collective effort. We are all involved in practice. Advancement will not occur with an occasional theory workshop nor with a few theorists writing papers. Commitment and action are required from each of us and from ITAA.
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Connections, Commonalities, and Contingencies: 
Some Working Areas of Convergence

Susan B. Kaiser, University of California, Davis
Mary Lynn Damhorst, Iowa State University

The contemporary cultural moment offers a complex array of social and cultural changes. In the foreground of many of these changes is a blurring or breakdown of boundaries of all sorts, including disciplinary areas of knowledge. Within our disciplines, we find that the certainties, procedures, methods, and our very structures of thought are now challenged and questioned almost daily. We work in a relativistic era of science. To function adequately in the present day university and scientific community, the prudent scholar—regardless of how focused his or her own program of research and teaching may be—must learn to respect that there is more than one way to study any problem and more than one perspective from which to define and to interpret concepts, principles, and theories. Each method and perspective potentially engender a unique and valuable solution to a problem. Each method and perspective have inherent strengths and limitations. Multiple perspectives, synergistically combined together, move a field ahead to advance understandings that cannot be achieved if everyone works from a single, dogmatic perspective.

The papers in this volume reveal a wide range of interests, ideas, and priorities among textiles and clothing scholars. In this summary paper, we suggest ways in which we can incorporate concepts of diversity and multiplicity into new understandings of textiles and clothing. To do so, we "revisit" the Venn diagram presented earlier in this volume and focus on sites of connection and synthesis. Why is it so important to articulate linkages as well as to understand our diverse philosophies of science? If textiles and clothing has experienced an evolutionary or revolutionary stage, it is probably right now as we move from a narrow emphasis on positivistic approaches to research toward a relativistic, global, cross-cultural, and pan method approach. Rather than being dominated by one ruling, dominating philosophy of science, we are increasingly recognizing that each philosophy, be it positivism, interpretivism, or feminism, has room and value in the field of textiles and clothing.

In an abstract sense, textiles and clothing scholars—anthropologists, chemists, designers, economists, historians, and social psychologists alike—are all going about the same business as we collect and examine data to solve problems or look for patterns to increase our understanding of textiles and apparel. Each scholar may use different procedures or attend to different types and sources of data. But our ultimate goal of understanding and using our observations and findings to explain how the production and consumption of textiles and apparel influence everyday life is shared by all of us.

In everyday life and in the specific topics we study and teach, traditional and familiar meanings are changing constantly. Our understandings of such concepts as comfort and physical disability and of cultural categories such as age, gender, and race/ethnicity need constant revision, reexamination and expansion. Thus it is not enough to define concepts or to characterize what it means to be part of a cultural category. What is needed are ways of understanding the dynamic relationships among concepts and intersections among cultural categories. Further, we need to understand how our values shape what we see, how we know, and what we find interesting in the terrain of textiles and clothing. It is becoming increasingly evident that science is not value-free; in fact, values may be what hold many of our understandings and explanations together.

Values as a Bridging Concept

Fekete (1987) argues that values constitute a powerful "bridging concept" that can link diverse areas of study (p. ii). He calls for a revival of the values concept, which prevailed in the social sciences in the late 1940s and 1950s and influenced early models of textiles and clothing subject matter (see the models by Wines and Perry as shown in Rudd's paper, in this volume). The
contemporary intellectual context demands attention to values in its numerous "postmodern probings into the wilderness of looming interdisciplinary agendas" (Fekete, 1987, p. 1). Interdisciplinary agendas are not new to textiles and clothing, but what we have not yet fully conceptualized is how our traditional emphasis on interdisciplinarity compares to the "looming interdisciplinary agendas" emerging in such fields as cultural studies, ethnic studies, and gender studies.

Many of the papers in this volume have implied that improving the quality of life is our underlying raison d'être in textiles and clothing. If this is so, then we cannot go about our business of teaching, doing research, or extending our knowledge to different constituency groups without understanding the importance of values. We cannot acquire a global perspective without acknowledging and accepting diverse value orientations. A "seriously global culture" (Gitlin, 1989, p. 61) is not likely to be brought to us courtesy of a multinational textile/apparel corporation alone. Nor does the imposition of one culture's values and perspectives over those of other cultures represent a global perspective.

Rather, the rock-bottom value, the overriding principle of this global culture has to be the preservation of the other...conversations require respect for the other. The fundamental value is that the conversation continue toward the global culture (Gitlin, 1989, p. 61, emphasis in the original).

In textiles and clothing, the "conversation" to which Gitlin refers may apply to any or all of the following: a two-way dialogue between a U.S. retail buyer and the individuals in the country who are responsible for producing her/his next line of private-label goods, an open and relativistic discussion of cross-cultural meanings of clothing and appearance within and across national boundaries, and a critical and creative exploration by international textile and clothing scholars of the various values embedded within our subject matter. The movement toward a global culture requires achievement of mutual understandings and meanings. In this regard, textiles and clothing scholars confront some fundamental paradoxes that are integral to the contemporary moment. One of these paradoxes pertains to diversity versus uniformity. The importance of celebrating and embracing diversity becomes evident in the global community. Diversity entails a true commitment to concepts such as indeterminacy, openness, pluralism, and multiplicity. In contrast, there seems to be a prevailing uniformity in which we are in textiles and clothing, based on our predominately white, western, and female values that continue to limit the realization and impact of diversity in our field. Yet we are certainly diverse in terms of our disciplinary and cross-disciplinary orientations. Perhaps what constrains us the most is the fact that we focus on objects often perceived as important only to women. We take for granted the fact that textile and apparel products are important, but the scientific community as a whole fails to value such a focus. Ironically, the community of textiles and clothing scholars that can be accused of uniformity and narrowness in its perspectives by virtue of gender and other factors is one of the few groups that brings some element of cross-disciplinary diversity to the larger scientific community.

Clearly, we have much to accomplish toward the goals of increasing our commitment to diversity in all of its forms and of identifying the values that enable us to bridge the different areas in our subject matter. As Forney, Hamilton, Gunn and others have suggested in this volume, the opportunity to acquire a global perspective begins at our doorstep. Textiles and clothing incorporates a variety of disciplinary cultures and therefore is multicultural as well as transdisciplinary. The future of textiles and clothing relies on our ability not only to capitalize on our diversity but also to conceptualize our linkages, creatively and critically.

Thus the issues regarding a global culture parallel those in the "culture" of textiles and clothing scholars. In short, we are faced with the challenges and delights that diversity affords, but in order to acknowledge these fully, we need to be willing to "stretch" intellectually and ideologically beyond our own perspectives. We need to take on the role of the other to see value in others' values and to avoid imposing our own "world view" on the diverse scholars within our own field. Rather than dismiss that which seems foreign to dominant perspectives, we need to acknowledge the value of having among us textiles and clothing scholars who adopt divergent perspectives such as feminism, human ecology, symbolic interactionism, transaction cost analysis, ethnmethodology, and critical relativism. Familiarity with multiple
perspectives can also enrich a single scholar's work and help in the development of a global perspective. Such a familiarity also enables us to identify the blending elements in our subject matter.

Toward a Fusion of Horizons

The "fusion of horizons" concept promotes an open and indeterminate view of knowledge, as well as a quest for knowledge that is grounded in a perspective (Gadamer, 1976). Thus the concept of "horizons" replaces that of knowledge boundaries. To have a perspective equated with a horizon is to have a view that not only has its limits but that also is open to connecting with horizons other than one's own (Nielsen, 1990, p. 28). The "fusion of horizons" metaphor seems quite appropriate to an understanding of textiles and clothing subject matter, which necessitates an interdisciplinary blending of world views, forms of inquiry, and ways of knowing. A new synthesis can emerge if we are willing to move freely among old and new theories, paradigms, and world views (Nielsen, 1990, p. 28). Such a synthesis needs to incorporate a global perspective, as noted by Forney and Hamilton (in this volume); it also needs to involve a creative and critical comparison of our own world views with those of other peoples, so we can acquire insights that surpass cultural conditioning (Gablik, 1984, p. 128).

As we "revisit" the Venn diagram presented in the beginning of this volume, we can address some of the areas of convergence that hold a great deal of promise for a fusion of horizons in textiles and clothing. By the use of a Venn diagram and a focus in this paper on areas of convergence (see Areas A, B, and C in Figure 1), it is not our intent to indicate that the amount of "space" in each area of the model implies volume in terms of our knowledge base. Nor do we mean to suggest that convergence in areas of knowledge "subtracts" content from their intellectual bases. Rather, we use a Venn diagram as a heuristic device and as a springboard for discussion of what intersects and why. Ultimately, as Nagasawa (in Part Five of this volume) points out, we will need to move beyond identifying our linkages toward theories that explain them. It is our hope that this volume and the following attempt to begin identifying examples of areas of convergence will stimulate movement in that direction.

Area A

Area A in the diagram points to the interface between production/distribution systems and appearances and social realities. This interface parallels the bridges we need to understand between production and consumption, as suggested in the introduction to Part Four. These bridges connect processes of production with processes of constructing and interpreting appearances as a means for understanding social realities. Individuals "seek to express their sense of freedom, their personal power, and their status aspirations" through consumption (Tomlinson, 1990, p. 6). But it is also important to examine consumption processes in relation to the political economies that influence the global production and distribution of textiles and apparel. For example, despite a worldwide circulation of textile and apparel commodities, fashionable appearance styles often seem to be created in small-group or subcultural contexts (Kaiser, Nagasawa, & Hutton, 1991). Thus any discussion of consumption processes needs to encompass social interactions and negotiations as well as macro interdependencies. Such a discussion should also incorporate a regard for fundamental shifts and variations in values as a function of producers' as well as consumers' class, racial, regional, generational, and gender identities (Tomlinson, 1990, p. 18). Topical areas such as the following deal with the sites of connection between production/distribution systems and consumers' constructions of social meaning:

- incorporation of symbolic meanings of apparel and textiles into advertising; consumer interpretations and reconstructions of symbolic meanings in apparel advertising
- historical and cultural variations in production/distribution systems as connected to consumers' purchases and perceptions of textiles and apparel
- trends in values toward recycling, protecting the environment, animal rights and the

---
1 See Paoletti (in this volume) for a different way of thinking about Venn diagrams and an alternative model/metaphor.
response of manufacturers in adjusting to those values; effects of changing values on fashion change, attitudes toward second-hand clothes, and use of mail-order catalogs
- the study of the diffusion of styles throughout the marketplace, and changes of meaning(s) of styles during this process (during diffusion, consumers become an integral part of the marketing and distribution process and determine meanings such as "fashionability")
- the study of the influence of commercial sources on the transfer of meaning to consumer goods
- studying the influence of subcultures on marketing strategies
- development and evaluation of service orientation in retailing
- consumers as prosumers: home sewing, customized sewing services and meanings that these processes add to the product; mixing and matching elements of style to construct appearances in the proactive sense (and how production/distribution systems may foster these processes)

Area B

Area B identifies sites of connection between production/distribution systems and processes of textile product evaluation. It reminds us that textile products are evaluated by human beings at all stages throughout the product pipeline. Ultimately, it is consumers' evaluations (see Sieben and Norton, in this volume) that determine what is purchased, worn, or discarded. However, we need to understand the relationships between consumers' evaluations and those of producers and distributors, as suggested by the following topical areas:
- marketing influences on acceptance of new textile innovations
- how textile production systems delimit types of fabrics available for development of product lines
- expert evaluation of hand versus consumer evaluation of hand: influence on understanding of hand
- effect of discontinuation of consumer product evaluation research by textile manufacturers on innovation in the marketplace
- extent to which consumers’ judgments of comfort influence design and production decisions on the part of apparel manufacturers
- relationship between safety concerns linked to textile products (e.g., flammability) and perceptions of risk from the perspectives of both consumers and producers
- influence of perceptions of textile/apparel quality on production and quality control decisions on the part of manufacturers
- influence of retailers as mediating influences on consumers’ evaluations of textile products
- influence of perceptions of functional clothes on the extent to which consumers are willing to make use of them (e.g., attitudes toward protective clothing or clothing designed for person with physical disabilities)
- visual assessment of garments as influenced by both tangible product characteristics and cultural ways of seeing
- linkages between *objective* and *subjective* ways of evaluating textile products

**Area C**

Area C deals with the convergence between textile product evaluation and appearances and social realities. Accordingly, it links personal and social dimensions with physical dimensions of textile products. Consumer decisions about aesthetic characteristics of textile products are inherent in this convergence. The importance of integrating physical and social science perspectives in the study of textiles and clothing is also reinforced, as suggested by the following examples:

- effects of consumer characteristics and culture on evaluations of hand, serviceability, design etc.
- evaluations of appropriateness of textiles and apparel for diverse end uses and how these vary as a function of historical and cultural context
- changing perceptions of fiber properties; for example, stereotypes associated with polyester (e.g., leisure suits) and how these may become altered as influential designers begin to use new polyester fabrics (products of fiber innovations and modifications) in their apparel lines
- parallels between perceptions of comfort and definitions of social situations
- proliferation of independent craftspersons and their influence on the availability and meanings of unique textiles for consumers
- the complex process of color forecasting in which experts watch consumers, the arts, and multiple cultural factors; experts forecast color trends; the textile industry incorporates trend advice into dyeing decisions; apparel producers and retailers adjust their lines and promotions to entice/limit consumers toward a narrow range of color choices; color trends emphasized in the marketplace develop meanings such as new, fashionable, current, ugly, etc.
- influence of color analysis services on dyeing decisions made by producers, selections offered by retailers and manufacturers, and ultimate choices on the part of consumers
- influence of multiple distribution systems (retailing, second hand, mail order, craft markets) on industry options in the variety of...
goods produced, the types of producers facilitated, and consumer options for self-expression and self-actualization.

Social and ethical considerations in (a) producers' and distributors' approaches to meeting consumers' needs and (b) consumers' consciousness of the practices of the producers and distributors they patronize.

Conclusion

The interdependencies that pervade the textile/apparel product chain from producer to consumer point to the need in textiles and clothing for theoretical linkages. We cannot afford to perpetuate arbitrary distinctions among cultural, economic, and social dimensions in the study of production, distribution, and consumption of textile and apparel products. In the present intellectual moment, we are experiencing an erosion of the boundaries among cultural, economic, and social realms of experience (Connor, 1989). And in our everyday lives, we are making decisions and constructing understandings that defy neat categories of experience. From the initial conception of a product to its eventual disposal, perceptions are linked to tangible properties. The design process, for example, absolutely demands integrating a variety of bits of knowledge so as to solve a specific problem.2 Thus it becomes especially imperative to pursue avenues of inquiry that emphasize global and integrative, rather than culturally and disciplinarily specific, thinking.

The concept of multiplicity needs to be embedded in our theories, methods, and practices. We need to continue to move beyond "discrete parcels" of knowledge (Fiske, 1986, p. 62) and beyond a "quest for precision" (Levine, 1985, p. 8) toward theories that encompass a cross-section, synthesis, or combination of these parcels. To do so will require that we tolerate ambiguity, celebrate diversity, and decipher sites of connection. We will need to work with multiple meanings of concepts and tolerate inconsistencies in terminology and methods. We will need to develop an appreciation

for the fact that along with our connections and commonalities there are contingencies in our subject matter, just as there are in our everyday lives.
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2 For this reason, we believe it is essential for designers to be an integral part of theoretical development efforts. This has not often been the case in the past, perhaps because we often tend to make arbitrary and artificial distinctions between visible artifacts and abstract ideas or meanings. It is time for a "fusion of horizons" across the arts and sciences. If textiles and clothing scholars cannot develop such a fusion, it isn't likely to happen in any field.
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