Theories Applied to Dress Phenomena

To "continue with our current research and teaching" without theory will perpetuate the accumulation of a mass of correlations that neither explain nor predict, but just are. They become "so what?" pieces of information. Many of the correlations in our subject matter are suspect because concepts have been defined differently by different authors, measurement devices have not measured what the author believes is being measured, thought processes have not been used to draw correlations together to show relationships among concepts, and much of our correlations are locked into a particular point in time (for example, potentially limited in applicability to the fashionable styles of a given historical context). Until these concerns are addressed, the knowledge base will not be cumulative and grow with new observations (Hutton, 1991, p. 59).

In this section we are offered a diversity of perspectives with which to study dress phenomena as scholars discuss over-arching patterns of behavior in relation to dress. In her discussant paper, Hilda Buckley Lakner describes the writers of the papers in this section as progressive with the papers in this section providing a major contribution to an assessment of the state of our science. Common themes are outlined and include expansion of methodological approaches in our research, emphasis on the importance of dress in everyday life as a unique focus of study, and the complex nature of dress. The value of the papers in this section, she states, is that they either propose a new theoretical approach to understanding research findings in the field or suggest a new way of interpreting the theories we use. She challenges us to refine and formalize our present theoretical approaches, use consistent terms for the object of our study, and test the theories we develop.
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While textiles and clothing scholars have made significant advances toward synthesizing a social psychological perspective on clothing and human behavior, they need to give closer attention to how culture mediates the expression of social identity. Kaiser (1990) acknowledges that culture must be considered as one facet of a complex social dynamic whereby the meaning of dress is constructed, understood, altered, and communicated. Culture, or more specifically cultural ideology, authenticates a collective meaning of appearance that, in turn, mediates human experience. Correspondingly, Hamilton and Hamilton (1989) argue that dress be examined as a powerful metaphor that marks the bond between person and cultural body. Analysis of dress in the context of ritual behavior and expression can manifest the "subtle values, relationships, and meanings" (p. 22) that shape individual action. Yet despite their work, textile and clothing researchers have given insufficient attention to the work of ethnographers working within the framework of symbolic anthropology. With interest in material culture, these anthropologists have sought to substantiate the meaning of artifacts within a broader cultural dynamic; some have focused on clothing and adornment.

Symbolic anthropology is part of the larger orientation of cognitive anthropology. Cognitive anthropologists locate the culture on the person in human processes of perceiving and knowing: "cultural behavior is symbolic behavior shared by the culture bearers and cultures are abstractions of ideas and behavior patterns with different meanings for different individuals" (Garbarino, 1983, p. 82). Garbarino notes that the objective of the cognitive anthropologist is to identify and describe these abstract cultural patterns, to locate the meanings from the perspective of the participant, and to identify the organizing principles that mediate social behavior. Symbolic anthropology, in particular, extends the concepts of culture and cultural patterning by viewing culture as symbolic system. Clifford Geertz (1973), among the most well-known of the symbolic anthropologists, defines culture as "an historically transmitted pattern of meanings embodied in symbols, a system of inherited conceptions expressed in symbolic form by means of which men communicate, perpetuate, and develop their knowledge about and attitudes toward life" (p. 89). Geertz suggests that we view culture as consisting of the "webs of significance" which people spin and in which they suspend themselves (p. 5). He has proposed a semiotic anthropology, one that is "not an experimental science in search of law but an interpretive one in search of meaning" (p. 5). The objective is to gain access to the conceptual world of a community and sort out the meanings that people create about their reality and employ to define individual and collective action.

The purpose of this paper is to highlight the contributions of selected anthropologists and art historians who have studied the cultural significance of dress within ethnographic settings. Through a discussion of their work, I propose the usefulness of metaphor and metonymy as interpretive tools. These rhetorical devices potentially help the researcher conceptualize the social function of dress. Meanings are understood as relations that link together the different aspects and dimensions of social life within a community. The physical form of dress is transformed into a cultural vehicle. Dress acts much like a trope, or a figure of speech, that binds the person with his/her culture. Dress symbolically isolates cultural values and integrates these as part of a person's social experience. As metaphor, dress potentially reveals meaning through a connotative correspondence of two dissimilar domains (e.g., culture and person). At the same time, dress locates meaning specifically with the person. In metonymy, there is a contiguity of dress with person (e.g., the dressed person) that
establishes the person's possession of certain character. Closer study of the semiotic nature of cultural artifacts would help us understand how, for example, an observer might assume that a woman wearing the traditional dress of a region supports the values of the community.

It is not my intent to provide a theoretical treatise on the semiotics of dress. Rather by documenting how ethnographers have described the meaning of dress within selected cultures, I call attention to the need to account for the effect of sociocultural context in structuring significance. The application of semiotic analysis to the ethnographic setting is based on the assumption that cultures construct an order to their worlds as a means of resolving the paradoxical nature of life's experiences. In particular, attention to the metaphoric and metonymic dimensions of dress illuminates its contributions in maintaining this order and at the same time, acknowledges the function of dress in defining social identity.

Semiotic Theory: Some Qualifications

Before discussion can focus on dress, some comments are necessary about semiotic theory and terminology. Semiotics, defined as a science of signs, is a pluralistic discipline (Noth, 1990, p. 3). It can be addressed from diverse perspectives and at varied levels of abstraction. Recognition of these differing perspectives not only allows for an appreciation of the insights offered by each scholar, but potentially contributes to lively discussions of theoretical issues and provides the foundations for a more comprehensive synthesis of knowledge. At this point in the development of semiotic theory, however, debate continues about the symbolic nature of the world. The attention of scholars to specific empirical phenomena and contexts make terminology diffuse and inconsistent. Faithfulness to one's data takes priority over operationalism.

However to provide some basis for synthesizing a semiotic of dress, the commonalities between similar terms need to be indicated. Within the broad domain of semiotic studies, scholars have referred to dress and culture as constituting meaning, symbolic, sign, or semiotic systems. Ethnographers with training in anthropology or art history generally use the designation symbolic, unless they are working explicitly within a framework of semiotic theory (e.g., Saussurian semiotics), when they use the designation semiotic or sign. The literature on sign and its specific manifestations as index, icon, or symbol is extensive and diverse. Debate about which typology best characterizes the communicative features of society is on-going. In this paper, I do not make the precise distinctions between sign and symbol often argued in the semiotic literature, but use them as synonyms. Noth (1990) has suggested that the "ubiquity" of symbol in many fields of research "suggest[s] that symbol and symbolic are often synonyms of sign and semiotic" (p. 115). For my purposes, both sign and symbol imply that particular objects and actions have meaning to members of a community and that this meaning influences their perceptions and behaviors. Furthermore, the relationship between the object/action and the meaning is arbitrary, not set by any inherent quality of the object/action, but defined within a sociocultural context.

In order to understand this discussion of metaphor and metonymy, the reader must continually reflect on how social life with all its ambiguities and contradictions is underscored by the suggestion of order. Social life is the context within which people collectively interact with others and experience their world. A person's participation in the culture by virtue of its social institutions and rituals mediates individual perception and behavior. Symbolic anthropology suggests that an underlying cultural order gives meaning to social life and helps the individual comprehend his/her world and act decisively. In semiotic analysis concepts of system and structure are employed to describe order. However a persistent question dominates much of this research: how does cultural order, although confounded by the realities of social life, nonetheless facilitate human knowledge of self and society?

Semiotic theory is premised by the view that social life is variously circumscribed by sign systems. According to Noth (1990),

system most generally implies the idea of elements forming an ordered whole. The
relations among these elements form the structure of the system. The elements may have common features, but their systemic character appears only in their function within the system. (p. 198)

A sign system is a totality ordered according to relations among signs and having an integrity defined by the communicative purpose of its signs. Language is one type of sign system, in which words can be selected and combined to express ideas. Saussure (1916/1974) has suggested that language is the most important of all sign systems (p. 68). Dress has been characterized as a sign system, not unlike that of language. Allison Lurie (1983) loosely applies the analogy with language to highlight dress as a form of social expression. For example, she calls our attention to the vocabulary, slang, conventions, and taste of clothing and adornment. Others have focused on the structural intricacies of a dress system: Rebecca Holman (1979, 1980a, 1980b) attempts to decode this sign system by developing a transcription format that facilitates correlation of clothing attributes with distinctive communication functions. Yet as in other areas of semiotic research, there is a lack of consensus. By noting that dress lacks the combinatorial freedom present in verbal language, McCracken (1988) questions the usefulness of the analogy with language. He finds no evidence that a viewer constructs an overall impression of a person's dress by adding together the individual attributes of clothing and adornment, as one would interpret the words of a sentence.

Nonetheless when considering the systematic nature of dress, scholars must acknowledge that sign systems are interdependent. Barthes (1964/1967) notes that verbal language "is a second-order language, with its unities no longer monemes or phonemes, but larger fragments of discourse referring to objects or episodes whose meaning underlies language, but can never exist independently of it" (p. 11). Likewise, dress is informed by a linguistic sign system. In the introduction, Barthes (1967/1983) explains that his study of the fashion system

already a system of signs: an ambiguous goal, for it does not correspond to the customary distinction which puts the real on one side and language on the other; thus, it escapes both linguistics, the science of verbal signs, and semiology, the science of object signs. (p. x)

He asserts that language is more than the model of meaning, it is its very foundation. The written discourse that constitutes the signification of fashion, promotes fashion as an integral part of the cultural order. Yet, for Barthes this is a language that must be interpreted as speech. This analytical perspective allows contradictions to be seen and discussed. Barthes notes, for example, that it is because the vindictive present which defines it is barely tenable, difficult to acknowledge, that Fashion is concerned to elaborate a fictive temporality which has an order, bearing, and maturity which are empirical on the level of functions, institutional on the level of Law, organic on the level of fact; . . . (p. 273)

Barthes' study of written fashion approaches some of the complexities of social life by seeking the semiotic logic that underscores the social impact of a fashion rhetoric.

Understanding dress as a sign system and questions about its structural nature can be traced to concepts formulated by Ferdinand de Saussure (1916/1974). The linguistic sign was among Ferdinand de Saussure's principal interests. And though Noth (1990) notes that Saussure's contribution to a general theory of signs has been minor, he does credit Saussure with providing guidelines to study nonlinguistic signs and with emphasizing the importance of studying signs within systems (p. 63).

Saussure suggested that elements of a system are constituted by the "differences that make it possible to distinguish [them] from all others, for [only] differences carry signification" (cited in Noth, 1990, p. 193). These differences become apparent in the structural relations among elements that comprise the system. Four elemental principles characterize the structural relations of language hierarchically from its most
basic form as sign and meaning system to its placement within the world according to usage and mutability. Although these principles are tied to linguistic analysis, they have been extended to other sign systems, such as clothing and adorning.

1. The sign consists of the arbitrary union between a sound image (the signifier) and a concept (the signified). Considered within a linguistic context, the sign sweater merges the letters s-w-e-a-t-e-r with the image of a knit garment worn over the upper torso of the human body. The relationship between the signifier (i.e., the letters s-w-e-a-t-e-r) and the signified (i.e., the image of a sweater) is arbitrary; there is nothing inherent about sign that motivates the union of word and image. We might just have easily also named this image a sweatshirt. This concept of sign can be extended to suggest the structure of signs in a dress sign system: the significance of the artifactual sign sweater represents a unity of an apparel form (e.g., garment worn over the upper torso) and a meaning (e.g., casual wear). As with the linguistic sign, there is nothing inherent to the vestimentary sign that necessitates an association as casual wear. Indeed, today sweaters are appropriate for a wide range of circumstances.

2. Language is a system of interdependent signs. The meaning of one sign results from its simultaneous opposition to other signs within a sign system. Meaning is defined through differences made apparent by syntagmatic and paradigmatic relations among signs. Syntagmatic relations concern the relationship of the sign with other signs present at the moment of perception. This principle likewise can be extended to dress, when it is assumed to constitute a sign system. The sweater is perceived by virtue of its association with other garments worn as part of an ensemble. A sweater worn with blue jeans, athletic shoes, and socks differs conceptually from a sweater worn with mini skirt, heels, and stockings. The meaning of one element of this syntagmatic set is defined in terms of the meanings of the other elements that comprise it, and the meaning of each element affects the meaning of the entire expression.

Paradigmatic relations concern the relationship of the sign with other signs that potentially can be substituted for it. In this case, the sweater is understood by virtue of its difference from other garments appropriate for the upper torso. Rather than a sweater, the wearer might have worn a blouse, blazer, vest. The meaning attributed to the sweater is a consequence of its difference from the blouse, blazer, and vest. In this case, differences are revealed through contrasting forms (e.g., garment styles, fabric structures, or fiber content) and meanings (e.g., dressy, professional, or masculine).

3. A sign system has dual reality: langue, an all-encompassing social code, governs parole, idiosyncratic expression. For example, cultural norms and rules (i.e., langue) of aesthetics and morality mediate how individual choices (i.e., parole) are made about how and when to wear a sweater. Saussure's focus on one aspect of this reality, language as a system or a code, rather than on the interrelationship of language and speech, suggests the additional complexity that speech poses to linguistic understanding. In reference to written fashion, Barthes (1967/1983) makes the distinction between the vestimentary code and its actualization in garments. To this he adds a rhetorical system that connects the meaning of fashionability to broader social implications and consequences (Noth, 1990, p. 312). Barthes notes the paradox that "written clothing is at once institution ("language") on the level of clothing, and action ("speech") on the level of language" governs his structural analysis (1967/1983, p. 18).

4. Finally, synchrony and diachrony differentiate temporal contexts of linguistic analysis. Synchronic analysis of a language examines its nature at one point in time, without reference to historical antecedents; while diachronic analysis addresses its historical development over time. In a synchronic study of sweaters, the semiotician might correlate the preferences of college students with the styles promoted among high fashion designers during the one season (seen in this instance as one moment in time) and develop parameters that define fashionability. In a diachronic study, the semiotician might trace changing styles of sweater over a ten year period, with attention on the impact of the couture designer. While in each case, the empirical evidence limited by the
temporal framework helps the investigator focus the research. Saussure employed only synchronic analysis to isolate the linguistic structure (Noth, 1990, p. 53). Similarly, anthropologists often analyze fieldwork observation in terms of an ethnographic present. Levi-Strauss (1963), however, argues for an anthropology that integrates historical methods. For example, he suggests that ethnographic and historic methods be used to "analyze each dual society [type of social structure] in order to discover, behind the chaos of rules and customs, a single structural scheme existing and operating in different spatial and temporal contexts" (p. 21). Combining synchronic and diachronic analysis in a study of sweater fashionability might reveal a structural schema that integrates aesthetic expression and social usage.

Structuralism has provided semiotic theory with the methods of speculating on the essential order of culture, its transformations through social life, and the impact on members of a society. Levi-Strauss (1963) proposes that we consider cultural phenomena as essentially symbolic and that the elemental structures of a society represent cultural symbolism. The example of kinship is used.

What confers upon kinship its socio-cultural character is not what it retains from nature, but, rather, the essential way in which it diverges from nature. A kinship system does not consist in the objective ties of descent or consanguinity between individuals. It exists only in human consciousness; it is an arbitrary system of representations, not the spontaneous development of a real situation. (p. 50)

Structuralism is based on the realization that "the world does not consist of independently existing objects, whose concrete features can be perceived clearly and individually, and whose nature can be classified accordingly" (Hawkes, 1977, p. 17). Rather, "the full significance of any entity or experience cannot be perceived unless and until it is integrated into the structure of which it forms a part" (p. 18).

Derived from Trubetzkoy's work on structural linguistics, Levi-Strauss (1963) suggests four basic operations of structural analysis: (a) a shift from the study of conscious phenomena to the study of their unconscious infrastructure, (b) an emphasis on the relations between terms rather than on terms as independent entities, (c) a focus on the whole system, and (d) a discovery of general laws within the system, either by induction or logical deduction (p. 33). The ramifications of Levi-Strauss' work is reflected in the following ethnographic studies. While structuralism may focus on characterizing the set of relations that connect the elements of a cultural system, the sign system being defined is seen in juxtaposition with a conscious, empirical reality. A tension between langue and parole, which shapes the experience of social life, is acknowledged.

To appreciate the place of structural analysis in semiotic theory, and hence to a semiotic of dress, study must extend beyond Levi-Strauss and include Jakobson, Hjelmslev, Barthes, and others. Noth (1990) provides a useful introduction to their contributions within the field, as well as citations for an in-depth reading of their works. A comprehensive review of their work is beyond the scope of this paper.

A Semiotic of Dress

The following ethnographic studies premise their interpretive stance on the view that culture is an elaborate semiotic system that mediates individual and collective action. The individual experiences culture through participation in the social life of a community. Attention to the nature of this social life reveals a complex of interdependent subsystems. Interpreting the significance of any phenomenon of social life, such as dress, demands study of this sociocultural context. The investigator understands the importance of the artifact, not as an isolated object but, as a vital component of social and cultural order.

Structural Dimensions of Meaning

Bogatyrev (1937/1971, 1936/1976) has initiated discussion about the semiotic dimensions of dress with his analysis of Moravian Slovakian folk costume. Language, and by extension dress, are seen as functional systems that serve the purpose of communication and exist in equilibrium with a larger cultural dynamic (Noth,
The concept function is used in semiotics to specify the importance of elements to the totality. More specifically, functional analysis explains the existence of structures, processes, or features of the system by specifying their contribution to the operation of the system as a whole. In the case of dress, function indicates how dress use within a community reinforces social order and world view.

Bogatyrev (1937/1971) employs the concept of "function" to locate the purpose of folk costume within a social milieu of Moravian Slovakian culture. Multiple functions are identified and indicate practical, aesthetic, socio-sexual, moral, ritual, and other purposes. The formal nature of the folk costume has both material and ideological realities; it exists as object and as sign, usually simultaneously since a costume may have several functions. Function characterizes physical form (e.g., its construction or artistic features) and/or indicates the ideological importance of dress to the community (e.g., the ethical ideals). Bogatyrev (1937/1971) notes that only the practical function, and in some cases, the aesthetic function relate to costume itself. Other functions relate both to the costume and to aspects of social life, including the status of the wearer or the significance of the event. The simultaneity of functions represented in juxtaposition to the form make the costume a microcosm of Moravian Slovakian culture.

In addition the simultaneity of function, what Bogatyrev (1937/1971) calls "the total structural interrelationship of functions," suggests the structural complexity of the Moravian Slovakian dress system. First, within the system, the costume's form and its function are reciprocal in meaning: form depends on function and function depends on form. Second, the meaning of one clothing item depends upon the correspondence of form and function among several items. This interdependence constitutes the structure of its functions and thus defines the unique sign system of costume.

In the structural analysis of function, structure is seen as a gestalt: the distinctive general function differs from the individual functions that comprise it. Folk costume, what Bogatyrev (1937/1971) calls "our costume," is one example in which the "general function of the structure of functions plus the emotional coloring originating in the closeness of the costume to its respective community" (p. 97) are combined. While awareness of the general function of costume does not prevent persons from differentiating functions in the same costume, the whole structure of functions influences the perception of individual functions. Bogatyrev (1937/1971) suggests that by examining the complex structural relationships underlying the expression of function in costume, the scholar can better grasp how costume characterizes social norms and cultural change.

Sherzer and Sherzer (1979) develop Bogatyrev's (1937/1971) idea of the structural interdependence of costume function and suggest the presence of social codes, or underlying rules of cultural expression and social behavior. They refer to these codes as semiotic subsystems. These systems differentiate mola function as art object, as clothing, as symbol of cultural identity, and as economic good. Each subsystem, while characterized by specific aesthetic and use parameters, represent function across all contexts within which the mola is found and used: among the Cuna Indians, in Panama, and throughout the western world. However, the full significance of the mola cannot be understood by any one code alone. They argue that the significance of the Cuna mola does not reside in its internal artistic structure but can be understood through awareness of the coexisting subsystems. "The internal artistic structure is not independent of these other semiotic subsystems, but rather interrelates and in part depends on them" (p. 1073). The Sherzers suggest that the identification of different meanings may indicate the presence of multiple semiotic subsystems, or codes. The study of one code is insufficient; all of these must be described and examined in relation to each other to have a comprehensive knowledge of the item's significance.

Relying principally on the Saussurian model outlined by Barthes (1967/1963), Roger Neich (1982) makes a semiologic analysis4 of Mount Hagen self-decoration. Like Bogatyrev and the Sherzers, he qualifies the structural interdependence of subsystems within a society. Self-decoration is one semiotic system that
functions in conjunction with other systems (including language, marriage rules, kinship). These distinctive subsystems variously contribute to the person's conscious and unconscious comprehension of social life. More importantly, Neich (1982) expands our understanding of the adornment subsystem as a specific cultural code. He addresses the underlying components of the system, unconscious to the wearer but instrumental to significance. However, the relationship among these subsystems and of subsystems to the whole is complex and does not necessarily bring coherence to social experience.

Meanings are defined through articulations that occur along a continuum from usage level (i.e., "substance of content") to schema level (i.e., "form of content"). At the level of conscious usage, there are multiple systems (e.g., self decoration, body, kinship). Each acts as a discrete system of communication that contributes in its own way to shape individual choice. These systems may contain elements of another subsystem, totally or partly, or may be independent of it. In the former case, "the same object may give rise to a mental image that links with different signified concepts in different systems and final meaning is given by articulation and value within each system" (Neich, 1982, p. 226). In both cases, the relationship will be defined through a hierarchy of transformations from conscious to unconscious knowledge. These systems merge into a unified "unconscious structure" that provides "a common basis for comparison and connection" (p. 228). In the case of the Mount Hagen people, Neich (1982) notes that Hageners can indicate the combinative constraints that influence the choice of appearance, although unconscious of the binary opposition.

Neich (1982) points to a "dialectical relation" between langue and parole that results from the "interplay of social convention and individual choice" (p. 221). The individual is not totally governed by the culture and indeed can affect social change.

All the actual self-decoration sets in the corpus provided by the [anthropologists] Stratherns constitute parole (speech), the result of individual acts of selection and articulation. In building up his set of decorations, the individual works with a systematized set of signs and rules, that is langue. Where performers standardize their decorations, we see a speech which is partly institutionalized. During the preliminary practices, performers are aware of the norm or ideal for the performance and attempt to conform to it. Nevertheless, their individual paroles will still display variations. . . . the norm determines usage and speech, but also at the same time usage and speech have an effect on the norm. (Neich, 1982, p. 221)

Neich (1982) suggests that the interdependency of norm and usage make the threshold between language and speech precarious.

In addition, Neich (1982) suggests that the expression of function may be contradictory in explanations about the physical, social, and ideological realities of a community. These contradictions occur between subsystems or with the translation of meaning between conscious usage and unconscious infrastructure. Denotative meanings are immediate, situationally determined, and factual in expression. Connotative meanings are global and find "reference in the total cultural ideology of each society" (p. 225), which is not always apparent. Connotations are more likely to transcend the empirical circumstances and refer to more elemental structures of society. Neich (1982) notes how diagramming denotative and connotative functions in a manner that reflects the empirical circumstance is difficult. According to Neich (1982), connotations work to transcend contradictions of empirical reality and ideology, made evident through denotation. However, the paradoxes posed by contradictions are persistent and never can be permanently resolved. Thus, the continuing attempt to overcome the "inadequacy between denotation and connotation [in explaining social experience] gives rise to a dynamic changing system" (p. 226).

These studies suggest that a clothing system does not exist in isolation, but is interconnected in complex ways with other cultural subsystems to constitute the experiences and activities of a community. Paradox is an integral part of the
expression as functional codes become contradictory in the explanation of the diverse aspects of social life.

Metaphoric and Metonymic Referents of Meaning

Attention to metaphor and metonymy offers one means of addressing the transposition of meaning within and across semiotic dimensions. Metonymy defines significance through a substitution based on contiguity within a semiotic statement—part for whole or whole for part (Eco, 1979, p. 280). Items or features of dress stand for a person. For example, seeing a distinctive style of sweater (e.g., a bulky mohair turtleneck) in the store might bring to mind a specific person who wears the particular style. Metaphor defines significance through a substitution based on semantic resemblance between dissimilar phenomenon (Eco, 1979, p. 280). There is a connotative correspondence between dress and the person. To continue with the sweater example, the mohair turtleneck sweater is an ideal garment to keep a person warm on a winter's day. This quality of warmth transfers to the individual the characteristics brought to mind upon seeing the sweater. A warm person is an amiable and sympathetic companion. The property of warmth, a part of a sweater/garment sign system is transferred to a person's sign system to qualify her character.

Nathan Joseph (1986) points out how these rhetorical devices structure person perception. Metaphor refers to the process by which the meaning inherent in a clothing symbol is transposed from one usage context or sign system to a second context or system. In contrast, metonymy characterizes the process by which a clothing symbol stands apart from the other symbols within a use context or sign system and acts as a key symbol that embodies the significance of the entire domain. Joseph urges metaphoric and metonymic analyses that extend beyond an account of denotive and connotative meanings. The meaning suggested by metaphoric and metonymic relations involves multiple sign systems and levels of signification. Acknowledgment of and attention to the paradoxes, contradictions, and ambiguity that result from this complexity can reveal underlying sociocultural factors that shape perception.

Joseph notes that in case of metaphor, the integration of selected social characteristics; e.g., "status, relationships, attributes" (p. 13), by virtue of the clothing sign facilitates the expression of more subtle ideological attitudes or philosophic beliefs about the person.

Metaphor and metonymy have implications that extend beyond the expression of identity; attention to their presence in dress can potentially yield insights about subjective experience. Much of human language draws upon metaphor and metonymy to relay an understanding of reality. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) posit that "conceptual metaphors are grounded in correlations within our experience" (p. 154-155) and that such metaphors are based on experiential, rather than objective, similarities. Lakoff and Johnson's work demonstrates the pervasive nature of metaphoric processes as they structure a person's conscious interpretation of the world and understanding of self. In metaphor, relationships of coherence are drawn across domains of experience.

Attention to the formulation of meaning through the juxtaposition of empirical phenomena, albeit within a semiotic network or across domains of experience, provides a grasp of how a culture shapes personal cognition. Meaning is not inherent to the object, but an expression of relations between phenomena. Within the semiotic context, dress, adornment, and cloth potentially function as part of the idiomatic expression of a community. As metonyms and metaphors, they become key symbols that reflect on cultural values shared by the community and/or the person's experience of self within the community (Ortner, 1975). The following case studies illustrate the application of metaphoric and metonymic concepts to cloth use or body alteration. The investigators isolate the textile or clothing artifact as a key symbol; their analyses document how the artifact embodies core beliefs of the community. In the first two studies, metaphor is used to point out structural correspondences between artifact, its design and use, and cultural ideology. In the latter two studies, the artifact functions as a visual metaphor that communicates cultural values and marks the person's integration in society.
In the structural analysis of East Sumban (Indonesia) ceremonial cloth, Marie Jeanne Adams (1975) finds parallels between the formal rules of ritual behavior (e.g., interpersonal relations evidenced by gift exchange, home/temple construction, marriage) and the compositional principles of textile design; e.g., dyadic-triadic set, mirror image, favored numbers linked with stratification. Art does not reflect society but responds to the same structural principles. The Sumbanese conception of the cloth shows a preference for the bipolar division masculine/feminine, prominent in their intellectual systems. She concludes that "the decorated textiles which incorporate an intellectually refined accommodation of major structural principles participate integrally in the larger thought systems of the Sumbanese people" (p. 277).

John Nunley (1981) finds a parallel between the organization of Yoruba (Sierre Leone) aesthetic principles on the concepts fancy and fierce and Levi-Strauss oppositions of "cultured and acultural, human and animal" (p. 55). Nunley suggests this culture/nature dichotomy is the key to understanding the behavioral and affective experience of the masquerade. Entertainment masks communicate the aesthetic of fanciness, while masks that mediate with a spiritual world communicate the aesthetic of fierceness. The affective experience of the masquerade is grounded in a juxtaposition of social life and cultural ideology, represented metaphorically through the masked appearance.

Bosko (1981) links the instrumental function of the Basotho blanket (used as apparel) to provide warmth with its symbolic value within society. The power of the blanket lies in its association with the vagina, a blanket-like tissue that, by generating heat, transforms "lifeless into life-giving entities" (p. 31). The blanket is the symbolic equivalent of the family group; through ritual, the blanket functions to effect "growth, qualitative change, and passage" for the benefit of the group (p. 31).

Likewise, Brett-Smith (1982) finds that the wearing of Basiae or NGale cloths by Bamana women of Mali functions as visual idiom. The cloth acknowledges the young girl's excision, a "spiritual and physical cleaning" that indicates her "transition from the wild impurity of childhood to the ordered, regular cleanliness of adult life" (p. 20). The maintenance of the ritual ensures social order; the cloth marks important transitions in the female's life and symbolizes her moral character.

Metaphoric and metonymic relationships underlie the power of these artifacts to mediate thought and behavior. Suggested in the above studies are the implications of cloth and apparel for the social identity of a dressed person. The cultural values and principles that mediate the garment design are transferred to the individual.

**Dress and Identity**

Just as language has been used as a metaphor applied to characterize its communicative function, the conception of dress as "social skin" (Turner, 1980) suggests the social implications of this communication. As suggested in previous paragraphs, this perspective has shaped research of nonwestern dress. Symbolic anthropologists have studied material culture as a means of better understanding the effect of culture on social life. But the metaphor must be examined more closely for a more complete understanding of its implications. By adorning the naked body, dress distinguishes the human from the natural world and gives the individual a culture. Euro-American authors speaking about their own culture have proposed similar conceptions. Marshall McLuhan (1964) has stated that "[c]lothing, as an extension of the skin can be seen . . . as a means of defining the self socially" (p. 114). The idea of clothing making the self apparent to society is implied by Roach and Eicher's *The Visible Self* (1973) and by Horn's *The Second Skin* (1975).

The metaphoric reference to dress as social skin suggests its function as a communicative code. Thus far, researchers of nonwestern dress have been the most attentive to the contextual factors that frame the use of dress and, thereby, shape the expression of meaning. The following two anthropologists initiate a discussion of what this context might entail. They suggest that clothing and adornment mediate a person's awareness of identity, by synthesizing knowledge of self, society, and the world. They differ, however, on the nature of these relationships.
For Terrance S. Turner (1980), culture is a symbol system "through which we communicate our social status, attitudes, desires, beliefs and ideals (in short our identities) to others" (p. 114). Bodily adornment is the symbolic medium "most directly and concretely" concerned with the socialization of persons; it is the body covering that defines the individual as a cultural being. From his study of the Kayapo society, Turner isolates key factors of adornment, pertinent to communication. First, the identity of the person has both subjective and objective facets. The objective capacity of dress places the person within the social structure visually through suggestion of roles typical of the community. The subjective capacity of dress qualifies this identity by suggesting the attention the individual places on conformity to these roles. Second, Turner maintains the hypothesis that the body surface is systematically modified in all human societies so as to conflate these three levels of relations. . . . At one level, the 'social skin' models the social boundary between the individual actor and other actors; but at a deeper level it models the internal, psychic diagram between the pre-social, libidinous energy of the individual and the 'internalized others', or social meanings and values that make up what Freud called the 'ego' and 'super ego'. At yet a third, macro-social level, the conventionalized modifications of skin and hair that comprise the 'social skin' define . . . categories or classes of individuals . . . [and] the boundary between social classes. (p. 140)

According to Turner, social skin is a symbol that structures identity along interactive, psychological, and collective dimensions. Within each dimension, the meaning of identity is defined as a relation between the individual and the "other." While features of adornment may reflect on specific relationships, the totality of dress ties together these respective dimensions as a unity of meaning.

Similarly, Ronald A. Schwarz (1979) suggests that dress is symbolic and plays a mediating role in society, yet he characterizes these dimensions more broadly. According to Schwarz, dress mediates "the relationship between nature, man, and his sociocultural environment. In dressing up, man addresses himself, his fellows, and his world" (p. 31, italics deleted). Furthermore, clothes do more than just indicate a person's sex, age, occupation, and position in a social hierarchy, they are associated with a complex of sentiments and serve to channel strong emotions. Like other symbols, clothes also have a conative aspect—they move men to act in prescribed ways. (p. 28)

The symbolic role of dress is revealed in social life. Likewise dress, as a vehicle of culture, contributes to the shaping of social life. For example, the aesthetic arrangement of clothing features replicates the ethical principles of equality and hierarchy and reciprocity that order Guambiano society. Correspondingly, the differences between male and female dress signify the respective privileges and responsibilities of gender. Dress reveals the social logic on the level of everyday experience.

The concept social skin integrates a complex of metaphoric and metonymic relationships, pertinent as part of western thought, to characterize the significance of dress. With respect to form and function, clothing and skin are similar; they both cover and protect the body. Western tailored dress often forms a skintight covering. Furthermore, clothing like skin is contiguous to the body. It becomes the surface most apparent to those perceiving the person. Just as gesture, facial expression, and voice are media by which the body communicates, so too does the body covering become expressive. In turn, the expression represents the speaker; it reveals something about the person to others participating in the interaction. Sign systems circumscribe this communication by structuring the perceptions and actions of the participants. Despite the acknowledgment of dress as a cultural idiom, there remains the need to explore this as a relevant concept in studies of western dress.

**Semiotic Conception of Culture**

If we consider dress as a sign that locates the individual within society and mediates his/her rationalization of self, then we need to understand the nature of that sign with
acknowledgment to social life. The discipline of anthropology has lent insight into how objects, including dress, have meaning in people's lives and how that meaning has implications in the definition of selfhood. In particular, the symbolic anthropologist views culture as a symbol system that interplays with personal experience and social relations. Geertz (1973) has contributed to this new paradigm of culture. Culture provides guidelines for interpersonal behavior and communication by virtue of a framework of symbols which specifies limits of and options for social perception and action, and thereby mediates the person's perception of self and the presentation of self to others. Culture becomes the "necessary medium" of social communication and thereby provides the particular meanings that integrate the person as part of the natural and social environment.

In his seminal work, Geertz (1973) emphasizes the semiotic nature of culture and proposes a semiotic approach to the study of culture. He challenges the scholar to sort out the semiotic structures by gaining access to and comprehending the symbolic dimensions of social action—that is, the conceptual world of the participants as relevant to their discourse and behavior. The task is "to uncover the conceptual structures that inform our subjects' acts . . . and to construct a system of analysis . . . " (p. 27). Geertz directs the scholar to the social actor and the interactive context: "Behavior must be attended to, and with some exactness, because it is through the flow of behavior—or, more precisely, social action—that cultural forms find articulation" (p. 17). In turn culture shapes behavior. Within the tradition of Geertz, D'Andrade (1984) suggests that the symbols affect the person; they "represent the world, create cultural entities, direct one to do certain things, and evoke certain feelings" (p. 96).

Since the 1960s, ethnographic research has moved from a focus on the nature of the symbol and its structure as part of a cultural system, to the study of behavior as symbolic action and person as actor in the system (Ortner, 1984). Among these scholars, Milton Singer (1978) proposes a semiotic anthropology that "contains a theory of how systems of signs are related to their meanings as well as to the objects designated and to the experience and behavior of the sign users" (p. 224). To this, Singer (1980) suggests a semiotic conception of self, "in which the locus, unity, and continuity of the self will be found in the system of signs [culture] that constitute the dialogues [communication] between utterers and interpreters of the signs" (p. 485). A person's conception of self is mediated by sociocultural circumstance; the symbolic action of a community is framed by systems of signs. As part of the symbolic action, cultural objects (e.g., dress) evince the values and beliefs that structure action and interaction, both to the participant and to the scholar.

**Conclusions**

The conception of dress as language suggests a distinctive sign system in which the significance of clothing can be interpreted by isolating its position in relation to other clothing elements. A more in-depth reading of this language presents a complex perspective on interdependent sign systems reflective of the psychological, social, and cultural contexts within which dress functions. Much work remains before a comprehensive understanding of the semiotic nature of dress can be attained.

Knowledge of semiotics, however, can enrich and be enriched by the study of American dress and its many variants. American society consists of many interrelated and interdependent subcultures. Membership in these subcultures is based on common roles, interests, beliefs, and/or values and is a consequence of such factors as age, sex, ethnicity, and/or occupation. Certain objects, especially dress, may stand out as key symbols of community values and social life. Semiotic analysis of dress allows the investigator to document the function of dress in terms of its use within the community, as well as in relation to expression in mainstream society.
articulation of their respective meanings. Yet dress, being an artifact of the sociocultural context, is an important mechanism by which the self is revealed and objectified. By locating meaning as part of the symbolic action of a community, the textile and clothing scholar can better document the role of dress in the mediation of selfhood. The assignment of meaning is a dynamic process that acknowledges a person's social experience within a cultural context.

This examination of selected semiotic applications in ethnographic research is only a preliminary survey, meant to stimulate questions rather than provide answers. However two points can be brought out from this discussion. First, as we broaden our investigation of the sociocultural circumstance of meaning, we must be diligent in our understanding of semiotic theory and its diverse schools of thought. Second, as we refine a semiotic theory of clothing and adornment, we must acknowledge the ambiguities and paradoxes that shape our understanding of dress. Ethnographic research, by documenting the complex variants of culture and their shaping of human perception and experience, provides a context within which to challenge assumptions and refine theoretical explanations about dress and identity.
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Endnotes

1 Symbolic anthropology has become a label for a number of diverse trends in anthropology initiated during the 1960s to account for the cognitive processes that underlie behavior within a society. In particular, they view communication as key to social and cultural analyses. A discussion of symbolic anthropology and subsequent developments can be found in Ortner (1984).

2 Noth provides a comprehensive overview of semiotics, its diverse schools of thought and the interconnections between these perspectives.

3 The mola is a blouse known for its reverse applique design. The blouse was originally made and worn by the Cuna women, but now the garment is an important commodity in tourist trade. The Cuna people reside on an island chain off the eastern coast of Panama.

4 The terms semiology and semiotics were originally used to distinguish Saussurian and Peircean schools of thought. Today semiotics refers to the field as a whole.

5 Neich (1982) is referring to Hjelmslev’s theory of connotation, adapted by Barthes in the semiotic analysis of culture (Barthes, 1957/1980, 1967/1983). Barthes’ interpretation of the fashion is based on the juxtaposition of the vestimentary code as a denotative system and the rhetorical system as a connotative system. Like Neich, Barthes (1957/1983) identifies a paradox between message and code of the fashion magazine.

6 The dyadic-triadic set in Sumba textile design refers to a cloth “composed of a pair of opposed but identical endfields plus a bi axial centerfield which ... exhibits a like relation to either end” (Adams, 1975, p. 268).

7 See Cerny (1992a, 1992b) for a discussion of the quilt and quilted apparel as key symbols in an American quilt guild.
Affect and Cognition in Appearance Management: A Review
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Dress, as defined by Roach and Musa (1980), is "the total arrangement of all the outwardly detectable modifications of a person's body and all material objects added to it" (p. 68). Appearance management is the inclusive concept for the thought processes, activities, and assessment of social implications associated with selecting, buying, and using appearance altering products (Kaiser, 1990). The study of appearance management suggests two parallel lines of inquiry: one into the self system and the other into the behavioral system. The self system can be defined as all thoughts and feelings about the self, the translation of those thoughts and feeling into strategies of concealment and revelation, and the expression of those strategies in dress (self-presentation). The behavioral-system can be defined as thoughts and feeling about the social implications of dress, the translation of those thoughts and feelings into selection strategies suited to the occasion and the desired effect on social interactions (impression management). Both lines of inquiry are suggested by Hamilton (1988) when she notes that merchandised products are selected and used to facilitate the personal and social agendas of individuals.

Popular books, magazine articles, and educational programs often focus on the "closet economics" of selection: wardrobe planning, price/quality interactions, and smart shopping. Such presentations invoke a cognitive approach to selection decisions. Advertising, television, music videos and movies often create or popularize images that propel acquisition through an affective response. Thus, consumers receive two kinds of messages about appearance management: that the task is systematic and cognitively demanding and that the task is a hedonic response to the demands of role taking, display, and identification.

The interaction of affect and cognition has been observed across several fields of inquiry including motivation and cognition (Sorrentino & Higgins, 1986), persuasion and information processing (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986), and model-building in consumer behavior (Holbrook, O'Shaughnessy, & Bell, 1990). Based on a review of theoretical frameworks from these fields of inquiry, the purposes of this paper are to provide an overview of the dual framework of affect and cognition, suggest ways this framework clarifies the research agenda in the study of appearance management, and propose research strategies for future studies.

Affect and Cognition

According to Peterson and Hoyer (1986), affect is used as a synonym for feelings or emotions with a physiological component while cognition is a mental activity associated with information processing. Batra (1986) defines affect as feelings toward a stimulus that lead to relative preferences for that object over all similar objects. It is the effect of this relative preference that has the most resonance with apparel management because it parallels exactly the consumer's experience of selecting a single "right" product from among relatively similar products within a product category.

Zajonc (1980) contends that affective responses are primary components of all perception. He underlines the importance of considering affect when he asserts that affective reactions are inescapable because they are not under voluntary control and irrevocable because they often persists even in the face of a reversal or revision. Affective responses mirror something in the self by identifying the relationship between the judge and the object. That relationship is, however, difficult to verbalize since it is not dependent on cognition and is sometimes separated from the content of the original impression. As Zajonc (1980) points out, research on "preferences, attitudes, attractions, expressions, aesthetic judgments, and similar affective responses" (p. 158) are more complex than calculating component averages and richer than simple cognitive representations of objects. Underlining that point is the study by DeLong,
Minshall, and Larntz (1986) in which they investigate category-based processing strategies used by consumers and find that consumers' evaluation of an apparel product (sweaters) is based on a holistic appraisal rather than on an attribute-by-attribute analysis and that consumers generalize from an exemplar sweater based on previous experience.

Zajonc (1980) states that when research invokes only cognitive factors, the results rarely explain more than about 20 percent of the total variance. Even with a study that mixes affective and cognitive factors, the selection of those factors may prove problematic. Although not intentionally designed to study affect and cognition factors, a study by Han, Morgan, Kotsiopulos, and Kang-Park (1991) uses cognitive factors (e.g., price/quality ratio and time and effort prior to purchase) and affective factors (e.g., window/in-store display and influence of advertising) to compare three samples of female consumers -- textile and clothing students, non-textile and clothing students, and older non-students. The purpose of the study is to identify variables which predict impulse buying. Even with over 20 variables representing a mix of affective and cognitive factors, the researchers conclude that variables not accounted for in the study must also affect the variation in impulse buying.

This research illustrates the difficulty faced by researchers in selecting variables to study. Affective factors are essentially non-verbal responses and, thus, difficult to study. Examining cognitive responses may produce demand effects -- consumers reporting rational decision making when affective, aesthetic, and emotional factors were actually responsible for purchase. Mixing both affective and cognitive factors provides a better overall view of the research question but presents problems in interpreting results. These difficulties may explain why very little research focuses on affect, studies focusing on cognition fail to reflect actual consumer behavior, and studies combining affect and cognition provide inconclusive results. Perhaps when researchers consider affective and cognition factors in the design of research, not just in the construction of measures, results may be more interpretable and conclusions more insightful.

Motivation and Cognitive Theory

Both motivation and cognitive theory attempt to explain the phenomenon of behavior. Motivation is a concept used to describe the forces that initiate and direct behavior (Petri, 1981). Cognitive psychology regards people as active symbol manipulators trying to make sense of the world around them by processing information based on an internal representation of reality (Harris, 1983). These representations are constructed through interactions between the environmental stimuli and what the person already has stored in memory (Harris, 1983; Shanteau, 1983).

Until recently, theorists and researchers have approached the problem of explaining behavior by attempting to determine whether motivation or cognitive theory offers the best explanation. However, Sorrentino and Higgins (1986) suggested that behavior is best explained as an interaction between motivation and cognition such that each is a property or facet of the other. According to this view, motivation and cognition operate together to produce effects.

Kuhl (1986) suggests that interactions among the subsystems of human behavior -- motivation, cognition and affect/emotion -- must be taken into account in explaining behavior. He argues for a modular approach to behavior -- interacting but separate modules instead of a unified cognitive architecture with three aspects.

The Debate: Primacy of Affect versus Primacy of Cognition

Zajonc (1980) argues that judgment can be formed on matters such as preferences, attitudes, attractions, expressions, aesthetic judgments, and similar affective responses prior to any cognitive processing and that affect and cognition are independent. Such claims are the exact opposite of the traditional view of psychology that objects must be cognized prior to evaluation. The debate between these two viewpoints -- the primacy of affect versus the primacy of cognition -- can be followed in Lazarus (1982), Zajonc (1984), Lazarus (1984), Zajonc and Markus (1982), Tsal (1985), Zajonc and Markus (1985). The crux of the debate is the question "which comes first?". For example,
Tsai (1985) contends that cognition and affect are always linked but such links are unreportable because the link is mediated by unconscious processes. Therefore, two rival explanations have been advanced for the formation of affective judgments by consumers—the cognitive-affective model in which affect is the last step in a chain of cognitive processes and the independence hypothesis in which affect and cognition are separate processes each capable of leading to decisions.

In a test of these rival explanations, Anand, Holbrook, and Stephens (1986) use words transmitted to the right ear and music transmitted to the left ear and find support for the cognitive-affective model over the independence hypotheses. Specifically, affect for both old and new stimuli depends on the cognitive process of correct identification (that is, on familiarity) and stimuli are rated higher in the efficient cognitive condition (verbal in the right ear/left hemisphere; music in the left ear/right hemisphere) versus the inefficient condition in which the independence of affect and cognition would be demonstrated. However, Janiszewski (1988) finds support for the independence hypothesis when attitude formation occurs independently of conscious consideration for pictorial stimuli. Janiszewski concludes that consumers use differential hemispheric strategies for task performance. While research continues on the rival hypotheses of the cognition-affect model and the independence model, Peterson and Hoyer (1986) suggest another approach ignoring the questions of primacy for affect or cognition. Instead they propose focusing on determining which decisions are primarily affective, what determines the strength of the affect, and what happens when affect and cognition are in conflict.

**Affect and Cognition In Models of Consumer Behavior**

Like the cognitive-affect approach, the traditional model of consumer decision making represents the process as cognitively demanding and systematic—clear evaluative criteria applied to a decision making situation (e.g., Howard & Sheth, 1969). The validity of such models has been questioned. Kassarjian (1978) suggests that such models attribute selection processes to consumers when no prepurchase process exists.

In a review of studies, Olshavsky and Granbois (1979) conclude that Kassarjian was right, not only are many purchases controlled by habit, but "for many purchases a decision process never occurs, not even on the first purchase" (p. 131). Instead, they identify purchases as occurring out of culturally constructed lifestyles, as complementary or interlocked purchases, in preferences grounded in childhood, from group norms or imitation of others, on the recommendation of others or through surrogates, or on a random or superficial basis. These views relate closely to the independence hypothesis that affect and cognition are separate systems.

Critics of a systematic model built on the primacy of cognition charge that such a model does not take into account the distinctions between functional products, hedonic products and symbolic products (Olshavsky & Granbois, 1979), the experiential and subjective state of consumption (Holbrook & Hirschman, 1982), and the different motivational and cognitive patterns associated with different products (Midgley, 1983; Olshavsky & Granbois, 1979).

**Affect and Cognition in Models of Information Processing**

Just as the traditional linear, systematic, and cognition-based model of consumer decision making has been challenged by scholars seeking a more comprehensive model, so too is the model describing how consumers process persuasive messages being revised. In the information processing model dominant until the mid-70s, McGuire (1968; 1978) represents information processing as a hierarchy of stages—attention, comprehension, yielding, retention, and action—based on high involvement and verbal processing. However in a test of the proposition that consumers acquire information by the examination of products and their attributes, Smith (1986) finds that such a proposition applies only under the conditions of perceived risk. In other words, consumers only examine products and their attributes when those products are associated with high risk.

Even Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) in their expectancy value theory of attitude formation see change in stages: belief formation then attitude formation then behavioral intention then
behavior. As Batra and Ray (1983) point out, the Fishbein and Ajzen model assumes that beliefs are "available" for change but in "most low-involvement situations -- the underlying beliefs are not retained after the global attitude has been formed" (p. 139). This mirrors Zajonc's (1980) view that affect persists even after reversal, revision, or separation from the original content on which the affect was based.

Research with television advertising supports the power of affect formed in low-involvement situations. Cognition-based measures of attitude are not significantly affected by single ads but repetitive advertising increases awareness and influences purchase intention to some degree (Krugman, 1965; Ray, 1973; Ray & Sawyer, 1971). Thus, cognition as measured by attitude change can be bypassed on the way to behavior, a finding that significantly undermines the validity of linear information processing models (e.g., Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; McGuire, 1968; 1978).

Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) maintain that the traditional information processing perspective of consumer behavior with its reliance on rational decision making ignores the experiential view in which consumption is a subjective state influenced by symbolic meanings, hedonic responses, and aesthetic criteria. They propose a new version paralleling the information processing model but expanding consideration of the consumption experience to include a complex multifaceted interaction between the consumer and the environment.

In a later elaboration of that view, Holbrook (1986) proposes a model of the consumption experience that bypasses the primacy of affect/primacy of cognition controversy by taking a more comprehensive view of human behavior. In this model, emotion (with the components of cognition, physiological responses, behavioral expression, and feelings) becomes the central element in the consumption experience. Encompassing all is consciousness, defined as "unaltered and altered mental states varying along a continuum from unconscious to subconscious to conscious awareness and subsuming various forms of diminished consciousness" (p. 27). According to Holbrook emotion depends on consciousness. Emotional processes produce output in the form of value, defined as an interactive relativistic preference experience -- interactive because it results from the relationship between consumer and object; relativistic because it is comparative, personal, and situational; preference because it is an affective response; experience because the object is evaluated as to use (extrinsic value) or appreciation (intrinsic value).

Once again pushing aside the argument over the primacy of either affect or cognition, Holbrook, O'Shaughnessy, and Bell (1990) argue against a one-sided focus on consumer behavior as either reasoned action or emotional reaction. They offer instead a synthesis based on complementary roles for reason and emotion. In calling for continuing research in the consumption experience these researchers cite work on the emotional aspects of advertising, shopping, and play while stating that "research has thus far only scratched the surface of what promises to be a fascinating set of problems" (p. 155).

Models Combining High and Low Involvement Information Processing

Whereas the old model can be characterized as post cognitive attitude affect such that attitude change leads to behavior given high involvement processing (e.g. Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975; McGuire, 1968; 1978), the emerging model can be characterized as precognitive, mere-exposure-based affect (Batra & Ray, 1983), a model for low involvement processing. In low involvement processing, the decision strategy is affect referral, that is, consumers decide based on overall affect and not component attributes. Such strategy acts as a simplifier when there is a large volume of messages available for processing or as heuristic when there is pressure to make a decision (Batra & Ray, 1983).

The models for high involvement and low involvement processing combine in the concept of two track processing with its two distinct routes to persuasion. According to Petty and Cacioppo (1986), the first track is the direct or central route consisting of rational considerations of relevant arguments. The second track is the peripheral route in which some simple cue in the message induces change. Central route
processing is likely to occur when the persuasion situation causes a person to consider carefully the issue-relevant arguments in the message -- high elaboration likelihood. In the high elaboration likelihood condition the consumer engages the persuasive message with arguments pro and con, a case of high involvement processing. Peripheral processing is more likely in situations in which affective associations are tied to peripheral cues in the persuasion context, low elaboration likelihood (Petty & Cacioppo, 1986).

In Petty and Cacioppo's (1986) view of peripheral processing, the cues in an ad (or other persuasive communication) either trigger affective states which become associated with the object or invoke guiding schemata or inferences. The power of cues to change attitude is related to personal relevance. Personal relevance is defined as the level of intrinsic importance, personal meaning, or significant consequences associated with the issue. Cues are more important in persuasion when personal relevance is low rather than high, that is, in low involvement situations.

In addition to Petty and Cacioppo, other researchers identify two track processing. Chaiken (1980) calls the routes systematic and heuristic; Gardner, Mitchell, and Russo (1985) suggest the terms "brand processing strategy" for processing with full attention and "non-brand processing" for incidental learning or memory trace formation; Craik and Lockhart (1972) call the routes deep and shallow; Schneider and Shiffrin (1977), controlled versus automatic; Langer, Blank and Chanowitz (1978), thoughtful versus mindless; Mitchell (1983) categorizes the two routes as intentional learning versus incidental learning. In the clothing literature, Shim and Drake (1989) use Chaiken's (1980) conceptualization of two track processing (systematic with considerable cognitive effort and heuristic with reliance on accessible information and processing efficiency) together with active/passive search to explain information seeking by employed women for employment apparel. They conclude that information seeking with respect to employment apparel is related to self-confidence: self-confidence leads to systematic processing with either active or passive search; lack of self-confidence leads to heuristic processing, passive search, and reliance on pal advice.

Batra and Ray (1985) take a slightly different approach to explain conditions of high and low involvement processing. They propose a percentage contribution model to explain the variable contribution of two attitude components, "utilitarian affect" and "hedonic affect", in determining purchase intention. The utilitarian component is defined as an appraisal of the product's instrumentality in delivering physical attributes. The hedonic component is defined as an approach-avoidance feeling toward the product overall. They hypothesize that in the low involvement situation the contribution of the utilitarian component will be lower than in high involvement situations. In this model, it should be noted, contributions refer to strength, not valence. In a test, Batra and Ray were unable to confirm or disconfirm the model due to measurement problems. However, they conclude that there is support for the "hypothesis that the two routes to attitude formation and change do work differentially through two components" (p. 18), utilitarian affect and hedonic affect.

The earlier cognition-based, linear, and systematic models explain attitude change in high involvement situations in which the consumer is a fully engaged, active processor of verbal information but fail to explain attitude change in low involvement situations. The emerging models of consumer processing of persuasive messages assume that high involvement is the rarity and that low involvement predominates. Further, these models seek to go beyond just verbal aspects to incorporate visual, emotional, and non-verbal components of the message.

Research Agenda: Appearance Management

As Holbrook (1986) points out, consumer research is interested in the perspective of consumers and the entire experience of buying and consuming. He sees the importance of such a focus because the consumption experience is an important component of social welfare and the quality of life. In setting an agenda for research Holbrook calls for research
at the macrolevel of analysis to find general patterns of consumption behavior. Thus, developing a research agenda might begin with consideration of two analysis levels: micro and macro. If macrolevel analysis seeks patterns of consumption, microlevel analysis seeks patterned behavior among individuals and groups. Few would argue that most research on appearance management and on consumer behavior has been at the microlevel of analysis. Perhaps the first step in reaching macrolevel analysis is to synthesize microlevel research. One possible approach might be through meta-analysis.

Light and Pillemer (1984) explain that in exact terms, meta-analysis refers to the kinds of statistical procedures used to combine studies and is a specialized research field of its own. Also called the science of reviewing literature, quantitative meta-analysis allows researchers to reanalyze data across a series of earlier studies in which there are inconclusive or conflicting findings. The purpose of meta-analysis is to resolve questions or to provide a clearer understanding of missing data. Because there are many quantitative studies related to various aspects of appearance management, researchers can profitably spend time and effort on the meta-analysis of these combined data sets, even including those with findings that fail to reach the usual level of significance. The resulting quantitative meta-analysis should provide a clearer view of the contributions of affective and cognitive variables and the way they interact.

Non-statistical reviews are sometimes labeled qualitative meta-analyses. Damhorst (1990) reviews 109 impression formation studies reported between 1943 and 1986 to find consistent themes in the measurement and findings. By examining instruments, findings, and research designs in the person perception literature, she facilitates continued research on the issues. Thus, review articles are useful in gaining insights at the macrolevel and prioritizing the research agenda at the microlevel.

The present review of literature across the parallel fields of motivation, information processing of persuasive messages, and model-building in consumer behavior illustrates an emerging integrative theoretical approach to the subsystems of behavior, e.g., motivation, cognition, affect. In motivation terms, the drive toward selection of appearance products is simultaneously workful and playful. That is, selection of clothing has both intrinsic motives associated with playfulness, intrinsic and extrinsic motives associated with workfulness, and these motives exist side by side (Day, 1981). From an information processing perspective, the information environment provides both attribute-based and non-attribute-based rationales for acquisition. Thus, products can be appraised for both instrumentality and hedonic components. Additionally, Petty and Cacioppo's work (1986) links information processing strategies with the construct of involvement. Persuasion literature highlights a shift from an emphasis on understanding rational decision making to an emphasis on understanding the power and prevalence of affect in purchase behavior.

Consumers effortlessly blend the subsystems of behavior, e.g., motivation, cognition, and affect, in decision making within a cluttered, crowded marketplace. Processing strategies incorporating both cognition and affect and driven both by intrinsic and extrinsic motivations are the consumer's way to order her/his marketing environment. How can theorists, researchers, and marketing/merchandising practitioners order their approaches to the study of appearance management?

Sorrentino and Higgins (1986) suggest that in research "affective value and information value in both the self-system and the behavioral system must be considered" (p. 15). Thus, the research agenda for appearance management at the microlevel should incorporate two parallel inquiries: an inquiry into the self-system (self-presentation through use of appearance products) and an inquiry into the behavioral system (impression management in social interaction). Both affective, non-attribute-based value and utilitarian, attribute-based factors should be incorporated within each inquiry. Using an analysis of variance approach as a metaphor, the research agenda within each system would consist of an assessment of main effects and interactions for affective value and utilitarian factors. With this framework, the state of knowledge of appearance management can
be assessed through reviews and meta-analyses. Specific topics for reviews may include synthesis of studies on product variables, message strategies, situational factors, involvement, and individual differences.

Use of such a framework by researchers may assist in identifying potential confounds in research and suggest measurement strategies to clarify questions. Although not designed to shed light on the distinction between affect and cognition, the work of Kwon (1987, 1988, 1991) illustrates the problems. Kwon (1987) investigates the interrelationships among motivating factors—temporal (e.g., weather and mood) and constant (e.g., personality)—that influence an individual's daily selection of clothes. She concludes that motivation for clothing selection is multidimensional and all factors are interdependent. In a follow-up study, Kwon (1988) tests the existence of exogenous and endogenous dimensions on college women, professional women, and suburban/nonworking women. She finds three factors: an expected situational exogenous factor, a situational endogenous factor combining weather and mood, and an endogenous clothing orientation factor. Further, she finds that the three groups of women differ in the degree to which they are influenced by the three factors. Later Kwon (1991) investigates the relationships between mood, self-consciousness, and selection of clothing among male and female students and finds females more sensitive to and more affected by mood (particularly by negative moods). These studies illustrate research at the microlevel of analysis in which the results might be confounded by the interaction of affective value (mood, personality factors, and clothing orientation) and utilitarian factors (practical and temporal considerations) in both the self system (self-presentation) and the behavioral system (impression management).

Researchers planning a study can use the framework of thoughts (cognitive factors and utilitarian value) and feelings (affective factors) to locate their investigation within the domain of appearance management, either in the self system (self-presentation) or in the behavioral system (impression management). In the self system, the inquiry will focus on the translation of thoughts and feelings about the self into strategies of concealment and revelation as expressed in dress (e.g., selection based on the self-appraisal of figure flaws and body image). In the behavioral system, the inquiry will focus on thoughts and feelings about the social implications of dress and the translation of those thoughts and feelings into strategies related to the occasion, situation, or expected social interactions (e.g., selection of career attire and appraisal of its relationship to career advancement). Use of the self system and behavioral system framework clarifies the scope of the investigation, identifies boundary conditions and limitations, and assists in framing the justifications for the study. Then, within the study, the researcher can consider using measures of affect and/or cognition. With careful placement within the framework, the researcher may be able to anticipate and deal with confounds and interpret findings. The framework also suggests an approach to programmatic research—a series of studies to explore related research questions across the spectrum of affect and cognition in both the self system and the behavioral system.

Research Strategies

Sorrentino and Higgins (1986) see motivation as inseparably linked with actual behavior and researchers as responsible for examining jointly the experiential state and the meaning of the action. Thus, descriptions of cognitive processes are incomplete unless they include non-cognitive, personal, and motivational factors.

Whereas apparel product selection may be an ideal laboratory for such an undertaking because of the dual nature of a playful and workful task, the research is complicated by a cluttered informational environment and by the inability of subjects to report reliably on their decision-making processes. The reason for this inability becomes clear if the researcher considers Batra's (1986) definition of affect as a relative preference for a stimulus out of a class of similar stimuli and Holbrook's (1986) view of an interactive relativistic preference experience growing out of emotional processes. These tasks call for inherently non-verbal reactions. Additionally, these affective responses may be, as Zajonc (1980) states, separated from the content of the original impression, further
hampering verbalization.

The challenge of simultaneously examining affective value and utilitarian factors in the self system (self-presentation) and/or behavioral system (impression management) is daunting. The research strategies used must be innovative and ingenious. Such research begins with observation in natural settings. Horton (1979), speaking of the relationship between personality and consumer behavior, suggests that the key may be found in the way consumers approach, modify, simplify, and react to their marketing environment. Structured and unstructured observations of consumers in the marketing environment while they select, try, buy, and use appearance products is the first, best step in studying appearance management.

Beyond questions of specific research techniques, researchers looking at consumer-object relationships must use consumer-derived product classification schemes, schemes that include both need satisfaction/utilitarian factors and emotional experiences/affective value (Fournier, 1991). Eckman, Damhorst, and Kadolph (1990) accomplish that through free response interviews at point of purchase. The purpose of the study is to identify criteria considered by consumers while making garment purchase decisions. They find four types of criteria – aesthetic, usefulness, performance and quality, and extrinsic criteria – but conclude that the most important criteria are related to aesthetics.

By using free response interviews, the researchers allow the natural language and benchmarks of the consumer to emerge and explore both affective and utilitarian criteria for purchase. Since aesthetic judgements are primarily affective responses (Zajonc, 1980), the importance of aesthetic criteria to the consumer illustrates the power of affective value in decision making.

By using research methods and measures sensitive to the dual nature of the apparel product selection task, researchers stand a better chance of understanding the myriad ways consumers approach, modify, simplify, and react to their marketing environment. Researchers must also strive to incorporate multiple measurement techniques into studies. For example, the quantitative forced choice pairwise comparison technique and questionnaire format suggested below are best employed with more qualitative measurement strategies or in programmatic research in which other measurement strategies will be used to explore the same variables. However, the following methods and measures, already in use, are a good starting point for studies considering both affective value and utilitarian factors in the selection of appearance products:

(a) Laddering, which involves in-depth interview techniques, consists of a process by which the researcher and informant construct the individual’s chains of product attributes, consequences, and values (Perkins & Reynolds, 1988).

(b) Forced choice pairwise comparisons of aesthetic products across an entire product range can be used to map preference patterns (Huber & Holbrook, 1982).

(c) A questionnaire format in which the subjects evaluate activities by indicating a percentage split between enjoyment ("because you enjoy the activity itself") versus instrumentality ("because you get something out of doing it") allows subjects to indicate the level of duality in a task (Day, 1981, p. 236).

(d) A procedure in which subjects exposed to an object furnish all one-word responses possible within 60 seconds with responses analyzed for dimensions is a shortened version of free response techniques – a device that makes analysis less cumbersome (Kleine & Kernan, 1988).

Beyond use of multiple measurements and subject-generated categories is the multimethod approach to data gathering, analysis, and interpretation. The strategy calls for deliberately combining research methods within a single study with the goal of counterbalancing the limitations of one with the strengths of another. As Brewer and Hunter (1989) put it, the power of the approach is that convergent findings lead to greater confidence in the results and divergent findings signal caution in interpretation and the need for a reanalysis of the problem. Because
the researcher must consider affective value and utilitarian factors in both the self system (self-presentation) and the behavioral system (impression management), the multimethod approach with its concern for reconciling contradictions offers the most promise for studying appearance management.

Blended qualitative and quantitative techniques, multiple measurement strategy, multimethod data gathering – the challenge for researchers is in planning and executing research broader in scope than that usually undertaken. Even when researchers are audacious enough to make the attempt, getting published may present hurdles. It is customary to submit a manuscript covering a particular study using a single method. As a reviewer of this paper points out, such manuscript may be rejected because the method and/or measure is individually imperfect. If such a paper refers to multiple methods and/or measures but does not present them, the reviewer can only comment on what is specifically presented in the manuscript. A full research report on multiple methods and/or measures will probably exceed the page limits of many journals. What is the solution? The reviewer suggests submitting a series of manuscripts (perhaps Part 1, Part 2, Part 3) and asking for the same reviewers for all. However, the long term solution will come when the discipline supports, encourages, and promotes programmatic research efforts using multiple methods to explore complex questions like those in appearance management.
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It is important to assess aspects of an individual that observers use as a basis for making inferences about that individual (Deaux & Kite, 1985). Observers tend to make inferences about others on the basis of easily noted or salient cues (McArthur, 1982). Thus, cues like dress and other aspects of appearance can serve as a basis for making inferences about others. Dress has been defined as the "total arrangement of all outwardly detectible modifications of the body itself and all material objects added to it" (Roach & Musa, 1980). Appearance has been used to refer to the "total, composite image created not only by clothing, but also by the human body and any modifications to the body that are visually perceived" (Kaiser, 1990). Thus, appearance is a visual context which includes clothing as well as physical features of the body (Kaiser, 1990).

Salient cues such as dress and other aspects of appearance can serve not only as a basis for inferences but also as a basis for placing people into cognitive categories. To the extent that categories correspond to real similarities and differences between people, categorization represents an effective and relevant method of adapting to a complex social world (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986). One of the first categories into which people are placed upon being observed by others is a sex or gender category. According to Kaiser (1990), sex refers to biological differences between males and females while gender is created through the process of socialization. Culturally defined expectations that males and females in a given situation are expected to fulfill are defined as their gender roles (Ruble & Ruble, 1982). Cognitive categories are associated with beliefs about persons who belong in the categories and those beliefs contribute to the content of stereotypes (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986). A stereotype has been defined as "a cognitive structure that contains the perceiver's knowledge, beliefs, and expectancies about some human group" (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986, p. 133). Thus, a gender stereotype is a cognitive structure containing a perceiver's knowledge, beliefs, and expectancies about appropriate gender-role behavior for males and females.

The basis of stereotyping may be the differential perception of groups (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986). According to Ashmore and Del Boca (1979), gender stereotypes are based on three types of attributes used to differentiate between males and females: defining, identifying, and ascribed. Defining attributes are biological characteristics associated with one or the other sex, such as facial hair, breasts, or genitals. Identifying attributes are physical characteristics such as clothing, hair style, or manner of movement, that are readily perceptible to an observer on first meeting another person. Ascribed attributes are inferred characteristics such as personality traits and role behaviors.

It has been suggested that gender stereotypes are based primarily on identifying attributes of dress and appearance (Myers & Gonda, 1982). Shakin, Shakin, and Sternflanz (1985) suggested that gender is made salient by gender symbols found in male and female clothing in U.S. society. If this is the case, it is not surprising that gender is one of the first and also one of the most accurate judgments made about another person (Horn & Gurel, 1981).

This paper proposes a theoretical link between cultural aesthetics and the social construction of
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gender which is manifest in dress. The purpose of this paper is to illustrate how the elements and principles of design can be manipulated to produce dress variations which are identifying attributes for gender roles within 20th century U.S. culture and to review literature which suggests implications of gender role stereotyping based on identifying attributes. Socialization agents (e.g., authors, designers, parents, and teachers) teach us that certain of the elements and principles of design are masculine and others are feminine. Although which are masculine or feminine is subject to change, the argument presented here is that individuals are socialized to view articles of dress in a binary manner, that is, as either masculine or feminine. We argue that the cultural aesthetic relative to the design and selection of clothing is socially constructed in a manner similar to the way that gender is socially constructed. This becomes important because individuals interpret others' appearances as a function of these socialized notions with respect to the aesthetics of dress. Because others' appearance is interpreted as a function of these internalized associations, the subsequent effect of gender-role identifiers may be noted in the behavior of individuals who attempt to satisfy gender role demands, in perceptions formed of males and females, and in interpersonal behavior.

Cultural Aesthetics

Whether dress is designed or selected, the elements of design are physical aspects which can be manipulated to produce visual images that can be communicated to perceivers (DeLong, 1987). Prescriptive literature for the design and selection of clothing assumes a base set of elements and principles of design appropriate for males and females (Roach & Eicher, 1973). The elements and principles of design are resources a designer uses to develop apparel designs. Contained in the printed advice, either explicitly or implicitly, are cultural associations of variations of the elements and principles of design with impressions of femininity and masculinity. By knowing what gender associations line, shape, space, color, and texture are presumed to have, designers can use the principles to manipulate the elements to achieve a "feminine" or "masculine" look. Thus, both educators and designers of clothing are socialization agents in the sense they can perpetuate identifying attributes associated with masculine and feminine gender roles. In order to illustrate that differences exist in identifying attributes in dress for masculine and feminine gender roles, information from three well-known and widely used textbooks (one from each of the last three decades) is presented: M. Davis (1987); McJimsey (1973); Morton (1964). These textbooks were supplemented by additional books and articles where necessary to provide examples of the associations of the elements and principles of design with masculinity and femininity.

Elements of Design

There was little disagreement among authors on which variations of the elements were masculine and which were feminine. In addition, not all authors addressed all elements with regard to their associations with masculinity and femininity, therefore, the information has been merged for presentation.

Line

Line is the unidimensional element of design which connects two points (M. Davis, 1987). Every line has nine aspects with which it can be analyzed: consistency, continuity, contour of edge, direction, evenness, length, path, sharpness of edge, thickness (M. Davis, 1987). Each aspect has an association with masculinity or femininity.

Feminine lines were defined as curved lines (restrained curves, full round curves, shallow curves, loops, waves, scallops, and rococo curves—small undulating curves as seen in ruffles), modified straight lines, thin, fuzzy, short, or interrupted lines, horizontal and upward movement of lines (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964). Masculine lines were defined as straight, angular, zigzag, thick, solid, sharp, long, continuous, unbroken, flattened curves, vertical, diagonal, and downward movement of line, lines having large sharp distinct breaks, and large, full round curves (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964).

In addition to a physical description of lines as identifying attributes, for example, curved lines are feminine, the descriptions frequently
contained terms associated with ascribed attributes of a wearer. For example, according to McJimsey (1973), restrained curves are associated with the lines of beautiful feminine figures and therefore, use of a restrained curve in a garment adds beauty and feminine dignity and suggests grace, subtlety, and softness. According to Ryan (1966), men usually wear strictly tailored clothes with severely tailored lines; thus straight severe lines suggest masculinity.

Shape and form

Shape is a two-dimensional space enclosed by a line and form is a three-dimensional area enclosed by a surface (M. Davis, 1987). Just as straight lines have a masculine association and curved lines have a feminine association, shapes enclosed by straight lines, such as squares, have a masculine association and shapes enclosed by curved lines, such as circles, have a feminine association. Thus, a curved pocket is more feminine in effect than a square pocket (McJimsey, 1973).

One basic shape with which a designer must work is the silhouette, or outline, of a garment (M. Davis, 1987). The following were described as features of a feminine silhouette: a bouffant, full skirt; small waist; curved bodice; graceful, flowing skirt; short, broken lines created by boleros, short capes, peplums, ruffles, small bustles, puffed sleeves, off-the-shoulder necklines, and soft fluffy collars (McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964). A masculine silhouette was described as composed of long, unbroken lines which combined the bifurcated silhouette with the wedge- or T-shaped silhouette (M. Davis, 1987; Kallal, 1985; McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964).

Texture

Texture is the visual appearance and feel of the surface of a fabric (M. Davis, 1987; Morton, 1964). Textures with a feminine association were described as smooth, soft, pliable, supple, thin, fine, wispy, fluffy, dull, crisp, sheer, napped, porous, delicate, slippery, transparent, and lightweight (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964). Textures with a masculine association were bulky, thick, closed, coarse, rough, heavy, stiff, rich, shiny, and luxurious (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964; Ryan, 1966).

In addition to fabric textures, some fabrics also have a cultural association with masculinity and femininity. Fabrics with a feminine association included lace, organdy, net, taffeta, soft sheer woolens, crisp cottons, and silk. The description of a fabric sometimes included terms associated with ascribed attributes of a wearer. For example, "The delicacy and lightness of lace makes it a women's fabric with an air of elegance, aloofness, yet soft femininity" and silk is "the most feminine and sensuous of all materials" (Rosencranz, 1972, p. 180). Fabrics with a masculine association included wool, heavy tweeds, and firm suiting.

Space

Space is the area within or between shapes (M. Davis, 1987). Femininity was associated with small, broken spaces and with large areas broken by gathers, shirring, tucks, pleats, fluting, seaming, or pockets (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964). In contrast, masculinity was associated with large, open spaces and plain, unrelieved unbroken areas (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964).

Color

Color has three dimensions: hue which is the name of a family of colors; value which is the lightness or darkness of a hue; and intensity which is the brightness or dullness of a hue (M. Davis, 1987). Femininity and masculinity can be expressed by the use of hue, value, or intensity.

Hue. M. Davis classified some hues as feminine (shell pink, dusty rose, scarlet, apricot, orange, rust, gold, yellow, mint green, fuchsia, wine, white) and some hues as masculine (hunter green, turquoise, teal, baby blue, royal blue, navy, royal purple, beige, brown, black). Rosencranz (1972) also considered black to be masculine and white to be feminine. Authors disagreed in the classification of warm and cool hues. Morton (1964) considered warm hues masculine and cool hues feminine while M. Davis (1987) considered warm hues feminine and cool hues masculine. Many Western cultures consider pink as feminine and blue as masculine (M. Davis, 1987; Paoletti, 1987).

Value. Dark value hues and strong value
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contrasts were masculine (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964). Femininity was expressed in subtle contrasts, in close value intervals, and by light (pastel) values (DeLong, 1987; Horn & Gurel, 1981; Morton, 1964; Ryan, 1966). McJimsey (1973) suggested that light values in dress are associated with summer and preferred by those who are feminine.

**Intensity.** Soft grayed intensities were considered feminine and bright intensities masculine (M. Davis, 1987; Morton, 1964). Bright intensity hues, as seen in football and other sports uniforms, have an association with masculinity and assertiveness (M. Davis, 1987).

**Pattern**

Pattern is an arrangement of lines, spaces, or shapes on or in a fabric (M. Davis, 1987). Technically, pattern is not a design element because it can be split into component elements of line, shape, space, and color (M. Davis, 1987). Thus, pattern combines the psychological and physical effects of line, shape, space, and color. Flower and plant motifs, shadowy abstracts, geometric patterns which blend closely with the background, small allover conventionalized floral designs, and small scale dainty motifs were considered feminine (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964). Stripes, plaids, animal and geometric motifs, bold motifs with sharp edges, large to medium size designs, sharply distinct figure and ground, and man-made objects (e.g., a ship's wheel and bell) were considered masculine (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964).

**Principles of Design**

Not only do the elements of design have prescribed associations with masculinity and femininity but the principles by which these elements are organized and combined in dress are also prescriptive and contribute to creating a "masculine" or "feminine" effect. The principles of design are guides for organizing and manipulating the elements. Authors of these textbooks suggested that, by using the principles of design, individuals can manipulate the available materials to suggest a masculine or feminine image.

**Balance**

Balance is a feeling of evenly distributed weight (M. Davis, 1987). Femininity was usually associated with formal (symmetrical) balance except in small details (McJimsey, 1973). According to Horn and Gurel (1981), men's dress provides a standard formula for achieving informal (asymmetrical) balance with a pocket handkerchief to the left and a hat tilted slightly to the right. Ryan (1966) listed one pocket on the chest (informal balance) as a masculine design feature.

**Emphasis**

Emphasis is the center of interest (M. Davis, 1987). Emphasis is a culturally dependent principle because emphasizing a part of the body physically also emphasizes that body part as one of psychological importance to the culture (M. Davis, 1987). In U.S. culture, the neckline is considered a desirable center of interest since attention may be focused on the face of the individual. According to Horn and Gurel (1981), a man's suit provides a standard formula for attaining emphasis with the center of greatest contrast near the face. Emphasis with a masculine association may be achieved by designs focusing on shoulder width, waistline, or hip line. A neck treatment other than a shirt collar, a yokeline, hemline, waistline, or back of a dress were areas of feminine emphasis (McJimsey, 1973; Ryan, 1966).

**Rhythm**

Rhythm is a feeling of organized motion (M. Davis, 1987). Rhythm with a feminine association was smooth and gentle or interrupted, staccato rhythm as found in buttons which are paired, creating different intervals of spacing (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973). Rhythm with a masculine association was long, continuous rhythm, dynamic rhythm, and regular marching rhythm as found in evenly spaced buttons with a continuous front opening (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973).

**Proportion**

Proportion is the comparative relationships of distances, sizes, amounts, degrees, or parts (M. Davis, 1987). It is assumed that clothing proportions are most attractive and work best when they are in agreement with the natural proportions of the body (M. Davis, 1987). The
basic proportional differences between male and female figures are that males are proportionately longer than females from the waist to the shoulders and females are proportionately longer than males from the waist down (Nakdimen, 1984). Because the natural proportions of the male body and the female body differ, the comparative relationships existing in dress for males and females differ. These proportional differences may be exaggerated in clothing design. For example, men's suit jackets cover the waist, replacing the waist visually with the lower edge of the jacket, thereby increasing the apparent waist-to-shoulder proportion (Nakdimen, 1984). Shoulder pads or epaulets also increase the apparent waist-to-shoulder proportion while conversely, high heels, an identifying attribute for the feminine gender role, increase the proportion from the waist down (Nakdimen, 1984).

Scale
Scale is the relationship of sizes to each other and to the whole (M. Davis, 1987). Scale refers to the size of pattern motifs, trims, accessories, pockets, collars, and other style features, to the size of the main parts of the garment and to the wearer. Since, on average, males are physically larger than females, psychologically, large scale seems masculine and small scale seems feminine (McJimsey, 1973).

Harmony
Harmony is agreement in feeling and a pleasing combination of elements of design (M. Davis, 1987). Harmony is a culturally conditioned feeling that things belong together, that all parts of a garment relate to each other and to the wearer (M. Davis, 1987). For example, to create a consistent mood of femininity pastel hues can be combined with curved lines, rounded shapes, small spaces, and soft, smooth textures (M. Davis, 1987). Decoration is feminine (Ryan, 1966). Thus, the feeling of femininity associated with formal gowns and fine lingerie is accentuated by decorative trimming such as lace, embroidery, ruffles, and beading (McJimsey, 1973). Masculine elements which "belong together" include straight, thick lines; large, unbroken spaces; large, solid shapes with sharp edges; dark values; and rough, stiff textures (M. Davis, 1987).

In sum, this section has illustrated that both the elements and principles of design are presented as methods to create dress variations with masculine and feminine associations. We propose that these dress variations then become identifying attributes for gender, and subsequently, gender roles.

Other Aesthetic Considerations
In the literature reviewed other themes were evident that support the argument that dress variations serve as identifying attributes for gender roles. Several authors suggested that specific design features, articles of clothing, accessories, and manner of fit are associated with gender. Several authors also noted the cultural expectation that males should look different than females. Following is a brief summary of these themes organized under the categories of design features, articles of clothing, accessories, fit, and the notion that males look different than females.

Design features
Traditions exist in the placement of design features that support a distinction between masculine and feminine clothing. For example, Paoletti (1987) noted that even when young boys and girls both wore dresses, boys' dresses buttoned up the front, girls' dresses fastened in back. Men's trousers always zip at center front; men's shirts and jackets always button at center front unless they are double-breasted (Kallal, 1985). However, women's closures can be located almost anywhere but are commonly found at center front, center back, or left side (Kallal, 1985). For center front closures, in women's clothing, the right side overlaps the left; in men's clothing, the left side overlaps the right (Kallal, 1985).

Articles of clothing
For centuries, in Western cultures skirts for women and trousers for men have been considered the norm (Horn & Gurel, 1981; Sawyer, 1987). In U.S. society, although women wear trousers, men do not wear skirts. According to Rosencranc (1972), masculinity is associated with a necktie, pockets, and with the out-of-doors with the derived clothing symbols being boots, lumber jackets and shirts, and sailors' caps. Listed as distinctly feminine articles
were brassieres, hosiery, petticoats, blouses, and slips (Rosencranz, 1972).

**Accessories**

According to Horn and Gurel (1981), shoes are particularly expressive in identifying gender roles. Feminine shoes were ballerina slippers, slings, T-straps, and high heels (M. Davis, 1987). Cosmetics, jewelry, purses, and hair ornaments such as barrettes, headbands, elastic hair ties, ribbons, and bows were considered feminine (Rosencranz, 1972; Thompson, 1975).

**Fit**

In addition to fitting body girth and length measurements, clothing includes comfort ease to permit body movement when the garment is worn (Kallal, 1985). Garments designed for men are allowed more comfort ease than garments designed for women (a comparison of ease allowances for men's and women's garments can be found in Kallal, 1985).

In addition to comfort ease, style ease is added to many garments to provide for fashion effects (Kallal, 1985). Examples include gathered skirts or sleeves, tent dresses, reglan and kimono sleeves, and flared skirts. In general, it appears that ease allowed in women's garments relates to style while ease allowed in men's garments relates to comfort and freedom of movement. Support for this interpretation comes from McJimsey (1973) who equated freedom of movement in dress with masculinity in dress and noted that increased physical activity was associated with females wearing masculine dress (slacks). McJimsey further noted the restricting effect of feminine dress on girls who were well-behaved because they did not want to disturb their appearance.

**Males look different than females**

There is a prevailing assumption that males look different than females (Thompson, 1975). Morton (1964) explained that being a woman means being as little like a man as possible. Horn and Gurel (1981) noted that U.S. society refuses to allow men to wear clothes defined as women's with laws preventing transvestism to uphold these standards. Males are expected to be insensitive to and unconcerned with dress and appearance while females are expected to be interested in dress and appearance (Kaiser, 1990; McJimsey, 1973).

**Stereotyping Gender and Aesthetics: A Review of the Literature**

As information about the identifying attributes of dress for gender roles was reviewed, it was possible to speculate on how perceivers organize and interpret aesthetic information as manifest in dress. On the basis of the prescriptions concerning aesthetics and dress which have been illustrated, it appears that at least some of the aesthetic information provided by dress is learned and organized in the form of a bipolar dimension anchored by the terms masculinity and femininity. Although there is empirical evidence that masculinity and femininity are distributional, matters of less/more, at least as far as traits are concerned, perceivers apparently view them as binary, matters of either/or (Myers & Gonda, 1982).

Gender stereotypes may be activated automatically upon receiving aesthetic information from dress identifiers (Ashmore & Del Boca, 1979). Automatic processing of gender stereotypes has a number of implications. Given the immediate availability of aesthetic information as exhibited in dress, information tied to gender stereotypes may be activated before additional, and possibly inconsistent, information can be processed. Further, it has been demonstrated that information about one component of gender stereotypes influences inferences about other gender-related attributes (Deaux & Kite, 1985). Therefore, the review of literature related to gender and aesthetics will provide evidence that aesthetic information received from dress identifiers (a) is interpreted as a signal of gender and associated gender role; (b) affects ascribed attributes of males and females; (c) influences interpersonal behavior; and (d) influences individual behavior.

**Evidence That Aesthetic Information Received from Dress Identifiers Is Interpreted as a Signal of Gender and Associated Gender Role**

According to Lauer and Lauer (1980), the definition of which elements of appearance to consider masculine or feminine is arbitrary because there is nothing intrinsic in any
particular style which marks it as either masculine or feminine. However, evidence that the cultural aesthetic defines how elements and principles of design are manipulated to create dress variations which are identifying attributes for gender roles can be found in prescriptive literature and in research (Cahill, 1989; Katcher, 1955; Lennon, 1990b; Levin, Balistrieri, & Schukit, 1972; Paoletti, 1983; Paoletti, 1987; Sawyer, 1987; Shakin, Shakin, & Sternglanz, 1985; and Thompson & Bentler, 1971).

Shakin, Shakin, and Sternglanz (1985) investigated whether parents used dress to communicate the sex of their infant. Observers visited malls, guessed the sex of infants who appeared to be one year of age or less, and recorded aspects of infants' appearance. Another observer verified the infants' sex. Of the 48 infants observed, 90% were dressed in sex-typed clothes. Identifying attributes included color, pattern, style, and trim of clothing, accessories such as socks, shoes, hats, blankets, and toys, and presence of hair. Blue was worn or carried by 79% of the boys while none wore or carried pink. Pink was worn or carried by 75% of the girls while 8% of the girls wore or carried blue. Boys were more likely than girls to wear red while girls were more likely than boys to wear yellow, lace, ruffles, puffed sleeves, and dresses. Infants were classified as female if they wore pink, yellow, ruffles, lace, puffed sleeves, or a dress, and as male if they wore blue. As noted earlier, ruffles and puffed sleeves contain curved lines and style ease and were considered feminine (M. Davis, 1987; McJimsey, 1973; Morton, 1964), lace was described as a feminine fabric (Rosencranz, 1972), a skirt as a feminine article of dress (Horn & Gurel, 1981; Sawyer, 1987), and pink and yellow were classified as feminine hues (M. Davis, 1987). Therefore, it is not surprising that ruffles, puffed sleeves, lace, a dress, pink, and yellow were used by observers to "accurately" identify the sex of an infant as female. Cahill's (1989) observations support the notion that parents and other caregivers in our society visually announce their infants' sex to others through aesthetic variations in dress such as color (masculine blue, feminine pink) and accessories (e.g., bows taped to female infants' hairless heads).

Children, as well as adults, use aesthetic information as manifest in dress to determine sex of others. According to Katcher (1955), Levin, Balistrieri, and Schukit (1972), and Thompson and Bentler (1971), children use identifying attributes of cranial hair and clothes as more powerful cues to distinguish between the sexes than defining attributes of genitals. Katcher (1955) examined children's abilities to recognize identifying attributes of masculinity and femininity and found these were, in order of significance, clothes, hair, genitals, and breasts. Levin, Balistrieri, and Schukit (1972) found that when hair or dress was the only cue, almost all of 262 children (ages 4-11) were able to discriminate between the sexes. It was only in the 11-year-old group that more than half of the children recognized that genitals are the dominant characteristic differentiating boys from girls. Thompson and Bentler (1971) examined whether 4- to 6-year-olds could identify attributes of males and females, specifically genitals, body type, and cranial hair. Results showed that the identifying attribute, length of cranial hair, was the primary cue used for discrimination of males and females.

Paoletti (1983) documented identifying attributes of boys' dress that were indicators of changes in image and definition of masculinity in the U.S. Aesthetic changes occurring between 1860 and 1910 were reduction in the range of colors used for boys' dress, use of less trim, simpler trim, sturdier fabrics, darker colors, less inhibiting styles, fewer skirted styles and fewer styles that were fussy or delicate.

Paoletti (1987) did a content analysis of design characteristics of children's dress (sleeve, neckline, silhouette, fabric, color, trim) using illustrations and descriptions in turn-of-the-century fashion magazines. Correlation of data with age and sex of the wearer indicated that from 1890 to 1920, children's dress styles moved toward distinctive sex-typed differences with changes most pronounced in boys' dress.

Lennon (1990b) found that in television comedies the dress of working men and working women became less differentiated as gender roles became less differentiated. Masculine symbols identified by Lennon were a business suit, briefcase, tie, and tailored clothing. Attributes of dress were classified as masculine
if they displayed angular lines, dark colors, heavy or rough fabric, blazer-type jackets or coats, shirts as opposed to blouses, shoulder pads, tie, loose, baggy pants, or short hair. The attributes of dress classified as masculine were consistent with information presented earlier in this paper: angular lines, bifurcated silhouette, heavy or rough texture, dark colors, solid colors, proportion and emphasis (shoulder padding), articles of dress including blazer-type jackets or coats, pants, necktie, shirts, comfort ease (loose, baggy) and the notion that males look different than females (long vs. short hair). Attributes of dress were classified as feminine if they displayed flowing lines including draped details, light or pale colors, patterned fabrics, soft fabrics, dress or skirt, lace, ruffles, bows, jewelry, bow tie, or long hair. The attributes of dress classified as feminine were consistent with information presented earlier in this paper: curved lines as in ruffles, flowing lines as in draped details, soft textures, lace fabric, values that were light or pale (pastels), patterned fabric, accessories such as jewelry and bows, articles of dress including dresses, skirts, and blouses, and style ease as manifest in ruffles. In television comedies, women's dress as a reflection of traditional gender roles in which women are expected to care for children, husband, and home consisted primarily of feminine identifiers. In the same comedies, men's dress as a reflection of traditional gender roles in which men are expected to work outside the home for pay consisted primarily of masculine identifiers. However, in television comedies, as gender roles became less differentiated, women's dress contained more masculine identifiers.

Evidence That Aesthetic Information Received from Dress Identifiers Affects Ascribed Attributes of Males and Females

Evidence that aesthetic information received from dress variations as identifying attributes for gender roles affects ascribed attributes of males and females can be found in research by Biernat (1991), Cahill (1989), L. Davis (1987), Kaiser (1989), Leone and Robertson (1988), Nakdimen (1984), Rosen (1977), and Sawyer (1987). For example, Sawyer (1987) asserted that as a gender identifier, women's dress makes a statement about status, sexuality, personality, and acceptance of a traditional feminine gender role. Sawyer observed that individuals dressed and identified as women (whether male or female) experienced being patronized by those in authority; were expected to accept with a smile inappropriately flirtatious conversation and behavior; were perceived to be emotionally unstable, illogical, mechanically inept, and professionally inferior. Although Sawyer did not describe how individuals dressed and identified as women were attired, the following items were mentioned in the article as female dress (and were consistent with information presented earlier in this article): high heels, girdles, false eyelashes, brassieres, skirts, wigs, makeup, and jewelry.

Cahill (1989), based on observational data, suggested that dressing infants by utilizing identifying attributes for gender roles also serves indirectly to grant them ascribed masculine or feminine traits. Cahill noted that an infant who is wearing a hair ornament, such as a bow (classified as a feminine accessory), is likely to be viewed as delicate rather than hardy and frightened rather than angry when the infant cries. In contrast, an infant who is wearing a baseball cap (classified as a masculine accessory) is likely to be viewed as hardy rather than delicate and angry rather than frightened when the infant cries.

Kaiser (1989) used aesthetic information in an exploration of use of clothing in assignment of ascribed attributes. Line drawings were made of a girl wearing four ensembles: jeans and T-shirt, feminine pants and blouse with Peter Pan collar, a simple jumper and blouse, and ruffled dress with puffed sleeves. Aesthetic information utilized in creating the four ensembles to represent a continuum of masculine/feminine dress consisted of the bifurcated and T-shaped silhouettes versus a silhouette with a bouffant, full skirt, ruffles, and puffed sleeves, straight lines of pants versus curved lines of Peter Pan collar, ruffles, and puffed sleeves, rectangular shapes of pant legs versus circular shapes of full skirts and puffed sleeves. It is unknown what aesthetic variation was used to define "feminine pants" or "simple jumper and blouse", but it can be assumed that the elements and principles of design were involved. Middle-childhood to early adolescent girls matched 13 sex-typed attributes with one of the four ensembles. Attributes
related to interpersonal attraction (concern with appearance and popularity) tended to be matched with the dress and attributes related to aggression, strength, and bravery tended to be matched with the jeans.

Biernat (1991) utilized subjects from kindergarten, third grade, seventh grade, tenth grade, and college to investigate the extent to which sex-typed attributes were perceived to be descriptive of self. Subjects rated themselves on 24 sex-typed attributes: (a) personality traits (masculine: tough and rough, takes care of self, makes decisions easily; feminine: emotional, helpful and kind to others, well behaved), (b) physical characteristics (masculine: tall, muscular, short hair; feminine: pretty smile, soft voice, delicate and soft), (c) behaviors/roles (masculine: good at fixing things, plays baseball, group leader; feminine: babysits, decorates room, cooks and bakes), and (d) occupations (masculine: construction worker, doctor, truck driver; feminine: nurse, teacher, secretary). At all grade levels, males rated themselves higher on masculine attributes than females and females rated themselves higher on feminine attributes than males. Males most strongly differentiated between their masculine and feminine physical qualities and females most strongly differentiated between their feminine and masculine roles. As early as age 5, children perceived themselves in congruence with cultural stereotypes of sex-typed attributes. Just as endorsement of sex-typed attributes fosters the idea that males and females are different, it also provides evidence to support the aesthetic consideration that males and females look different. We propose that internalization of the cultural aesthetic, in which a binary classification scheme is used, could partially account for identification with masculine and feminine attributes. For example, if boys are consistently dressed in masculine clothing made of rough, sturdy fabrics, they may consequently identify themselves as rough and tough. As mentioned earlier, the restrictive fit associated with feminine clothing could contribute to identification with being well behaved. If girls are consistently dressed in clothing made of feminine fabrics with soft, delicate textures these attributes may come to be identified with the self as soft and delicate. As boys and girls observe others and note (consciously or unconsciously) aesthetic differences in dress, they may come to associate these aesthetic differences with differences in physical traits, roles, personality characteristics, and occupations.

Leone and Robertson (1988) videotaped an 11-month-old infant in three types of dress: feminine (white patterned dress with a ribbon, gathered sleeves, and ruffles—aspects of dress classified as feminine by authors in earlier part of this paper); masculine (blue shorts, blue/green/white striped shirt—aspects of dress classified as masculine by authors in earlier part of this paper); and ambiguous (white shirt, yellow pants—mixture of masculine/feminine elements). After viewing a videotape, subjects identified sex of the child and rated potency of the child on scales: strong/weak, heavy/light, hard/soft, and large/small. Compared with the infant in ambiguous dress, subjects who saw the infant in feminine dress identified the infant as female and those who saw the infant in masculine dress identified the infant as male. The infant in feminine dress was rated as less potent (i.e., weaker, lighter, softer, smaller) than the infant in masculine or ambiguous dress.

Rosen (1977) tested whether gender labeling via dress identifiers influenced descriptions in narrative and with semantic differential scales of five people observed in films. Four of the people were anatomically different from the gender in which they were presented by dress or manner. One person was congruent in presenting gender and in anatomical gender. Rosen did not describe the aesthetic information that comprised what these people wore...simply described their attire as "female clothing". The assumption underlying this omission seems to be that "female clothing" needs no description as it is a commonly shared perception. Rosen may have been correct in this assumption as subjects did use dress cues to identify gender of the individuals. When the person was presented as a female, subjects identified the person as female and assigned feminine stereotyped traits regardless of whether the person was anatomically male or female.

Nakdimen (1984), in a theoretical article, proposed that gendered appearances convey impressions of personality traits. For example, when a mental status report noted that a patient was attractive, Nakdimen contended that it was
a judgment of how successfully the patient's appearance suggested gender stereotyped personality traits. Nakdimen pointed out that clothing can be manipulated to change the apparent proportions of the body and as a result produce impressions consistent with those proportions. For example, the greater waist-to-shoulder proportion of men's clothing increases perceptions of energy, confidence, authority, and dominance. In contrast, women's clothing, with its increased proportion from the waist down, increases perceptions of vulnerability and submissiveness. According to Nakdimen, men's neck attire (shirt collar and tie) enhances the impression of strength and invulnerability by protecting the neck and making it look shorter. In contrast, neckline treatments for women's dress often lengthens the line of the neck and thereby increases perceptions of vulnerability.

In addition to aesthetic information as manifest in dress influencing perceptions of ascribed attributes, dress identifiers may also affect employment opportunities and/or others' expectations for occupational success which, in turn, could influence actual success in terms of self-fulfilling prophecies. Leslie Davis (Burns) (1987) investigated whether perceptions of ascribed attributes and occupational success would be affected by perceived gender role, as inferred from gender-related dress, that was consistent or inconsistent with occupational gender role expectations. Subjects were shown a slide of either a male or a female said to be employed in either a masculine, feminine, or sex-neutral occupation and wearing either masculine or feminine dress. Masculine clothing for the male consisted of a gray tailored 3-piece suit, white shirt, striped tie, and briefcase and for the female a navy skirted tailored suit, white blouse, striped tie, and a briefcase. Feminine clothing for the male consisted of beige front pleated slacks, beige mesh shoes, a pastel cotton sweater and a gold hoop earring and for the female a pink cotton dress with short puffed sleeves, white strappy sandals, white beads, and a white purse. Except for the skirt and blouse in masculine clothing for the female, the aesthetic information presented was consistent with masculine/feminine divisions as noted earlier in this paper. Gender-related dress served as a source of information for inferring gender-role orientation. Persons wearing masculine dress were rated as more masculine than persons wearing feminine dress; and persons wearing feminine dress were rated as more feminine than persons wearing masculine dress. Gender role as inferred from dress influenced perceptions of ascribed attributes and occupational success.

From the information presented, it is apparent that aesthetic information available from dress variations which served as identifiers for gender roles affected perceptions of others' ascribed attributes such as personality traits and expected behaviors. Aesthetic information as manifest in dress also affects interpersonal behavior.

Evidence That Aesthetic Information Received from Dress Identifiers Influences Interpersonal Behavior

Researchers have demonstrated that adults interact in different ways with boys and girls, for example, in which toys they offer a child (Culp, Cook, & Housely, 1983; Shakin, Shakin, & Sternglanz, 1985). According to Shakin, Shakin, and Sternglanz (1985) when someone interacts with a child and a sex label is available, the label functions to direct the interaction along the lines of traditional gender roles. Thus, even strangers' interactions with infants, who are wearing sex-typed clothing, are likely to reinforce traditional gender roles. Evidence that aesthetic information available from dress variations operates as identifiers for gender roles and subsequently affects interpersonal behavior can be found in research by Block (1979), Culp, Cook, and Housely (1983), Fagot (1978), Joffe (1971), and Shakin, Shakin, and Sternglanz (1985). Interpersonal behavior may involve socialization processes such as positive and negative sanctions, choices for others (e.g., choice of toys, clothing, or gifts for children), evaluations of accomplishments and performance, and expectations about occupational roles, among others.

For example, Shakin, Shakin, and Sternglanz (1985) found that parents selected their infant's clothing so that children could be identified correctly in terms of sex and that labeling an infant as a boy or girl by the aesthetic information available via identifying attributes of dress affected behavior toward the infant. People may interact with a child dressed in blue
by handling the child less gently and perhaps offering the child a football to play with because the child is perceived as "rough", "active", or "strong" while a child dressed in pink is handled gently and is offered a doll as a toy because the child is perceived to be "smooth", "passive", or "delicate" (Stone, 1982).

Culp, Cook, and Housley (1983) utilized aesthetic information as identifying attributes when they dressed an infant in blue overalls (masculine identifiers) or a pink dress (feminine identifiers) and observed male and female adults interacting with the child. When the child was perceived to be a girl, there was more interaction without gaze, more verbal interaction, and more neutral facial expressions than when the child was perceived to be a boy. When the child was perceived to be a boy, the child received more direct gazes and was smiled at more often. A feminine toy (a doll) was selected most frequently by females for use when interacting with a child perceived to be a girl. Predispositions were apparent for both male and female adults on the basis of perceived sex of child, however, interview data revealed that adults were unaware of any predispositions.

In related research, Fagot (1979) observed 12 boys and 12 girls (ages 20-24 months) and their parents in their homes using a checklist of 46 child behaviors and 19 parent reactions. Parents reacted more favorably to a child when the child was engaged in same-sex-preferred behavior and were likely to respond negatively to cross-sex-preferred behaviors. Parents responded negatively to girls who engaged in active, large motor activities and positively to girls who engaged in dependent behavior, doll play, dress up behavior, and dancing. Parents responded negatively to boys who played with dolls or other soft toys, asked for help, and followed parents around and positively to boys who played with blocks. Parents differed in reactions to children's activities based on the child's sex, but parents were unaware of differences in their reactions. Both positive and negative sanctions were observed in parents' interaction with their children as they encouraged sex-typed choices in toys and behaviors, including experimentation with dress. We speculate that positive and negative sanctions are methods by which parents transmit the cultural expectation that males and females dress differently and have different interests regarding clothing and appearance.

Block (1979) also found that parents responded differently to boys and girls. Achievement, competition, independence, and control of emotions were emphasized for boys. Parents discouraged girls from engaging in rough-and-tumble play and expected girls to be clean and to engage in ladylike behaviors. Consistent with McJimsey (1973), it might be speculated that one way to discourage rough-and-tumble play and to encourage cleanliness and ladylike behavior is to dress girls in confining and restricting, sex-appropriate, dress.

Joffe (1971) used participant observation to investigate the role of the nursery school in the transmission of gender role expectations. One seemingly trivial event which occurred fairly often, and which conveyed messages about gender role expectations, was acknowledgment of girls' dress. Girls' appearance was more frequently admired than boys' and girls received more compliments on days they wore dresses (a feminine aesthetic cue) rather than pants (a masculine aesthetic cue). Joffe gives this as an example of a subtle way in which girls (and boys) get instruction concerning social images of femininity and masculinity. In nursery schools, both literature and toys were cited as sources of traditional gender role learning. Joffe noted, as evidence of the strength of gender role socialization in our culture, the fact that in a non-threatening environment such as a nursery school only six children experimented with assuming cross-sex identities, for example, a boy dressing in feminine apparel.

Evidence That Aesthetic Information Received from Dress Identifiers Influences Individual Behavior

Evidence that aesthetic information as manifest in dress variations as identifiers for gender roles affects individual behavior can be found in research by Cahill (1989), L. Davis (1984-1985), Fagot (1978), Kaiser, Rudy, and Byfield (1985), Lennon (1990a), Serbin and Spafrink (1986), and Thompson (1975). An individual's behavior may be affected in attempts to meet the demands of gender role expectations. Specific behaviors
influenced by the association of aesthetic information as manifest in dress with gender roles may range from an individual's choice of clothing, toys, activities, friends, or occupation to performance of gender role expected behaviors.

For example, L. Davis (1984-1985) found that males and females reported wearing clothing consistent with gender-role expectations. Clothing consistent with a masculine gender role was an athletic supporter, going shirtless, a necktie, football jersey, basketball shoes, hiking boots, and watch face larger than one inch in diameter. As noted earlier, aesthetic information consistent with masculinity included large scale (watch face), an association with the out-of-doors (hiking boots, sports clothing), and a necktie. In this study, clothing consistent with a feminine gender role was a skirt with ruffle, blouse with lace, pantyhose, fingernail polish, eye makeup, two-piece swimsuit, purse or satchel, hair shoulder length or longer, shoes with heels higher than two inches, and watch face smaller than one inch in diameter. As noted earlier, aesthetic information consistent with femininity included skirts, ruffles, blouses, lace, hosiery, cosmetics, purses, long hair, high heels, and small scale (watch face).

Cahill (1989) suggested that both older peers and adults implicitly instruct young children to manage their appearance so that it clearly announces their ascribed gender identity. To illustrate this point, Cahill cited an example from field research in preschool settings in which a preschool aide encountered a young girl who was dressed in a bright yellow sunsuit bordered with lace. The girl snapped the straps of her sunsuit, looked at the aide, and said "I got lace". The aide replied "You are all girl, aren't you?...You're so sweet". Cahill stated that by the end of the preschool years, children begin to commit to their ascribed gender identities. This is evidenced in children's commitment to wearing clothing reserved for their gender. For example, Cahill related an incident of a 55-month old preschool boy refusing to wear a necklace because it was "for girls".

Adults' socialization of gender specific behaviors relative to dress do not necessarily deter girls from engaging in cross-gender behaviors. Kaiser, Rudy, and Byfield (1985) observed girls in a preschool setting to determine if girls wearing feminine clothing were more likely to engage in feminine play activities. Play behavior did not vary significantly when girls wore pants as opposed to skirts. Some of the girls were more likely to engage in masculine behavior when wearing dresses than when wearing pants and were more likely to engage in feminine behavior when wearing pants than when wearing dresses.

However, Fagot (1978) found sex differences in frequency of seven behaviors from observations of 20-24 month old boys and girls in their homes. Boys played with transportation toys and blocks and manipulated objects more frequently than girls, who played with soft toys and dolls, danced, and asked for help more than boys. Parents rated rough-and-tumble play and aggressive behavior as more appropriate for boys and doll play, dressing up, and dancing as more appropriate for girls. In Fagot's study, boys did not engage in dressing up and dancing frequently enough to do statistical analyses, suggesting perhaps that by age 20-24 months boys had already internalized a binary classification scheme and had learned to avoid activities associated with girls, such as expressing an interest in and experimenting with dress.

Lennon (1990a) suggested that gender appropriate dress for women restricts (by design and construction) women's behaviors to those deemed socially acceptable. Lennon labeled these design and construction features bondage elements. Bondage elements in women's dress were a tight or buttoned bodice, short skirt, tight pants, fitted waistline, uplift bra, high heels, crinolines, and corset. These elements are consistent with aesthetic information presented earlier in this paper as associated with femininity. Features in women's dress which contributed to freedom of movement were loose fit, partially unbottoned bodice, medium length skirt, loose pants, undefined waist, natural line bra, and flat shoes. With the exception of the skirt and bra, these elements are consistent with aesthetic information presented earlier in this paper as associated with masculinity. Lennon analyzed women's dress in television comedies and found the most elements of bondage in dress of a female lead in a comedy televised during a time
period of traditional gender role orientation. The
most elements of freedom and fewest of
bondage were found in dress of a lead female in
a comedy televised during a time period of
nontraditional gender role orientation. Lennon
speculated that restrictive dress prevents women
from engaging in some activities but did not
examine if dress actually prevented activity.

Thompson (1975) used seven tests to examine
children's use of gender labels to guide
preferences for behavior including the self-sort
test, gender label identification test, labeled-
picture preference test, and sex-role stereotype
test. Thompson's research was based on the
premise that socializing pressures may restrict
boys or girls from associating with things
culturally defined as being for the other sex and
may result in avoidance of objects or activities
labeled as being appropriate for the other sex.
Subjects were 11 males and 11 females in each
of three ages: 24, 30, and 36 months. At age 24
months, children evidenced gender-role
stereotyping in sorting of clothing and household
articles. The sorting of clothing by gender is
evidence that children had already internalized
the cultural aesthetic regarding which principles
and elements of design were feminine and which
were masculine, as it can be assumed they
utilized this information in their sorting. At age
36 months, gender labels influenced preferential
behavior as evidenced by children consistently
choosing same-sex objects. Thompson
concluded that by age 36 months, children have
accepted their gender label and this affects their
gender-role behavior, including, we can
presume, their choice of clothing.

Serbin and Sprafkin (1986) examined the
degree to which children use gender to make
personal affiliation choices. Subjects were 147
boys and girls aged 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7. As an
affiliation preference measure, children were
presented with pairs of photographs, each
containing a picture of a man or a woman, and
were asked with which person they would like to
play. (It is unknown what aesthetic information
was provided in the photographs that enabled
the children to distinguish between men and
women. It was evident, however, that children
recognized the aesthetic information associated
with males and females.) Boys increased
gender-based affiliation choices from 31% at age
3 to 74% at age 7 while girls responded fairly
consistently in different age groups. Children
ranked from most to least favorite, drawings of a
person of the subject's sex (it is unknown what
aesthetic information was used to depict each
sex) engaged in five male stereotyped and five
female stereotyped activities and occupations.
Each child was shown photographs of
"masculine" and "feminine" toys and indicated the
toy with which she or he would prefer to play.
Each child was shown photographs of the
members of their class and asked to identify the
three children with whom they would most and
least like to play. Sex typing of activity,
occupational preferences, toy choices, and
preference for same-sex peers were all found to
relate to the use of gender (as depicted using
unknown aesthetic variations) in the affiliation
preference measure.

The review of literature related to gender and
aesthetics has provided evidence that aesthetic
information received from dress identifiers is
interpreted as a signal of gender and associated
gender role, that this information affects ascribed
attributes of males and females, and further, that
aesthetic information influences both
interpersonal behavior and individual behavior.

Discussion

According to Kaiser (1991), everyday choices,
acts, interpretations, and negotiations produce
and reproduce gendered appearances. Kaiser
(1990) noted the importance of identifying how
dress and appearance cues are used to signify
gender boundaries. Each gender role has
explicit and implied standards of dress subject to
cultural and historical interpretations. Culture
furnishes a means of socially organizing gender
categories (Kaiser, 1990). One way in which this
is accomplished is by socialization agents who
teach us which variations of the elements and
principles of design are masculine and which are
feminine. Aesthetic rules regarding the elements
and principles of design are culturally shared by
both producers (designers) and consumers of
fashion in our cultural system. Individuals learn
(early) to recognize aesthetic information
associated with dress variations as identifying
attributes for gender roles, to utilize those
identifiers to guide their selection of clothing for
self and others, to determine the sex of others
and thereby to anticipate another's social role at a glance, and further, to adjust their own behavior to meet gender role expectations. Cultural aesthetic information, as manifest in dress, factors into the perceptions of gendered appearances. We interpret the appearance of others as a function of internalized notions with respect to the cultural aesthetic—a cultural ideology that we do not question. According to Kaiser (1990), conceptual linkages exist between cultural ideology that we do not question, and an implicit tendency to categorize or stereotype others according to gender. Therefore, it is important to understand and critically analyze the basis for gender dichotomies because of their potential impact on social interaction (Kaiser, 1990). Associations are subject to change, but one principle remains stable—the use of a binary categorization scheme anchored by the terms femininity and masculinity.

In this paper, a theoretical relationship is proposed between cultural values related to aesthetics and cultural values related to gender stereotypes that is grounded in the two categories of literature presented. One important aspect of a proposed theoretical relationship is the raising of questions and issues that result from having looked critically at some body of data or literature. Following are a few of the issues and questions which evolved from this review.

The studies cited described various socialization agents, for example, parents, peers, teachers, and television. What is the role of various socializing agents in transmitting the cultural aesthetic and gender associations? What is the relative importance of each agent? How are ridicule and other sanctions used to encourage conformance with the cultural aesthetic? As socialization agents, what are the implications of this discussion for educators in the field of clothing and textiles? How do we teach the elements and principles of design? Do we question them, encourage students to question them, consider their history, and consider the variation in ways they are manifest in dress? Moreover, do we use the link between the elements and principles of design and gender roles to demonstrate the intimate relationship that exists in the content of our often disparate-appearing courses—like design fundamentals and social aspects of dress, for example?

In many of the research studies conducted, the researchers tried to hold everything constant except the aesthetic information. In real life, however, social cognition is rarely an unidimensional phenomenon. Hence, what is the relative importance, or combined effect of visual aesthetic information and non-visual cues, such as vocal quality, manner of deportment, language usage/grammar, in the cognitive processes of an observer? Further, what is the relative importance of aesthetic information as manifest in dress to other first-impression cues in assessing not only gender but other factors (e.g., competency, intelligence, appropriateness) as well?

Many of the studies cited were concerned with initial perceptions, rather than with the evolution of perception over time. What is the effect of aesthetic information as manifest in dress on the perceptions of others when there is opportunity for refinement or redefinition of perceptions? Over time, what is the relative importance of aesthetic information as manifest in dress in mediating the impact of other cues on perceptions related to gender? What length of encounter is required and in what contexts in order for time to have a redefining effect on these perceptions?

Most of the studies cited focused on young people. Does the relative dependence on aesthetic information as manifest in dress change over the lifetime of an individual? What is the effect of life cycle changes on perceptions associated with dress/gender cues?

Many of the studies cited provide evidence of the cause-effect problem of explaining aesthetic/gender values. Do very young females act like females (rather than males) because observers, who respond to the aesthetic information as manifest in the dress of these children, and assume that the child is a female, treat them like females? When will perceivers be challenged to interpret in greater detail rather than indulge in an automatic tendency to categorize a person? At what point will perceivers, as Kaiser (1990) suggests, be forced to engage in a more interpretive kind of thinking,
taking into account situational variables and deriving additional information from social interactions?

How does knowledge of, or sensitivity to, the way stereotyping works vis-a-vis gender and aesthetic values manifest itself in manipulating, consciously or unconsciously, social interaction? What are the implications of associations of the principles and elements of design with gender roles for appearance management?

How has women's entry into the labor force and into positions of public and professional responsibility influenced, or how may we expect it to influence, the traditional associations of aesthetics with gender? What data might be valuable to begin collecting now for analysis 20 or 30 years from now? Why do some cultural beliefs about male and female roles and relationships seem to endure despite dramatic alterations in the realities of everyday life (Kaiser, 1990, p. 68)? How resistant to change are the traditional associations of aesthetics with gender? How might one explore change in cultural values regarding aesthetics and/or gender? What are the conditions necessary for perceivers to restructure gender categories or aesthetic definitions?

If pink, ruffles, and puffed sleeves each signify a female role, then will (a person wearing) an ensemble which includes all three components be judged as more feminine than (a person wearing) an ensemble that includes only one of them (the counting hypothesis)? How many components are needed in an ensemble to convey an overall impression of femininity? Is there a saturation point? What is the relative power of each component in conveying impressions of masculinity and femininity? What kind of impression is conveyed when components are mixed between masculine and feminine (manipulation of harmony)? What if a woman is wearing clothing consisting of mostly masculine components or if a man is wearing clothing consisting of mostly feminine components? Do subcultural or marginal groups (e.g., homosexuals, transvestites) send appearance messages which are mixed in terms of masculine and feminine elements? Is this what makes a dominant culture uneasy about the appearances of marginal groups? How might one explore the clash of such values between subcultures or classes within a complex cultural system?

What kind of perceiver variables might affect a counting hypothesis? Will people who profess a non-traditional gender ideology need fewer or different feminine elements in an ensemble to consider (the person wearing) it feminine than people who profess a traditional gender ideology? How are age, gender, cultural heritage, subcultural membership, social class, and other aspects of the perceiver, related to judgments of femininity and masculinity?

Addressing many of the questions/issues listed above may require addressing the issue of research method and the assumptions underlying research. A linkage between sociocultural influences (the social construction of gender and the cultural aesthetic) and psychological perceptions (impressions of masculinity and femininity, stereotyping, categorization) may require a combination of research approaches to analyze and elucidate the relationship.

Kaiser (1991) contended that people live in socially constructed environments of which aesthetics are a part. Kaiser further noted the importance of exploring choice as an integral component of aesthetics. Our theoretical position would suggest that choice is much more limited than we are led to believe since the cultural aesthetic and its association with gender appears to be internalized at a very early age. Perhaps those who exercise non-normative choice in aesthetics are marginalized as a function of their appearances (e.g., transvestites, punks, hippies). Kaiser suggested that we have an opportunity to acknowledge the importance of both aesthetics and power relationships in everyday life. Our position suggests an inseparable link between aesthetics and the social construction of gender with the associated power relationships. Researchers need to explore these issues in greater depth.
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Physical Disability as an Aspect of Appearance

Jane M. Lamb
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Much can be learned by studying contrasts. We learn about our own language while studying foreign languages. We gain insight about our own culture by studying other cultures. We can learn more about the physically able by studying individuals who have physical disabilities.

The term physical disability is being used in this paper as a more recognizable label for physical anomaly. Visible signs of disability, rather than the medical conditions defined as disability (Wright, 1983), are of interest. As used here, the term physical disability applies to people whose bodies may not conform to typical shapes, surfaces, or motions, or whose assistive devices (e.g., wheelchairs, crutches, braces, or prostheses) form part of the appearance picture conceptualized by Hillestad (1980) and Stone (1962). Physical disability is a visible anomaly that deviates from societal standards of attractiveness. Thus people with physical disabilities are appearance-impaired (Beuf, 1990).

Personal appearance is the visual statement an individual makes and the basis of others' judgments in social encounters. Visible signs of disability are appearance cues that can work with or against clothing and other cues in impression formation and social interaction. Others' responses to these appearance cues yield social feedback that becomes incorporated in the individual self-concept. Dress and other forms of appearance management allow the individual to present images of the self to others within social contexts.

Physical disability is an aspect of appearance deserving greater attention in clothing and human behavior research because there is potential to advance theory development and to improve instruction about clothing for people with special needs. The purposes of this paper are to examine recent research, offer suggestions for additional studies, and highlight some implications for apparel design and marketing.

Research Areas

Previous reviews of early research studies on clothing for physically disabled persons mainly focused on physical problems such as easy dressing, comfort, and safety (Newton, 1984-1985; Yep, 1976). More recent studies have addressed social psychological concerns of people with disabilities, including impression formation (Christman & Branson, 1990; Ray, 1985-1986), stigmata (Feather, Rucker & Kaiser, 1989; Kaiser, Freeman & Wingate, 1985), and appearance management (Kaiser, Wingate, Freeman & Chandler, 1987). These studies illustrate the need for and promise of research on disability and appearance.

Appearance and Impressions on Others

A few researchers have examined clothing and physical impairment cues as variables in impression formation. Miller (1982) found that manipulations of the suit and hearing aid worn by a male stimulus person affected causal attributions made by university students. Ray (1985-1986) found that manipulations of the suit worn by a male job applicant pictured in a wheelchair affected ratings of personal characteristics, recommendations to hire, and recommendations for entry-level salary by managerial personnel. Christman (1987) found that dress was a more powerful influence than physical condition on ratings made by employers, rehabilitation personnel, and disabled students of a female job applicant who was depicted as able-bodied, using crutches, or using a wheelchair.

In a slightly different approach, Kaiser and colleagues treated functional clothing designed for people with disabilities as the stimuli (Freeman, Kaiser, & Chandler, 1987; Freeman, Kaiser & Wingate, 1985-1986; Wingate, Kaiser, & Freeman, 1985-1986). Perceptions of the garments by able-bodied college students and students with physical disabilities confirmed the salience of special features as cues in impression formation.
All of these studies to date suggest possibilities for further research on impression formation, examining the salience of both body-related and clothing-related aspects of appearance. Future researchers will need to vary perceivers, stimulus persons, and contexts to determine whether similar results occur for different impairment cues and different clothing strategies in a variety of situations. Researchers could test the relative importance of various appearance cues in situations in which people with disabilities are being mainstreamed into society (schools, workplaces, public accommodations, public services) and in traditional settings where people with disabilities have been expected sights (e.g., residential schools, sheltered workshops, health care facilities).

**Perceivers.** People with different backgrounds form different interpretations of appearance cues. Some researchers (Belgrave, 1985; Christman, 1987; Miller, 1982; Weinberg & Davis, 1987) used university students as perceivers of stimulus persons with disabilities or of functional clothing stimuli (Freeman et al., 1987; Wingate et al., 1985-1986). In other studies (Christman & Branson, 1990; Ray, 1985-1986) employers were the perceivers. Christman (1987) also used rehabilitation personnel. Including both able-bodied persons and persons with disabilities as perceivers is an important consideration (Christman, 1987; Freeman et al., 1987). Perceiver variables such as sex (Ray, 1985-1986), age (Workman & Johnson, 1989), and ethnic background (Belgrave, 1985) also might affect impressions of people with disabilities. Researchers could examine how similarities and differences between perceivers and stimulus persons in physical abilities, occupational status, sex, age, and ethnic background influence impressions formed of people with visible disabilities.

**Stimulus persons.** An obvious concern is how to depict physical disability in person perception studies. Wheelchairs (Christman & Branson, 1990; Ray, 1985-1986), crutches (Christman & Branson, 1990), and a hearing aid (Miller, 1982) have been used in clothing-related studies. The stimulus persons have appeared in photographs (Ray, 1985-1986) and videotapes (Christman & Branson, 1990; Miller, 1982). Other physical conditions have been depicted in behavioral research on reactions to disabled persons in which dress was not a variable. These included leg amputation (Kleck, 1969), visual impairment (Belgrave, 1985), and facial scarring (Weinberg & Davis, 1987). Involuntary movements (Parkinsonism, multiple sclerosis), exaggerated movements (cerebral palsy), disproportionate figures (spina bifida), and irregular posture (hemiplegia, kyphosis) are other signs of disability likely to affect impression formation in social encounters.

Some researchers have varied apparel cues presented by stimulus persons with physical disabilities. Miller (1982) used solid colored versus patterned suits for males shown with and without a hearing aid. Ray (1985-1986) varied outfits for males shown in a wheelchair to depict three levels of appropriateness for managerial positions. Similar levels of appropriateness for females shown as able-bodied, using crutches, and using a wheelchair were depicted by a skirted suit, a pants suit, and a sweater and pants outfit (Christman & Branson, 1990). The differing evaluations of functional clothing stimuli by students with disabilities and able-bodied students in research by Kaiser and associates (Freeman, Kaiser, & Chandler, 1987; Freeman, Kaiser, & Wingate, 1985-1986; Wingate, Kaiser, & Freeman, 1985-1986) suggest that clothing designed with self-help or special fit features for persons with disabilities warrants investigation as an aspect of stimulus persons' appearance. Important considerations are commonness, fashionability, attractiveness, and conspicuousness of the clothing (Freeman et al., 1987). Researchers could vary dress of stimulus persons with disabilities to compare the impact of both conventional and specially designed garments on impressions formed.

Researchers doing experiments on impressions or reactions to people with disabilities must be cognizant of how clothing and the body of the stimulus person work together to create the individual appearance. Appearance of clothing on the person can provide cues for perceivers that the stimulus person is an actor simulating disability (Wiesenthal, Theodor, & Hurford, 1982). Therefore, researchers unable to use stimulus persons with genuine signs of disability should ensure that the way a garment hangs on the body, signs of wear from assistive devices, and
the body stance or movements performed are convincing portrayals.²

Context. Because respondents in their study had viewed line drawings of context-free stimuli, Freeman et al. (1987) recommended that context-specificity be explored as a variable in non-disabled persons' perceptions of functional clothing. In previous social perception research on dress and physical disability, stimulus persons with disabilities have appeared as college students (Miller, 1982) or job applicants (Christman & Branson, 1990; Ray, 1985-1986). Public businesses such as retail stores, hotels/motels, and restaurants offer other contexts in which appearance is likely to affect impressions of persons with disabilities. Researchers could test the impact of appearance when the stimulus person with a visible disability is an employee of the business and when he or she is a patron.

Multiple methods. Additional methods of data collection, such as field experiments and observation, would strengthen generalizability of findings on impressions. Field experiments could provide realistic tests of clothing manipulations that previous laboratory studies indicated would foster favorable impressions in social interaction. For example, a follow-up study to Miller's (1982) study of physical disability and clothing cues might be conducted. In the laboratory experiment (Miller, 1982), students viewed a videotape featuring a non-impaired actor in solid colored clothing and another actor who either wore solid colored clothing with or without a hearing aid, or patterned clothing with or without a hearing aid; the students were then asked their impressions of the actors in a series of questionnaires. Results showed that the manipulations of the physical appearance variables, hearing aid and clothing, had a significant impact on the impressions formed. A researcher could design field experiments in which interactions would be observed and conclusions drawn concerning impression formation. Confederates wearing solid colored and patterned clothing, with and without a hearing aid, could approach students in a request for help scenario (e.g., completing a questionnaire, providing campus directions). Students' verbal and non-verbal responses would be noted. In other experiments, observers could detect interactional patterns (e.g., length of conversation, personal space) experienced by individuals with disabilities wearing dress varying in appropriateness or fashionability.

If researchers could determine how physical anomalies and dress affect first impressions, then ultimately their theories might predict what appearance strategies (including clothing manipulations) would create desired effects. Additional research might also demonstrate that clothing cannot always reduce negative impressions (e.g., cases of multiple discrediting cues), or that some conditions require specific clothing strategies to produce favorable reactions (e.g., camouflage of disability signs).

Research that regards both physical disability and dress as aspects of appearance affecting impressions would benefit scholars in a variety of fields. As Kaiser (1990) noted, many of the earlier studies from other disciplines on person perception did not acknowledge clothing as a variable. Similarly, most studies concerned with impressions of people with disabilities (Wright, 1983) did not deal with the clothing aspect of appearance. Research on salience of disability and dress cues could be an application of the social cognitive framework on clothing and human behavior outlined by Lennon and Davis (1989).

Clothing and Self Feelings

Popular press articles about specially designed clothing imply that clothing concerns are (or should be) more important to individuals who have physical disabilities than to those who do not. The research base does not provide strong statistical support for that notion.

Feather, Martin and Miller (1979) found that, although groups of able-bodied and physically disabled students at one university differed in their attitudes toward fashion, management, comfort, and durability, they did not differ in their attitudes toward appearance. The two groups did not differ significantly on self-concept scores.

Kaiser, Wingate, Freeman, and Chandler (1987) found little statistical support for the hypothesized relationship between disability acceptance and attitudes toward personal appearance among a national sample of
physically disabled university students. The data did suggest, however, that individuals whose disabilities are salient aspects of their personal identities may regard appearance management as a means of easing the impact of disability in social encounters.

In a comprehensive study of women who had mastectomies, clothing importance (as a life concern) was not significantly related to appearance satisfaction or to self-esteem; however, appearance satisfaction was significantly related to self-esteem (Feather, Kaiser, & Rucker, 1988). Specific garment concerns of post-mastectomy women were related to social contexts in which the garments would be worn (Feather, Rucker, & Kaiser, 1989).

Thus the question of how a physical anomaly affects one's feelings about his or her appearance has a multifaceted answer. Previous studies indicate that researchers might investigate appearance management of persons with disabilities from the perspectives of negotiated outcome (Kaiser, Freeman, & Wingate, 1985), symbolic interaction (Feather, Kaiser, & Rucker, 1988), symbolic self completion (Feather, Kaiser, & Rucker, 1989), or stigma (Feather, Rucker, & Kaiser, 1989).

Qualitative research strategies offer promise as ways to document the relationship of clothing to the self-images of people who have physical disabilities. Kaiser et al. (1985) used comments from focused group interviews and mailed questionnaires to examine the part played by clothing in the management of appearance by persons with physical disabilities. Similarly, Feather and colleagues (Feather, Kaiser, & Rucker, 1988; Feather, Kaiser & Rucker, 1989; Feather, Rucker, & Kaiser, 1989) supplemented questionnaire data from a large sample of post-mastectomy women with open-ended interviews of a subset of the respondents. The use of multiple methods enriched findings about appearance concerns, appearance management strategies, and self-esteem.

These studies demonstrate that when individuals who have experienced a disabling condition are allowed to tell their feelings in their own terms, they provide rich descriptions of how clothing relates to self-image within the context of their different life situations. Able Lives (Morris, 1989), a book based on open-ended questionnaire responses from women in England who had experienced spinal cord injury, provides another example. The impact of spinal injury on women's physical appearances and self-images is vividly described by women of different ages and social circumstances.

Implications

Design/Manufacture of Clothing for Physically Disabled Persons

If individuals who embark on design projects or business ventures concerned with "clothing for the handicapped" (or whatever label is used) are to be successful, they must offer products that their target customers want. Research has shown that some functionally designed garments, which were easy to don or comfortable, lacked aesthetic appeal for the intended consumers (Freeman et al., 1985-1986). Some specially designed garments are attractive, but they lack current fashion appeal or situational appropriateness. Designers must give attention to how wearers might feel about themselves and how others in their social environments would react to their appearance when wearing these garments (Freeman et al., 1987).

In the best possible scenario (Lamb, 1991a), evaluation of a clothing product designed to meet special needs would include multiple considerations. Ideally, wear tests dealing with performance in the social environment as well as in physical conditions would precede marketing of such items. When costs of wear tests are prohibitive, social science research could yield guidance for designers. Kaiser's research on functional clothing stimuli (Freeman, Kaiser & Chandler, 1987; Freeman, Kaiser & Wingate, 1985-1986; Wingate, Kaiser & Freeman, 1985-1986) provides a model for determining reactions to designs by both the intended consumers and others in their social worlds. Important concerns would be social desirability, protection, comfort, and consumer satisfaction.
Textiles and Clothing Curricula

Textiles and clothing scholars have recommended incorporation of special needs topics in a variety of courses (Chowdhary, 1988). Treating physical disability as an aspect of appearance permits inclusion of "clothing for special needs" within an ongoing textiles and clothing curriculum. Through coursework on social science aspects of dress, students can be exposed to appearance concerns of people with physical impairments, figure irregularities, or other anomalies. Kaiser's (1990) contextual framework is a useful perspective for including people with special needs in a social psychology of dress course. Projects can be developed that encourage students to take a market segmentation view of people with special needs (Lamb, 1986).

Most clothing and textiles undergraduates are enrolled in merchandising programs. Garner and Buckley (1988) used ratings from retailers, educators, and graduates to offer recommendations for items to be included, possibly de-emphasized, or eliminated from baccalaureate programs in fashion marketing. "Clothing for the handicapped" was one of 16 items recommended for de-emphasis if there are time constraints in the retail oriented curriculum. "Social psychological aspects of apparel" was included in the group of elements rated as neither very important nor of no importance. However, "figure analysis and apparel selection for individuals" and "clothing needs of individuals and families" made the list of highly recommended items which should be given second priority in the curriculum. These highly rated items suggest a way to incorporate both clothing for people with disabilities and social psychological aspects of clothing within a merchandising program. The concept of figure analysis and apparel selection relates to appearance management ("social psychological aspects"), which is part of the configuration of clothing needs faced by individuals, including those who are physically challenged ("handicapped"). This linkage can be integrated into a core course that serves all textiles and clothing students (Lamb, 1991b).

Conclusion

Physical disability is an aspect of appearance that warrants attention in social psychological research. Scholars need to consider the visible signs of disability along with clothing as cues in person perception and as contributors to self-image. Strengthening the research on disability and appearance will contribute to theories about clothing and human behavior. All clothing and textile professionals would benefit from theoretical frameworks that encompass physical disability as well as other aspects of appearance.
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Endnotes

1 Clothing for special needs is "clothing that reduces or eliminates the barrier to an individual's social, functional, or economic functioning resulting from a permanent physical, mental, and/or visual condition that might otherwise be stigmatizing and set them apart from the majority of the population" (Feather, 1991, p. 118)

2 Collaboration with occupational therapists or other professionals familiar with the ramifications of disabling conditions is one strategy for ensuring such realism.
A Paradigm for the Study of the Social Meaning of Clothes:
Complementarity of Social-Psychological Theories
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All too often, research articles addressing the role of clothing as a form of human behavior provide introductory paragraphs describing why this particular study should be done and outlining a theory from a basic discipline such as sociology or psychology. Concluding paragraphs of the article contain comments such as "It would appear that results of this study support such-and-such theory. Further, investigation (replication) with other populations is necessary to...."

The reader of such research has the feeling the investigator has conducted a study and then searched for a theoretical framework under which these findings might fit. The position taken here is that the question of interest to the researcher might fit under several theories depending upon his or her focus and basic assumptions regarding human behavior. We present a paradigm demonstrating complementarity of theories from the social sciences in order to facilitate an understanding of the 'bigger picture' guiding our inquiry. The paradigm should encourage the researcher to recognize before research is undertaken what basic assumptions underlie a selected research methodology, types of information sought, and theory selected. We contend that scholars exploring the social meaning of clothes are in a unique position to appreciate this complementarity, given our openness to diverse disciplinary perspectives and methodological approaches. Understanding the underlying linkages among theories not only gives us more "room to roam" conceptually but also clarifies the relationships among theories that individuals wedded to a specific theoretical or disciplinary orientation are likely to miss or ignore. Indeed, our subject matter demands an integrative approach, invites creative as well as critical inquiry, and fosters acceptance of a spirit of diversity in research methods, strategies, and explanations.

Thus this paper offers a paradigm for the study of the social meaning of clothes. The paradigm is used to provide a framework to organize and subsume four basic models in social psychology: cognitive, behavioral, bio-volitional, and symbolic. For this purpose, we (a) briefly outline the metatheories or basic assumptions underlying each of the four models of the paradigm, (b) locate various theories that fall under each model, (c) sketch the metatheories as they relate to the study of clothing, (d) illustrate how the paradigm orders the models' methods and strategies, and (e) assess how existing research on the human use of clothing falls under the various models. We then provide suggestions for future research.

Paradigms and Models

Paradigms? Models? What are they, how do they differ, and how applicable are they to textiles and clothing and the study of the social meaning of clothes? In the social sciences, the term paradigm is used in many ways. According to Masterman (1970), Kuhn (1962) left considerable room for different interpretations of the concept of paradigm. For our purposes, we use the term generally to refer to a frame of reference for viewing the social world. It consists basically of a set of concepts and assumptions which are more or less taken for granted. The concepts (or the smallest units of the paradigm) specify the entities of the social world embraced by the paradigm. The concept of paradigm is more comprehensive than that of model and
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closely follows Ritzer’s (1975) definition:

A paradigm is a fundamental image of the subject matter within a science. It serves to define what should be studied, what questions should be asked, how they should be asked, and what rules should be followed in interpreting the answers obtained. The paradigm is the broadest unit of consensus within a science and serves to differentiate one scientific community (or "subcommunity") from another. It subsumes, defines, and interrelates the exemplars, theories, and methods and instruments that exist within it. (p. 7)

The concept of model as viewed here is not the same as a paradigm. A model postulates a system that represents the kinds of situation(s) that might exist in the real world but does not necessarily reflect what is actually "out there." It describes the phenomenon in as if terms, that is, how the phenomenon could occur. The model is accepted on faith. For example, the Ptolemaic model of our planetary system dominated the view of the universe until the 16th century. Today the Copernican model of the planetary system, which describes the paths and velocities of planets, eclipses, etc., is accepted. Hence, models state the basic presuppositions about the nature of the phenomenon in question and thus refer to the underlying structure of theories (Nagasawa, 1991). In this sense, models suggest theories, and the theories that derive from a model subscribe to the metatheory or basic assumptions of the model. The model is untested. It is the theory, based on the model, which is empirically tested. In short, a model postulates an image of what might be; a theory explains what is. In the Copernican model, the paths and velocities of the planets are explained by Newtonian laws of physics.

The proposed paradigm consists of a triad of elements which we claim the major theories in social psychology focus upon in order to explain human behavior. The elements of the triad can be schematized in this general form:

\[ S - [O] - R \]

where: 
- \( S \) = some stimulus (external to the individual)
- \([O]\) = some human organism (person) (inferences are made about features of the person's internal state)
- \( R \) = some response

The symbol \( S \) refers to some stimulus external to the actor (i.e., social situation, context, other actors). The letter \( O \) in brackets refers to the actor (person) or human organism. The brackets refer to the actor’s internal state (unobserved properties), which is distinct from his/her behavior \( R \). If we want to understand the effects of variations in the stimulus \( S \) and/or the response \( R \), we must make certain assumptions about the internal states of the person \([O]\). Finally, \( R \) refers to the actor’s response or behavior. The three elements can be combined into three pairs and a triad which form or constitute the models subsumed by the paradigm. The four models of the paradigm are symbolized in the lower case to distinguish them from upper case symbols of the paradigm itself (See Figure 1).

![Paradigm Diagram](image)

**Figure 1. Relation between paradigm, models, and theories.**
The S-[O]-R paradigm will be used as a guide for asking questions and as a framework for integrating the various models used in the study of clothing as a form of human behavior. The paradigm tells us what elements are important or are stressed by a given model and makes it possible to link various theories in social psychology. Additionally, the paradigm allows us to indicate how models differ in basic ways.

The paradigm allows us to see where various theories and hypotheses used to study the social meaning of clothes fit in regard to the models in social psychology. It is a heuristic device to organize and to compare the various theories and models used in the study of clothing. Each model focuses on its own problems and specific methods it will accept. For example, some models of human behavior give major emphasis to the S-[O] elements of the triad, others focus on the [O]-R, still others deal primarily with the S-R, and, finally, models may concern themselves with all three elements of the paradigm.

**Models In Social Psychology**

Four basic models tend to dominate in social psychology today: cognitive, behavioral, biovolitional, and symbolic. (For further reading on these models, see the listing following References.) Each of these models differs in how it views human nature.

The **Cognitive** model views the organism [O] as an active agent who receives, uses, manipulates, and transforms information (S). According to this model, humans mentally manipulate images, symbols, and ideas. They think, plan, solve problems, and make decisions. This model asserts that humans are cognitive beings who strive to make sense of the environment. Briefly, the metatheory of the cognitive perspective may be outlined as follows:

1. Humans are rational, thinking organisms who try to make sense of the social world.
2. Humans process external stimuli by an internal mechanism (cognitive structure) that receives and organizes information.
3. The cognitive structure helps the organism to make sense of the environment and to construct social realities.
4. The key to understanding human behavior lies in the understanding of how people perceive and process external stimuli.

In contrast to the active agent view of humans in the cognitive model, the **Behavioral** model views humans as passive receivers of stimuli. The internal or mental processes that intervene between the stimulus and the response, the [O], are minimized. Hence, the stimulus enters the "box" only to come out as a response. The behavioral model stresses the functional relationship between the S and R elements of the paradigm as would occur in a machine. The behavioral model's metatheory is outlined by the following basic assumptions:

1. Humans are passive receivers of stimuli.
2. Human behavior is regulated by its consequences (i.e., the consequences determine what behaviors actors will learn and which of the behaviors they will continue to perform).
3. Humans learn social behaviors through their own experiences or from watching the behaviors of others (i.e., modeling).
4. Mental processes that intervene between the stimulus and response are minimized since they are not directly observable.

The **Bio-volitional** model takes the view that drives for behavior (R) originate within the organism. Behavior stems from the internal state [O] of the individual. This model may address unconscious drives as in Freud's psychoanalytic perspective, basic personality predispositions as in the psychodynamic perspective, or biological bases for behavior as in the sociobiological perspective. For example, sociobiology assumes the biological basis of social behavior. The metatheory behind this bio-volitional model consists of the following basic assumptions:

1. Humans are genetically predisposed to engage in certain types of social behavior.
2. Humans behave so as to maximize inclusive fitness (as measured by reproductive success).
3. Human behavior is the product of natural selection. The behaviors that enable humans to reproduce effectively are selected.
4. The selected behaviors are said to be adaptive in that they enable the organism to adapt effectively to the environment.
5. The adaptive behaviors are retained and
passed from one generation to another (i.e., the genetic determinants of behavior that are adaptive are transmitted in the gene pool of the species).

The fourth major model, Symbolic, views humans as social beings who fashion meanings and devise ways to associate meanings to their actions. Humans [O] behave in ways (R) according to the meanings attributed to behavior or situations (S). In this way, humans are able to fit their lines of action together to achieve meaningful experiences. Blumer (1969) identified the basic assumptions of the symbolic model as follows:

1. Humans act toward objects on the basis of the meanings they attribute to the objects.
2. The meanings of objects are derived from social interaction.
3. The meanings are assigned to objects by the perceiver through an interpretive process (i.e., the human being is an acting organism with a self).
4. Verbal and nonverbal symbols are the keys to understanding social interaction.

Doubtless, others might select different lists of basic assumptions for the four models above. It is not the purpose here to set forth lists that receive a high degree of consensus. Our purpose is simply to identify the models that underlie major theories in social psychology. Even though there are different versions of theories in a given perspective, they all share common underlying assumptions which we label as the metatheory. It might be useful to sketch the four models in terms of their foci and to locate the major theories of social psychology that fall under each model.

Foci of Models and Major Theories

**s - (o): Cognitive Model--Person as "thinker."** Individuals respond to stimuli and seek reward or profit. Impetus for behavior stems from reward attached to behavior. Learning theories (Bandura, 1962; Skinner, 1938, 1974) and exchange theories such as Thibaut and Kelley's (1963) in psychology and Homans' (1974) in sociology are linked to this model.

**s - (r): Bio-volitional Model--Person as "animal."** Behavior is driven by internal drives or mechanisms. Drives may be psychodynamic (human behavior is problem solving) or biological (human behavior is based on adaptive survival mechanisms). This model covers the psychogenic premise of psychoanalytic theory that human action is problem solving (see Brill, 1938) as well as the sociobiologic premise that human behavior is the product of a complex interplay of biogenetic and environmental factors (Lorenz, 1966; Tiger & Fox, 1969; van den Berghe, 1974; Wilson, 1975).

**s - (o) - r: Symbolic Model--Person as "symbol user."** Impetus for behavior stems from interpretation of symbols. This model postulates that nonverbal and verbal symbols are the keys to understanding human behavior. The symbolic-interactionist views of Mead (1934), Cooley (1954), and Blumer (1969) fall within this model.

It should be noted that the elements identified above as basic to the models refer only to the model's focus and that the omission of the third element does not mean that it is unimportant. Rather, each of the models incorporates all elements of the triad but differ in the degree to which each element is stressed.

It can be seen that these models place the various theories in social psychology in terms of their focus on the elements of the paradigm. The models not only tell us how the theories differ but also illustrate where they differ in focus. That is, certain elements are emphasized or minimized in each model. For example, Skinner's behaviorism minimizes the [O] element or the human internal state, whereas cognitive, bio-volitional, and symbolic interaction have in common the importance of [O] in understanding human behavior. Hence, the paradigm orders and synthesizes theories in social psychology which appear on the surface to be competitors but which are actually part of a single, social-
psychological paradigm, that is, represent the broadest unit of consensus according to Ritzen's (1975) criteria.

The Social Psychology of Clothing

Let us now turn to the study of clothing and briefly describe the metatheories of the four models as they relate to clothing and appearance.

Cognitive metatheory. The cognitive perspective focuses primarily on how people form impressions of others and of themselves. Clothing thus provides cues about what a person is like. In relation to clothing and appearance, the cognitive view assumes the following (Kaiser, 1990):

1. Humans are motivated to explain appearances in terms of people or situations.
2. Perceivers often use clothing and appearance implicitly to simplify and make sense of social interactions.
3. Perceivers strive for some consistency and continuity in their appearance perceptions.
4. Humans also seek and use aesthetic stimulation in their environments.

Behavioral metatheory. The behavioral perspective focuses mainly on overt actions related to clothing and appearance (e.g., appearance management or the consequences thereof) and might be summarized thus:

1. Humans are passive receivers of clothing and appearance cues.
2. Appearance management and perception are regulated by their consequences.
3. Appearance management and perception are learned behaviors.
4. Overt appearances and their consequences are emphasized to a greater extent than intervening mental processes, which cannot be observed.

Bio-volitional metatheory. The bio-volitional perspective promotes a predisposition toward an emphasis on genetic factors in physical appearance, the relationship between physical characteristics and appearance management/perception, personality traits, and the unconscious. Thus, innate human characteristics are emphasized over social processes. Representative assumptions might be as follows:

1. Humans are genetically predisposed by physical characteristics (e.g., height, weight, facial features) to possess various traits, emotional/mental characteristics, or views about the self and others.
2. Physical appearance influences interpersonal attraction.
3. Humans use clothes as adaptive mechanisms to adjust to their environments.
4. Personality traits influence personal approaches to appearance management and perception.
5. Appearance management and perception are based, at least in part, on unconscious drives.

Symbolic metatheory. The symbolic-interaction perspective evaluates social actions and social objects. Through social interaction, the meanings of clothing are defined or socially constructed. Kaiser (1990) outlines the metatheory that underlies this perspective as it bears on the study of clothing and appearance.

1. Humans create their own identities, in part, by managing their appearances.
2. People use symbols to fit their lines of action.
3. Perceivers act toward other persons, in part, on the basis of the meanings the observed persons' appearances hold for them.
4. Meanings associated with appearance symbols emerge from social interactions with others.
5. Meanings assigned to clothing and appearance are manipulated and modified through interpretive processes.

It follows, then, that the models allow us to examine the similarities and differences among perspectives used in the study of clothing. The underlying assumptions are assumed to be true. For example, from the cognitive metatheory we accept on faith that humans strive for some consistency and continuity in their perceptions. From the metatheory we construct theories to explain the character of clothing in human behavior. It is the theory based on the model that we test empirically.
### Table 1. S - [O] - R and the social psychology of clothing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paradigm:</th>
<th>S - [O] - R</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Models:</td>
<td>S - (o)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems:</td>
<td>Perception of dress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theories:</td>
<td>Person perception</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cognitive consistency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumptions:</td>
<td>Modification of appearance induces variations in perceptions of individuals' traits or qualities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methods:</td>
<td>Experiment (laboratory or field survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Observation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategies:</td>
<td>Provide S and determine how person perceives or makes sense of S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings:</td>
<td>Perception varies with type of costume</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Methodology and Strategies

The paradigm identifies the kinds of questions posed and the methodology and types of strategies best suited for each model (see Table 1). It follows that some social-psychological theories call for experiments as the major strategy of research, while others are more
inclined to suggest surveys or field studies. For example, operant conditioning and modeling studies tend to employ experimental designs; symbolic interaction leans toward participant observation and interviews. A recent review of the research literature of clothing and social cognition (Lennon & Davis, 1989a) has suggested that researchers tend to use the experimental design more than the survey or field study. The use of this method is understandable since the studies tend to focus on attribution, social perception, and stereotyping, which are based on the cognitive model. Even survey studies in textiles and clothing fall within the cognitive model in the sense that the questionnaire is used to obtain data on attitudes toward clothing and the impact of clothing on social activities and personal status.

The elements of the S-[O]:R paradigm also correspond to the concept of the data matrix which maps the Cartesian product S x O on R, where S refers to the stimuli or n questions, O refers to the subjects, and R refers to subjects' responses (Galtung, 1969). The data matrix arranges data as shown in Table 2:

As illustrated in Table 2, R_{mn} is the response m gives to stimulus n; hence, the data matrix tells us that there is only one value for each combination (O, S). The three methods used in social psychology (survey, experiment, field study) can be viewed in the form of the data matrix as follows.

The typical sample survey starts out with m subjects (O) who are given a questionnaire with n questions (S) and r different response options (R). For surveys, then, the entire matrix is used.

In experiments, m subjects (O) in the experimental group are exposed to n tasks (S) and the r behavior (R) is observed. The focus of this design is down the matrix's column since the stimuli S_n are kept to a minimum for purposes of control.

Finally, the field study observes n behavior (R) of m subjects (O) in r social situations (S). The subjects (O) are interviewed and/or are observed in natural settings. Unlike the experiment or survey, field studies focus on only a few subjects or cases (i.e., across the matrix's row). Hence, the field study, like the experiment, is concerned with only parts of the data matrix. In this way, the tripartite forms of the data of the three designs are clearly visible for comparative purposes.

Table 2. Data matrix mapping effects of stimulus on subject resulting in response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>S_1</th>
<th>S_2</th>
<th>S_3</th>
<th>...</th>
<th>S_n</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O_1</td>
<td>R_{11}</td>
<td>R_{12}</td>
<td>R_{13}</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>R_{1n}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O_2</td>
<td>R_{21}</td>
<td>R_{22}</td>
<td>R_{23}</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>R_{2n}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O_3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O_m</td>
<td>R_{m1}</td>
<td>R_{m2}</td>
<td>R_{m3}</td>
<td>...</td>
<td>R_{mn}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Utility of the Paradigm for the Social Psychology of Clothing

In addition to integrating the models and theories of social psychology, the paradigm can also be used to classify or categorize empirical research in a discipline. For example, research studies which are often scattered and unorganized in the literature may be classified in terms of focus and characterized in terms of their most common practices. The paradigm allows for the identification of "ruling" theories and methods. It also pinpoints major omissions in the discipline. It is possible to illustrate how some of the research in clothing may be ordered under the various models.

- (O) (Cognitive). In studies using the cognitive model, the researcher observes effects of a stimulus on the [O]. These would include many studies on career appearance whereby dress, S, is manipulated and recruiters' [O], impressions of characteristics of S (competence, etc.) are measured. In the "Clean for Gene" and "Beautiful is Good" studies, the dress of petitioners or physical attractiveness of stimuli, S, is manipulated, and responses from subjects, [O], are measured. Rosencranz (1962) TAT research presented ambiguous stimuli, S, to subjects [O], and subjects' responses were

Numerous studies on clothing as a form of human behavior have been and continue to be conducted using the cognitive model. This model implies humans are active in processing information from the environment. The strategy is to provide a stimulus to individuals and to determine how the person perceives, evaluates, or makes sense of the stimulus. As Table 1 indicates, existing research reveals that human perceptions of others are altered as a function of modifications in appearance. Due to their complexity, appearance stimuli afford numerous and rich possibilities for experimental manipulation. Furthermore, reviews of cognitive studies (L.L. Davis, 1984; Lennon & Davis, 1989a, 1989b) indicate that most manipulations of dress cues elicit statistically significant perceptions. Damhorst (1990) subjected clothing’s role in impression formation to meta-analysis and found that four recurrent cognitive themes could categorize 93% of the findings published between 1943 and 1986. Not surprisingly, the cognitive model is used more frequently than any other in research on clothing as a form of human behavior.

s - r (Behavioral). Some studies of this type, where the person [O] is minimized, have been conducted in clinical or educational settings among mentally challenged persons to teach or change specific dressing skills or patterns. (For example, see Adelson-Bernstein & Sandow, 1978; Ball, Seric, & Payne, 1971; Ford, 1975; Thompson, Braam, & Fuqua, 1982). The researcher is not overly concerned with how or why but mainly that behavior is changed. In this model the strategy is generally to reinforce desired behavior (R) with a reinforcer(S’). The assumption is that [O] cannot be adequately evaluated. As Table 1 indicates, the S-R model is not one that has been employed frequently in clothing studies.

(o) - r (Bio-volitional). This model postulates that behavior or response R is dependent on the organism [O]. Typically studies fitting this model have focused on personality traits [O] that are expected to correlate with responses, R to devices measuring interest in clothing, fashion leadership, color choice, perceptions of dress, etc. The strategy used in this model generally requires classification of individuals by some means, and then response is explained by the classification (e.g., see Pinaire-Reed, 1979; Rosenfeld & Flex, 1977). The assumption is that some characteristic within or about the individual motivates the individual’s choices and actions.

As pointed out in Table 1, (o) - r studies tend to focus upon the why underlying responses to clothing. The psychoanalytic approach and its emphasis on the unconscious would tend to fall into this model, as would psychodynamic theories explaining behavior based on personality. Some of the work addressing body-image boundaries deals with the unconscious (see Fisher, 1986, pp. 411-418 for a review). Body-image boundaries, as measured through projective techniques (e.g., ink blot protocols), have been correlated with certain responses to clothing. In general, however, very little is known about the realm of the unconscious as it pertains to clothing. Recently, Michelman (1991) has called for a focus on the unconscious, drawing from neo-Freudian feminist theory to pursue gender studies in dress. The methodological challenge posed by this approach is great, but the potential for learning more about unconscious associations with dress may be well worth the effort.

Other efforts have looked for evidence of relationships between an individual’s body characteristics and personality traits or temperaments, but findings are ambiguous. Cortes and Gatti (1970) studied several populations and concluded that some relationships existed between body build and temperamental traits. Evans (1972) concluded that common factors underlie physical and personality characteristics of homosexual males. On the other hand, facial attractiveness and physique were judged less important than behavior as predictors of gender-role identity among three- to nine-year-olds (LaVoie & Andrews, 1976). Shea, Crossman, and Adams (1978) found no differences in personality styles among attractive and unattractive adult males and females. While the popular literature provides a great deal of advice for an individual
to select clothing based on personality type or on one's skin color (Cho, 1986; Dubrow, 1981; Jackson, 1983), little research backs up such claims.

**s - (o) - r (Symbolic).** The symbolic-interactionist perspective has inspired a great deal of research in the social psychology of clothing, stemming largely from the theoretical insights of Stone (1965) on appearance and the self, Blumer (1969) on fashion and, more recently, Davis (1985, 1988) on identity ambivalence. Yet textiles and clothing researchers focusing on social-psychological dimensions have generally been reluctant to employ the methods used most often by symbolic interactionists, that is, ethnographic or field studies. (See Cahill, 1989; Fine, 1987, for recent examples of ethnographic studies by sociologists incorporating appearance as a variable of interest.)

However, studies on the social meanings of clothes in other cultures typically employ the ethnographic method suggested by the s-(o)-r model. An important consideration with the s-(o)-r model (and, indeed, within the larger S-[O]-R paradigm) is to encompass the totality of the social context including the abstract as well as the concrete. Historical or cross-cultural studies may or may not fit within the s-(o)-r model. Studies emphasizing the artifact exclusively tend not to fit the model; however, study of the artifact can fit the S-[O]-R paradigm when focus shifts from the artifact to broader generalizations about social processes. Several authors have researched the artifact within the cultural context. (See, e.g., Boynton, 1986; Daly, 1987; Daly, Eicher, & Erekosima, 1986; Eicher & Erekosima, 1987; Littrell, 1980; Melé & Wass, 1983). An example of how to focus on a broader perspective within these types of studies is provided by Geertz (1973) who promotes an interpretive sensitivity to cultural context and urges the researcher to provide a "thick" description of an entire situation or context.

Similar concerns as to research method and focus underscore problems associated with the separation of artifact from social process in the study of historic costume (Cunningham, 1988; Pannabecker, 1990; Rexford, 1988). The clothing artifact may be studied for its own intrinsic nature or it may be studied for what it can reveal about elements in the culture or changes in the cultural context.

**S-[O]-R Paradigm.** Most research on clothing as a form of human behavior falls under the s-(o) or, to a lesser extent, the (o) - r model. The focus of the research has generally been on the stimulus or on the response. However, it is our position that the discipline can advance further if more attention is given to a model incorporating all three elements of the paradigm (i.e., the symbolic model). The paradigm presented here suggests we need a broader range of methodologies and strategies to encompass the impact of clothing in the natural setting of everyday interaction. The paradigm suggests that field observations recording the impact of clothing in actual social settings need to be done, but it is unlikely that researchers will conduct such studies as long as they are wedded exclusively to the cognitive, behavioral, or bio-volitional models with their assumptions and inherent methodologies.

The compatibility of cognitive and symbolic-interactionist perspectives in the study of clothing has been pointed out by Kaiser (1983-1984). Within the framework of the S-[O]-R paradigm it becomes evident why this compatibility occurs. The challenge is to employ methodologies that capture the essence of the S-[O]-R paradigm. In addition to the need for interpretive field research, as noted earlier, the use of multiple methods can lead toward a more comprehensive understanding of clothing in the context of everyday life. For example, Sweat and Zentner (1985) encompassed both s-(o) and (o)-r components in their study of 360 students' perceptions of women's clothing styles, s-(o), and psychological preferences in relation to these perceptions, (o)-r.

Kaiser, Rudy, and Byfield (1985) incorporated the methods of interviews and observations of young girls. Subjects, [O] were presented with different clothing styles, S and were asked to select which style would be worn for each of 20 play activities. This portion of the research follows the cognitive model s-(o) by providing a stimulus and determining perceptions of subjects. Analysis indicated presence of gender typing of garments with activities. However,
observations of the girls’ actual play behaviors as a function of dress, (O)-r (recorded prior to the interviews), indicated that responses, R (play behavior), did not vary according to unisex versus feminine attire.

Consider the consequences if either portion of the Kaiser, Rudy, and Byfield research had been published by itself, in isolation. Study 1 would have concluded that preschool females perceive feminine garments as more appropriate for female-typed play activities and unisex garments as more appropriate for male-typed play activities. Study 2 would have concluded that there is no relationship between garments worn by female preschoolers and types of play activities in which they are engaged. Each finding contributes something to the literature, but much more insight into preschool female behavior with dress can be gained when it can be concluded that there is a difference between young girls’ stereotypes about clothing and the way young girls actually behave in clothing.

Discussion

Why is research in clothing and textiles predominately s-[o]? As the Kaiser, Rudy, and Byfield (1985) research indicated, perception/cognition differs from actual behavior. The value of the S-[O]-R paradigm is its ability to enhance our understanding of just what existing research and current findings are telling us. What is the focus of the study? Which component is the study clarifying or amplifying: S, [O], R, or some combination thereof? S-[O]-R looks at the larger context in which clothes are embedded. The paradigm reminds us that we cannot separate the study of clothes from everyday life.

Too often the method known or most prominent in a discipline determines what methods are appropriate and thereby which model to employ. Have researchers in clothing and textiles been wedded more to method than to theory? Hutton (1984) found that predominant methods used in clothing and textiles research were questionnaire types with increasingly complex statistical analysis. Methods have not changed much over the years; the analyses have just become more complicated. Is there a fear within the discipline that a trained researcher cannot objectively ask a question verbally, probe responses, or make observations? The methods we know or perceive as accepted have determined the questions we have asked. It is time to allow the curiosity of phenomena to determine the questions we ask and, consequently, which methods we use.

While clothing researchers have often used the symbolic-interactionist perspective for guidance and explanation for research findings, they have succumbed more often to methodological practices that focus on s-[o]. As researchers have attempted to explain social phenomena related to clothing, they have been quite willing, as a rule, to "shop" for the most compatible theories. For some reason, however, they have tended to employ a limited range of methods. The S-[O]-R paradigm discloses a need to expand the scope of methodological practice. By expanding the conception of S to incorporate the larger contexts in which clothes are embedded, the richness of understanding will be enhanced. The dynamic processes by which one S replaces another in the course of fashion change will become clearer, and the interpretive processes that people use to make sense of clothes in social life will assume greater prominence. Pursuing these larger contexts requires a more expansive concept of methodological endeavors. If the same type of openness to methodologies could be adopted as is, given adoption/acceptance of theories, the ability to understand the role of clothing as a form of human behavior under the S-[O]-R paradigm would be enhanced.

As noted previously (Nagasawa, Kaiser, & Hutton, 1989), every study need not try to explain everything. There is room in scientific inquiry for a variety of approaches and perspectives. However, if the field of study is to progress as a discipline, there is a need to move, in a collective sense, toward an understanding of the total S-[O]-R of clothing as a form of human behavior. This may be accomplished through a type of division of labor in which a disciplinary attitude of tolerance allowing for pluralism in theories and methodology is developed and sustained. Progress can result only from a move toward an expanded vision of the clothing and textiles subject matter accompanied by a willingness to identify just what it is we are trying
to explain and using methods enabling us to explain that which we have identified as worthy of explanation.

Further, there is a need to broaden our understanding of S to include not only clothing, but also the larger context of appearance. Then, we need to expand our conception of S to include social context as embedded within a cultural and historical context (See Damhorst, 1984-1985; 1990; Kaiser, 1983-1984; 1989). There remains a need to move beyond the scope of s-(o) which is essentially clothing or appearance perception, to encompass the two-way, reciprocal process of communication. The use of more interpretive methodologies will allow an integration of an understanding of (o)-r with that of s-(o) in order to provide a more complete picture of clothing in everyday life, including the meaning of clothes as well as the consequences of these meanings. We need to explore the development of new methodologies which enable us to capture the complex dimensions (aesthetic, physical, social-psychological, cultural) of clothing within the S-[O]-R paradigm.

Conclusions

There is a need to "break out" of the present mold guiding inquiry in the social psychology of clothing in order to grasp the comprehensive and richer dimensions of this area of study. Clothing and textiles scholars need to work together and draw upon the diversity represented within individual backgrounds to develop theories, hypotheses, and methodologies that truly tap the aesthetic, symbolic, and interactive nature of clothing in everyday life.

This paper offers a paradigm that allows us to break out of the present mold by identifying and ordering the four basic models currently used in social psychology. The paradigm encourages examination of basic assumptions underlying inquiry and fosters appreciation for the interrelatedness of various theoretical positions. The models within the paradigm identify and locate various contemporary social-psychological theories used in the study of clothing as a form of communication. The paradigm suggests that current theories in social psychology are not competitive but simply part of a single perspective. Each model differs in its assumptions on the nature of humans, so theories that fall within a particular model differ from others only in the sense that they focus on different combinations of elements in the paradigm.

From the perspective of the paradigm, it appears that symbolic interaction is the most comprehensive of the four basic models, which is not to say that the other three are not useful. Rather, the paradigm in its entirety calls for the need to consider not only all three elements (stimulus, organism or person, and response) but also to incorporate an appreciation for the assumptions underlying each model.

The paradigm also suggests methodological strategies best suited for the models in question. In doing so, the paradigm can be used for meta-analysis in providing the framework to categorize existing studies as to the nature of the design used in research. The paradigm allows the discovery of designs omitted in current research and isolates the theoretical areas in which the discipline is underrepresented.
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Endnotes

1 The focus in this paper is on the social meaning of clothes as well as the behavioral consequences thereof. The paradigm we present is intended with this focus in mind. We concur with Roach and Mass (1980) that a basic function of dress is communication, and we argue further that meaning is a central component of human action and interaction in any temporal or spatial context: the "here and now," the "here and now," and the "there and then." (See Cunningham, 1988; Pannabecker, 1990; Ruxford, 1988 for dialogue in the history of dress relative to social meaning and context.) Thus we suggest that historical and cross-cultural, as well as social-psychological, dimensions of clothes (as they pertain to social meaning) can fall within the scope of the paradigm, although it is based on theories derived mainly from the social-psychological literature in sociology and psychology. It is conceivable that the paradigm may be applied to other aspects of textiles and clothing (beyond social meaning) as well, but such an application is beyond the scope of this paper.

It is our intent to offer a paradigm to order and to highlight the basic components contributing to social meaning and the behavioral consequences thereof. The paradigm is not intended to be used as a constructed, formal language system but rather as a system of utility, one that streamlines and pinpoints relevant and central elements.

2 We use the term metatheory here to refer to the underlying structure of each perspective. In other words, the basic assumptions on which each perspective rests (Nagasawa, 1991). (See Ritzer [1988] for a discussion of the advantages of metatheory as a process of examining and comparing existing theories as an aid in creating and developing new theories.)

3 It is important to bear in mind, however, that a stimulus such as a photograph or illustration of a clothed body in a questionnaire, for example, is extracted, in a sense, from its social context and hence is less realistic or complete as compared to the context of a field study.
Theoretical Themes in the Social Science Aspects of Dress

Hilda Buckley Lakner
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

The basic aim of science is theory. Perhaps less cryptic, the basic aim of science is to find general explanations of natural events. Such general explanations are called theories. (Kerlinger, 1973, p. 8)

...although researchers with this focused interest (social science aspects of dress) share concepts, terminology, and research methods with these (sociology, psychology, and anthropology) and various disciplines, they are developing a unique approach to theory and research. (Roach-Higgins & Elcher, 1992, p. 4)

As scholars who study the social science aspects of dress, we continually make discoveries about patterns of human behavior in relation to dress. These discoveries result from our systematic and controlled research. For our research discoveries to make a contribution to the science of the textile and apparel field, however, we must generate theories to help us understand what is going on among the research findings. If we agree with Kerlinger 1973 statement, cited above, that theory is the goal of science, where, then is textile and apparel as a science?

The maturity of our field as a science is determined by the extent to which we have developed our own unique theories to hold together and explain our research findings. In my 1985 Clothing and Textiles Research Journal article in which I contributed to the operationalization of the concept of dress, I argued that at that time our scientific discipline was in its infancy (Buckley, 1985). I felt then that our discipline was in, what Thomas Kuhn (1970) called, its random fact-gathering generation. Since then, I have come to realize that today, we are well beyond that fact-gathering generation. Today, I believe that our field is in a more mature generation. I, hereby, propose that textiles and apparel is in its third generation as a scholarly field, a generation which clearly marks it as a scientific discipline. Although my comments are restricted to the area within the discipline of textiles and apparel, the social science aspects of dress, the theoretical developments within that area reflect on the state of the science of the discipline as a whole.

Although scholarly work in the area of the social science aspects of dress began at least as early as the early 1900 with the works of Flaccus, Simmel, and Veblen, we might consider the beginning of an interdisciplinary approach to study the area as beginning sometimes after the second World War. My earliest documentation of a serious attempt to address the social science aspects of dress from an interdisciplinary perspective is a paper by Hartmann (1949) which summarizes his presentation in November of 1948 at the conference of the College Teachers of Textiles and Clothing--Eastern Region. In that presentation, Hartmann raised questions concerning the values sought in dress and, generally, how dress serves the individual and society. The purpose of his presentation was to stimulate objective study of dress as an aspect of human behavior.

Not only are clothes a matter of intimate individual concern and therefore an appropriate subject for serious, systematic psychological study but they involve extensive group reactions rich in meaning for the operation of many of our major community institutions and are consequently a topic squarely within the field of the social sciences. . . . the home economics clothing and textile specialists at the college level may have opened a relatively new area of scholarly inquiry of far more fundamental significance than they themselves have hitherto recognized. (Hartmann, 1949, p. 295)

Apparently Hartmann's comments were heard,
for since that conference a series of conferences
in the late 1940s and early 1950s were held
addressing the social science aspects of dress.
The late 1940s, thus marks the beginning of the
first generation of this new area of knowledge
within textiles and apparel. During that first
generation, scholarly work comprised primarily of
needs assessments studies, the development of
clothing inventories, correlational and descriptive
studies, and many arm chair types of scholarly
treatises.

As borrowing from root disciplines evolved
sometimes in the early 1960s, a second
generation in our scholarly history could be
considered to have begun. During that second
generation, we find a proliferation of
demonstration studies to support theories
borrowed from the root disciplines. Analyses
and research designs became much more
sophisticated than in the first generation.

In the early 1980s scholars in the area of the
social science aspects of dress began a bold
new venture—that of expanding on theories they
borrowed from root disciplines, given the findings
they discovered about dress. In this third
generation, theoretical developments unique to
the social science aspects of textiles and apparel
began. Sontag and Schlater (1982) work on the
importance of dress, and Kaiser (1983-84) work
on developing a contextual approach to the
social science aspects of dress illustrate two
eyear examples of theory development unique to
textiles and apparel. During this third and (as of
this volume) current generation, methodological
and statistical designs have become increasingly
varied and highly sophisticated. The
"Methodological Approaches and Refinements"
section of this volume illustrates some of this
current sophistication. With increasing numbers
of conferences, workshops, and publications on
theory development, the discipline has clearly
matured into a science in its own right.

The present section contains some of the latest
theoretical thinking in the social science aspects
of dress. Each of the papers in this section
provides a new approach to theory in the field.
The authors of these papers represent some of
our scientifically more progressive scholars. The
diversity of their approaches illustrates the
richness and complexity of our field. The first
four papers, the paper on affect and cognition by
Brannon, semiotics by Cerny, physical disability
by Lamb, and gender differentiation by Workman
and Johnson, provide thought provoking
explanations of dress phenomena. The paper by
Nagasawa, Hutton, and Kaiser suggests a way to
conceptualize theoretical efforts in the social
science aspects of dress. As a whole, this
section provides a major contribution to an
assessment of the state of our science.

The papers in this section, besides serving to
progress the field of textiles and apparel as a
science, have within them at least five common
theoretical themes. One commonality is that
each borrows to varying degrees from disciplines
other than textiles and apparel. Brannon
borrows from consumer behavior and its parent,
psychology, as she describes her theoretical
approach to everyday selection of items of dress.
Cerny borrows extensively from anthropology as
she applies semiotic theory to an understanding
of dress. Lamb and Workman and Johnson
borrow to lesser degrees than Cerny and
Brannon; Lamb borrows from the field of
rehabilitation and Workman and Johnson borrow
from aesthetics. Both papers draw heavily from
the textiles and apparel field. Nagasawa, Hutton,
and Kaiser, borrow from sociology and
psychology to the extent that they use theories
from these two disciplines in their paradigm. Of
the five papers, that by Workman and Johnson
is possibly the most interdisciplinary in its
approach. In fact, Cerny, Brannon, and
Nagasawa, Hutton, and Kaiser specifically state
and Lamb suggests that dress is a complex
variable which needs to be approached from an
interdisciplinary perspective.

A second common theme is that authors of
four of the papers (Brannon, Cerny, Lamb, and
Nagasawa, Hutton, and Kaiser) encourage
expansion of the methodological approaches
typically used in the field to include qualitative
data gathering methods. Brannon specifically
encourages the use of structured and
unstructured observations and meta-analysis,
and Cerny recommends the use of
ethnographies. The use of multiple
measurements are encouraged by the authors of
all four of these papers.

A third commonality is the emphasis on the
importance and/or uniqueness of dress in everyday life. According to Brannon, the dual nature of the apparel selection task, that is, that the task is both "playful" and "workful," makes it "an ideal laboratory" for studies of affective and cognitive processes in human behavior. Workman and Johnson emphasize the importance of dress in the interpretation of gender differences and in influencing individual and interpersonal behavior. Cerny suggests that dress is important because it is unique. Lamb stresses its importance since it serves as a cue when perceiving people and since it contributes to one's self-image.

In addition to the issue of the importance of dress, is the fourth common theme running through many of the papers—the complex nature of the topic. Brannon, Cerny, and Lamb each stress that dress is a complex variable to study. Brannon, specifically states that dress is "cluttered" as well as complex. The aspect of the complexity of dress is a common reason given for the encouragement of qualitative and multiple data gathering approaches.

Probably the most valuable contribution of the five papers is that each brings to the science a new or a refined approach to the study of the social science aspects of dress. The papers by Brannon, Cerny, Lamb, and Workman and Johnson each propose a new theoretical approach to understanding of specific categories of research findings in the field. Nagasawa, Hutton, and Kaiser suggest a new way of interpreting the theories used in the field. Each theoretical contribution is specified in a very different manner than the others. This fifth commonality leads to my remarks regarding the uniqueness of each paper.

Each of the papers to this section contributes its unique scholarly approach to the social science aspects of dress. Brannon and Cerny each expand upon existing theories in other disciplines as the theories might be used to interpret the social science aspects of dress. Brannon borrows and applies a related set of theories to the understanding of the social science aspects of dress. As she abstracts from her analysis of behavior related to dress, she recognizes the duality of cognitive and affective aspects of dress as related to the self (self-presentation) and to behavior (impression management). In doing so, she proposes a theoretical framework which integrates this duality. She discusses the topics of motivation, cognition, and affect from the viewpoint of three areas of study: Motivation, information processing of persuasive messages, and model building in consumer behavior. Each topic is discussed as it facilitates the understanding of apparel selection. Brannon provides a good review and integration of the approaches of cognitive psychology and consumer behavior to the understanding of the influence of cognitive and affective factors on the selection of everyday dress.

Cerny, realizing the complexity of dress, borrows and applies semiotic theory to the understanding dress. She considers dress as a symbol and emphasizes that its symbolism is unique in each culture. As she fits dress into semiotic theory, she draws heavily on ethnographic data to support its inclusion. Her challenge is to consider ethnographic research to test theories of dressing the body, especially those theories related to identity. She makes a strong argument for viewing dress in context with other aspects of culture. Dress, according to Cerny, is interconnected with other sign systems in complex ways unique to each society. Her paper, thereby, represents a semiotic theory of dress.

Lamb links the study of physical disabilities to person perception and self-image using dress as the linchpin. Her purpose in making this linkage is to encourage an active study of physical anomalies which, in this context might be defined as those appearances which are outside standards of physical attractiveness as set by a given society. Her paper contributes to theories in the social science aspects of dress by helping scholars to abstract more in their theoretical development by considering appearances that go beyond those that scholars typically study. As we study Lamb's paper, we might ask such questions as the following to help us think more abstractly: How does dress interface between perception and self-image for all physical appearances? What is it about dress which leads to perception of personal traits and the development of self-image? Lamb suggests that consideration be given to all types of physical
appearances to help one understand the nature of dress in general—that is, the role of dress irrespective of physical appearance. Nagasawa, Kaiser, and Hutton (1989) state that by abstracting more, scholars of textiles and apparel can develop a broader perspective. By moving to more abstract explanations for behavior regarding dress, theoretical development can progress. In helping scholars look beyond the physically average, Lamb helps them to discern the social science aspects of dress.

Workman and Johnson link principles and elements of aesthetics (cultural aesthetics) in relation to the design of dress to the social construction of gender using aspects of dress. They argue convincingly that values related to aesthetics and values related to gender stereotypes are both socially defined and created through socialization. They suggest that the aesthetic aspects of dress are used as signs which influence: (a) the interpretation of gender, (b) individual behavior, and (c) interpersonal behavior. As justification for their theoretical position, Workman and Johnson cite research findings relevant to the topic. Although they concentrate on cultural aesthetics regarding dress in relation to the social construction of gender using dress as a sign, their theoretical proposition seems to be that the use of dress is culturally defined and internalized at a very early age. This abstraction of their paper, needs, of course, to be argued and empirically tested.

The final paper, that by Nagasawa, Hutton, and Kaiser, provides a paradigmatic view of the nature of the theories used in the social science of dress. According to the paradigm, three elements can be found in the theories used in the field: stimulus, organism or person, and response. The authors propose four models to organize the theories typically used; each model is based on its unique focus on the three elements of the paradigm. The paradigm, besides serving to organize and compare the theories, also facilitates the consideration of the nature of the topics, assumptions, methods, strategies, and findings typically identified for each model. Each model considered in relation to the other models within the paradigm allows scholars to recognize its complementarity to the others, the underlying linkages among the models, and, thereby, the whole of the theoretical development, thus far, in the social science aspects of dress. According to Nagasawa, Hutton, and Kaiser, most of the work thus far in the field would be classified under the cognitive model and to a lesser degree the symbolic model, with significantly lesser amounts under the behavioral model or the bio-volitional model. This conclusion is certainly consistent with recent authors of reviews of literature in the social science aspects of dress (e.g., Hutton, 1984; Lennon & Davis, 1989). Nagasawa, Hutton, and Kaiser, conclude with the recognition that the symbolic model is the most comprehensive of the four models. The authors caution, however, that work in the other models should not be curtailed in favor of work under the symbolic model, merely that work in the symbolic model be enhanced.

If one classifies the first four papers in this section according to the paradigm proposed by Nagasawa, Hutton, and Kaiser, one would agree with them that the cognitive model and the symbolic model are used more often than the behavioral model or the bio-volitional model. The papers by Brannon and Lamb represent the cognitive model; the papers by Cerny and Workman and Johnson represent the symbolic model. Cerny clearly views dress as a symbol, a characteristic of the symbolic model. In addition, Cerny emphasizes the importance of the context within which individuals find themselves and their responses to not only the symbolism of the dress (stimulus), but also the response: "Culture must be considered as one facet of a complex social dynamic whereby the meaning of dress is constructed, understood, altered, and communicated." Workman and Johnson consider dress as a symbol, (an identifier), of gender and gender roles (s-o) as well an influence on individual and interpersonal behaviors (s-(o)-r). Brannon considers the influences of the stimulus on the person; her theoretical framework integrates cognition in the interpretation of dress. Lamb links the stimulus, dress or the person appearing in certain forms of dress, to aspects of the person, how that person is perceived, or how his/her self-image is developed. In the papers by both Brannon and Lamb assumptions of the cognitive model are evident. However, both Brannon and Lamb recognize the need for multiple and qualitative methods in order to truly
understand how dress facilitates perception and self-image. Thereby, if the papers by Brannon and Lamb, were to be expanded to give further consideration to the response element of the Nagasawa, Hutton, and Kaiser paradigm, they too would represent the symbolic model. However, due to the purpose of the theories of Brannon and Lamb in their current papers, the cognitive model best serves to specify that specific component of the S-(O)-R paradigm.

This section provides an important contribution to an assessment of the state of the science of the field of textiles and apparel. Collectively the papers suggest that textiles and apparel has matured as a scientific discipline. As illustrated by the papers, the field has matured well beyond the random fact gathering generation into the generation of theory development. As we go beyond the present volume, four recommendations might be followed to further the field. First, and most obviously, we need to refine the present theoretical approaches, and to continue to develop general explanations to help us understand our research findings. Second, we need to concentrate more on using consistent terms for our objects of study. I was struck by how often the authors of this section used the terms "apparel," "clothing," "dress," and the like almost interchangeably. Third, we need to formalize our theoretical approaches into analytical models and formal propositions to make them testable. And fourth, we need to test our theories. As we continue to build and refine our theories, our field will become more and more recognizable as a science in and of itself.
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