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Chapter 1

RELATED LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL ORIENTATION

Introduction

"The importance of clothing to people in an interacting society, such as America, and the extent to which clothing is used as a symbol of status are two aspects of human behavior about which very little is known.¹ This observation by the noted fashion consultant, Emma Kittles, emphasizes the need for increased understanding of public appeal for clothing articles and the fashion diffusion process.

One specific problem area, the amount of fashion influence exerted by one social class on another, has been briefly explored. Traditionally, the fashion diffusion process has been considered a downward flow by social class. More recently, however, several researchers have contested the downward flow theory, contending that fashion leaders exist on all social strata. The research related to this problem emphasizes the need for resolving these contradictions for marketing, advertising, and clothing theorists.

Background and Related Research

Many areas in the social and the natural sciences provide background for research applicable to clothing and fashion diffusion. It should be noted, however, that no study exists which directly addresses the problem posed in the present investigation. Tangentially related to the research problem is the classic study by Katz and Lazarsfeld on voting behavior. Their conclusions resulted in a theory dealing with the diffusion of innovation, known as the "two step flow of communication." It suggests that product information flows from the mass media and other sources to opinion leaders. These leaders in turn control the information that flows from them to others in their sphere of influence.

Expanding their theory into specific areas, including that of clothing and the influence of fashion leaders, Katz and Lazarsfeld proposed the hypothesis of "horizontal influence" to stand alongside the traditional "vertical influence" theory. Interviewing a cross sample of women in Decatur, Illinois, the investigators suggested that within this community the fashion leader was not necessarily a glamorous woman of high social status, but more likely to move in generally similar social circles with the advice seeker. Following this view, the authors
concluded "... fashion leaders exist on all social strata, and that influence rarely crosses status lines."2

Supporting this viewpoint is Margaret Pauline Grindereng's study of style dispersion and leadership. She stated that the characteristics of fashion leaders suggest that they "... may be ramified throughout the social classes and not limited to an upper social stratum."3

Summers' investigation of the characteristics of women fashion transmitters also demonstrated that opinion leadership in the area of women's clothing is a widespread trait.4 Also contrary to traditional research were Britt's findings that the upper social class does not necessarily determine women's fashion.5

A recent study of product endorsement by prominent athletes by the Alan R. Nelson Research Inc. concluded,


4John Oliver Summers, "The Identity of the Women's Clothing Fashion Transmitter," Dissertation Abstracts, XXIX, No. 3 (1968), 711A.

after questioning 2,500 men on the product-pushing talents of 192 sports figures that, "... consumers are far more likely to trust endorsements by less flamboyant personalities." Although only testimonials by notable sportsmen were examined, Nelson Research found that an athlete's potential success as an endorser depended not on his skill or fame but on his "likeability" by the public. "And what the public appears to like is the quiet, comfortable, old-shoe personalities - not the abrasive or swinging types."

From a marketing standpoint, these findings bring into question the advantage of associating a highly famous and successful individual with a clothing style, and particularly the benefit of employing celebrities - a subset of the upper social and economic class - for testimonial type advertisements.

Traditionally, however, the social elite have been viewed as the originators of fashion and the fashion diffusion process has been believed to be a downward flow by social class. Attesting to this view is J.C. Flugal's text on the psychology of clothing. "It is a fundamental human trait," he stated, "to imitate those who are admired and envied ... and what more natural, and at the

7Ibid.
same time, more symbolic, than to start the process of imitation by copying their clothes, the very insignia of the admired and envied qualities."

Other authors have placed high merit on the association of a celebrity with selected products. George Burton Hotchkiss stated in Advertising Copy that the testimonials of "... persons whose eminence is due to their position in the social or theatrical world are not valuable as proof, but may be valuable because of their associations." He cited women's magazines as an extremely effective medium for association copy and specifically referred to fashion as a product greatly enhanced by celebrity testimonials.

Monroe F. Dreher's essay "On Behalf of Testimonials" supports Hotchkiss. Showing fashionable personalities amidst exclusive settings, he stated, offers "... an appeal of charm and glamour, placed within the reach of the average American woman through the purchase of the product."

Sandage and Fryburger, in their text Advertising Theory and Practice spoke of a spirit of emulation as the


strength behind advertising testimonials. In other words, consumers, they believe, achieve a sort of vicarious satisfaction by buying a product allied with the charm and glamour of fashionable personalities.¹¹

Studies by Daniel Starch and his associates further attest to the value of the celebrity testimonial as an effective advertising tool. A comparison of testimonial and non-testimonial ads showed an advantage of from eight to twenty-six per cent for the testimonial over the non-testimonial advertisement.¹²

A later study by the same researcher used 100 testimonials each matched with a non-testimonial ad of the same size, color, feature, and product classification. The findings showed that celebrity endorsed ads were seen and read to a much greater extent on the average than were non-testimonials. It was also determined that non-celebrity testimonial ads were not consistently better than non-testimonials.¹³

To further the research by Starch, Harold Rudolph analyzed a sample of advertisements in the Saturday Evening Post and compared readership for the testimonial approach


¹³Ibid.
with that of other approaches. Again, testimonial copy ranked first on a "read most" index. Furthermore, advertisements featuring well-known personalities surpassed testimonials using identified individuals by the following percentages:

- ads with stage and screen stars: 56%
- ads with other identified individuals: 15%
- ads with undifferentiated individuals: 7%


The use of celebrities in testimonial-type advertisements has been further researched by the American Newspaper Publishers Association. Their continuing study of newspaper reading confirms the effectiveness of well-known personalities in attracting readers. 14

Product endorsements by famous, successful individuals are apparently believed to be beneficial by many companies, for millions of dollars are spent annually to obtain the services of a celebrity to promote a specific product. In fact, personal endorsements are the single most important source of outside income for many celebrities. Charles Barnes, manager for the Southern California football star O.J. Simpson, disclosed a sum of $500,000 paid to his client for endorsements, before his first professional game. Edie Adams, likewise received

14DeVoe, op. cit., p. 92.
nearly $500,000 in cash and stock from Cut and Curl, Inc. for lending her name and image to a string of beauty salons and beauty products.  

"Americans are obsessed with success," stated an article in *Forbes* magazine. "They like to associate with it, invest in it, even buy products from those who have it, as though through association some of the success might rub off on them." Basically, the endorsement involves a celebrity lending the use of his name and image in return for cash or corporate equity. "It provides the business-man an instant door-opener, the celebrity an easy source of additional wealth, the consumer a status symbol and a vicarious association with glamour and success."  

Currently in selling and advertising, sports personalities have ascended to a position of eminence. "The athlete provides recognition," stated Steve Arnold, one of the founders of Pro Sports, Inc., a company that represents athletes in their sundry negotiations. "More than that, he also supplies the image. For most people, the athlete is still the all-American boy . . . he provides sincerity." Athletes have therefore suddenly

---


16 Ibid.

found that their unusual shapes, habits, or attitudes are in demand for advertisements. Thus, Wilt Chamberlain can be seen climbing into a Volkswagen, Joe Namath lathering with Noxema shaving cream, Denny McLain pumping a Hammond organ, and all 26 pro football right guards favoring a certain deodorant. 18

A few of the more famous and outstanding testimonial campaigns of the past include Chevrolet's Dinah Shore, Wheaties' Breakfast of Champions, and Miss America's Oldsmobile.

Strangely enough, however, no recent study exists relating the effects of associating a celebrity with a specific garment. There is almost a complete absence of research dealing with public appeal for clothing articles and fashion diffusion.

A much more widely researched and popular area occurs in the field of speech and relates the effect of prestige upon judgments of literature, art, and personal taste.

Muzafer Sherif falsely attached different author's names to passages judged to be of equal literary merit. Correlations between the ranking of authors and the subsequent rankings of passages to which the authors' names were attached were held to represent the effects of

18 Ibid.
prestige. Sherif asserted that the name of the author exerted considerable influence upon the ratings of the passages.19

More recently in India, Das, Rath, and Das studied the effect of author prestige upon evaluations of poetry. They concluded that prestige influenced judgment greatly but this effect was weakened when the factors of understanding and merit were stressed.20

Judgments of art seem to be similar. Farnsworth and Misumi obtained data indicating that recognition of the artist's name had some favorable effect on the evaluation of pictures.21 In another experiment Bernberg found that evaluations of alleged art critics significantly affected the judgments by artistically naive students.22


In the area of personal taste and perception, similar effects have been found. Karl Duncker presented a story to nursery school children in which a fictional hero endorsed a food actually less desirable than an alternative selection. The after-effect, however, was decidedly positive - a larger percentage of the children selected the endorsed food when given a choice.23

Adults, high school students, and college undergraduates were subjects of an investigation by Donceel, Alimena, and Birch. Each person was presented with a description of himself which supposedly came from tests and expert evaluations, but actually was determined by chance. Under mild suggestion a significant number of students accepted these statements as valid, and under strong suggestion all subjects yielded. They accepted as true the false descriptions of their personalities and reversed previous answers to questions in a personality test.24


A well-known study by Haiman investigated the persuasive influence of the prestige factor in a public speaking situation. Three experimental groups were presented a tape-recorded speech variously attributed to Thomas Parran, Surgeon General of the U.S.; to Eugene Dennis, Secretary of the Communist Party in America; and to a Northwestern University Sophomore. Not only was Parran rated significantly more competent than the other two, but also, his speech was significantly more effective in changing attitudes. Haiman therefore concluded that the prestige of a speaker does influence the effectiveness of his persuasion.\(^{25}\)

Kulp attempted to develop an index of prestige based on attitude change. In a classic design, which has been repeated with variations many times, various subgroups were told that the responses supplied them had been written by social scientists, educators, and lay citizens. The relative amounts of attitude shift toward each of these sources was used as the basis for computing an index of prestige for each of the several groups. The

data demonstrated that educators exerted the greatest influence on the subjects' ratings, although even the lay citizens had noticeable prestige.26

In 1938, Lurie defined prestige as "... the change in scale value of certain items brought about by attaching the name of the symbol to these items." He obtained scale values for prestige by administering a test of attitude without attaching prestige labels to the items, by administering the same test two weeks later with prestige labels attached, and by then subtracting the scores on the first test from those on the second. The remainder was the index of prestige.27

Lurie points to the need for further prestige-effect studies and suggests attaching fictitious or neutral names, rather than no names, to the unrecognized statements.

A study by Saadi and Farnsworth ascertained the effect of well liked and disliked persons on acceptance of dogmatic statements. In general, the authors found


greater acceptance for dogmatic statements when they were attributed to well liked persons than in the situation in which they were attributed to disliked individuals.28

These studies point to the significant effect which prestige has on an individual's perception of a source. Although none of the above studies specifically refer to the effect of prestige on attitudes toward clothing, research does exist regarding the opposite effect - the influence that clothing has on opinions toward individuals. A brief survey of a few of these studies may be beneficial to understanding this relationship.

An investigation of "Esteem Accorded to Clothed Figures as Related to Fashion and Perception" by Muriel Kathleen Jones, ascertained the importance of fashion as an element in the appraisal of unknown persons. She concluded from a group of female college student respondents that clothing varies in its communicativeness according to the frame of reference of the perceiver, and those wearing in-fashion clothing are held in higher esteem than those in out-of-fashion clothing,

other factors being equal. She also found that neither the security or insecurity level of the perceiver nor her dominant interests appeared to be significant factors in determining the emphasis placed upon the fashionableness of the others' clothing when according esteem in a first contact situation. The fashion interest of the perceiver, however, was significant.29

Agreeing that clothing does have a definite influence on impression of stimulus persons, Helen Irene Douty's study rejected a null hypothesis that there would be no difference in social status ratings with changes in clothing. The design of this study, using colored slides presented as stimuli for the attitude responses, is of particular interest due to the use of a similar method in presenting fashions in the proposed experiment.30

Also concerned with the influence of dress on initial impressions is Paul N. Hamid's study on stereotyping. His results confirmed the hypothesis that


there are consistent stereotypes based on style of
dress.31

Thomas Ford Hoalt, in working with college men,
noted that in a specified experimental situation, cloth-
ing did not appear to have been associated with impor-
tant social ratings when they were rated by acquaintan-
tes; instead the ratings made were associated with the
degree of social closeness the judges expressed for the
men judged. In another controlled situation employing
unacquainted male subjects, attractiveness ratings for
men previously rated low went up when the men were pic-
tured wearing clothing independently rated high in appro-
priateness; and vice versa.32

Hoalt refrains from generalizing from these re-
sults. He does admit, however, in the conclusion of
his study to the "... scarcity of empirical data
available on the subject."33

31 Paul N. Hamid, "Style of Dress as a Perceptual
Cue in Impression Formation," Perceptual and Motor Skills,
XXVI (1968), 904-6.

32 Thomas Ford Hoalt, "Experimental Measurement
of Clothing as a Factor in Some Social Ratings of Se-
324-28.

33 Ibid.
point to the need for additional research, Thomas Ford Hoalt observed:

It is true that "everyone knows" clothes play such a part in human society; however, the exact nature and extent to which clothing functions in an interacting world remain unknown ... Here, then, is a rich, untapped field for social research ... \(^{34}\)

\(^{34}\)Ibid.
Purpose and Hypotheses

The preceding review emphasizes the need for research in the area of clothing habits in general and the diffusion of fashion, in particular. The contradictions present in existing research and the significance of the problem to marketing and advertising theory, further necessitate additional study in the area. Clearly of consequence to clothing manufacturers and advertisers is the degree of effectiveness of the testimonial as an advertising technique and the benefit of employing celebrities to endorse new clothing styles.

The present field experiment was designed to supply additional information which may be used to resolve the problems and contradictions present in existing research. The specific purpose of the study was to determine if the association of a prestigious woman with a fashionable garment influenced middle-class women's attitudes toward the garment. Specifically, the experiment tested the following hypotheses:

1. Fashions associated with prestigious women will receive significantly higher likeability ratings than those which are either not associated with women or are associated with fictitious women.

2. Fashions associated with fictitious women will receive significantly higher likeability ratings than those which are not associated with women.
3. Women will exhibit significantly greater propensity for buying a fashion when the fashion is associated with a prestigious woman than when the fashion is either not associated with a woman or when it is associated with a fictitious woman.

4. Women will exhibit significantly greater propensity for buying a fashion when the fashion is associated with a fictitious woman than when the fashion is not associated with a woman.

Hypotheses one and three were logically derived from research regarding the downward flow theory of fashion diffusion expounded by J. C. Flugal; and study by Starch and others relating the effects of celebrity testimonials on subjects' readership ratings. They also concur with the assertion of several advertising theorists that consumers achieve a vicarious satisfaction by buying a product allied with a fashionable personality. This theory is further advanced by source credibility research by Sherif, Duncker, Haiman, etc.

Although no study exists relating the effects of associating a fictitious name with a fashionable garment, some research in the area of speech regarding the influence of prestige upon judgments of art, literature, and personal taste, indicates that even unknown individuals exert a small amount of prestige. Hypotheses two and four were derived from these findings.
Chapter 2

PILOT RESEARCH

The desirability for a field experiment approach to the current investigation required an extensive pilot study to resolve any problems before execution of the final experiment. College women were subjects for the pilot administered during the spring of 1973 at Florida Technological University. This investigation was divided into five distinct stages. The first three were preparatory to the actual collection and analysis of data, stage four consisted of the data collection, and the final stage involved statistical analysis of the data.

Designing a questionnaire to measure prestige comprised the first stage. A list was compiled of well-known women, including political leaders, movie and television stars, vocalists, and commentators, believed to be the most widely famous and representative in their field. An equal number of fictitious women's names was also listed.

A group of 22 female respondents enrolled in an introductory Speech class at Florida Technological University rated each woman on two semantic differential scales (Appendix A). One measured the fame of the in-
dividual (famous - unknown), the other her importance (important - unimportant). The sum of the two ratings operationally defined each woman's prestige. The ten women receiving the highest scores and the ten receiving the lowest were used in the experiment. Thus, any fictitious names, mistakes considered prestigious; and any prestigious women not considered eminently famous and important, were eliminated from the final list. The women's names are presented in rank order in Appendix B.

Stage two of the data collection consisted of photographing a collection of garments at Ivey's Department Store, Winter Park, Florida. Several clothing styles were selected and photographed in a hanging position. All environmental variables including lighting, exposure, and setting were held constant. Sales, price, and direction tags were removed or cautiously hidden from the camera. Several slides of each garment were taken using a 35 mm. camera. The best slide of each selected fashion was chosen for the study.

The third stage of the experiment involved gathering subjects and dividing them into experimental and control conditions. Female students enrolled in Speech 101 classes at Florida Technological University and members of three University sorority groups were subjects for the experiment. In order to preclude any correlation between the pretest and the experiment, those students
who had previously determined prestige did not participate in this stage of the pilot investigation.

A total of 110 subjects were randomly assigned to high prestige (group A), low prestige (B), and control (C) treatment conditions and shown the slides. The garments rated by group A were attributed to the ten prestigious women; the same garments attributed to the fictitious names were rated by group B. The control group was simply asked to rate the garments without having the fashions associated with a female buyer. In this manner all aspects of the three slide presentations were as similar as possible except for the association of an individual with the garment shown.

The questionnaires (Appendix C) were composed of two semantic differential scales for each of the ten slides. The instructions read: "Please rate each garment as you view it on the slide. Place your mark (X) that space on the scale which most closely indicates your judgment of the garment. On the second scale, rate your chance of purchasing this garment (assuming you have the money)." An example of the two scales for each treatment group follows:

**Treatment A**

1. This garment worn by Pat Nixon.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike

Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: No

Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Chance
Treatment B

1. This garment worn by Florence Moyer.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike
Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: No Chance

Treatment C

Slide 1.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike
Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: No Chance

The experiment was administered six times in University classrooms. Subjects were advised not to glance at other papers or speak during the presentations. All other environmental variables, such as lighting and timing, were controlled so that each treatment was as identical as possible to all other treatments.

Information was transferred from questionnaire to computer cards for statistical analysis. The number of subjects (n) and the mean (x) for each treatment are presented in Table 1.
Table 1

The Number of Subjects and Mean for each Treatment of Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>( \bar{x} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment A</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment B</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment C</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analysis of variance of subject ratings of likeability of garments, indicated in Table 2, revealed significant differences existed between groups.

Table 2

Analysis of Variance of Subject Ratings of Likeability of Garments for Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige level</td>
<td>695.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>347.95</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>11376.32</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>106.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12072.22</td>
<td>109</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The test for significant differences between group means on likeability of a garment partially sup-
ported hypothesis one. Fashions associated with prestigious women received significantly higher likeability ratings than those associated with fictitious women ($t=2.51, p<.01$).

Hypothesis two was not supported. Subjects exhibited no significant difference in their likeability between those fashions associated with fictitious women or those not associated ($t=1.07$). The tests for significance between group means on likeability of a garment are presented in Table 3.

**Table 3**

Test for Significant Differences Between Group Means on Likeability of a Garment for Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>$x^1-x^2$</th>
<th>$t$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. A-B</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. B-C</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. A-C</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypotheses three and four were not supported.

The analysis of variance of subject ratings of propensity for buying garments demonstrated no significant difference among groups.

The results supporting hypothesis one indicate a prestige factor is instrumental in determining college women's likeability of a garment. However, likeability
was not increased by the association of a garment with a fictitious name. In fact, the reverse effect appeared true. Rankings of subjects receiving the fictitious associations (treatment B) were lower than the control treatment rankings, although the difference was not significant.

A major weakness of the pilot experiment may have contributed to the rejection of hypotheses three and four. The garments, selected to conform to the prestigious women's public images, included many styles designed for mature women, much older than the average university coed. This factor may have resulted in high likeability and low propensity for buying ratings for many of the garments.

Other possible contaminating effects were revealed upon further evaluation of the pilot experiment. The pretest, designed to determine the prestige level of numerous women, did not include a fashion leadership factor. Consequently several women, notorious for their poor clothing taste, were among the prestigious women selected for use in the study. If these prestigious names exerted a negative influence on subjects' ratings of the associated garments, a boomerang effect may have occurred. That is, an unfashionable prestigious woman may have had an adverse effect on subjects' likeability and propensity for buying ratings of the associated fash-
ion. If this were the case, the fictitious association with the garment may have had a more positive influence on subjects' ratings of the garment than the prestigious treatment.

Other weaknesses affected the credulity of the study. The erroneous attribution of garments to the prestigious individuals was discerned by a few of the Treatment A subjects. Several expressed disbelief that the associated garments were actually worn by the prestigious women. Verbal exclamations, such as "She never wore that!" and "Jackie never wears dresses" occurred during several presentations. Although instructions were given entreaty subjects to refrain from gazing at other questionnaires and talking during the experiment, they evidently were not explicit. Other subjects compared their questionnaires to neighboring students' papers and verbally questioned the discrepancy.
The final investigation attempted to overcome the weaknesses of the pilot experiment. Although similar in experimental design to the pilot, a major variation was the selection of subjects. Only middle-class women ranging in age from 35 to 55 years were asked to participate. They were members of Orlando, Florida women's groups, and included three sorority alumnae organizations, two church women's societies, and a community service club.

Respondents to the pretest were members of an additional women's group and part of the larger population of middle-aged, middle-class female subjects. They replied to a questionnaire designed to determine the prestige and fashion leadership of 24 well-known middle-aged women and 24 fictitious women's names.

Prestige is defined by A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms as "the attribute of being highly regarded by associates so that one's actions strongly influence others." Many factors contribute to prestige, including position, role,
and personal qualities and traits. The definition also states that prestige may affect the process by which an opinion becomes acceptable, or an incentive more powerful. For the purpose of this study, prestigious women were defined as those women highly regarded by others whose position, role, and personal qualities include eminent fame and success, as well as fashion leadership.

Fourteen respondents rated the fame (famous - unknown), success (successful - unsuccessful), and fashion leadership (fashion leader - fashion conformer) of 48 well-known and fictitious women's names on three semantic differential scales (Appendix D). The mean of the fame and success ratings plus the mean of the fashion leadership rating operationally defined each woman's prestige. The fifteen women receiving the highest scores and the fifteen receiving the lowest were used in the experiment. The women's names are presented in rank order in Appendix E.

Recent publicity was gathered on each of the fifteen prestigious women to determine the type of clothing, including style, color, and fabric, ordinarily worn by the women in public. This measure was necessary to reduce any incredulity possibly resulting from the erroneous association of the garments with the prestigious women's names.

On the basis of this information, cooperation
was requested from the management of Gibbs-Louis, a prominent Orlando clothing store carrying designer fashions. A garment consistent with each prestigious woman's public image was selected and photographed in a draped position. All environmental variables were held constant. The manner of photography was identical to that outlined in the procedure for the pilot study. The photo slides used for this investigation are on file in the Communication Department, Florida Technological University, for reference by any interested party.

The assignment of subjects to treatment conditions was also similar to the pilot method. A total of 84 subjects were randomly assigned to high prestige (group A), low prestige (B), and control (C) treatment conditions and shown slides of garments respectively attributed to prestigious, fictitious, and no women's names.

The questionnaires (Appendix F) were composed of two semantic differential scales for each of the fifteen slides. In order to facilitate the association of the selected garments with the prestigious women, the following statement appeared at the top of each questionnaire: "The garments you are about to view are copies of designer originals." The instructions followed: Please rate each garment after viewing it on
the slide. Check (X) that space on the scale which most closely indicates your likeability of the garment. On the second scale, rate your chance of purchasing this garment for yourself, assuming the price was within a reasonable range." The two scales corresponding to slide one for each of the questionnaires follows:

**Treatment A**

1. Rate this garment designed for Julie Christie.
   
   Like: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: ____ Dislike
   
   Practically Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

**Treatment B**

1. Rate this garment designed for Lilian Chase.
   
   Like: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Dislike
   
   Practically Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

**Treatment C**

Slide 1. Rate this garment.

Like: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Dislike

Practically Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

Further precautions were taken to reduce incredulity. A blank sheet covered each questionnaire and subjects were asked to not turn this page until further instructed. They were also told different fashion questions were being asked and therefore to re-
frain from talking and gazing at other papers.

Two final questions asked subjects to indicate their age group and social class. Three categories were included for each question: under 35, 35-55, and over 55; and lower class, middle class, and upper class. Questionnaires of women not falling into the middle age and class categories were discarded. This measure provided further control and eliminated women from rating garments inappropriate to their own age group.

During all six administrations, each slide was shown for thirty seconds during which time subjects rated the garments. A slide screen was used for all presentations and all other environmental variables were controlled.

After completion of the investigation, subjects received an explanation of the nature of the experiment.

Results

Sixty-nine of the 84 women queried qualified by age and social class as subjects for the experiment. Twenty-three received each treatment.

As predicted in hypothesis one, fashions associated with prestigious women received significantly higher likeability ratings than those not associated with women or associated with fictitious women. The analysis of variance findings presented in Table 4
demonstrate the relationship is statistically significant at the .05 level.

Table 4

Analysis of Variance of Subject Ratings of Likeability of Garments for Field Experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige level</td>
<td>1176.72</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>588.36</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>11701.83</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>162.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11878.55</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual t tests performed between group means on likeability of a garment produced t ratios significant at the .01 level for the prestigious and fictitious conditions (t=2.598), and at the .05 level for the prestigious and control conditions (t=2.352). Subjects did not significantly differ in their likeability of fashions associated with fictitious women and fashions not associated with women (t=0.243). As in the pilot study, hypothesis two was not supported. The difference between the two conditions, however, was in the predicted direction.

An analysis of variance of subject ratings of propensity for buying garments supported hypothesis three.
As demonstrated in Table 5, subjects exhibited significantly greater propensity for buying a fashion when the fashion was associated with a prestigious woman than when the fashion was either not associated or associated with a fictitious woman.

Table 5
Analysis of Variance of Subject Ratings of Propensity for Buying Garments for Field Experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prestige Level</td>
<td>1426.90</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>713.45</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>9214.26</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>139.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10641.16</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significant t ratios were found between prestigious and fictitious conditions (t=3.187, p<.01) and the prestigious and control conditions (t=1.878, p<.05). However, contrary to the fourth hypothesis, subjects' propensity for buying a fashion was not significantly greater when the fashion was associated with a fictitious woman than when the fashion was not associated with a woman (t=1.263, p<.15).
DISCUSSION, SUMMARY, AND CONCLUSIONS

Discussion

The present investigation suggests that the association of a prestigious individual with a fashion does increase likeability and propensity for buying the fashion. Subjects receiving the prestigious treatment rated the fashions significantly higher than subjects in both the fictitious and control treatment groups. What this indicates for advertising strategy is the recognition of the advantage of employing a famous and successful individual for fashion endorsement. It also concurs with the findings of Starch and others regarding celebrity testimonials and with source credibility research by Sherif, Duncker, Haiman, etc.

The mere association of a name with a garment, however, proved to be less beneficial. No statistical significance was found between the fictitious and control conditions, although the results were in the predicted direction for both dependent variables. This finding should not be discredited, for the net effect of most advertising campaigns is very small. A selling edge of a few percent for a product in a national
market, for example, may represent a sizable gain.

To clothing theorists, the study lends credence to the downward flow theory of fashion diffusion and supports a conjecture expounded by several authors that a vicarious satisfaction is achieved by imitation of the social elite. However, the scarcity of data in the area impedes the establishment of any far-reaching conclusions. An open field remains for future research.

Implications for Future Research

Additional empirical studies would supplement the knowledge gained from the present investigation. A parallel study could determine male attitudes toward fashions associated with prestigious and fictitious men. Men could also be employed as subjects for a comparison study of male and female ratings of women's fashions, and the degree to which sexual differences influence attitudes toward clothing determined. Other comparison studies could relate the effects of age, social class, and race on clothing habits. Research of this type, to determine the characteristics of individuals most susceptible to prestige suggestion, would be highly advantageous to marketing and advertising personnel.

The potential benefit of employing a celebrity to endorse a specific product should be studied. The paucity of research in this area is appalling at a time when millions of dollars are spent annually for this purpose.
Celebrities, however, are not the only persons reaping benefits from product endorsements. Currently in advertising, several previously unknown individuals have ascended to fame only by their testimonials for various products. Examples include Rodney Allen Rippy's testimonial song for Jack-in-the-Box and the endorsement of canned meat by Mason Reese. Although their success is not explained by research, an investigation in this area would certainly be valuable to advertising strategists.

Relevant to clothing research and the present investigation would be a study of the recurrent association of a fictitious name with a specific fashion. Conceivably, in light of the success of these current non-celebrity campaigns, attitudes toward the fashion may become more positive as subjects familiarize themselves with the previously fictitious name.

Research is also needed in the areas of fashion diffusion and clothing psychology. A continual study of the characteristics of the fashion transmitter is required since her influence may fluctuate and change along with fashion trends. Past attempts to develop set characteristics of the fashion advice giver may be the cause of discrepancies in fashion diffusion research.

Literature concerning the extent to which clothing varies in its communicativeness with variance in
fashionableness is also contradictory. Although clothing has been recognized as a symbol for conveying information about the personality of the wearer, the influence of dress on the type of impression formed is little understood. This fascinating area offers a challenge for research to investigators in the clothing field.

In short, thoughtful investigation is needed in all areas of clothing merchandising, clothing advertising, and clothing psychology before scientifically based generalizations in the area are justified. The present investigation should help to point the direction for some future research in this relatively untouched field of inquiry.

Summary

The present field experiment emphasized the marketing, advertising, and psychological factors involved in determining attitudes toward and expenditure for clothing. Specifically, it was designed to determine if the possibility of a causal relationship between prestigious individuals and attitudes toward associated fashions is tenable. The four research hypotheses tested were:

1. Fashions associated with prestigious women will receive significantly higher likeability ratings than those which are either not associated with women
or are associated with fictitious women.

2. Fashions associated with fictitious women will receive significantly higher likeability ratings than those which are not associated with women.

3. Women will exhibit significantly greater propensity for buying a fashion when the fashion is associated with a prestigious woman than when the fashion is either not associated with a woman or when it is associated with a fictitious woman.

4. Women will exhibit significantly greater propensity for buying a fashion when the fashion is associated with a fictitious woman than when the fashion is not associated with a woman.

The independent variable, the prestige level of individual women, in this study was defined as the amount of fame, success, and fashion consciousness accorded to the women. Three different conditions were manipulated by the investigator: High prestige (prestigious); low prestige (fictitious) and no prestige (control). In the high prestige condition, subjects rated slides of garments attributed to fifteen prestigious women. The low prestige condition subjects rated the identical garments, attributed to fifteen fictitious names. The control group simply rated the garments without association. In this manner, all aspects of the slide presentations were as similar as possible except for the association of an individual with the garment.
shown.

The dependent variables in this study were likeability and propensity for buying the garments. Subjects recorded their opinions of each of the fifteen fashions on two semantic differential scales. One measured the subjects' likeability (like - dislike) of the garment; the other her chance of purchasing it, assuming the price was within a reasonable range (practically certain - practically no chance).

Precautions were taken to reduce any incredulity possibly resulting if subjects realized all questionnaires were not identical. A pilot study resolved other contaminating variables before execution of the final field investigation.

Subjects for this experiment were drawn from women's social, service, and church organizations in Orlando, Florida. Sixty-nine middle-class, middle-aged subjects were randomly assigned to the three treatment conditions. Their ratings of each garment provided the data for analysis.

Two analyses of variance were made. The first determined whether subjects differed among groups in their likeability of garments. The differences were significant at the .05 level. The analysis of variance of subject ratings on propensity for buying a garment also demonstrated statistical significance (p<.01).
Subsequent $t$ tests revealed the significance occurred between the prestigious and fictitious groups for both dependent variables. No statistical significance was found between the fictitious and control treatments for either variable, although the difference occurred in the predicted direction.

On the basis of the statistical analyses and the discussion of results, the following tentative conclusions seem warranted:

1. The association of a prestigious individual with a fashion does increase subjects' likeability and propensity for buying the fashion.

2. Product endorsement by famous and successful individuals is a valuable marketing and advertising technique.

3. Fashion transmitters, usually members of an upper socio-economic class, initiate the downward flow of fashion diffusion.

4. The association of a fictitious name with a fashion contributed little to increase subjects' likeability and propensity for buying the fashion, although in the latter case the trend approached an acceptable level of significance.

5. Product testimonials by previously unknown individuals may be a valuable advertising technique in a national campaign. The value of this strategy would probably increase as the audience became more familiar with
the product endorser.

6. Additional research is needed in all areas of clothing merchandising and clothing psychology before any of these tentative conclusions can be advanced with certainty.
Appendix A

SAMPLE PRETEST, PILOT STUDY
INSTRUCTIONS

On each question of this questionnaire you will find a different person to be rated, and beneath it a set of scales. Please place your mark (X) on that space which most closely indicates your judgment of each person. Make each person a separate and independent judgment. Work at a fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry over individual items. It is your first impressions, the immediate "feelings" about the person.

Barbara Walters

Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___Unimportant

Pat Nixon

Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___Unimportant

Edith Hough

Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___Unimportant

Ann Willman

Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___Unimportant

Julie Reese

Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___Unimportant
Patricia Russell
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unimportant

Lena Mead
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unimportant

Carol Burnett
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unimportant

Laura Kent
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unimportant

Barbara Streisand
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unimportant

Bonnie Walker
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unimportant

Faye Dunaway
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unimportant

Hatti Cofer
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Unimportant
Joan Baez
Famous: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unknown
Important: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unimportant

Virginia Young
Famous: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unknown
Important: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unimportant

Ardella Manns
Famous: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unknown
Important: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unimportant

Florence Moyer
Famous: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unknown
Important: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unimportant

Ali McGraw
Famous: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unknown
Important: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unimportant

Princess Margaret
Famous: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unknown
Important: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unimportant

Carol King
Famous: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unknown
Important: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unimportant

Goldie Hawn
Famous: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unknown
Important: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: _____: Unimportant
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Famous</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Janet White</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Briscoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shirley Temple Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cher Bono</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Chase</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucille Ball</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Famous</td>
<td>Important</td>
<td>Unimportant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diana Ross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eunice Caperton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinah Shore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Onassis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mildred Carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Kelly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann Landers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophia Loren</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cynthia Johnson
Famous: Unknown
Important: Unimportant

Jane Fonda
Famous: Unknown
Important: Unimportant

Beverly Ford
Famous: Unknown
Important: Unimportant

Louise Shepherd
Famous: Unknown
Important: Unimportant

Evelyn Faust
Famous: Unknown
Important: Unimportant

Margaret Mead
Famous: Unknown
Important: Unimportant

Nina Hattin
Famous: Unknown
Important: Unimportant

Emma Ashton
Famous: Unknown
Important: Unimportant
Angella Cundell

Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unknown
Important: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unimportant
Appendix B

SUBJECTS' RANKINGS OF PRESTIGIOUS AND FICTITIOUS NAMES,
PILOT STUDY
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects' Ratings of Prestigious Women's Names (Highest - Lowest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Pat Nixon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Princess Margaret</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Shirley Temple Black</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Barbara Streisand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Jane Fonda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Julie Andrews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Ann Landers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Elizabeth Taylor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Grace Kelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Diana Ross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Jackie Onassis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Sophia Loren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Lucille Ball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Margaret Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Carol Burnett</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Joan Baez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Cher Bono</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Dinah Shore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Carol King</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Goldie Hawn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Faye Dunaway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Barbara Walters</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects' Ratings of Fictitious Women's Names (Lowest - Highest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ann Willman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Julie Reese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Florence Moyer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Bonnie Walker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Laura Kent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Nina Hattin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Emma Ashton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hatti Cofer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Janet White</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Mildred Carlson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Lena Mead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Edith Hough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Louise Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Beverly Ford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Angella Cundell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Barbara Briscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Evelyn Faust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Virginia Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Eunice Caperton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Ardelia Manns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Cynthia Johnson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Patricia Russel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Lillian Chase</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRES,
PILOT STUDY
Instructions

Please rate each garment as you view it on the slide. Place your mark (X) in that space on the scale which most closely indicates your judgment of that garment.

On the second scale, rate your chance of purchasing this garment (assuming you have the money).

1. This garment worn by Pat Nixon.


2. This garment worn by Shirley Temple Black.


3. This garment worn by Barbara Streisand.


4. This garment worn by Jane Fonda.


5. This garment worn by Julie Andrews.

6. This garment worn by Elizabeth Taylor.
   Practically No
   Certain Chance

7. This garment worn by Princess Margaret.
   Practically No
   Certain Chance

8. This garment worn by Grace Kelly.
   Practically No
   Certain Chance

9. This garment worn by Ann Landers.
   Practically No
   Certain Chance

10. This garment worn by Diana Ross.
    Practically No
    Certain Chance
Instructions

Please rate each garment as you view it on the slide. Place your mark (X) in that space on the scale which most closely indicates your judgment of that garment.

On the second scale, rate your chance of purchasing this garment (assuming you have the money).

1. This garment worn by Florence Moyer.

2. This garment worn by Bonnie Walker.

3. This garment worn by Emma Ashton.

4. This garment worn by Ann Willman.

5. This garment worn by Mildred Carlson.
6. This garment worn by **Julie Reese**.

Like: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: Dislike

Practically: __: __: __: __: __: __: No

Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: Chance

7. This garment worn by **Janet White**.

Like: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: Dislike

Practically: __: __: __: __: __: __: No

Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: Chance

8. This garment worn by **Hatti Cofer**.

Like: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: Dislike

Practically: __: __: __: __: __: __: No

Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: Chance

9. This garment worn by **Nina Hattin**.

Like: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: Dislike

Practically: __: __: __: __: __: __: No

Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: Chance

10. This garment worn by **Laura Kent**.

Like: _____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: Dislike

Practically: __: __: __: __: __: __: No

Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: Chance
INSTRUCTIONS

Please rate each garment as you view it on the slide. Place your mark (X) in that space on the scale which most closely indicates your judgment of that garment.

On the second scale, rate your chance of purchasing this garment (assuming you have the money).

Slide 1.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike

Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Chance

Slide 2.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike

Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Chance

Slide 3.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike

Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Chance

Slide 4.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike

Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Chance

Slide 5.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike

Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Chance
Slide 6.

Like: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike
Practically: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No
Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Chance

Slide 7.

Like: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike
Practically: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No
Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Chance

Slide 8.

Like: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike
Practically: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No
Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Chance

Slide 9.

Like: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike
Practically: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No
Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Chance

Slide 10.

Like: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike
Practically: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No
Certain: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Chance
Appendix D

SAMPLE PRETEST,
FIELD EXPERIMENT
INSTRUCTIONS

On each question of this questionnaire you will find a different person to be rated, and beneath it a set of scales. Please place your mark (X) on that space which most closely indicates your judgment of each person. Make each person a separate and independent judgment. Work at a fairly high speed through this test. Do not worry over individual items. It is your first impression, the immediate "feelings" about the person.

Julie Christie
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __ Conformer

Grace Kelly
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __ Conformer

Barbara Walters
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __ Conformer

Mildred Carlson
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __ Conformer
Cory Simpson
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Conformer

Julia Reese
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Conformer

Angella Cundell
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Conformer

Elizabeth Taylor
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Conformer

Natalie Wood
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Conformer
Patricia Langan
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unknown
Successful: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Conformer

Diana Wallins
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unknown
Successful: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Conformer

Shirley Temple Black
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unknown
Successful: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Conformer

Evelyn Faust
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unknown
Successful: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Conformer

Florence Henderson
Famous: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unknown
Successful: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Conformer
Buffy Adams
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Conformist

Queen Elizabeth
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Conformist

Ann Willman
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Conformist

Lori Nelson
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Conformist

Virginia Young
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Conformist
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Famous</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Fashion Leader</th>
<th>Fashion Conformer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joan Kennedy</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>Conformer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Burnett</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>Conformer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah Miles</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>Conformer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol Channing</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>Conformer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Kent</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Unsuccessful</td>
<td>Fashion</td>
<td>Conformer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Eunice Coperton
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __

Hattie Cofer
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __

Emma Ashton
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __

Lilian Chase
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __

Nina Hatten
Famous: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unknown
Successful: __: __: __: __: __: __: __ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader: __: __: __: __: __: __: __
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Famous</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Fashion Leader</th>
<th>Unknown</th>
<th>Unsuccessful</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Edith Hough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lena Mead</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackie Onassis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audrey Meadows</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anita Bryant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mary Tyler Moore
Famous ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ____ Unknown
Successful __: __: __: __: __: __: ____ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ____ Conformer

Patricia Russel
Famous ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ____ Unknown
Successful __: __: __: __: __: __: ____ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ____ Conformer

Marlo Thomas
Famous ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ____ Unknown
Successful __: __: __: __: __: __: ____ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ____ Conformer

Shelley Winters
Famous ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ____ Unknown
Successful __: __: __: __: __: __: ____ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ____ Conformer

Audrey Hepburn
Famous ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ____ Unknown
Successful __: __: __: __: __: __: ____ Unsuccessful
Fashion Leader ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ____ Conformer
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Famous</th>
<th>Successful</th>
<th>Fashion Leader</th>
<th>Fashion Conformer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Julie Donohue</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Woodward</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Andrews</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Joyce Brothers</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara Buscoe</td>
<td></td>
<td>U</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Famous</td>
<td>Successful</td>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>Fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faye Dunaway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louise Shepherd</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connie Stevens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn Jamison</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

SUBJECTS' RANKINGS OF PRESTIGIOUS AND FICTITIOUS NAMES,
FIELD EXPERIMENT
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects' Ratings of Prestigious Women's Names (Highest - Lowest)</th>
<th>Subjects' Ratings of Fictitious Women's Names (Lowest - Highest)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3. Mary Tyler Moore</td>
<td>3. Julie Donohue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Grace Kelly</td>
<td>4. Angella Cundell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Joan Kennedy</td>
<td>5. Virginia Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Audrey Hepburn</td>
<td>7. Patricia Russel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Carol Burnett</td>
<td>8. Barbara Buscoe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dr. Joyce Brothers</td>
<td>9. Edith Hough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Carol Channing</td>
<td>12. Emma Ashton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Anita Bryant</td>
<td>13. Lilian Chase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Joanne Woodward</td>
<td>15. Patricia Langen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Connie Stevens</td>
<td>17. Evelyn Faust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Faye Dunaway</td>
<td>18. Marilyn Jamison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Queen Elizabeth</td>
<td>19. Ann Willman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Sarah Miles</td>
<td>20. Louise Shepherd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Audrey Meadows</td>
<td>22. Julia Reese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Barbara Walters</td>
<td>23. Buffy Adams</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix F

SAMPLE QUESTIONNAIRES,
FIELD EXPERIMENT
The garments you are about to view are copies of designer originals. Please rate each garment after viewing it on the slide. Check (X) that space on the scale which most closely indicates your likeability of the garment. On the second scale, rate your chance of purchasing this garment for yourself, assuming the price is within a reasonable range.

1. Rate this garment designed for **Julie Christie**.
   
   Like ___: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Dislike
   
   Practically Certain ___: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Practically No Chance

2. Rate this garment designed for **Carol Burnett**.
   
   Like ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Dislike
   
   Practically Certain ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Practically No Chance

3. Rate this garment designed for **Mary Tyler Moore**.
   
   Like ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Dislike
   
   Practically Certain ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Practically No Chance

4. Rate this garment designed for **Grace Kelly**.
   
   Like ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Dislike
   
   Practically Certain ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Practically No Chance

5. Rate this garment designed for **Shirley Temple Black**.
   
   Like ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Dislike
   
   Practically Certain ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____: ____ Practically No Chance
6. Rate this garment designed for Elizabeth Taylor.
Like __: ____: ____: ____: _ _: __: ____ Dislike
Practically Certain __: ____: ____: ____: __: __: ___ Practically No Chance

7. Rate this garment designed for Anita Bryant.
Like __: ____: ____: ____: __: _ _: ____ Dislike
Practically Certain __: ____: ____: ____: __: __: ___ Practically No Chance

8. Rate this garment designed for Natalie Wood.
Like __: ____: ____: ____: __: _ _: ____ Dislike
Practically Certain __: ____: ____: ____: __: __: ___ Practically No Chance

9. Rate this garment designed for Jackie Onassis.
Like __: ____: ____: ____: __: _ _: ____ Dislike
Practically Certain __: ____: ____: ____: __: __: ___ Practically No Chance

10. Rate this garment designed for Carol Channing.
Like __: ____: ____: ____: _ _: __: ____ Dislike
Practically Certain __: ____: ____: ____: __: __: ___ Practically No Chance

11. Rate this garment designed for Joanne Woodward.
Like __: ____: ____: ____: __: _ _: ____ Dislike
Practically Certain __: ____: ____: ____: __: __: ___ Practically No Chance
12. Rate this garment designed for Julie Andrews.
Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike
Practically
Certainly ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: No Chance

13. Rate this garment designed for Dr. Joyce Brothers.
Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike
Practically
Certainly ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: No Chance

14. Rate this garment designed for Joan Kennedy.
Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike
Practically
Certainly ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: No Chance

15. Rate this garment designed for Audrey Hepburn.
Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: Dislike
Practically
Certainly ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: No Chance

Please indicate the age group to which you belong:

under 35 _____
35-55 _____
over 55 _____

Of which socioeconomic class do you consider yourself a member?
lower _____
middle _____
upper _____
The garments you are about to view are copies of designer originals. Please rate each garment after viewing it on the slide. Check (X) that space on the scale which most closely indicates your likeability of the garment. On the second scale, rate your chance of purchasing this garment for yourself, assuming the price is within a reasonable range.

1. Rate this garment designed for Lilian Chase.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike

Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ No Chance

2. Rate this garment designed for Virginia Young.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike

Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ No Chance

3. Rate this garment designed for Patricia Russel.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike

Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ No Chance

4. Rate this garment designed for Hattie Cofer.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike

Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ No Chance

5. Rate this garment designed for Mildred Carlson.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike

Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ No Chance
6. Rate this garment designed for Barbara Buscoe.
   Like __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike
   Practically Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

7. Rate this garment designed for Nina Hatten.
   Like __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike
   Practically Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

8. Rate this garment designed for Cory Simpson.
   Like __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike
   Practically Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

9. Rate this garment designed for Patricia Langen.
   Like __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike
   Practically Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

10. Rate this garment designed for Julie Donohue.
    Like __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike
    Practically Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

11. Rate this garment designed for Emma Ashton.
    Like __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike
    Practically Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance
12. Rate this garment designed for Angella Cundell.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike

Practically

Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ No Chance

13. Rate this garment designed for Eunice Coperton.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike

Practically

Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ No Chance

14. Rate this garment designed for Laura Kent.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike

Practically

Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ No Chance

15. Rate this garment designed for Edith Hough.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike

Practically

Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ No Chance

Please indicate the age group to which you belong:

under 35 ___

35-55 ___

over 55 ___

Of which socioeconomic class do you consider yourself a member?

lower ___
middle ___

upper ___
The garments you are about to view are copies of designer originals. Please rate each garment after viewing it on the slide. Check (X) that space on the scale which most closely indicates your likeability of the garment. On the second scale, rate your chance of purchasing this garment for yourself, assuming the price is within a reasonable range.

Slide 1. Rate this garment.

Like __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike

 Practically Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

Slide 2. Rate this garment.

Like __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike

 Practically Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

Slide 3. Rate this garment.

Like __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike

 Practically Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

Slide 4. Rate this garment.

Like __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike

 Practically Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance

Slide 5. Rate this garment.

Like __: __: __: __: __: __: __: Dislike

 Practically Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: __: No Chance
Slide 6. Rate this garment.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike
Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Practically
No Chance

Slide 7. Rate this garment.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike
Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Practically
No Chance

Slide 8. Rate this garment.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike
Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Practically
No Chance

Slide 9. Rate this garment.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike
Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Practically
No Chance

Slide 10. Rate this garment.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike
Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Practically
No Chance

Slide 11. Rate this garment.

Like ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Dislike
Practically Certain ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___: ___ Practically
No Chance
Slide 12. Rate this garment.

Like __: __: __: __: __: __: ___Dislike

Practically
Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: ___No Chance

Slide 13. Rate this garment.

Like __: __: __: __: __: __: ___Dislike

Practically
Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: ___No Chance

Slide 14. Rate this garment.

Like __: __: __: __: __: __: ___Dislike

Practically
Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: ___No Chance

Slide 15. Rate this garment.

Like __: __: __: __: __: __: ___Dislike

Practically
Certain __: __: __: __: __: __: ___No Chance

Please indicate the age group to which you belong:

under 35 _____
35-55 _____
over 55 _____

Of which socioeconomic class do you consider yourself a member?

lower _____
middle _____
upper _____
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