

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

ScholarWorks@UARK

---

Apparel Merchandising and Product  
Development Undergraduate Honors Theses

Apparel Merchandising and Product  
Development

---

5-2022

## The Effects of Price and Brand on the Perceived Quality of Ladies Leggings Between Competitive Retailers

Olivia Thornton

*University of Arkansas, Fayetteville*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/ampduht>



Part of the [Fashion Design Commons](#), and the [Service Learning Commons](#)

---

### Citation

Thornton, O. (2022). The Effects of Price and Brand on the Perceived Quality of Ladies Leggings Between Competitive Retailers. *Apparel Merchandising and Product Development Undergraduate Honors Theses* Retrieved from <https://scholarworks.uark.edu/ampduht/21>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Apparel Merchandising and Product Development at ScholarWorks@UARK. It has been accepted for inclusion in Apparel Merchandising and Product Development Undergraduate Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UARK. For more information, please contact [scholar@uark.edu](mailto:scholar@uark.edu), [uarepos@uark.edu](mailto:uarepos@uark.edu).

The Effects of Price and Brand on the Perceived Quality of Ladies  
Leggings Between Competitive Retailers

Olivia Thornton

## Table Of Contents

Abstract.....	pg 3
Introduction.....	pg 4
<i>Background and Need</i> .....	pg 4
<i>Problem Statement</i> .....	pg 5
<i>Research Objectives</i> .....	pg 5
Literature Review.....	pg 5
Methodology.....	pg 9
<i>Data Collection</i> .....	pg 11
Results.....	pg 12
<i>Limitations</i> .....	pg 14
Conclusion.....	pg 15
References.....	pg 16
Appendix.....	pg 18

### Abstract

The purpose of this study is to determine if brand or price affects the quality perception of the consumer. The research examined what consumers look for when evaluating quality of a garment. Previous studies have shown that consumer expectations of quality in a garment is inconclusive. Research objectives that guided the study were:

- Does brand contribute to the consumers perception of quality?
- Does price contribute to the consumers perception of quality?

This study is a quantitative study using a digital survey and questionnaire looking into fabric, construction, and aesthetics of the leggings. This study involved human subjects; therefore, the Institution Review Board approval was received before research began. Three leggings were chosen to be analyzed by the participants at three different price points with a similar aesthetic look. The leggings were given a letter to keep the brand names unidentified. A = Brand 1 retailing for \$14.96, B = Brand 2 retailing for \$128, and C = Brand 3 retailing for \$98. There were three different experimental groups. The first group knew both the price and the brand of the leggings. The second experimental group knew the brand of the leggings, with the price left unknown. The third experimental group did not know the price or the brand of the three different leggings.

After analyzing the data from the three different consumer groups, it was found that overall, none of the data from the experimental groups was statistically significant to claim that the three leggings were different in terms of fabric, construction, or aesthetics. None of the leggings were statistically proven different. From this survey, the conclusion is that brand and price do not influence the consumers decision on ladies' leggings.

*Keywords: leggings, apparel brand, perception of quality*

## Introduction

### Background and Need

Consumer-based quality in a garment is defined as the garment meeting the needs and wants of a consumer (Bubonia, 2014). Many studies have been conducted about how consumers perceive quality in an apparel garment, yet the results from these studies vary greatly. Some studies discovered consumers perceive quality in apparel items by where the garment was purchased (Heisey, 1990). Other studies found consumers rely on pricing or store image to evaluate the quality (Liljander & Riel, 2009). Consumers may also assess the garment by design, style, and durability. In contrast, 58% of consumers believe that higher-priced clothes are better quality than their lower-priced counterparts (Salfino, 2018). However, many studies on quality apparel can become biased very quickly depending on the group of consumers chosen to study. For example, a group of students in an apparel major may have a better understanding on how to assess quality. This bias could lead to skewed results on how students look at the garments which is unlike the normal consumer. There have been numerous studies completed about how consumers perceive quality, yet interestingly enough, each study's results vary greatly.

It is unclear whether the consumers today are wanting an apparel garment based on price, level of quality, or a combination of price and quality. Identifying what the wants and needs of consumers are important for the retailer to know. If the retailer does not understand what consumers are expecting, then they may purchase the wrong garments to offer, therefore selling limited garments due to the items not meeting the wants of the consumer. The results of previous studies show there is a large gap in research of how the average consumer assesses the quality of an apparel garment.

## **Problem Statement**

Previous studies have shown that consumer expectation of quality in a garment is inconclusive. The problem is not knowing enough information about consumers and what they look for when perceiving the quality of a garment.

## **Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study is to determine if brand or price affects the quality perception of the consumer. This research seeks to examine what consumers look for when evaluating a garment (fabric, construction, and aesthetics) for the quality of the apparel item. Main factors determining how a consumer perceives quality include where the garment was purchased, the brand name of the garment, or by the price of the garment (Heisey, 1990; Clodfelter & Fowler, 2001).

## **Research Objectives**

The following research objectives guided this study:

- Does brand contribute to the consumers perception of quality?
- Does price contribute to the consumers perception of quality?

## **Literature Review**

Many past studies of how a consumer perceives quality result in different findings. Most studies have focused on brand name, store where purchased, and price. The studies performed have all used very similar research methods with different groups of people yet have resulted in various findings. Much of this research has been driven and refined by similar previous studies completed. Following is a literature review and background information of previous studies regarding consumer perception of quality in apparel. Many of these studies have focused on very similar objectives yet have obtained varying results.

## Quality of Garments

In apparel, there are three distinct approaches to quality; product defined, user defined, and manufactured defined quality (Bubonia, 2014). Product defined quality focuses on the physical features of a garment. User defined quality is when the garment meets the customers wants and needs. Manufactured defined quality is when the manufacturer meets the specifications of the legally binding contract provided to the manufacturer by the company (Bubonia, 2014). This study will be focusing on user defined quality, which is how the garment meets the needs and wants of the consumer.

In research conducted by Forsythe (1990), the consumers were asked to evaluate the quality of three shirts. Unknown to the consumer, all three shirts were identical, but all labels were removed and replaced with a national, private, or designer label and priced accordingly. The consumers rated the shirts based on perceived quality, quality of notions, quality of construction, and design quality. The results of this study showed that, overall, the brand name did not affect the consumers perception of quality (Forsythe, 1990). However, in a study by Yoon, Oh, Song, Kim, and Kim (2014), quality was tested again with consumers comparing two different retailers. This study found that when consumers are shopping in respected or high-status stores, they believe that quality is a given so then they focus on what price they are willing to pay. Therefore, consumers who shop in discount or less prestigious stores are already under the impression that they will not be receiving high-quality in their garments (Yoon, Oh, Song, Kim, & Kim, 2014). These two different studies are very interesting to compare, as they have both compared consumers perception of quality, yet both have completely opposite results from their respective studies.

In a study conducted by De Klerk and Lubbe (2008), research found that sensory, emotional, and cognitive dimensions of their experience play a large part in consumers evaluating the quality of an apparel garment. The study held 45 interviews with 15 adult women. The goal for holding these interviews was to place them in a specific decision-making situation and see how exactly they would react.

Some consumers focus their quality perception on where the garment was made. In a study conducted by Clodfelter and Fowler (2001), they tested quality by the weight of the fabric and the seams for their own knowledge. Clodfelter and Fowler then surveyed with different consumers on the quality of the different apparel items. The researchers found that the consumers who participated in their study perceived differences that lead them to think one garment was of higher quality, and much of this quality perception was based off where the label said the garment was created (Clodfelter and Fowler, 2001).

The environment and labeling in garments are additional indicators of how some consumers perceive quality. In a study led by Heisey (1990), students rated the quality of completely identical sweaters. At the end of this study, Heisey discovered that the quality of a garment is perceived to be higher if it is from a specialty store, whereas the same sweater which was labeled from an ordinary store was seen as lower quality. These results are similar to what was found in the study mentioned earlier by Yoon, Oh, Song, Kim, and Kim (2014), where it was found that consumers who are shopping in high-status stores assume the quality of a garment is better than one found in a discount or less prestigious store.

Heisey (1990) also found that some consumers look at the tag located within a garment to reveal what materials the garment consists of. For example, sweaters which were labeled 100%



cotton averaged 14% higher in terms of quality than those labeled “cotton/acrylic” (Heisey, 1990). Consumers think that if a garment is only made of one source, then it is of higher quality.

A study conducted by Gagliano and Hathcote (1994) found that consumers focus mainly on tangible influences when shopping and deciding if they should purchase an apparel garment. These tangible influences include store appearances, well-dressed employees, and appealing promotional materials. The study established that if a store is neat, clean, and aesthetically pleasing, a consumer perceives the quality of an apparel item higher than if a store was dirty, unorganized, and uncoordinated (Gagliano & Hathcote, 1994).

In addition, research has shown that product characteristics that a consumer is looking for may be specific to the apparel item (Fiore & Damhorst, 1992). Ninety female undergraduates participated in the study and looked at 24 garment features which included style features, construction, fiber content, care, etc. (Fiore & Damhorst, 1992).

This previous research drove, refined, and impacted this study. Many previous studies focused on brand name, store where purchased, and price, which is also the main focus for this study. Similarly, this study focuses on ladies leggings at three different price points from three different stores. Experimental groups will look, evaluate, and complete a given survey which is similar to a survey given in research done by previously studied research (Yoon, Oh, Song, Kim, & Kim, 2014; Clodfelter & Fowler, 2001).

In addition, previous research did not define what type of quality was analyzed. The three different types of quality are product defined, user defined, and manufacturer defined (Bubonia, 2014). As stated previously, this study will focus on consumer-based, or user defined, quality.

## **Methods and Materials**

The purpose of this study is to determine how the quality of apparel products are assessed by consumers based on store, brand, and price. Many past studies have had various results on what main factors contribute to the consumers perception of quality within the apparel garment. The three main factors determined by collected past studies will be examined: brand name, retail price, and store atmosphere. Participants will rate three different categories of apparel garments from three competitive stores using a quality assessment questionnaire.

### **Restatement of the Research Objectives**

The following research objectives guided this study:

- Determine whether consumer's perception of quality is determined by brand.
- Determine whether consumers' perception of quality is determined by price.

### **Design of the Study**

This study is a quantitative study using a digital survey and questionnaire to find consumer perceptions. Similar studies were conducted using a digital or printed survey and questionnaires (Yoon, Oh, Song, Kim, & Kim, 2014; Clodfelter & Fowler, 2001). For example, in a previous study, a computer-administered survey was made for undergraduate freshman to complete (Yoon, Oh, Song, Kim, & Kim, 2014). This study resulted in a finding that the price of the garment was a main factor which contributed to the consumers perception of quality (Yoon, Oh, Song, Kim, & Kim, 2014). The participants of the study will evaluate three different pairs of leggings at three different price points using the exact same survey questions for each pair.

### **Participants and Sampling**

The population of this study was a convenience sample using undergraduate college students majoring in an apparel program at a mid-southwest university. The survey was

completed by apparel students who know how to correctly decipher quality; therefore, they were able to correctly determine the differences in quality. The survey focused on three main categories that the participant evaluated, fabric, construction, and aesthetics. A similar study was conducted by Heisey who used 40 junior and senior female Retail and Textiles and Clothing majors (Heisey, 1990). A digital questionnaire was developed to collect responses. Each participant evaluated the quality of three different leggings ranging in price point. Legging A retailed for \$14.96, Legging B retailed for \$128, and Legging C retailed for \$98. The participants used the same survey questions to correctly evaluate each legging.

### **Rigor**

To complete this study, participants only evaluated the garments and filled out the survey once, so issues of attrition and maturation were not present. In addition, the survey was held in the same space, inside a classroom, for every participant. Therefore, situational/contextual factors were not an issue for this study. The participation size for this study was large, ranging in gender and age. The survey given to participants was reviewed for face and content validity by a panel of experts to seek feedback on how to refine or change to receive the best results.

### **Instrumentation**

A digital questionnaire was developed focusing on consumer's perceptions about actual traits of the garment (i.e., seams, weight of fabric, durability, etc.) and the aesthetic look and finish of the garment. The questionnaire also asked if the garment would meet the wants and needs of the consumer. The questionnaire was on a rating scale of 1-5, with 5 being high quality and 1 being low quality. The questionnaire included, but was not limited to, categories about the fabric, construction of the garment, and overall aesthetics of the garment. Examples of statements included were:

- The fabric is free from defects.
- The fabric has good resiliency.
- The hems and facings are appropriate.
- The style has interesting features.

A similar questionnaire was used in a previous study conducted by Fiore and Damhorst (1992).

### **Data Collection**

This study involved human subjects; therefore, the Institution Review Board approval was received before research began. A questionnaire was developed into digital format focusing on physical traits of the garment and the aesthetic look and finish.

Three leggings were chosen to be analyzed by the participants at three different price points with a similar aesthetic look. The leggings were given a letter to keep the brand names unidentified. A = Brand 1 retailing for \$14.96, B = Brand 2 retailing for \$128, and C = Brand 3 retailing for \$98.

There were three different experimental groups. The first group knew both the price and the brand of the leggings. The second experimental group knew the brand of the leggings, with the price left unknown. The third experimental group did not know the price or the brand of the three different leggings.

The participants included undergraduate college students majoring in an apparel program from a mid-southwest university. The participants compared leggings A (\$14.96), B (\$128), and C (\$98), answering the same survey questions for each legging. The participants recorded their findings on a provided Surface Pro tablet.

### **Data Analysis**

Once the survey was completed and data was collected, data was plugged into JMP to analyze. Each question on the survey was compared and analyzed. For example, question one for Brand A, was compared to question one for Brand B, and question one for Brand C. This allowed comparisons between the three experimental groups in order to determine whether or not knowing the brand and price, knowing just the brand, or neither knowing brand or price would impact what the participants thought of the quality of the legging. That same analysis was performed for each question on the survey and for each of the three experimental groups.

After the data was analyzed individually, the data was pulled and compared by groups. For example, all the “Fabric” section on the survey was compared to each of the three experimental groups (see survey in Appendix). Comparing each section in the survey allowed the data to be looked at from a wider view, and therefore interpreted more easily.

## **Results**

Results for this study varied from results of previous studies researched before this study began. Below are results found from conducting this study with undergraduate college students majoring in an apparel program at a mid-southwest university.

In the experimental group where the students knew brand and price, the students determined that in terms of defects for the three leggings, Brand A (\$14.96) leggings were different from the Brand C (\$98) and Brand B (\$128) leggings (see survey in Appendix). The p-value for defects where the experimental group knew brand and price was .0056. There was also a statistical difference in the same experimental group, where brand and price were known, about the softness of the leggings (see survey in Appendix). The p-value for softness where the experimental group knew brand and price was .0002. This same experimental group also noted differences in the stretchiness between the three leggings. The p-value for stretchiness where the

experimental group knew brand and price was .0056. Overall, the experimental group that knew both brand and price determined that there was a statistically significant difference in the three leggings with the defects of the leggings, softness of the leggings, and stretchiness of the leggings.

The experimental group that knew brand but did not know price had very similar results to the group that knew both the brand and price of the leggings. In the experimental group where the students knew brand but did not know price, the Brand A (\$14.96) leggings were again rated different from the Brand C (\$98) and Brand B (\$128) regarding the defects. The p-value for defects where the students knew brand but did not know price was .0056 (see survey in Appendix). There was also a statistical difference in the same experimental group, where brand was known but price was unknown, about the softness of the leggings (see survey in Appendix). The p-value for softness where the experimental group knew brand but not price was .0002. This same experimental group also noted differences in the stretchiness between the three leggings. The p-value for stretchiness where the experimental group knew brand but not price was .0258. Overall, the experimental group that knew brand but did not know price determined that there was a statistical difference in the three different leggings in defects, softness, and stretchiness.

Notably, the experimental group that knew brand and price and the experimental group that just knew the brand and price was unknown had the same results. Both groups found differences in defects, softness, and stretchiness between the three leggings at the three different price points. Both groups did not note any statistically significant evidence that the three leggings were different in anything other than defects, softness, and stretchiness. These three questions were all under the Fabric category (see survey in Appendix). The experimental group

that knew brand and price and the experimental group that only knew the brand did not note any statistically significant information about the other two categories, Construction and Aesthetics.

The experimental group who did not know brand or price did not note any of the leggings to be statistically different in any way regarding fabric, construction, or aesthetics. All the data collected from the experimental group was not statistically significant to claim differences between legging A (\$14.96), B (\$128), and C (\$98).

After analyzing the data, it was found that overall, none of the data from the experimental groups was statistically significant to claim that the three leggings were different in terms of fabric, construction, or aesthetics. None of the leggings were statistically proven different. This conclusion was determined by looking at the three different experimental group's results. Out of the three categories (fabric, construction, and aesthetics), only one category was found to have any differences after the three experimental groups evaluated the leggings. The category where the two groups who found differences, the group who knew price and brand and the experimental group who only knew brand, was fabric. In the fabric category those two experimental groups found statistically significant evidence that the defects, softness, and stretchiness were not of the same quality among all the leggings. Out of 14 questions to evaluate the quality of the leggings, only three were statistically proven different from one another in two experimental groups.

From this survey, the conclusion is that brand and price do not influence the consumers decision on ladies' leggings.

### **Limitations**

The limitations for this survey were that there was only a convenient sample of apparel students. Future studies should focus on non-apparel students, or even those who are not students

at all. Doing so would be helpful to see how a more traditional consumer would evaluate the quality of the three different leggings. With this survey focusing undergraduate college students majoring in an apparel program at a mid-southwest university, the actual quality of the leggings was correctly assessed, however their knowledge does not represent the knowledge of the average consumer. Having future studies focus on non-apparel students would help give the retailer more accurate information on how their average consumer perceives quality of apparel garments.

Future studies should also investigate adding a performance section to the survey or creating a separate study on performance of the three different leggings. Performance is an important aspect of determining the quality of ladies leggings. This part of the study could have a participant wear one of the leggings to do a workout, such as running two miles. After completing the run, the participant would then complete a survey focusing on the performance of the leggings (i.e., breathable fabric, resiliency, elasticity, etc.). The participant would then complete the same workout for the other two pairs of leggings and complete the same survey. This would help evaluate the performance of the leggings instead of only the fabric, construction, and aesthetic of the three leggings.

## **Conclusion**

After collecting and analyzing the data, the conclusion of this study is that neither brand nor price contribute to the consumers perception of quality. Therefore, the consumers perception of quality in ladies' leggings is not determined by brand or price.



## References

- Bubonia, J. E. (2014). *Apparel Quality: A Guide to Evaluating Sewn Products*, New York, New York: Bloomsbury
- Clodfelter, R., & Fowler, D. (2001). A comparison of apparel quality: Outlet stores versus department stores. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 5(1), 57-66.
- De Klerk, H. M., & Lubbe, S. (2008). Female consumers' evaluation of apparel quality: exploring the importance of aesthetics. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 12(1), 36-50.
- Gagliano, K., & Hathcote, J. (1994). Customer expectations and perceptions of service quality in retail apparel specialty stores. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 8(1), 60-69.
- Liljander, V., Polsa, P., & Van Riel, A. (2009). Modelling consumer responses to an apparel store brand: Store image as a risk reducer. *Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services*, 16(4), 281-290.
- Salfino, Catherine. (2018, March 22). *Price, Quality, and Style: Consumers Seek Shopping Symmetry*. Retrieved from <https://sourcingjournal.com/topics/lifestyle-monitor/price-quality-style-consumers-seek-shopping-symmetry-81026/>
- Heisey, F. L. (1990). Perceived quality and predicted price: Use of the minimum information environment in evaluating apparel. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 8(4), 22-28.
- Forsythe, S. M. (1991). Effect of private, designer, and national brand names on shoppers' perception of apparel quality and price. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 9(2), 1-6.

Yoon, S., Oh, S., Song, S., Kim, K. K., & Kim, Y. (2014). Higher quality or lower price? How value-increasing promotions affect retailer reputation via perceived value. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(10), 2088-2096.

## Appendix

### Participation

#### **QUALITY PERCEPTIONS OF APPAREL GARMENTS BASED ON PRICE AND BRAND**

***Purpose and Evaluation:*** The purpose for this research is to determine if price and brand contribute to consumer quality perception when purchasing apparel products for a major retailer. Consumers may view products of the same quality differently based on the different prices or brands.

Participants will be asked to evaluate the quality of the garments. Based on their perceptions, participants will complete a digital survey provided on a Microsoft Surface Pro. The estimated time for completing is 15-30 minutes.

***Safety Protocols:*** After each participant has evaluated the garments and completed the digital survey, the garments will be sanitized with a antibacterial spray and the Microsoft Surface Pro will be wiped with an sanitizing wipe.

***Voluntary Participation:*** Participation in this study is completely voluntary and refusing to participate will not adversely affect any other relationship with the University or research.

I agree

I disagree

### Demographics

What gender do you identify with?

- Male
- Female
- Other

How old are you?

- Under 18
- 18-24
- 25-34
- 35-44
- Above 44

What classification are you in college?

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Grad Student
- Non-Degree Student
- Other

How would you describe your ethnicity? Select all that apply.

- White
- Black or African American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Asian
- Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander
- Other

**Number of Garment**

Please choose the number on the garment you are evaluating.

- 1
- 2
- 3

### **FABRIC 1**

The fabric is free from defects.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric has good resiliency.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric is soft.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric is stretchy.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric has a smooth surface.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fiber content is desirable.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

## CONSTRUCTION 1

The hems and facings are appropriate.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

The seams are well stitched and pucker free.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

The stitch length is good.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

The thread color is appropriate.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

## **AESTHETICS 1**

The style is fashionable.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The style has interesting features.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The style is unique.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

## OVERALL 1

Please rate your overall perception of quality on a scale of 1-7 with 7 being high quality and 1 being low quality.

- 1      2      3      4      5      6      7
- 

**PLEASE WAIT UNTIL YOU GET THE NEXT GARMENT.**

## Garment # 2



Please choose the number on the garment you are evaluating.

- 1
- 2
- 3

## Fabric 2

The fabric is free from defects

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric has good resiliency

- Strongly Agree
- Somewhat Agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric is soft.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric is stretchy.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric has a smooth surface.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fiber content is desirable.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

**con 2**

The hems and facings are appropriate

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

The seams are well stitched and pucker free.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

The stitch length is good.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

The thread color is appropriate.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

**aes 2**

The style is fashionable.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The style has interesting features

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The style is unique

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

**overall 2**

Please rate your overall perception of quality on a scale of 1-7 with 7 being high quality and 1 being low quality.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7

                      

**PLEASE WAIT UNTIL YOU GET THE NEXT GARMENT.**

**Fabric 3**

The fabric is free from defects.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric has good resiliency.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric is soft.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric is stretchy.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fabric has a smooth surface.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The fiber content is desirable.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

### Con. 3

The hems and facings are appropriate.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The seams are well stitched and pucker free.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

The stitch length is good.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

The thread color is appropriate.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

### **Aes. 3**

The style is fashionable.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

Neither agree nor disagree

Somewhat disagree

Strongly disagree

The style has interesting features.

Strongly agree

Somewhat agree

- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

The style is unique.

- Strongly agree
- Somewhat agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Somewhat disagree
- Strongly disagree

**OVERALL 3**

Please rate your overall perception of quality on a scale of 1-7 with 7 being high quality and 1 being low quality.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7

                      

**FINAL**

Please rate your overall perception of quality on a scale of 1-7 with 7 being high quality and 1 being low quality.

1      2      3      4      5      6      7



### **Abstract**

The purpose of this study is to determine if brand or price affects the quality perception of the consumer. The research examined what consumers look for when evaluating quality of a garment. Previous studies have shown that consumer expectations of quality in a garment is inconclusive. Research objectives that guided the study were:

- Does brand contribute to the consumers perception of quality?
- Does price contribute to the consumers perception of quality?

This study is a quantitative study using a digital survey and questionnaire looking into fabric, construction, and aesthetics of the leggings. This study involved human subjects; therefore, the Institution Review Board approval was received before research began. Three leggings were chosen to be analyzed by the participants at three different price points with a similar aesthetic look. The leggings were given a letter to keep the brand names unidentified. A = Brand 1 retailing for \$14.96, B = Brand 2 retailing for \$128, and C = Brand 3 retailing for \$98. There were three different experimental groups. The first group knew both the price and the brand of the leggings. The second experimental group knew the brand of the leggings, with the price left unknown. The third experimental group did not know the price or the brand of the three different leggings.

After analyzing the data from the three different consumer groups, it was found that overall, none of the data from the experimental groups was statistically significant to claim that the three leggings were different in terms of fabric, construction, or aesthetics. None of the leggings were statistically proven different. From this survey, the conclusion is that brand and price do not influence the consumers decision on ladies' leggings.