

Differences In The Results of The So-En Multi Tamara and Soekarno Kebayas On The Hourglass Body

Nurrizka Agustiwi¹, Tri Utari Ismayuni^{2*}

^{1,2}Program Studi Pendidikan Vokasional Desain Fashion, STKIP Pangeran Antasari, Indonesia

Corresponding author:

Email: tarismayunii@gmail.com

Abstract.

This study compares modified kebaya outcomes produced using the So-En pattern method developed by Multi Tamara Boutique and the So-En pattern by Soekarno on one hourglass-body model. A quantitative comparative experimental design was used. Two kebayas were produced under controlled conditions of model, design, measurements, material, sewing technique, and finishing, then assessed by two fashion lecturers using 13 indicators across four aspects. Descriptive analysis showed total scores of 93 (89.42%) for Kebaya A and 99 (95.19%) for Kebaya B. The Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test yielded an Exact Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.500, exceeding 0.05. Thus, descriptive score differences were observed, particularly in placement accuracy and garment shape, but the difference was not statistically significant under the conditions of this study.

Keywords: kebaya modification, So-En pattern, hourglass body, pattern construction and comparative experiment.

I. INTRODUCTION

The fashion industry is a sector of the creative economy that continues to grow and interact with changing lifestyles. The kebaya, a traditional Indonesian garment, has also undergone a transformation into a modern attire worn for various formal and semi-formal occasions. This transformation demonstrates the kebaya's ability to adapt to evolving trends without losing its inherent cultural identity (Kusumadewi & Jerusalem, 2023). This development has led to the emergence of modified kebayas through changes in silhouette, materials, decorative details, and clothing construction.

In modified kebaya, the accuracy of pattern construction is an important part because it is directly related to the shape, size, balance of design lines, comfort, and quality of fitting. (Widiyanti et al., 2023) shows that the application of the So-En system to modified kebaya can produce comfort and good fitting if the construction is done properly. (Darmansius & Puspaneli, 2025) also emphasized that the suitability of the pattern to the body's characteristics determines the quality of the finished garment. Therefore, the selection and application of patterning methods must be tailored to the design and the wearer's body characteristics.

The So-En pattern is a flat pattern construction system used in making women's clothing. (Soekarno, 2025) So-En is positioned among various pattern construction methods, each with its own dimensions, formula, and shaping steps. In practice, precision in measuring, forming the base pattern, fitting, and finishing influences the suitability of the final product. (Susmelly et al., 2025) explains the importance of understanding the stages of creating basic patterns for the So-En system, while (Krisjayusman & Mariah, 2024) shows that the So-En pattern has a good fitting factor for women's blazer style clothing.

In industrial practice, patterning methods can be adjusted based on the experience of the fashion maker. Multi Tamara Fashion Designer & Textile Art Boutique uses the So-En pattern method, developed through adjustments to measurement techniques, pattern construction, and the fitting process. These adjustments are used in creating modified kebayas for customers with diverse body characteristics. This situation is interesting to study scientifically because the method that has been adapted in practice needs to be compared with the So-En pattern referenced by Soekarno for the same body condition.

Body characteristics are an important variable in the study of pattern construction. Penko & Rudolf (2025) explains that differences in women's body shapes affect clothing fitting. (De Silva et al., 2024) also demonstrated a significant relationship between body size and pattern construction in traditional pattern drafting methods. Therefore, this study used a single model with hourglass body characteristics to control for body shape factors. Using the same model allows for more focused comparisons of the differences in pattern drafting methods.

The hourglass figure generally displays a balanced shoulder and hip area with a narrower waistline. In kebaya design, these characteristics require precise shoulder lines, waistlines, cupped hemlines, body circumference measurements, and a balanced silhouette. Therefore, the final product is evaluated not only on aesthetics but also on the accuracy of placement, sizing, shape, and overall fit. These aspects align with the kebaya fitting assessment indicators used.(Ariani & Sugiyem, 2021)and relevant to the assessment of the feasibility of the modified kebaya discussed by Yuliani and(Yuliani & Prasetyaningtyas, 2023).

Previous research has discussed the use of So-En patterns in kebaya and women's clothing, resizing techniques in kebaya, and the development of contemporary kebaya designs.(Syeila & Hidayati, 2024)shows the importance of adjusting the size in producing a kebaya that fits the customer's body.(Putri & Indarti, 2026)discusses the development of contemporary kebaya through different design approaches. However, there are still limited studies that directly compare the results of modified kebayas from the So-En pattern developed by Butik Multi Tamara with the So-En Soekarno pattern on a single hourglass model under the same production conditions.

Based on these gaps, this study aims to determine the differences in the results of modified kebaya using the So-En Butik Multi Tamara pattern and the So-En Soekarno pattern on the hourglass body characteristics. Assessments were carried out on the accuracy of placement, accuracy of size, kebaya shape, and overall results. The results of the study are expected to provide empirical information regarding the application of two pattern methods on controlled body conditions and can be used as study material for vocational education in fashion design and clothing construction practices.

II. METHOD

The research was conducted at the Multi Tamara Fashion Designer & Textile Art Boutique, Berjaya Palace Complex, Jalan Tuamang No. 47, Sidorejo Hilir, Medan Tembung District, Medan City, North Sumatra, from January to August 2026. The research used a quantitative approach with a comparative experimental design. This design was chosen to compare two treatments with relatively similar research conditions, except for the pattern method which is the focus of the comparison. This approach is in accordance with the principles of quantitative research and comparative experiments which emphasize objective measurement and control of conditions.(Creswell & Creswell, 2023; Schickore & Newman, 2024)

The research objects are two modified kebayas made on one model with hourglass body characteristics. Kebaya A is made using the So-En pattern method developed by Butik Multi Tamara, while Kebaya B is made using the So-En Soekarno pattern. The model, design, size, type of material, sewing technique, and finishing technique are made the same. The color of the two kebayas is distinguished only as a product identity and is not analyzed as a research variable. The use of the same unit in two conditions is in accordance with the principle of within-subject design because the results of each condition can be compared on the same unit.(Moerbeek, 2023).

The sample is determined purposively because the object must meet specific characteristics according to the research objectives. The purposive sampling technique is a subset of nonprobability sampling that determines the sample based on certain considerations.(Sugiyono, 2023)Sampling considerations in this study included the use of a single hourglass model, the same body size, the same design, the same materials and manufacturing techniques, and the only difference in treatment was the patterning method. Selecting a sample that aligns with the research objectives is also crucial in maintaining the relevance of the collected data.(Firmansyah & Dede, 2022).

Data were collected through observation, documentation, and product assessment. Observations were conducted from model measurements, pattern making, cutting, sewing, fitting, and finishing to ensure the conditions of both treatments remained under control. Documentation was used as evidence of the research process. The primary data were obtained from the assessment of both kebayas by two panelists with expertise in fashion design using the same instrument.

The research instrument was a kebaya evaluation sheet consisting of 13 indicators. The indicators were grouped into four aspects: accuracy of placement, accuracy of size, shape of the kebaya, and overall kebaya

result. Each indicator was assessed using a four-level scale: 4 = very good, 3 = good, 2 = adequate, and 1 = poor. The indicators were compiled based on the kebaya fitting aspect and adapted to the research object. The clarity of the indicators and their suitability to the variables being measured were crucial in instrument development.(De Silva et al., 2024).

Table1 Aspects and indicators for assessing kebaya results

Aspect	Summary indicators	Item
Accuracy of location	Shoulder line, waist line, cuff line	1-3
Accuracy of size	Chest circumference, waist, armhole, back length	4-7
Kebaya shape	Hourglass fit, silhouette balance, design lines	8-10
Overall results	Design suitability, neatness, characteristics of modified kebaya	11-13

Research conditions were controlled to ensure that the observed differences in results remained consistent with the primary treatment, the patterning method. The same model was used for both kebayas, ensuring that body shape characteristics remained unchanged between treatments. Similarly, the design, size, material, sewing technique, and finishing were maintained. With these controls, the research aimed to determine how the application of the two So-En patterning methods yielded different finished product characteristics for the same object.

The research stages include determining the model and body size, applying the So-En Butik Multi Tamara pattern method for Kebaya A, applying the So-En Soekarno pattern for Kebaya B, making both products under controlled conditions, assessment by two panelists, data processing, and drawing conclusions. The pattern serves as the main reference in translating the design into cut and assembled clothing parts; therefore, differences in pattern construction are the main treatments observed (Habib & Alam, 2024).

Data analysis was conducted descriptively by calculating the total score, mean, standard deviation, percentage of achievement, and score for each aspect. Inter-panelist assessment reliability was reviewed using Cronbach's Alpha and Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC). The ICC is used to describe the consistency or agreement of assessments between assessors, with interpretation taking into account the assessment design and number of assessors.(Andrade, 2026)The difference in scores between the two kebayas was tested using the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test because the data were paired scores from the same panelist and the number of panelists was limited. The significance level was set at 0.05.

Table2 Controlled experimental conditions

Component	Kebaya A	Kebaya B
Body model	The same hourglass	The same hourglass
Design	Same	Same
Size	Same	Same
Sewing materials & techniques	Same	Same
Finishing	Same	Same
Pattern method	So-En Multi Tamara	So-En Soekarno

The comparative experimental design used in this study involved distinguishing one primary treatment, the pattern method, while holding other conditions constant. This principle of condition control is necessary so that changes in the final results can be observed in relation to the focal treatment.(Schickore & Newman, 2024)discusses the importance of controlling and stabilizing conditions in experimental practice when researchers want to gain knowledge through comparison. Based on this, this study establishes the model, design, size, material, sewing technique, and finishing as controlled conditions.

The research model is a single model with hourglass body characteristics. Using a single model allows measurements and fittings to be performed on the same body. The model's body measurements are used as the basis for compiling both patterns so that differences in pattern shape are not confused with differences in

body size. Once the measurements are obtained, both patterning methods are applied separately to produce the patterns used for each kebaya.

Kebaya A was created using the So-En pattern method developed by Butik Multi Tamara. Kebaya B was created using the So-En Soekarno pattern. In both cases, the kebaya design, materials used, cutting techniques, sewing techniques, fitting processes, and finishing techniques were identical. Therefore, the difference in pattern construction is the only deliberate distinction in the manufacturing process of the two products.

The assessment scale uses four levels: 4 for excellent, 3 for good, 2 for adequate, and 1 for poor. The accuracy of placement includes the shoulder line, waist line, and the accuracy of the dart line on the kebaya. The accuracy of size includes the bust circumference, waist circumference, armholes, and back length. The shape aspect includes the suitability to the hourglass body, silhouette balance, and design lines. The overall result aspect includes the suitability of the design, neatness, and characteristics of the modified kebaya.

Data analysis was conducted in two main stages. First, the data were described through total scores, averages, achievement percentages, and scores for each aspect. Second, differences in scores between the two kebayas were tested using the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test. This test is adapted to paired data, as the same panelists evaluated both products. Given the limited number of assessors, test results should be interpreted with caution and not separated from the context of the research design.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research resulted in two modified kebayas made on a single model with hourglass body characteristics. Kebaya A uses the So-En pattern developed by Butik Multi Tamara, while Kebaya B uses the So-En Soekarno pattern. Both products went through the same manufacturing process, aside from the pattern method, from measuring, cutting, sewing, fitting, and finishing. After completion, two panelists assessed both kebayas using the same 13 indicators.

The recapitulation results show that Panelist 1 gave a score of 48 to Kebaya A and 50 to Kebaya B. Panelist 2 gave a score of 45 to Kebaya A and 49 to Kebaya B. The total score of Kebaya A was 93 with an average of 46.50, while Kebaya B obtained a total score of 99 with an average of 49.50. Thus, descriptively there is an average difference of 3.00 points. The standard deviation of Kebaya A is 2.121 and Kebaya B is 0.707, so the assessments of the two panelists on Kebaya B are closer than the assessments on Kebaya A. Table3Recapitulation of total panelist assessment scores

Panelists	Kebaya A	Kebaya B
Panelist 1	48	50
Panelist 2	45	49
Amount	93	99
Average	46.50	49.50

The overall maximum score was obtained from 13 indicators $\times$ 2 panelists $\times$ the highest score of 4, namely 104. Based on these values, Kebaya A achieved 89.42%, while Kebaya B achieved 95.19%. This percentage indicates a descriptive difference in the assessment results of the two kebayas. However, a higher percentage does not necessarily indicate absolute superiority of a method because the comparison also needs to be read in each aspect and tested inferentially.

Table4Percentage of kebaya assessment results

Kebaya	Total score	Maximum score	Percentage
A	93	104	89.42%
B	99	104	95.19%

Comparison based on four aspects shows a non-uniform pattern. In the aspect of position accuracy, Kebaya A obtained a score of 17 and Kebaya B 23. In the aspect of size accuracy, both kebayas obtained the same score, namely 31. In the aspect of kebaya shape, Kebaya A obtained 21 and Kebaya B 22. On the other hand, in the aspect of the overall kebaya results, Kebaya A obtained 24 and Kebaya B 23. This finding shows

that differences in pattern methods produce differences in scores in certain aspects, while other aspects show the same score or different directions of difference.

Table5 Comparison of assessment results based on aspects

Aspect	Kebaya A	Kebaya B
Accuracy of location	17	23
Accuracy of size	31	31
Kebaya shape	21	22
Overall results	24	23
Total	93	99

The largest difference was found in the accuracy of placement, with six points. This aspect covers the position of the shoulder line, waist line, and dart. Accuracy of placement is closely related to how the pattern construction places the clothing lines on the body. The difference in scores on this aspect may indicate variations in the results of pattern construction between the two methods. This finding is consistent with the principle that the relationship between the body and the pattern influences the position and fit of clothing parts on the body.(De Silva et al., 2024; Penko & Rudolf, 2025).

In terms of sizing accuracy, both kebayas received similar scores. This includes bust circumference, waist circumference, armhole circumference, and back length. The similarity in scores is understandable because both products were made based on the same model's body measurements and other conditions were controlled. These results indicate that under the conditions of this study, differences in patterning methods did not result in differences in the assessment of all observed sizing components.

In terms of kebaya shape, Kebaya B scored one point higher than Kebaya A. These aspects include the suitability of the kebaya shape to the hourglass characteristics, silhouette balance, and design line suitability. The small difference indicates that the results of the two methods are relatively close in terms of shape. The use of a single hourglass model allows the shape and silhouette of both kebayas to be observed on the same body condition, thus minimizing the influence of differences in body characteristics.

In terms of overall results, Kebaya A scored one point higher than Kebaya B. This aspect encompasses the suitability of the appearance to the design, neatness, and the suitability of the finished product to the characteristics of the modified kebaya. These results confirm that a higher total score for one product does not necessarily mean that the product scored higher on all aspects. In fashion evaluation, final quality is a combination of several dimensions that can indicate different assessment directions.

The reliability test of the assessment produced a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.534, an ICC for Single Measures of 0.359, and an ICC for Average Measures of 0.528. Based on the interpretation used in the study, the ICC for Single Measures is in the low category and the ICC for Average Measures is in the medium category. Because the study only involved two panelists, these values are interpreted as a limited description of the agreement between the panelists, not as the sole basis for declaring the instrument as a whole reliable or unreliable.(Hove et al., 2024)emphasized that the selection and interpretation of ICC must be adjusted to the measurement design, while Andrade (2026) emphasized the importance of reading ICC according to the context of use.

Difference testing was conducted using the Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test. The results showed negative ranks of 0, positive ranks of 2, and ties of 0. This means that both panelists gave a total score of Kebaya B higher than Kebaya A. However, the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) value was 0.180 and the Exact Sig. (2-tailed) value was 0.500. Because the Exact Sig. value of 0.500 is greater than 0.05, H_0 is not rejected. Thus, there is not enough statistical evidence to state a significant difference between the assessment results of the two kebayas under the conditions of this study.

Table6 Summary of reliability tests and difference tests

Analysis	Mark	Brief interpretation
Cronbach's Alpha	0.534	Limited internal consistency

ICC Single Measures	0.359	Low individual suitability
ICC Average Measures	0.528	Average fit is moderate
Wilcoxon Exact Sig. (2-tailed)	0.500	> 0.05; H ₀ is not rejected

It's important to distinguish between descriptive and statistical results. Descriptively, Kebaya B had a higher total score and percentage. However, the inferential test showed no significant difference. This is due to the very limited sample size of two panelists, which also limited the test's ability to detect differences. Therefore, the study's results should not be used to assert that one pattern method is absolutely superior.

The findings on the accuracy of placement support the view that pattern construction determines the position of clothing lines on the body. In the process of making a kebaya, the position of the shoulder, waist, and cuff lines significantly influences the appearance and fit.(Widiyanti et al., 2023)shows that the construction accuracy of the So-En system is related to the comfort and quality of the fitting.(Krisjayusman & Mariah, 2024)also reported good fitting factors for So-En implementations in women's fashion. This study expands on this context by showing that two So-En implementations can produce different scoring patterns on the placement aspect even when applied to the same model.

The similarity in size scores demonstrates the importance of controlling model size. When body measurements, design, materials, and manufacturing techniques are identical, both methods can yield equivalent size assessments on the indicators used. This aligns with the concept of pattern construction, which aims to translate body measurements into patterns that can be assembled into garments.(Habib & Alam, 2024)However, the similarity of scores in this study cannot be generalized to all body types because there is only one model and it has hourglass characteristics.

Body characteristics need to be taken into account in interpreting the results.(Penko & Rudolf, 2025)This study shows that differences in body shape can affect clothing fit. Because this study only used the hourglass shape, the results are more appropriately viewed as evidence for that particular body shape. Future research should apply both methods to other body shapes, such as pear, rectangle, or inverted triangle, to assess the consistency of the results across different body characteristics.

In the context of kebaya practice, the technique of adjusting the size still has an important role.(Syeila & Hidayati, 2024)This study demonstrates that resizing kebaya is necessary to adapt the product to the customer's body size. The results of this study also indicate that fitting is not solely influenced by the pattern system, but rather is the result of an interaction between size, construction, fitting process, sewing technique, and finishing. Because factors other than pattern method were controlled, this study provides a more focused picture of the differences in the results of the two pattern approaches in the same situation.

Modern kebaya has also developed as a medium of expression and design innovation.Kusumadewi & Jerusalem (2023)discusses the changing meaning of kebaya in the context of lifestyle and self-representation, while(Putri & Indarti, 2026)demonstrates the development of contemporary kebaya that combines elements of modern design and Indonesian textiles. In this context, construction quality remains crucial for design innovation to translate into body-conforming clothing. Therefore, the study of patterning methods is relevant to both the fashion design industry and vocational education.

From an educational perspective, the research findings can be used as an example that fashion product evaluation should be conducted using structured indicators, not just based on general visual impressions. Assessment across multiple aspects allows students to understand that a product may excel in one area but not in another. This approach aligns with product-based learning in vocational fields, which prioritizes the quality of practical results as a key source of information for assessing skills.(Andina & Ismayuni, 2026).

The main limitation of this study is the use of a single hourglass model and two panelists. Furthermore, the instrument consists of 13 indicators that assess the finished product visually and by fitting, so it does not cover all possible dimensions such as long-term comfort, seam durability, or user preference. The low to moderate inter-panel fit scores also indicate the need to increase the number of panelists and strengthen assessor training in future studies. Developing an instrument with more detailed indicators could help improve the accuracy of the evaluation.(Khairi et al., 2025).

Overall, the So-En Butik Multi Tamara and So-En Soekarno patterns yielded differences in descriptive scores in several aspects, but these differences were not statistically significant. These findings should be interpreted within the limitations of the research design used. The value of this study lies primarily in the empirical documentation of the application of the two methods under controlled conditions and in the presentation of assessment aspects that can serve as a basis for research with a wider sample size and panel of panelists.

Descriptive results should be interpreted based on the structure of the indicators used. Differences in total scores do not necessarily indicate that one method is superior across all indicators, as each aspect is composed of multiple assessment items. Therefore, the discussion is conducted by examining the scores for each aspect as well as the overall results. This approach helps explain the parts of the kebaya that received different scores without ignoring the statistical test results.

In terms of placement accuracy, Kebaya B scored higher. This difference relates to the placement of construction lines, which are assessed using the shoulder line, waist line, and dart line indicators. Meanwhile, in terms of sizing accuracy, both kebayas received the same score. These findings indicate that differences in patterning methods do not always result in differences in assessment across all dimensions of the finished product.

In terms of kebaya shape, Kebaya B scored slightly higher than Kebaya A. This assessment included the suitability of the shape to the hourglass body characteristics, silhouette balance, and design lines. In terms of overall results, Kebaya A scored slightly higher. Thus, the results of the study show a non-uniform pattern of scores across aspects, so interpretation cannot be done solely based on the total score.

The Wilcoxon test yielded an Exact Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.500, with a significance level of 0.05. This value is above the established significance limit, so the null hypothesis is not rejected. This means that the descriptive score difference does not provide sufficient statistical evidence to indicate a significant difference between the two kebaya results under the conditions of this study.

The limited number of models and panelists provides important context for interpreting the research results. The study used only one model with hourglass body characteristics and two panelists. Therefore, the results obtained reflect the experimental conditions of the subjects and assessors used, not generalizations to all body shapes or all assessors. Further research with more subjects and panelists could provide a broader picture.

Based on the indicators, the research results show that differences in scores primarily arise in aspects related to the position of the kebaya lines and shape. This is understandable because changes in pattern construction are directly related to the position of the lines when applied to the body. The shoulder line, waist line, and dart line are all areas that visually reveal the construction results in the finished product. In the context of a fitted kebaya, precise line position is crucial, as even small changes can affect the overall sense of balance in the garment.

The accuracy of the dart line placement is also an important indicator in this study. The dart serves to create space in clothing to conform to the body's shape. The difference in dart position between the two patterning methods can be seen in the finished product because the line forms part of the garment's structure. In this study, the term used in the instrument is "precision of dart line placement on the kebaya." The use of this term is adapted to the research object so that panelists assess the position of the dart construction that is actually visible on the product.

In terms of sizing accuracy, both kebayas received the same score, 31. This similarity indicates that different patterning methods do not always result in differences in the panelists' measurements. This could be related to the measurement and fitting process performed on the same model. When body size and manufacturing conditions are controlled, both products can achieve relatively similar levels of fit despite their different pattern constructions.

In terms of kebaya shape, Kebaya B scored 22, while Kebaya A scored 21. A one-point difference indicates that the two products scored relatively closely. This aspect encompasses the fit of the shape to the hourglass figure, silhouette balance, and design lines. Therefore, the differences are best understood as

variations in the level of achievement of these indicators, rather than significant changes in shape between the two products.

In terms of overall results, Kebaya A scored 24, while Kebaya B scored 23. This result indicates that Kebaya B's higher overall score did not occur across all aspects. Kebaya A actually scored higher overall. This demonstrates the importance of examining data by aspect, as the total score can mask differences in assessment direction on specific indicators.

The total recapitulation shows that Kebaya A obtained 93 and Kebaya B obtained 99. When compared to the maximum score of 104, the respective achievement percentages are 89.42% and 95.19%. Descriptively, Kebaya B has a total score six points higher. However, this difference must be interpreted in conjunction with the distribution of scores for each aspect and the results of statistical tests. Descriptive analysis serves to describe data patterns, while statistical tests are used to assess whether the differences in paired scores provide sufficient evidence at the specified significance level.

The Wilcoxon test results show an Exact Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.500. Because this value is greater than 0.05, the null hypothesis is not rejected. Thus, this study has not provided sufficient statistical evidence to state a significant difference between the results of Kebaya A and Kebaya B. This statement does not eliminate the existence of a descriptive score difference, but places the difference in accordance with the results of statistical testing under the research conditions used.

The statistical test results also need to be understood in conjunction with the very limited number of data pairs. Only two panelists provided ratings for both kebayas. This situation limits the variety of data that can be analyzed and makes the test results unable to be broadly generalized. Therefore, the study's conclusions are limited to the application of the two pattern methods to one hourglass model and the two panelists involved in the study.

The ICC test was used to assess the suitability of the assessment between panelists. The Single Measures ICC value of 0.359 and the Average Measures ICC of 0.528 indicate that the assessment results need to be interpreted according to the measurement format used. The Average Measures value of 0.528 is in the moderate category based on the criteria used in this study. Therefore, the reliability results are not declared unreliable, but indicate that the assessment suitability is not yet at a very strong level. Interpretation of the ICC does require consideration of the type of ICC, measurement unit, and assessment design. (Hove et al., 2024).

A Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.534 also indicates that the instrument has internal consistency, which should be interpreted with caution. Because the study used two panelists and indicators related to product assessment, reliability results should not be used to invalidate the product assessment results. Instead, these values provide methodological information regarding the instrument's level of consistency under the research conditions. Assessment of instrument validity and reliability requires consideration of the data characteristics and measurement objectives. (Khairi et al., 2025).

Substantively, the research findings show that the two applications of the So-En pattern can produce kebaya products that have a high level of achievement in the assessed indicators. Kebaya B obtained a higher total score, primarily due to the achievement in the aspects of the accuracy of the kebaya's placement and shape. Kebaya A obtained a higher score in the overall results. Both results indicate that the characteristics of the finished product are not determined by a single aspect, but rather a combination of the accuracy of construction, size, shape, and overall quality of the product.

Thus, the research findings are not intended to establish that one patterning method is always superior to another. They reflect empirical conditions for one subject, two treatments, and two panelists. The primary value of the research lies in the comparisons made under controlled conditions, measurements using the same indicators, and analysis that separates descriptive results from statistical ones. This approach allows for more proportionate conclusions to be drawn within the limitations of the available data.

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTIONS

The study shows that Kebaya A using the So-En Butik Multi Tamara pattern obtained a total score of 93 with an average of 46.50 and a percentage of 89.42%, while Kebaya B using the So-En Soekarno pattern obtained a total score of 99 with an average of 49.50 and a percentage of 95.19%. The difference in scores did not occur uniformly in all aspects: Kebaya B was higher in the accuracy of the position and shape of the kebaya, both kebayas were the same in the accuracy of the size, while Kebaya A was slightly higher in the overall results. The Wilcoxon test produced an Exact Sig. (2-tailed) of $0.500 > 0.05$ so that H_0 was not rejected. Thus, the descriptive differences found have not been proven statistically significant in research conditions involving one hourglass model and two panelists.

It is recommended that further research involve a larger number of models and panelists, test different body shapes, and develop more specific assessment indicators so that differences in pattern construction results can be observed in more detail. For practitioners and the Multi Tamara Boutique, the results of this study can be used as empirical documentation regarding the application of the So-En pattern to modified kebaya, while still considering the limitations of generalizability of the research results.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Andina, S., & Ismayuni, TU (2026). Utilization of Fabric Scraps in Making Entrepreneurial Products for Grade XI Students of SMK Gelora Jaya Nusantara. 9, 3320–3325.
- [2]. Andrade, C. (2026). A primer on the intraclass correlation coefficient as a measure of reliability in medical research. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 196–200. <https://doi.org/10.4103/indianjpsychiatry>
- [3]. Ariani, A., & Sugiyem, MP (2021). Differences In Kebaya Fitting Results Using Meyneke And Danckaerts System Patterns Author. *Journal Of Fashion Engineering Education*, Faculty Of Engineering, Yogyakarta State University, 1–15.
- [4]. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2023). Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches (6th ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- [5]. Darmansius, GH, & Puspaneli, P. (2025). Suitability of the Helen Joseph Armstrong Dress Pattern System for Tall and Large Indonesian Adult Women. *Edutech*, 24(2), 647–658. <https://doi.org/10.17509/e.v24i2.82866>
- [6]. De Silva, R. K. J., Navodhya, P. U., & Gill, S. (2024). Analysis of body-to-pattern relationship using traditional pattern drafting techniques: implications for automated digital prototyping. *International Journal of Fashion Design, Technology and Education*, 17(1), 37–49.
- [7]. Firmansyah, D., & Dede. (2022). General Sampling Techniques in Research Methodology: Literature Review. *Journal of Holistic Education*, 1(2), 85–114.
- [8]. Habib, A., & Alam, S. (2024). A Comparative Study of 3D Virtual Pattern and Traditional Pattern Making. 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.4236/jtst.2024.101001>
- [9]. Hove, D. ten, Jorgensen, T.D., & Ark, L.A. van der. (2024). Updated Guidelines on Selecting an Intraclass Correlation Coefficient for Interrater Reliability, With Applications to Incomplete Observational Designs. *American Psychological Association*, 29(5), 967–979.
- [10]. Khairi, MF, Hidayat, MN, Sismita, N., Nurhayati, & Herlinda. (2025). Evaluation of the Validity and Reliability of Research Instruments. *Scientific Journal of Education*, 15(September), 709–716. <https://doi.org/10.33087/dikdaya.v15i2.891>
- [11]. Krisjayusman, Z., & Mariah, S. (2024). Comparison Of Fitting Factor Of Practical Construction Patterns With So-En Patterns On Women's Blazer Clothing. *National Seminar On Culinary And Clothing Engineering Education*, 19(1).
- [12]. Kusumadewi, PDA, & Jerusalem, MA (2023). A review: The transformation of the meaning of kebaya from national clothing to a medium of self-representation and lifestyle. *Mudra Journal of Arts and Culture*, 38(2), 174–187. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31091/mudra.v38i2.2005>
- [13]. Moerbeek, M. (2023). Optimal placebo-treatment comparisons in trials with an incomplete within-subject design and heterogeneous costs and variances. *PLOS ONE*, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0283382>
- [14]. Penko, T., & Rudolf, A. (2025). The effect of the difference in female body shapes on clothing fitting. *AUTEX Research Journal*, 25(1), 14.
- [15]. Putri, TFL, & Indarti, I. (2026). Contemporary Kebaya with 'Berkain' Gen-Z Theme Through Front Bustier and Indonesian Textiles. *Home Economics Journal*, 10(1), 1–14.
- [16]. Schickore, J., & Newman, W.R. (2024). Elusive Phenomena, Unwieldy Things.

- [17]. Soekarno. (2025). Basic Clothing Pattern Making Guidebook (New Edition). Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- [18]. Sugiyono. (2023). Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods (H. Sutopo, Ed.; 5th Edition). Alfabeta.
- [19]. Susmelly, S., Ernawati, E., Nelmira, W., Suci, Ph, & Hadiastuti, H. (2025). Development Of E-Module On Basic Pattern Making Materials Of So-En System For Clothing Pattern Construction Course For Fashion Design Students Of State University Of Padang. *Edutech*, 24(3).
- [20]. Syeila, Ev, & Hidayati, L. (2024). Application Of Kebaya Resized Techniques At Maya Raisa Kebaya And Make Up Boutique Surabaya. *Jpbd (Journal Of Fashion And Design Research)*, 4(2), 51–58.
- [21]. Widiyanti, E., Wening, S., & Budiastuti, E. (2023). Modification Of Kebaya With Bustier Is Closely Linked To The Soen System. *Home Economics Journal*, 7(2), 56–62.
<https://doi.org/10.21831/Hej.V7i2.56848>
- [22]. Yuliani, AEW, & Prasetyaningtyas, W. (2023). Feasibility of Modified Kebaya Products Made from Indonesian Traditional Textiles Using Zero Waste Pattern Techniques. *Fashion and Fashion Education Journal*, 12(1), 10–16.