

This dissertation has been 64-1279
microfilmed exactly as received

MATTHEWS, Lillian Beatrice, 1918-
COLLEGE STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD
CLOTHING AND THEIR RELATION TO CERTAIN
PERSONALITY TRAITS.

The Ohio State University, Ph.D., 1963
Home Economics

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

COLLEGE STUDENTS' ATTITUDES TOWARD CLOTHING AND THEIR
RELATION TO CERTAIN PERSONALITY TRAITS

DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the Graduate
School of The Ohio State University

By

Lillian Beatrice Matthews, B.Sc., M.S.

The Ohio State University

1963

Approved by

D. Lois Gilmore
Adviser
School of Home Economics

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For the encouragement and advice so generously given throughout this study, the author wishes to express sincere thanks and appreciation to Dr. D. Lois Gilmore, Associate Director of the School of Home Economics and Acting Head of the Department of Textiles and Clothing at The Ohio State University. Thanks are also extended to committee members Dr. Enrico Quarantelli, Associate Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and Dr. Christine Hillman, Professor of Family and Child Development, School of Home Economics.

The author wishes to thank the professors in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology for making the participants in the study available. Appreciation is extended to these students without whose cooperation this study would not have been possible. Thanks are also expressed to Dr. Robert P. Bullock, Professor, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, for his advice on the statistical analysis of the data.

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
CHAPTER	
I INTRODUCTION	1
II LITERATURE ON CLOTHING AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE TO PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS	5
III THE PROBLEM AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE STUDY	13
Problem, Objectives, and Hypotheses	13
Theoretical Framework for the Study	15
Adler's Theory of Human Behavior	15
Langner's Application of the Symbolism of Clothes to Adler's Theory of Human Behavior	18
Rationale for Method of Procedure	23
IV PROCEDURE	33
Selection and Development of Measurements .	33
Pre-Test	39
Reliability of the Developed Instruments .	40
The Final Instruments	45
The Sample	45
Administration of the Schedules	48
Treatment of the Data	49
V FINDINGS	51
Descriptive Findings Concerning Participants	51
Ascendance-Submission Norms	53
Reliability of Scales	56
Variance of Means of Scores on Clothing Scales for Total Sample	57
Correlation between Ascendance-Submission and Distinguished Dressers	58

CONTENTS--(continued)

Chapter		Page
V	Analysis of Variance between the Means of Scores on the Clothing Scales by Quartile Groups on the A-S Study and by Sex	59
VI	DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS	68
VII	SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	77
	Summary	77
	Conclusions	82
	Recommendations	83
	APPENDIXES	86
A	Ascendance-Submission Reaction Study	86
B	Pre-Test "Opinions about Clothing Behavior" Scale	101
C	Key for Scoring Weights on Pre-Test "Opinions about Clothing Behavior" Scale	107
D	Opinions about Clothing Behavior Scale	109
E	Attitudes toward Clothing Scale	113
F	Key for Scoring Weights on Opinions about Clothing Behavior Scale	117
G	Key for Scoring Weights on Attitudes toward Clothing Scale	119
H	Coding Instructions	121
I	Results of Internal Consistency Test Completed on Clothing Scale Opinions about Clothing Behavior	123
J	Kittle's Clothing Importance Scale	125
K	Critical Ratios of Items on the Attitudes toward Clothing Scale	129
L	Formulas Used for Statistical Analysis	131
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	133
	AUTOBIOGRAPHY	137

TABLES

Table		Page
1	Percentage of each class rank represented in the total sample and in the total under- graduate enrollment	47
2	Percentage distribution of students in sample and in the undergraduate enrollment by sex and class level	47
3	Frequency and percentage distributions of males and females by class rank	52
4	Frequency and percentage distribution of subjects' college affiliation	53
5	Quartile scores of the A-S Study for men and women	55
6	Means, standard deviations, and t test for ascendance-submission and clothing scales by sex	55
7	Coefficient of correlation between ascendance-submission and distinguished dressers by sex	59
8	Means of scores from Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale by groups on the A-S Study and by sex	60
9	Means of scores from Attitudes toward Clothing scale by groups on the A-S Study and by sex	60

Chapter I

INTRODUCTION

Studies of dress made by sociologists and social psychologists deal for the most part in speculative appraisals concerning the fluctuations of fashion. Although there is little empirical evidence to support their observations, most of them agree that fluctuations in fashion manifest tendencies for human beings both to differentiate themselves from others and to represent their commonalities. The present study deals with the use of clothes by the individual to express certain traits of personality which in turn help to differentiate him from others.

The basic reason for changes in fashion is generally believed to be the conflicting desire for both individuality and conformity. That uniformity and differentiation is symbolic in character may be inferred from Sapir's belief that "functional irrelevance as contrasted with symbolic significance . . . is implicit in all fashion."¹ Symbolic significance he states is founded in custom: "fashion is custom in the guise of departure from custom."²

Fashion becomes a means of communication in social relations if one accepts the concept that the symbolic significance

¹Edward Sapir, "Fashion," Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, 6 (1930), p. 144.

²Ibid., p. 140.

of fashion is grounded in custom. Communication makes possible an understanding among the individual components of a social group; it launches and expands custom and mutual expectations which bind together all the elements of a society. A clear expression of the linkage between the significance of symbols and social relations is given by Mead:

The significant gesture or symbol always presupposes for its significance the social process of experience and behavior in which it arises; . . . This universe of discourse is constituted by a group of individuals carrying on and participating in a common social process of experience and behavior, within which these gestures or symbols have the same or common meanings for all members of that group, whether they make them or address them to other individuals, or whether they overtly respond to them as made or addressed to them by other individuals.³

Stone, in summarizing the use of clothes as symbols, explains that meaning is derived from common responses to already existing gestures and symbols.⁴ He stresses the importance of gestures and symbols in bringing the person into ongoing relations with others. It is conceded, therefore, that dress may be treated as a significant symbol.

The meaning of clothing in social relations is its extrinsic value in identifying the social position of the wearer. This becomes quite apparent when we consider the part clothing plays in the socialization process. All major changes in social positions moving through the different stages of formal education,

³George H. Mead, Mind, Self and Society (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934), p. 89.

⁴Gregory P. Stone, "Clothing and Social Relations: A Study of Appearance in the Context of Community Life" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1959).

getting a job, marriage, parenthood, and illness are marked by changes of wardrobe. Social stratification studies also reveal overwhelming evidence that difference in social honor, wealth, and authority are reflected in apparel. Even institutional differences such as those identified by the division of labor are similarly characterized by variations of dress. Clothing, therefore, becomes an excellent means of symbolizing differentiated roles of social positions.

Technical and popular literature, not only agree that clothing is a means of symbolizing differentiated roles of social positions, but also contend that the symbolic significance of clothing is related to individual self-expression. This was aptly stated by Dearborn:

The really well-dressed persons in general wear clothes which are not easily differentiated from the rest of their personality at all The clothes a man wears are really part of his personality considered from a common-sense (the pragmatic) point of view. Therefore, they should fit into it as well as on to it. They should be for whom they are made unobtrusive. They should be part of the individual and then properly and socially speaking, they are part of him.⁵

Flugel also stresses the dual role played by clothing; its use in social role identification and in individual self-expression.⁶ He stated that we do not react to bodies but to clothes; it is the individual's clothes which give us first impressions of the individual and not the individual himself.

⁵George Van Ness Dearborn, "The Psychology of Clothing," The Psychological Monographs, 26, No. 1, (1918) p. 65.

⁶John Flugel, The Psychology of Clothes (London: The Hogarth Press, 1950), p. 9.

Thus, clothes, seemingly mere extraneous appendages, have entered into the very core of our existence as social beings.

If dress serves as a medium for the recognition of the personality of the wearer, then what specific dimensions of clothing behavior and attitudes toward clothing are symbolic of different personality types or traits of personality? This question forms the basis for the problem to be investigated.

Chapter II

LITERATURE ON CLOTHING AND ITS SIGNIFICANCE TO PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS

The limited literature on the symbolic meaning of clothes is highly descriptive in character, therefore, it does not provide a theoretical base upon which to build social-psychological research concerned with the exploration of such meaning. Some studies which relate attitudes toward clothing to personality traits differentiate those holding such attitudes by placing them into different social categories. Other studies in clothing relate attitudes toward dress as only an expression of personal motives. Interpretations of these attitudes as motives are often the opinions of the authors of the studies.

It is difficult to distinguish studies dealing with clothing behavior as clearly psychological, sociological, or social-psychological. Though many early studies were placed in a psychological orientation, they were both sociological and psychological in nature. These studies dealt with attitudes toward dress as traits of the sexes, age, or classes, and provided limited knowledge for the construction of a theoretical frame of reference within which the meaning of dress might

proceed. The early research by Hall¹ and Flaccus,² for example, revealed that children and adolescents dress for others rather than personal comfort and that clothing is an important cue for the child's appraisal of other children. Clothing appeared to have an effect on the sociability, self-consciousness, and self-esteem of the samples studied. Hurlock studied such questions as whether people dress for their own or opposite sex and her findings have lent meaning to the dress of the sexes.³ Her discussion and findings concerning the use of clothing to bolster self-esteem or self-confidence also provide important data. In a follow-up of Hurlock's work, Barr investigated the extent to which habits in dress reflect a conforming or individualizing motivation to fashion. She concluded that conformity for the group of women studied was a stronger motive for clothing choice than self-expression.⁴

Trait differences disclosed by these studies have a tendency to be interpreted as expressions of personal motives which transcend social situations. Even the work of Flugel, perhaps the best known analyst of clothing behavior, takes on its significance from the view of the analyst and minimizes the

¹G. Stanley Hall, "Some Aspects of the Early Sense of Self," American Journal of Psychology, IX (1897-1898), pp. 315-395.

²Louis W. Flaccus, "Remarks on the Psychology of Clothes," Pedagogical Seminary, XIII (1906), pp. 61-83.

³Elizabeth Hurlock, The Psychology of Dress: An Analysis of Fashion and Its Motive (New York: The Ronald Press, 1929).

⁴Estelle DeYoung Barr, "A Psychological Analysis of Fashion Motivation," Archives of Psychology, 26 (June 1934).

responses of others concerning their clothing behavior.⁵ However, when the studies of Hall, Flaccus, Hurlock, and Barr are observed closely, it is perceived that they have a tendency to be sociological in nature as well as psychological. The authors of such studies probably did not apprehend the sociality of the human organism as a constant; it must be remembered that at the time these studies were completed social-psychological theories of personality were not as fully formulated as they are at present.

More recent studies which related personality factors to clothing behavior and attitudes toward clothes are also difficult to identify as only psychological in nature. Silverman, in 1945, found that adolescent girls exhibited the psychological need for approval, to be sexually attractive, and for self-confidence and that these needs could be satisfied in part through clothes and appearance.⁶ In comparable studies in 1953-54, Ryan's findings revealed similar results. The investigator states:

The girl who feels well dressed seems generally to be more relaxed, at ease, and more confident The girl who feels that she is poorly dressed is worried about her appearance, generally ill-at-ease, and is more self-centered.⁷

⁵Flugel, op. cit.

⁶Sylvia S. Silverman, Clothing and Appearance: Their Psychological Implications for Teen-Age Girls (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1945), p. 118.

⁷Mary S. Ryan, Psychological Effects of Clothing, Part III, Report of Interviews with a Selected Sample of College Women (Ithaca, N. Y.: Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, Bulletin 900, 1953), p. 22.

Warden found that college women desired clothing which would allow them to be somewhat distinctive but at the same time to conform to the clothing norms of the group.⁸ Although Warden did not attempt any type of personality measurement, she generally concluded that her study indicated a relationship between personality differences, physique, clothing needs, and interests.

Hoffman used more mature women for her sample when she endeavored to find whether significant relationships existed between clothing behavior and personality factors.⁹ High aesthetic interests in clothes appeared to be closely related to self-confidence for the group of women included in her study. Lapitsky, in an empirical study of clothing values, also found that women identified as secure individuals were concerned more with the aesthetic expression of their clothing than insecure women who expressed greater concern about the judgment of others.¹⁰

Compton found experimental evidence from her study with freshman college girls to support the concept that the self is

⁸ Jessie Warden, "Some Factors Effecting the Satisfactions and Dissatisfactions with Clothing of Women Students in the College of Education and the College of Liberal Arts" (Ph.D. dissertation, School of Home Economics, The Pennsylvania University, 1955).

⁹ Adeline Hoffman, "Clothing Behavioral Factors for a Specific Group of Women Related to Aesthetic Sensitivity and Certain Socio-Economic and Psychological Background Factors" (Ph.D. dissertation, School of Home Economics, Pennsylvania State University, 1956).

¹⁰ Mary Lapitsky, "Clothing Values and Their Relation to General Values and to Social Security and Insecurity" (Ph.D. dissertation, School of Home Economics, The Pennsylvania State University, 1961).

expressed in one's selection of clothing fabrics. Students preferring deep shades and saturated colors scored higher in sociability than those preferring tints. A high feminine orientation was projected by these students into preferences for small designs.¹¹

Other research studies have also dealt with various aspects of clothing interests and attitudes as they affect the selection and purchase of wearing apparel by different socio-economic groups and for people of various ages. While they have contributed some factual evidence of what people do, they have not always attempted to interpret the findings in light of psychological or sociological concepts basic to human behavior. Treece attempted to show that theories of social psychology form a system of knowledge for understanding the symbolism of dress. In applying the concepts of self and role to clothing as a social symbol, Treece hypothesized:

If the self-concept is as important in determining behavior as it is believed to be, and if individuals naturally strive to defend the self and present it in a complementary fashion, it can be anticipated that some individuals would perceive their dress as conveying an impression to others of their self-concept. The more highly one holds the self in a position of esteem, the greater would be the importance which he should attach to clothing.¹²

and

¹¹ Norma Haynes Compton, "Clothing Fabric Preference in Relation to Selected Physical and Personality Characteristics" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1962).

¹² Anna Jean Treece, "An Interpretation of Clothing Behavior Based on Social Psychological Theory" (Ph.D. dissertation, School of Home Economics, The Ohio State University, 1959), p. 163.

If one believes that clothing speaks a silent language to important others and that it assists in communicating an individual's feeling and personal qualities to his associates, then it is justifiable to hypothesize that clothing contributes to role performance.¹³

The perspective of the symbolic transaction between self and role was developed by Mead.¹⁴ One recent study which investigated clothing behavior appears to fit into the Meadian frame of reference within which meaning is provided by role-taking or placing one's self in the attitude of the other. Stone hypothesized that the meaning of dress varies for the sexes, for different age categories, and for different status levels.¹⁵ This hypothesis was made on the assumptions that (a) such categories are universal, (b) members of such groupings have been differently socialized, and (c) that the audiences which give meaning to appearances of dress in these categories are different.¹⁶ Stone proceeded to test his hypotheses by categorizing responses of his subjects into phases of identity, value, mood, and attitude.

The design of a second study which appears as an outcome of social-psychological theory is that of Ditty. The investigator was interested in discovering whether clothing is primarily an aspect of individual self-expression or is related to the individual's perception of his social function. She related clothing preferences to personality characteristics of masculinity-

¹³ Ibid., p. 164.

¹⁴ Anselm Strauss, (ed.), The Social Psychology of George Herbert Mead (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956).

¹⁵ Stone, op. cit.

¹⁶ Ibid., p. 227.

femininity as well as to tendencies for sociability-individuality.

A third relationship was hypothesized between high social aspirations, high sociability tendencies and uniformity in clothing preferences for various social roles. Ditty discovered for the group of college women who participated in her study, that masculinity-femininity were significantly related to clothing preferences for certain items of clothing as well as fluctuation in clothing preferences according to various social roles.

General conclusions drawn were: "As social role prescriptions become more definite and if the individual is socially immature or passive-receptive in her traits, the use of clothing is increasingly related to the individual's perception of the social role and its requirements, rather than individual self-expression.¹⁷

These studies indicate that clothing is an important contributory aspect of social role participation and is, therefore, an excellent means by which individuals can adapt themselves to social situations. The principle of extension of personality refers to the individualistic aspect of dress; the principle of adaptation to the individual's use of dress within a social situation.

It is evident, from the literature reviewed in this chapter, that studies concerned with relating dress to human behavior are necessarily identified as both social and psychological in nature, even though many of the studies do not fit

¹⁷ Dona D. Ditty, "Social-Psychological Aspects of Clothing Preferences of College Women" (Ph.D. dissertation, School of Home Economics, The Ohio State University, 1962).

specifically into any particular existing social-psychological theory of personality. However, these studies do contribute to our understanding of the interrelationship between the individual and environmental influences. The present study deals with clothing as an expression of certain individual personality traits, therefore, is psychological in nature. The present study is based on the assumption that personality traits do exist and are identified as behavior tendencies which are interdependent and overlapping, resulting in a structured personality. The following discussion presents a theoretical frame of reference from which the problem was developed.

Chapter III

THE PROBLEM AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK FOR THE STUDY

Problem, Objectives, and Hypotheses

It was stated in the introduction of this study that "fluctuations in fashion manifest a tendency for human beings both to differentiate themselves from others and to represent their commonalities." The question asked is, "why do human beings wish to differentiate themselves and how do they symbolize this desire through dress?" Many philosophical and psychological explanations have been offered to clarify the basic motivation for man's behavior, but few of these theories have been used as a basis for finding meaning in the wearing of clothes. Such authors as Dearborn,¹ Flugel,² and Laver,³ who have written on the psychology of clothes, agree that man's need to manifest his importance and his superiority through his clothes has become an important function of clothes. This theory of the desire for superiority in mankind forms the basis of a recent publication by Langner. Langner⁴ supports the theories of Adler⁵ and

¹Dearborn, op. cit.

²Flugel, op. cit.

³James Laver, Clothes (New York: Horizon Press, 1953).

⁴Lawrence Langner, The Importance of Wearing Clothes (New York: Hastings House, 1959).

⁵Ibid., p. 8.

Dearborn⁶ that the need to overcome inferior feelings by making oneself superior is the basic motivation for man's behavior. He explains that the reasons for inventing clothes are an outcome of this psychological need and civilization could not have progressed without the invention of clothing which has served to identify those individuals of authority within our society.

The present study purposes to test Langner's thesis that man demonstrates to others his "striving for superiority" by choosing to wear distinguishing clothes. The personality trait of dominance was chosen as the indicator of "striving for superiority." It was planned to explore the extent to which this trait in a group of college men and women might be reflected in their opinions about clothing. The specific purposes of this investigation were:

1. To develop a reliable instrument to measure opinions about clothing behavior.
2. To determine if a significant difference exists between the opinions about clothing behavior of those persons who are identified as dominant personalities and the opinions about clothing behavior of those persons who are submissive personalities.
3. To determine if ascendant men differ from ascendant females in their opinions about clothing behavior and if submissive men differ from submissive women in their opinions about clothing.

Four hypotheses were formulated from these objectives.

Hypothesis 1. There is a significant difference between the clothing behavior of persons who are identified as extremely

⁶Dearborn, op. cit., p. 51.

ascendant and the clothing behavior of persons who are identified as extremely submissive.

Hypotheses 2. Persons who are extremely ascendant are more distinguished dressers than persons who are extremely submissive.

Hypotheses 3. Those persons who are "average" in that they do not indicate strong tendencies toward either ascendancy or submission are also "average" in terms of distinguished dressers.

Hypotheses 4. There is no significant difference between men and women in relation to hypotheses 1, 2, and 3.

Theoretical Framework for the Study

Langner based his philosophy for the reasons of wearing clothes on Alfred Adler's system of individual psychology with emphasis on "striving for superiority." Adler's beliefs concerning the motivation of human behavior is discussed first.

The symbolic nature of Langner's illustrations for the importance of clothing is then applied to Adler's psychological theory. The latter discussion is followed by a rationale for method of procedure.

Adler's theory of human behavior

Adler assumed that man's behavior was motivated primarily by social urges and as a result he became a social being. These social urges of man, Adler came to believe, manifested themselves in relationships with other people when he engaged in cooperative social activities in a way which placed social welfare above selfish interest. Characteristic ways of behaving in specific human relationships and experiences aided the individual

in fulfilling his unique style of life which was predominantly social in orientation. This social interest was inborn but specific types of relationships with people and social institutions which developed were determined by the nature of the society into which a person was born.

This development of a unique style of life from innate social urges and from experiences was accomplished by the creative self, according to Adler's theory. In essence, the doctrine of a creative self asserts that man makes his own personality which gives meaning to his life. Hall and Lindzey, in interpreting Adler, state that the creative self creates the goal as well as the means to the goal of life.⁷

What is the goal which motivates man to develop a unique style of life and a creative self? Adler held consistently that the striving for superiority was the motivating factor to all human behavior and that this striving was compensatory for inherent feelings of inferiority. Adler's later writings included the goal of perfection as a means of inducing a feeling of inferiority, which in turn "presses toward its own conquest."⁸ In this struggle for perfection, Adler believed man was always in a state of agitation. There were, however, satisfying stages in this upward struggle when he had a feeling of accomplishment, value, and happiness.

⁷Calvin Hall and Gardner Lindzey, Theories of Personality (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1957), p. 125.

⁸H. L. Ansbacher and Rowena R. Ansbacher (eds.), The Individual-Psychology of Alfred Adler (New York: Basic Books, 1956).

Adler began to formulate his theory of individual psychology in 1908 from the behavior of abnormal personalities. At that time he described the striving of men as the "strive of aggression" for this was the type of behavior he observed in his patients. Later Adler changed his concept of striving for aggression to that of a "will to power." This was a striving from "below" to "above" which at first meant a striving for power, self-esteem, and security for the individual.

Adler used the normal personality as his frame of reference for his studies between the years 1920 and 1930. During this period his conception of "striving for superiority" changed considerably. He came to explain this striving as a striving for perfect completion. It was "the great upward drive." Adler described it this way:

I began to see clearly in every psychological phenomenon the striving for superiority. It runs to physical growth and is an intrinsic necessity of life itself. It lies at the root of all solutions of life's problems and is manifested in the way in which we meet these problems. All functions follow its direction. They strive for conquest, security, increase, either in the right or in the wrong direction. The impetus from minus to plus never ends. The urge from below to above never ceases. Whatever premises all our philosophers and psychologists dream of--self-preservation, pleasure principle, equalization--all these are but vague representations, attempts to express the great upward drive.⁹

However, Adler was not completely satisfied with the self-boundedness of this theory of personality for the normal individual. He came to realize, as he modified his views, that the

⁹Carl Murchison (ed.), Psychologies of 1930 (Worchester, Mass.: Clark University Press, 1930), p. 398.

striving of each actively moving individual was toward overcoming, not toward power. Striving for personal power represented only one of a thousand ways by which individuals sought perfection. Adler made his theory more comprehensive as he expressed striving for perfection not only in terms of the self but in terms of outside objects as well. He thus explained the behavior of normal individuals in terms of social interest.

The need for social interest and human cooperation, Adler explained, was necessary in the solution of problems related to social relations in general. Thus the whole individual became part of the larger whole which was formed by the groups to which he belonged, ranging from the face-to-face groups to the whole of mankind ultimately. Adler did not forfeit the theory of "striving for superiority," in formulating this "holistic" approach to human behavior, but merely subordinated it to his more important thesis of social interest. It is quite clear that Adler in his final definition made social interest the integral part of the striving for superiority and not conquest of selfish forces such as striving for social distinction, leadership, or pre-eminent position in society.¹⁰

Langner's application of the symbolism
of clothes to Adler's theory of human
behavior

It has been noted that Adler developed his theory of human behavior over several years and during that time his concept of

¹⁰Hall and Lindzey, op. cit., p. 120.

"striving for superiority" as the goal of all human behavior changed considerably. From what era of Adler's theory did Langner place his interpretation of this goal of the psyche?

In essence, Langner inferred that man's "striving for superiority" was aimed at both satisfying his individual psychological need of identifying his superiority among his associates as well as the accomplishment of perfection for society as a whole. Clothes have always been an outward emblem of man's psychological need to suppress his inherent fears and to express his superior personal qualities over others. In Langner's words:

. . . man has from the earliest times worn clothes to overcome his feeling of inferiority and to achieve a conviction of his superiority to the rest of creation, including members of his own family and tribe, and to win admiration and assure himself that he "belongs!"¹¹

The development of clothes, according to Langner, has at the same time been representative of man's striving to better his environment not only for himself but for all society. This second basic belief the author continued to point up throughout the book and specifically stated it in the following way:

He (man) ever searches to improve his world in one field or another, and his achievements keep adding to the sum of man's knowledge. Little of this progress would have been possible but for the invention of clothing which originally gave man the feeling of superiority which ever urges him on and on to the conquest of greater heights.¹²

It is interesting to note from this quotation that the author indicates that man's feeling of superiority through clothing came before his social interest in improving his world. The sequence

¹¹ Langner, op. cit., p. 12.

¹² Ibid., p. 312.

of these events follows those evidenced in the development of Adler's theory of human behavior.

Langner used numerous illustrations to support his conclusions as he traced the evolution of clothes in relation to the development of man's religions, his government, his social conduct, his associations with the opposite sex, and his ability to improve his physical appearance. The following account will illustrate Langner's thesis that man symbolizes his personal "striving for superiority" through the clothes he chooses to wear.

Man's first striving for superiority began with his need to identify himself with superior beings and deities whom he portrayed in pictorial art forms in his own image and covered with clothes similar to those he himself was wearing at the time. By this means men established "a relationship which fortified their self-esteem and gave them faith and courage to rise above their origins and achieve as godlike humans."¹³ Man's social interest evolved slowly and as it did he developed and organized social institutions. As each of these institutions grew into complex systems, man's need to identify his superiority within the institution became paramount. Thus, "it is clothes that make it possible for governments to obtain obedience, religious reverence, judiciaries a respect for law, and armies discipline."¹⁴

Past and present members of these authority groups have not only been recognized by their uniforms, but their official

¹³ Ibid., p. 113.

¹⁴ Ibid., p. xiv.

rank (or degree of power they hold) has been further symbolized by the use of additional identifying decoration or ornamentation. The individual can demonstrate his superior achievements through social institutions in this way and thereby win the admiration of his fellow men and women which according to Langner is one of man's deepest spiritual needs.¹⁵

When regimented, symbolic uniforms were not required as a means of identifying members of the institution, man contrived, through his civilian clothes, subtle ways of using style, color, and materials which would identify his membership in superior groups as well as his elevated social position within that group.

The foregoing account seems to express Langner's feeling that the individual's "striving for superiority" was a striving to prove that he was better than others. This type of behavior results in a ranking of individuals according to their degree of superiority or importance within society. This connotation of "striving for superiority" infers Adler's earlier concept of this term when he related striving to authority and power, to rising from a lower to a higher position, and from defeat to victory. Langner's use of Adler's early interpretations for the goal of human behavior is also substantiated by Hall and Lindzey who explained that Adler's later interpretation was not a "striving for distinction, leadership, or a pre-eminent position in society."¹⁶

¹⁵ Ibid., p. 11.

¹⁶ Hall and Lindzey, op. cit., p. 120.

Even though Langner reported evidence that clothes were an emblem of showing one's self-importance over others, he realized there were independent individuals who did not express their superiority by wearing clothes which identified them as being superior. Those persons who showed indifference or refused to conform to acceptable standards of dress he stated "achieve a feeling of superiority because of the fact that they are shockingly unconventional. We get a thrill of satisfaction from the notice our 'different' or slovenly clothes attract."¹⁷ This attitude he thought indicated the possibility that a few individuals chose to demonstrate their superiority by being distinctively unconventional in their dress rather than distinctively conventional.

Langner referred not only to a desire to be superior but also to "feelings of superiority" which do not have the connotation of proving one's superiority over others. This writer believes that the meaning of "feelings of superiority" in the following illustrations from Langner's book are closely associated with mood or a particular state of mind.

You meet a handsome woman friend wearing a highly fashionable dress which suits her style of beauty. She looks adorable, and you tell her so. By her radiant expression you realize she has achieved a definite if transitory state of happiness. Why? Because her clothing has given her a feeling of superiority, which she enjoys to the utmost.¹⁸

You know a woman friend who was feeling utterly rejected and depressed. She buys herself a new hat

¹⁷ Langner, op. cit., p. 13.

¹⁸ Ibid., p. 11.

and dress. She feels happy again. Why? Her new clothes have given her a feeling of superiority and lifted her out of the doldrums.¹⁹

These statements reveal that the wearing of certain types of clothes apparently gives the individual a sense of reorganization of self from a sense of disorganization leaving a feeling of well-being or uplift. Explanation for the motivation of such behavior may be found in Remits' belief that the goal of all human behavior is the maintenance of superior feelings rather than a striving for superiority.²⁰

Langner's thesis, which is presented here, is based on both Adler's earlier and later connotations of "striving for superiority" as the basic motivation for human behavior. Langner supported his beliefs by illustrating man's use of clothes as an overt expression of his self-importance within the institutions he developed during the progress of civilization. These interpretations point up man's ability to design and adapt his clothing to meet the psychological and sociological needs of himself and his society.

Rationale for method of procedure

The main purpose of the present study was to test Langner's thesis that man demonstrates to others his feelings and striving for superiority by choosing to wear distinguishing

¹⁹ Ibid., p. 11.

²⁰ Ernest L. Remits, The Feeling of Superiority and Anxiety-Superior: The Ottawa Pilot Study (Ottawa: Runge Press Ltd., 1953).

clothes. The rationale for a method of procedure to investigate the problem is described below.

Personality characteristics which identify superior type of behavior

Adler stated that the self creates the goal for the expression of superiority as well as the means of accomplishing this goal. Individuals whose goal is to have others realize their superiority and position in society, therefore, will find means for doing so, and in the process develop characteristic behavior patterns which will act as indicators of their goal.

The question then arises, what common behavior patterns will individuals develop whose goal is expressing their superiority over others? It is reasonable to conclude that persons who desire to make themselves felt and noticed among other members in the society, will behave in a manner which will contribute to satisfying this desire. Aggressive behavior implies, in a favorable sense, "initiative and a bold and energetic pursuit of one's goals."²¹ It appears that individuals striving for an expression of their self-importance will need to acquire some degree of aggressiveness as part of their behavior pattern. The strength of this aggressive behavior will depend upon the magnitude of the desire for acquiring superiority in any specific phase of life.

Individuals who aim for superiority may also acquire some degree of self-assertiveness. Assertive behavior implies self-confidence as well as a persistent determination to express

²¹ Webster's New World Dictionary (College Edition) (New York: The World Publishing Co., 1960), p. 28.

oneself or one's opinions.²² Krech and Crutchfield describe dominance, prestige, and power, as different aspects of self-assertive behavior.²³

Dominance, Krech and Crutchfield state, is recognized in individuals who appear to be ascendent over others in social groups. These individuals more frequently take the lead, give orders, dominate the group activities, take the best seats in the room, the best food, and the biggest part. They are more likely to be able to criticize others.²⁴ Such dominance-behavior, the authors continued, is determined by many factors. The first set of factors has to do with the physical size, strength, energy, power, or competence of the individual. The second set is concerned with the personality traits of self-confidence, persuasiveness, poise, and vigor. A third set of factors which contributes to dominance-behavior results from cultural beliefs such as those concerning the role of the adult in relation to the child, the role of the male-vis-a-vis the female, and the upper-class person in comparison with the lower-class person.²⁵

Prestige, the second aspect of self-assertive behavior, as described by Krech and Crutchfield, is derived from

²² Ibid., p. 28.

²³ David Krech and Richard S. Crutchfield, Elements of Psychology (New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1958).

²⁴ These characteristic types of behavior of dominance were identified earlier by Dr. Gordon W. Allport and used in the formation of his A-S Reaction Study.

²⁵ Krech and Crutchfield, op. cit., p. 284.

one's material possessions, achievements, social position, ancestry, skin color, and age. The individual's need and desires for prestige and status depend significantly upon how he thinks other people regard him as well as the recognition from certain groups he especially values.²⁶

Power, the third aspect of self-assertive behavior, according to these authors, relates to the aspects of dominance and prestige. In his drive for power, the person may be seeking autonomy so that he can become free from the influence of others, to be independent, and to develop self-mastery.²⁷

It can be assumed from this discussion, that the aspects of self-assertive behavior can reasonably be expected to act as indicators for the goal of "striving for superiority." Since the physical and social factors of dominance may be reflected in actual behavior, and thus in the personality factors of self-confidence, persuasiveness, poise, and vigor, then these observable factors may also serve adequately as indicators of the goal of superiority.

The trait of dominance, as described by Krech and Crutchfield, is the tendency toward assertiveness and ascendancy by an individual in his relations with other individuals. Ascendancy implies paramount influence, or that which ranks higher than any other, supremacy, authority, and dominance.²⁸ Although it cannot be said with certainty that assertiveness, ascendancy,

²⁶ Ibid., p. 284.

²⁷ Ibid., p. 286.

²⁸ Webster's New World Dictionary, op. cit., p. 85.

and dominance are equated, they appear to be related enough when describing human behavior, that a scale which measures one would probably be an indicator of the other.

Assuming that dominance and/or ascendancy, as discussed by Krech and Crutchfield are identifiable traits of personality, then it may also be assumed that these traits may be measured. Allport's theory of trait personality was explored as a basis for measurement.

Trait theory of personality

The personality factors making up the self-concept must be measured to discover uniformities of personality from which behavior is to be predicted. One of the most common psychological approaches to this problem is through the study of traits.

Allport defines a trait as follows:

. . . a trait is a broad system of similar action tendencies existing in the person we are studying. "Similar action tendencies" are those that an observer, looking at them from an actor's point of view, can categorize together under one rubric of meaning.²⁹

Allport believes that these traits are interdependent and overlapping resulting in a structured personality.³⁰ He warns one that the titles or tags given to these traits, which are derived from perceptions of another's behavior, are in

²⁹ Gordon W. Allport, Pattern and Growth in Personality (New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, Inc., 1961), p. 31.

³⁰ The trait theory of personality is criticized by Lindesmith-Strauss and other psychologists for its lack of sufficient explanation concerning the origin of traits and how these traits become interdependent during periods of change and stress.

danger of simplifying personality. This risk of simplifying personality is prevalent in every personality rating scale, for by virtue of the scale's uniform schedule of traits it forces individual behavior into separate and independent elements.

Trait psychologists "have stressed matters of measurement of traits, devising and validation of tests, the statistical interrelationship of traits, and the manner in which traits are distributed in individuals and in populations."³¹ Allport justifies the method of measuring traits in a given personality on a common dimensional scale along with other people on the basis that normal people in a given culture-area necessarily tend to develop somewhat roughly comparable modes of adjustment. Based on this reasoning, Allport devised a measure for the traits of ascendancy-submission and justifies the measurement of these particular traits when he writes:

. . . In a competitive society, such as ours, every individual tends to find a level of assertiveness or ascendancy that is congenial to his own way of life. One person may live quite comfortably . . . by being a "yielder." Another (by temperament or training) finds that dominance is a more congenial style of adjusting to, and mastering, his environment. Some people evolve a style of extreme aggressiveness; others, of extreme passivity. The point is that in our society people can be compared (roughly) in the way they have solved this problem of relating to the environment and to other people.³²

Allport realizes that a standardized uniform scale for measuring traits is at the best approximate. Referring to the

³¹ Alfred R. Lindesmith and Anselm L. Strauss, Social Psychology (2nd ed.; New York: Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1956), p. 492.

³² Allport, op. cit., p. 339.

ascendant-submissive traits, he states that there are endless varieties of dominators, leaders, aggressors, followers, yielders, and timid souls. The scale, therefore, cannot recognize the subtle shadings of traits of individuals.

Syndrome of behavior characteristics which identify traits of ascendancy-submission

In his article explaining the need for the Ascendance-Submission Reaction Study, Allport states that many individuals from earliest childhood seem to be characteristically dominant in face-to-face groups; others seem to be characteristically submissive or yielding.³³ Traits are frequently a consistent part of the behavior pattern of the individual by the time adolescence is reached. Thus, a fair predication can be made concerning ones tendency to control, or to be controlled by other people in social situations.

When two people meet face-to-face in most social situations, psychologically one assumes the dominant role and the other the submissive role. These roles on occasion may be reversed when for instance the subject under discussion is one in which the submissive personality happens to have superior knowledge or experience. However, individuals who usually assume dominant roles and individuals who usually assume submissive roles when in contact with one other person, tend to exhibit these same traits in group contacts. This does not mean that

³³Gordon W. Allport, "A Test for Ascendance-Submission," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 23 (1928-29), pp. 118-136.

the predominantly ascendant personality will not have characteristics of submissiveness and vice versa. Even the most dominant person will sometimes manifest shyness and submission in certain social situations and at certain periods of his life. Conversely, the predominantly submissive person also will show some characteristics of dominance. No person is completely integrated, for dominant status is a relative thing and refers to a particular relationship between two or more persons.

These two traits of ascendancy and submission, according to Allport, are found to be fairly constant characteristics of behavior. Statistically, they are said to possess linearity, since they range in varying degrees of incidence of one over the other from a predominantly submissive to a predominantly ascendant integration. The "average" persons are those subjects in whom one trait practically cancels the other insofar as the number of manifestations are concerned.³⁴

Allport discovered, after empirically testing his ascendancy-submission scale, that an ascendant person has a tendency to behave in such a way that he places himself in a position of advantage, he takes initiative, he assumes leadership responsibilities, and he acts independently of others. Allport also discovered that submissive persons in the same situations tended to act in the opposite direction.

Maslow in 1937 studied the relationships between dominance-feeling and dominance-status among college women and

³⁴ Ibid., p. 121.

reported that dominance-behavior was dependent upon dominance-feelings.³⁵ However, dominance-behavior, although social, and dominance-feelings could be independent of social status. That is to say, a person with high dominance-feeling may show a degree of constancy in certain behaviors regardless of his status at the moment, the same is true for persons with low dominance-feeling.

Maslow also showed that dominance-feelings express an attitude which the individual has toward himself in relation to and toward the social world around him. Findings from his empirical investigation enabled him to define this relationship more explicitly for he discovered a syndrome of feelings which were characteristic of the extremely dominant and non-dominant individuals. The individual with high feelings of dominance is characterized by:

self-confidence, self-esteem, high self-respect, high evaluation of self, consciousness or feeling of "superiority" in a general sense, a feeling of being able to handle other people, a feeling of masterfulness and of mastery, a feeling that others do and ought to admire and respect him, a feeling of general capability, and absence of shyness, timidity, self-consciousness or embarrassment.³⁶

The individual with a low feeling of dominance is characterized by the absence of these feelings as well as by certain other positive characteristics. Philip reaffirmed

³⁵ A. H. Maslow, "Dominance-Feeling Behavior and Status," Psychological Review, XLIV (1937), pp. 404-429.

³⁶ Ibid., p. 407.

Maslow's findings concerning the identifiable components of low dominance-feeling and lists them as follows:

. . . uncertainty, lack of self-confidence, general inferiority, weakness, general admiration and respect for others rather than himself, a feeling of being, in a metaphorical sense, "below others," of being looked down upon, of wanting to be like some one else rather than oneself, of being dominated by others, of lack of faith in oneself and in one's abilities. He often feels shy, inhibited, timid, unworthy, self-conscious and embarrassed.³⁷

It can be concluded that individuals who manifest the types of behavior found by Allport to be indicators of the traits of dominance or submission, will also possess a syndrome of feelings similar to those offered by Maslow as symptoms of high dominance-feelings or low dominance-feelings.

It appears obvious that dominance-status must vary greatly from one situation to another, while dominance-feeling, being well generalized, is a more stable and characteristic part of the personality of the individual and thus is the basis for an identifiable dominant trait of behavior.

³⁷ Eisenber Philip, "Expressive Movements Related to Feeling of Dominance," Archives of Psychology, No. 221 (May, 1937), p. 7.

Chapter IV

PROCEDURE

The design of this exploratory study involved the investigation of the relationship between the goal of "striving for superiority" and attitudes toward clothing and clothing behavior. The variables included variations in individual tendencies toward personality traits of ascendancy-submission and opinions associated with attitudes toward clothing and clothing behavior. In planning the practical execution of this research design the investigator was limited by the scarcity of available reliable, behavioral measures concerning clothing and its implications for human behavior.

This chapter gives an account of the procedure followed in carrying out the study. The description includes: (1) selection and development of the measurements, (2) the pre-test, (3) the reliability of the developed instruments, (4) the final instruments, (5) the sample, (6) administration of the schedules, and (7) treatment of the data.

Selection and Development of Measurements

Three instruments were used to measure the variables in this study. These were: (a) Allport's Ascendance-Submission Reaction Study; (b) Opinions about Clothing Behavior, which was

developed for the purposes of this research; (c) Attitudes toward Clothing, an adaptation of a previously devised scale (not given to pre-test sample).

Ascendance-submission reaction study

The use of the Ascendance-Submission Reaction Study, hereafter designated as the A-S Study, has already been partly justified by Dr. Allport's rationale for developing the scale. It has also been established that a measure of the traits of ascendance and submission and/or the degree of dominance can be an indicator of "strivings for superiority" and/or feelings of superiority. It was decided that the A-S Study could be used as an adequate measure of these personality traits.

In building the A-S Study, Allport followed three criteria for identifying a personality trait; namely, the frequency with which a person adopts a certain type of adjustment, the range of situations in which he adopts this same mode of acting, and the intensity of his reactions in keeping with this "preferred pattern" of behavior.¹ Allport presents verbally a fairly large number of situations, in each of which the subject is required to select one of a group of standardized responses which most nearly characterizes his usual behavior in that situation. The author of the test explains that not all of the responses chosen will reveal an invariable ascendance or submission, for most people show both types of behavior at different times and under different conditions. Allport believes

¹Allport, op. cit., 1961, p. 340.

that the study has enough situations to detect which of these two types of reaction, if either, is the more characteristic; and the total score gives an expression of the dominance of the one or the other.

Further justification for using this scale can be found in its high internal reliability and its reliability through repeated use. Dr. Allport developed the A-S Study in 1928 and revised it somewhat in 1939. In his 1939 revision the author reports the split-half reliability for the Form for Men as .85 and for the Form for Women as .90. Repeat reliabilities range usually around .78 for both forms. At the time of the 1939 revision, Allport questioned the validity of the study because of the lack of suitable criterion for validation. He presumed, however, that the ultimate validity of the study would be established in its practical success in vocational guidance, clinical and personnel work, and other forms of personality study.²

The A-S Study has been used frequently since its development. Although more recent reliability figures were not found in the literature, other researchers have ascertained success with the A-S Study in differentiating individuals according to ascendancy-submission traits of personality. Some

²Gordon W. Allport and Floyd H. Allport, The A-S Reaction Study: A Scale for Measuring Ascendance-Submission in Personality, Manual of Directions, Scoring Values, and Norms (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1939), p. 13.

of the research completed in which this function of the study was assumed to be successful are as follows:

- (1) The Genesis and Constancy of Ascendance and Submission as Personality Traits.³
- (2) Ability, Perceptual Personality, and Interest Factors Associated with Different Criteria of Leadership.⁴
- (3) Relationships between College Aptitude and Discouragement-Buoyancy among College Freshman.⁵
- (4) Dominance in the Personality of the Student Nurse as Measured by the A-S Reaction Study.⁶
- (5) Two Forms of Social Conformity; Acquiescence and Conventionality.⁷
- (6) Personality Correlates of Independence and Conformity.⁸

The A-S Study was selected for use in this study since its validity and reliability have been proven through repeated use.

³Sister Mary Aquinas McLaughlin, "The Genesis and Constancy of Ascendance and Submission as Personality Traits," Studies in Education, 4, No. 5 (Dec. 1931).

⁴Carter, Launor, and Mison, "Ability, Perceptual Personality, and Interest Factors Associated with Different Criteria of Leadership," Journal of Psychology, 27 (Apr. 1949), pp. 377-388.

⁵Bernice S. Hornall, "Relationships between College Aptitude and Discouragement-Buoyancy among College Freshmen," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 74 (June, 1949), pp. 185-243.

⁶Alma P. Beaver, "Dominance in the Personality of the Student Nurse as Measured by the A-S Reaction Study," The Journal of Psychology, 38 (1954), pp. 73-78.

⁷H. Beloff, "Two Forms of Social Conformity: Acquiescence and Conventionality," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 56 (1958), pp. 99-104.

⁸Miriam E. Odell, "Personality Correlates of Independence and Conformity," (Master's thesis, The Ohio State University (1959).

Opinions about clothing behavior

Langner's theory that man uses clothing to demonstrate to others his feelings of superiority and his superior status was accepted as the basis for this investigation. Some means for identifying clothing behavior with feelings of superiority had to be devised since none was found in the literature. The formulated scale, Opinions about Clothing Behavior, seeks to differentiate those individuals who choose to wear clothes which will symbolize their feelings of superiority, their striving for superior positions, and who also identify other superior persons by their distinguishing dress, from those individuals who do not choose to wear clothes for such reasons. Subjects who indicate that they dress in such a distinguished manner are identified in this study hereafter as "distinguished dressers" and are defined as follows:

Distinguished Dresser--is an individual who indicates he dresses with an air of distinction, not only in the sense of dressing differently from others, but also in a manner which makes one seem superior or worthy of special recognition.

It is also assumed that those individuals who become distinguished dressers place higher importance on the social uses of clothing than persons who are not as distinguished in their appearance. Therefore, terms such as "clothing importance," "importance placed on clothing," and "attitudes toward clothing" accompanied with quantifying adjectives and adverbs are used interchangeably throughout this study to indicate the ranking of distinguished dressers.

The investigator attempted to build a reliable clothing scale using the same format as that used by Allport in his A-S Study. That is, to provide situations and statements dealing with attitudes toward the social and personal uses of clothes which might aid in placing subjects on a continuum from very distinguished dressers to less distinguished dressers or from high to low in terms of the presence or absence of preference for characteristics generally attributed to those who have a high regard for clothing. Many of the situations and statements used in the scale refer to the use of clothes as an aid in identifying other superior persons, the desire to advance one's social or professional position, personal reactions to others' mode of dress, and feelings of superiority in the sense of "uplift."

In building the scale, "Opinions about Clothing Behavior," Allport's three criteria for identifying a personality trait were considered. It was assumed, in the present scale, that the frequency with which a person adopts a certain type of attitude or behavior, the range of situations in which he adopts this same mode of behavior or attitude, and the intensity of his reactions in keeping with this "preferred pattern" of behavior would help to identify a respondent as a distinguished dresser. It was realized that not all the responses chosen would reveal an invariable distinguished dresser for many persons change their modes of dress at different times and under different conditions. It was believed that the final

scale had enough statistically reliable situations to detect a range of attitudes toward clothing and the total score identifies the more characteristic behavior. The subject was required to select from each of twenty-eight situations presented for pre-testing in the "Opinions about Clothing Behavior" scale, one of three responses which most nearly characterized his usual behavior in the situation. A score of three was assigned to the response designating the behavior most characteristic of the distinguished dresser, one to the response designating that most characteristic of the least distinguished dresser, and two to the response designating a clothing behavior between these two extremes. The criteria for assigning the scores to the specific responses for each situation presented in the scale were determined by:

- (1) the writer's estimation of the assumed clothing behavior and attitudes of persons designated as distinguished dressers and non-distinguished dressers.
- (2) the decisions made by the writer were then examined and discussed by five other persons: three professors of clothing and textiles, one woman doctoral candidate in fine arts, and one male master of science student in fine arts.

The Pre-Test

Only one of the three instruments used in this study was pre-tested for reliability through use with a pilot group. This was the "Opinions about Clothing Behavior" which was developed by the writer for the purposes of this study. The demonstrated

reliability of the A-S Study gave sufficient justification for its use. The decision to use the "Attitudes toward Clothing" scale was made after the pre-testing procedure.

Ninety members of the 4-H college group at The Ohio State University made up the pre-test population. Three of the ninety questionnaires were improperly completed leaving eighty-seven usable questionnaires for analysis. Of the thirty-four male respondents, twenty-eight were registered in the College of Agriculture. Of the fifty-three females, twenty-eight were registered in the School of Home Economics, fourteen in the College of Education, and the remaining in the School of Nursing, and the College of Liberal Arts.

It was realized that the pre-test sample was not representative of the university student population. However, due to the willingness of the group, and the pressure of time, the decision was made to use this group for pre-testing the Opinions about Clothing scale.

Reliability of the Developed Instruments and the Final Instruments

Reliability of the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale

The scales were scored and coded according to the assigned values for each item (see Appendix C). The data were then transferred to I.B.M. cards for ease of analysis. The thirty highest and the thirty lowest total scores for the twenty-eight items on the schedule were utilized as representative of the extreme high and low scores. Thus respondents were eliminated who appeared

to react to the scale with neither positive nor negative convictions and the minimum number of scores which would yield statistical significant relationships was obtained.

The criterion for the internal consistency of any test indicates whether the differentiation yielded by a given item is consistent in direction with that yielded by the total score.⁹ The internal consistency tests chosen to determine the most significant items on the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale were the Critical Ratio, Scale Value Difference (S.V.D.), Maximum Potential Scale Value Difference (M.P.S.V.D.), and the Scale Value Difference Ratio (S.V.D.R.). The critical ratio was the first internal consistency test used and items which had a Critical Ratio less than 2.0 were considered not significant and were eliminated immediately from the test. Ten items were thus eliminated leaving eighteen items with Critical Ratios ranging from 2.10 to 5.165 to be considered.

The second test for choosing the most significant items on the scale was the scale value difference ratio. This value is determined by utilizing the Maximum Potential Scale Value Difference (M.P.S.V.D.) which is the maximum discriminative value that a given item can attain if it is scored in any possible combination of items. In this study it was computed on the basis of responses in the three alternative response positions for a given item and a given group. The range of

⁹R. F. Sletto, Construction of Personality Scales by the Criterion of Internal Consistency (Hanover, N.H.: The Sociological Press, 1937), p. 2.

M.P.S.V.D.'s for the eighteen items on the scale was from .3996 to 1.6983 which shows that the items were fairly broad in their discriminating power. Three of these eighteen items were eliminated because their S.V.D.R.'s did not appear to discriminate the items sufficiently (see Appendix I for values of these tests).

Items within a scale must be tested in terms of the degree to which they test the same characteristic. This is determined by using one of the measures of reliability. The split-half method of reliability was used on the final fifteen items remaining in this scale. After dividing the odd and even number items the responses of the analysis sample were then tabulated. The Pearsonian Product Moment Formula¹⁰ was used to determine the coefficient of correlation between the two halves. The formula yielded a coefficient of correlation of .56. The Spearman Brown Correction Formula, adjusting the correlation to a full size scale, corrected the coefficient of correlation to .72. This level of reliability, although not high, appeared to give a satisfactory scale which would be sufficiently discriminating.

Attitudes toward Clothing scale

The decision to add the Attitudes toward Clothing scale to the study was made when the pre-test of the scale Opinions about Clothing Behavior failed to show a high level of reli-

¹⁰G. A. Ferguson, Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959), p. 92.

ability. It was believed that the addition of this second scale would aid in identifying distinguished dressers since it would also place respondents on a continuum according to his overall presence or absence of preference for the characteristics generally attributed to one who has a high regard for clothing.

The basic structure of this second scale was taken from one developed by Kittles¹¹ which when pre-tested on a sample of women college students had shown a reliability coefficient of .98 (this scale in Appendix J). As the investigator wished to develop a reliable scale which could be used for both men and women college students, the Kittles' scale was revised somewhat and lengthened. Of the twenty items on the Kittles' Likert type scale, five were deleted on the basis of not being suitable items for men respondents. Another fifteen items were added by the author bringing the final scale to thirty items (see Appendix E).

Kittles, in developing her scale, defined a high estimation of clothing importance as the personal attitudes of the individual with respect to her utilization of clothing as a symbol of status. As this dimension for building the scale was similar to that given for the development of "Opinions about Clothing Behavior," namely, that a distinguished dresser is defined as one who utilizes clothing as an indicator of

¹¹Emma L. Kittles, "The Importance of Clothing as a Status Symbol among College Students" (Ph.D. dissertation, School of Home Economics, The Ohio State University, 1961).

"striving for superiority," it was decided that an adaptation of the Kittles' scale could be used. It was also evident that the characteristics upon which the basic assumption of the Kittles' scale were formulated were similar to those incorporated into the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale. The latter characteristics were:

1. Personal reactions to others' mode of dress.
2. Advancing one's social or professional position.
3. Use of clothes as an aid in identifying other superior persons and for determining first impressions of others.
4. Feelings of importance and feelings of superiority in the sense of "uplift."

Other characteristics of the final scale which were part of the Kittles' scale are:

1. Placing attractiveness of clothing above that of comfort.
2. Desirous of wearing fashionable clothes.
3. Judging socio-economic status through clothing.

It has already been noted that the attitude scale under discussion was developed by the Likert technique.¹² This technique of scale building is a technique of summated ratings and internal consistency. Each item on the scale calls for a response by checking one of five words such as "definitely true," "partially true," "undecided," "partially false," and "definitely false." In such a five-point continuum weights of 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, or 5, 4, 3, 2, 1 are assigned in proper order to the several expressions, the direction of the weighting being determined by the favorableness or unfavorableness of the statement.

¹²Pauline V. Young, Scientific Social Surveys and Research (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956), pp. 333-34.

In the present attitude scale one was used as a measure of the strongest response for a low estimation of clothing importance, and a weight of five represented the strongest response for a high estimation of clothing importance. The total score is found by adding the values of the checked statements.

The split-half reliability coefficient for this scale ($N = 372$) was .878. For further evaluation of this scale see Chapter V, p. 56.

The Final Instruments

The final battery of measures consisted of the Ascendance-Submission Reaction Study, the Opinions about Clothing Behavior, and Attitudes toward Clothing. Since the A-S Study is a standardized and copyrighted scale, permission was granted by the author and the publisher for the duplication and use of this measure by the investigator.¹³ This measure is included in Appendix A. A copy of the Opinions about Clothing Behavior appears in Appendix D and a copy of Attitudes toward Clothing is presented in Appendix E.

The Sample

The research universe consisted of male and female college students who were registered in Sociology 401 and Sociology 507 classes during the fall quarter, 1962, at The Ohio State University. This group of students was selected because

¹³ Permission to duplicate the A-S Reaction Study was granted by Dr. Gordon W. Allport, and Houghton Mifflin Co., Boston, Mass.

of its accessibility and because it formed a captive audience on a specific day. The above named courses are basic social science courses for undergraduate students, therefore, are considered to contain a cross section of the undergraduate students registered at The Ohio State University. It was assumed that these students were representative of the student body.

This assumption proved only partially true when the percentage of freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors represented in the total sample were compared to the percentage of these class ranks in the total undergraduate enrollment of the university during Spring Quarter, 1962.

The percentage of freshmen and juniors represented in the total sample is almost identical with the percentage of freshmen and juniors represented in the total undergraduate population (see Table 1). The lower percentage of seniors represented in the total sample may be due to the fact that most seniors fulfilled the requirements of these lower level courses before their senior year. Sociology 507 is a required course for all sophomore Liberal Arts students which may partially account for the larger percentage of sophomore students in the sample than in the total undergraduate enrollment.

A comparison of the percentage of female and male students in each class rank in the sample with that in the total undergraduate enrollment, shows an even greater discrepancy in representation (see Table 2).

Table 1.--Percentage of each class rank represented in the total sample and in the total undergraduate enrollment

Class Rank	Sample		University	
	Number (N=372)	Percent- age	Number (N=20340) ^a	Percent- age
Freshmen	126	34	6730	33
Sophomores	157	42	4833	24
Juniors	75	20	3996	20
Seniors	14	4	3530	17
Others	--	--	1251	6

^aThese numbers were taken from the Annual Report of the Registrar and University Examiner, The Ohio State University, 1961-1962, p. 51.

Table 2.--Percentage distribution of students in sample and in the undergraduate enrollment by sex and class level

Class Rank	Percentage of Females in		Percentage of Males in	
	Total Sample (N=132)	Total Enrollment (N=7109)	Total Sample (N=240)	Total Enrollment (N=13231)
Freshmen	83	37 ^a	17	63 ^a
Sophomores	66	35	35	65
Juniors	40	34	60	67
Seniors	20	35	80	64

^aCalculations from numbers enrolled as listed in the Annual Report of the Registrar and University Examiner, The Ohio State University, 1961-1962, p. 51.

The proportion of female freshmen and sophomores in the total sample is much larger than in the total enrollment for each of these class ranks. On the other hand, the percentage of freshmen and sophomore male students in the sample was much smaller than that represented in their respective universes. The percentage of juniors and seniors in the total sample for both female and male students was nearer to the percentage in each of these categories in the total undergraduate population.

These differences in male and female representations according to class rank may be due to the fact that a larger proportion of the women than men students are enrolled in the types of curricula requiring the social sciences. This explanation appears to have some support in that: (1) 40 per cent of the total sample were registered with the College of Education, 50 per cent of whom were female students and 22 per cent male students; and (2) 12 per cent of the female sample were enrolled in the School of Home Economics but only one male student was enrolled in the College of Agriculture.

Administration of the Schedules

The three schedules used in the study were administered to a total of 395 students in six different classes (four Sociology 401, two Sociology 507) from December 6 to 13, 1962. The schedules were administrated during the regular scheduled class time and took approximately one-half hour to complete. As the instructions accompanying the schedules were clear and concise, little verbal explanation was needed.

Treatment of the Data

This discussion includes (1) scoring methods and coding of the data, and (2) statistical methods of data interpretation.

The A-S Study was scored according to the values recommended in the manual of instructions.¹⁴ The total score was calculated for each respondent, coded and transferred to the I.B.M. card. Quartile divisions of the total scores were calculated in preparation for testing the hypotheses basic to the study.

Methods of scoring both clothing scales have already been discussed. The score assigned to each item of these two scales was coded and transferred to each respondent's I.B.M. card. Split-half reliability coefficient of correlation for both scales, were calculated. In addition, critical ratios were determined for each item on the Attitudes toward Clothing scale. This statistical measure indicated which items in the scale were sufficiently differentiating to retain for future use of the scale.

Background information concerning the respondents collected on the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale, was coded and recorded on the I.B.M. cards for further accumulative data describing the character of the sample. The coding instructions for the study are presented in Appendix H.

¹⁴Gordon W. Allport and Floyd H. Allport, The A-S Reaction Study: Manual of Directions, Scoring and Norms. 2nd Revised Edition (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1939).

Statistical methods of
data interpretation

The statistical measure of correlation coefficient was used to determine if an association existed between ascendance-submission and distinguished dressers. Correlation is concerned with describing the relation between the variables and takes values from -1 to +1. A value of -1 describes a perfect negative relation and a value of +1 describes a perfect positive relation. A value of zero describes the absence of a relation, therefore, the further the value deviates from zero the more significant is the relation. The Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient was the measure used for this purpose.

The analysis of variance was used to test the significance of the differences between the means of a number of different samples. The indication of a variable relating significantly to the difference was determined by use of the t test and the F test. These formulas test the hypothesis that the regression coefficient equals zero; therefore, all the hypotheses were converted to null hypotheses to ascertain their acceptance or rejection. Formulas for the statistical tests used in this study are presented in Appendix L.

Chapter V

FINDINGS

Responses collected during the fall quarter 1962 from 372 college students comprised the data for the study. These findings are presented in the following sequence: (1) descriptive findings concerning participants, (2) ascendance-submission norms, (3) reliability of the clothing scales, (4) variance of means of scores on clothing scales for total sample according to sex, and (5) correlation between ascendance-submission and distinguished dressers.

Descriptive Findings Concerning Participants

Information concerning age, college class rank, college affiliation, and sex were background factors collected. Of the 395 respondents who filled in the schedules, 142 were males and 253 were females. Ten schedules returned by male respondents and thirteen schedules returned by female respondents were rejected because of improper completion. Therefore, the 372 schedules retained for analysis consisted of those completed by 132 males and 240 females.

The age range of 96.75 per cent of the 372 subjects was from 17 to 22 years. Ninety-four per cent of the 132 males in the sample were between the ages of 18 and 22; the remaining 6

per cent were between 23 and 27 years of age. The 240 females ranged in age from 17 to 40 years with 98.3 per cent in the age group 17 to 22 and the remainder in the 23 to 26 age group. One female student was 40 years of age. The class rank distribution showed approximately 23 per cent of the sample to be freshmen, 42 per cent sophomores, 20 per cent juniors, and 4 per cent seniors. The frequency and percentage distributions of male and female subjects by class rank are presented in the following table.

Table 3---Frequency and percentage distributions of males and females by class rank

Class Rank	Male		Female		Total	
	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage	Number	Percentage
Freshmen	22	17	104	43	126	34
Sophomores	54	41	103	43	157	42
Juniors	45	34	30	13	75	20
Seniors	11	9	3	2	14	4
Totals	132		240		372	

Table 4 shows that the College of Education and the College of Arts and Sciences had considerably larger representation than the other colleges. The largest proportion of the male students were registered in the College of Arts and Sciences while the largest proportion of the female students were registered in the College of Education. There was almost equal distribution of male and female students in the College of Commerce.

Table 4.--Frequency and percentage distribution of subjects' college affiliation

College	Male		Female		Male & Female	
	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age	Number	Percent-age
Agr.	1	1	29 ^a	12	30	8
Arts & Sc.	64	48	59	25	123	33
Commerce	31	23	26	11	57	15
Education	29	22	122	51	151	41
Eng.	7	5	0	0	7	2
Dentistry	0	0	2	1	2	0
Sc. of Nursing	0	0	2	1	2	0
Total	132		240		372	

^aThese students were registered in the School of Home Economics which is in the College of Agriculture.

Ascendance-Submission Norms

Each response-choice checked in the various situations presented in the A-S Study is considered as having a diagnostic value. This value indicates ascendance or submission according to the score-values assigned by Allport. A plus score indicates responses which show ascendance; a minus score denotes submissive reactions. A few responses have no diagnostic value either way. These are given a value of zero. The final score is the algebraic sum of the scores for the separate items. The possible range of scores for men is from +81 to -79 and for women +77 to -81. A score of zero for both men and women is considered a null attitude, therefore, mean scores for men and women can be compared

when observing the tendency of each sex for ascendancy-submission. The A-S mean score for the 132 males in the study was +0.053 and for the 240 women +2.846. Females, for this group of college students, have a tendency to be more ascendant or dominant in their personalities than men but this difference was not significant (see Table 6). The direction of this tendency coincides with that found by Allport in his 1928 study, which was based on 2578 college male students and 600 female college students. The A-S mean score for the men in that study was -0.01 and for women +4.75.

The A-S scores for both men and women were divided into quartile divisions in order to ascertain their degrees of ascendancy-submission. The two middle quartile groups which indicated slight tendencies to either ascendancy or submission were considered "average" in personality as far as these traits are concerned. The first quartile represents those persons with extreme traits of ascendancy and the fourth quartile represents those subjects manifesting low ascendancy or extreme submissiveness. The range of scores for each quartile division is presented in the following table.

Although the male scores ranged from +56 to -47, there was only one score above +40 and one score below -37. The female scores ranged from +47 to -49 with three scores above +40 and five scores below -37. It appears that for this sample individual men are more likely to reach the extreme in ascendancy

but as a group they seem more submissive than females; however, this variance is not significant (see Table 6).

Table 5.--Quartile scores of the A-S Study for men and women

Quartile	Degree of Ascendance-Submission	Form for Men	Form for Women
1	A-2	+56 ^a to +13	+47 ^a to +15
2	A-1) Avg.	+12 to -1	+14 to +3
3	S-1)	-2 to -12	+2 to -6
4	S-2	-13 to -47 ^a	-7 to -49 ^a

^aExtreme values actually obtained with the A-S Reaction Study in the present study.

Table 6.--Means, standard deviations, and t test for ascendance-submission and clothing scales by sex

	Males		Females		
	Mean (n=132)	St. Dev. (n=132)	Mean (n=240)	St. Dev. (n=240)	t Test ^a
A-S Study	.053	18.09	2.846	17.92	1.00
Attitudes toward clothing	95.674	15.25	99.78	13.054	1.88
Opinions about clothing behavior	32.03	4.009	33.85	33.602	3.13 ^b

^aLevel of confidence for acceptance or rejection of t values are based on confidence values for a two-tailed test.

^b0.01 level of confidence ($t=2.576$).

Reliability of Scales

Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale

Even though the reliability coefficient of .72 for the scale Opinions about Clothing Behavior was accepted after pre-testing, it was decided to test the consistency of this reliability level on the larger sample. The split-half correlation between scores of the odd and even numbered items on this scale was 0.39 and 0.56 with the Spearman-Brown correction formula. This reliability level indicated that all the items on the scale apparently do not test the same behavior factor. The investigator believes that since some of the items are subjective in nature they probably test personality traits and feelings while other items test objective attitudes toward clothing or opinions concerning clothing behavior. Items representing such a variance of attitudes could account for the low reliability of the scale. However, a t of 3.13, which is significant above the 0.01 level, indicates for the total sample that this scale differentiates attitudes between college men and women.

Attitudes toward Clothing scale

As this scale was not pre-tested for reliability it was necessary to establish this before proceeding with the testing of the hypotheses. The split-half reliability test using the Pearsonian Product-Moment formula was used to determine the coefficient of correlation of .783 and the Spearman Brown Correction formula corrected this to .878 ($N=372$). The coefficient

of correlation of .90 is considered very good in differentiating between individuals, therefore, the correlation coefficient calculated from data on this scale was accepted with confidence.

The Critical Ratio was also calculated for each item on the Attitudes toward Clothing scale to determine if a significant difference existed between the scores of the extreme quartiles on that particular item. In this way those items which were not differentiating the segments could be eliminated before any future use of the scale. Item twenty-one and item twenty-four proved to have Critical Ratios below 3.0. With the cutting point established at this level, twenty-eight of the thirty items remained with Critical Ratios ranging from 3.98 to 14.28 (see Appendix K). It was decided that the scale under discussion was sufficiently reliable to use as a means for differentiating distinguished dressers, therefore, it could be used in testing the hypotheses of this study.

Variance of Means of Scores on
Clothing Scales for Total
Sample According to Sex

Women in the sample scored higher on both clothing scales than the men indicating that women college students tend to be the more distinguished dressers (see Table 6). The possible range of scores on the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale was 15 to 45 and the mean score for all the men in the sample was 32.03 and for all the women 33.85. The t test of variance between these mean scores was highly significant above the 0.01

level. It must be remembered that this scale proved to be less reliable than the Attitudes toward Clothing scale in differentiating distinguished dressers. However, it not only revealed the same results as the latter scale in that the total women in the sample obtained a higher mean score than the men, but its apparent ability to differentiate the attitudes of men and women is of great import. Whether these attitudes are concerned only with clothing behavior or also with some other unobservable variable inserted into the scale is not clear.

The possible range of scores on the Attitudes toward Clothing scale was 30 to 150. The mean score for men on this scale was 95.67 and for women 99.78. The t test of variance between these means of scores was not significant.

From these findings it appears that women college students of this sample tend to be more ascendant than men college students and they place significantly more importance on clothing than the men students.

Correlation between Ascendance-Submission and Distinguished Dressers

The Pearsonian coefficient of correlation was used to determine what association, if any, existed between the variables ascendance-submission and distinguished dressers. Negative correlations were evidenced as shown in Table 7. These negative correlations indicated that an association existed between submissiveness and distinguished dressers which was the direct opposite association of that hypothesized. However, this

relationship was not significant for men students on either of the clothing scales or for women students on the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale. Findings from the Attitudes toward Clothing scale showed that for women students the association between submissiveness and distinguished dressers was significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 7.--Coefficient of correlation between ascendance-submission and distinguished dressers by sex

	Clothing Scales	
	Attitude toward Clothing	Opinions about Clothing Behavior
Male (n = 132)	-0.16	-0.16
Female (n = 240)	-0.24 ^a	-0.13

^a0.05 level of confidence ($r = .205$).

Analysis of Variance between the Means of
Scores on the Clothing Scales by
Quartile Groups on the A-S
Study and by Sex

Four hypotheses were established for the purposes of the study. The following discussion will relate the data to these hypotheses. The two measures, Opinions about Clothing Behavior and Attitudes toward Clothing were used to determine the extent to which college students, with varying strengths of the traits ascendance-submission, differ in their attitudes toward clothing and/or as distinguished dressers. The analysis of the data from the two clothing measures in relation to the personality traits under discussion and to sex are presented in Tables 8 and 9.

Table 8.--Means of scores from Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale by groups on the A-S Study and by sex

	Male	Female	t Test ^e
High A-S	30.58 (n=33)	33.35 (n=60)	3.32 ^b
Avg. A-S	32.70 (n=63)	34.83 (n=118)	2.11 ^c
Low A-S	32.19 (n=36)	34.16 (n=62)	2.66 ^d
t test high-low A-S	1.37	1.24	
F test 3 A-S groups	3.18 ^a	0.85	

$$^a F_{05} = 2.68$$

$$^b t_{005} = 2.576$$

$$^c t_{05} = 1.65$$

$$^d t_{01} = 2.36$$

^eLevel of confidence for acceptance or rejection of t values in Tables 8 and 9 was based on confidence levels for a one-tailed test.

Table 9.--Means of scores from Attitudes toward Clothing scale by groups on the A-S Study and by sex

	Male	Female	t Test
High A-S	91.27 (n=33)	95.73 (n=60)	1.42
Avg. A-S	97.65 (n=63)	99.96 (n=118)	1.11
Low A-S	96.25 (n=36)	103.35 (n=62)	2.49 ^c
t test high-low A-S	1.37	3.63 ^b	
F test 3 A-S groups	1.96	5.41 ^a	

$$^a F_{01} = 3.95$$

$$^b t_{0005} = 3.29$$

$$^c t_{01} = 2.36$$

Hypothesis I. There is a significant difference between the clothing behavior of persons who are identified as extremely ascendant and the clothing behavior of persons who are identified as extremely submissive.

The Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale revealed no significant difference between the clothing behavior of men and women who were identified as extreme ascendants and those identified as extreme submissives. The Attitudes toward Clothing scale revealed a similar result for men but disclosed a significant difference well above the 0.0005 level between women in these two A-S groups. Hypothesis I, therefore, was not confirmed for the group of college men in the sample but was confirmed for the group of college women on the basis of the Attitudes toward Clothing scale. Although the difference between the clothing attitudes of male ascendants and male submissives was not significant, there was a slight difference as indicated by a t of 1.37 as shown on both Table 8 and 9.

Hypotheses II. Persons who are extremely ascendant are more distinguished dressers than persons who are extremely submissive.

This hypothesis was rejected for the reverse of this association was found to be true. The more significant relationship between distinguished dressers and extreme submission rather than extreme ascendancy was manifested by the means of clothing scores of men and women students in these two A-S groups (see Tables 8 and 9). The means of scores of the extreme submissives, male and female, are higher on both clothing scales than those of the extreme ascendants. An analysis of variance

of these means of clothing scores proved significant only for the female students in their response to the Attitudes toward Clothing scale. The t test in this instance was significant at the .0005 level (one-tailed test).

These findings strongly suggest, that both men and women college students who are extremely submissive in personality tend to be more distinguished dressers than those who are extremely ascendant.

Hypothesis III. Persons who are "average" in that they do not indicate strong tendencies toward either ascendancy or submission, are also "average" in terms of distinguished dressers.

This hypothesis was upheld for the female "average" A-S group on the Attitudes toward Clothing scale but was not supported by the male segment of this group on either of the scales or by the females of this group on the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale. "Average" distinguished dressers were identified when the means of clothing scores of the "average" A-S group, male and female, fell approximately half way between the means of clothing scores of the two extreme A-S groups. This condition was evidenced only for women students of the "average" A-S group in their responses to the Attitudes toward Clothing scale (see Table 9). Their mean score was 99.96 in comparison to the mean score of the extreme ascendants of 95.73 and that of the extreme submissives of 103.35. The F test of 5.41 indicated a significant ($0.01 = 3.95$) difference between the degree of importance placed on clothing by women in the three A-S groups. It can be concluded, on the basis of the reliability of the Attitudes

toward Clothing scale, that college women who are "average" in regard to the traits of ascendancy-submission, are also moderate in their clothing behavior as compared to college women who manifest more extreme tendencies to these personality traits.

The above finding from the Attitudes toward Clothing scale was not confirmed by the data collected from the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale. The clothing mean score of 34.83 for the "average" A-S women on this scale was approximately the same as that of the extreme submissive group of women which was 34.16. The F test of 0.85, calculated from the means of scores of the three A-S groups of women subjects, was not significant. This finding further supports the possibility that the scale Opinions about Clothing Behavior does not differentiate attitudes toward clothing (or some other variable) within the same sex to the extent that it differentiates attitudes between the sexes.

The male students who participated in the present study and who were identified as "average" in their tendencies to ascendancy-submission, scored slightly higher on both the clothing scales than the male extreme submissives and somewhat higher than the extreme ascendants. The mean score of the "average" A-S group on the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale was 32.70, for the extreme submissives 32.19, and for the extreme ascendants 30.58. On the Attitudes toward Clothing scale these means of scores for these A-S groups were respectively 97.65, 96.25, and 91.27. An F value of 3.18 on the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale for the male respondents

in the three A-S groups was significant above the 5 per cent level ($0.05 = 2.68$). This finding was important in that the difference between males who were extremely ascendant and males who were extremely submissive was not significant. This result appears to indicate that there is greater variance in attitude toward clothing between extreme ascendancy and tendencies to ascendancy and/or submission than between extreme ascendancy and extreme submissives. This trend was also perceived for male subjects on comparing the means of their scores on the scale Attitudes toward Clothing. However, the F test for this example was not significant nor was there a significance difference between the mean score of the extreme ascendant group and that of the extreme submissive group was significant.

In summarizing the findings from the data in relation to Hypothesis III it can be concluded that men college students of the universe represented who are "average" in their tendencies to ascendancy-submission place as much or more importance on clothing than those male students who are extremely submissive and somewhat more importance than those male students who are extremely ascendant. As the differences of attitudes toward clothing of male students identified with the three A-S groups were not significant, "average" distinguished dressers for the male student universe cannot be defined. Data from the Attitudes toward Clothing scale, however, contributed to the clarification of this definition for the female student universe. It appears that as women students move from low ascendancy or

extreme submission to extreme ascendancy, they become significantly less distinguishing in their dress. In other words, the stronger the trait of submission in the female personality, the greater importance she places on clothing and/or the greater is her conversion to a distinguished dresser. The "average" female distinguished dresser, therefore, might be recognized in relation to the moderation of the traits ascendancy-submission in her personality.

Hypothesis IV. There is no significant difference between men and women in relation to hypothesis II and hypothesis III.

Hypothesis II stated that persons who are extremely ascendant are more distinguished dressers than those persons who are extremely submissive. However, the reverse of this statement was found to be true for both men and women college students. That is, distinguished dressers were correlated more with the submissive type of personality than with the ascendant type of personality. Interpretation of the data, therefore, will proceed on the acceptance of this finding.

Hypothesis IV purports that men and women who manifest the same extreme A-S trait place about equal importance on clothing resulting in similar clothing behavior. This supposition was not substantiated by the extreme submissives as the difference between the attitudes of men and women toward clothing was significant for this group. The difference between the means of clothing scores of men and women in the extreme submissive group revealed a t of 2.66 on the Opinions about

Clothing Behavior scale and a t of 2.49 on the Attitudes toward Clothing scale both of which were significant above the 0.01 level of confidence ($0.01 = 2.36$). The significantly higher means of clothing scores for college women of the A-S group under discussion support the fact that they regarded clothing as more important than male college students who exhibited this extreme submissive trait.

Data collected on the Attitudes toward Clothing scale confirmed that there was no significant difference between the clothing attitudes of men and women who were extremely ascendant in personality. The higher mean clothing score of the ascendant women indicated that they are considerably more distinguished in their dress than ascendant men as shown by a t of 1.42 which was close to significance at the 0.05 level. However, the difference between the means of scores for men and women of the extreme ascendancy group on the Opinions toward Clothing Behavior scale show a t of 3.32 which was significant above the .005 level ($.005 = 2.57$).

Because of the apparent ability of the Attitudes toward Clothing scale to distinguish extreme attitudes toward clothing, Hypothesis IV was accepted for the extreme ascendant group. That is, the clothing behavior of women college students who exhibit a strong ascendant trait do not differ significantly in the importance they place on clothing and/or as distinguished dressers from men college students who exhibit this same trait. This finding was also accepted for the "average" A-S group in the

study. The variance between the means of clothing scores of men and women of this group was not significant on the Attitudes toward Clothing scale but was significant at the 0.05 level on the Opinions about Clothing scale.

Hypothesis IV also stated that both men and women who are "average" in that they do not indicate strong tendencies toward either ascendancy or submission are also "average" in terms of distinguished dressers. This postulate was rejected on the basis of the data collected from the Attitudes toward Clothing scale. The specific analysis of differences between men and women college students in reference to Hypothesis III has already been stated. It is sufficient to summarize here. Women college students in the sample who disclosed that their tendencies to ascendancy-submission were "average" also indicated, on the Attitudes toward Clothing scale, that the importance they place on clothes was moderate in comparison to the lesser importance placed on clothes by the female extreme ascendants and the greater importance placed on clothes by the extreme submissives.

Men college students in the sample who identified themselves with the "average" A-S group indicated on the same scale that they tend to place as much or more importance on clothing as the men students who were extremely submissive and somewhat more importance than those who were extremely ascendant. "Average" distinguished dressers among the male students, therefore, were not discernable but they were clearly discernable among the female students.

Chapter VI

DISCUSSION AND INTERPRETATION OF FINDINGS

Interpretations of the underlying facts as revealed by the data in the present study are discussed in this chapter in relation to other theoretical suppositions, and empirical findings and Lawrence Langner's thesis which formed the core of the present study.

First, and most important, the data revealed that college students who manifested tendencies to a submissive personality generally regarded clothing as more important than those college students who exhibited tendencies to an ascendant personality. Submissive persons, therefore, are designated as more distinguishing in their dress than individuals who are ascendant in personality. In other words, those college students who exhibit tendencies to self-assertiveness, aggressiveness, hold themselves in high esteem, are counter-suggestible, and who express a high degree of self-confidence place less importance on clothing and/or wear clothing which is less distinguishing than those college students who are open to persuasibility, are dominated by others, lack self-confidence, feel self-conscious, hold themselves in low esteem, and imitate the behavior of others. This finding substantiates Simmel's theoretical explanation of

the relationship between fashion and personality. He expresses the idea this way:

Fashion also supplements a person's lack of importance, his inability to individualize his existence purely by his own unaided efforts, by enabling him to join a set characterized and singled out in the public consciousness by fashion alone. Here also, to be sure, the personality as such is reduced to a general formula, yet this formula itself, from a social standpoint, possesses an individual tinge, and thus makes up through the social way what is denied to the personality in a purely individual way.¹

Treese also hypothesized in her theoretical study that individuals in defending themselves would attempt to present clothing as a means of conveying this impression to others.² However, from this reasoning she further hypothesized that the more highly one holds the self in a position of esteem, the greater would be the importance which one would attach to clothing. This statement does not concur with that of Simmel's (above) or with the findings from the present study which indicated that submissive persons, who have been found to hold the self in lower esteem than ascendant persons, place higher importance on clothing.

Conclusions drawn from the empirical studies of Hurlock,³ Silverman,⁴ and Ryan⁵ inferred that being well dressed bolsters self-esteem and/or self confidence of adolescent girls.

¹ Simmel, op. cit., p. 145.

² Treese, op. cit.

³ Hurlock, op. cit.

⁴ Silverman, op. cit.

⁵ Ryan, op. cit.

If those college students in the present study who identified themselves as being more submissive than ascendant in personality are striving to overcome their lack of self-confidence and to elevate their self-esteem, then the greater importance they place on clothing substantiates the findings of the above mentioned studies.

The clothing studies by Lapitsky⁶ and Ditty⁷ revealed somewhat similar findings even though the terms they used to describe secure-insecure persons and social role adjustment differed. Their findings generally indicated that persons who are socially secure use apparel as an expression of the self and that socially insecure persons regard clothing more as a means of social approval, conformity, and social role adjustment. If high self-esteem and self-confidence are behavior characteristics of the socially secure individual, and low self-esteem and self-confidence are characteristics of the insecure individual, as they appear to be, then the findings of the present study infer similar interpretations to those of Laptisky and Ditty in that those persons who supposedly expressed feelings of low self-esteem and/or extreme submissiveness placed high importance on the social use of clothing.

The second most important finding in the present study was that the variance of importance placed on clothing by women students in the three A-S groups was significant, but this variance was not significant between men students in these A-S

⁶Lapitsky, op. cit.

⁷Ditty, op. cit.

categories. Women students in the three A-S groups consistently scored higher as distinguished dressers than men students in the same A-S groups. The fact that women generally have a tendency to place greater importance on clothing than men is partially derived from the traditions of our culture. The socialization of children and young adults by parents, the community, and the fashion industry encourages girls more than boys to devote time, money, and care to their dress and physical enhancement.

Simmel offers another somewhat straightforward explanation to this phenomenon. He feels that because women as well as men need ways of expressing their desire for conspicuousness and individual prominence, they generally take advantage of this socially accepted means of doing so. Man, because he is the more many-sided creature, is allowed more ways of satisfying his psychological needs, thus can get along better without such outward changes provided by dress.⁸

Simmel's hypothetical explanation of the variance in clothing behavior between men and women appears particularly apropos in interpreting the findings from the present study. The greatest difference between the attitudes of men and women toward clothing appeared in the greater importance placed on clothing by the extremely submissive women than the extremely submissive men. This finding strongly indicated that the behavior characteristics associated with extreme submissiveness are dominant motivating factors underlying women's choice of the clothes they wear.

⁸ Simmel, op. cit., p. 145.

Because submissive persons tend to be dominated rather than to dominate, it is generally thought that they rely more on social status and material acquisitions as a means of expressing their desire for superiority. This impression is implied by Krech and Crutchfield when they state that prestige, as a factor of self-assertive behavior, is partially derived from one's material possessions.⁹ As clothing is recognized in our society as a social symbol and because it is socially accepted for women to regard clothing highly, clothing can become a powerful tool for women in acquiring superior status. It is generally agreed that men become more absorbed in careers than women and as a result enter a relatively uniform class in which they resemble many others. It is assumed that in this social-occupational class the behavior characteristics associated with extreme submissiveness are more dominant motivating factors underlying men's choices of behavior in other areas of life than in the area of clothing choices.

A third finding of the study indicated that men and women college students who were extremely ascendant placed the least importance on clothing. Although ascendant women considered clothing more important than ascendant men this variance of attitude was not significant. It is possible that this difference stems more from the effects of different socialization of the sexes than from the greater use of clothing by ascendant women for specific role adjustment or as an expression

⁹Krech and Crutchfield, op. cit., p. 284.

of social status. Persons who are extremely dominant in personality exhibit behavior characteristics contrary to those exhibited by extremely submissive persons; therefore, it is assumed that in their drive for superiority they do not compensate their anxieties by the same outward means as the extremely submissive group, thus their lower emphasis on clothing.

The results of much social research reports that the behavior of individuals who acquire moderate traits of personality fluctuates to the extent that it is difficult to predicate their future behavior. This may have some bearing on the fact that men college students who manifested "average" tendencies to ascendancy-submission did not reveal an "average" attitude in terms of distinguished dressers. Women college students within this same A-S group, however, indicated that they were definitely "average" as distinguished dressers in relation to those women in the two extreme A-S groups. An explanation of this variance of attitudes between men and women may also be in the difference in the clarity of the role that clothing plays in the social lives of men and women as well as in their psychological differences. The role of clothing, as stated previously, is more clearly defined for women through the socialization process than for men.

In further explanation of the differences of attitudes toward clothing by men and women, Gregory Stone found from his study that men and women seem to be envolved differently; men placed greater saliency on value when choosing clothes while

women placed greater saliency on mood. Stone suggests from this finding that

It may well be, although our data cannot support the contention, that a fundamental basis of sex differences inheres precisely in these different lines of involvement.¹⁰

In conclusion, it can be said that people generally assign to women a distinctive interest in clothing. The resignation on the part of men to this interest and the appropriation on the part of women of this interest serves as a further guarantee of sexual differentiation.

Relation of Findings to Langner's Thesis

It was concluded on the outset of this study that Langner's thesis connoted that man demonstrates to others his striving for superiority over others by choosing to wear distinguishing clothes. It was also decided that the extreme personality trait of dominance would serve as an indicator of this goal for superiority. The hypothesis stated, therefore, that extremely ascendant individuals place more importance on clothing and/or are more distinguishing in their dress than the extremely submissive individuals. This hypothesis was proven, by the data of the present study, to be reversed for the college students in the sample.

Langner, in applying Adler's theory of human behavior to man's use of clothes, referred more to the behavior of men collectively within a society and not specifically to individual

¹⁰ Stone, op. cit., p. 250.

behavior. Adler believed that striving for superiority was the goal of all human behavior but that the means of achieving superiority varied for individuals. Langner discussed clothes as a means of demonstrating the desire for superiority and did not raise the question that individual variance in personality traits may influence the choice of other means for satisfying this goal. Nor did he suggest the possibility that in our society individuals with certain personality traits would exhibit greater need for expressing their feelings of superiority through clothes than others. It is not surprising, therefore, that when applying Langner's general assumptions to a specific group of individuals in relation to their personality traits, anticipated relationships may be reversed.

From the above discussion it can be assumed that the means of achieving superiority for ascendants is on a different level than that of the submissives. It may be that the goal of the striving for ascendants is that of "power" and that of the submissives "social status." Several clothing research studies which dealt with the relationship between social mobility and clothing importance agreed that individuals striving for higher social status usually placed greater value on clothing than those individuals who do not. If the above assumption is true, that submissive persons have as their goal "social status," then the findings from this study confirm the relationship between social status and clothing importance. Ascendant persons, on the other hand, apparently striving for superiority over people

and ideas, find other means of demonstrating to others the goal of their striving. They, therefore, rely less on the symbolism of clothing for this purpose.

It can be concluded, according to Adler, that both extremely submissive persons and extremely ascendant persons have as their goal superiority but the means of obtaining superiority varies for the two groups. Differences in individual personality traits apparently have some influence on the means chosen by various individuals for achieving superiority. One of the means chosen to gain recognition by persons exhibiting an extreme submissive personality appears to be that of placing importance on clothing and thus becoming a distinguished dresser.

Chapter VII

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

This research was undertaken to determine if Langner's thesis that man demonstrates to others his "striving for superiority" by choosing to wear distinguishing clothes holds true for college men and women within our modern society. Langner's connotation of "striving for superiority" was interpreted by the writer as a striving for superiority over others. The trait of dominance, therefore, which is the tendency toward self assertiveness and ascendancy, was chosen as the indicator of the goal of superiority and Gordon W. Allport's Ascendance-Submission Reaction Study was chosen as the measure of this trait.

Two clothing scales were developed to determine the extent to which male and female students who identified themselves as extremely ascendant, "average" in the traits of ascendancy-submission, or extremely submissive, differed in their attitudes toward clothing importance and/or as distinguished dressers. After pre-testing the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale, the clothing items incorporated into the final schedule gave a level of reliability sufficiently high for the scale to be differentiating.

The second clothing scale utilized was the Attitudes toward Clothing scale. As this scale was revised from an existing scale which had proved reliable in differentiating women college students' attitudes toward clothing importance, pre-testing this scale was not undertaken. Reliability tests were rerun on both of these clothing scales after their administration to the sample of the study. The reliability for the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale dropped to .56 in this final analysis. However, data from this scale were utilized in testing the hypotheses and the statistical analyses obtained were compared with those calculated from data collected on the Attitudes toward Clothing scale. The reliability of the latter scale proved to be statistically good as did 28 of the 30 items which made up the scale.

The sample used in this investigation was composed of 240 women students and 132 men students enrolled in specified sociology courses at The Ohio State University during the fall quarter, 1962. The students represented an age range of 17 to 27 years, all class levels, and seven different colleges of the University.

The findings from the Ascendance-Submission Study disclosed that the women college students tended to be more ascendant in personality than the men college students. Both the correlations of the variables ascendance-submission and distinguished dressers, and the means of clothing scores of men and women identified with the three A-S groups, evidenced

association between the trait of submission and distinguished dressers. This relationship was the direct opposite to that hypothesized.

The t test and the F test were the statistical methods used for determining significance of the difference between means of clothing scores of the two sexes identified with the three A-S groups, extreme ascendance, "average" A-S scorers, and extreme submission. The statistical information from both clothing scales did not always indicate the same trends; in those instances where they differed, the trends manifested by the Attitudes toward Clothing scale were accepted on the basis of this scale's greater reliability in differentiating the strength of importance placed on clothing by college students.

Findings from the scales Attitudes toward Clothing and Opinions about Clothing Behavior indicated that no significant difference existed between the clothing attitudes of men students who were extremely ascendant in personality and those who were extremely submissive. The Attitudes toward Clothing scale revealed that a highly significant difference does exist between the attitudes of women students toward clothing in these two extreme A-S groups. However, this latter finding was not significant for the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale. The association between extreme ascendants and extreme submissives in regard to the strength of importance each group placed on clothing varies considerably between the sexes. Submissive male students appeared to be more distinguishing in their dress than

ascendant males but this difference was not significant. This variance in attitude toward clothing was highly significant between submissive college women and ascendant college women.

College men who balance their tendencies toward ascendancy and/or submission tended to place more importance on clothing and thus to be more distinguishing in their dress than those college men who exhibited more extreme tendencies to ascendancy-submission. However, a comparison of the means of clothing scores of men students revealed a greater variance in attitudes toward clothing between the extreme ascendants and the "average" A-S group than between the means of scores of the latter group and the extreme submissives. The F test on the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale showed a significant difference between these means of clothing scores for men students in the three A-S groups but this difference was not significant on the Attitudes toward Clothing scale. It can be concluded from these findings that for men college students an "average" distinguished dresser" appears to be imperceptible.

"Average" distinguished dressers were clearly manifested within the female segment of the sample. The mean score of the "average" A-S female group on the Attitudes toward Clothing scale fell approximately midway between the means of scores of the extreme ascendants and the extreme submissives. The differences between these three means of clothing scores were significant at the 0.01 level. This finding supports the hypothesis that persons who are "average" in their tendencies to ascendancy-

submission are also "average" in terms of a distinguished dresser. This conclusion was not supported by the data collected on the Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale. On this scale the women "average" A-S scorers and the extreme submissive women appeared to place about equal importance on clothing which was not significantly different from the importance placed on clothing by the extreme ascendants.

The data from both clothing scales indicated that the group which placed most importance on clothing was the female submissive group and the group which placed the least importance on clothing was the male ascendant group. Among the women importance placed on clothing increased significantly from the extremely ascendant group to the "average" A-S group, to the extremely submissive group. Among the men the importance placed on clothing increased from the extremely ascendant group to the "average" A-S group but not significantly and the latter group tended to consider clothing slightly more important than the extremely submissive group.

The Attitudes toward Clothing scale revealed no significant difference between the attitudes toward clothing of men and women who were extremely ascendant or between men and women who were "average" in their A-S traits. The Opinions about Clothing Behavior scale, however, showed significant differences between the attitudes toward clothing of the sexes in these two A-S groups. Both clothing scales indicated a significant difference above the 0.01 level between these attitudes of the

extremely submissive men and the attitudes of the extremely submissive women.

Conclusions

The specific conclusions drawn from the investigation of college students' attitudes toward clothing and their relation to the personality traits of ascendancy-submission are set forth in the following statements:

1. Clothing importance is associated more with the personality trait of submission than with the trait of ascendancy.
2. Among women the extremely submissive ones place a much greater emphasis on clothing than the extremely ascendant ones.
3. Those women who are "average" in the personality traits of ascendancy-submission are also "average" in the importance they place on clothes.
4. Among men there is no significant variation in the importance that the different personality types place on clothing.
5. Women generally place more importance on clothing than men.
6. There is a significant variation in the importance placed on clothing between men and women who exhibit a predominant trait of submission.

These conclusions point out an association between clothing used as an aid in social adjustment and certain personality characteristics. The fact that the use of clothing is a part of the socialization process does not hinder its further function as an instrument in satisfying the psychological need for recognition of the goal of superiority. The extent to which any individual uses clothes for this purpose seemingly is related

to the combination and balancing of certain traits which structure his total personality. It is probable that persons who lack certain dominant personality characteristics utilize clothes to supplement their self-assertativeness in social interaction. Thus the theoretical view that clothes are an extension of the personality seems to be evidenced by this study.

Recommendations

This study provides various implications for further study. The following recommendations are related to the limitations of the present investigation, the clothing importance variable and its measurement, and possible elaborations of the research.

The author believes that the Attitudes toward Clothing Behavior scale used in the present study has potential for further use. It is suggested that the weighting system applied be reevaluated and with minor revisions the scale may prove to be more effective in differentiating contrasting attitudes placed on clothing.

Clothing measures utilized in this study were crude in that they distinguish gross differences of attitudes toward clothing and/or clothing behavior. Because of the many interdependent variables influencing human behavior it is difficult to separate shades of varying attitudes placed on clothes. Confusion and inaccuracies which have arisen in the structuring of such measures may be lessened if more precise definitions concerning these more subtle differences of attitudes were

available. As acquired attitudes toward clothing seem to be partially a justification for certain personality characteristics, it is suggested that for both sexes extreme cases of other personality concepts be identified within various age groups, occupational groups and socio-economic groups. From personal interviews with these persons a more precise conceptual scheme of clothing behavior might evolve. Any existing associations between various personality characteristics and attitudes toward clothing such as disinterest, negativeness, and resentfulness and clothing behaviors such as style leaders and aesthetic dressers may be detected. The resultant typology would aid in the construction of more effective scales in differentiating these more tenuous differences of attitudes toward clothing and/or clothing behavior.

Research based on actual clothing behavior in relation to the same traits of personality studied in the present study may substantiate the findings which have resulted from the use of attitudinal scales. It is recommended that information about types of clothes owned, the quantity and quality owned, and the uses and care of clothes be gathered through longitudinal studies or through individual case studies.

It is suggested that further research test other theoretical assumptions concerning clothing behavior and attitudes in relation to variations in age, socio-economic background characteristics, and professional and occupational orientations

of the subjects. It is highly probable that associations found in the present study would vary in relation to the above factors for the homogeneity of the sample is one of its restrictions.

APPENDIX A
Ascendance-Submission Reaction Study

Form for Women

Schedule Number _____

SCORE _____

A-S REACTION STUDY

DIRECTIONS: Most of these situations will represent to you your own actual experiences. Reply to the questions spontaneously and truthfully by checking the answer which most nearly represents your usual reaction. If a situation has not been experienced, endeavor to feel yourself into it and respond on the basis of what you believe your reaction would be. If the situation seems totally unreal or impossible to respond to, you may omit it.

1. At a hairdressers are you persuaded to try new shampoos and new styles of hairdressing?

frequently _____
 occasionally _____
 Never _____

2. a) At a reception or tea do you seek to meet the important person present?

usually _____
 occasionally _____
 never _____

- b) Do you feel reluctant to meet him?

yes, usually _____
 sometimes _____
 no _____

3. At church, a lecture, or an entertainment, if you arrive after the program has commenced and find that there are people standing but also that there are front seats available which might be secured without "piggishness" but with considerable conspicuousness, do you take the seats?

habitually _____
 occasionally _____
 never _____

4. a) A salesman takes manifest trouble to show you a quantity of merchandise. You are not entirely suited. Do you find it difficult to say "No"?

yes _____
 no _____

- b) Do you mind taking articles that you have bought back to stores?

no _____
 somewhat _____
 very much _____

5. Do you feel reluctant to solicit funds for a cause in which you are interested?

yes _____
no _____

6. a) A professor or lecturer asks any one in the audience, say of 50 people, to volunteer an idea to start discussion. You have what appears to be a good idea, do you speak out?

usually _____
occasionally _____
rarely _____
never _____

- b) Do you feel self-conscious when you speak under such circumstances?

very _____
moderately _____
not at all _____

7. You have heard indirectly that an acquaintance has been spreading rumors about you which, though not likely to be serious in consequence are nevertheless unjustified and distinctly uncomplimentary. The acquaintance is an equal of yours in every way. Do you usually

"have it out" with the person _____
let it pass without any feeling _____
feel disturbed but let it pass _____

8. Beggars solicit you with hard luck stories; do you give them money?

usually _____
occasionally _____
never _____

9. Some one tries to push in ahead of you in line. You have been waiting for some time, and can't wait much longer. Suppose the intruder is the same sex as yourself, do you usually

remonstrate with the intruder _____
call the attention of the man _____
at the ticket window _____
"look daggers" at the intruder or make
clearly audible comments to your
neighbor _____
decide not to wait, and go away _____
do nothing _____

10. Do you feel self-conscious in the presence of superiors in the academic or business world?

markedly _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

11. Some possession of yours is being worked upon at a repair shop. You call for it at the time appointed, but the repair man informs you that he has "only just begun work on it." Is your customary reaction

to upbraid him _____
to express dissatisfaction mildly _____
to smother your feelings entirely _____

12. At a stupid party something must be done to inject some life; you have an idea. Do you take the initiative in carrying it out?

invariably _____
occasionally _____
never _____

13. Have you worn a bikini or followed any style of dress merely because you wished to, even though you knew that the practice would be commented on, since the innovation you proposed was not according to custom?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

14. Have you crossed the street to avoid meeting some person?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

15. Have you haggled over prices with tradesmen or junk men?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

16. a) Have you appeared as lecturer or entertainer before gatherings of over ten people?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

b) Have you experienced "stage fright"?

occasionally _____
once or twice _____
never _____

17. If you made purchases at Woolworth's or at the bargain counters, would you mind your friends knowing it?

sometimes _____
no _____

18. In playing games when young, did you take the lead and decide what the group should play?

usually _____
occasionally _____
seldom _____

19. a) If you are sitting between two young men on a crowded bus, and a woman of about fifty-five enters the car, and stands in front of you; and if neither of the young men gets up, will you rise to offer her your seat?

certainly _____
perhaps _____
no _____

b) Will you feel any embarrassment in carrying out your decision?

yes _____
no _____

20. Have you been president or recognized leader of an organized group composed of girls or women?

more than six times _____
less than six times but
 more than once _____
only once _____
never _____

21. a) In general, are your most intimate friends

younger than yourself _____
older than yourself _____
about the same age _____

22. a) If you feel a person is dictorial and domineering, and if you are unavoidably thrown with him at a gathering, do you feel much annoyed?

yes _____
no _____

- b) Do you usually

try to treat him the same way
he treats you _____
behave normally, but wish either
you or he had not come _____
feel and behave normally _____

23. a) When you see someone in a public place or crowd whom you think you have met or have known, do you inquire of him whether you have met before?

sometimes _____
rarely _____
never _____

- b) Are you embarrassed if you have greeted a stranger whom you have mistaken for an acquaintance?

very much _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

24. a) Have you ever been made to feel antagonistic or irritated on account of the "bossy" way a chairman conducts a meeting?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

- b) Do you take the initiative in opposing such a person?

usually _____
sometimes _____
never _____

25. If you have broken or lost a tennis racquet, or some such article, belonging to another person, would you tell him right away?

yes _____
perhaps _____

26. If a student in class discussion makes a statement that you think erroneous, do you question it?

usually _____
occasionally _____
never _____

27. If you hold an opinion the reverse of that which the lecturer has expressed in class do you usually volunteer your opinion?

in class _____
after class _____
not at all _____

28. If you have been in accidents or fires at school or elsewhere, where there were several persons present, have you as a rule

taken an active part in assisting _____
taken the part of a spectator _____
left the scene at once _____

29. Have you had a "crush" in college?

no _____
one _____
a number _____

30. Have you ever attempted so many activities at college that you were forced to give something up?

yes _____
no _____

31. Have you ever felt that a professor talks too much in class and should give you more chance to express your views and conclude points?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

32. If the majority of your friends are having new dresses for a dance, are you disturbed by having to wear an old frock; one that you know will be recognized?

very much _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

33. Do you find it difficult to ask a gentleman to accompany you to college dances?

very _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

34. In a mixed social group where many people are strangers to each other, do you constitute yourself a hostess and begin introductions and conversation?

usually _____
sometimes _____
never _____

Form for Men

Schedule Number _____

SCORE _____

A-S REACTION STUDY

DIRECTIONS: Most of these situations will represent to you your own actual experiences. Reply to the questions spontaneously and truthfully by checking the answer which most nearly represents your usual reaction. If a situation has not been experienced, endeavor to feel yourself into it and respond on the basis of what you believe your reaction would be. If the situation seems totally unreal or impossible to respond to, you may omit it.

1. In witnessing a game of football or baseball in a crowd, have you intentionally made remarks (witty, encouraging, disparaging, or otherwise) which are clearly audible to those around you?

frequently _____
 occasionally _____
 never _____

2. a) At a reception or tea do you seek to meet the important person present?

usually _____
 occasionally _____
 never _____

- b) Do you feel reluctant to meet him?

yes, usually _____
 sometimes _____
 no _____

3. At church, a lecture, or an entertainment, if you arrive after the program has commenced and find that there are people standing, but also that there are front seats available which might be secured without "piggishness" or discourtesy, but with considerable conspicousness, do you take the seats?

habitually _____
 occasionally _____
 never _____

4. A salesman takes manifest trouble to show you a quantity of merchandise; you are not entirely suited; do you find it difficult to say "No"?

yes _____
 sometimes _____
 no _____

5. a) Have you solicited funds for a cause in which you are interested?

yes _____
no _____

- b) Do you feel reluctant to do such soliciting?

yes _____
no _____

6. a) A professor or lecturer asks any one in the audience, say of 20 or more people, to volunteer an idea to start discussion. You have what appears to be a good idea, do you speak out?

habitually _____
occasionally _____
rarely _____
never _____

- b) Do you feel self-conscious when you speak under such circumstances?

very _____
moderately _____
not at all _____

7. You have heard indirectly that an acquaintance has been spreading rumors about you which, though not likely to be serious in consequence, are nevertheless unjustified and distinctly uncomplimentary. The acquaintance is an equal of yours in every way. Do you usually

"have it out" with the person _____
let it pass without any feeling _____
take revenge indirectly _____
feel disturbed but let it pass _____

8. Someone tries to push ahead of you in line. You have been waiting for some time, and can't wait much longer. Suppose the intruder is the same sex as yourself, do you usually

remonstrate with the intruder _____
"look daggers" at the intruder or
make clearly audible comments
to your neighbor _____
decide not to wait, and go away _____
do nothing _____

9. Do you feel self-conscious in the presence of superiors in the academic or business world?

markedly _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

10. Some possession of yours is being worked upon at a repair shop. You call for it at the time appointed, but the repair man informs you that he has "only just begun work on it." Is your customary reaction

to upbraid him _____
to express dissatisfaction mildly _____
to smother your feelings entirely _____

11. After a very tiring day you decide to keep your seat in a crowded bus even though ladies have to stand. You overhear one of the ladies refer to the situation in some remark to her companion. Do you

rise and offer your seat _____
remain in your seat feeling
 ill at ease _____
remain in your seat without
 embarrassment _____

12. You are at a mixed party where about half the people are friends of yours. The affair becomes very dull, and something should be done to enliven it. You have an idea. Do you usually

take the initiative in carrying it out _____
pass it on to another to put into execution _____
say nothing about it _____

13. When you are served a tough steak, a piece of unripe melon, or any other inferior dish at a high class restaurant, do you complain about it to the waiter?

occasionally _____
seldom _____
never _____

14. Have you crossed the street to avoid meeting some person?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

15. Have you haggled over prices with tradesmen or junk men?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

16. In tennis or any similar competition when you are pitted against someone considerably superior to you in this particular ability, are you as a rule

determined to win in spite of
his advantage _____
not especially hopeful, but
unwilling to concede defeat
at the start _____
inclined to admit to yourself
defeat at the outset, hoping
only to make a presentable
score _____

17. You desire to board a boat or train to see a friend off, or to enter an exhibition or park; the guard forbids you on what seem to be entirely unnecessary technicalities, do you argue with him and bluff your way past?

habitually _____
occasionally _____
never _____

18. When you were 10 or 12 years of age were you the "goat" for your playmates? (e.g., in playing war would they force you to fight on the unpopular side?)

usually, yes _____
occasionally _____
never _____

19. Suppose you have recently become a salesman and are trying to sell life insurance to a middle-aged financier of great note. He says, "Young man, I don't know how long you have been in this game, but you will never succeed unless you acquire more experience and confidence in yourself." What will be your reaction?

to persist in the attempt to sell
insurance _____
to agree and seek further advice from
him _____
to become emotionally disturbed in
your reply--angry, embarrassed,
or condescending _____
simply to take leave _____

20. You are with a group of people in the woods, and although not certain of the path, you probably know as much about it as anyone present. Do you take responsibility of guiding the group?

take the full responsibility _____
make suggestions or agree to share
the responsibility _____
let another take the lead according
to his judgment _____

21. a) If you feel a person is dictatorial and domineering, do you as a rule make it a point to avoid him?

yes _____
no _____

- b) If unavoidably thrown with him at a gathering, do you feel annoyed?

yes _____
no _____

- c) Do you usually

try to treat him the same way
he treats you _____
behave normally, but wish
either you or he had not come _____
feel and behave normally _____

22. a) When you see someone in a public place or crowd whom you think you have met or known, do you inquire of him whether you have met before?

sometimes _____
rarely _____
never _____

- b) Are you embarrassed if you have greeted a stranger whom you have mistaken for an acquaintance?

very much _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

23. a) Have you ever been made to feel antagonistic or irritated on account of the "bossy" way a chairman conducts a meeting?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

b) Do you take the initiative in opposing such a person?

usually _____
sometimes _____
never _____

24. If a student in class discussion makes a statement that you think erroneous, do you question it?

usually _____
occasionally _____
never _____

25. If you hold an opinion the reverse of that which the lecturer has expressed in class, do you usually volunteer your opinion

in class _____
after class _____
not at all _____

26. When an accident occurs where many people are present besides yourself do you usually

take an active part in assisting _____
take the part of a spectator _____
leave the scene at once _____

27. When a book-agent or insurance salesman comes to your home or to your room, do you as a rule find it difficult to refuse to listen to him, or to get rid of him as soon as the purpose of his visit becomes clear?

quite difficult _____
moderately difficult _____
not at all difficult _____

28. When the clerk in a store where you have been waiting for some time for service overlooks you and waits on a customer who has come into the store after you, do you as a rule

call his attention to the fact _____
wait silently, though perhaps
with an injured air _____
go out to another store _____

29. Have you ever felt that a professor talks too much in class and should give you more chance to express your views and conclude points?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

30. a) Have you largely on your own initiative in the past five years organized clubs, teams, or other such groups?

more than three _____
one to three _____
none _____

- b) Have you within the past five years been recognized as leader (president, captain, chairman) of groups?

more than six _____
one to six _____
none _____

31. In conversing with a person older than yourself whom you respect, on an issue about which you disagree, do you characteristically

maintain your views in argument _____
conciliate your opponent by seeming
to agree with him, and yet try
indirectly to carry your point _____
agree with him, at least verbally
and let it go at that _____

32. You are dining with a young lady whom you are trying to impress. The waiter presents a bill which is slightly larger than you expected it to be. Do you verify the bill before paying it?

openly _____
in a secret manner _____
not at all _____

33. A friend with whom you are not particularly intimate has a racquet, skates, skis, or some similar article which you would like very much to borrow for an afternoon. Do you feel a hesitation in asking for it?

usually _____
sometimes _____
rarely _____

APPENDIX B
THE PRE-TEST
OPINIONS ABOUT CLOTHING BEHAVIOR SCALE

OPINIONS ABOUT CLOTHING

Please check the following information about yourself. This is needed to complete this study.

MALE _____ FEMALE _____ MAJOR AREA OF STUDY or
Anticipated Major _____

DIRECTIONS

This questionnaire is designed to discover the attitudes and opinions people have concerning clothing. There are no right or wrong answers. Most of the situations presented are similar to those you have already experienced. Reply to these questions without much hesitation. Check the answer which most nearly represents your usual behavior or feeling. If you have not been confronted with a situation, try to feel yourself into it and respond on the basis of what you believe your reaction would be.

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS

1. At a large week-end, mixed party say in Cleveland, where you are to meet socially prominent persons, would you

dress in a distinguished manner to make a
good impression _____

dress attractively but not necessarily to
make an impression one way or the other _____
give little thought to the effect your clothes
will have on others _____

2. You are new in a community and are invited to a welcome party planned for you. Are you inclined to be more friendly to persons who are particularly well dressed?

usually _____
sometimes _____
hardly ever _____

3. At a large reception do you recognize the important people because they are distinguished by their refined manner of dress?

usually _____
sometimes _____
almost never _____

4. You planned well in advance for a friend of yours to meet your parents for lunch at a particularly fine restaurant. Your friend appears inappropriately dressed for the occasion. Would you

be greatly displeased _____
be aware of the social error but not be too upset _____
not be aware of the social error _____

5. Have you been upset because a lecturer or speaker was dressed unsuitably for the occasion?

frequently _____
sometimes _____
never _____

6. John hopes to acquire a job at the local bank. The manager takes him out for coffee to continue the interview. While walking down the street they meet a friend of John's who is very unkempt in his appearance. Should John

stop and introduce the manager to his friend _____
greet his friend with a friendly "hello"
but not stop _____
give his friend a slight nod of recognition
making sure the manager does not notice _____

7. When shopping "downtown" do you wear clothes which will impress the sales clerk thereby influencing her (him) to be more courteous and to give you faster service?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
almost never _____

8. Do you like to receive compliments on the clothes you wear?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
not at all _____

9. On arriving at a friend's house for a small dinner party, you discover you have dressed too informally for the occasion. Do you feel self-conscious?

noticeably _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

10. You wish to gain approval for membership in a social fraternity or sorority, or other prestige social group. If you did not already own appropriate clothes, would you purchase new clothing in order to make a good impression and be sure of membership?

definitely _____
probably _____
never _____

11. Do you think people choose to wear certain types of clothes so that they will stand out somewhat in a crowd?

many people _____
some people _____
very few people _____

12. You are to attend a mixer party where many of your friends will also be present. Do you avoid wearing a new fashion which others are not yet wearing?

usually _____
sometimes _____
hardly ever _____

YOU ARE DOING FINE. HAVE YOU ANSWERED ALL QUESTIONS SO FAR?

13. As a college student, do you consider it important to dress according to the latest college fashions?

frequently _____
sometimes _____
almost never _____

14. Does dressing smartly help people attain success in business ventures?

very frequently _____
occasionally _____
almost never _____

15. Do you receive compliments concerning the clothing you wear?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

16. When purchasing new clothing are you persuaded to buy new styles and colors which you haven't worn before?

frequently _____
sometimes _____
almost never _____

17. At a university homecoming dance another student is wearing a dress or suit exactly like the one you are wearing. Would this situation bother you?

very much _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

18. Do you think that persons who continually dress in a careless manner have little self-esteem?

frequently _____
sometimes _____
hardly ever _____

19. Do you refrain from choosing clothes which allows you to be noticed somewhat in a crowd?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
almost never _____

20. You are in a bus station with more luggage than you can handle yourself and there are no red caps available. The nearest person is very shabbily dressed. Would this deter you from asking him for help?

definitely _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

21. Do you feel self-conscious in the presence of someone whom you consider better dressed than you?

noticeably _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

22. When planning your college wardrobe, do you feel it is necessary to choose clothing similar in style and quality to those worn by your college associates?

quite _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

23. Mary Jones is employed as a junior clerk-receptionist and by virtue of seniority is next in line for a promotion. Instead the promotion goes to another employee because he (or she) has consistently been better dressed than Mary. Do you think Mary should

ask advice about improving her standard of dress _____
try to improve her standard of dress without
the advice of others _____
seek a position where high standards of dress
are not so important _____

24. Do you think men and women who are in the public eye should be exceptionally well dressed?

most of the time _____
sometimes _____
makes no difference _____

25. It is your responsibility to present a resolution concerning a controversial issue to members of an organized group to which you belong. You are anxious to have this resolution pass. Do you think being particularly well dressed for this occasion will help you to be successful?

definitely _____
somewhat _____
not particularly _____

26. Do you wear certain items of clothing in your wardrobe because they give you a feeling of "well-being"?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
almost never _____

27. In your experience, would you say that dressing similarly to everyone else enables most people to acquire self-confidence?

definitely _____
somewhat _____
not particularly _____

28. You are president of an organization but circumstances have not allowed you to know many of the members, yet you need to allocate responsibility. Would you approach first those persons who impressed you because they are well dressed?

most of the time _____
sometimes _____
hardly ever _____

THANK YOU. HAVE YOU FILLED IN ALL QUESTIONS?

APPENDIX C

**KEY FOR SCORING WEIGHTS ON PRE-TEST OPINIONS
ABOUT CLOTHING BEHAVIOR SCALE**

**KEY FOR SCORING WEIGHTS ON PRE-TEST OPINIONS
ABOUT CLOTHING BEHAVIOR SCALE**

Item Number	Score First Alternative	Score Second Alternative	Score Third Alternative
1	3	2	1
2	3	2	1
3	3	2	1
4	2	3	1
5	2	3	1
6	1	2	3
7	3	2	1
8	3	2	1
9	2	3	1
10	3	2	1
11	3	2	1
12	1	2	3
13	2	3	1
14	3	2	1
15	3	2	1
16	2	3	1
17	2	3	1
18	3	2	1
19	1	2	3
20	3	2	1
21	2	3	1
22	2	3	1
23	2	3	1
24	3	2	1
25	3	2	1
26	3	2	1
27	2	3	1
28	3	2	1

APPENDIX D
FINAL OPINIONS ABOUT CLOTHING BEHAVIOR SCALE

Schedule Number _____

OPINIONS ABOUT CLOTHING BEHAVIOR

Please check the following information about yourself. This is needed to complete this study.

MALE _____ FEMALE _____ MAJOR AREA OF STUDY or
ANTICIPATED MAJOR _____

The College in which you are registered _____

Your Age _____ Freshman _____ Sophomore _____ Junior _____ Senior _____ Grad.S. _____

DIRECTIONS: This questionnaire is designed to discover the attitudes and opinions people have concerning clothing. There are no Right or Wrong Answers. Most of the situations presented are similar to those you have already experienced. Reply to these questions without much hesitation. Check the answer which most nearly represents your usual behavior. If you have not been confronted with a situation, try to feel yourself into it and respond on the basis of what you believe your reaction would be.

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS

1. At a large week-end, mixed party say in Cleveland, where you are to meet socially prominent persons, would you

dress in a distinguished manner to make
a good impression _____
dress attractively but not necessarily
to make an impression one way or
the other _____
give little thought to the effect your
clothes will have on others _____

2. You are new in a community and are invited to a welcome party planned for you. Are you inclined to be more friendly to persons who are particularly well dressed?

usually _____
sometimes _____
hardly ever _____

3. At a large reception do you recognize the important people because they are distinguished by their refined manner of dress?

usually _____
sometimes _____
almost never _____

4. You planned well in advance for a friend of yours to meet your parents for lunch at a particularly fine restaurant. Your friend appears inappropriately dressed for the occasion. Would you

be greatly displeased _____
be aware of the social error but
not be too upset _____
not be aware of the social error _____

5. Have you been upset because a lecturer or speaker was dressed unsuitably for the occasion?

frequently _____
sometimes _____
never _____

6. Do you like to receive compliments on the clothes you wear?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
not at all _____

7. Do you think people choose to wear certain types of clothes so that they will stand out somewhat in a crowd?

many people _____
some people _____
very few people _____

8. When purchasing new clothing are you persuaded to buy new styles and colors which you haven't worn before?

frequently _____
sometimes _____
almost never _____

9. You are in a bus station with more luggage than you can handle yourself and there are no red caps available. The nearest person is very shabbily dressed. Would this deter you from asking him for help?

definitely _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

10. Do you feel self-conscious in the presence of someone whom you consider better dressed than you?

noticeably _____
occasionally _____
not at all _____

11. Do you receive compliments concerning the clothing you wear?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
never _____

12. When planning your college wardrobe, do you feel it is necessary to choose clothing similar in style and quality to those worn by your college associates?

quite _____
somewhat _____
not at all _____

13. It is your responsibility to present a resolution concerning a controversial issue to members of an organized group to which you belong. You are anxious to have this resolution pass. Do you think being particularly well dressed for this occasion will help you to be successful?

definitely _____
somewhat _____
not particularly _____

14. Do you wear certain items of clothing in your wardrobe because they give you a feeling of "well-being"?

frequently _____
occasionally _____
almost never _____

15. You are president of an organization but circumstances have not allowed you to know many of the members, yet you need to allocate responsibility. Would you first approach those persons who impressed you because they are well dressed?

most of the time _____
sometimes _____
hardly ever _____

THANK YOU. HAVE YOU ANSWERED ALL QUESTIONS IN THIS SECTION?

APPENDIX E
ATTITUDES TOWARD CLOTHING SCALE

Schedule Number _____

ATTITUDES TOWARD CLOTHING

DIRECTIONS: For each statement circle the abbreviations to indicate whether you believe the statement is "definitely true" (DT), "partially true" (T), "partially false" (F), "definitely false" (DF); or if you are undecided, circle the abbreviation for "undecided" (U).

- | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|---|---|----|
| 1. I am usually well impressed by a well dressed student. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 2. It is more important for me to have clothes that last a long time than to wear new styles. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 3. I have purchased some clothes because they make me feel "important." | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 4. My clothes are important in helping me to establish a "place" for myself. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 5. I frequently judge students that I do not know by their clothes. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 6. I would rather not attend a social function if I do not have the right clothes. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 7. Students who have nice clothes are more likely to have dates. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 8. I usually pay close attention to what students wear. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 9. It is important for me to wear the latest clothing fashions. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 10. It is more important for me to look attractive in my clothes than it is for me to be completely comfortable. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 11. I feel that it is more important for me to have "fine" clothes than to have a collection of good books. | DT | T | U | F | DF |

12.	I avoid wearing certain clothes because they do not make me feel "important."	DT	T	U	F	DF
13.	I am more concerned about saving money on my clothes than I am about impressing other people.	DT	T	U	F	DF
14.	I receive many compliments concerning the clothes I wear.	DT	T	U	F	DF
15.	Clothes are more important in making an impression on people than a car.	DT	T	U	F	DF
16.	If a young man is on the way up professionally, he must dress with distinction.	DT	T	U	F	DF
17.	A person who is consistently unpressed and unkempt will have difficulty getting ahead in life.	DT	T	U	F	DF
18.	Lectures or speakers should always dress with distinction.	DT	T	U	F	DF
19.	It is usually easy to recognize important people by the clothes they wear.	DT	T	U	F	DF
20.	I seldom "classify" students by their clothes.	DT	T	U	F	DF
21.	I like my clothes to be somewhat different than those worn by most college students.	DT	T	U	F	DF
22.	Buying a new item of clothing often boosts my morale.	DT	T	U	F	DF
23.	On special occasions I like to be fashionably dressed.	DT	T	U	F	DF
24.	It is more important for me to wear popular styles than new styles.	DT	T	U	F	DF
25.	I usually feel "good" when I dress up.	DT	T	U	F	DF

- | | | | | | | |
|-----|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|---|---|----|
| 26. | It is important for me to dress
the way others expect me to dress. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 27. | A wife's clothes should indicate
her husband's social and economic
position. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 28. | It is more important for me to
have clothes that last a long
time than to dress with a dis-
tinguished air. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 29. | It is difficult to get "dates"
if I do not pay attention to
the way I dress. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 30. | I expect being well-dressed will
help me to gain promotions in
my future position. | DT | T | U | F | DF |

APPENDIX F
KEY FOR SCORING WEIGHTS ON OPINIONS
ABOUT CLOTHING BEHAVIOR SCALE

KEY FOR SCORING WEIGHTS ON OPINIONS
ABOUT CLOTHING BEHAVIOR SCALE

Item Number	Score First Alternative	Score Second Alternative	Score Third Alternative
1	3	2	1
2	3	2	1
3	3	2	1
4	2	3	1
5	3	2	1
6	3	2	1
7	3	2	1
8	2	3	1
9	3	2	1
10	2	3	1
11	3	2	1
12	2	3	1
13	3	2	1
14	3	2	1
15	3	2	1

APPENDIX G
KEY FOR SCORING WEIGHTS ON ATTITUDES
TOWARD CLOTHING SCALE

KEY FOR SCORING WEIGHTS ON ATTITUDES
TOWARD CLOTHING SCALE

Item Number	Score				
	First Choice	Second Choice	Third Choice	Fourth Choice	Fifth Choice
All Items	5	4	3	2	1
except 2, 13, 20, 24, 28	1	2	3	4	5

APPENDIX H

CODING INSTRUCTIONS

CODING INSTRUCTIONS

Item	Column Numbers on Punch Card	Code
Schedule Number	1,2,3	
(1 through 372)		
Sex	4	Male - 0 Female - 1
College	5	Agriculture - 0 Arts & Sc. - 1 Commerce - 2 Education - 3 Engineering - 4 Dentistry - 5 School of Nr. - 6
Age	6,7	
Class Rank	8	Freshman - 1 Sophomore - 2 Junior - 3 Senior - 4
Total A-S Score	9,10,11	Y for plus numbers X for minus numbers
Opinions about clothing behavior scale. (Numerical score for each item) . . .	12 to 26	
Attitudes toward clothing scale. (Numerical score on each item)	27 to 56	

APPENDIX I

RESULTS OF INTERNAL CONSISTENCY TEST COMPLETED
ON CLOTHING SCALE, "OPINIONS ABOUT CLOTHING
BEHAVIOR."

RESULTS OF INTERNAL CONSISTENCY TESTS COMPLETED
 ON PRE-TEST OF THE SCALE "OPINIONS ABOUT
 CLOTHING BEHAVIOR"^b

Item Number	Critical Ratio	S.V.D.	M.P.S.V.D.	S.V.D.R.
1 ^a	4.1134	.4662	.8658	.538
2 ^a	4.32	.5994	.8658	.700
3 ^a	2.527	.3996	.8658	.461
4 ^a	2.525	.3663	.6327	.578
5 ^a	3.58	.7992	1.6650	.480
6	1.182	.0999	.2331	.428
7 ^a	2.390	.2664	.3996	.666
8 ^a	2.84	.3663	.8991	.407
9	0	0	0	0
10 ^a	2.148	.3330	.9990	.333
11	3.375	.4329	.6327	.684
12	2.021	.4329	1.4985	.288
13	2.61	.4995	1.6983	.294
14 ^a	1.33	.3996	.8658	.461
15 ^a	5.165	.4995	.4995	1.000
16 ^a	2.10	.3996	.9990	.400
17	1.51	.1665	.4995	.333
18	1.69	.2664	.9990	.266
19 ^a	.314	.1665	1.2321	.135
20 ^a	2.761	.4329	1.0323	.419
21 ^a	3.80	.8325	1.6983	.490
22 ^a	3.64	.5661	1.1655	.485
23	.238	.0333	.6327	.368
24 ^a	1.859	.2337	.6327	.368
25 ^a	2.42	.6660	1.0656	.625
26 ^a	3.86	.6327	1.2321	.513
27 ^a	.386	1.286	.5328	.500
28 ^a	3.28	.5328	.9324	.571

^aItems retained in the final scale.

^bNumber equals 60.

APPENDIX J

KITTLE'S CLOTHING IMPORTANCE SCALE

Part I. Clothing Importance Scale

Some people believe that clothes play a very important part in their lives, while other people believe that clothes are relatively unimportant. Your responses to the following statements will help in a study of the Importance of Clothing to College Students.

There are no Right or Wrong answers. The only Right answer is your opinion. Your responses cannot be associated with you in any way; therefore, you should feel free to give your honest opinion.

For each statement circle the abbreviations to indicate whether you believe the statement is "definitely true" (DT), "partially true" (T), "partially false" (F), "definitely false" (DF); or if you are undecided, circle the abbreviation for "undecided" (U).

- | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----|---|---|---|----|
| 5. I am usually favorably impressed by a well dressed student. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 7. It is more important for me to have clothes that last a long time than to wear the current styles. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 8. Acceptance by my group is determined by my clothes. | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 13. I have purchased some clothes because they make me feel "important." | DT | T | U | F | DF |
| 14. I am more concerned about saving money on my clothes than I am about impressing other people. | DT | T | U | F | DF |

15.	I am more concerned about selecting clothing that will accent my personality than I am about being accepted.	DT	T	U	F	DF
16.	A girl does not have to own expensive clothes to be accepted.	DT	T	U	F	DF
17.	My clothes are important in helping me to establish a "place" for myself	DT	T	U	F	DF
18.	I frequently judge students that I do not know by their clothes.	DT	T	U	F	DF
19.	I am more concerned about wearing clothes that fit comfortably than I am about wearing what others wear.	DT	T	U	F	DF
21.	I seldom judge students that I do not know by their clothes.	DT	T	U	F	DF
22.	I would rather not attend a social function if I do not have the right clothes.	DT	T	U	F	DF
23.	Girls who have nice clothes are more likely to be asked for dates.	DT	T	U	F	DF
24.	I usually pay close attention to what other students wear.	DT	T	U	F	DF
25.	It is more important for me to look attractive in my clothes than it is for me to be completely comfortable.	DT	T	U	F	DF
26.	"Women of distinction" consistently dress well.	DT	T	U	F	DF
29.	It is important for me to wear the latest clothing fashions.	DT	T	U	F	DF
30.	I feel that it is more important for me to have "fine" clothes than to have a collection of good books.	DT	T	U	F	DF

31. I avoid wearing certain clothes because they do not make me feel "important." DT T U F DF
32. I seldom "classify" students by their clothes. DT T U F DF

APPENDIX K

**CRITICAL RATIOS OF ITEMS ON THE ATTITUDES
TOWARD CLOTHING SCALE**

**CRITICAL RATIOS OF SCORES BETWEEN EXTREME
QUARTILES OF ITEMS ON THE ATTITUDES
TOWARD CLOTHING SCALE, BASED ON
TOTAL CLOTHING SCORE. (N=372)**

Item Number	Critical Ratio	Item Number	Critical Ratio
1	10.91	16	7.31
2	7.20	17	3.98
3	12.22	18	8.05
4	12.19	19	9.12
5	13.52	20	9.29
6	7.55	21	2.64
7	4.43	22	9.57
8	13.65	23	7.84
9	14.28	24	1.57
10	12.77	25	8.70
11	10.47	26	6.42
12	9.77	27	7.54
13	7.66	28	7.30
14	6.19	29	5.26
15	6.55	30	6.71

APPENDIX L

FORMULAS USED FOR STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

FORMULAS USED FOR STATISTICAL ANALYSES

1. Critical Ratio: $\frac{\sqrt{N}(\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2)}{\sqrt{N\sum x_1^2 - (\sum x_1)^2} \sqrt{N\sum x_2^2 - (\sum x_2)^2}}$

2. S.V.D.: $\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2$

3. M.P.S.V.D.: $\frac{\text{Total Scores of High Values}}{N} - \frac{\text{Total Scores of Low Values}}{N}$

4. S.V.D.R.: $\frac{\text{S.V.D.}}{\text{M.P.S.V.D.}}$

5. Pearsonian Product Moment:

$$r = \frac{N\sum(xy) - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{N\sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2} \sqrt{N\sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2}}$$

6. t test: $\frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N_1-1}} + \frac{\sigma}{\sqrt{N_2-1}}}$

7. F test: $\sum x^2 = \sum x^2 - \frac{(\sum x)^2}{N}$

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Adler, Alfred. Understanding Human Nature. New York: Greenberg Publisher, Inc., 1927.
- Allport, Gordon W. Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehard and Winston, Inc., 1961.
- Ansbacher, H. L., and Rowena, R. (eds.). The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler. New York: Basic Books, 1956.
- Ferguson, George A. Statistical Analysis in Psychology and Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1959.
- Flugel, John. The Psychology of Clothes. London: The Hogarth Press, 1950.
- Hall, Calvin S., and Lindzey, Gardner. Theories of Personality. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1957.
- Hurlock, Elizabeth. The Psychology of Dress: An Analysis of Fashion and Its Motive. New York: The Ronald Press, 1929.
- Krech, David, and Crutchfield, Richard S. Elements of Psychology. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1958.
- Langner, Lawrence. The Importance of Wearing Clothes. New York: Hastings House, 1959.
- Laver, James. Clothes. New York: Horizon Press, 1953.
- Lipset, Seymour M., and Lowenthal, Leo (eds.). Culture and Social Character: The Work of David Riesman. New York: Free Press of Glencoe, 1961.
- Mead, George H. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1934.
- Murchison, Carl (ed.). Psychologies of 1930. Worcester, Mass.: Clark University Press, 1930.

- Remits, Ernest L. The Feeling of Superiority and Anxiety-Superior: The Ottawa Pilot Study. Canada: Runge Press Ltd., 1953.
- Sletto, Raymond F. Construction of Personality Scales by the Criterion of Internal Consistency. Hanover, N. H.: The Sociological Press, 1937.
- Stagner, Ross. Psychology of Personality. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1948.
- Silverman, Sylvia S. Clothing and Appearance: Their Psychological Implications for Teen-Age Girls. New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1945.
- Strauss, Anselm (ed.). The Social Psychology of George Herbert Mead. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Webster's New World Dictionary (College Edition). New York: The World Publishing Co., 1960.
- Young, Pauline V. Scientific Social Surveys and Research. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1956.

Articles and Periodicals

- Adler, Alfred. "Progress in Individual Psychology," British Journal of Medical Psychology, 4 (1924) 22-31.
- Allport, Gordon A. "A Test for Ascendance-Submission," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 23 (1928-1929), 118-136.
- Asch, Solomon E. "Studies of Independence and Conformity: A Minority of One Against a Unanimous Majority," Psychological Monographs, 70 (1956), 1-70.
- Barr, Steele De Young. "A Psychological Analysis of Fashion Motivation," Archives of Psychology, 26 (June, 1934).
- Beaver, Alma P. "Dominance in the Personality of the Student Nurse as Measured by the A-S Reaction Study," The Journal of Psychology, 38 (1954), 73-78.
- Beloff, Halla. "Two Forms of Social Conformity: Acquiescence and Conventionality," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 56 (1958), 99-104.

- Bender, I. E. "Ascendance-Submission in Relation to Certain Other Factors in Personality," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 23 (1928), 137-143.
- Carter, Launor, and Nixon. "Ability, Perceptual Personality, and Interest Factors Associated with Different Criteria of Leadership," Journal of Psychology, 27 (Apr. 1949), 337-388.
- Dearborn, George Van Ness. "Psychology of Clothing," The Psychological Monographs, 26, No. 1 (1918), 1-72.
- Hornall, Bernice S. "Relationships Between College Aptitude and Discouragement Buoyancy Among College Freshman," Journal of Genetic Psychology, 74 (June, 1949), 185-243.
- Flaccus, Louis W. "Remarks on the Psychology of Clothes," Pedagogical Seminary, 13 (1906), 61-83.
- Hall, Stanley G. "Some Aspects of the Early Sense of Self," American Journal of Psychology, 9 (1897-1898), 315-395.
- Jackson, Douglas N. "Independence and Resistance of Perceptual Field Fource," Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology, 56 (1959), 279-281.
- Janis, I. L. "Personality Correlates of Susceptibility of Persua sion," Journal of Personality, 22 (1954), 504-518.
- Maslow, A. H. "Dominance-Feeling Behavior and Status," Psychological Review, 44 (1937), 404-429.
- McLaughlin, Sister Mary A. "The Genesis and Constancy of Ascendance and Submission as Personality Traits," University of Iowa Studies: Studies in Education, 6 (no. 5), (Dec. 1931).
- Philip, Eisenber. "Expressive Movements Related to Feeling of Dominance," Archives of Psychology, (No. 221) (May, 1937).
- Sapir, Edward. "Fashion," Encyclopedia of Social Sciences, 6 (1930), 139-144.
- Simmel, George. "Fashion," International Quarterly, 10 (Oct. 1904), 130-155.
- Zuckerman, Marvin, and Gross. "Suggestibility and Dependency," Journal of Consulting Psychology, 22 (1958), 22.

Ph.D. Dissertations

Compton, Norma Haynes. "Clothing Fabric Preference in Relation to Selected Physical and Personality Characteristics." University of Maryland, 1962.

Ditty, Dona D. "Social-Psychological Aspects of Clothing Preferences of College Women." The Ohio State University, 1962.

Hoffman, Adeline. "Clothing Behavioral Factors for a Specific Group of Women Related to Aesthetic Sensitivity and Certain Socio-Economic and Psychological Background Factors." Pennsylvania State University, 1956.

Kittle, Emma L. "The Importance of Clothing as a Status Symbol Among College Students." The Ohio State University, 1961.

Lapitsky, Mary. "Clothing Values and Their Relation to General Values to Social Security and Insecurity." Pennsylvania State University, 1961.

Stone, Gregory P. "Clothing and Social Relations: A Study of Appearance in the Context of Community Life." University of Chicago, 1959.

Treece, Anna Jean. "An Interpretation of Clothing Behavior Based on Social Psychological Theory." The Ohio State University, 1959.

Warden, Jessie. "Some Factors Effecting the Satisfactions and Dissatisfactions with Clothing of Women Students in the College of Education and the College of Liberal Arts." The Pennsylvania State University, 1955.

Other Sources

Allport, Gordon W., and Floyd, H. The A-S Reaction Study: A Scale for Measuring Ascendance-Submission in Personality, A Manual of Directions, Scoring, Values, and Norms. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1939.

Odell, Miriam E. "Personality Correlates to Independence and Conformity," Unpublished Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, 1959.

AUTOBIOGRAPHY

I, Lillian Beatrice Matthews, was born at Toronto, Ontario, Canada, and received my elementary and secondary education in the Ontario Public schools. I received my Bachelor of Science degree from Macdonald College of McGill University, Montreal, in 1950. From 1950 to 1954 I taught home economics in Quebec and Ontario schools. I received my Master of Science degree from Pennsylvania State University in August, 1955. From 1955 to 1960 I held the position of Clothing Specialist for the Cooperative Extension Service at the University of New Hampshire. From June, 1960, I continued to work to meet the requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy.