INFORMATION TO USERS

This material was produced from a microfilm copy of the original document. While the most advanced technological means to photograph and reproduce this document have been used, the quality is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original submitted.

The following explanation of techniques is provided to help you understand markings or patterns which may appear on this reproduction.

1. The sign or "target" for pages apparently lacking from the document photographed is "Missing Page(s)". If it was possible to obtain the missing page(s) or section, they are spliced into the film along with adjacent pages. This may have necessitated cutting thru an image and duplicating adjacent pages to insure you complete continuity.

2. When an image on the film is obliterated with a large round black mark, it is an indication that the photographer suspected that the copy may have moved during exposure and thus cause a blurred image. You will find a good image of the page in the adjacent frame.

3. When a map, drawing or chart, etc., was part of the material being photographed the photographer followed a definite method in "sectioning" the material. It is customary to begin photoing at the upper left hand corner of a large sheet and to continue photoing from left to right in equal sections with a small overlap. If necessary, sectioning is continued again — beginning below the first row and continuing on until complete.

4. The majority of users indicate that the textual content is of greatest value, however, a somewhat higher quality reproduction could be made from "photographs" if essential to the understanding of the dissertation. Silver prints of "photographs" may be ordered at additional charge by writing the Order Department, giving the catalog number, title, author and specific pages you wish reproduced.

5. PLEASE NOTE: Some pages may have indistinct print. Filmed as received.

76-19,411

DARDEN, Leatha Anne, 1939-
PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF CLOTHING
INTEREST FOR A GROUP OF NON-
INCARCERATED AND INCARCERATED WOMEN
AGES 18 TO 30.

The University of North Carolina at
Greensboro, Ph.D., 1975
Home Economics

PERSONALITY CORRELATES OF CLOTHING INTEREST

FOR A GROUP OF NON-INCARCERATED

AND INCARCERATED WOMEN

AGES 18 TO 30

by

Leatha Anne Darden

A Dissertation Submitted to
the Faculty of the Graduate School at
The University of North Carolina at Greensboro
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Greensboro
1975

Approved by

Eunice M. Leemer
Dissertation Advisor

APPROVAL PAGE

This dissertation has been approved by the following committee of the Faculty of the Graduate School at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro.

Dissertation
Adviser _____

Committee Members _____

_____

_____

_____

_____
Date of Acceptance by Committee

DARDEN, LEATHA ANNE. Personality Correlates of Clothing
Interest for a Group of Non-Incarcerated and Incarcerated
Women Ages 18-30. (1975) Directed by: Dr. Eunice
M. Deemer. Pp. 210.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine

whether measurable relationships exist among selected

types of clothing interest and personality characteris-

tics believed to be associated with the different levels

of adjustment. A non-incarcerated and an incarcerated

group were compared on the basis of the clothing concerns

measured by Creekmore's 1968 "Importance of Clothing

Questionnaire" and the personality factors identified

by the 1967-68 edition of Cattell's 16 PF Test, Form

A. Biographical information was collected by means

of a demographic data sheet.

A total of 188 women participated. Ninety-four

were students enrolled at The University of North

Carolina at Greensboro during the first summer session,

1974. The remaining 94 respondents were women concur-

rently enrolled in the prison school of The Correctional

Center for Women, Raleigh, North Carolina.

Pearson's product moment correlation coefficients

indicated that small but definite relationships existed

between specific clothing concerns and personality

characteristics under study. Five such relationships

were found for non-incarcerated respondents and eight were identified for incarcerated women. Personality Factors G and Q_3 ranked first and second in importance for both populations. Findings indicated that as subjects increased in personality characteristics described by Cattell as conscientious, staid, and rule-bound, their general level of clothing interest increased. Also, as subjects increased in social awareness, regard for social reputation, and self-respect, their willingness to devote time to clothing and to use it to attract attention increased. These findings were true for both non-incarcerated and incarcerated women.

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) indicated that the two sample populations were different in regard to their willingness to give time to experimenting with clothing and to use it to attract attention. Incarcerated women scored higher on both clothing behaviors.

To identify relationships between clothing concerns and personality characteristics believed to be associated with levels of adjustment, groups were compared on the basis of: non-incarceration-incarceration; score level on individual personality factors; and mean scores on the clothing subscales for each subgroup. Results of these MANOVA procedures were identical for both sample populations. These results indicated:

1.   Respondents who were concerned with the modesty of their dress tended to be emotionally less stable, lower in ego strength, and to suffer from timidity and inferiority feelings.

2.   Women who were concerned with the aesthetics and management of clothing tended to be socially aware, composed, satisfied, and self-respecting.

3.   Subjects who were interested in the use of clothing to win social approval tended to be socially aware, self-respecting, and to have regard for social reputation.

Pearson's product moment correlation coefficients indicated that there were no significant relationships between clothing concern and socioeconomic position as measured by Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index of Social Position," for either population group.

The conclusions of this research were that, for the women who participated:

1.   Small but definite relationships existed between personality characteristics and clothing concerns.

2.   Specific clothing concerns were related to certain personality characteristics believed to be associated with levels of adjustment.   The same

relationships between clothing and personality existed

regardless of whether subjects were incarcerated or

not.

this research would not have been possible. Indebtedness must also be expressed to those students at The University of North Carolina who willingly took part in this study.

To my colleagues at Arizona State University, particularly Dr. Bruce Campbell for his assistance with the computer programs, the members of the University Testing Service, and to Miss Elinor O'Connor for her encouragement, I extend sincerest appreciation.

Finally, to my fellow graduate students and especially to my family and Mrs. W. C. Garrett I would like to express a heartfelt "thank you" for your support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The decades since the 1940's have given rise
to a growing body of research concerned with acquiring
an understanding of basic principles related to human,
social, and psychological development. Much of this
research has centered around the development of
personality characteristics and their effect upon
individual modes or styles of behavior. Attempts
have been made to associate constellations of per-
sonality characteristics with behavior manifested
through achievement, occupational choice, addiction
to drugs or alcohol, and other forms of social and
emotional adjustment.

Some research has involved the possible
relationship between personality characteristics
and interest in clothing. Many authorities suggest
that clothing is an important form of non-verbal
communication between individuals and groups.[1]
Roach phrased this belief in the following way:

---

[1]M. S. Ryan, Clothing: A Study in Human
Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston,
Inc., 1966), pp. 8-40.

"Clothing use, by people of all ages, is related to two kinds of survival: survival of the species and survival of the individual human being."[2]

These two forms of survival are inseparably interrelated. Survival of the individual depends not only upon the preservation of the biological organism but upon the psychological and social well-being of that organism as well. Social psychologists suggest that individuals are attracted to and seek affiliation with social groups on the expectation of need satisfaction. Need satisfaction, in turn, is based upon personality and, hence, social affiliation is related to personality. Through his clothing the individual seeks to communicate his similarity to and eligibility for group membership. In short, he seeks to create an impression upon his social environment which will allow him to participate within its organization and benefit from the rewards it has to bestow. Thus, it would appear that an individual employs clothing as an indirect vehicle in his attempts to meet and fulfill his psychological needs.

---

[2]M. E. Roach, "Adolescent Dress," Journal of Home Economics 61 (November 1969): 694.

If a more comprehensive understanding of this channel of communication and its relationship to need satisfaction is to be gained, empirical knowledge about individual and collective meanings of clothing is essential. Perhaps a logical point of departure is with the individual. How does the individual see, value, and use clothing? How does the individual's interest in clothing relate to that portion of his psychological make-up referred to as personality? Do groups of individuals with similar interests, goals, and personality characteristics use clothing in similar ways? Are there differences in the clothing interests and concerns of individuals who exhibit personality characteristics believed to be indicative of different levels of adjustment?

In 1949 Stepat[3] conducted a study to investigate the possible relationship between social and emotional adjustment and concern about clothing. Results indicated that, for the female college freshmen sampled, individuals who gave evidence of lower levels of social and emotional adjustment also tended to exhibit more uncertainty about, and problems with,

---

[3]M. S. Ryan, Clothing: A Study in Human Behavior (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1966), pp. 88-89.

their clothing. Conversely, individuals with the
least number of clothing problems tended to have a
broader range of interests, activities, and experiences.
Therefore, it would appear that lower levels of clothing
concern might be related to higher levels of adjustment.

Numbers of research projects have been conducted
in an effort to associate conformity and individuality
in dress with peer acceptance, social participation,
and self-esteem.[4] Other projects have endeavored to
link style of dress and appearance with personality
characteristics[5] and philosophical outlook.[6] Few
attempts, however, have been made to determine
whether a relationship does exist between personality
characteristics, level of adjustment, and specific

---

[4]A. M. Creekmore and S. H. Kuehne, "Relationships
among Social Class, School Position, and Clothing of
Adolescents," Journal of Home Economics 63, (October
1971): 555-56; K. B. Hambleton, M. E. Roach, and K.
Ehle, "Teenage Appearance: Conformity, Preferences,
and Self Concepts," Journal of Home Economics 64
(February 1972): 29-33; L. C. Taylor and N. H. Compton,
"Personality Correlates of Dress Conformity," Journal
of Home Economics 60 (October 1968): 653-56.

[5]L. M. Gurel, J. C. Wilbur, and L. Gurel,
"Personality Correlates of Adolescent Clothing Styles,"
Journal of Home Economics 64 (March 1972): 42-47.

[6]L. E. Thomas, "Clothing and Counter-Culture:
An Empirical Study," Adolescence 8 (Spring 1973):
93-112; D. M. Kness, "The Clothing Attitudes and
Social-Political beliefs of University Men Identified
as Conservative and Hippy Dressers" (Master's thesis,
The Pennsylvania State University, 1971), pp. 1-3.

types of concern about clothing. It would appear
that such knowledge is basic to a more thorough
understanding of the complex significance clothing
has within the context of social groups.

Purposes and Objectives of the Study

The primary purpose of this study was to ascertain whether measurable relationships exist among
selected types of clothing interests and personality
characteristics believed to be associated with different
levels of adjustment. This study included a comparison
between a non-incarcerated group and an incarcerated
group. The comparison was made on the basis of
clothing interest test scores and personality profiles.

Two objectives to be realized from the comparison
of these two groups were:

1. To determine whether specific types of
clothing interests are associated with specific personality
characteristics.

2. To ascertain whether certain categories of
clothing interests are related to personality characteristics believed to be associated with various levels
of adjustment.

Definitions

Adjustment Level--"the degree to which an individual has effected a harmonious relation with his environment"[7] as indicated by score position on Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Test (hereafter referred to as the 16 PF).

Clothing Concerns--the types of interests an individual professes to have in his clothing as expressed through self-report using the Creekmore "Importance of Clothing Questionnaire."

High Adjustment Levels--all standard tens scores (hereafter referred to as stens) which did not fall within the realms of extreme scores on Cattell's 16 PF Test.[8] These scores were considered indicative of the degree to which an individual is able to maintain a harmonious relation with his environment, to obtain satisfaction for his needs, and meet fairly

---

[7]H. B. English and A. C. English, A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms: A Guide to Usage (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1965), p. 13.

[8]Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Manual for the 16 PF (Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1972), p. 5.

well the demands, physical and social, placed upon him.[9]

Low Adjustment Levels--all scores which fell within the extreme ranges, whether low (sten of one to three) or high (sten of eight to ten) on Cattell's 16 PF Test.[10] These scores were considered indicative of potential difficulties in coping with the problems posed by the everyday environment.

Personality--"the pattern of motivation and of temperamental or emotional traits of the individual" which determine his adjustment to his environment.[11]

Personality Traits--"an enduring disposition or quality of a person that accounts for his relative consistency in emotional, temperamental, and social behavior."[12]

---

[9]H. B. English and A. C. English, A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms: A Guide to Usage (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1965), p. 384.

[10]Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Manual for the 16 PF (Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1972), p. 5.

[11]H. B. English and A. C. English, A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms: A Guide to Usage (New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1965), p. 382.

[12]Ibid., p. 384.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Theoretical Background

The theoretical framework which provided the

premise for this study was the trait approach to the

analysis of human personality. This approach suggests

that all human responses are overt signs of fundamental

and pervasive mental predispositions. It further

suggests that these underlying predispositions are the

causal effects of both general and specific behavior

directed toward goal attainment and adjustment to the

environment.[13] Allport states that:

> A specific act is always the product of many
> determinants, not only of lasting sets, but
> of momentary pressures in the person and the
> situation. It is only the repeated occurrence
> of acts that have the same significance . . .
> following upon a definable range of stimuli
> having the same personal significance that makes
> necessary the inference of traits . . . .
> These tendencies are not at all times active
> but are persistent even when latent . . . .[14]

Thus, personality would seem to form the basis

for selective perception which sensitizes various

---

[13]G. W. Allport, _Pattern and Growth in Personality_
(New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961).

[14]_Ibid._, p. 374.

individuals to classes of stimuli. In addition, the
mode of behavior which the individual selects as a
means of coping with the stimulus condition is determined
by the hierarchical constellation of traits which
constitute his personality. The readiness to respond
and the response are believed to be anchored in
personality traits which are relatively enduring.
The general stability of traits accounts for the
tendency toward behavioral consistency.

The line of reasoning followed by many trait
theorists leads to definitions of personality similar
to the one proposed by Allport: "Personality is the
dynamic organization within the individual of those
psychophysical systems that determine his characteristic
behavior and thought."[15]

The repertory of typical behavior patterns
exhibited by the individual is seen as outward manifesta-
tion of his personal characteristics. Clothing behavior,
when viewed as part of the typical behavior of the
individual, may be considered a derivation of
personality characteristics. Therefore, the assumptions
which guided this study were derived from the trait
theory of personality. These assumptions were:

---

[15]Ibid., p. 28.

1. Traits are "underlying characteristics, qualities, or processes"[16] that have a directive function in the determination of behavior.

2. "Traits are relatively stable and enduring predispositions that exert fairly generalized"[17] behavioral effects.

3. These predispositions may be acquired through learning.

4. Certain traits are commonly shared in varying amounts by groups of people.

5. Traits can be measured by paper-and-pencil tests.

6. It is possible to compare persons or groups of people on the basis of trait dimensions.[18]

Personality, Social Participation, and Clothing Behavior

Proponents of diverse sociological and and psychological theories of personality suggest that personality is, at least in part, a product of the

---

[16]W. Mischel, Personality and Assessment (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968), p. 5.

[17]Ibid., p. 6.

[18]C. S. Hall and G. Lindzey, Theories of Personality, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970), pp. 258-98.

socialization process.[19] For example, underlying person-
ality characteristics determine the modes of coping behav-
ior an individual uses in his efforts to adjust to his
social environment. Clothing has frequently been recognized
by authorities[20] as a form of coping behavior learned through
the process of socialization. As such, clothing can facilitate
social participation by gaining entry for the individual
into groups which have the power to reward or punish his
social performance. Since it is believed that an individual
is attracted to social groups on the basis of expectation of
need fulfillment through the attainment of personal goals,[21]

---

[19]A. Bandura, _Principles of Behavior Modification_
(New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969), pp.
45-48; A. M. Combs and D. Snygg, _Individual Behavior_,
revised ed. (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1959)
pp. 237-265; C. S. Hall and G. Lindzey, _Theories of Person-
ality_, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970),
pp. 117-160; R. May, _Psychology and the Human Dilema_ (New
Jersey: D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1967), pp. 25-55.

[20]H. B. Baker, "Psychology of Clothing as a Treat-
ment Aid" _Mental Hygiene_, 39 (January 1955): 94-98;
E. Goffman, "The Inmate World," in _The Self in Social
Interaction_, Vol. 2, ed. C. Gordon and K. Gergen (New
York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968), pp. 267-74; M. S.
Ryan, _Clothing: A Study in Human Behavior_ (New York:
Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1968), pp. 57-81.

[21]D. Cartwright and A. Zander, ed., _Group Dynamics:
Research and Theory_, 3rd ed. (New York: Harper and Row,
Publishers, 1968), pp. 3-63.

it would appear that:

> . . . the selection of a particular mode
> of dress is seldom a random or purposeless act.
> Consciously or unconsciously, an individual
> chooses his clothing on the basis of identi-
> fiable psychic and physical needs that have
> been prompted by environmental stimuli, both
> social and physical.[22]

Personality and Clothing Behavior

Taylor and Compton[23] hypothesized that conformity

in dress would be related to preferences for color, design,

and texture in fabrics as well as to selected personality

characteristics of college women. Their hypothesis was

founded upon the social psychological postulate that

conformity in dress is a means of reducing anxiety

through gaining acceptance by individuals and groups.

Consequently, the personality characteristics investi-

gated were those related to social interaction orienta-

tion. Results indicated that conformity in dress

had a significant and positive relationship for

respondents showing a social perspective characterized

by interest in the maintenance of harmonious group

[22]Bulletin of Western Regional Research
Cooperative Project W-98, Relationship of Clothing to
the Personal and Social Acceptability of Adolescents
(Washington State University: Washington Agricultural
Experiment Station, February 1972), p. 1.

[23]L. C. Taylor and N. H. Compton, "Personality
Correlates of Dress Conformity," Journal of Home
Economics 60 (October 1968): 653-56.

relationships. No significant relationships were found between conformity in dress and interaction orientations emphasizing individualism and self sufficiency. The findings of this study supported the belief that clothing may be viewed as one aspect of coping behavior based upon the psychological needs of the individual. For individuals who were group-oriented, it appeared that clothing was used to enhance a sense of social well-being through alleviation of anxiety such as fear of ridicule or rejection by the group.

A somewhat similar relationship between psychological needs and clothing conformity and non-conformity was found by Hiller.[24] Murray's need theory of personality as a motivating force in behavior provided the framework for this study. This research was designed to determine whether fashion innovators displayed different constellations of personality needs, tolerance of ambiguity and socioeconomic status from those displayed by non-innovators. Findings indicated that innovators exhibited lower levels of needs for order and deference and higher levels of needs for

_____

[24]G. Hiller, "Comparison of Two Groups of University of Alberta College Women: - Innovators of a Specific Fashion in Clothing and Members of the Normative Dress Majority - on Selected Characteristics" (Master's thesis, Utah State University, 1971), p. 48.

autonomy and nuturence. No significant differences
were found between tolerance of ambiguity or socio-
economic status for the two participating groups.
It appeared that personality characteristics which tend
to contribute to independence, self-sufficiency, and
self-assurance may be associated with a willingness
to adopt new fashions, and, thereby, deviate from
contemporary clothing norms.

White and Kernalequen were concerned with the
following concept of deviancy and conformity to social
group pressures:

> Deviancy and conformity in varying degrees
> are not specific types of behavior present at
> birth but develop as a result of interaction
> with the environment and reflect the psycho-
> logical, sociological, and cultural adjustments
> of the individual. As the individual matures,
> his behavior becomes modified in response to
> the demands and expectations around him. How
> the individual incorporates these responses in
> his conduct determines his degree of deviance
> from and/or conformity to societal norms.[25]

It was their belief that variation from group
norms governing clothing behavior could be attributed
to differences in selected perceptual and personality
variables exhibited by those who deviated from the norm

---

[25]B. O. White and A. P. Kernalequen, "Comparison
of Selected Perceptual and Personality Variables
Among College Women Deviant and Non-Deviant in Their
Appearance," Perceptual and Motor Skills 32 (February
1971): 87.

and those who did not. The criterion of deviation selected for study was skirt length. This criterion was examined from the perspectives of: (a) orientation to seek social rewards or to avoid punishment; and (b) orientation to dress differently or to dress the same as others. The independent variables upon which the deviants and nondeviants were compared included: field dependence-independence; psychological security-insecurity; and inner-other directedness.

Findings indicated that women who deviated from the clothing norm were more field-independent, more secure, and had a stronger orientation toward dressing to seek rewards and to be different from others. According to Witkin's theory of field dependence-independence and Maslow's view of psychological security-insecurity, these results suggested that individuals who are "free" to deviate from clothing norms are relatively independent of environmental pressures and are not unduly influenced by the authority of others. Respondents who did not deviate from the clothing norms tended to use clothing to avoid punishment and to be more like others in outward appearance. There was no significant difference between the two groups with regard to inner-other directedness. These findings

tended to confirm those of Taylor and Compton as well
as those of Hiller.

In an earlier study, Creekmore[26] investigated
the relationship among selected clothing behaviors,
general values, and striving for basic needs. The Allport,
Vernon, Lindzey Study of Values provided the basis for
measurement of general values. Maslow's hierarchy of
needs served as the foundation for the instrument
devised by Creekmore to assess basic needs. The author
also constructed an instrument designed to measure 14
clothing behaviors (later refined into "The Importance
of Clothing Questionnaire"). For the college women
who participated, results indicated that individuals
who emphasized different general values in their strivings
to satisfy basic needs, perceived clothing differently
and used it in ways which were compatible with their
schemata of values.

A further investigation into the interrelationships
between personality and clothing was conducted by Gurel,
Wilbur, and Gurel.[27] These authors were interested in the

---

[26]A. M. Creekmore, "Clothing Behaviors and Their
Relation to General Values and to the Striving for Basic
Needs" (Ph.D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania State
University, 1963), p. 48.

[27]L. M. Gurel, J. C. Wilbur, and L. Gurel,
"Personality Correlates of Adolescent Clothing Styles,"
Journal of Home Economics 64 (March 1972): 42-47.

thesis that "observable diversity of dress reflects something about the psychological make-up of adolescents, both as individuals and as groups."[28] To test this hypothesis, groups of adolescents displaying different clothing styles completed the California F-scale and the Rekeach Dogmatism Scale. Results tended to support the hypothesis. Each of the four clothing style groups designated as "straights, greasers, mods, and hippies" tended to score differently on the personality scales employed. The authors concluded that:

> . . . overt human behavior reflects those integrated and organized systems of beliefs, values, and ideals commonly denoted by the "personality," and further, that dress and grooming practices constitute a useful, . . behavioral avenue to personality study.[29]

Results of this study and those previously cited indicated that clothing behavior is influenced by personality and that it is one form of behavior associated with need fulfillment. Since it is through interaction with others that the individual primarily strives to attain physiological and psychological well-being; it seems logical to postulate that clothing behavior is influenced by social participation. This postulate is examined in the following section.

---

[28] Ibid., p. 46.

[29] Ibid., p. 46.

Social Participation and Clothing Behavior

Creekmore and Kuehne[30] believed that adolescents
construct their own status systems within the social
organization of the high school. Their primary concern
was to determine whether clothing use was related to
these hypothetical systems. The Creekmore "Importance
of Clothing Questionnaire" was employed to measure
clothing usage. Data from this source were correlated
with socioeconomic and high school status variables.
Results indicated that various uses of clothing
(aesthetic, modesty, interest, comfort, management)
were more important to the status of the girls in the
sample than to that of boys. Only the aesthetic use of
dress was significantly related to high school status for
both sexes. Another finding was that clothing usage
was more predictive of high school status than socio-
economic position. It appeared that clothing can facilitate
social participation within specified groups or social
systems; and that clothing is a symbol manipulated by
individuals in their attempt to attain desired status
within these groups and systems.

---

[30]A. M. Creekmore and S. H. Kuehne, "Relationships
Among Social Class, School Position, and Clothing of
Adolescents," Journal of Home Economics 63 (October
1971): 555-56.

In a study conducted by Humphrey and Creekmore,[31]
it was hypothesized that clothing plays a role in sociali-
zation and, thereby, in the development and maintenance
of self concept. If this thesis proved accurate, then
specific uses of dress might conceivably be related
to feelings of social security and insecurity as indica-
ted by stable vs. unstable self conceptions. Findings
indicated the following: (a) unstable or insecure
respondents, of both sexes, were more concerned with
the management use of clothing than were stable respondents;
(b) insecure boys tended to be concerned about appearance
and comfort while insecure girls were interested in
experimenting with parts of the costume; and (c) as the
level of insecurity of girls increased so did their
concern with the comfort use of clothing. On the basis
of these data the authors concluded that ". . . clothing
functions in different ways for individuals with different
psychological characteristics."[32] Thus, it seemed that
coping behavior in the form of clothing usage differed
with the personal attributes of the individual and with
his sense of social well-being. Perhaps those individuals
who were ill-at-ease within social situations employed

---

[31]
M. K. Humphrey and A. M. Creekmore, "Clothing
and Self-Concept of Adolescents," Journal of Home
Economics 63 (April 1971): 246-50.

[32]Ibid., p. 249.

clothing as a means of alleviating uncertainty by enhancing their physical appearance within the norms established by the group.

Previously, it had been suggested that the general values held by an individual modify and influence his perception of clothing and its functions. When these values are reinforced by norms supported by groups for which the individual has positive regard, or in which he holds membership, it seems probable that these values will become even stronger. With the increased strength of the values which guide the individual's behavior, it is logical to suppose that his selective perception and use of clothing which are founded upon these values will also become more firmly established.

Christiansen and Kernaleguen[33] were interested in the possible relationship between values (which they defined as the relatively stable basis for discriminations, judgments, and analyses made by individuals) and clothing behavior. The specific relationship which was investigated was the association between the religious values of membership in the Mormon Church and conservatism in the form of modesty in dress. Results denoted a significant,

---

[33]K. Christiansen and A. Kernaleguen, "Orthodoxy and Conservatism - Modesty in Clothing Selection," Journal of Home Economics 63 (April 1971): 251-55.

positive correlation between orthodoxy and preferences
for conservative styles of clothing. The strongest
preference for conservative modes of dress were found
among respondents who participated in more church
activities and who traveled with church youth groups.
It was suggested that values shared by the group served
as a cohesive function for that group. For example,
social solidarity seems to be enhanced by a common view
of what are considered appropriate or inappropriate forms
of dress. It may be that different groups of individuals
exhibiting diverse schemata of values place different
collective emphases upon clothing and its subsequent
uses.

In accordance with the social psychological
frame of reference, Creekmore and Smucker[34] suggested that:

> . . . behavior, . . . is best understood in
> terms of the social collectivity in which it
> occurs. It is only by observing the common
> ways of behaving that the effects of the group
> on the individual and its power can be estab-
> lished.[35]

As members of a group engage in various forms of
interaction over time, a common frame of reference often

---

[34]A. M. Creekmore and B. Smucker, "Adolescents'
Clothing Conformity, Awareness, and Peer Acceptance,"
Home Economics Research Journal 1 (December 1972):
92-97.

[35]Ibid., p. 93.

emerges. This frame of reference is used as a yardstick in the evaluation of a wide range of behaviors exhibited by group members. Among the behaviors which fall within the sanction of a group are recognition of and adherence to clothing norms.

Creekmore and Smucker applied this idea in the study of interrelationships among adolescents' awareness of clothing modalities within the sophomore class of a selected high school, conformity to these clothing modalities, and peer acceptance. It was reasoned that awareness of the clothing mode and conformity to the mode would be positively related. It was also reasoned that both awareness of and conformity to the mode would be positively related to general peer acceptance. Findings of the investigation tended to support the hypotheses and the authors concluded that adolescents appeared to intentionally conform to the clothing norms which they perceived to be shared by the group. Creekmore and Smucker suggested that the relationship of awareness and of conformity to clothing norms and acceptance by peers may be indicative of the importance of clothing in group interaction and attraction among group members.

Littrell and Eicher[36] hypothesized that opinions about clothing and appearance would be a significant factor in movement from social isolation to social acceptance. This idea grew from the following points of view. First, that an individual who desires membership within a specified group will tend to learn to express the values, attitudes, and behaviors of the group prior to gaining admission into membership. Second, that appearance is an aspect of all social transactions. Third, that it is appearance which establishes the identities of the participants and helps to define reciprocal role relationships.

For purposes of investigation, reference groups were defined as reciprocal friendship structures (RFS) into which the isolate made a friendship choice. The social transaction which was of interest to the authors was acceptance into the chosen group.

Although the sample was small, results were in the direction predicted by the hypothesis. Isolates whose opinions about clothing, appearance, and social acceptance approximated those of their selected reference groups tended to become members of those groups. It was also

---

[36] M. B. Litterll and J. B. Eicher, "Clothing Opinions and the Social Acceptance Process Among Adolescents," Adolescence 8 (Summer 1973): 197-205.

found that isolates who made choices into more cohesive

groups were more likely to be accepted into these groups

than were isolates who selected less cohesive groups.

The authors explained this phenomenon in the following

way: "It may be easier for a RFS with a narrow range

of opinions to recognize when a potential group member

has the same opinions and, likewise, for the potential

member to recognize and approximate the opinions of the

desired group."[37]

It was concluded that general approximation

of opinions held by specific reference groups were

sufficient for membership providing other factors were

met. Clothing and appearance were considered to be

important in the movement from social isolation to social

acceptance.

The idea that personal clothing styles might

serve as an index of adherence or non-adherence to values

expressed by society in general prompted a study by

Thomas.[38] It was suggested that personal styles of dress

which displayed a "radical" orientation would be indicative

of values described as "counter" to those of the dominant

---

[37]Ibid., p. 205.

[38]L. E. Thomas, "Clothing and Counter-Culture:
An Empirical Study," Adolescence, 8 (Spring 1973): 93-112.

American culture. Findings supported the basic thesis

of the investigation and the author concluded that:

> Dress behavior which violates basic dress 'custom'
> appears to be related to a tendency to violate other
> cultural norms, and hence, be indicative of a general
> 'counter-culture' outlook.[39]

On the basis of current research findings it seems

possible that different interests in and uses of clothing

might be associated with different personality traits.

Also, it appears that clothing might serve as an

expression of philosophical outlook and social affilia-

tion for individuals and groups. To date the majority

of these findings has been based upon research limited

to student populations. If clothing does function in

these ways for students, it might be that different

interests in clothing are related in similar ways for

different groups of individuals. More specifically, it

might be that differences in clothing interests are

related to various levels of adjustment and to the

personality characteristics believed to be associated

with these levels of adjustment regardless of social

groups affiliation.

---

[39]Ibid., p. 110.

CHAPTER III

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

The primary purpose of this exploratory research
was to determine whether measurable relationships exist
among personality characteristics believed to be associated
with different levels of adjustment. The study
involved a comparison between a non-incarcerated and an
incarcerated group on the basis of clothing interest
test scores and personality profiles. The objectives
were:

1. To determine whether specific types of
clothing interests are associated with specific personality
characteristics.

2. To ascertain whether certain categories of
clothing interests are related to personality
characteristics believed to be associated with various
levels of adjustment.

Hypotheses

The general hypothesis which guided this study
was that concern about clothing is related to
certain personality factors believed to be associated
with adjusment.

Sub-Hypotheses

To facilitate research procedure, the following sub-hypotheses, stated in positive form, were set forth:

1. There is a difference between non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups with regard to concern about clothing.

2. Individuals of both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who score high on specific personality traits have similar concerns about clothing.

3. Individuals of both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who score low on specific personality traits have similar concerns about clothing.

4. Individuals of both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who have average scores on specific personality traits have similar concerns about clothing.

5. There is a difference between individuals of both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who score high and those who score low on specific personality traits with regard to concern about clothing.

6. There is a difference between individuals of both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who have average scores and those who have high scores

and those who have high scores on specific personality traits with regard to concern about clothing.

7. There is a difference between individuals of both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who have average scores and those who have low scores on specific personality traits with regard to concern about clothing.

Scope and Limitations

This study was concerned only with the possible association between personality characteristics and specific clothing interests for a group of non-incarcerated and a group of incarcerated women. No attempt was made to generalize about personality characteristics which may lead to incarceration.

Respondents in the investigation were restricted to those selected on the basis of sex, non-incarceration, incarceration, and age range. Because of the need to work with a group of female inmates, randomization in sample selection was not possible. Other limitations, any were associated with the ex post facto nature of group subdivisions. Respondents were self-selected into subgroups on the basis of their score level on a standardized personality inventory. Due to these limitations, inferences about clothing interests as they relate to

personality traits associated with different levels of
adjustment apply only to the individuals participating
in this research. No generalizations can be made
to other populations.

Limitations associated with the instruments
selected for use in this study must also be noted. The
Creekmore "Importance of Clothing Questionnaire," a
Likert-type rating scale designed to measure clothing
attitudes, was subject to the restrictions inherent in
any attitude scale.

> Care must be taken in interpreting the results
> of attitude scales. There is no scientific way
> of knowing whether the five point scoring system
> used represented equal intervals or whether an
> individual who marked "agree" on an item
> possessed twice as much interest in clothing as
> the individual who marked "disagree" . . . .
> Since attitude scales do not represent true
> interval measurement any summation of such
> a scale must be used with these limitations
> in mind.[40]

For this reason, all that has been claimed for individuals
who scored high on the various subscales within the
"Importance of Clothing Questionnaire" was that they
evidenced a "greater" though no "proportionally greater,"
degree of clothing interest in the realms measured by

---

[40]L. M. Gurel, "Dimensions of Clothing Interest
Based on Factor Analysis of Creekmore's 1968 Clothing
Measure" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of North
Carolina at Greensboro, 1972), p. 39.

those subscales than individuals who score low on the
same scales.

This particular questionnaire was also subject
to the acquiescence of response set, due to the limited
number (five) of negatively worded statements.

Among the limitations suggested by various
authors[41] in regard to Cattell's 16 PF Test was one
set forth for all self-report measures:

> In (such) test responding, all you have are data
> of people trying to describe themselves as best
> they can remember and as frank as they wish to
> be in terms of questions posed by someone else.[42]

Related to this criticism was the fact that the 16
PF Test contains no "faking scales" to assist in
identifying truthful responses or those individuals
who might have "faked good or bad" in their answers.

Weaknesses were also inherent in the use
of Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index of Social Position."
Since the social position of an individual or house-
hold is determined by two items (the precise occu-
pational role of the head of the household and his

---

[41]O. K. Buros, ed., The Seventh Mental Measurements
Yearbook, Vol. 1 (New Jersey: The Gryphon Press, 1972),
pp. 332-35; S. R. Maddi, Personality Theories: A
Comprehensive Analysis (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey
Press, 1968), p. 369.

[42]S. R. Maddi, Personality Theories: A Compre-
hensive Analysis (Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey Press,
1968), p. 369,

level of formal education), ratings cannot be obtained
for individuals who do not supply this information.

Assumptions

With these limitations clearly in mind the
following statements were assumed to hold true for
this study:

1. Traits are "underlying characteristics,
qualities, or processes"[43] that have a directive
function in the determination of behavior.

2. "Traits are relatively stable and
enduring predispositions that exert fairly generalized"[44]
behavioral effects.

3. These predispositions may be acquired
through learning.

4. Certain traits are shared in varying
amounts by groups of people.

5. Traits can be measured by pencil-and-
paper tests.

---

[43]W. Mischel, *Personality and Assessment*
(New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968), p. 5.

[44]*Ibid.*, p. 6.

6. It is possible to compare persons or groups of people on the basis of trait dimensions.[45]

7. It is possible to measure attitudes even though questions of validity arise.

8. Due to the anonymity of responses and the group sessions employed for data collection, the tendency to fake responses was minimal.

9. Because of the non-random method of sample selection, the assumptions underlying some of the statistical procedures may have been violated, particularly that of homogeneity of variance. However, many statisticians believe that the use of parametric procedures with non-random populations does not seriously affect the validity of the results if groups of the same size are compared.[46]

10. Due to the necessity of defining adjustment level on the bases defined by Cattell's 16 PF Test, group size inequalities resulted. A more stringent alpha level of .01 was designated to reduce the likelihood of committing a Type I Error. Also, findings from this portion of statistical treatment were

---

[45]C. S. Hall and G. Lindzey, Theories of Personality, 2nd ed. (New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970), pp. 258-98.

[46]W. L. Hays, Statistics (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1963), p. 408.

considered to be tenuous in nature.

Selection of the Instruments

Importance of Clothing Questionnaire

A review of research focusing upon the psychological and sociological study of clothing behavior indicated that the instrument which had gained the greatest acceptance was the one developed and refined by Dr. A. M. Creekmore and a group of five graduate students at Michigan State University. This instrument, in its latest revision (1968), consisted of eight Likert-type subscales designed to measure clothing uses. The specific uses of clothing purported to be measured by the "Importance of Clothing Questionnaire" were: (1) aesthetic; (2) approval; (3) attention; (4) comfort; (5) dependence; (6) interest; (7) management; and (8) modesty. Definitions of each of these scales are found in Appendix A.

The original questionnaire contained 170 statements. After three pretestings and subsequent revisions, the final form consisted of 89 statements. The first item was introductory in nature and was not used in scoring. The remaining 88 items comprised eight subscales of 11 statements each. Respondents indicated degree of

agreement with individual items on a summated rating

scale of five points. Degree of agreement with a

statement was recorded in the following way: "Almost

Always - very few exceptions," (weighting of five);

"Usually - majority of the time," (weighting of four);

"Sometimes," (weighting of three); "Seldom - not very

often," (weighting of two); and "Almost Never - very few

exceptions," (weighting of one). Five items (numbers

two, six, ten, 60 and 76) were negatively worded and

weightings of these statements were reversed for compu-

tational purposes. High scores on given subscales were

interpreted as an indication of frequency of occurrence of

the clothing behavior being measured. A high overall score

on the questionnaire was interpreted as an indication of a

high degree of clothing interest. A reproduction of the

instrument may be found in Appendix B.

Construct validity for the "Importance of Clothing

Questionnaire" was established by Gurel[47] through factor

analysis using data obtained from 500 college students.

> Claims for construct validity for the Creekmore
> "Importance of Clothing Questionnaire" could . . .
> be supported by the results of this study. The
> significant correlations (r=.800 or greater)
> between item assignments to subscales and item

---

[47]L. M. Gurel, "Dimensions of Clothing Interest
Based on Factor Analysis of Creekmore's 1968 Clothing
Measure" (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of North
Carolina at Greensboro, 1974), p. 114.

assignments to factors, the magnitude of
relationships between factor and subscale titles
representing the basic instrument constructs,
all lent credence to the basic theories
underlying the measure's validity.[48]

Some degree of reliability for the instrument
was established by Fetterman, using a population of
505 adolescent boys and girls.[49] The reliability
coefficients of each subscale for the female respondents
(N=269) were: (a) interest, r=.77; (b) dependence,
r=.75; (c) attention, r=.71; (d) approval, r=.71; (e)
modesty, r=.71 (f) management, r=.67; (g) comfort,
r=.57; and (h) aesthetic, r=.46. "Fetterman recommended
using the scales in their present form with other
populations before revisions."[50]

Sixteen Personality Factor Test

Criteria which guided selection of the personality
measure used in this investigation by this author were:

1. Constructs identified by the instrument had
to be imbedded in the theoretical framework which provided
the basis for this study.

---

[48]Ibid., p. 122.

[49]A. M. Creekmore, Methods of Measuring Clothing
Variables (Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Agricultural
Experiment Station Project #783, 1966), p. 97.

[50]Ibid., p. 98.

2. Comprehensive information about the personality structure of groups of respondents had to be obtained in as short a period of time as possible.

3. The instrument had to be grounded in empirical research and coefficients of reliability and validity had to reach acceptable levels.

4. The language of the instrument had to be meaningful to populations who had not attained a high educational level.

After a review of literature relating to the trait theory of personality, the 1967-68 edition, Form A, of Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Test was decided upon. "The Sixteen Personality Factor Questionnaire . . . is an objectively scorable test devised by basic research in psychology to give the most complete coverage of personality possible in a brief time."[51]

The test endeavored to cover the entire range of personality components susceptible to measurement. More specifically, the instrument was designed to identify "source traits" which were defined as underlying causes of numbers of observable behavioral events which seem "to go together." These observable events were classified as "surface traits" by Cattell.

---

[51]Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, Manual for the 16 PF (Champaign, Illinois: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1972), p. 5.

In order to measure underlying source traits,
scores were obtained for "sixteen functionally independent
and psychologically meaningful dimensions isolated and
replicated in more than thirty years of factor analytic
research . . . ."[52] Each item was purported to contri-
bute to the score on only one factor and the correlations
among the 16 scales were reported to be of such low
magnitude that each scale provided new information about
the personality structure tested. Names and definitions
of the 16 primary factors contained in the 16 PF Test
appear in Appendix C.

Reliability based on short-term test-re-test
correlations ranged from r=.58 to r=.83. Nine of the 16
scales attained coefficients of concept validity which
ranged from r=.67 to r=.92. Seven of the scales were
somewhat less valid (from r=.35 to r=.63). Factor B
received the lowest rating.[53] Tables indicating coeffi-
cients of reliability and validity for each of the 16
scales reported for Form A are in Appendix D.

Form A also complied with the last criterion set
for instrument selection. It was appropriate for use with

---

[52]Ibid., p. 5.

[53]Ibid., p. 10.

"individuals whose educational level is roughly
equivalent to that of the normal high school student."[54]

Two Factor Index of Social Position

Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index of Social
Position" was employed as an objective estimate of the
socioeconomic status of respondents. As the name
implied, this procedure for assessing social position
rested upon the proper combination of two criteria -
occupation and educational level of the head of the
household.

Occupational level was presumed to reflect the
skills and power of individuals within society, and a
hierarchical list of occupations was included within the
Index. This scale of occupations was:

> . . . premised upon the assumption that occupa-
> tions have different values attached to them by
> the members of our society. The hierarchy
> ranges from the low evaluation of unskilled,
> physical labor toward the more prestigeful use
> of skill, through the creative talents of ideas,
> and the manipulation of men.[55]

The educational scale specified by the Index
was founded "upon the assumption that men and women
who posses similar educations will tend to have similar

---

[54]Ibid., p. 75.

[55]A. B. Hollingshead, "Two Factor Index of Social
Position." Vale Station, New Haven, Connecticut, 1968,
p. 8. (mimeographed).

tastes and similar attitudes, and they will also tend
to exhibit similar behavior patterns."[56] This scale
was rank-ordered into seven positions beginning with the
highest level (graduate professional training) through
the lowest (less than seven years of school).

The scale value on each of the two factors for
a specified individual is multiplied by its designated
weight (seven for occupation and four for education).
These scores are then added to produce a combined
score which is indicative of that individual's social
position. Scores may range from a low of 11, indicating
the highest social position, to a high of 77, indicating
the lowest social position.

Hollingshead[57] recommended the following score
divisions as meaningful for social class designations:

Social Class	Range of Computed Scores
I	11-17
II	18-27
III	28-43
IV	44-60
V	61-77

---

[56]Ibid., p. 9.

[57]Ibid., p. 10.

Sample Selection

Data for this investigation were collected during
the summer of 1974 from 232 women who were between the
ages of 18 to 30.

Ninety-four of the respondents were inmates of
the Correctional Center for Women in Raleigh, North
Carolina. Because of the necessity to work with the
incarcerated group within the structure of the institu-
tional routine, questionnaires were completed only by
inmates enrolled in the prison school.

The remaining 138 participants were students
concurrently enrolled in classes at the University of
North Carolina at Greensboro. Both intact classes
(Department of Sociology, School of Home Economics)
and volunteers comprised the student sample.

To equate groups, 94 students were randomly
selected from the total population of students who comple-
ted the protocols. Data from 188 individuals (94 non-
incarcerated and 94 incarcerated persons) provided the
basis for statistical procedures.

Administration of the Instruments

Cattell's Sixteen Personality Factor Test and
the "Importance of Clothing Questionnaire," designed by
Creekmore, were administered in group sessions to all

respondents over a two week period in June, 1974. Both instruments were completed by participants in single groups administrations. Approximately one and one-half hours were required for the completion of these instruments.

It was necessary to obtain the data within a relatively short period of time, so on two occasions simultaneous administrations were necessary for the student testing. Officials of the women's correctional facility stipulated the desirability that institutional personnel administer the questionnaire to the incarcerated population. Protocols were collected by the researcher, a research assistant, and an instructor at the prison school. Identical instructions for the completion of the questionnaires were read to each group prior to the administration of the instruments. These instructions are found in Appendix F.

Analysis of Data

Frequency counts were obtained for all biographical information collected on the demographic data sheet (Appendix E). Modes were computed for the background information of age, social class, occupation, and educational level.

Pearson's product moment correlation coefficient was used to ascertain whether any overall relationships existed between the clothing concerns and personality factors under study. Separate correlational matrices were established for the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups.

The second portion of data analysis employed multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) in an effort to identify differences in the eight clothing concerns and the 16 primary personality factors for the two population groups. Further MANOVA procedures were employed to identify differences in clothing concerns which might be related to personality characteristics believed to be associated with various levels of adjustment. This last MANOVA process required group comparisons on the basis of: (1) non-incarceration-incarceration; (2) score level on each personality factor; and (3) mean score for each subgroup on the eight clothing subscales.

The last portion of statistical treatment used Pearson's product moment correlation coefficients to ascertain whether any significant relationship in clothing concern for the two population groups might be attributed to differences in socioecnomic status as determined by Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index of Social Position."

Because of the necessity of group subdivisions
on the basis of score level on Cattell's 16 PF Test
and inequality in the sizes of these groups. an alpha
level of $p \leq .01$ was set for rejection of null hypotheses.
In the portion of statistical treatment which involved
correlational analyses, magnitude of the coefficients
of correlation were considered indicative in addition
to alpha level. An r of .300 was interpreted as indi-
cation of a small but definite relationship and an r
of .500 was interpreted as a substantial relationship.[58]
All data were processed by The University Testing Service
at Arizona State University.

---

[58]J. P. Guildford, Fundamental Statistics in
Psychology and Education, 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-
Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 145.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This research endeavored to determine whether
measurable relationships exist between selected types of
clothing interest and personality characteristics
believed to be associated with levels of adjustment.
Levels of adjustment were defined by score range on
Cattell's 16 PF Test. The Manual for the 16 PF[59] identi-
fied strongly deviant scores on each of the 16 primary
factors as those within the sten ranges of three to one
or eight to ten. Individuals scoring within either
of these ranges were considered to display characteristics
which might contribute to lower levels of adjusment.
All other sten scores were considered indicative of
higher levels of adjustment.

The Sample

The research sample for this study consisted of
two populations, a non-incarcerated and an incarcerated
group. All non-incarcerated subjects were female
students enrolled at The University of North Carolina at

---

[59] Institute for Personality and Ability Testing,
Manual for the 16 PF Test (Champaign, Illinois:
Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1972), p. 17.

Greensboro during the first summer session, 1974.

Incarcerated respondents were students in the prison

school of the Correctional Center for Women in Raleigh,

North Carolina. A total of 188 women (94 non-incarcerated

and 94 incarcerated) participated in the study.

Demographic data for the two groups are in Table 1.

TABLE 1

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION FOR NON-INCARCERATED
AND INCARCERATED SUBJECTS

Variable	Non-Incarcerated Frequency	Incarcerated Frequency
Age[a]		
18-21	50	51
22-25	32	24
26-30	12	18
No Answer		1
Total	94	94

[a]Modal age for both groups = 22.

[b]Modal educational level for non-incarcerated = junior
in college. Modal educational level for incarcerated =
partial high school.

[c]Socioeconomic class based upon occupation and education
of father. Sixty-three of the 94 incarcerated supplied
adequate information; 63 non-incarcerated randomly
selected from all those who supplied adequate information.
Modal socioeconomic class for non-incarcerated was
Class III. Modal socioeconomic class for incarcerated
was Class IV.

TABLE I (Continued)

Variable	Non-Incarcerated Frequency	Incarcerated Frequency
Residence Major Portion First 15 Years of Life		
State		
North Carolina	66	57
Other States	24	30
Foreign Country	1	
No Answer	3	7
Totals	94	94
Area		
Rural	43	31
Urban	50	59
No Answer	1	4
Total	94	94
Marital Status		
Married	17	17
Single	71	50
Divorced	2	12
Separated	2	14
Widowed	1	1
No Answer	1	
Total	94	94
Race		
Caucasian	87	49
Negro	7	44
American Indian		1
No Answer		
Total	94	94
Religious Preference		
No preference	12	4
Protestant	75	76
Catholic	3	9
Jewish	2	
Other	2	
No Answer		5
Total	94	94

TABLE 1 (Continued)

Variable	Non-Incarcerated Frequency	Incarcerated Frequency
Education[b]		
Graduate Student	20	1
Senior	12	1
Junior	30	2
Sophomore	12	3
Freshman	20	4
High School		25
Partial High School		24
Junior High		21
Less than seventh grade		13
No Answer		
Total	94	94
School in College		
Music	5	
Physical Education	4	1
Home Economics	32	
Arts and Sciences	22	2
Education	26	
Business	2	2
No Answer	3	6
Total	94	11
Socioeconomic[c] Class		
I (highest)	11	3
II	9	2
III	20	2
IV	15	34
V (lowest)	8	22
Total	63	63

Age and Race

Approximately one-half of the respondents in both groups were between the ages of 18 and 21 (50 non-incarcerated; 51 incarcerated). The modal age for both groups

of respondents was 22.

Education

Of the non-incarcerated respondents, 74 were under-graduates and 20 were graduate students enrolled in the Master's program. Only 11 of the incarcerated women had attended college. One of these had reached the senior year and one had been a graduate student. The Majority (58) of the incarcerated women had not completed high school. The modal educational level achieved by the non-incarcerated or student group was junior class standing and that of the incarcerated group was partial high school.

Most of the non-incarcerated subjects represented three schools: Home Ecomonics (32); Education (26); and Arts and Sciences (22). Only five of the 11 incarcerated subjects who had attended college identified the schools in which they were enrolled (Physical Education, Arts and Sciences, and Business).

Marital Status

The majority (71) of the non-incarcerated women were single while a little over one-half (50) of the incarcerated subjects were single. Seventeen respondents in each group were currently married.

Residence

Most of the women in both population groups had spent the largest portion of the first 15 years of their lives in North Carolina. Fifty non-incarcerated and 50 incarcerated respondents had lived in rural areas during these first 15 years.

Religious Preference

The religious preference identified by the majority of subjects in both groups was Protestant. Seventy-five non-incarcerated and 76 incarcerated women indicated this preference.

Social Position

Socioeconomic status was determined from the occupation and educational level of the respondent's father. Adequate information was obtained from 63 incarcerated women. Therefore, 63 non-incarcerated subjects were randomly selected from all those who supplied the required information.

The largest number (20) of non-incarcerated respondents were within Class III. The largest number (34) of the incarcerated subjects were in Class IV.

Summary

Demographic data obtained in this study evidence that the groups were satisfactorily matched in regard to: age; area of residence during the first 15 years of life; and religious preference. They were less satisfactorily matched with regard to marital status and poorly matched on race, education, and social class standing.

Means and Standard Deviations for Clothing Interest and Personality Characteristics

Each of the subjects in the incarcerated and non-incarcerated groups received a score on the eight Creekmore subscales and a score on the 16 primary personality factors identified by Cattell. The Cattell instrument was scored by National Computer Systems, 4401 West 76th Street, Minneapolis, Minnesota, 55435. These data were returned in the form of personality profiles scored in stens.

Clothing Subscales

Table 2 is composed of the means and standard deviations for both groups on the eight Creekmore subscales. Means on four of the clothing subscales were appreciably above the mid-point for subjects in the non-incarcerated group. Highest agreement was registered

TABLE 2

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON CLOTHING SUBSCALE
SCORES FOR NON-INCARCERATED
AND INCARCERATED WOMEN

Clothing Subscales	Means	Standard Deviations
Aesthetic		
Non-incarcerated	41.734	6.077
Incarcerated	41.883	5.827
Modesty		
Non-incarcerated	20.691	7.447
Incarcerated	32.245	8.357
Interest		
Non-incarcerated	36.191	8.923
Incarcerated	40.660	7.014
Comfort		
Non-incarcerated	38.468	5.821
Incarcerated	38.468	6.120
Attention		
Non-incarcerated	20.309	6.987
Incarcerated	35.532	9.264
Management		
Non-incarcerated	38.436	6.412
Incarcerated	40.032	8.640
Approval		
Non-incarcerated	30.223	5.577
Incarcerated	30.862	8.466
Dependence		
Non-incarcerated	38.798	6.744
Incarcerated	36.702	8.553

Note: Possible range on each subscale was 11-55.
        N=188
        n= 94

with aesthetic concern for clothing followed by
dependence, comfort, and management concerns.

Data for the incarcerated groups also revealed
four subscales with means appreciably above the mid-
point. The four major clothing concerns for this group
ranked in the following order: aesthetic; interest;
management; and comfort.

Further examination of the means indicated
several similarities between non-incarcerated and
incarcerated respondents. Both groups rated aesthetic
concern with clothing as most important and desire to
seek approval through clothing behavior as least important.
Another similarity between the two groups was revealed
by their response to the comfort subscale. Mean scores
on the subscale for the two groups were identical. A
fourth indication of similarity in clothing behavior
between the two groups was that of concern with the
management of clothing; the incarcerated women were
slightly more concerned with this aspect of clothing.

Major differences between the groups were in
degree of agreement with the subscales which measured
interest in clothing and use of clothing to attract
attention. Both of these subscales received higher
ratings by incarcerated women (approximately five points
for each subscale).

Summary

The order of emphasis placed upon the eight aspects of clothing behavior by the non-incarcerated group was: aesthetic; dependence; comfort; management; interest; modesty; attention; and approval. The order of importance for incarcerated respondents was: aesthetic; interest; management; comfort; dependence; attention; modesty; and approval. There were only two subscales which received the same position in the order for both groups. These were aesthetic, ranked first, and approval, ranked last.

Personality Factors

Table 3 contains the means and standard deviations for the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups on the 16 primary personality factors identified by Cattell. The profile sheets indicated the average range of scores on each of these 16 factors was between a sten of 4.5 and 6.5. All respondents were scored against general population norms. Cattell's guide for interpretation of the various sten levels, as described in the Manual for the 16 PF, provided the basis for the discussion of results.

Examination of data in Table 3 reveals that only one mean score for the non-incarcerated group fell outside the average range. Personality Factor F accounted

TABLE 3

MEANS AND STANDARD DEVIATIONS ON PERSONALITY FACTORS
FOR NON-INCARCERATED AND INCARCERATED WOMEN

	Personality Factors															
	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	Q_4
Means																
Non-inc.	5.399	6.426	5.838	6.256	7.052	5.294	6.254	5.932	6.384	5.355	4.756	5.269	5.811	5.861	5.362	6.152
Inc.	6.068	4.231	4.657	5.785	6.313	5.119	5.753	5.754	7.129	4.561	5.336	6.513	6.623	6.034	6.027	5.923
Standard Deviations																
Non-inc.	2.139	1.707	2.056	1.893	2.037	2.132	2.026	1.817	1.961	1.591	1.735	1.735	1.896	1.749	1.785	1.749
Inc.	1.694	1.846	2.001	1.508	1.769	1.982	1.883	1.822	1.793	1.457	1.531	2.141	1.506	1.873	1.637	1.907

Note: Possible range on each factor = 1-10.
        Extremely low scores = 1-3.
        Extremely high scores = 8-10.
        N=188
        n=94

for this deviation with a mean sten of 7.052. This finding indicated that the non-incarcerated women who participated in this study were slightly more happy-go-lucky, heedless, and enthusiastic than the general population norms. The lowest mean received by the non-incarcerated group was a sten of 4.756 on Factor N. This group was like the general population in the degree to which they were forthright, natural, and sentimental.

Means of two factors were found to fall outside the average range for the incarcerated group. The first was Factor B with a mean sten of 4.231 which indicated that this group was slightly below the general population in intelligence. The second factor which was outside the average range was Factor L with a mean of 7.129. Cattell claims that above average scores on this factor indicate a tendency to be suspicious, self-opinionated, and unconcerned about other people.

Summary

Neither group differed markedly from the general population norms on any of the 16 primary personality factors listed by Cattell. For this study, Cattell's second order factors were not considered.

Correlations Between Clothing Interest and
Personality Characteristics

Pearson product moment correlations were computed
between the scores on the eight Creekmore subscales
and those on the 16 primary factors appearing in
Cattell's inventory. Results of this analysis are
presented in Table 4.

Magnitude of the coefficients of correlation
was considered in addition to significance levels,
even though significant r's may indicate rejection of
the null hypothesis. This procedure was followed
because of the belief that more meaningful interpre-
tations of the data would be possible if strength of
relationships was examined. Therefore, the criteria
of $\pm$ .300 representing small but definite relationship
and $\pm$ .500 representing substantial relationship were
selected for purposes of evaluation.[60]

Non-Incarcerated Respondents

A review of data for non-incarcerated women
showed that 38 of the 128 correlations were significant
at the .05 level of confidence or better. Nineteen of
these were significant at .01 and five were significant

---

[60]J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in
Psychology and Education 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-
Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 145.

TABLE 4

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CLOTHING INTEREST SCORES AND CATTELL's
SIXTEEN PRIMARY PERSONALITY FACTOR SCORES FOR
NON-INCARCERATED AND INCARCERATED WOMEN

Clothing Subscales	Personality Factors															
	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	Q_4
Aesthetic																
Non-Inc.	-1096	-1417	-0893	0097	0784	4216***	0760	-1642	1043	-1165	1041	-1090	-0685	-0717	2986**	-1103
Inc.	2755**	0209	1436	-0664	1047	3606***	1684	1711*	-1931*	0416	-2493**	-1224	0245	0275	3747***	-2969**
Modesty																
Non-Inc.	0645	-0252	-1750*	-2679**	-1186	4737***	-2239*	-0663	-0714	-2354*	2531**	0992	-2853**	0943	2722**	-1315
Inc.	1007	-2659**	-1575	-1296	-3226***	2657	-2169*	0969	0905	-1218	1429	1710*	-0313	1152	0498	0327
Interest																
Non-Inc.	1565	-2472**	2023*	1125	3176***	2626**	1693	-1579	2115*	-0970	-0387	-0978	-0972	-2840**	2036*	-2336*
Inc.	3120***	-0520	0807	1085	1557	3316***	1501	0913	1420	-0629	-0832	-0176	-1400	-2970**	2881**	-2697**
Comfort																
Non-Inc.	-1643	-2563**	-1038	0184	0561	0983	-0559	-0121	2241*	-1210	-1163	0538	0502	-0781	0010	1138
Inc.	2593**	-0812	-1666	0679	-1379	2847**	-0557	1502	1617	-1428	1291	-0405	-0713	-0281	2154*	-0309

Note: All values should be read with four decimal places.   *p .05
      All values without signs should be considered positive.   **p .01
      N=188   ***p .001
      n= 94

TABLE 4 (continued)

Clothing Subscales	Personality Factors															
	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	Q_4
Attention																
Non-Inc.	2317*	-1865*	2419**	1340	2870**	2490**	1909*	-0427	2115*	-0055	-0204	0192	-0003	-2440**	2000*	-1769*
Inc.	3485***	-0527	0003	1883*	0714	2917**	1644	1010	1068	-1231	-0788	-1019	-0688	-0695	2496**	-2547**
Management																
Non-Inc.	1212	-0606	1472	0019	-0354	4804***	0796	-1174	0095	-1995*	1220	-1472	-0653	-1130	3728***	-2930**
Inc.	2209*	-0499	0522	-0133	-0877	4617***	1025	2870**	-0134	0439	-0333	-0434	-1441	-1486	4466***	-2492**
Approval																
Non-Inc.	1249	-1696	-1810	-0410	2129*	2235*	-0514	-1499	1556	-2017*	-0587	1363	-0478	-1462	1157	0265
Inc.	0435	-1173	-1950*	-1575	-1494	1259	-1652	0100	0774	-1197	1462	1763*	-1367	-1819*	2154*	-0528
Dependence																
Non-Inc.	0305	-0383	1301	0585	1767	2868**	0307	-1335	0502	-0118	0943	0808	-0672	-1379	1410	-0886
Inc.	1669	0215	-0918	-0681	-0669	1879*	-0848	1274	0857	0427	-0550	1641	-1239	-0122	0763	-0717

at .001. Only 14 of the significant correlations

attained an r of .262 or better. None reached the

magnitude of substantial relationship. Only those five

coefficients which attained a level of .001 fell within

the category of small but definite relationships.

These five relationships were (a) aesthetic concern

with clothing with personality Factor G; (b) modesty

in dress with Factor G; (c) interest in clothing with

Factor F; and (d) management of clothing with Factors

G and Q_3. The three strongest relationships between

clothing concern and personality characteristics which

appeared for the non-incarcerated group were: management

with Factor G, r=.4804; modesty with Factor G, r=.4737;

and aesthetic with Factor G, r=.4216. Because of the

low magnitudes of the relationships found between clothing

behavior and personality characteristics, only the

three personality factors (G, F, and Q_3) which accounted

for the five relationships significant at .001 will be

discussed.

The personality factor which had the most

important relationship with clothing behavior for the

non-incarcerated women was Factor G. Seven of the eight

clothing subscales had a positive and significant

relationship with this factor. Three of these attained

the level of .001. According to Cattell's interpretation

of Factor G, it can be stated that as non-incarcerated respondents increased in characteristics which denote a sense of duty, perservering, responsible, and rule-bound attitude, their overall level of clothing interest increased. More specifically, the areas of clothing concern which would be most affected by an increase in this characteristic would be those of management, modesty, and aesthetics. The one which would be least affected would be interest in comfort of clothing.

The second most important personality factor with regard to clothing behavior for non-incarcerated women was Factor Q_3. Of the eight clothing subscales, five were positively and significantly correlated with this factor. One of these relationships was significant at .001. As these respondents increased in social awareness, self-respect, and regard for social reputation, their concern with aesthetics and modesty in dress, their interest in clothing and its use to attract attention, and their concern with the management of clothing increased. The area of clothing behavior which would be most affected by an increase in this personality characteristic (Factor Q_3) would be emphasis on management whereas that least affected would be comfort.

Factor F was the third personality factor in order of importance with regard to clothing concern. Three of the Creekmore subscales were significantly related to this factor. These were interest, attention, and approval. Only the interest subscale achieved a relationship with Factor F significant at .001. Based on Cattell's description of Factor F, as non-incarcerated subjects became more cheerful, active, frank, and carefree their concern with the interest subscale and their use of clothing to attract attention and to win approval increased. An increase in personality Factor F would have greatest effect on willingness to devote time to clothing, as denoted by the interest subscale, and least effect on concern with management of dress.

Summary

The magnitude of the majority of the correlations between the personality characteristics identified by Cattell and clothing concerns defined by Creekmore was found to be low. Although 19 of the coefficients were statistically significant at the .01 level of confidence only five attained a magnitude of small but definite relationsip. Three of these five relationships were associated with Factor G, one with Factor Q_3, and

one with Factor F. None of the coefficients reached
the magnitude of substantial relationship.

Incarcerated Respondents

Data in Table 4 for the incarcerated group
reveals 35 of the 128 correlations were significant
at the .05 level. Twenty-three of these were significant
at .01 and eight at .001. Of the 35 significant
correlations only 18 reached an r of .262 or better.
None attained the magnitude of substantial relationship.
Only those eight coefficients significant at .001
had a magnitude showing small but definite relationships.
These eight relationships were: (a) aesthetic concern
with clothing with Factors G and Q_3; (b) modesty in
dress with Factor F; (c) interest in clothing with
Factors A and G; use of clothing to attract attention
with Factor A; and (d) management of clothing with
Factors G and Q_3. The strongest relationships between
clothing concern and personality characteristics for
incarcerated respondents occurred between management of
clothing and Factors Q_3 (r=.4466) and G (r=.4617).
Because of the low magnitude of the relationships identi-
fied in Table 4 only the four personality factors (G, Q_3,
A, and F) which accounted for the eight relationships
significant at .001 will be discussed.

Personality Factor G had the most important relationship to clothing behavior for this group of women. All of the Creekmore subscales, with the exception of approval, were significantly and positively related to this factor. Three of these reached the .001 level of confidence. Based upon Cattell's interpretation of Factor G, it can be stated that as incarcerated subjects increased in attributes which denote a sense of responsibility, of duty, and a perservering nature, their general level of interest in clothing tended to increase. The areas of clothing concern which would be most affected by an increase in personality Factor G would be management, aesthetics, and interest; the one least affected would be the use of clothing to win approval.

The personality factor second in importance in its relationship to clothing behavior was Factor Q_3. Six of the eight correlations were positive and significant. The clothing subscales which were related to Factor Q_3, were aesthetic, interest, comfort, attention, management, and approval. As these women increased in self-respect and ability to control their behavior and emotions, and as they became more socially aware, their interest in the aesthetics, comfort, and management of dress, as well as their willingness to devote time to

clothing (interest subscale), to use it to attract
attention, and to win approval increased. An increase
in the personality characteristics associated with
Factor Q_3 would have greatest effect upon concern with
management of clothing and least effect upon modesty
in dress.

Factor A was third in order of importance with
regard to clothing behavior for this group. It was
positively and significantly related to the five clothing
subscales of aesthetic, interest, comfort, attention,
and management. These results indicated that as
incarcerated subjects became more warmhearted, easy-
going, and cooperative, their willingness to devote time
to clothing, to use it to attract attention, and their
interest in the aesthetics, comfort, and management of
clothing increased. The areas of clothing behavior
most affected by an increase in personality Factor A
would be willingness to devote time to clothing (interest
subscale), and to use it to attract attention. The
area of clothing behavior least affected would be the
use of dress to win social approval.

There was one correlation between personality
Factor F and clothing behavior which attained a magnitude
of small but definite relationship and a probability
level of .001. This relationship was between Factor F

and modesty in dress. The direction of the relationship was negative. According to Cattell's definition of Factor F, as the incarcerated women became more restrained, reticent, and introspective, their concern with the modesty of their clothing increased. Based upon the data presented in Table 4 the area of clothing behavior most affected by an increase in Factor F would be modesty while that least affected would be dependence.

Summary

The magnitude of the majority of correlations between personality characteristics and clothing concerns for the incarcerated group was low. Of the 23 coefficients significant at .01 only eight reached the magnitude of small but definite relationship. Three of these eight relationships were associated with Factor G, two with Factor Q_3, two with Factor A, and one with Factor F. None of the coefficients reached the magnitude of substantial relationship.

Comparison of Non-Incarcerated and Incarcerated Respondents

Two personality factors (G and Q_3) accounted for major similarities in relationships between clothing concerns and personality characteristics. Factor G

ranked first in importance for both sample populations.
It was significantly (p ≤ .05) and positively related
to seven of the eight clothing subscales for the two
groups. The exception for non-incarcerated women was
interest in the comfort of clothing; while that for
incarcerated women was concern with the use of clothing
to win social approval. The relationships between Factor
G and concern with the aesthetics and management of
clothing were significant at .001 for both groups of
respondents. As subjects increased in personality
characteristics defined by Cattell as conscientious,
persevering, staid, and rule-bound, their general level
of concern about clothing increased.

Factor Q_3 ranked second in importance with
regard to the relationship between personality charac-
teristics and clothing concerns for the two sample
populations. For non-incarcerated subjects it was
significantly (p ≤ .05) and positively related to the
five clothing subscales of aesthetic, modesty, interest,
attention, and management. It was significantly (p ≤ .05)
and positively related to six subscales for incarcera-
ted respondents. These subscales were aesthetic,
interest, comfort, management, and approval. The indica-
tion was that as respondents in this study increased in

personality characteristics which contribute to social

awareness, regard for social reputation, self-respect,

and self control, their concern with the aesthetics

and management of clothing as well as their willingness

to devote time to clothing and to use it to attract

attention increased.

Table 5 presents the differences obtained when

correlations between the clothing subscales and personali-

ty factors for the two groups were compared by simple

subtraction. Only six of these comparisons exceeded

the magnitude of .300. These six comparisons were

considered indicative of the nature of differences in

clothing concerns for the non-incarcerated and incarcera-

ted women who participated in this study (see Table 6).

Each of these differences was due to a significant

relationship for one group and a non-significant

relationship for the other group. Five of the relation-

ships were significant for the incarcerated respondents

and one was significant for the non-incarcerated

subjects. The six areas of difference, by order of

magnitude, were:

1. <u>Comfort in dress as it was related to</u>

<u>personality Factor A</u>. For non-incarcerated subjects

this relationship was both negative and non-significant.

For incarcerated subjects it was positive and significant

Table 5

DIFFERENCES IN RELATIONSHIPS AMONG CLOTHING SUBSCALES
AND PERSONALITY FACTORS BETWEEN NON-INCARCERATED
AND INCARCERATED WOMEN BASED ON
CORRELATIONAL MAGNITUDE

Personality Factors	Clothing Subscales							
	Aesthetic	Modesty	Interest	Comfort	Attention	Management	Approval	Dependence
A	3851*	0362	1555	4236**	1168	0997	0814	1284
B	1626	2407	1952	1751	1338	0107	0523	0598
C	2269	0075	1216	0628	2416	0950	0140	2219
E	0761	1383	0040	0495	0543	0152	1165	1266
F	0263	2040	1619	1940	2156	0523	3623*	2436
G	0610	2080	0690	1864	0427	0187	0976	0989
H	0924	0070	0192	0002	0265	0229	1138	1155
I	3353*	1632	2492	1632	1437	4044**	1599	2609
L	2974	1619	0695	0624	1047	0229	0782	0355

Note: All values should be read with four decimal places.
    * = small but definite differences.
    N=188
    n=94

TABLE 5 (continued)

Personality Factors	Clothing Subscales							
	Aesthetic	Modesty	Interest	Comfort	Attention	Management	Approval	Dependence
M	1581	1136	0341	0218	1176	2434	0820	0545
N	3534*	1102	0445	2454	0584	1553	2049	1493
O	0134	1618	0732	0943	1211	1038	0400	1358
Q_1	0930	2540	0428	1215	0685	0788	0889	0567
Q_2	0992	0209	0130	0500	1745	0356	0357	1257
Q_3	0761	2224	0845	2144	0496	0738	0997	0647
Q_4	1866	1642	0361	1447	0778	0438	0793	0169

TABLE 6

NATURE OF DIFFERENCES IN RELATIONSHIP AMONG CLOTHING SUBSCALES
AND PERSONALITY FACTORS BETWEEN NON-INCARCERATED
AND INCARCERATED WOMEN

Clothing Subscales	Relationships															
	Non-Significant & Negative Personality Factor				Significant & Positive Personality Factor				Non-Significant & Positive Personality Factor				Significant & Negative Personality Factor			
	A	F	I	N	A	F	I	N	A	F	I	N	A	F	I	N
Comfort																
Non-Inc.	x										x					
Inc.					x**											x**
Management																
Non-Inc.			x													
Inc.							x**									
Aesthetic																
Non-Inc.	x		x													
Inc.					x**		x*									
Approval																
Non-Inc.						x*										
Inc.		x														

Note: * p .05; ** p .01; N = 188; n=94.

at the .01 level. This difference indicated that the women of the incarcerated group who were concerned with comfort in their clothing tended to be warmhearted, easy-going, and cooperative.

2. <u>Management of clothing as it was related to personality Factor I</u>. This relationship was non-significant and negative for non-incarcerated respondents, but positive and significant at .01 for the incarcerated group. From these findings it appeared that incarcerated women who showed an interest in the management of their clothing tended to be dependent, sensitive, artistic, and feminine.

3. <u>Aesthetic interest in dress as it was related to personality Factor A</u>. Once again the relationship was non-significant and negative for the non-incarcerated group. Whereas, it was positive and significant at .01 for incarcerated subjects. Women of the incarcerated population who were concerned with the aesthetics of their dress tended to be warmhearted, easy-going, and cooperative.

4. <u>The approval subscale as it was related to personality Factor F</u>. This was the only difference in relationship which was significant at .05 and positive for the non-incarcerated population. It was negative

and non-significant for the incarcerated women. These results indicated that the members of the non-incarcerated group who used clothing to win social approval were happy-go-lucky, cheerful, and frank.

5.   Aesthetic interest as it was related to personality Factor N. For non-incarcerated subjects this relationship was both non-significant and positive. It was negative and significant at .01 for the incarcerated women who were concerned about the aesthetics of their dress tended to be forthright, unsophisticated, and sentimental.

6.   The aesthetic subscale as it was related to personality Factor I. The relationship was non-significant and negative for the non-incarcerated group, but positive and significant at .05 for the incarcerated group. Women of the incarcerated population who were concerned with the aesthetics of dress tended to be dependent, sensitive, artistic, and feminine.

Summary

Similarities between the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups were found with regard to the relationships between personality Factors G and Q_3 and clothing concerns. Factor G ranked first in importance for both groups and was found to be related to seven of

the eight Creekmore subscales for each sample population. Concern with comfort in clothing was the exception for non-incarcerated women and the use of clothing to gain social approval was the exception for incarcerated women. Factor Q_3 ranked second and was related to the five clothing concerns of aesthetic, modesty, interest, attention, and management for non-incarcerated respondents. This factor, for the incarcerated respondents, was related to the six clothing concerns of aesthetic, interest, comfort, attention, management, and approval.

Essentially, differences in the relationships found between clothing interests and personality characteristics for the two groups were associated with four of the Creekmore subscales which were aesthetic, comfort, management, and approval and four of Cattell's 16 primary factors which were A, F, I, and N. Each of these differences was due to a significant relationship for one group and a non-significant relationship for the other group. Of the six differences discussed, three were related to aesthetic concern with clothing (related to Factors A, I, and N); one was related to use of clothing to win social approval (related to Factor F); one was associated with comfort in dress

(related to Factor A); and one with interest in the management of clothing (related to Factor I).

Multivariate Analysis of Vairiance

This portion of the analysis of data was divided into two sections. The first involved a comparison of the entire non-incarcerated group with the incarcerated group on the basis of specific areas of clothing concerns and personality characteristics. The second involved procedures used to determine differences in clothing concerns which might be related to personality charac- teristics believed to be associated with levels of adjustment. These comparisons were made on the basis of both non-incarceration - incarceration and extremely high, average, or low scores[61] on the 16 PF Test as these criteria related to the clothing concerns of the subjects.

---

[61]Visual inspection of the way respondents were grouped within the three score levels on the individual personality factors indicated a difference might exist between non-incarcerated and incarcerated subjects. Chi Square was used to determine whether any of these differences achieved statistical significance. Although not a part of the original plan, such information was considered an interesting addition. Results are found in Appendix G.

MANOVA Between Non-Incarcerated and
Incarcerated Respondents

Tables 7 and 8 present the results of the
MANOVA tests on the 24 variables with which this study
was concerned. The obtained F indicating the rela-
tionship between non-incarceration - incarceration and
the 16 personality factors, are shown in Table 7 along
with the results of the univariate F tests. Table 8
contains the overall multivariate F and univariate
analyses which denote the relationship between non-
incareration - incarceration and clothing concerns.

When the two groups were compared on the basis
of personality characteirstics they were found to be
different at .001. An examination of the univariate
F tests comprising the overall multivariate F suggested
that the groups differed most in regard to the following
personality characteristics: Factors B, C, M, O,
and Q_1 at .001; Factors L, Q_3, and F at .009; and Factors
N and A at .018. To arrive at a more meaningful
interpretation of these differences, group means on
individual personality factors (Table 3) were inspected.
Listed below is the outcome of this comparison based
upon Cattell's definitions.

1. Non-incarcerated respondents were found to
be significantly more intelligent (Factor B, $p < .001$).

TABLE 7

MANOVA TEST OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NON-INCARCERATED AND
INCARCERATED WOMEN ON CATTELL'S SIXTEEN PRIMARY PERSONALITY
FACTORS USING WILKS LAMBDA CRITERION

Test of Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	α Level
1 Through 1	9.798	16.000	171.00	$p < .001$

Univariate F Tests

Personality Factors	F (d.f.=1,186)	Mean Square	α Level
A	5.655	21.045	$p < .018$
B	71.623	226.381	$p < .001$
C	15.921	65.537	$p < .001$
E	3.565	10.439	$p < .061$
F	7.060	25.693	$p < .009$
G	.338	1.431	$p < .562$
H	3.086	11.800	$p < .081$
I	.448	1.483	$p < .504$
L	7.385	26.064	$p < .007$
M	12.757	29.681	$p < .001$
N	5.903	15.799	$p < .016$
O	19.147	72.689	$p < .001$
Q_1	10.586	31.048	$p < .001$
Q_2	.430	1.413	$p < .513$
Q_3	7.087	20.778	$p < .008$
Q_4	.735	2.459	$p < .393$

Note: N=188
        n= 94

TABLE 8

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NON-INCARCERATED AND INCARCERATED
WOMEN ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES USING WILKS LAMBDA CRITERION

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	α Level
	1 through 1	7.282	8.000	179.000	p < .001
Clothing Subscales		Univariate F Tests			
	F (d.f.=1.186)	Mean Square			Level
Aesthetic	.029	1.043			p < .864
Modesty	1.810	113.383			p < .180
Interest	14.568	938.298			p < .001
Comfort	.000	.000			p < 1.000
Attention	19.049	1282.345			p < .001
Management	2.068	119.681			p < .152
Approval	.373	19.149			p < .542
Dependence	3.480	206.431			p < .064

Note: N=188
      n= 94

2. Non-incarcerated subjects were more emotionally stable, mature, and realistic than incarcerated women (Factor C, p < .001).

3. Non-incarcerated women were more concerned with inner-urgencies, self-motivation, more creative, and unconcerned with everyday matters (Factor M, p. < .001).

4. Non-incarcerated respondents were more happy-go-lucky, cheerful, and frank (Factor F, p. < .009).

5. Incarcerated respondents were more apprehensive, worried, and depressed (Factor O, p < .001).

6. Incarcerated women were more critical, liberal, and less inclined to moralize (Factor Q_1, p < .001).

7. Incarcerated subjects were more mistrusting, doubtful, harder to fool, and self-opinionated than the non-incarcerated group (Factor L, p < .007).

8. Incarcerated women had more control over their behavior, were more socially aware, and had higher regard for social reputation (Factor Q_3, p < .008).

9. Incarcerated women were more shrewd, calculating, and worldly than the non-incarcerated group (Factor N, p < .016).

10. Incarcerated respondents were more warm-
hearted, emotionally expressive, attentive to people,
and cooperative (Factor A, p < .018).

A comparison of the two groups on the basis of
data in Table 8 also revealed a significant difference
(p < .001) with regard to clothing concerns. Inspection
of the univariate F tests which accounted for the overall
difference showed that only two of the Creekmore sub-
scales (interest, p < .001 and attention, p < .001) were
significantly different for the two groups. Means on
the eight clothing subscales (Table 2) suggested that:
(a) the incarcerated respondents were more willing to
give time to and experiment with clothing (interest
subscale); and (b) they were also more concerned with
the use of clothing to attract attention than were non-
incarcerated subjects.

Summary

The non-incarcerated group was found to differ
from the incarcerated group on the criteria of personal-
ity characteristics. Non-incarcerated women had higher
scholastic mental capacity, greater ego strength, were
more imaginative, trusting, reserved, artless, and care-
free. They were less practical, guilt prone, radical
in their thinking, suspicious, shrewd, emotionally
expressive, socially aware, and careful.

Two statistically significant differences were found in the clothing concerns of the two groups. Incarcerated women were more concerned with the interest and attention subscales.

MANOVA Between High, Average, and Low Scoring Subgroups on the 16 PF Test

The analyses discussed in this section were conducted in an effort to determine whether differences in clothing concerns were related to: (a) extremely high, average, or extremely low scores on Cattell's 16 primary personality factors; (b) non-incarceration - incarceration alone; or (c) interaction between non-incarceration - incarceration and level of score on the personality measure.

A limitation of this portion of the statistical treatment was the difference in the number of observations which fell within the six cells under study (three score levels for each population group). For this reason, and based upon Waehlke's[62] preliminary investigation of the robustness of the MANOVA Technique,

---

[62]P. H. Waehlke, "An Empirical Investigation of the Robustness of MANOVA When the Assumption of Normality is Violated" (Master's thesis, Arizona State University, 1972), p. 30.

the probability level set as an indication of significant differences was p $\leq$ .01.

When data indicating the relationship between non-incarceration - incarceration and clothing concerns were examined for each personality factor, results were identical to those discussed in the previous section. Each factor showed a significant relationship (p < .001) with the interest and attention subscales. Incarcerated women scored higher on both clothing concerns. Eight of the 16 primary personality factors showed no other relationship to clothing behavior as measured by the Creekmore instrument. These eight factors were: A, B, E, I, L, O, Q_1, and Q_2. Because no new information was obtained from this part of the analyses of the individual personality factors, data regarding the effect of non-incarceration - incarceration upon clothing concerns will not be repeated in this section of the discussion. The reader is referred to Appendix H for tables containing these data.

MANOVA Factor C: Affected by Feelings vs. Emotionally Stable

Listed in Table 9 are the number of respondents in each population group who scored extremely high, average, or extremely low on personality Factor C.

TABLE 9

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR C OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	15	64	15	94
Incarcerated	24	66	4	94
TOTALS	39	130	19	188

The outcomes of the multivariate tests of significance for clothing interest as it related to non-incarceration - incarceration, and the various levels of Factor C are found in Table 10. Two of the five multivariate F's were significant at p < .001. The first of these suggested that there was a difference in the clothing concerns of respondents who fell within the various score levels of Factor C. Data in Table 11 suggested that the dimension of clothing interest which distinguished the subgroups was concern with modesty in dress (p < .001). Inspection of the means presented in Table 12 revealed that the high scoring subgroups on personality Factor C were less concerned with modesty in clothing than were the average or low scoring subgroups. Although this finding can only be

TABLE 10

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR C

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	⍺ Level
Interaction	1 through 2	.683	16.000	350.000	p < .811
Score Level	1 through 2	2.930	16.000	350.000	p < .001
Non- Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.280	8.000	175.000	p < .001

Note: N=188
n=94

TABLE 11

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES FOR
LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR C

Clothing Subscales	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝ Level
	1 through 2	2.930	16.000	350.000	p < .001

Univariate F Tests

	F (d.f.=1,182)	Mean Square	∝ Level
Aesthetic	1.195	42.601	p < .305
Modesty	7.516	439.150	p < .001
Interest	1.987	126.988	p < .140
Comfort	1.179	41.972	p < .310
Attention	1.399	93.941	p < .250
Management	.972	56.836	p < .380
Approval	2.723	137.321	p < .068
Dependence	2.100	123.838	p < .125

Note: N=188   Average n=130
        Low n=39   High   n= 19

TABLE 12

MEANS ON THE MODESTY SUBSCALE FOR LOW, AVERAGE,
AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON PERSONALITY
FACTOR C

| | Score Level | | |
Subjects	Low	Average	High
Non-Incarcerated	30.200	31.875	26.133
Incarcerated	31.667	33.167	20.500

Note: N=188
        n= 94
        Possible score range on each subscale was 11-55.

taken as a tentative indication of the relationship

between Factor C and modesty in dress, the implication

is that the more mature and emotionally stable the

respondents were the less interested they were in the

aspect of modesty in clothing. This was true regardless

of whether subjects were incarcerated or not.

The second overall F which showed a significant

difference indicated that the non-incarcerated group

differed from the incarcerated group on the basis of

the relationship between personality Factor C and clothing

concern. Again the two groups were distinguished by their

degree of concern with the interest and attention sub-

scales (see Table 7, Appendix H).

The combination of these findings suggested that:

1. The degree of concern about modesty in dress for subjects in this study could best be predicted by a knowledge of score level on Factor C.

2. The degree of willingness to give time to clothing and to use it to attract attention could best be judged by a knowledge of whether the subject was incarcerated or not.

MANOVA Factor F: Sober vs. Happy-Go-Lucky

Table 13 contains the numbers of participants within each of the three score levels on personality Factor F.

TABLE 13

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR F OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	10	45	39	94
Incarcerated	9	63	22	94
TOTALS	19	108	61	188

The results of the multivariate tests of significance for clothing concern as it related to non-incarceration - incarceration, and the various levels of Factor F are presented in Table 14. Of these five overall F's, two were significant at p < .001. The first of these indicated that there was a difference in the clothing concerns of respondents within the three score levels of Factor F. Data in Table 15 revealed that the dimension of clothing concern which distinguished the subgroups was modesty in dress. The means listed in Table 16 give additional evidence that the low scoring subgroup was the group most concerned about modesty of dress. The data appeared to imply that respondents who tended to be restrained, reticient, and primly correct were more concerned with modesty in clothing than were their cheerful, frank, and impulsive counterparts.

The second overall F which revealed significant differences between groups was the test for non-incarceration - incarceration and its relationship to clothing concern (see Table 11, Appendix H). The results implied that:

1. A respondent's degree of emphasis upon modesty in clothing could be predicted most accurately by a knowledge of score level on Factor F.

TABLE 14

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION—INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR F

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	α Level
Interaction	1 through 2	1.095	16.00	350.000	p < .358
Score Level	1 through 2	2.855	16.00	350.000	p < .001
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.470	8.000	175.000	p < .001

Note: N=188
        n=94

TABLE 15

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES FOR
LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON PERSONALITY FACTOR F

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝ Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 2	2.855	16.000	350.000	p< .001

Univariate F Tests

	F (d.f.=2,182)	Mean Square	∝ Level
Aesthetic	.175	6.319	p < .840
Modesty	4.896	288.710	p < .008
Interest	3.524	221.623	p < .031
Comfort	.448	16.043	p < .640
Attention	1.018	67.660	p < .363
Management	1.419	80.600	p < .245
Approval	.177	8.865	p < .838
Dependence	1.729	99.283	p < .180

Note: N=188   Average n=108
       Low n=19   High   n= 61

TABLE 16

MEANS ON THE MODESTY SUBSCALE FOR LOW, AVERAGE,
AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON PERSONALITY
FACTOR F

Subjects	Score Level		
	Low	Average	High
Non-Incarcerated	35.900	29.511	30.718
Incarcerated	36.667	33.048	28.136

Note: N=188
       n=94
       Possible score range on each subscale was 11-55.

2. The degree of willingness to devote time
to clothing and to use it as a tool to attract attention
could be predicted best by a knowledge of whether the
subject was incarcerated or not.

MANOVA Factor G: Expedient vs. Conscientious

Listed in Table 17 are the numbers of respondents
in each of the designated score levels on personality
Factor G. Table 18 presents the results of the multi-
variate analyses which compared non-incarcerated and
incarcerated subjects with the score level on personality
Factor G and clothing concern. Three of the five

TABLE 17

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR G OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	25	56	13	94
Incarcerated	22	64	8	94
TOTALS	47	120	21	188

overall F's shown in Table 18 were significant, one at
$p < .008$ and two at $p < .001$.

Table 19 presents the results of the tests for
interaction among the variables. This table evidences
that, although the test of roots 1 through 2 attained
a significance level of $p < .008$, none of the univariate
F tests reached the required probability level of .01.

Results pertaining to the clothing interests of
respondents at various score levels of Factor G are
listed in Table 20. The univariate F tests revealed
that six of the eight Creekmore subscales were signifi-
cantly different for the subgroups. The means in Table
21 indicated that participants in this study who scored
low on personality Factor G seemed to have a general
tendency to be less concerned with clothing than did

TABLE 18

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION—INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON PERSONALITY
FACTOR G

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	α Level
Interaction	1 through 2	2.098	16.000	350.000	p < .008
Score Level	1 through 2	4.158	16.000	350.000	p < .001
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.345	8.000	175.000	p < .001

Note: N=188
       n=94

TABLE 19

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION BETWEEN
NON-INCARCERATION - INCARCERATION AND SCORE
LEVEL ON PERSONALITY FACTOR G WITH
SCORES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES

	Test of Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝ Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 2	2.098	16.000	350.000	p < .008

Univariate F Tests

	F (d.f.=2,183)	Mean Square	∝ Level
Aesthetic	1.113	34.275	p < .331
Modesty	3.187	174.961	p < .044
Interest	.015	.925	p < .985
Comfort	4.253	140.899	p < .016
Attention	2.397	149.315	p < .094
Management	1.858	86.693	p < .159
Approval	2.266	111.892	p < .107
Dependence	.430	24.860	p < .651

Note: N=188
       n= 94

TABLE 20

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES
FOR LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR G

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	α Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 2	4.158	16.000	350.000	$p < .001$

	Univariate F Tests		
	F (d.f.=2,182)	Mean Square	α Level
Aesthetic	14.938	459.922	$p < .001$
Modesty	11.934	655.250	$p < .001$
Interest	6.885	421.273	$p < .001$
Comfort	4.874	161.497	$p < .009$
Attention	7.114	443.105	$p < .001$
Management	22.501	1049.950	$p < .001$
Approval	3.491	172.422	$p < .033$
Dependence	4.092	236.320	$p < .018$

Note: N=188   Average n=120
       Low n=47   High   n= 21

TABLE 21

MEANS ON THE SIX SIGNIFICANT CLOTHING SUBSCALES FOR LOW, AVERAGE,
AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON PERSONALITY FACTOR G

Clothing Subscales	Subjects	Score Level		
		Low	Average	High
Aesthetic	Non-Inc.	38.840	41.839	46.846
	Inc.	38.045	42.891	44.375
Modesty	Non-Inc.	26.600	31.018	37.154
	Inc.	27.545	34.000	31.125
Interest	Non-Inc.	32.920	36.929	29.308
	Inc.	37.045	41.484	44.000
Comfort	Non-Inc.	38.440	27.911	40.923
	Inc.	34.318	39.578	41.000
Attention	Non-Inc.	28.560	30.286	33.769
	Inc.	29.773	37.297	37.250
Management	Non-Inc.	33.727	41.063	49.124
	Inc.	34.680	39.000	43.231

Note: N=188   Possible score range for each subscale was 11-55.
        n= 94

subjects who fell within the average or high ranges. This appeared to be the case regardless of whether respondents were incarcerated or not. It appears that respondents who showed a tendency to evade rules and to feel few obligations seemed to have less concern for clothing. Conversely, subjects who tended to be conscientious, perservering, and rule-bound showed a greater interest in clothing.

The third multivariate F which was significant was the test of the relationship between non-incarceration - incarceration and clothing concern. The differences were within the realms of willingness to devote time to clothing (interest subscale) and to use it to attract attention from others (see Table 12, Appendix H).

The combination of these results suggested that for respondents in this study:

1. A difference in degree of concern with the aesthetic, modesty, interest, comfort, attention, and management clothing subscales might be predicted on the basis of score levels on personality Factor G. Low scorers were generally less concerned with clothing.

2. Knowledge of whether the subject was incarcerated or not seemed to be an accurate criterion of prediction for estimating degree of concern with the interest and attention subscales. Incarcerated women

tended to score higher on both of these Creekmore sub-scales.

3. Some form of interaction among non-incarceration - incarceration, score level on Factor G, and clothing concern appeared to exist (p < .008). However, none of the univariate F tests attained the probability level (p ≤ .01) which was established for discussion of the results.

MANOVA Factor H: Shy vs. Venturesome

Table 22 presents the numbers of subjects who scored extremely low, average, or extremely high on personality Factor H.

TABLE 22

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR H OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	15	58	21	94
Incarcerated	16	67	11	94
TOTALS	31	125	32	188

Outcomes of the MANOVA tests of significance which compared subjects on the criteria of non-

incarceration - incarceration, level of score on personality Factor H, and clothing interests are listed in Table 23. Two of the five multivariate F's were statistically significant at p < .01.

The first of these suggested that there was a difference in clothing interests among respondents who fell within the various score levels of Factor H. Table 24 reveals that the area of clothing interest which distinguished the subgroups was modesty in dress (p < .006). A study of the means contained in Table 25 indicated that respondents who scored high on Factor H were less interested in modesty in dress. As individuals approached the low end of the scoring continuum on Factor H, their concern with modesty in clothing seemed to increase progressively. The relationship indicated by this finding was that socially - bold, uninhibited respondents were significantly less concerned with modesty in dress than were those who were retrained and timid. This result was true for both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups.

The second overall F which showed a significant difference indicated that the two groups were distinguished by their degree of concern with the attention and interest subscales (see Table 13, Appendix H).

This combination of results suggested that:

TABLE 23

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION – INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON PERSONALITY
FACTOR H

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	α Level
Interaction	1 through 2	.831	16.000	350.000	p < .650
Score Level	1 through 2	2.311	16.000	350.000	p < .003
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.436	8.000	175.000	p < .001

Note: N=188
        n= 94

TABLE 24

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES
FOR LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING
GROUPS ON PERSONALITY FACTOR H

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	α Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 2	2.311	16.000	350.000	p < .003

Univariate F Tests

	F (d.f.=2,182)	Mean Square	α Level
Aesthetic	1.534	54.640	p < .218
Modesty	5.235	316.227	p < .006
Interest	2.078	132.761	p < .128
Comfort	2.939	103.046	p < .055
Attention	3.471	229.819	p < .033
Management	1.204	69.720	p < .302
Approval	2.118	107.202	p < .124
Dependence	.103	6.119	p < .903

Note: N=188   Average n=125
       Low n= 31   High   n= 32

TABLE 25

MEANS ON THE MODESTY SUBSCALE FOR LOW, AVERAGE,
AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON PERSONALITY
FACTOR H

Subjects	Score Level		
	Low	Average	High
Non-Incarcerated	31.733	31.603	27.429
Incarcerated	33.875	32.731	26.909

Note: N=188
n= 94
Possible score range on each subscale was 11-55.

1. The degree of concern about modesty in dress might be predicted most accurately by a knowledge of score level on Factor H.

2. The degree of willingness to give time to experimenting with clothing (interest subscale) and to use it to attract attention might be judged most correctly by a knowledge of whether the individual was incarcerated or not.

MANOVA Factor M: Practical vs. Imaginative

Table 26 presents the numbers of respondents in each population group who fell within the different score levels on personality Factor M. An interesting

TABLE 26

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR M OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	19	69	6	94
Incarcerated	39	55	0	94
TOTALS	58	124	6	188

result was that none of the incarcerated women scored

within the extremely high range. This end of the

continuum is defined by Cattell as follows:

> The person who scores high on Factor M tends
> to be unconventional, unconcerned over
> everyday matters, Bohemian, self-motivated,
> imaginatively creative, concerned with
> "essentials," and oblivious of particular
> people and physical realities. His inner-
> directed interests sometimes lead to
> unrealistic situations accompanied by
> expressive outbursts. His individuality
> tends to cause him to be rejected in group
> activities.[63]

Although the fact that none of the incarcerated women

fell within the high score category was enlightening,

it prevented the completion of the MANOVA Technique

for Factor M.

---

[63]Institute for Personality and Ability Testing,
Manual for the 16 PF (Champaign, Illinois: Institute
for Personality and Ability Testing, 1972), p. 20.

MANOVA Factor N: Forthright vs. Shrewd

Table 27 contains the numbers of subjects who scored extremely high, average, or extremely low on Factor N.

TABLE 27

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON FACTOR N
OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	32	58	4	94
Incarcerated	22	69	3	94
TOTALS	54	127	7	188

The significance tests for the multivariate analysis of the relationships among clothing concerns, non-incarceration - incarceration and the three score levels on personality Factor N are found in Table 28. From these data it was evident that the test for inter-action of roots 1 through 2 approached the probability level of p = .01. However, none of the univariate F tests for this segment of the analysis (Table 29) reached the required probability level (p $\leq$ .01).

TABLE 28

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION - INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR N

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	$\propto$ Level
Interaction	1 through 2	2.034	16.000	350.000	p < .001
Score Level	1 through 2	1.238	16.000	350.000	p < .237
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.174	8.000	175.000	p < .001

Note: N=188
       n= 94

TABLE 29

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT INTERACTION BETWEEN NON-INCARCETRATION –
INCARCERATION AND SCORE LEVEL ON PERSONALITY FACTOR N
WITH SCORES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES

Clothing Subscales	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	$\propto$ Level
	1 through 2	2.034	16.000	350.000	p < .011

Univariate F Tests

	F (d.f.=2,182	Mean Square	$\propto$ Level
Aesthetic	3.730	129.465	p < .026
Modesty	.460	27.728	p < .632
Interest	1.283	83.120	p < .280
Comfort	2.096	74.265	p < .126
Attention	.605	41.315	p < .547
Management	.267	15.640	p < .766
Approval	2.745	139.480	p < .067
Dependence	.749	44.338	p < .474

Note: N-188   n=94

The second overall F which showed a significant difference (p < .001) was the relationship between clothing concern and non-incarceration - incarceration. The two Creekmore subscales of interest and attention differentiated the two population groups (see Table 22, Appendix H).

MANOVA Factor Q_3: Undisciplined
Self-Conflict vs. Controlled

Listed in Table 30 are the numbers of subjects within each score category on personality Factor Q_3.

TABLE 30

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR Q_3 OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	18	69	7	94
Incarcerated	11	73	10	94
TOTALS	29	142	17	188

The results of the multivariate tests of significance for clothing concern as it related to non-incarceration - incarceration and the various levels of Factor Q_3 are shown in Table 31. Of these five overall F's, two were statistically significant (p < .001).

TABLE 31

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION - INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON PERSONALITY
FACTOR Q_3

	Tests of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	α Level
Interaction	1 through 2	1.390	16.000	350.000	p < .144
Score Level	1 through 2	2.795	16.000	350.000	p < .001
Non-Incarcera-tion versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.416	8.000	175.000	p < .001

Note: N=188
       n= 94

The first of these significant differences indicated
that respondents within the various score levels on
Factor Q_3 were distinguished from one another on the
basis of clothing concerns. Data in Table 32 revealed
that these differences were associated with the three
clothing subscales of aesthetics, management, and
approval. Examination of means contained in Table 33
indicated that the low scoring subgroup was less concerned
with any of these areas of clothing behavior than were
the average or high scoring groups. It was also evident
that as the women participating in this study scored
progressively higher on Q_3 their concern with the
aesthetics of dress, management of clothing, and the use
of clothing to win social approval increased. Such
findings denote that subjects who score within the
category identified by Cattell as being undisciplined,
in self-conflict, and who have little regard for social
demands exhibit significantly less interest in the
aesthetics, management, and approval uses of clothing
than do their more socially aware, self-controlled,
and self-respecting counterparts. This was true
regardless of whether the subjects were or were not
incarcerated.

TABLE 32

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES
FOR LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS
ON PERSONALITY FACTOR Q_3

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	α Level
	1 through 2	2.795	16.000	350.000	p < .001
Clothing Subscales					
			Univariate F Tests		
	F (d.f≈2,182)		Mean Square		α Level
Aesthetic	6.041		204.437		p < .003
Modesty	1.648		101.509		p < .195
Interest	3.256		206.863		p < .041
Comfort	.251		9.093		p < .779
Attention	3.082		204.334		p < .048
Management	11.250		590.418		p < .001
Approval	5.349		260.804		p < .006
Dependence	2.238		132.142		p < .110

Note: N=188   Low n=29   Average n=142   High n=17

TABLE 33

MEANS ON THE THREE SIGNIFICANT CLOTHING SUBSCALES
FOR LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS
ON PERSONALITY FACTOR Q_3

Clothing Subscales	Subjects	Score level		
		Low	Average	High
Aesthetic	Non-Inc.	40.444	41.594	46.429
	Inc.	38.727	41.849	45.600
Management	Non-Inc.	34.722	38.899	43.429
	Inc.	35.182	39.781	47.200
Approval	Non-Inc.	28.167	30.681	31.000
	Inc.	24.000	31.822	31.400

Note: N=188
        n= 94
        Possible score range on each subscale was 11-55.

The second overall F which showed a significant difference between groups suggested that the non-incarcerated group differed from the incarcerated group on the basis of concern with the interest and attention subscales (see Table 30, Appendix H).

This combination of results implied that:

1. A respondent's degree of concern with the
aesthetics of dress, management of clothing, and the
use of clothing as a tool to win social approval might
be most accurately predicted by a knowledge of score
level on Factor Q_3.

2. The degree of willingness to devote time
to clothing (interest subscale) and to use it as a
means of attracting attention might be judged most
correctly by a knowledge of whether the respondent
was incarcerated or not.

MANOVA Factor Q_4: Relaxed vs. Tense

Table 34 presents the numbers of subjects within
the three score levels on personality Factor Q_4.

TABLE 34

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR Q_4 OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	10	67	17	94
Incarcerated	13	71	10	94
TOTALS	23	138	27	188

Table 35 gives the significance tests for the multivariate analyses of the relationships among clothing concerns, non-incarceration - incarceration, and the various score categories on personality Factor Q_4. One of these five overall F's was significant at p < .004 and one was significant at p < .001.

Results pertaining to the clothing concerns of respondents within the three score levels on Factor Q_4 are listed in Table 36. The univariate F tests revealed that two of the eight Creekmore subscales attained the probability of p < .01. These were the subscales of aesthetics and management.

The means in Table 37 indicate that subjects who scored low on Factor Q_4 were significantly more concerned with the aesthetic and management aspects of clothing behavior than were those who scored high. Also, it was evident that as score level on Factor Q_4 progressively decreased, concern with these two aspects of clothing behavior increased. The implication of these findings was that women in this study who could be classified, according to Cattell, as tense, frustrated, and over-wrought showed less interest in the aesthetics and management of clothing than did those who could be termed relaxed, composed, and satisfied.

TABLE 35

SUMMARY ON MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION - INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON PERSONALITY
FACTOR Q_4

	Tests of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	α Level
Interaction	1 through 2	1.592	16.000	350.000	p < .069
Score Level	1 through 2	2.249	16.000	350.000	p < .004
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.457	8.000	175.000	p < .001

Note: N=188
        n= 94

TABLE 36

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES
FOR LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR Q_4

Clothing Subscales	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	α Level
	1 through 2	2.249	16.000	350.000	p < .004

Univariate F Tests

	F (d.f.=2,182)	Mean Square	α Level
Aesthetic	5.967	197.289	p < .003
Modesty	1.136	71.406	p < .323
Interest	4.433	275.329	p < .013
Comfort	.587	20.879	p < .557
Attention	4.385	280.525	p < .014
Management	10.704	561.292	p < .001
Approval	.262	13.666	p < .770
Dependence	.659	39.550	p < .519

Note: N=188   Low n=23   Average n=138   High n=27

TABLE 37

MEANS ON THE TWO SIGNIFICANT CLOTHING SUBSCALES
FOR LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS
ON PERSONALITY FACTOR Q_4

| Clothing Subscales | Subjects | Score Level | | |
		Low	Average	High
Aesthetic	Non-Inc.	43.800	41.612	41.000
	Inc.	45.538	42.042	36.000
Management	Non-Inc.	43.100	38.672	34.765
	Inc.	43.538	40.479	32.300

Note: N=188
n= 94
Possible score range on each subscale was 11-55.

The second overall F which showed a statistically significant difference between groups was the test of differences in clothing concerns as they related to non-incarceration - incarceration. Again, two clothing subscales (interest and attention) were found to distinguish the two population groups (see Table 31, of Appendix H).

This combination of results suggested that, for respondents in this study:

1. A difference in degree of concern with the aesthetics and management of clothing could be judged most accurately on the basis of a knowledge of score level on Factor Q_4.

2. The best criterion for predicting degree of concern with the interest and attention clothing subscales was a knowledge of whether the subject was incarcerated or not.

Summary

The relationship between non-incarceration - incarceration, clothing concern, and the individual personality factors indicated that incarcerated women were more concerned with the interest and attention clothing subscales than were non-incarcerated women. Each factor showed a significant relationship ($p < .001$) with the two Creekmore subscales. Eight of the 16 primary personality factors (A, B, E, I, L, O, Q_1, and Q_2) appeared to have no other relationship to clothing behavior as measured by "The Importance of Clothing Questionnaire."

Score level on five personality factors (C, F, H, Q_3, and Q_4) was found to be significantly related to specific types of clothing behavior regardless of whether the subject was incarcerated or not.

1. <u>Concern with modesty in dress was associated
with average and low scores on Factors C and H.</u> Such
results suggested that respondents who were concerned
with the modesty of their attire tended to: (1) be
emotionally less stable, easily upset, lower in ego
strength (Factor C); (2) suffer from inferiority
feelings (Factor H); and (3) be restrained, intro-
spective, and primly correct (Factor F).

2. <u>Interest in the aesthetics and management
of dress were related to high scores on Factor Q_3 and
low scores on Factor Q_4.</u> The indications were that
participants in this study who were interested in
the aspects of aesthetics and management of clothing
tended to: (1) have a high self concept, be socially
aware, be in control of their emotions (Factor Q_3);
and (2) be sedate, relaxed, composed, and satisfied
(Factor Q_4).

3. <u>Concern with the use of clothing to win
social approval was associated with average and high
scores on Factor Q_3.</u> These results suggested that the
more socially aware, self-controlled, and self-
respecting respondents were more likely to use clothing
to gain the approval of others.

Only personality Factor G showed significant
relationships for both score level and interaction

with non-incarceration - incarceration. Unfortunately, none of the univariate F tests for interaction attained the required probability level of .01. Average and high scores on Factor G were found to be related to the six clothing subscales of aesthetics, modesty, interest, comfort, attention, and management. Such results suggested that subjects who tended to be conscientious, perservering, and rule-bound showed greater interest in these aspects of clothing behavior.

The MANOVA for Factor M was not completed because none of the incarcerated women fell within the high scoring category (for a definition of score levels for Factor M see Appendix C).

Although the significance level for interaction between score level on Factor N, clothing interest, and non-incarceration - incarceration approached $p \leq$ .01; none of the univariate F tests for interaction attained the required level.

Correlations Between Clothing Interest and Social Position

Pearson product moment correlations were computed between group means on the eight Creekmore subscales and the social position of each of the two population groups. Magnitude of the coefficients of

correlation was considered in addition to significance

levels because of the belief that more meaningful inter-

pretations of the data would be possible if strength of

relationships was examined. Criteria of ± .300

representing small but definite relationship and ± .500

representing substantial relationship were selected for

purposes of evaluation.[64]

Non-Incarcerated Respondents

A review of data for non-incarcerated women

(Table 38) revealed that none of the correlation

coefficients attained either statistical significance

or a magnitude indicating small but definite relationship.

Social position appeared to be unrelated to clothing

concern for the non-incarcerated group.

Incarcerated Respondents

Data in Table 38 indicate that only the clothing

subscale of approval was related to social status for

incarcerated women (p < .05). The strength of this

relationship was weak and quite possibly could have been

due to chance. It appeared unlikely that clothing concern

and social position were related for the incarcerated group.

---

[64]J. P. Guilford, Fundamental Statistics in
Psychology and Education 3rd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill
Book Company, Inc., 1956), p. 145.

TABLE 38

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN CLOTHING INTEREST SCORES
AND SOCIAL POSITION[a] FOR NON-
INCARCERATED AND INCARCERATED
WOMEN

Clothing Subscales	Non-Incarcerated	Incarcerated
	Social Position Class III	Social Position Class IV
Aesthetic	-1379	1527
Modesty	-1151	-0731
Interest	-0969	-0568
Comfort	-0994	-1007
Attention	-1017	-1130
Management	-1190	0509
Approval	-1537	-2218*
Dependence	-0670	-0586

Note: [a]Social position determined by Hollingshead's
"Two Factor Index of Social Position."
All values should be read with four decimal
places.
All values without signs should be considered
positive.

n=63
  *p   .05
 **p   .01
***p   .001

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Discussion of the conclusions drawn from this study has been divided into two sections. The first portion is concerned with the fulfillment of the two objectives of the investigation. The second section is devoted to a discussion of the hypotheses, stated in positive form, which provided the basis for research procedures.

Objectives

Objective One: To determine whether specific types of clothing interests are associated with specific personality characteristics.

Pearson product moment coefficients indicated that small but definite relations did exist between specific clothing interest and certain personality characteristics for the two groups who participated in this research. Five such relationships were identified for non-incarcerated women and eight were identified for incarcerated women. Three personality factors (G, Q_3, and F) accounted for the majority of relationships found for non-incarcerated women while four

(G, Q_3, A, and F) accounted for the majority of

relationships identified for incarcerated respondents.

Factors G and Q_3 ranked as first and second in order

of importance with regard to the clothing concerns

of both groups. It was concluded that, although the

magnitude of the coefficients was relatively low,

specific types of clothing interest tended to be

associated with specific personality characteristics for

the two groups who participated in this study.[65]

Thus, it was concluded that this objective was achieved.

Objective Two: To ascertain whether certain

categories of clothing interests are related to person-

ality characteristics believed to be associated with

various levels of adjustment.

Conclusions based upon the outcomes of the

MANOVA procedures designed to identify relationships

between levels of adjustment and clothing concern must

be viewed with caution because of the inequality in

subgroup size which resulted from classification by

---

[65]A separate factor analysis for each population
group was conducted as an additional test of the rela-
tionship between personality characteristics and clothing
concerns. None of the clothing concerns and personality
factors clustered together after orthogonal rotation was
completed. It is possible that no relationships
were found through factor analysis because: (1) there
were too few subjects in each group; and (2) the correla-
tions were of relatively low magnitude.

score level on Cattell's 16 PF Test. However, indications were that for women who took part in this research, certain categories of clothing concern were related to personality characteristics believed to be associated with various levels of adjustment.

It was found that, regardless of whether the subject was incarcerated or not, respondents who were concerned with modesty in attire tended to be: emotionally less stable; lower in ego strength; primly correct; restrained; and to suffer from timidity and inferiority feelings.

Women in both populations who were concerned with the aesthetics and management of clothing tended to: have a high self concept; be socially aware; be sedate; and be composed and satisfied.

Respondents in both groups who were interested in the use of clothing to win social approval were socially aware and self-respecting.

Although low and high scoring subgroups consistently differed on the basis of clothing concerns as they related to specific personality traits, average scorers were not consistently different from extremely high or extremely low scoring groups. Instead, average scoring respondents were grouped with either the high or

low scoring subjects when differences in clothing interest were found. It was concluded that there was a tendency for special types of clothing concerns to be related to levels of adjustment believed to be associated with certain extreme scores on given personality factors identified by Cattell. Therefore, it was concluded that this objective was achieved.

Hypotheses

The general hypothesis which guided this exploratory research was that: "Concern about clothing is related to certain personality characteristics believed to be associated with adjustment." Research procedures were facilitated by the seven sub-hypotheses discussed below.

Sub-Hypothesis One: There is a difference between non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups with regard to concern about clothing.

Multivariate analysis of variance was employed to identify specific areas of clothing concern which tended to distinguish the two population groups. Statistically significant differences ($p < .001$) were found for the interest and attention subscales. Incarcerated women scored higher on both, indicating that they were more willing to devote time to and

experiment with clothing and to use it to attract the attention of others. Thus, sub-hypothesis one was confirmed.

Sub-Hypothesis Two: Individuals of both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who score high on specific personality traits have similar concerns about clothing.

To test this hypothesis it was necessary to compare respondents on the basis of: (a) non-incarceration - incarceration; (b) score level on individual personality factors; and (c) mean scores on each of the eight clothing subscales for each subgroup. Because of inequality in subgroup size these conclusions must be considered tentative.

No significant differences between high scoring subgroups were found. It was concluded that all subjects who scored high on Cattell's 16 primary personality factors tended to have similar concerns about clothing. Thus, sub-hypothesis two was confirmed.

Sub-Hypothesis Three: Individuals of both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who score low on specific personality traits have similar concerns about clothing.

Multivariate analysis of variance was employed to test the relationship specified in sub-hypothesis

three. No significant differences were found between non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who scored low on Cattell's 16 primary personality factors. It was concluded that individuals participating in this study who scored low on specific personality traits tended to have similar concerns about clothing. Hence, sub-hypothesis three was confirmed.

Sub-Hypothesis Four: Individuals of both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who have average scores on specific personality traits have similar concerns about clothing.

The relationship set forth in this hypothesis was tested by the same MANOVA procedures used in sub-hypotheses two and three. There were no statistically significant differences between the clothing concerns of the non-incarcerated and incarcerated women who scored within the average range on Cattell's 16 primary personality factors. It was concluded that respondents in both populations who had average scores on specific personality traits tended to exhibit similar clothing concerns. Therefore, sub-hypothesis four was confirmed.

Sub-Hypothesis Five: There is a difference between individuals of both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who score high and those who score

low on specific personality traits with regard to
concern about clothing.

Several statistically significant differences
emerged from MANOVA procedures designed to test sub-
hypothesis five. Differences indicated that respondents
in both populations who scored low on personality Factors
C and H were more concerned with the modesty of their
clothing than were those who scored high on the same
factors. Respondents who scored high on personality
Factors Q_3 and Q_4 were more interested in the aesthetics
and management of clothing than were low scorers on
the same factors. Also, women in both populations who
scored high on Factor Q_3 used clothing more often to
win social approval than did subjects who scored low
on this factor. A final difference between high and
low scorers was found for personality Factor G and
six clothing subscales (aesthetic, modesty, interest,
comfort, attention, and management). High scorers
were more concerned with all six clothing behaviors.
Thus, sub-hypothesis five was confirmed.

Sub-Hypothesis Six: There is a difference
between individuals of both the non-incarcerated and
incarcerated groups who have average scores and those
who have high scores on specific personality traits
with regard to concern about clothing.

Multivariate analysis of variance indicated that high scoring respondents on personality Factors C and H were significantly less concerned about modesty in dress than were average scoring respondents. Therefore, sub-hypothesis six was confirmed.

Sub-Hypothesis Seven: There is a difference between individuals of both the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups who have average scores and those who have low scores on specific personalty traits with regard to concern about clothing.

Results of the MANOVA procedures indicated that women in both groups who had average scores on personality factors of F, G, Q_3, and Q_4 had different concerns about clothing from those who had low scores on the same factors. Hence, sub-hypothesis seven was confirmed.

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY

Clothing has been regarded for many years as an important part of non-verbal communication used by individuals in their attempts to gratify basic physiological and psychological needs. It has only been during the decades since the 1940's that empirically derived results have begun to substantiate this popular belief. A growing volume of research has begun to penetrate the ways in which individuals see, value, and use clothing in their efforts to: gain acceptance by social groups; strengthen their self conceptions; and express their philosophical outlook. Several studies have begun to prove the relationship between personality characteristics and clothing behavior. The majority of evidence which has been accumulated to date is limited to research with student populations; little is known about whether or not similar relationships hold true for other social categories. Also, little work has been done to determine whether specific types of clothing concerns are related to personality characteristics believed to be associated with various levels of adjustment.

The purpose of this exploratory research was to provide empirically based insight into the relationship, if any, between personality characteristics believed to be associated with levels of adjustment and clothing behavior. Also, it was designed to determine whether or not similar relationships hold true for student and non-student populations. Therefore, the study included a comparison between a non-incarcerated (college students) and an incarcerated group.

The Instruments

The "Importance of Clothing Questionnaire," devised by Dr. A. M. Creekmore and refined by Dr. Creekmore and five graduate students at Michigan State University, was used to measure clothing concerns. The selection of this instrument was based upon its wide acceptance for use in sociopsychological clothing research and because of its construct validity.[66]

Cattell's 16 PF Test was chosen as the measure of personality characteristics. This choice was based upon: (1) the theoretical background selected for this study; (2) the frequency with which the 16 PF Test

---

[66]L. M. Gurel, "Dimensions of Clothing Interest Based on Factor Analysis of Creekmore's 1968 Clothing Measure," (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1974), p. 114.

is used by personality researchers, (3) the comprehensive information it provides in a relatively short time; and (4) its appropriateness for use with respondents who have not attained a high educational level.

Hollingshead's "Two Factor Index of Social Position" was employed to determine socioeconomic status for the two population groups.

The Sample

The research sample for this study was composed of a non-incarcerated and an incarcerated group. Non-incarcerated subjects were female students enrolled at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro during the first summer session, 1974. Incarcerated subjects were women concurrently enrolled in the prison school of the Correctional Center for Women in Raleigh, North Carolina. A total of 188 women participated, each group consisted of 94 respondents.

The groups were similar in regard to: age, with a modal age of 22 years; area of residence during the first 15 years of life, in rural areas of North Carolina; and religious preference, Protestant. They were less similar in regard to marital status. Seventeen respondents in each group were currently married.

Fifty of the incarcerated and 71 of the non-incarcerated

women had never been married. The two populations were

dissimilar in regard to race, educational level, and

socioeconomic status. The majority of the non-incarcera-

ted group were Caucasian, while the incarcerated

respondents were approximately equally divided between

the Caucasian and Negro races. The mean educational

level achieved by non-incarcerated respondents was

junior class standing in college while that of

incarcerated subjects was some high school education.

The modal social position of the non-incarcerated group

was Class III, which represents the middle position on

Hollingshead's five class scale; that of the incarcerated

group was Class IV, or the second lowest position on

Hollingshead's scale.

The Statistical Analysis

Pearson's product moment correlation coefficients

were used to ascertain whether any overall relationships

existed between the clothing concerns and personality

factors under study. The separate correlational matrices

established for each group indicated that small but

definite relationships did exist between specific clothing

interests and certain personality characteristics. Five

such relationships were found for non-incarcerated

respondents and eight were found for incarcerated subjects. Three personality factors (G, Q_3, and F) accounted for the majority of these relationships for both groups. Personality Factors G and Q_3 ranked first and second in importance with regard to clothing concern for both populations. The findings indicated that as subjects increased in personality characteristics interpreted by Cattell as conscientious, persevering, staid, and rule-bound, their general level of clothing concern increased (Factor G). Also, as they increased in social awareness, regard for social reputation, self-respect, and self-control, their concern with the aesthetics and management of dress, their willingness to devote time to clohting, and to use it to attract attention tended to increase (Factor Q_3).

These personality characteristics are the ones which Cattell suggests are associated with high superego strength and high self concept. Both of these aspects of the psychological make-up of individuals are initiated and maintained through the process of social interaction. Since these characteristics were found to bear the strongest relationships with clothing concerns of subjects in both populations, the belief that clothing behavior aids in the preservation of psychological

and social well-being of individuals was empirically strengthened. Moreover, some groundwork was established which indicates that a degree of similarity probably exists across groups of people with regard to the use of clothing as a form of social psychological coping behavior.

Multivariate analysis of variance was used to identify differences in the eight clothing concerns which existed for the non-incarcerated and incarcerated groups. Significant differences were found at the .001 level of confidence for the interest and attention subscales, with incarcerated women scoring higher on both.

This finding may have been due to several alternative factors. First, it might be attributed to a situation of deprivation or lack of freedom of choice in the styles and colors of clothing worn by the inmates. Although these women wore skirts and blouses, dresses, slacks and shirts, or shorts and shirts, the style of similar garments was the same and the color was always light blue. Perhaps the desire to experiment with clothing and to use it to attract attention was a logical result of the restricted range of selection and small latitude of variation permitted to the inmates.

Certainly, such a result and explanation would conform

to the use of clothing as a tool in the creation and

maintenance of a feeling of "personhood" which has been

suggested by Goffman and others. A second possibility

may be that the differences in clothing concerns for the

two groups were due to the substantial differences in

race, education, and social status, or to an interaction

among these variables. This seems a reasonable alterna-

tive because each of these represents an important

component of the social milieu in which individuals

learn appropriate use of tools that are instrumental

in need satisfaction.

Multivariate analysis of variance was employed

to determine whether any differences existed between the

two groups on the basis of clothing concerns which might

be related to personality characteristics believed

to be associated with levels of adjustment. Because

of the necessity of group subdivision on the basis of

score level on the 16 PF Test, inequality in subgroup

size resulted. A more stringent alpha level of $p \leq .01$

was set for rejection of null hypotheses. Findings

based on these MANOVA procedures were considered

tentative. The findings, regardless of whether subjects

were incarcerated or not, were:

1.   Those concerned with modesty of their clothing tended to be emotionally less stable, lower in ego strength, restrained, and to suffer from timidity and inferiority feelings.

2.   Those concerned with the aesthetics and management of dress tended to be socially aware, sedate, composed, satisfied, and to possess a high self concept.

3.   Those interested in the use of clothing to win social approval tended to be socially aware, possess a high self concept, and to respect social reputation.

Results from this portion of the statistical analysis showed consistent differences in the clothing concerns of respondents who scored high and those who scored low on specific factors of Cattell's 16 PF Test. No consistent demarcations were found between average and high or low scorers on the basis of clothing interest. Whenever differences in clothing concerns were found, average scoring subjects exhibited similar clothing interest to either one or the other group with extreme scores. Therefore, there seemed to be a tendency for specific types of clothing concerns to be related to levels of adjustment believed to be associated with

certain extreme scores on given personality factors identified by Cattell.

The similarity in the relationships between clothing concerns and personality characteristics found for the two groups might be explained, to some extent, by the process of social interaction. Although different individuals are socialized by different groups and subcultures, some similarities in social expectations permeate any given society. In addition to the existence of broad societal norms and mores, the existence of mass media and systems of transportation probably have a developmental implication upon personality and patterns of behavior which show similarity across groups. For example, in a mass society which emphasizes youth and beauty, an individual who tends to suffer from inferiority feelings, timidity, and low ego strength might be expected to evidence concern about the modesty of his attire. Also, individuals who are sensitive to the workings of social systems and to the importance of these systems in the realization of personal goals and satisfaction of needs could logically be predicted to show interest in the functional utility of clothing. This seems particularly probable in a society which brings the individual into contact with a wide variety

of people whose interaction tends to be guided, at least in its earliest stages, on the basis of observable cues.

Pearson's product moment coefficients were employed to identify any relationships between clothing concern and socioeconomic status for the two population groups. No relationships of this nature emerged from the data.

CHAPTER VII

RECOMMENDATIONS

Results of this exploratory study have indicated that relationships between clothing concerns and personality characteristics believed to be associated with various levels of adjustment do seem to exist for the respondents who participated in this study. Moreover, the same relationships appeared to hold true regardless of whether the subjects were incarcerated or not. The following recommendations for future research are made:

1. Replication of this study using groups large enough to warrant factor analysis as a further test of the relationship between personality characteristics and clothing concerns would increase the understanding of psychological meanings of clothing behavior.

2. A comparison of other groups may help to confirm or refute the relationships identified by this research.

    a. Similar groups located in other parts of the country may demonstrate the same or different relationships between clothing concern and personality characteristics.

  b. Women who are inmates of correctional

facilities which permit civilian dress

might provide evidence of different

relationships between clothing concern

and personality characteristics from

inmates who are required to wear

specified uniforms.

  c. Research with respondents in different

age groups would serve as a further

test of the relationships between

clothing concerns and personality

factors believed to be associated

with levels of adjustment.

 3. A comparison of selected groups on the
basis of the second order factors in Cattell's <u>16 PF</u>
<u>Test</u> is suggested. Such an investigation might provide
more concise information regarding relationships
between clothing concerns and personality factors
believed to be associated with levels of adjusment.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Articles

Books

Bandura, A. "A Social Learning Interpretation of
     Psychological Dysfunctions." In Foundations
     of Abnormal Psychology, pp. 293-345. Edited
     by P. London. New York: Holt, Rinehart
     and Winston, Inc., 1968.

Goffman, E. "The Inmate World." In the Self in Social
     Interaction, Vol. 1: 267-74. Edited by C.
     Gordon and K. Gergen. New York: John Wiley
     & Sons, Inc., 1968.

Journals

Aiken, L. L. "The Relationship of Dress to Selected
     Measures of Personality in Undergraduate
     Women." Journal of Social Psychology 59
     (February 1963): 119-28.

Apfeldorf, M., Hunley, P. J., and Cooper, C. D.
     "Differences Between Older Insitutionalized
     Offenders and Non-Offenders on MMPI Hostility
     and Control Scales." Journal of Clinical
     Psychology 27 (July 1971): 370-72.

Ayres, R., and Posnak, M. F. "Clothing Attitudes and
     Personality Characteristics of Fashion
     Innovators." Journal of Home Economics
     61 (November 1969): 698-702.

Baker, H. B. "Psychology of Clothing as a Treatment Aid."
     Mental Health 39 (January 1955): 94-98.

Berry, G. W. "Personality Patterns and Delinquency."
     British Journal of Educational Psychology
     41 (June 1971): 221-22.

Brown, R. K., and Richard, W. C. "Social Responsibility and Its Correlate Among Normal and Behaviorally Disordered Children." Psychology in Schools 9 (January 1972): 52-55.

Christiansen, K., and Kernaleguen, A. "Orthodoxy and Conservatism-Modesty in Clothing Selection.: Journal of Home Economics 63 (April 1971): 251-55.

Compton, N. H. "Personal Appearance in Relation to High School Girls Scholastic Achievement and Social Behavior." Journal of Secondary Education 42 (April 1967): 166-68.

Cowden, J. E., Pacht, A. R., and Bodemer, O. A. "The 16 PF vs. the MCI in a Group Testing Program of Reformatory Inmates." Journal of Clinical Psychology 26 (October 1970): 510-13.

Cowden, J. E., Schroeder, C. R., and Petersen, W. M. "The CPI vs. the 16 PF at a Reception Center for Delinquent Boys." Journal of Clinical Psychology 28 (January 1971): 109-11.

Creekmore, A. M., and Kuehne, S. H. "Relationships Among Social Class, School Position, and Clothing of Adolescents." Journal of Home Economics 63 (October 1971): 555-56.

Creekmore, A. M., and Smucker, B. "Adolescents' Clothing Conformity, Awareness, and Peer Acceptance." Home Economics Research Journal 1 (December 1972): 92-97.

Eysenck, S. B. B., and Eysenck, H. G. "Crime and Personality: An Impirical Study of the Three-Factor Theory." British Journal of Criminology 10 (July 1970): 225-39.

Forrest, A. K., and Joghughi, M. S. "Eysenck's Theory of Criminality." British Journal of Criminology 10 (July 1970): 240-54.

Gurel, L. M., Wilbur, J. C. and Gurel, L. "Personality Correlates of Adolescent Clothing Styles." Journal of Home Economics 64 (March 1972): 42-47.

Hambleton, K. B., Roach, M. E., and Ehle, K. "Teenage Appearance: Conformity, Preferences, and Self-Concepts." Journal of Home Economics 64 (February 1972): 29-33.

Humphrey, M. K., and Creekmore, A. M. "Clothing and Self-Concept of Adolescents." Journal of Home Economics 63 (April 1972): 246-50.

Kelley, E. H., and Good, E. H. "Teenage Boys' Perception of the Role Clothing Plays in the Occupational World." Journal of Home Economics 63 (May 1971): 332-36.

Kinsey, L. R. "Some Observations on the Psychodynamics of Juvenile Delinquents." Adolescence 17 (Summer 1970): 197-206.

Littrell, M. B., and Eicher, J. B. "Clothing Opinions and the Social Acceptance Process Among Adolescents." Adolescence 8 (Summer 1973): 197-205.

Pasewark, R. A., Fitzgerald, B. J., and Watson, R. L. "Associated Personality Differences in Delinquents and Non-Delinquents." Journal of Personality Assessment 35 (April 1971): 159-61.

Roach, M. E. "Adolescent Dress." Journal of Home Economics 61 (November 1969): 693-97.

Taylor, L. C., and Compton, N. H. "Personality Correlates of Dress Conformity." Journal of Home Economics 60 (October 1968): 653-56.

Thomas, L. E. "Clothing and Counter-Culture: An Empirical Study." Adolescence 8 (Spring 1973): 93-112.

White, O. B., and Kernaleguen, A. P. "Comparison of Selected Perceptual and Personality Variables Among College Women Deviant and Non-Deviant in Their Appearance." Perceptual and Motor Skills 32 (February 1971): 87-92.

Books

Allport, G. W. Pattern and Growth in Personality. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

Bandura, A. Principles of Behavior Modification. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1969.

144

Brody, N. _Personality Research and Theory_. New York: Academic Press, 1972.

Buros, O. K., ed. _The Seventh Mental Measurements Yearbook_. Vol. 1. New Jersey: The Bryphon Press, 1972.

Cartwright, D., and Zander, A., ed. _Group Dynamics: Research and Theory_, 3rd ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1968.

Cattell, R. B. _The Scientific Analysis of Personality_. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1966.

Creekmore, A. M. _Methods of Measuring Clothing Variables_. Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station Project #783, 1966.

Combs, A. W., and Snygg, D. _Individual Behavior_ revised ed. New York: Harper and Row, Publishers, 1955.

Cortes, J. B., and Gatti, F. M. _Delinquency and Crime: A Biopsychosocial Approach_. New York: Seminar Press, 1972.

English, H. B., and English, A. C. _A Comprehensive Dictionary of Psychological and Psychoanalytical Terms: A Guide to Usage_. New York: David McKay Company, Inc., 1965.

Freud, S. _An Outline of Psychoanalysis_. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1949.

Freud, S. _New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis_. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., 1956.

Guilford, J. P. _Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education_. 3rd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

Hall, C. S., and Lindzey, G. _Theories of Personality_ 2nd ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1970.

Hathaway, S. R., and Monachesi, E. D. _An Atlas of Juvenile MMPI Profiles_. Minneapolis: The University of Minnesota Press, 1961.

Hathaway, S. R., and Monachesi, E. D. Adolescent
    Personality and Behavior: MMPI Patterns of
    Normal, Delinquent, Dropout, and Other
    Outcomes. Minneapolis: The University of
    Minnesota Press, 1963.

Hays, W. L. Statistics. New York: Holt, Rinehart and
    Winston, 1963.

Horn, M. J. The Second Skin: An Interdisciplinary
    Study of Clothing. Boston: Houghton Mifflin
    Company, 1968.

Liebret, R. M., and Spiegler, M. D. Personality: An
    Introduction to Theory and Research. Homewood
    Illinois: The Dorsey Press, 1968.

Maddi, S. R. Personality Theories: A Comprehensive
    Analysis. Homewood, Illinois: The Dorsey
    Press, 1968.

May, R. Psychology and the Human Dilema. New York:
    D. Van Nostrand Company, Inc., 1967.

Mischel, W. Personality and Assessment. New York:
    John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1968.

Ryan, M. S. Clothing: A Study in Human Behavior.
    New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc.,
    1966.

Schlater, J. D., director. National Goals and Guidelines
    for Research in Home Economics. Lansing,
    Michigan: Bulletin Office Information Services,
    Michigan State University, 1970.

Manuals and Bulletins

Bulletin of Western Regional Research Cooperative
    Project W-98. Relationship of Clothing to the
    Personal and Social Acceptability of Adolescents.
    Washington State University: Washington Agricultural
    Experiment Station, February 1972.

Institute for Personality and Ability Testing. Manual
    for the 16 PF. Champaign, Illinois: Institute
    for Personality and Ability Testing, 1972.

Unpublished Materials

Creekmore, A. M. "Clothing Behaviors and Their Relation
    to General Values and to the Striving for Basic
    Needs." Ph. D. dissertation, The Pennsylvania
    State University, 1963.

Gurel, L. M. "Dimensions of Clothing Interest Based
    on Factor Analysis of Creekmore's 1968
    Clothing Measure." Ph.D. dissertation, University
    of North Carolina at Greensboro, 1974.

Hiller, G. "Comparison of Two Groups of University of
    Alberta College Women: - Innovators of a
    Specific Fashion in Clothing and Members of the
    Normative Dress Majority - on Selected
    Characteristics." Master's thesis, Utah
    State University, 1971.

Hollingshead, A. B. "Two Factor Index of Social
    Position," Val Station, New Haven, Connecticut,
    1968. (Mimeographed.)

Hugo, J. A. "Abbreviation of the Minnesota Multiphasic
    Personality Inventory Through Multiple Regression."
    Ph.D. dissertation, University of Alabama, 1971.

Kness, D. M. "The Clothing Attitudes and Social -
    Political Beliefs of University Men Identified
    as Conservative and Hippy Dressers." Master's
    thesis, The Pennsylvania State University, 1971.

Waehlke, P. H. "An Empirical Investigation of the
    Robustness of MANOVA when the Assumption of
    Normality is Violated." Master's thesis,
    Arizona State University, 1972.

APPENDIX A

DEFINITIONS OF CREEKMORE'S EIGHT
CLOTHING SUBSCALES

DEFINITIONS OF CREEKMORE'S EIGHT
CLOTHING SUBSCALES[67]

Aesthetic: Use of clothing to achieve a pleasing or beautiful appearance.

Approval: Use of clothing to attain a feeling of belonging or the approval of others; usually indicates conformity to group norms.

Attention: Seeking of prestige and status through use of clothing; may be either socially approved or disapproved.

Comfort: Use of clothing to achieve comfort whether this relates to temperature, physical response to textures, or tightness or looseness of garments.

Dependence: Sensitivity to the influence of clothing feelings (sense of well-being, general good feeling, or changing of moods).

Interest: Willingness to give attention, investigate, manipulate, or experiment with clothing.

Management: Thoughtful and careful use of time, money, and energy in planning, buying, and using clothing; thus an economic aspect.

Modesty: Preference for inconspicuous clothing, quite conservative in color, fit, design, and body exposure.

---

[67]A. M. Creekmore, Methods of Measuring Clothing Variables (Lansing, Michigan: Michigan Agricultural Experiment Station Project #783, 1968), p. 96.

APPENDIX B

IMPORTANCE OF CLOTHING QUESTIONNAIRE

IMPORTANCE OF CLOTHING QUESTIONNAIRE

Read the following statements and rate each according to the scale given below. Mark the letter corresponding to your choice on the IBM answer sheet.

> Scale: A. Almost always--very few exceptions
> B. Usually--majority of the time
> C. Sometimes
> D. Seldom--not very often
> E. Almost Never--very few exceptions

1. The way I look in my clothes is important to me.

2. When I am shopping I choose clothes that I like even if they do not look the best on me.

3. It bothers me when my shirt tail keeps coming out.

4. I consider the fabric texture with the line of the garment when choosing my clothing.

5. I use clothing as a means of disguising physical problems and imperfections through skillful use of color, line and texture.

6. I wear clothes which have buttons or snaps missing.

7. I pay a lot of attention to pleasing color combinations.

8. I keep my shoes clean and neat.

9. I carefully coordinate the accessories that I wear with each outfit.

10. I wear the clothing fads that are popular in our school even though they may not be as becoming to me.

11. I spend more time than others coordinating the colors in my clothes.

12. I try to figure out why some people's clothes look better on them than others.

13. Unlined sheer dresses, blouses, or shirts reveal too much of the body.

14. I select clothes that are conservative in style.

> Scale: A. Almost Always
> B. Usually
> C. Sometimes
> D. Seldom
> E. Almost Never

15. I feel uncomfortable when someone has forgotten to close his or her zipper.

16. The first time in the season that I go to a public beach or pool I feel exposed in my bathing suit.

17. I choose clothing with small prints, even though a larger design looks equally good on me.

18. I feel embarrassed when I see someone in too low cut a dress.

19. I select clothes which do not call attention to myself in any way.

20. I feel embarrassed when I see someone in clothes that are too tight.

21. I like dark or muted colors rather than bright ones for my clothes.

22. I hesitate to associate with those whose clothes seem to reveal too much of their body.

23. I wonder why some people wear clothes that are immodest.

24. My friends and I try each others clothes to see how we look in them.

25. I enjoy trying on shoes of different styles and colors.

26. I study collections of accessories in the stores to see what I might combine attractively.

27. I try on some of the newest clothes each season to see how I look in the styles.

28. I read magazines and newspapers to find out what is new in clothing.

29. It's fun to try on different garments and accessories to see how they look together.

                    Scale: A. Almost Always
                            B. Usually
                            C. Sometimes
                            D. Seldom
                            E. Almost Never

30. I experiment with new or different "hair do's" to see how I will look.

31. I like to know what is new in clothing even if none of my friends care and I probably would not want to wear it anyway.

32. I try on clothes in shops just to see how I look in them without really planning to buy.

33. When I buy a new garment I try many different accessories before I wear it.

34. I am curious about why people wear the clothes they do.

35. The way my clothes feel to my body is important to me.

36. There are certain textures in fabrics that I like and especially try to buy, for example, soft, fuzzy, sturdy, smooth.

37. I am more sensitive to temperature changes than others and I have difficulty being comfortable in my clothes as a result.

38. I wear my pants or slacks with an easy fit even when tight ones are fashionable.

39. I get rid of garments I like because they are not comfortable.

40. I find it difficult to buy clothes suitable to the temperature.

41. I would buy a very comfortable bathing suit even if it were not the current style.

42. I avoid garments that bind the upper arm.

43. I am irritable if my clothes are uncomfortable.

44. I am extremely sensitive to the texture of the fabrics in my clothing.

45. I wonder what makes some clothes more comfortable than others.

              Scale: A. Almost Always
                      B. Usually
                      C. Sometimes
                      D. Seldom
                      E. Almost Never

46. When new fashions appear on the market, I am one of the first to own them.

47. I have clothes that I don't wear because everyone else has them.

48. I like to be considered an outstanding dresser by my friends.

49. I try to keep my wardrobe in line with the latest styles.

50. I go to nearby cities to shop for better fashions.

51. I try to buy clothes which are very unusual.

52. I avoid wearing certain clothes because they do not make me feel distinctive.

53. I enjoy wearing very different clothing even though I attract attention.

54. I try to buy clothes with the best labels.

55. I wear different clothes to impress people.

56. I am interested in why some people choose to wear such unusual clothes.

57. I plan for and prepare clothes to wear several days in advance.

58. I see that my out-of-season clothing is cleaned and stored.

59. I look over the clothing in my wardrobe before each season so that I know what I have.

60. I am enticed into buying garments I like without having anything to go with them.

61. I enjoy trying to get the most for my money in clothing purchases.

Scale: A. Almost Always
B. Usually
C. Sometimes
D. Seldom
E. Almost Never

62. I wear a raincoat or carry an umbrella to protect my clothes in rainy weather.

63. I have something to wear for any occasion that occurs.

64. I have a long-term idea for purchasing more expensive items of clothing such as coats or suits.

65. I carefully plan every purchase so that I know what I need when I get to a store.

66. I am more concerned about the care of my clothing than my friends are about theirs.

67. I try to find out how I can save as much time, energy and money as possible with my clothes.

68. I check with my friends about what they are wearing to a gathering before I decide what to wear.

69. I would rather miss something than wear clothes which are not really appropriate.

70. I feel more a part of the group if I am dressed like my friends.

71. I wear clothes that everyone is wearing even though they may not look good on me.

72. I am uncomfortable when my clothes are different from all others at a party.

73. I try to dress like others in my group so that people will know we are friends.

74. I get new clothes for a special occasion if the clothes I have are not the type my friends will be wearing.

75. I have gone places and then wished after I got there that I had not gone because my clothes were not suitable.

76. I wear what I like even though some of my friends do not approve.

                    Scale: A. Almost Always
                            B. Usually
                            C. Sometimes
                            D. Seldom
                            E. Almost Never

77. When I buy a new article of clothing I try to buy something similar to what my friends are wearing.

78. When someone comes to school dressed unsuitably, I try to figure out why he is dressed as he is.

79. Certain clothes make me feel more sure of myself.

80. I decide on the clothes to wear according to the mood I'm in that day.

81. Days when I feel low I wear my gayest clothes.

82. I "dress-up" to make an ordinary occasion seem more exciting.

83. I am aware of being more friendly and out going when I wear particular clothes.

84. I feel and act different according to whether I am wearing my best school clothes or not.

85. I buy clothing to boost my morale.

86. I get bored with wearing the same kind of clothes all the time.

87. I have more self confidence when I wear my best school clothes.

88. When things are not going well I like to wear brighter colors.

89. I wonder why some clothes make me feel better than others.

APPENDIX C

NAMES AND DEFINITIONS OF CATTELL'S SIXTEEN
PRIMARY PERSONALITY FACTORS

NAMES AND DEFINITIONS OF CATTELL'S SIXTEEN PRIMARY PERSONALITY FACTORS[68]

Low Score Direction   High Score Direction

FACTOR A

Reserved, Detached Critical, vs. Outgoing, Warmhearted,
Cool (Sizothymia)   Easy-going, participating
                                       (Affectothymia)

    The person who scores low   The person who scores
(sten of 1 to 3) on Factor A   high (sten of 8 to 10) on
tends to be stiff, cool,   Factor A tends to be good-
skeptical, and aloof. He   natured, easy-going,
likes things rather than   emotionally expressive
people, working alone, and   (hence naturally Affectothy-
avoiding compromises of   mia), ready to cooperate,
viewpoints. He is likely to   attentive to people, soft-
be precise and "rigid" in   hearted, kindly, adaptable.
his way of doing things and   He likes occupations deal-
in personal standards, and   ing with people and social-
in many occupations these   ly impressive situations.
are desirable traits. He   He readily forms active
may tend, at times, to be   groups. He is generous in
critical, obstructive or   personal relations, less
hard.   afraid of criticism, better
                                       able to remember names of
                                       people.

FACTOR B

Less Intelligent, Concrete- vs. More Intelligent, Abstract-
thinking (Lower scholastic   thinking, Bright (Higher
mental capacity)   scholastic mental capability)

    The person scoring low   The person who scores
on Factor B tends to be   high on Factor B tends to
slow to learn and grasp,   be quick to grasp ideas, a
dull, given to concrete and   fast learner, intelligent.
literal interpretation. His   There is some correlation

---

[68]From the manual for the 16 PF @ 1972 by the
Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1602
Coronado Drive, Champaign, Ill. Reproduced by permission.

dullness may be simply a reflection of low intelligence, or it may represent poor functioning due to psychopathology.

with level of culture, and some with alertness. High scores contraindicate deterioration of mental functions in pathological conditions.

Low Score Direction   High Score Direction

FACTOR C

Affected By Feelings, Emotionally Less Stable, Easily Upset (Lower ego Strength) vs. Emotionally Stable, Faces Reality, Calm, Mature (Higher ego strength)

The person who scores low on Factor C tends to be low in frustration tolerance for unsatisfactory conditions, changeable and plastic, evading necessary reality demands, neurotically fatigued, fretful, easily emotional and annoyed, active in dissatisfaction, having neurotic symptoms (phobias, sleep disturbances, psychosomatic complaints, etc.). Low Factor C score is common to almost all forms of neurotic and some psychotic disorders.

The person who scores high on Factor C tends to be emotionally mature, stable, realistic about life, unruffled, possessing ego strength, better able to maintain solid group morale. Sometimes he may be a person making a resigned adjustment* to unsolved emotional problems.

*Shrewd clinical observers have pointed out that a good C level sometimes enables a person to achieve effective adjustment despite an underlying psychotic potential.

FACTOR E

Humble, Mild, Accommodating, Conforming (Submissiveness) vs, Assertive, Independent, Aggressive, Competitive, Stubborn (Dominance)

The person who scores low on factor E tends to give way to others, to be docile, and to conform. He is often dependent, confessing, anxious for obsessional correctness. This

The person who scores high on Factor E is assertive, self-assured, and independent-minded. He tends to be austere, a law to himself, hostile or extrapunitive, authoritarian

passivity is part of many neurotic syndromes.

(managing others), and disregards authority.

<u>Low</u> <u>Score</u> <u>Direction</u>

<u>High</u> <u>Score</u> <u>Direction</u>

FACTOR F

<u>Sober</u>, Prudent, Serious, Taciturn (Desurgency)

vs.

<u>Happy-go-lucky</u>, Impulsively Lively, Enthusiastic (Surgency)

The person who scores low on Factor F tends to be restrained, reticent, introspective. He is sometimes dour, pessimistic, unduly deliberate, and considered smug and primly correct by observers. He tends to be a sober, dependable person.

The person who scores high on this trait tends to be cheerful, active, talkative, frank, expressive, effervescent, carefree. He is frequently chosen as an elected leader. He may be impulsive and mercurial.

FACTOR G

<u>Expedient</u>, Evades Rules, Feels Few Obligations (Weaker superego strength)

vs.

<u>Conscientious</u>, Persevering, Staid, Rule-bound (Stronger superego strength)

The person who scores low on Factor G tends to be unsteady in purpose. He is often casual and lacking in effort for group undertakings and cultural demands. His freedom from group influence may lead to anti-social acts, but at times makes him more effective, while his refusal to be bound by rules causes him to have less somatic upset from stress.

The person who scores high on Factor G tends to be exacting in character, dominated by sense of duty, persevering, responsible, planful, "fills the unforgiving minute." He is usually conscientious and moralistic, and he prefers hard-working people to witty companions. The inner "categorical imperative" of this essential superego (in the psychoanalytic sense) should be distinguished from the superficially similar "social ideal self" of Q_3+.

Low Score Direction   High Score Direction

FACTOR H

Shy, Restrained, Diffident, ^{vs.}   Venturesome, Socially-bold,
Timid (Threctia)   Uninhibited, Spontaneous
                                       (Parmia)

   The person who scores low   The person who scores
on this trait tends to be   high on Factor H is
shy, withdrawing, cautious,   sociable, bold, ready to
retiring, a "wallflower."   try new things, spontaneous,
He usually has inferiority   and abundant in emotional
feelings. He tends to be   response. His "thick-
slow and impeded in speech   skinnedness" enables him
and in expressing himself,   to face wear and tear in
dislikes occupations with   dealing with people and
personal contacts, prefers   grueling emotional situa-
one or two close friends to   tions, without fatigue.
large groups, and is not   However, he can be careless
given to keeping in contact   of detail, ignore danger
with all that is going on   signals, and consume much
around him.   time talking. He tends to
                                       be "pushy" and actively
                                       interested in the opposite
                                       sex.

FACTOR I

Tough-minded, Self-   ^{vs.}   Tender-minded, Dependent
reliant, Realistic, No-   overprotected, Sensitive
nonsense (Harria)   (Premsia)

   The person who scores   The person who scores
low on Factor I tends to   high on Factor I tends to
be practical, realistic,   be tender-minded, day-
masculine, independent,   dreaming, artistic, fas-
responsible, but skepti-   tidious, feminine. He is
cal of subjective, cultural   sometimes demanding of
elaborations. He is some-   attention and help,
times unmoved, hard, cyni-   impatient, dependent,
cal, smug. He tends to   impractical. He dislikes
keep a group operating on   crude people and rough
a practical and realistic   occupations. He tends to
"no-nonsense" basis.   slow up group performance,
                                       and to upset group morale
                                       by unrealistic fussiness.

Low Score Direction	High Score Direction

FACTOR L

Trusting, Adaptable, Free of Jealousy, Easy to Get on With (Alaxia)

vs.

Suspicious, Self-opionionated, Hard to Fool (Protension)

The person who scores low on Factor L tends to be free of jealous tendencies, adaptable, cheerful, uncompetitive, concerned about other people, a good team worker.

The person who scores high on Factor L tends to be mistrusting and doubtful. He is often involved in his own ego, is self-opinionated, and interested in internal, mental life. He is usually deliberate in his actions, unconcerned about other people, a poor team member.

FACTOR M

Practical, Careful, Conventional, Regulated by External Realities, Proper (Praxernia)

vs.

Imaginative, Wrapped up in Inner Urgencies, Careless of Practical Matters, Absentminded (Autia)

The person who scores low on Factor M tends to be anxious to do the right things, attentive to practical matters, and subject to the dictation of what is obviously possible. He is concerned over detail, able to keep his head in emergencies, but sometimes unimaginative.

The person who scores high on Factor M tends to be unconventional, unconcerned over everyday matters. Bohemian, self-motivated, imaginatively creative, concerned with "essentials," and oblivious of particular people and physical realities. His inner-directed interests sometimes lead to unrealistic situations accompanied by expressive outbursts. His individuality tends to cause him to be rejected in group activities.

Low Score Direction	High Score Direction

FACTOR N

Forthright, Natural, Art- ^{vs.} less, Sentimental (Artlessness)

Shrewd, Calculating, Worldly, Penetrating (Shrewdness)

The person who scores low on Factor N tends to be unsophisticated, sentimental, and simple. He is sometimes crude and awkward, but easily pleased and content with what comes, and is natural and spontaneous.

The person who scores high on Factor N tends to be polished, experienced, worldly, shrewd. He is often hardheaded and analytical. He has an intellectual, unsentimental approach to situations, an approach akin to cynicism.

FACTOR O

Placid, Self-assured, Con- ^{vs.} fident, Serene (Untroubled adequacy)

Apprehensive, Worrying, Depressive, Troubled (Guilt proneness)

The person who scores low on Factor O tends to be placid, with unshakable nerve. He has a mature, unanxious confidence in himself and his capacity to deal with things. He is resilient and secure, but to the point of being insensitive of when a group is not going along with him, so that he may evoke antipathies and distrust.

The person who scores high on Factor O tends to be depressed, moody, a worrier, full of foreboding, and brooding. He has a childlike tendency to anxiety in difficulties. He does not feel accepted in groups or free to participate. High Factors O score is very common in clinical groups of all types.

Low Score Direction	High Score Direction

FACTOR Q_1

Conservative, Respecting Established Ideas, Tolerant of Traditional Difficulties (Conservatism)   vs.   Experimenting, Critical Liberal, Analytical, Free-thinking (Radicalism)

The person who scores low on Factor Q_1 is confident in what he has been taught to believe, and accepts the "tried and true," despite inconsistencies, when something else might be better. He is cautious and compromising in regard to new ideas. Thus, he tends to oppose and postpone change, is inclined to go along with tradition, is more conservative in religion and politics, and tends not to be interested in analytical "intellectual" thought.

The person who scores high on Factor Q_1 tends to be interested in intellectual matters and has doubts on fundamental issues. He is skeptical and inquiring regarding ideas, either old or new. He tends to be more well informed, less inclined to moralize, more inclined to experiment in life generally, and more tolerant of inconvenience and change.

FACTOR Q_2

vs.

Group-dependent, A "Joiner" and Sound Follower (Group adherence)

Self-sufficient, Prefers Own Decisions, Resourceful (Self-sufficiency)

The person who scores low on Factor Q_2 prefers to work and make decisions with other people, likes and depends on social approval and admiration. He tends to go along with the group and may be lacking in individual resolution. He is not necessarily gregarious by choice; rather he needs group support.

The person who scores high on Factor Q_2 is temperamentally independent, accustomed to going his own way, making decisions and taking action on his own. He discounts public opinion, but is not necessarily dominant in his relations with others (see Factor E). He does not dislike people but simply does not need their agreement or support.

Low Score Direction	High Score Direction

FACTOR Q_3

Undisciplined Self-conflict, vs. Careless of Protocol, Follows Own Urges (Low integration)

The person who scores low on Factor Q_3 will not be bothered with will control and regards for social demands. He is not overly considerate, careful, or painstaking. He may feel maladjusted, and many maladjustments (especially the affective, but not the paranoid) show Q_3-.

Controlled, Socially precise, Following Self-image (High self-concept control)

The person who scores high on Factor Q_3 tends to have strong control of his emotions and general behavior, is inclined to be socially aware and careful, and evidences what is commonly termed "self-respect" and regard for social reputation. He sometimes tends, however, to be obstinate. Effective leaders, and some paranoids are high on Q_3.

FACTOR Q_4

Relaxed, Tranquil, Torpid, vs. Unfrustrated (Low ergic tension)

The person who scores low on Factor Q_4 tends to be sedate, relaxed, composed, and satisfied (not frustrated). In some situations, his oversatisfaction can lead to laziness and low performance, in the sense that low motivation produces little trial and error. Conversely, high tension level may disrupt school and work performance.

Tense, Frustrated, Driven, Overwrought (High ergic tension)

The person who scores high on Factor Q_4 tends to be tense, excitable, restless, fretful, impatient. He is often fatigued, but unable to remain inactive. In groups he takes a poor view of the degree of unity, orderliness, and leadership. His frustration represents an excess of stimulated, but undischarged drive.

APPENDIX D

TABLES OF DEPENDABILITY AND VALIDITY FOR
CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST[69]

---

[69]Ibid., pp. 10, 12.

TABLE 1

16 PF DEPENDABILITY COEFFICIENTS: TEST-RETEST
WITH 2- TO 7-DAY INTERVALS

Form							Source Trait										
	A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	Q_4
A[a]	86	79	82	83	90	81	92	90	78	75	77	83	82	85	80	72
A[b]*	81	58	78	80	79	81	83	77	75	70	61	79	73	73	62	81
B[b]	75	54	74	80	81	77	89	79	77	70	60	81	70	75	62	87
(A + B)[b]	89	65	87	88	90	88	93	89	87	82	76	89	83	85	78	91
(A + B)[c]	82	45	76	78	80	75	86	83	69	68	60	76	66	76	76	80
(C + D)[d]	82	76	83	77	80	83	86	83	75	68	67	79	75	68	77	82

[a]Canadian subjects: N = 243 high school males and females.
[b]American subjects: N = 146; 79 employment counselors and 67 undergraduate students.
[c]New Zealand subjects: N = 95 high school males and females.
[d]American subjects: N = 150 undergraduate males and females.
Note: Decimal points have been omitted.

*Reliability (dependability) coefficients referred to in this research.

TABLE 2

DIRECT CONCEPT VALIDITIES OF THE 16 PF SCALES

Form	N	Source Trait															
		A	B	C	E	F	G	H	I	L	M	N	O	Q_1	Q_2	Q_3	Q_4
A + B	958	86	53	77	71	88	77	94	80	67	71	64	86	68	80	80	63
C + D	794	87	91	63	82	90	54	90	45	65	85	74	71	68	82	70	80
A*	958	79	35	70	63	83	67	92	70	49	44	41	71	62	70	68	57
B	958	78	44	66	64	79	69	87	75	63	73	60	81	51	70	69	59

Note: Decimal points have been omitted.

*Concept validity coefficients referred to in the text of this research.

APPENDIX E

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES

Introduction

You are being asked to participate in a study designed to determine whether a relationship exists between personality and clothing. As you know, many people believe that clothing choices are strongly influenced by the personality of the individual making the selection. At the present time there is no firm research evidence which can support or refute this popular belief. It is hoped that this study will be one step in establishing such evidence.

To provide the information we need, we are asking different groups of women to complete two questionnaires and a biographical data sheet. One questionnaire deals with personality and the other concerns clothing interest. From this information we hope to learn:

1. Whether specific clothing interests are related to specific personality characteristics; and

2. If the same personality characteristics are related to the same clothing interests for different groups of people.

Since we are interested in group results only, the questionnaires will in no way be identified with any single individual.

Instructions

      1. You will find the first page of your packet is entitled "Biographical Data Sheet." Please fill in this sheet first, but do not write your name on it. <u>Answer all the questions</u> as accurately as you can. I will be glad to answer any questions you may have.

      2. When you complete this sheet, go on to the green questionnaire entitled "16 PF" (16 Personality Factor). The answer sheet for this questionnaire is on the inside of the first page of the booklet. <u>Read the instructions carefully.</u> Use the side of the answer sheet marked "Form A." Do not write your name on the answer sheet but <u>answer all the questions</u>. If you have any questions I will be glad to help you.

      3. As soon as you finish the "16 PF" go on to the white questionnaire entitled "Importance of Clothing." The answer sheet is clipped to the outside of the questionnaire. <u>Read the instructions carefully.</u> <u>Answer all the questions</u> but do not write your name. Should you need help, I will be glad to assist.

      Before you begin, we would like to extend our grateful appreciation for your most valuable help with this project.

<div align="right">

Leatha Anne Darden
University of North Carolina
at Greensboro
</div>

APPENDIX F

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA SHEET #_____

1. Date of birth: Month____Day____Year____

2. Where did you live during the major part of the first
    15 years of your life? Town_____State_____
    Was this an urban area (city) or rural area?
    Urban_____Rural_____

3. How many brothers and sisters do you have?
    Number of older   Number of younger
       brothers____   brothers____
    Number of older   Number of younger
       sisters_____   sisters_____

4. What is/was your mother's occupation?_____

5. What is/was your father's occupation?_____

6. How many years in school did your father complete?

    _____

7. How many years in school did your mother complete?

    _____

8. How many years in school have you completed?

    _____

9. If you are in college, in what school are you enrolled
    and what is your major?
    School_____
         (A & S; Bus. & Econ.; Home Ec.; etc.)

10. What is your religious preference?

    _____
    (Baptist; Methodist; Catholic; Jewish; no preference)

11. Are you: Married___Single___Divorced____
                    Separated_____ Widowed_____

12. If married, what is your husband's occupation?

    _____

13. What is your occupation?_____

14. How many children do you have? Boys____Ages_____
                                    Girls____Ages_____

APPENDIX G

CHI SQUARE TESTS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NON-INCARCERATED
AND INCARCERATED RESPONDENTS ON THE BASIS OF SCORE
LEVEL ON INDIVIDUAL PERSONALITY FACTORS
ON CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

CHI SQUARE TESTS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NON-INCARCERATED
AND INCARCERATED RESPONDENTS ON THE BASIS OF SCORE
LEVEL ON INDIVIDUAL PERSONALITY FACTORS
ON CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

Eight of the 16 chi square values which tested
differences between non-incarcerated and incarcerated
respondents on the basis of score level on Cattell's
primary personality factors were significant. The eight
personality factors which showed significant differences
were: A, B, C, E, F, L, O, and Q_1. Contingency tables
for these factors are reproducted below. Two of the
factors (M and N) contained expected frequencies of less
than five observations and were considered invalid. The
remaining six factors (G, H, I, Q_2, Q_3, and Q_4) showed no
significant differences between scores received by the two
population groups.

TABLE 1

Subjects	Score Level on Personality Factor A			
	Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Inc.	25	61	8	94
Inc.	10	76	8	94
Totals	35	137	16	188

χ^2 = 8.07091
Degrees of Freedom = 2
Significant at p = .02

TABLE 2

| Subjects | Score Level on Personality Factor A | | | |
	Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Inc.	11	66	17	94
Inc.	53	38	3	94
Totals	64	104	20	188

χ^2 = 44.90096
Degrees of Freedom = 2
Significant at p = .01

TABLE 3

| Subjects | Score Level on Personality Factor C | | | |
	Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Inc.	15	64	15	94
Inc.	24	66	4	94
Totals	39	130	19	188

χ^2 = 8.47611
Degrees of Freedom = 2
Significant at p = .02

TABLE 4

| Subjects | Score Level on Personality Factor E | | | |
	Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Inc.	13	62	19	94
Inc.	9	77	8	94
Totals	22	139	27	188

$\chi^2 = 6.82746$
Degree of Freedom = 2
Significant p = .05

TABLE 5

| Subjects | Score Level on Personality Factor F | | | |
	Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Inc.	10	45	39	94
Inc.	9	63	22	94
Totals	19	108	61	188

$\chi^2 = 7.79034$
Degrees of Freedom = 2
Significant at p = .05

TABLE 6

| Subjects | Score Level on Personality Factor L | | | |
	Low (sten 1-3)	Average	High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Inc.	10	65	19	94
Inc.	3	59	32	94
Totals	13	124	51	188

$\chi^2 = 7.37328$
Degrees of Freedom = 2
Significant at p = .05

TABLE 7

| Subjects | Score Level on Personality Factor O | | | |
	Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Inc.	25	64	5	94
Inc.	13	56	25	94
Totals	38	120	30	188

$\chi^2 = 17.65614$
Degrees of Freedom = 2
Significant at p = .01

TABLE 8

| Subjects | Score Level on Personality Factor Q_1 | | | |
	Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Inc.	20	63	11	94
Inc.	5	72	17	94
Totals	25	135	28	188

$\chi^2 = 10.88571$
Degrees of Freedom = 2
Significant at p = .01

APPENDIX H

MANOVA TABLES

TABLE 1

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR A OF CATTEL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	25	61	8	94
Incarcerated	10	76	8	94
Totals	35	137	16	188

TABLE 2

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR A

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
Interaction	1 through 2	.664	16.000	350.000	p<.829
Score Level	1 through 2	1.073	16.000	350.000	p<.380
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.428	8.000	175.000	p<.001

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 3

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR A

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 1	7.428	8.000	175.000	p<.001

Univariate F Tests

	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			∝Level
Aesthetic	.029	1.043			p<.864
Modesty	1.798	113.383			p<.182
Interest	14.875	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.00
Attention	19.283	1282.346			p<.001
Management	2.074	119.681			p<.152
Approval	.375	19.149			p<.541
Dependence	3.434	206.431			p<.065

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 4

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR B OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	11	66	17	94
Incarcerated	53	38	3	94
Totals	64	104	20	188

TABLE 5

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, and HIGH SCORES ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR B

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	$\propto$Level
Interaction	1 through 2	1.027	16.000	350.000	p<.426
Score Level	1 through 2	1.667	16.000	350.000	p<.051
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.465	8.000	175.000	p<.001

Note: N = 188
        n - 94

184

TABLE 6

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR B

Clothing Subscales	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	αLevel
	1 through 1	7.465	8.000	175.000	p<.001
		Univariate F Tests			
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			αLevel
Aesthetic	.030	1.043			p<.863
Modesty	1.885	113.383			p<.171
Interest	15.326	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	19.277	1282.345			p<.001
Management	2.063	119.681			p<.153
Approval	.373	19.149			p<.542
Dependence	3.434	206.431			p<.065

Note: N = 188
        n = 54

TABLE 7

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR C

Clothing Subscales	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
	1 through 1	7.280	8.000	175.000	p<.001
	Univariate F Tests				
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			∝Level
Aesthetic	.029	1.043			p<.864
Modesty	1.941	1113.383			p<.165
Interest	14.684	938.297			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	19.092	1282.346			p<.001
Management	2.048	119.681			p<.154
Approval	.380	19.149			p<.539
Dependence	3.500	206.431			p<.063

Note: N = 188
        n = 94

TABLE 8

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR E OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	13	62	19	94
Incarcerated	9	77	8	94
Totals	22	139	27	188

TABLE 9

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING, SUBSCALES ON THE
BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND
HIGH SCORES ON PERSONALITY FACTOR E

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
Interaction	1 through 2	.780	16.000	350.000	p<.709
Score Level	1 through 2	1.827	16.000	350.000	p<.027
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.363	8.000	175.000	p<.001

Note: N = 188
 n = 94

TABLE 10

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR E

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 1	7.363	8.000	175.000	p<.001
	Univariate F Tests				
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			∝Level
Aesthetic	.029	1.043			p<.864
Modesty	1.850	113.383			p<.175
Interest	14.326	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	19.106	1282.346			p<.001
Management	2.049	119.681			p<.154
Approval	.377	19.149			p<.540
Dependence	3.412	206.431			p<.066

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 11

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR F

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
	1 through 1	7.470	8.000	175.000	p<.001
		Univariate F Tests			
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			∝Level
Aesthetic	.029	1.043			p<.865
Modesty	1.923	113.383			p<.167
Interest	14.921	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	19.297	1282.345			p<.001
Management	2.107	119.681			p<.148
Approval	.382	19.149			p<.538
Dependence	3.595	206.431			p<.060

Note: N = 188
        n = 94

TABLE 12

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR G

Clothing Subscales	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DRERR	∝Level
	1 through 1	7.345	8.000	175.000	p<.001
	Univariate F Tests				
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			∝Level
Aesthetic	.034	1.043			p<.854
Modesty	2.065	113.383			p<.152
Interest	15.336	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	20.587	1282.346			p<.001
Management	2.565	119.681			p<.111
Approval	.388	19.149			p<.534
Dependence	3.575	206.431			p<.064

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 13

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR H

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 1	7.436	8.000	175.000	p<.001
	Univariate F Tests				
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			∝Level
Aesthetic	.029	1.043			p<.864
Modesty	1.877	113.383			p<.172
Interest	14.683	938.297			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	19.367	1282.345			p<.001
Management	2.068	119.149			p<.152
Approval	.377	19.149			p<.540
Dependence	3.458	206.431			p<.065

Note: N = 188
        n = 94

TABLE 14

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR I OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	18	59	17	94
Incarcerated	15	68	11	94
Total	33	127	28	188

TABLE 15

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR I

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	αLevel
Interaction	1 through 2	.822	16.000	350.000	p<.660
Score Level	1 through 2	.816	16.000	350.000	p<.667
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.219	8.000	175.000	p<.001

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 16

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR I

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 1	7.219	8.000	175.000	p<.001
	Univariate F Tests				
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			∝Level
Aesthetic	.030	1.043			p<.863
Modesty	1.782	113.383			p<.184
Interest	14.830	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	18.833	1282.346			p<.001
Management	2.125	119.681			p<.147
Approval	.369	19.149			p<.544
Dependence	3.450	206.431			p<.065

Note: N = 188
        n = 94

TABLE 17

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR L OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	10	65	19	94
Incarcerated	3	59	32	94
Totals	13	124	51	188

TABLE 18

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR L

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
Interaction	1 through 2	.776	16.000	350.000	p<.713
Score Level	1 through 2	1.174	16.000	350.000	p<.287
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.223	8.000	175.000	p<.001

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 19

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR L

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 1	7.223	8.000	175.000	p<.001
	Univariate F Tests				
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			∝Level
Aesthetic	.029	1.043			p<.864
Modesty	1.816	113.383			p<.179
Interest	14.608	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	18.864	1282.346			p<.001
Management	2.036	119.681			p<.155
Approval	.370	19.149			p<.544
Dependence	3.490	206.431			p<.063

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 20

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR N

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 1	7.174	8.000	175.000	p<.001
	Univariate F Tests				
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			∝Level
Aesthetic	.030	1.043			p<.863
Modesty	1.880	113.383			p<.172
Interest	14.484	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	18.765	1282.345			p<.001
Management	2.043	119.681			p<.115
Approval	.377	19.149			p<.540
Dependence	3.488	206.431			p<.063

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 21

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR O OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	25	64	5	94
Incarcerated	13	56	25	94
Totals	38	120	30	188

TABLE 22

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR O

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	αLevel
Interaction	1 through 2	.691	16.000	350.000	p<.803
Score Level	1 through 2	.933	16.000	350.000	p<.531
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.140	8.000	175.000	p<.001

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 23

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR O

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	αLevel
Clothing Subscales	1 through 1	7.140	8.000	175.000	p<.001
	Univariate F Tests				
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			αLevel
Aesthetic	.029	1.043			p<.865
Modesty	1.831	113.383			p<.178
Interest	14.383	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	18.772	1282.346			p<.001
Management	2.055	119.681			p<.153
Approval	.373	10.149			p<.542
Dependence	3.421	206.431			p<.066

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 24

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR Q_1 OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	20	63	11	94
Incarcerated	5	72	17	94
Totals	25	135	28	188

TABLE 25

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCARATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR Q_1

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	αLevel
Interaction	1 through 2	1.044	16.000	350.000	p<.409
Score Level	1 through 2	1.053	16.000	350.000	p<.400
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.301	8.000	175.500	p<.001

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 26

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR Q_1

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 1	7.301	8.000	175.000	p<.001

	Univariate F Tests		
	F (d.f. = 1, 182)	Mean Square	∝Level
Aesthetic	.030	1.043	p<.864
Modesty	1.812	113.383	p<.180
Interest	14.413	938.298	p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000	p<1.000
Attention	18.720	1282.346	p<.001
Management	2.064	119.681	p<.153
Approval	.370	19.149	p<.544
Dependence	3.503	206.431	p<.063

Note: N = 188
n = 94

TABLE 27

LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORING GROUPS ON
FACTOR Q_2 OF CATTELL'S 16 PF TEST

	Extremely Low (Sten 1-3)	Average	Extremely High (Sten 8-10)	Totals
Non-Incarcerated	15	70	9	94
Incarcerated	16	65	13	94
Totals	31	135	22	188

TABLE 28

SUMMARY OF MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING
SUBSCALES ON THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
AND LOW, AVERAGE, AND HIGH SCORES ON
PERSONALITY FACTOR Q_2

	Test of Roots	Obtained F	DFHYP	DFERR	αLevel
Interaction	1 through 2	1.075	16.000	350.000	p<.378
Score Level	1 through 2	1.859	16.000	350.000	p<.023
Non-Incarceration versus Incarceration	1 through 1	7.375	8.000	175.000	p<.001

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 29

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR Q_2

	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
Clothing Subscales	1 through 1	7.375	8.000	175.000	p<.001
	Univariate F Tests				
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			∝Level
Aesthetic	.029	1.043			p<.865
Modesty	1.813	113.383			p<.180
Interest	15.238	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	18.900	1282.345			p<.001
Management	2.049	119.681			p<.154
Approval	.385	19.149			p<.536
Dependence	3.470	206.431			p<.064

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 30

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR Q_3

Clothing Subscales	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	$\propto$Level
	1 through 1	7.416	8.000	175.000	p<.001
	Univariate F Tests				
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			$\propto$Level
Aesthetic	.031	1.043			p<.861
Modesty	1.840	113.303			p<.177
Interest	14.768	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	19.344	1282.346			p<.001
Management	2.281	119.681			p<.133
Approval	.393	19.149			p<.532
Dependence	3.496	206.431			p<.063

Note: N = 188
       n = 94

TABLE 31

MANOVA TESTS OF SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ON CLOTHING SUBSCALES ON
THE BASIS OF NON-INCARCERATION-INCARCERATION
FOR PERSONALITY FACTOR Q^4

Clothing Subscales	Test Roots	Overall F	DFHYP	DFERR	∝Level
	1 through 1	7.457	8.000	175.000	p<.001
	Univariate F Tests				
	F (d.f. = 1,182)	Mean Square			∝Level
Aesthetic	.032	1.043			p<.859
Modesty	1.804	113.383			p<.181
Interest	15.109	938.298			p<.001
Comfort	.000	.000			p<1.000
Attention	20.044	1282.345			p<.001
Management	2.282	119.681			p<.133
Approval	.367	19.149			p<.546
Dependence	3.437	206.431			p<.065

Note: N = 188
       n = 94