STRATIFICATION ASPECTS OF CLOTHING IMPORTANCE

By

Arthur M. Vener

A THESIS

Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

1953

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study represents one phase of the "Clothing Project," sponsored by the Michigan State College Agricultural Experiment Station and is a joint undertaking of the Department of Textiles, Clothing, and Related Arts and the Department of Sociology and Anthropology. The project was initiated largely through the efforts of Dr, Charles P. Loomis, Head of the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and Professor Hazel B. Strahan, Head of the Department of Textiles, Clothing, and Related Arts, and has been conducted under the general supervision of Professor Gregory P. Stone.

The writer wishes to express his sincerest gratitude to Dr. Duane L. Gibson and Professor Gregory P. Stone for the time and effort they expended in the guidance and supervision of this thesis.

The writer also wishes to acknowledge his appreciation to Dr, William H. Form for his many suggestions in respect to the occupational aspects of stratification and to Dr. Arnold L. Form for his aid in the development of the Guttman-type scale.

Finally, the writer wishes to express his everlasting gratitude to his wife, Madeline Robins Vener, for her patience, understanding, and general helpfulness without which this study could not have been accomplished.

****
****
****
*****
***
*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF TABLES -- Continued PAGE

CHAPTER I

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A universal characteristic of social life is the phenomenon of cooperative activity based upon the integration and differentiation of statuses.[1] In order that individuals might function harmoniously in group activity, an adequate appraisal of the statuses of others is an indispensible requirement. It is essential that the "occupant of each status act toward others in a manner which conveys the impression that his conception of himself and of them is the same as their conception of themselves and him."[2] Numerous symbols exist such as differences in speech patterns, dialect, deportment, social etiquette, clothing, living quarters, general interests, etc., which facilitate accurate appraisals

---

[1] "Status" as used here refers to "any institutionally defined position of an individual in the social structure." Quote by Talcott Parsons, Essays in Sociological Theory Pure and Applied (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949) p. 184, footnote 11. See also Ralph Linton, The Study of Man (New York: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1936) chap. vii.

[2] Erving Goffman, "Symbols of Class Status," British Journal of Sociology, II (December, 1951), 294-304. Quote on p. 294. The theoretical conceptualization of this thesis has been strongly influenced by Gregory P. Stone, "Clothing and Social Structure: A Study of Expressive Symbols in Community Life," Unpublished Manuscript, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Michigan State College, 1953.

of others' statuses.[1] In this respect, one of these symbols, clothing, is extremely important in the initial appraisal of others when interacting with unknown persons. "It makes it possible for a stranger to determine at once the social category to which the wearer belongs and thus avoid acts or attitudes toward him which would be social errors."[2] This function of the initial appraisal of clothing in the placement of strangers in the "correct" social categories is important to those 1) who interact in impersonal relationships a good percentage of the time, 2) who are in an occupational position in which people, rather than things, are manipulated, and 3) who are highly mobile in a physical or territorial sense. It is those persons with relatively high social class status, the professionals, proprietors, managers, officials, etc. who are likely to be more involved in these three kinds of activities. Consequently, these persons would probably be more sensitive to subtle differences in dress and might also be expected to emphasize the importance of clothing in their social interaction.

---

[1]For a general approach to the study of status symbols see Herbert Spencer, The Principles of Sociology (New York: D, Appleton and Company, 1895), Vol. II, Part IV "Ceremonial Institutions". See also Erving Goffman, op. cit. The author closes with a "plea for empirical studies which trace out the social career of particular status symbols." (p. 304).

[2]Ralph Linton, op. cit., p. 614.

In this thesis, we shall attempt to explain variations in personal estimates of clothing importance within a sociological frame of reference. More specifically, we shall attempt to explain differences in personal estimates of clothing importance in terms of differences of positions in a scale of social stratification,[1] and also in terms of two other aspects of stratification--differences in vertical social mobility, and differences in the degree of social participation.

Review of Related Literature

In general, there has been a dearth of relevant substantive literature dealing with the sociological aspects of clothing. It would seem as if past researchers and thinkers considered such an area as being too obvious, or too trite a subject matter to be studied scientifically. With few exceptions, much of the relevant sociological information consists of a limited number of passing observations and

---

[1]Position in a scale of social stratification is only one aspect of status. Social stratification refers to the "differential ranking of the human individuals who compose a given social system and their treatment as superior and inferior relative to one another in certain socially important respects." See Parsons, op. cit., "An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Social Stratification," pp. 166-184. Quote on p. 166. Henceforth, when the term "status" is employed in this thesis it will refer to positions in our scale of stratification (see Chap. III), and not in the more general sense of the term.

speculations.[1] The associated substantive studies which do exist are to be found in other disciplinary areas, especially psychology. However, some of this material contains pertinent sociological information which can be employed in the development of relevant concepts and hypotheses. Since the number of these studies is too limited to justify categorization of any sort, the different empirical studies will be presented in chronological order. A critical evaluation of these studies will follow.

In 1898, G, S. Hall[2] developed the first questionnaire on clothing in order to investigate the relationships between clothes and the development of the sense of the self. About 80 per cent of over 500 returned questionnaires were answered by teachers or students of psychology. The material reported came from their observations of children's behavior over several years' time. Hall concluded that the ornamental aspect of clothing was most important for children, and that

---

[1]Possible exceptions here are the theoretical contributions of Tarde, Veblen, Simmel, and Ross to an understanding of the dynamics involved in clothing fashion. In this respect, Kroeber's empirical study of fashion changes should also be mentioned. These, along with the theoretical contributions in the field of psychology which predominantly deal with the origins of clothing and the emotional value of dress, will be omitted in this review of literature, since they are of little relevance to our present study.

[2]G. Stanley Hall, "Some Aspects of the Early Sense of Self," American Journal of Psychology, IX (1897-1898), 351-395. Note especially pp. 364-367.

articles of clothing played an important part in the development of the self. He states:

> The child who is habitually well dressed learns to avoid acts and environments which tend to soil his clothes and may become dainty, finical, fastidious and effeminate. The child who is rudely and poorly dressed, on the other hand, comes in closer contact with the world about him and acquires a knowledge more real and substantial ... Cleanliness of body like clean dress has a prodigious moral effect upon children, who change manners, temper, conduct and put on a better self after being washed.[1]

Hall also demonstrated that even at an early age children will dress for others rather than for self comfort. He emphasized that for children, and especially girls, the main criteria for the wearing of specific garments was not how it felt, but how it appeared to others.

In 1905, Hall developed another clothing questionnaire which was sent to a normal school in New York State and 181 replies from the girl students were received. Among other things, the subjects were asked how being well-dressed or the opposite affected them and how they were impressed by the dress of others. The material was turned over to Flaccus,[2] who analyzed the replies and presented the findings.

In respect to being well dressed, the girls reported a feeling of being more sociable, a feeling of having met the

---

[1] Ibid., p. 367.

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

approval of others, a sense of power, and a sense of worth. On the other hand, in respect to being ill-dressed, the girls reported feelings leading to unsociableness, unpleasant feelings of being depressed, distressed, cross, or disagreeable self-consciousness, excessive sensitivity of being ridiculed by people, envy of others, and a general lowering of self esteem. Also, it was evident from the replies that clothing was a strong element in the appraisal of individuals by each other.

In 1918, G. Van Ness Dearborn,[1] influenced by the findings of Flaccus, investigated the relationship between clothing and success. He obtained statements bearing on this relationship from 24 men and women psychology students at Harvard. The replies emphasized the value of clothing in impressing one's social worth upon others, and the value of clothing in inspiring self confidence. Some of these replies were summarized as follows:

> A well-dressed person more easily gains the confidence of people in the business world.
>
> Consciousness of good personal appearance frees the individual from the fear of the most common form of adverse criticism.
>
> The personality of an individual is judged, first of all, by his external appearance.
>
> First impressions are lasting with many individuals.

---

[1]George Van Ness Dearborn, The Psychology of Clothes (Princeton, New Jersey and Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Psychological Review Company), 1918.

> Being well-dressed has an effect upon the emotions of the individual, such as joy, ecstasy, etc.[1]

In 1929, Hurlock,[2] published the results of a comprehensive study of motivation in fashion. Her schedule was answered by approximately 1,500 people ranging in age from 16 to 51 years, and including both university men and women, and high school and normal school boys and girls. Along with Hall and Flaccus, Hurlock emphasized the effect of clothing upon children's behavior and happiness. The relationship of clothing and success upon which Dearborn placed so much emphasis was also corroborated. That individuals constantly consider the effect their clothing has on others is also emphatically acknowledged by Hurlock:

> All of these results show that the social value of clothes is very great. The presence of others, especially if they are not members of one's immediate family, seems to be a great incentive to carefulness about appearance. ... people of mature experience realize that the first impression of others count for much in life, while when one is with friends, other factors than appearance receive great consideration.[3]

As for the sex of the others for which persons dress, she demonstrated that more people dress for their own sex and for both sexes than for the opposite sex alone. Both sexes attempt to

---

[1] Ibid., p. 56.

[2] Elizabeth B. Hurlock, "Motivation in Fashion," Archives of Psychology, No. 111 (1929).

[3] Ibid., p. 54.

avoid the criticism of both their own and the opposite sex in their selection of clothing.

In 1934, Barr,[1] studied the psychology of choice in relation to clothing. Her questionnaire was presented to groups for which such facts as age, height and weight, educational background, reading interests, and professional or technical interests in fashion were known. The sample, all women from 17 to 50 years of age, included dressmakers and designers, Pratt Institute home economics students, Brooklyn College psychology students, and Y. W. H. A. counsellors. Among the fundamental attitudes involved in the psychology of choice of dress, the desire to conform was the most significant and diffuse single item. Two other items, desire for comfort with respect to temperature and tactual sensations, and desire for economy were also found to be widespread in all groups. Desire to conform was found to be a more effective motive in determining the time of buying of specific items of dress than the desire for economy.

In 1945, Silverman,[2] published an excellent study dealing with the psychological aspects of clothing and appearance

---

[1]Estelle De Young Barr, "A Psychological Analysis of Fashion Motivation," Archives of Psychology, XXVI, No. 171 (June, 1934).

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

for teen-age girls. Approximately 370 girls, ranging in age from 12 to 18 in grades 7 to 12 of a suburban six-year high school, responded to the author's questionnaire. In general, Silverman's methodological techniques are much more sophisticated than the above mentioned researchers, but her findings closely parallel theirs. The main elements operating in the choice of clothing were desire for approval, self confidence, and happiness, and "the belief in advantages in vocational and social areas to be achieved from good clothing and an attractive appearance."[1]

A group ranking highest in appearance and a group ranking lowest in appearance was established on the basis of teachers' ratings and were compared in respect to personality characteristics, intelligence, age, economic status, participation in school activities, and prominence as leaders. The personality differences between the two groups as measured by the responses to Sheviakov and Friedberg "Interests and Activities" scales were summed up by the author as follows:

> As compared with the good-appearing group, the poor-appearing group tended to show a greater dislike for companionship with other girls, for boy-girl relationships, and for social contacts in group activities both at school and in the community. They also tended to dislike being in situations which gave them prominence in the group. On the whole they tended to be negativistic in their responses, to dislike giving free play to their imaginative powers, and to show a relatively smaller capacity for establishing

---

[1] Ibid., p. 116.

> friendships. They also gave indications of lack of self-love and of feelings of self-effacement.[1]

Good-appearing girls tended to be brighter, tended to have a slightly higher economic background (low correlation of .103), tended to participate to a greater degree in school activities, and were more often sought as leaders than the poor-appearing girls.

More recently, Rosencranz,[2] in studying differences in clothing interest of 180 married and unmarried women, developed a questionnaire which attempted to ascertain differences in degree of clothing interest through reported differences in amount of "time, energy, money, thought, and attention given to clothing." The author found that rural or urban background, age, occupation, and income were related to total scores on the interest in clothing questionnaire. Other elements, education, marital status, children in the family, and membership in organizations were related to a person's interest in clothing to a lesser degree. In general, urban (cities of 10,000 or more) persons had higher clothing interest than rural people, people in higher income brackets also had more clothing interest, younger women had higher

---

[1] Ibid., p. 118.

[2] Mary Lou Rosencranz, "A Study of Interest in Clothing Among Selected Groups of Married and Unmarried Young Women," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Textiles, Clothing, and Related Arts, Michigan State College, 1948.

clothing interest than older persons, single women had more interest in clothing than married women, and childless, married women had higher clothing interest than married women with children. The group of college students was found to have a higher interest in clothing than the group which consisted largely of factory workers and business women.

Criticism. The sample population of most of the above summarized studies were heavily biased in the direction of middle status persons. Hall's study was based upon the interpretations of children's clothing behavior by college teachers and students, Flaccus' study was based upon the responses of normal school students, Dearborn's sample consisted of 24 Harvard psychology students, Hurlock's sample consisted largely of college students and private secondary school students, and Barr's sample consisted of college teachers and students and Y. W. H. A. counsellors. The two more recent researchers, Silverman and Rosencranz, seem to have made a serious attempt at representative sampling. However, even Silverman's excellent study was not completely free of this middle status bias. Her sample was selected from a coeducational, suburban, New Jersey high school located in the greater metropolitan area of New York City. Since a large portion of the 13,500 persons living in the community were employed or were in business in New York and commuted daily, we might assume that this community is typical of the many middle status living areas which surround a large metropolis.

In short, when these above studies are examined in totality, they contribute mainly to an understanding of the clothing attitudes of middle status persons, and we cannot assume that upper and lower status individuals would have identical attitudes.

Problem and Hypotheses

Many of the researchers in the past have attempted to explain differences in clothing attitudes in terms of differences in individual personality systems. Within this conceptual scheme, their studies ignore the vital symbolic function of clothing in social life, which has been previously mentioned.[1] In contrast to this, the symbolic function of clothing in facilitating the communication of others' statuses, will be a prime element in our attempt to explain differences in personal estimates of clothing importance.

Three focal hypotheses guided the study. Since each has been developed in some detail throughout the text, they will only be briefly stated here.

1) Personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to social status.

The function of clothing in facilitating accurate appraisals of others' statuses is important to those who deal with strangers a good percentage of the time, to those who

---

[1] See supra, pp. 1-2.

are in occupational positions in which people, rather than things are manipulated, and to those who are highly mobile in a territorial sense. It is those persons with relatively high social status who are likely to be more involved in these kinds of social activities, and therefore, might be expected to emphasize the importance of clothing in their social interaction.

2) Personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to vertical social mobility.

Persons who are striving toward higher status goals are more likely to become sensitive to the symbols which differentiate the social strata. These persons are probably anxious to sever ties with peers and establish new ties with superordinates. In order to be identified as a higher status member, it is necessary to manipulate and incorporate the symbols which distinguish this strata. In this respect, clothing, especially in impersonal relationships, is an important manipulative device which can be employed in impressing one's social worth upon others.

3) Personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to social participation.

Those persons who are more active in social life are also more apt to become aware of the necessity of correctly appraising the statuses of others in order to avoid making social errors. These persons are more likely to realize the

symbolic importance of subtle differences in dress in the determination of an individual's social category, especially when interacting in anonymous situations.

Procedure

The testing of these above hypotheses has been made possible through the use of data which was collected over a three year period in Coldwater, a Michigan city of 10,000 residents and the county seat.[1]

A Guttman type attitude scale was developed in order to measure the dependent variable--variations in personal estimates of clothing importance. Chapter II will describe the scale construction method, and will discuss some limitations of the scale.

In Chapter III, we shall consider the first hypothesis that personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to social status. A modified version of W. L. Warner's Index of Status Characteristics will be employed as an indicator of social status and will be correlated with the scores on the Guttman type clothing importance scale developed in Chapter II. Each component of the Index--occupational status, source of

---

[1]The study, known as the "Clothing Project", has been sponsored by the Michigan State College Agricultural Experiment Station and conducted under the general supervision of Gregory P. Stone. The writer has been involved in the study for about two years. In the text of this dissertation, we shall refer to this project as the "larger study". In this thesis, the Guttman type attitude scale, developed in Chapter II, represents the writers major independent contribution.

income, and house type, along with two other conventional indices of status--amount of income and amount of education--will also be correlated with scores on the clothing importance scale. The Chi square test will be employed to determine the statistical significance between clothing importance scores and a final indicator of status which was based upon Alba Edwards' Occupational Groups.

In Chapter IV, we shall consider the second hypothesis that personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to vertical social mobility. Social mobility will be defined in terms of a single dimension--occupational mobility. A Chi square test will be used to determine the statistical significance between occupational mobility and our prime indicator of status, the Index of Status Characteristics.

In Chapter V, we shall consider the third hypothesis, that personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to social participation. We shall consider four social participation factors--membership in associations, officerships in voluntary organizations, church attendance, and church activity--and their relationship to the clothing importance scale.

Finally, Chapter VI will summarize the findings of the study and present some of its conclusions.

CHAPTER II

CHAPTER II

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SCALE

Since our aim in this thesis is to explain differences in personal estimates of clothing importance, it was necessary to arrange the available data in some sociological meaningful way. A number of alternative categorization techniques were possible, i.e., a qualitative typology, subjective ratings of responses by a group of qualified judges, or some scaling device. Since we are interested in a single attitude dimension--clothing importance--the most desirable categorization could be accomplished through the use of some objective scaling technique. Upon examination, the data demonstrated an amenability by treatment to a known scaling method--the Cornell Technique for Scalogram Analysis,[1] one of the several alternative devices developed by Louis Guttman. The Cornell Technique was selected because it was the most facile to

---

[1]Louis Guttman, "The Cornell Technique for Scale and Intensity Analysis," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XII (1947), 247-279. The ensuing discussion closely follows the steps for Scalogram Analysis as outlined in this article. All statements of fact made concerning this technique were abstracted from its text, unless otherwise noted. For an excellent introduction to Scale Analysis see Louis Guttman, "A Basis for Scaling Qualitative Data," American Sociological Review, IX (1944), 139-150.

manipulate and has proved to be very useful for general research purposes. In this chapter, we shall describe how the available data were utilized to develop this unidimensional, Guttman type scale. There is, however, one major deviation from the procedures cited which requires some explanation.

One of the initial steps of the Cornell Technique requires that the universe of content be defined; that is, the general content of the questions to be asked must be decided upon. A small sample of these questions is then used to test the universe for scalability. Another requirement is that the questions be of the categorized, five point scale type of "strongly agree", "agree", "undecided", "disagree", and "strongly disagree".[1] Since the larger study, of which this is a small part, had already been completed before the present study was specifically planned, the choice of questions to be included in the scale were limited to those included in the original schedules. Hence, there was no large pre-defined universe of questions from which a small sample could be drawn. Furthermore, none of the questions were of the categorized, five point scale type. A few were completely

---

[1]The items need not be of this type. See examples of several different types of questions in Samuel A. Stouffer et al., Measurement and Prediction, Vol. IV of Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, ed. Frederick Osborn et al., 4 vols. (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949-50) pp. 125-149.

open-ended, while others were a combination of the two. This necessitated a modification of the Cornell Technique. Since all of the questions were in some degree open-ended, it was necessary to evaluate an individual's response in terms of the importance he placed upon clothing. Therefore, to reduce the element of subjectivity which might result if the research alone determined the assessment of responses, a qualified group of judges was selected.

The Trial Scale

In order to establish the amenability of the material to a Guttman type scale, a trial scale was attempted. Four questions were selected because they seemed to aim at the same universe, the importance of clothing. The questions selected were:

41a. In general, how important a part do clothes play in your job?
Why?

41b. Do you think clothes are more, or less important in making a good impression than say; a car, or the way your house looks?
More ( ) Less ( ) Same ( ) Other ( )
If other: Specify.

42. Which bothers you most when it doesn't look the way you really want it to?
Clothes ( ) Car ( ) House ( ) Other ( )
If other: Specify.

43. In general, how important would you say clothing and appearance is to you?

Three professional sociologists in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology who were connected with the larger

study, were asked to evaluate the responses to each of the questions on the basis of high or low importance of clothing to the individual. The criterion for the final rating selected was a majority opinion, that is, two out of three. The reproducibility for the four items was 84 per cent. When item 41a, which had a low reproducibility of 76 per cent, was dropped from the scale, the over-all reproducibility was increased to 87 per cent. Since the reproducibility closely approximated the required 90 per cent, and some other criteria for scalability were met[1] when the technique for Content Scale Analysis was applied, a more rigorous scale was attempted. This was accomplished by: 1) increasing the number of items, 2) increasing the number of judges, and 3) increasing the gradations of the evaluation scale.

The Final Scale

After a rather intensive re-examination of all the items included in the original study, only two more were found (in addition to the four indicated above) which might conceivably be a part of the same universe of content. The six items which became the basis for an attempt to develop a final satisfactory scale were as follows:

41a. In general, how important a part do clothes play in your job?
Why?

---

[1]To be discussed later, in the section "Test for Scalability".

41b. Do you think clothes are more, or less important in making a good impression than say; a car, or the way your house looks?
More ( ) Less ( ) Same ( ) Other ( )
If other: Specify.

42. Which bothers you most when it doesn't look the way you really want it to?
Clothes ( ) Car ( ) House ( ) Other ( )
If other: Specify.

43. In general, how important would you say clothing and appearance is to you?

1. Do you like to have people notice your clothes?
Yes ( ) No ( ) Other ( )
Specify for other:
Why? (Why not?)

7. What kind of a judge of clothes are you?

To help increase objectivity in the interpretation of the responses, thirteen judges were selected. Eleven of the thirteen judges were graduate assistants in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, and the others were graduate students in related departments. The verbatim responses of each respondent to all of the items were reproduced and a copy was given to each judge. The judges were asked to evaluate the responses to the questions on the basis of how important they felt clothing was to the respondent. Ratings based upon a three point scale-- "high importance", "medium importance", and "low importance"--were requested of the judges. Importance of clothing was not to be considered in the practical sense of keeping the body warm, or best clothes for the job, but rather, the effect clothing had in interpersonal relationships. Modal ratings were employed in the

final catergorization of each response. From this point on, the Cornell Technique for Scalogram Analysis was followed rather closely.

Initial steps. Arbitrary weights of 1 to 3 were assigned to each type of response to the questions used. A weight of 3 was assigned to the most favorable statement, high importance of clothing, a weight of 2 was assigned to statements connoting medium importance of clothing, and a weight of 1 was given to those connoting low importance. A total score was obtained for each person by totaling the weights assigned to the responses he made to the relevant questions. Then the scores were arranged in a rank order, according to total scores. The results are presented in Table I, where the ratings of the responses of each person to each question is indicated by an "x".

Test for scalability. Four main criteria are used to determine scalability: 1) the coefficient of reproducibility, 2) the number of items and response categories, 3) the range of marginal frequencies, and 4) the pattern of error.[1]

1) Coefficient of reproducibility. In Table I, an intensive examination of the overlapping of the X's within the columns of each question was made to determine which categories could be combined in order to minimize the error of reproducibility for each of the questions. As a result, six

---

[1]Samuel A. Stouffer et al., op. cit., pp. 78-80, 117-119.

TABLE I

QUESTIONS USED IN FIRST TRIAL SCALE DEVELOPMENT

Total Score	41a Weights*			41b Weights			42 Weights			43 Weights			1 Weights			7 Weights		
	3	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	1	3	2	1
17	x			x				x		x			x			x		
17	x			x				x		x			x			x		
17	x			x			x			x			x				x	
17	x			x			x			x			x				x	
17	x			x			x			x			x				x	
17		x		x			x			x			x			x		
17	x			x			x			x				x		x		
16	x			x				x		x			x				x	
16	x				x		x			x			x				x	
16		x		x			x				x		x			x		
15		x		x			x				x		x				x	
15		x			x			x		x			x			x		
15	x				x			x		x			x				x	
15	x				x			x		x			x				x	
15		x		x			x				x		x				x	
15	x			x				x			x		x				x	
15	x			x				x		x				x			x	
15	x				x			x		x			x				x	
15	x					x		x		x			x				x	
15		x		x			x				x		x				x	
15	x			x			x				x			x			x	
14		x		x			x			x					x		x	
14		x		x				x			x		x				x	
14	x			x				x			x			x			x	
14		x		x				x			x		x				x	
14	x				x		x				x			x			x	
14			x	x			x				x		x				x	
14	x			x				x			x			x			x	
13		x		x			x			x				x				x
13	x			x				x			x			x				x
13		x		x				x			x		x				x	
13		x		x			x				x			x			x	
13		x			x			x			x			x			x	
13		x		x				x			x			x			x	
13		x			x			x			x		x				x	
13			x	x				x		x			x					x
13	x				x		x				x				x		x	
13		x		x				x			x		x					x
12		x			x			x			x			x			x	
12	x				x				x		x			x			x	
12		x			x			x			x			x			x	
12			x		x			x			x		x				x	
12			x	x					x		x		x				x	
12		x			x			x			x			x			x	
12		x			x			x			x			x			x	
12			x	x			x				x				x		x	
12		x			x			x			x			x			x	
12			x	x			x				x		x				x	
12			x	x				x		x				x				x
12			x		x		x			x				x			x	
12			x	x				x			x			x			x	
12		x		x				x		x				x				x
11		x		x				x			x			x				x
11			x	x			x				x			x				x
11			x		x			x		x				x				x
11		x			x				x		x			x			x	
11			x		x			x			x				x	x		
11		x				x		x			x			x			x	
11		x			x			x			x				x		x	
11		x				x		x			x			x			x	
11		x			x			x				x		x			x	
11		x			x		x				x				x			x
10			x		x			x				x		x			x	
10		x				x		x			x			x				x
10			x			x		x			x				x	x		
10			x			x			x		x		x				x	
10		x			x				x		x			x			x	
10			x	x				x			x				x			x
9			x		x			x				x		x				x
9			x		x			x			x				x			x
9			x			x		x			x				x			x
9		x				x		x			x				x			x
9			x		x			x				x			x		x	
9			x			x			x		x			x			x	
9		x			x				x		x			x				x
8			x			x			x		x				x		x	
8			x		x				x			x			x		x	
8		x				x			x		x				x			x
6			x			x			x			x			x			x
6			x			x			x			x			x			x
Freq.	23	37	28	42	33	13	26	50	12	28	53	7	30	32	26	10	58	20

* All weights based upon modal ratings of judges. See text.

of the questions were dichotomized, while a seventh, question 7, which demonstrated a complete lack of patterning, was eliminated from the scale.[1]

By reassigning weights, a second trial rank order was established on the basis of the combined categories. Dichotomous, arbitrary weights of 2 for high clothing importance and 0 for low clothing importance were used. These combinations, together with the weights assigned, are presented in Table II.

TABLE II

COMBINATIONS AND RE-WEIGHTING OF CATEGORIES

Question	Combinations	
41a	(1,2)	(3)
41b	(1,2)	(3)
42	(1)	(2,3)
43	(1,2)	(3)
1	(1,2)	(3)
Re-weighting	0	2

Each person was given a new score, and then shifted into a new rank order. Table III was prepared from these re-combined data, using the same procedure as in Table I.

Cutting points[2] were established in the new rank order to separate the ratings for each question into groupings they

[1]This will be clarified further later.

[2]Horizontal red lines in Table III.

TABLE III

QUESTIONS USED IN SECOND TRIAL SCALE DEVELOPMENT

Total Score	41a		43		1		41b		42	
	Weights*		Weights		Weights		Weights		Weights	
	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	2	0
10	x		x		x		x		x	
10	x		x		x		x		x	
10	x		x		x		x		x	
10	x		x		x		x		x	
10	x		x		x		x		x	
10	x		x		x		x		x	
8		x	x		x		x		x	
8		x	x		x		x		x	
8	x		x			x	x		x	
8	x		x		x			x	x	
8	x		x		x			x	x	
8	x		x		x			x	x	
8	x			x	x		x		x	
8	x		x			x	x		x	
8	x		x		x			x	x	
8	x		x		x			x	x	
6		x		x	x		x		x	
6		x		x	x		x		x	
6		x	x		x			x	x	
6		x		x	x		x		x	
6		x		x	x		x		x	
6	x			x		x	x		x	
6		x	x			x	x		x	
6		x		x	x		x		x	
6		x	x			x	x		x	
6		x		x	x		x		x	
6		x	x			x	x		x	
6		x	x			x	x		x	
6		x	x			x	x		x	
6		x	x			x	x		x	
6	x		x			x	x		x	
6		x		x	x		x		x	
6		x		x	x		x		x	
6	x			x		x	x		x	
6	x			x		x	x		x	
6		x		x	x		x		x	
6		x		x	x		x		x	
6		x	x			x	x		x	
6		x	x			x	x		x	
6		x	x			x	x		x	
4		x		x		x	x		x	
4	x			x		x		x	x	
4		x		x		x	x		x	
4		x		x		x	x		x	
4		x		x	x			x	x	
4	x			x		x		x	x	
4		x		x	x			x	x	
4		x		x	x		x			x
4		x		x		x	x		x	
4		x		x		x	x		x	
4		x	x			x		x	x	
4		x		x	x			x	x	
4		x		x		x	x		x	
4		x		x		x	x			
4		x	x			x		x	x	
4		x		x		x	x		x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2	x			x		x		x		x
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x		
2		x		x	x			x		x
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
2		x		x		x		x	x	
0		x		x		x		x		x
0		x		x		x		x		x
0		x		x		x		x		x
0		x		x		x		x		x
0		x		x		x		x		x
0		x		x		x		x		x
0		x		x		x		x		x
0		x		x		x		x		x
0		x		x		x		x		x
Freq.	23	65	28	60	30	58	42	46	76	12

* All weights based upon combined modal ratings of judges. See text.

would assume if the scale were perfect. Those ratings which fall out of place are considered errors. The total number of errors found for the entire scale is 56. Since there are 440 responses for the entire scale, this means a 13 per cent error, or a reproducibility of 87 per cent. In 1944, Guttman set the lower acceptible ideal limit for the coefficient of reproducibility at 85 per cent or better,[1] and more recently at "about 90 per cent".[2] It is therefore feasible to accept this scale as included within the outer limits of acceptibility determined by the criterion of reproducibility.

2) The number of items and response categories. Guttman states that if items are dichotomized, at least ten items should be used, with a lesser number being satisfactory if the marginal frequencies of several items are in the range of 30 to 70 per cent.[3] This scale contains five items in its final form, all of which have been dichotomized. Three of the five items (43,1,41b) have marginal frequencies within the 30 to 70 per cent range, while a fourth (41a) has 26 per cent in one category and 74 per cent in the other. Only item 42, with marginal frequencies of 14 per cent and 86 per cent, are extreme. Our scale, therefore, adequately meets this criterion.

---

[1]Louis Guttman, "A basis for Scaling Qualitative Data", American Sociological Review, IX (1944), p. 140.

[2]Quotations and underlining ours.

[3]Samuel A. Stouffer, et al., op. cit., p. 779.

3) Range of marginal frequencies. Reproducibility might be spuriously high if the items have extreme frequencies. Therefore, Guttman emphasizes that the reproducibility of an item should never be less than the largest frequency of its categories, regardless of whether the area is scalable or not. As was mentioned above, this criterion is fairly well met. However, some items with extreme frequencies, such as question 42, are needed in order to get differentiated scale types.

4) Pattern of error. The pattern of error should be inspected to see whether or not there are a large number of nonscale types of persons. Since errors should be randomly distributed, nonscale types can be recognized by solid segments ("five or more") in one column which fall outside the cutting points.[1] No items in this scale have such clusterings. Yet, the errors of items 43 and 41b do not seem to be completely random. Item 43 especially, seems to fit the gradient quasi--scale error pattern, since the errors that do occur decrease as one moves further and further away in either direction from the cutting point. Despite these minor variations, it appears logical to conclude that the scale meets this criterion adequately, since no extreme clusterings exist.

---

[1] Ibid., pp. 159-163. Note especially the differences between random scale, grouped nonscale, and gradient quasi-scale errors.

And finally, as a rule, no category should have more errors in it than non-errors. The five items of the scale as shown in Table III, meet this requirement.[1]

Conclusion. There are serious weaknesses which exist in the development of our scale in terms of the theory of construction of ideal scales. First, the universe of content was not defined in advance of the data gathering: and secondly, no large number of items was available from which to sample the content area. Nevertheless, this does not prevent a judgment about the unidimensionality of the five scale items alone. In this respect, Festinger, after establishing the futility of insisting on unidimensional universes in the social sciences, except for the most simple variables, asserts:

> Scale analysis still provides the investigator with a good technique for scale construction and a means for determining quantitatively the extent to which his data depart from the ideal of unidimensionality. Such knowledge should help the investigator considerably in interpreting his data.[2]

Since the criteria for scalability are satisfied here, it is feasible to assume, for the purposes of this study, that there is only one dominant variable involved in the scale: the importance of clothing to the individual.

---

[1]The lack of patterning noted by inspection, which resulted in dropping question 7 immediately following the first trial, was found to be particularly deficient in this respect. Also, question 7 did not conform to the error pattern of either the "true" scale or the quasi-scale.

[2]Leon Festinger, "The Treatment of Qualitative Data by Scale Analysis," Psychological Bulletin, XLIV (1947), p. 159.

Intensity analysis. The main purpose of performing an intensity analysis is to establish an invariant and unbiased zero point for attitude and opinion scales, where all people to the right of the point are "favorable" and all people to the left are "unfavorable". The socialization process has so imbued the average individual with the necessity of clothing, that it would be extremely difficult to elicit "unfavorable" feelings toward clothing without the use of depth interviewing. Since this type of data was not available, our scale can only ascertain the degree of "favorableness" towards clothing, and hence, it is pointless to perform an Intensity Analysis to obtain an absolute zero point.

Limitations of the Scale

In dealing with unidimensional scales of this kind, there is the possibility of overlooking or losing pertinent sociological information which might have contributed to a more comprehensive interpretation of empirical findings.

In the analysis of the items used in the scale, it was observed that the responses of individuals from higher status levels were often based upon specific projected situations, i.e., parties, business meetings, picnics etc., and consequently, were given medium, or even low ratings by the judges. For example, the following response to question 41a ("In general, how important a part do clothes play in your job?") by a livestock broker of fairly high status was given a modal

rating of only 2 (medium importance) by the thirteen judges:

> At times it plays an important part, especially when you're going to the packing houses on business, or when you're attending social affairs. At other times it doesn't make any difference. I wouldn't get dressed up for an average days work in buying from the farmers. It might not settle too good with them if I got all dressed up. The way you dress is determined a lot by who you are dealing with. It's human nature. You're not going to dress your best in order to sell a farmer, but I wouldn't meet ... at the Booke-Cadillac in Detroit wearing overalls. That's common sense.

It is also interesting to note that the judges demonstrated a large amount of agreement in rating this response: eleven gave it a rating of medium importance (2), while only two rated it high importance (3).[1]

Since our scale was designed to discriminate in terms of a single dimension, the phenomenon discussed above, which was useful in interpreting some of the findings of this research,[2] could only have been detected through a qualitative analysis of the data.

---

[1]If in some way the roles which are involved in clothing importance could have been scaled, this situational factor would have been taken into consideration.

[2]See Chapter III.

CHAPTER III

CHAPTER III

CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND SOCIAL STATUS

The central hypothesis of this thesis is that the degree of importance which a person places upon clothing will be related to that individual's social status.[1] An attempt shall be made to validate the hypothesis in this chapter. Although this hypothesis has been anticipated by a number of sociologists and psychologists, they have presented little empirical evidence to demonstrate its validity. Our major consideration is empirical verification. Consequently, only a limited number of the relevant contributions are reviewed here.

Thorstein Veblen, in his presentation of the principle of conspicuous consumption,[2] convincingly demonstrates the relationship between clothing and status. He states that in a highly industrialized, mobile society the individual is exposed:

> ... to the observation of many persons who have no other means of judging of his reputability than the display of goods (and perhaps breeding) which

---

[1] "Status" in the sense of social honor, or prestige.

[2] Thorstein Veblen, The Theory of the Leisure Class (New York: The Modern Library, Inc., 1934). Originally published in 1899; the new edition was published in 1918.

> he is able to make while he is under their direct observation.[1]

He further emphasizes that there are a number of methods of "putting ones pecuniary standing in evidence", but:

> ... expenditure on dress has this advantage over most other methods, that our apparel is always in evidence and affords an indication of our pecuniary standing to all observers at the first glance.[2]

George Van Ness Dearborn, writing on the psychological psychology of clothes,[3] states that the clothes a man wears are part of his whole personality and that they should "fit into it as well as on it." He further states:

> Fine, expensive clothing implies wealth of the wearer or else the having of wealthy friends; and well-fitting clothes in like degree imply taste and culture. Therefore, to the cultured and the wealthy, fine and well-fitting clothing is <u>right</u> and normal.[4]

Consequently, the individual cannot have a complete sense of "well-being", unless he is wearing clothing which is appropriate to his station in life.

And finally, the authors of <u>Deep South</u>, when listing the criteriam used in the stratification of Old City state:

---

[1] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 86. Underlining added.

[2] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 167. In Veblen's day the importance of the automobile as a display items was not yet in evidence.

[3] George Van Ness Dearborn, <u>op. cit</u>.

[4] <u>Ibid</u>., p. 66. Underlining added.

> There are many clews to assist in the "placing" of people within broad limits, some easily observable, such as peculiarities of speech, type of clothing worn, the manner of drinking and "carrying" liquor, or occupation.[1]

The above citations give considerable weight to a focal postulate of the larger study, namely, that "clothing functions in social life as a symbol of social status."[2] A further assumption of the larger study was that individuals of different social status would use this symbol, clothing, differentially. This can be corroborated in part by reproducing some of the responses to the question:

---

[1] A. Davis, B. B. Gardner, and M. R. Gardner, Deep South; A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1941) p. 60. Underlining added. For other citations in the same vein see C. H. Cooley, Social Organization (New York: C. Scribner and Sons, 1909) p. 305, and Milton M. Gordon, "Kitty Foyle and the Concept of Class as Culture", American Journal of Sociology, LIII (November, 1947), 210-217. The assumption that status differences in the type of clothing worn are discernible in social life is implicit in the arguments of those writers who see the processes of imitation--inferiors copying the dress of superiors, and differentiation--superiors in turn, attempting to differentiate themselves from the dress of inferiors, as an element of fashion changes. See E. A. Ross, Social Psychology (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1929) pp. 99-101; E. Sapir, "Fashion," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. V and VI combined (1937); L. L. Bernard, An Introduction to Social Psychology (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1926) pp. 547-555; E. S. Bogardus, Fundamentals of Social Psychology (New York and London: The Century Company, 1924) chap. xiii.

[2] G. P. Stone and W. H. Form, "Instabilities in Status; The Problem of Hierarchy in the Community Study of Status Arrangements", American Sociological Review, XVIII (April, 1953), 149-162. Quote on p. 153.

> Do you think that people dress in different ways for different reasons?
> Yes ( ) No ( ) Other ( )
> If other: Specify.
> If yes or appropriate other: What reason can you think of?

Many individuals in the higher status levels seemed to emphasize the "impression-on-others" aspect of clothing. For example:

> Yes. They wish to create a better impression for the purpose of getting a job they want higher up.
>
> Yes. They want to be noticed, to accomplish something like a deal.
>
> Yes. ... One type is always trying to be the height of fashion, regardless of their ability to pay for it. (Interviewer's probe.) They're just trying to attract attention.
>
> Yes. I guess they want to look their best in front of some and are indifferent to others.

Those in the lower status levels emphasized either the categorical or the functional aspects of clothing. For example:

> Yes. A guy wouldn't go to church or his wedding in overalls.
>
> Yes. Different jobs call for differences in dress.
>
> Yes. If they go to a lodge meeting they dress up.
>
> Yes. If you wear a tie it'll get caught in the machines and you're liable to get your face smashed up.

Finally, directly bearing on the assumption that individuals of different social status use clothing differentially, is the respondent of low status who looked askance at the "odd" clothing behavior of his employer. He states:

> I don't know. I worked for a guy last summer at the lake. He'd get all dressed up just to go to town and when he'd get back he'd strip down to shorts and run around the house that way the rest of the day.

It is the position of this thesis that clothing not only functions as a symbol of social status and that it is looked upon by different social classes as performing different social functions, but also, that social classes will vary in the general degree of importance they place upon the social function of clothing in facilitating accurate appraisals of others' statuses. Previously, it was hypothesized that this function of clothing would be important to those who deal with strangers a good percentage of the time, to those who are in occupational positions in which people, rather than things are manipulated, and to those who are highly mobile in a territorial sense.[1] It was also stated that it is those persons with relatively high social status who are likely to be more involved in these kinds of social activities, and therefore, might be expected to emphasize the importance of clothing in their social interaction.

Clothing Importance and the Index of Status Characteristics

If the hypothesis that the degree of importance placed upon clothing would be related to social status is to be

---

[1]See Chapter I.

tested, we need, in addition to the scale measuring clothing importance (described in Chapter II), some adequate measure of social status. A modified version of Warner's revised Index of Status Characteristics was employed as an indicator of social status.[1]

Warner acknowledges the possibility that one of the four characteristics of the revised scale--occupational status, source of income, house type, and dwelling area--may not be obtainable. He states that the Index is effective if only three of the characteristics are available, but that certain alterations are needed in the weighting scheme.[2]

In obtaining the data for this study, it was found that one of the four characteristics was unobtainable. Since there was no clear-cut ecological pattern which could be used as a basis for obtaining dwelling area ratings, it was necessary to drop this element of the Index.

One further modification involved the assignment of ratings to different occupations along a seven-point scale.

---

[1]W. L. Warner, M. Meeker, and L. Eells, Social Class In America (Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1949). For a highly critical appraisal of Warner's work in community stratification, see H. W. Pfautz and O. D. Duncan, "A Critical Evaluation of Warner's Work in Community Stratification," American Sociological Review, XV (April, 1950) 205-215. For a more constructive evaluation, see Paul K. Hatt, "Stratification in Mass Society," American Sociological Review, XV (April, 1950) 216-227. Note especially his discussion of "The Relationship Between Community Reputational Analysis and Solution by Correlation," pp. 221-222.

[2]W. L. Warner, M. Meeker, and L. Eells, op. cit., p. 185.

It was felt that some of the occupational ratings developed by Warner did not adequately reflect the relative status of those occupations in this particular community. This was particularly true of the "trucker group", who made up a relatively high percentage of the population[1] and whose level in the community was thought to be somewhat higher than those in the communities on which the Warner Index was validated. Therefore, 13 long-term residents from all occupational levels of the city were selected to rate the 88 different occupations of the larger sample on a seven point scale.[2] These ratings were averaged and used to correct Warner's occupational scores for the Coldwater universe.

Through the use of this modification of the Warner social status index and our clothing importance scale, Table IV, summarizes the relationship between clothing importance and status ratings. The probability that clothing importance was not associated with ratings in the Index was less than 2 per cent, but greater than 1 per cent. The probability is small enough to consider the null hypothesis untenable.[3]

---

[1] About 5 per cent of the approximately 2700 employed males in Coldwater were truckers.

[2] G. P. Stone and W. H. Form, op. cit., p. 154. The authors use "Vansburg" as a pseudonym for Coldwater.

[3] The following qualifying adjectives shall be used in this thesis to denote the following probability ranges:
$.05 > p > .01$ - moderately significant
$.01 > p > .001$ - highly significant
$.001 > p$ - extremely significant

TABLE IV

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND RATINGS ON THE INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS

Clothing Importance Scale[b]	Ratings on the Index of Status Characteristics[a] 16 24	25 33	34 42	43 51	52 60	61 69	70 78	Totals
10	1	1	3	1	..	..	..	6
8	1	..	1	3	1	3	1	10
6	2	3	5	2	8	3	2	25
4	1	1	2	4	2	5	1	16
2	1	3	1	3	6	5	3	22
0	..	..	..	3	4	1	1	9
Totals	6	8	12	16	21	17	8	88
$r = .25$[c]				$p < .02$				

[a] Computed from Warner's Index of Status Characteristics. Low numerals represent high ratings.

[b] Scores obtained from the second trial rank order. See supra, p. 21.

[c] The method used in the computation of the product-moment correlation coefficient followed the procedure outlined in Allen L. Edwards, Statistical Analysis for Students in Psychology and Education (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1948), pp. 94-99, 187-188. In this thesis, all other computations involving the product-moment correlation coefficient will follow this procedure.

(3 Cont'd) Originally used by George W. Snedecor, Statistical Methods: Applied to Experiments in Agriculture and Biology (Ames, Iowa State College Press, 4th ed., 1946). Reproduced in Margaret J. Hagood, Statistics for Sociologists (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1952), p. 325.

A positive correlation of .25 indicates a relatively low degree of relationship between the two variables. Several factors might have affected the lowness of the correlation.

First, it became increasingly apparent in the analysis of the occupational ratings by the 13 residents selected,[1] that there was much agreement in the ratings of the very high and very low occupations, but little agreement in the ratings of the occupations in the middle range.[2] This factor is of greater consequence when we consider that the occupational characteristic is given the highest weight in the computation of the Index. Furthermore, the problem of the differentiation of ratings in the middle range became even more evident when the house types were rated by a research team. Since the "juxtaposition of 'good' and 'bad' housing ... [was] ... the dominant pattern in the town",[3] it was difficult to maintain consistency in the ratings of houses. For this reason, the general opinion of the research staff was that the ratings on house type were the least reliable of the three characteristics used in the Index.

We might conclude, from the foregoing discussion, that the extreme ratings are more reliable than those in the

---

[1] See supra, p. 36.

[2] G. P. Stone and W. H. Form, op. cit., p. 154.

[3] Loc. cit.

middle range. In Table IV, for example, no individual with a total score of 10 on the clothing importance scale received an Index rating of more than 51, and no individual with a low score of 0 received an Index rating of less than 43.

Another possible explanation of the low correlation has been anticipated in the discussion of the limitations of the clothing importance scale.[1] In the analysis of the items used in the scale, it was observed that the responses of individuals from higher status levels were often based upon specific projected situations, i.e., parties, picnics, etc., and consequently, were given medium, or even low ratings by the judges. This may account for the fact that in Table IV, individuals with high Index ratings of from 16 to 33 were almost equally distributed along the entire range of the scale.

This observation, that those individuals with Index ratings of 16 to 33 were almost equally distributed along the entire range of the scale, takes on added significance when we consider that out of a total of 12 persons with Index ratings of 34 to 42, only 3 received low clothing importance scores (scores of 4 to 0), while three times as many, 9, had high clothing importance scores (scores of 10 to 6).

---

[1] See supra, pp. 28-29.

It appears that clothing decreases in importance in the highest status categories. A possible explanation of this phenomenon may lie in the fact that these high status individuals either may have already attained their status goals, or, more likely, have inherited their high status positions. As a result, clothing as a symbol of success or as a means to a higher status goal is of little consequence in the social life of these people. On the other hand, those individuals of slightly lower status may not have reached their status goals. They are more conscious of those "above"--their superiors with greater social status--and those presently considered "below"--their inferiors with less social status. This follows, since they probably are anxious to sever ties with former peers and establish new ties with superordinates. Clothing here is employed as a means of impressing one's social worth upon others.[1]

It is also probable that the mass production of clothing has decreased its value as a status symbol for persons of high status, and that more emphasis has been placed upon such symbols as birth, inheritance, and "culture" for communicating their status to others. In this respect, Barber and Lobel,[2] analyzing the advertising "copy" of a number of

---

[1]See Chapter IV. A positive relationship exists between social mobility and clothing importance.

[2]B. Barber and L. S. Lobel, "'Fashion' in Women's Clothes and the American Social System," Social Forces, XXXI, No. 6 (December, 1952), 124-131.

woman's fashion magazines, observe that "old money families" with a long established social position do not compete for status by the conspicuous consumption of "high fashion" clothing, but stress esthetic values and usually are more concerned with birth distinctions and heredity. The authors state, furthermore, that those persons of slightly lower status show great concern for "high fashion" in clothing and are usually the Paris conscious style leaders.

It was possible, of course, that a single characteristic of the Index might have been associated with clothing importance at a higher level of significance than the total Index. Therefore, each component of the Index was correlated separately with the clothing importance scores.

Occupational status and source of income. It is evident from Table V that a substantially higher level of statistical significance exists in the relationship between clothing importance and occupational status than with clothing importance and the total Index. Since the probability that the variables were not associated was less than 1 per cent, but greater than 0.1 per cent, the null hypothesis can be rejected. Also, with a positive correlation of .32, there is a slightly higher degree of association between occupational status and clothing importance than that of .25 between the total Index and clothing importance.

TABLE V

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND OCCUPATIONAL STATUS

Clothing Importance Scale	Ratings on Occupational Status[a]							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Totals
10	1	3	1	1	..	..	..	6
8	1	..	2	2	3	1	1	10
6	2	5	1	8	5	2	2	25
4	2	..	2	3	5	2	2	16
2	1	2	2	4	5	5	3	22
0	..	..	..	2	5	1	1	9
Totals	7	10	8	20	23	11	9	88
$r = .32$				$p < .01$				

[a] Based upon the ratings by 13 residents of Coldwater of the 88 different occupations in the larger sample. A seven point scale was used. Low numerals represent high ratings.

Table VI, demonstrates that the same high level of significance exists in the relationship between clothing importance and source of income as did with clothing importance and occupational status. The same degree of association, a positive correlation of .32, also exists between the variables.

TABLE VI

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND SOURCE OF INCOME

Clothing Importance Scale	Ratings on Source of Income[a]								
	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5	5.5	Totals
10	..	..	1	3	2	..	..	..	6
8	..	1	2	..	2	..	4	1	10
6	4	..	4	2	6	..	9	..	25
4	..	1	1	1	7	1	5	..	16
2	2	1	1	..	4	..	13	1	22
0	..	..	..	..	3	..	6	..	9
Totals	6	3	9	6	24	1	37	2	88

$r = .32$ $p < .01$

[a] One of the indices from Warner's Index of Status Characteristics. In the computation of the product-moment coefficient, the first two, second two, third two, and fourth two columns were combined. Low numerals represent high ratings.

The fact that occupational status and its highly related variable, source of income, show the greatest degree of relationship to clothing importance, increases in consequence when we consider that many students of stratification hold that occupational status is a major, if not the prime, element in social status. Anderson and Davidson express this view rather vividly:

> The occupation one follows fills most of one's waking time. It assigns the individual a particular place in society, which can be changed only by most exceptional circumstances. It has much to do with determining the location and kind of residence of the family, and thereby the schooling, playmates, social contacts, and leisure--time activities of its various members. ... it forms the range of his conversation and intellectual interest, fastens upon him habits of dress and conduct, and defines the circle of his friends and acquaintances, who in turn have a powerful effect on his thoughts and actions.[1]

House type. Table VII, summarizes the relationship between clothing importance and ratings on house type. Although the direction of the relationship is positive, there is a lack of statistical significance. Since the probability that the two variables were not associated was less than 30 per cent and no less than 20 per cent, the null hypotheses cannot be considered untenable. Furthermore, the low correlation of .12 between clothing importance and house type represents a substantially lower correlation than that between clothing importance and the total Index, and between clothing importance and its other two components, occupational status and source of income, which were .25,

---

[1]D. Anderson and P. E. Davidson, Ballots and the Democratic Class Struggle (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 1943) p. 82. For others who point out the significance of occupation as a major element in social status see D. C. Miller and W. H. Form, Industrial Sociology (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1951), Talcott Parsons, "An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Sociological Stratification," American Journal of Sociology, XLV, No. 6 (May, 1940), 841-862, and Paul K. Hatt, "Occupation and Social Stratification", American Journal of Sociology, LV, No. 6 (May, 1950).

TABLE VII

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND HOUSE TYPE

Clothing Importance Scale	Ratings on House Type[a]							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Totals
10	1	1	1	3	..	..	..	6
8	..	1	..	3	2	3	1	10
6	2	2	3	7	5	3	3	25
4	..	2	2	5	2	4	1	16
2	1	1	3	5	5	6	1	22
0	..	..	2	3	2	1	1	9
Totals	4	7	11	26	16	17	7	88
$r = .12$				$p < .30$				

[a] One of the indices from Warner's Index of Status Characteristics. Low numerals represent high ratings.

.32, and .32 respectively. This low correlation between clothing importance and house type has been anticipated in the discussion of the difficulties encountered in the attempt to maintain consistency in the rating of houses.[1]

Summary. Since it has been shown that a large amount of agreement exists on the prestige value of occupations,

[1] See supra, p. 38.

regardless of region or size of community,[1] and that "we have commonsense agreement that source of income is a constant value throughout our society",[2] the value of both of these indices is generalizable, and therefore, inferences which might be drawn on a cross-community basis from the above empirical findings, would have greater foundation. On the other hand, the employment of house type as a cross-community index is limited, since its value is expressed in terms of the local community only.[3] These considerations seem to enhance the empirical finding that both occupational status and source of income demonstrate a substantially higher degree of relationship to clothing importance than does house type (occupational status and clothing importance, $r = .32$; source of income and clothing importance, $r = .32$; house type and clothing importance, $r = .12$). In turn, this low degree of relationship between house type and clothing importance, which was of no statistical significance ($p < .30$),

---

[1] C. C. North and P. K. Hatt, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," in L. Wilson and W. A. Kolb, Sociological Analysis (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1949), pp. 464-473.

[2] Paul K. Hatt, "Stratification in the Mass Society," American Sociological Review, XV (April, 1950), 216-222. Quote from p. 222.

[3] Ibid. Houses are rated on a comparative basis with others in the community being studied. It is for this reason that Hatt recommends that both house type and dwelling area, the two other components of Warner's revised Index, be replaced by a more generalizable value, such as a simple rental index which he claims would be a more reliable value of both the quality of housing and the quality of the neighborhood.

served to lower the over-all degree of relationship between the total Index and clothing importance (r = .25).

Other Status Indicators

Two other indices of status, education and amount of income, employed in Warner's original Index of Status Characteristics,[1] have also been considered. In addition another conventionally employed status indicator, based upon Alba Edwards' Occupational Groups, was considered.

Amount of income. Table VIII, summarizes the relationship between amount of income and clothing importance. The low, but positive correlation of .17 is not statistically significant. Since the probability that the two variables were not significantly associated was less than 20 per cent and no less than 10 per cent, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Two possible explanations of this low correlation between amount of income and clothing importance are considered below.

Certain phenomena were observed, both during the interviewing process and in the analysis of the schedules, which might have effected the over-all reliability of the income data. It was apparent that many individuals in the higher

---

[1] W. L. Warner, M. Meeker, and L. Eells, op. cit., chap. x. The original Index was developed for use in Jonesville, the latest town studied in the Warner tradition. See W. Lloyd Warner and Associates, Democracy in Jonesville (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1949).

TABLE VIII

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND INCOME

Clothing Importance Scale	Income[a]						
	plus $10,000	$9,999 $5,000	$4,999 $3,000	$2,999 $2,000	$1,999 $1,000	$999 Less	Totals
10	2	1	2	1	..	..	6
8	1	1	6	1	..	1	10
6	3	2	12	4	3	1	25
4	1	3	6	6	..	..	16
2	2	5	6	5	4	..	22
0	..	..	7	..	2	..	9
Totals	9	12	39	17	9	2	88
r = .17				p < .20			

[a] In the computation of the product-moment coefficient, the mid-point for the first column was set at $15,000, and the mid-point for the last column was set at $500.

income brackets were consistently underestimating their yearly incomes, while those in the lower brackets (not the extremely low) tended to overstate their yearly earnings. And still others, especially those who were not steadily employed, found it extremely difficult to give accurate estimates of their yearly income. Also, in the analysis of the schedules, a considerable amount of disagreement existed

between the spouses as to the total amount of family income.[1] These observations cast serious doubts upon the reliability of the income data. Would this variable then, be a useful indicator of social status? In order to test the empirical usefulness of amount of income as an indicator of status, it was necessary to ascertain its degree of relationship with our standard of social status, the Index of Status Characteristics.

It is evident from the figures summarized in Table IX, that with a correlation of .70, a relatively high degree of association exists between amount of income and the Index of Status Characteristics. Moreover, since the probability that these two variables were not associated was less than 0.1 per cent, the null hypothesis must certainly be rejected. For the purposes of this thesis, therefore, we can conclude that amount of income is a fairly reliable index of social status. We have already demonstrated that occupational status and source of income are significantly associated with clothing importance. We know also, that occupational status, source of income, and amount of income are highly interrelated.[2] There is, then, only one remaining

---

[1]Generally, the husband and wife were questioned simultaneously, and if possible, in a different physical area of the residence. In the final analysis, and as a working rule, the husband's estimate of the total yearly income of the family was used in instances of disagreement.

[2]We have demonstrated a .64 correlation between occupational status and amount of income, a .58 correlation

TABLE IX

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN RATINGS ON THE INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS AND INCOME

Income[a]	Ratings on the Index of Status Characteristics							
	16 24	25 33	34 42	43 51	52 60	61 69	70 78	Totals
plus $10,000	6	3	..	..	..	..	..	9
$9,999 $5,000	..	2	5	1	2	2	..	12
$4,999 $3,000	..	3	5	11	13	7	..	39
$2,999 $2,000	..	..	..	3	5	4	5	17
$1,999 $1,000	..	..	1	1	1	4	2	9
$999 less	..	..	1	..	..	..	1	2
Totals	6	8	12	16	21	17	8	88

$r = .70$ $p < .001$

[a] In the computation of the product-moment coefficient, the mid-point for the first row was set at $15,000, and the mid-point for the last row was set at $500.

(2 Cont'd) between amount of income and source of income, and a .76 correlation between occupational status and source of income. See Appendix, Tables XXIV, XXV and XXVI.

explanation of the low correlation between amount of income and clothing importance--the possibility that the income categories themselves are inadequate for discriminating differences in clothing importance. However, this cannot be verified, for the class limits of the income categories had been established in the larger study, and the data had already been gathered before this smaller study was initiated.

Grade completed. As was mentioned above, grade completed and amount of income were both employed in Warner's original Index of Status Characteristics. Table X, summarizes the relationship between grade completed and clothing importance. It is evident that the rather low positive correlation of .12 between the variables is not statistically significant. Since the probability that grade completed and clothing importance were not associated in the universe studied was less than 30 per cent and no less than 20 per cent, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. As in the case of amount of income, grade completed was correlated with the Index to ascertain its usefulness as an indicator of status.

Table XI demonstrates a statistically significant association between grade completed (education) and the Index of Status Characteristics. Since the probability that the variables were not associated in the universe studied was less than 0.1 per cent, we can consider the null hypothesis untenable. However, the correlation of .57 between grade

TABLE X

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND GRADE COMPLETED

Clothing Importance Scale	Grade Completed[a]										
	0	1 4	5 7	8	9 11	12	13 14	15	16	17 plus	Totals
10	..	1	..	..	3	..	..	..	2	..	6
8	..	1	..	2	2	2	1	..	1	1	10
6	1	..	2	6	6	5	2	..	3	..	25
4	..	..	..	4	1	8	1	..	..	2	16
2	..	1	3	5	3	5	2	1	2	..	22
0	..	1	2	1	3	2	..	..	..	..	9
Totals	1	4	7	18	18	22	6	1	8	3	88

$r = .12$ $p < .30$

[a] In the computation of the product-moment coefficient, the mid-point for the last row was set at 18.5.

completed and the Index is substantially lower than the .70 correlation between amount of income and the Index. The reliability of grade completed as an indicator of status, therefore, is somewhat lower than that of amount of income. This relatively lower dependibility of grade completed may have been a factor in the low degree of relationship demonstrated between grade completed and the Index of Status Characteristics. In this respect, it is interesting to note

that in Table X, the one individual who had no formal education but who had received a relatively high rating of 6 on the clothing importance scale, also had received the relatively high status rating of 34-42 on the Index. In addition, in Table XI, the individual who had received the

TABLE XI

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN RATINGS ON THE INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS AND GRADE COMPLETED

Grade Completed[a]	Ratings on the Index of Status Characteristics							
	16 24	25 33	34 42	43 51	52 60	61 69	70 78	Totals
0	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1
1-4	..	..	..	1	..	1	1	3
5-7	1	..	..	..	3	2	2	8
8	..	..	2	3	4	6	4	19
9-11	..	2	1	3	7	3	1	17
12	1	..	4	5	7	5	..	22
13-14	..	2	2	2	..	..	..	6
15	..	..	1	..	..	..	..	1
16	2	3	1	2	..	..	..	8
17-plus	2	1	..	..	..	..	..	3
Totals	6	8	12	16	21	17	8	88
$r = .57$				$p < .001$				

[a] In the computation of the product-moment coefficient, the mid-point of the last row was set at 18.5.

high status rating of 16-24 on the Index but had only completed the 5-7 grade, also had received the relatively high score of 6 on the clothing importance scale.

Occupational Groups. We have seen that occupational status, along with source of income, demonstrated the highest degree of relationship to clothing importance (.32). Would another occupational ranking, such as Alba Edwards' social-economic groups,[1] not primarily based upon status, although closely related to it,[2] also show this same degree of association with the clothing importance scale? Table XII, summarizes the relationship between occupational groups and clothing importance, and presents the lack of statistical significance. Since the probability that the two variable were not associated was less than 20 per cent and no less than 10 per cent, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Although the degree of relationship is relatively low, the over-all association between the variables is positive. Thirteen of the Professionals, Proprietors, Officials, Managers group have scores of 10 to 6 on the clothing importance scale, while only 7 have scores of 4 to 2 and none

---

[1]Alba M. Edwards, Alphabetical Index Of Occupations (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1937).

[2]Table XVIII in the appendix summarizes the relationship between occupational groups and the Index of Status Characteristics. It is evident, that with a T of .62 ($p < .001$), a fairly high degree of relationship exists between the two variables.

TABLE XII

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

Clothing Importance Scale[b]	Occupational Groups[a]			
	Professionals Proprietors Officials Managers	Clerks & Kindred Workers	Manual	Totals
10	3	3	..	6
8	2	1	7	10
6	8	3	14	25
4	2	3	11	16
2	5	5	12	22
0	..	1	8	9
Totals	20	16	52	88
$\chi^2 = 3.60$[c]		$p < .20$		T = .17[d]

[a] Based upon the social-economic groups classification found in Alba M. Edwards, Alphabetical Index of Occupations (Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1937), p. 3. The first column includes groups 0, 1, and 2; the second column includes group 3; and the last column includes groups 4, 5, 6, 7, and 8.

[b] The first three and last three rows were collapsed in the computation of the chi square.

[c] The method used in the computation of the chi square followed the procedure outlined in Allen L. Edwards, Statistical Analysis for Students in Psychology and Education (New York: Rinehart and Company, Inc., 1948), pp. 239-253. In this thesis, all other computations involving chi square shall follow this procedure.

[d] The method used in the computation of Tschuprow's "coefficient of contingency" (T) followed the procedure outlined in Margaret J. Hagood and Price, Statistics for Sociologists (New York: Henry Holt and Company, Revised, 1952) pp. 370-371.

have a score of 0. Those in the Clerks and Kindred Workers group are fairly evenly divided, with only 7 having scores of 10 to 6, and while 9 have scores of 4 to 0. At the other extreme, only 21 in the Manual group have scores of 8 to 6, while none have a score of 10 and 31 have scores of 4 to 0. However, the T of .17 between occupational groups and clothing importance represents a substantially lower degree of relationship than the r of .32 between occupational status and importance of clothing.[1] Status, therefore, seems to be a strong element in this greater degree of relationship between occupational status and clothing importance, since the occupations were rated solely on the basis of prestige[2] by the thirteen long term residents of Coldwater.

Summary

Before summarizing the findings of this chapter, it might be well to indicate the perspective on the meaning of statistical significance, as it will be considered in this dissertation.

---

[1]Tschuprow's "coefficient of contingency" (T) has an upper limit of 1.0 no matter how many cells there are in the table. In light of the discussions by Margaret J. Hagood and Price, Statistics for Sociologists (New York: Henry Holt and Company, Revised 1952) pp. 370-371, and G. Udny Yule and M. G. Kendall, An Introduction to the Theory of Statistics (London: Charles Griffin and Company, Limited, Thirteenth Ed., Revised 1949) pp. 68-71, Tschuprow's "coefficient of contingency" (T) shall be considered as the equivalent of the product moment correlation (r) for the purposes of this thesis.

[2]Status and prestige are here used synonymously.

Charles Peters, writing on the misconceptions of statistical significance, sees a strong element of magic in the drawing of a hard and steadfast line at a particular level in ascertaining the statistical significance of a relationship.[1] He demonstrates that small differences which are consistently in the same direction are of statistical consequence, and can be considered more reliable than occasional large differences which are not prevailingly in the same direction.

In this same vein, Stuart Chapin, in analyzing the findings of a research project states:

> None of these findings are statistically significant as single differences. The important point is that they are consistent and in the same direction. ... Our opinion is unequivocally that small differences in the same direction may be as important as one large difference that is statistically significant.[2]

Chapin presents two reasons for this assertion:

> First, social phenomena are complex and not likely to show large differences because of the configurational character of the social situation. The separate factors in a social situation are usually functionally related. Second, the conventional tests of the significance of sampling are based upon the theory of random samples, and in the present stage of experimental work, as we have attempted to show, it is the terminal homogeneity and purity in the sample, rather than initial representativeness of

---

[1]Charles C. Peters, "Note on a Misconception of Statistical Significance." American Journal of Sociology, XXXIX (July, 1933-May 1934) 231-236.

[2]F. Stuart Chapin, Experimental Designs in Sociological Research (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1947), p. 104.

> heterogeneity, that is important in demonstrating the <u>real</u> relationship between two variable factors.[1]

In our findings, all of the indices of status used, i.e., the Index of Status Characteristics, occupational status, source of income, house type, amount of income, grade completed, and occupational groups, demonstrated a positive relationship with the clothing importance scale. Occupational status and source of income showed the greatest degree of relationship with the clothing importance scale ($r = .32$, $p < .001$). The Index of Status Characteristics, which includes source of income, occupational status, and house type, demonstrated a slightly lower degree of relationship with the clothing importance scale ($r = .25$, $p < .02$). The low degree of relationship between house type (believed to be the least reliable of all the indices of status employed) and the clothing importance scale ($r = .12$, $p < .30$) served to lower the over-all degree of relationship between the total Index and the clothing importance scale. Income demonstrated a .17 ($p < .20$) correlation with the clothing importance scale, occupational groups a T of .17 ($p < .20$), and grade completed an r of .12 ($p < .30$).

In light of these empirical findings, and considering the assertions of Peters and Chapin, the hypothesis that the degree of importance which a person places upon clothing will be related to that individual's social status can be accepted.

---

[1] <u>Ibid.</u>, p. 104. Underlining added. "Real" originally italicized.

CHAPTER IV

CHAPTER IV

CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND SOCIAL MOBILITY

In dealing with stratification aspects of clothing importance, our study cannot be complete without a consideration of the effect of status mobility upon relative clothing importance.

A person who is striving towards higher status goals is more likely to become sensitive to the symbols which differentiate the social strata. In order to be identified as a higher status member, it is necessary to manipulate and incorporate the symbols which distinguish this strata. In impersonal or secondary group relationships, clothing is an important symbol in influencing in a desired direction "others" initial judgment of one's social status.

Evelyn Ellis, studying the social psychological aspects of occupational mobility among unmarried career women, shows that upward mobile persons are likely to be more socially isolated than non-mobile persons. They were also found to have less intimate friends and their length of friendships lasted over a shorter period of time than the non-mobile persons. She states:

> The evidence is consistent with the theory that upward social mobility is likely to be an outgrowth of basically neurotic drives resulting from

> unsatisfactory early primary group relations, and that mobility leads to a continuation of superficial, impermanent primary group relations and other overt manifestations of emotional maladjustment.[1]

Within this vein, upwardly mobile persons would most likely demonstrate a greater dependence upon impersonal, secondary group relationships in social life in which, as we have mentioned above, clothing plays an important function as an indicator of social status.

In "The Theory of Social Stratification,"[2] Parsons states that, in our society, a large component of standards of living is to be found in the symbolic significance of many of its items in relation to status. One type of situation where this component becomes important is in:

> ... the case of a group who are involved in a highly competitive struggle for achieved status, where the status of a large proportion of them at any given time is either newly acquired or relatively insecure or both.[3]

The upwardly mobile person is more likely, therefore, to place a great deal of emphasis upon the various status symbols.

---

[1]Evelyn Ellis, "Social Psychological Correlates of Upward Social Mobility Among Unmarried Career Women," American Sociological Review, XVII, No. 5 (October, 1952), 558-563. Quote on page 563.

[2]Talcott Parsons, Essays in Sociological Theory Pure and Applied (Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press, 1949), pp. 166-184.

[3]Ibid., p. 180.

Considering the above discussion, we would hypothesize that those who have been upwardly mobile will demonstrate a higher degree of clothing importance than those who have either been non-mobile, or downwardly mobile.

Although we are interested in over-all social mobility, we shall define mobility in terms of a single dimension--occupation--which is considered by many leading students of stratification as the most valid single index of social status.[1] As our measure of occupational status, we shall employ the seven-point occupational prestige scale developed in Coldwater, and used in the Index of Status Characteristics (see Chapter III).

A job history was obtained from each individual and each was categorized in respect to six mobility patterns;

1. None; 2. Continuously upward; 3. Continuously downward; 4. Irregularly upward; 5. Irregularly downward; 6. Irregularities--no mobility.[2]

Since there were relatively few individuals in several of the mobility patterns, it was necessary to amalgamate the six mobility patterns into three in order to compute the statistical significance between clothing importance

---

[1]This point has been previously discussed. See supra, pp. 43-44.

[2]One individual's occupational history was incomplete and was classified as "indeterminate".

and occupational mobility. Mobility patterns 1 and 6 were combined into a "non-mobile" category; 2 and 4 into an "upward mobile" category; and 3 and 5 into a "downward mobile" category (no individual fell into the third mobility pattern).

Table XIII, summarizes the relationship between the clothing importance scale and occupational mobility, and presents a statistically significant relationship. Since the probability that the two variables were not associated was less than 1 per cent, but greater than 0.1 per cent, the null hypothesis can be rejected. Although the degree of association is fairly low (T = .28), the over-all relationship between the variables is positive. Those in the upward mobile group had the largest proportion of persons in the high clothing importance range (scores of 10 to 6). Out of a total of 53 persons in this group, 31 had high clothing importance scores and only 22 had low clothing importance scores (scores of 4 to 0), while only 10 of the 27 persons in the non-mobile group had high clothing importance scores and 17 had low clothing importance scores. All 7 persons in the downward mobile group had low clothing importance scores.

The reader will recall our previous note that the group with Index ratings of 34 to 42 had the greatest proportion of persons who received high clothing importance scores

TABLE XIII

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

Clothing Importance Scale	Occupational Mobility[a]			
	Upward Mobile	No Mobility	Downward Mobile	Totals
10	6	..	..	6
8	8	2	..	10
6	17	8	..	25
4	8	5	3	16
2	10	8	3	21
0	4	4	1	9
Totals	53	27	7	87[b]
$\chi^2 = 7.00$		$p < .01$		$T = .28$

[a] The first three rows and the last three rows, and the second and third columns were collapsed in the computation of the chi square.

[b] One individual's occupational history was incomplete.

(9 received high scores, while only 3 received low scores).[1] If this is considered, along with the fact that all 12 of the persons in this group were upwardly mobile,[2] we have a

[1] See supra, p. 39.

[2] See Appendix, Table XIX. Occupational mobility demonstrates a fair degree of association with the Index of Status Characteristics ($T = .49$, $p < .001$).

further corroboration of our hypothesis that those who have been upwardly mobile will demonstrate a higher degree of clothing importance than those who have either been non-mobile or downwardly mobile.

CHAPTER V

CHAPTER V

CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND SOCIAL PARTICIPATION

Since status is said to be fundamentally a matter of evaluative participation in local community life,[1] no attempt to explain clothing importance in terms of social status differentials can be complete without some concrete consideration of the range of social participation on the part of the members of the community and some interpretation of the influence of that range on their estimates of clothing importance.

Home economists at the Mississippi Agricultural Experiment Station have employed social participation as a criterion for determining scientific minimum standards in clothing.[2] In this respect, clothing is considered as a type of consumer-good "which is not primarily used for 'physical welfare', but rather for 'psycho-social welfare'".[3]

---

[1]This is implicit in the employment of the Evaluated Participation technique for investigating and measuring social status. See W. L. Warner, M. Meeker, and K. Eells, op. cit., pp. 47-117.

[2]Dorothy Dickins, "Social Participation as a Criterion for Determining Scientific Minimum Standards in Clothing," Rural Sociology, IX (December, 1944), 341-349. In this study, the definition for a socially participating family was "attendance at daytime preaching at least once a quarter during the schedule year." (p. 345).

[3]Ibid., p. 348.

In demonstrating the utility of social participation as a basis for setting clothing standards, these home economists show that in their investigations, the majority of those families with the lowest social participation were in the group whose clothing supplies were ranked as minimum, while those families with above average social participation were also in the group whose clothing supplies were ranked as above average.[1] In relation to this, Rosencranz, studying the clothing interests of 180 women, demonstrates that the range of the types of garments in an individual's wardrobe is a sensitive indicator of that individual's interest in clothing.[2] The same study revealed a significant association between degree of clothing interest and number of associational memberships.

Warner and associates have demonstrated the relationship between social status[3] and the number of organizations

---

[1] Ibid., p. 345.

[2] Mary Lou Rosencranz, "A Study of Interest in Clothing Among Selected Groups of Married and Unmarried Young Women," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Textiles, Clothing, and Related Arts, Michigan State College. Interest in clothing was defined "in terms of interest evidenced by time, energy, money, thought, and attention given to clothing." (p. 3).

[3] For the purposes of exposition, social status will here be considered as being synonomous with social class. Warner has demonstrated that on the basis of the Index of Status Characteristics alone (our measure of social status), the social class of an individual can accurately be predicted. See W. L. Warner, M. Meeker, and K. Eells, op. cit. Note especially chapter xiii.

to which an individual belongs:

> As the class rank increases, the proportion of its members who belong to associations also increases; and as the position of a class decreases the percentage of those who belong to associations decreases.[1]

The relationship of social status with types of associational memberships and religious affiliation has also been verified.[2] And finally, the initial analysis of the data of the larger study seems to overwhelmingly corroborate the fact that the number and variety of clothes possessed is related to social status.

Since we have demonstrated the existence of a positive relationship between social status and clothing importance (third chapter), and since we know that social participation is related to social class,[3] we might also anticipate the existence of a positive relationship between social participation and clothing importance.

In this thesis, we shall consider four social participation factors--membership in associations, officerships in

---

[1]W. L. Warner and Paul S. Lunt, The Social Life of a Modern Community (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941), p. 329.

[2]Ibid., pp. 301-365. See also W. Lloyd Warner and Paul S. Lunt, The Status System of a Modern Community (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1942).

[3]In this thesis, when the four social participation factors employed were associated with our measure of status, the I.S.C., a statistically significant relationship was demonstrated in each case. See Appendix, Tables XX, XXI, XXII, and XXIII.

voluntary organizations, church attendance, and church activity--and their relationship to our clothing importance scale.

Memberships in organizations. Table XIV, summarizes the relationship between scores received on the clothing importance scale and the number of organizational memberships. The extremely low correlation of .08 is not statistically significant. Since the probability that the two variables were not significantly associated was less than 50 per cent and no less than 40 per cent, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. We wish here, to present a number of pertinent observations concerning the relationship of the two variables, but first, in order to simplify exposition, it will be necessary to dichotomize the scale. Scores of 10 to 6 shall be referred to as high clothing importance, while scores of 4 to 0 shall be referred to as low clothing importance.

It is interesting to note that up to a point, the overall relationship between clothing importance and number of organizational memberships is positive. Only 15 of those individuals with either 0 or 1 organizational memberships have scores within the high clothing importance range, while nearly twice as many, 29, have scores which lie within the low clothing importance range. On the other hand, 22 of those individuals with 2 to 4 organizational memberships

TABLE XIV

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS

Clothing Importance Scale	Number of Organizational Memberships									
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Totals
10	1	..	3	..	1	1	..	..	..	6
8	2	3	3	1	..	..	..	1	..	10
6	6	3	4	7	3	1	..	1	..	25
4	5	5	1	1	..	1	2	..	1	16
2	5	8	2	1	1	3	..	1	1	22
0	4	2	1	1	1	..	..	..	..	9
Totals	23	21	14	11	6	6	2	3	2	88
r = .08					p < .50					

have scores within the high clothing importance range, while only 9 have scores within the low clothing importance range. However, from memberships in 5 or more organizations, the relationship between the variables becomes negative. Only 4 individuals with 5 to 8 organizational memberships have scores which lie within the high clothing importance range, whereas, more than twice as many, 9, have scores within the low clothing importance range.[1] Since we have seen that

[1]In Table XV, when the scale is collapsed into high clothing importance and low clothing importance, and the

many high status individuals received medium, or even low scores on the clothing importance scale,[1] and since we know that number of organizational memberships exhibits a fairly high relationship to ratings on the Index of Status Characteristics ($r = .59$, $p < .001$),[2] this negative relationship between 5 or more organizational memberships and clothing importance might have been anticipated.

We have observed, both in Coldwater and in other communities of equivalent size, a tendency for persons of very high status to avoid prominence in respect to community activity. These individuals can usually be relied upon to help initiate community projects, such as welfare drives, hospital funds, etc., but usually gravitate to an "honorary membership" type of position, rather than participate in the actual organization of these projects. On the other hand, those individuals of slightly lower status, seem to be the ones who not only initiate, but also organize and direct such community activities. Furthermore, it would seem that these "actives" are more often the office holders of the medium to medium-high status associations of the community.

(1 cont'd) number of organizational memberships is trichotomized into 0, 1, and 2 or more organizational memberships, a statistically significant correlation of .23 ($p < .05$) is demonstrated.

[1]See p. 39.

[2]See Appendix, Table XX.

In this respect, social participation is looked upon as a means of enhancing one's social honor, or prestige.[1]

Within the framework of the preceding empirical findings and considerations, then, we anticipate the existence of a higher degree of association between number of officerships in voluntary organizations and clothing importance than between number of organizational memberships and clothing importance.

Officerships in voluntary organizations. It is evident from Table XV, that a substantially higher level of statistical significance does exist in the relationship between clothing importance and number of officerships in voluntary organizations than with clothing importance and number of organizational memberships. Since the probability that the variables were not associated was less than 5 per cent, but greater than 2 per cent, the null hypothesis can be rejected. Also, as anticipated above, with a positive correlation of .27, there is a greater degree of association between number of officerships in voluntary associations and clothing importance than that of .08 between number of organizational memberships and clothing importance.

---

[1]The above observation seems to be partially corroborated in view of our empirical finding that number of officerships in voluntary organizations and ratings on the Index demonstrate a statistically significant, but substantially lower degree of relationship ($r = .47$, $p < .001$) than number of organizational memberships and ratings on the Index ($r = .59$, $p < .001$). See Appendix, Tables XX and XXI.

TABLE XV

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND OFFICERSHIPS IN VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

Clothing Importance Scale	Number of Officerships					
	0	1	2	3	Not a Member*	Totals
10	2	2	1	..	1	6
8	5	1	2	..	2	10
6	17	..	2	1	5	25
4	5	5	..	1	5	16
2	13	3	1	..	5	22
0	4	..	1	..	4	9
Totals	46	11	7	2	22	88
$r = .27$			$p < .05$			

* This column was not included in the computation of the product-moment coefficient.

The medium-high status group has the greatest percentage of persons who lie within the high clothing importance range,[1] and also has the greatest percentage of persons who have 1 or more officerships in voluntary organizations.[2] Since a

[1] See Table IV. Of the 12 individuals with ratings of 34 to 42 on the I.S.C., 9 have scores which lie within the high clothing importance range, while only 3 have scores which lie within the low clothing importance range.

[2] See Appendix, Table XXI. Of the 12 individuals with ratings of 34 to 42 on the ISC., only 4 have no officerships, while 6 have officerships in 1 or more organizations. (Two persons do not belong to any organizations).

statistically significant association exists between clothing importance and number of officerships in voluntary organizations, it would seem that those who play an active role in community life are also those who place a high value upon clothing. In this respect, in Table XV, of the 22 individuals who have no organizational memberships, only 8 have scores which lie within the high clothing range, while almost twice as many, 14, have scores which lie within the low clothing importance range.

Church attendance. Table XVI summarizes the relationship between clothing importance and frequency of church attendance. The persons placed in the occasional church attendance category are those who attended church at least once and less than 80 per cent of the Sundays within the last six months immediately preceding the time of the interview, while those placed in the regular church attendance category attended church 80 per cent or more of the Sundays during this period.

The association between the two variables is statistically significant. Since the probability that the two variables were not significantly associated was less than 5 per cent and no less than 2 per cent, the null hypothesis can be rejected. Although the degree of relationship between the two variables is fairly low (T = .22), the overall relationship is positive. The regular church attendance group has the greatest percentage of persons who lie within

TABLE XVI

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND CHURCH ATTENDANCE

Clothing Importance Scale[a]	Frequency of Church Attendance			
	None	Occasional	Regular	Totals
10	3	2	1	6
8	3	3	3	9
6	12	3	10	25
4	9	5	2	16
2	13	6	3	22
0	5	3	1	9
Totals	45	22	20	87[b]
$\chi^2 = 6.13$		$p < .05$		$T = .22$

[a] In the computation of the chi square, the first three and last three rows were collapsed.

[b] One individual failed to respond to this item.

the high clothing importance range. Of the 20 persons in this group, 14 received high clothing importance scores, while only 6 have scores which lie within the low clothing range. On the other hand, of the 67 persons in the none and occasional church attendance groups, only 26 have scores which lie within the high clothing importance range, while 41 have scores which lie within the low clothing importance

range. In general, then, persons who attend church services rather regularly, are more likely to receive high scores on the clothing importance scale.

These findings augment the previously cited work of the Home Economists at the Mississippi Experiment Station in their employment of social participation as a criterion for determining scientific minimum standards in clothing, since social participation was defined in terms of frequency of church attendance.[1] Furthermore, since these Home Economists demonstrate a positive relationship between frequency of church attendance and clothing supplies, these "high clothing importance" regular church goers are probably also the ones who possess the greatest number and variety of clothing.

Church Activity. Table XVII, summarizes the relationship between clothing importance and our final social participation factor, extent of church activity. The persons placed in the nominal church activity category are those who belonged to a church, but who demonstrated little participation in church activities. Those persons placed in the active church activity category are those who actively participated in church activities (at least regular church goers), and those who usually had some official position in the church.

---

[1]See supra, p. 65.

TABLE XVII

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN CLOTHING IMPORTANCE AND EXTENT OF CHURCH ACTIVITY

Clothing Importance Scale[a]	Extent of Church Activity			
	No Church Activity	Nominal Activity	Active	Totals
10	..	5	1	6
8	3	3	3	9
6	10	5	10	25
4	8	6	2	16
2	10	8	4	22
0	4	4	1	9
Totals	35	31	21	87[b]
$\chi^2 = 4.83$		$p < .10$		$T = .20$

[a] In the computation of the chi square, the first three and last three rows were collapsed.

[b] One individual failed to respond to this item.

The association between clothing importance and extent of church activity is not statistically significant. Since the probability that the two variables were not significantly associated was less than 10 per cent and no less than 5 per cent, we cannot reject the null hypothesis. Although the degree of relationship between the variables is fairly low ($T = .20$), the over-all relationship is positive. Of the 21

persons in the active church activity group, 14 received high clothing importance scores, while half as many, 7, received low clothing importance scores. However, only 26 of the 66 persons in the no church activity and nominal church activity groups received high clothing importance scores, while 40 received low clothing importance scores.

The degree of relationship between the extent of church activity and clothing importance (T = .20) is about the same as that between frequency of church attendance and clothing importance (T = .22). This might have been anticipated, since frequency of church attendance and extent of church activity are not mutually exclusive items. An individual who holds some official church position is usually one who attends church regularly. Moreover, both frequency of church attendance and extent of church activity demonstrate close to the same degree of association with ratings on the Index of Status Characteristics (T = .28, $p < .01$, and T = .32, $p < .01$ respectively).[1]

It would be of interest to compare the clothing importance scores of those who were active church members and who usually had some official church position, with those who were active, but who did not usually hold some official

---

[1]See Appendix, Tables XXII and XXIII. Number of organizational memberships and number of officerships in voluntary organizations both, demonstrate a considerably greater degree of relationship with ratings on the I.S.C. (r = .59, $p < .001$, and r = .48, $p < .001$, respectively).

church position. The implication here being that the former group, demonstrating the greatest degree of participation, would also have the greatest percentage of individuals with high clothing importance scores. Since there were relatively few individuals in either one of these two groups, it was necessary to amalgamate both of them in an "active church activity" category in order to compute the statistical significance of the variables. If we set aside consideration of statistical significance, an examination of the two groups before amalgamation reveals a relationship which is in the direction of our hypothesis that those who demonstrate a greater degree of social participation will also demonstrate a higher degree of clothing importance. Of those 11 individuals who were active church members and who usually held some official position in the church, 8 had high clothing importance scores, while nearly a third as many, 3, had low clothing importance scores. In comparison with this, of the 10 individuals who were active church members, but who did not usually hold some official church position, 6 had high clothing importance scores, while 4 had low clothing importance scores. The former group, the officials of the church, has the greater proportion of individuals with high clothing importance scores.

Summary

The intimate association between social status and social participation was established.

In our findings, all of the social participation factors employed, number of organizational memberships, number of officerships in voluntary organizations, frequency of church attendance, and extent of church activity, demonstrated a positive relationship with the clothing importance scale. Number of officerships in voluntary organizations exhibited the greatest degree of association with the clothing importance scale ($r = .27$, $p < .05$). Frequency of church attendance demonstrated a slightly lower degree of association with the clothing importance scale ($T = .22$, $p < .05$). Extent of church activity demonstrated a T of .20 ($p < .10$) with clothing importance, and number of organizational memberships exhibited a low r of .08 ($p < .50$) with clothing importance.

A number of interrelated observations were made which may aid in the explanation of the substantially lower degree of association which existed between number of organizational memberships and clothing importance ($r = .08$, $p < .50$) than between clothing importance and number of officerships in voluntary organizations ($r = .27$, $p < .05$). We observed that the highest status individuals tended to avoid active officerships, whereas, those of slightly lower status seemed

to "pursue" officerships. We observed also that the individuals with the highest status ratings received medium, or even low clothing importance scores, while individuals with slightly lower status ratings tended to receive high clothing importance scores. In the light of these observations and findings, we decided that a lower degree of relationship between number of organizational memberships and clothing importance could be anticipated than that between number of officerships in voluntary organizations and clothing importance.

In conclusion, and with our perspective on the meaning of statistical significance in mind,[1] the hypothesis that those who demonstrate a greater degree of social participation will also demonstrate a higher degree of clothing importance, can be accepted.

---

[1]See supra, pp. 56-57.

CHAPTER VI

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In this thesis, we have attempted to explain differences in a clothing attitude--the importance of clothing--within a sociological frame of reference. More specifically, we have attempted to explain differences in personal estimates of clothing importance in terms of differences of positions in a scale of social stratification, and also in terms of two other aspects of stratification, differences in vertical social mobility, and differences in the degree of social participation.

Three focal hypotheses guided the study:

1) Personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to social status.
2) Personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to vertical social mobility.
3) Personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to social participation.

A Guttman type, unidimensional attitude scale was developed in order to measure the dependent variable, variations in personal estimates of clothing importance. A limitation of this type of scale, i.e., the possibility of

overlooking or losing pertinent qualitative sociological information was recognized.

The hypothesis that personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to social status was considered first. A modified version of Warner's Index of Status Characteristics was employed as an indicator of social status and correlated with the scores on the Guttman type clothing importance scale. Each component of the Index, occupational status, source of income, and house type along with two other conventional indices of status, amount of income and amount of education, were also correlated with scores on the clothing importance scale. The chi square test was employed to determine the statistical significance between clothing importance scores and a final indicator of status based upon Alba Edwards' Occupational Groups.

In our findings, all of the above indices of status demonstrated a positive relationship with the clothing importance scale. Occupational status and source of income showed the greatest degree of relationship with the clothing importance scale ($r = .32$, $p < .001$). The Index of Status Characteristics demonstrated a slightly lower degree of relationship with the clothing importance scale ($r = .25$, $p < .02$). The low degree of relationship between house type (believed to be the least reliable of all the indices of status employed) and the clothing importance scale

($r = .12$, $p < .30$) served to lower the over-all degree of relationship between the total Index and the clothing importance scale. Income demonstrated a .17 ($p < .20$) correlation with the clothing importance scale, occupational groups a T of .17 ($p < .20$), and grade completed an r of .12 ($p < .30$).

In the light of our empirical findings, and considering our perspective on the meaning of statistical significance, i.e., that small differences which are prevailingly in the same direction are of statistical consequence, the hypothesis that the degree of importance which a person places upon clothing will be related to that individual's social status was accepted.

One exception to this general hypothesis was evident. We observed that those in the medium-high status group had the greatest proportion of persons who had received high clothing importance scores, while clothing seemed to decrease in importance for those in the highest status categories. Several explanations for this phenomenon were offered:

1) The responses of individuals from the highest status levels were often based upon specific projected situations, i.e., parties, picnics, business meetings, etc., and consequently, were given medium, or even low ratings by the judges.

2) These high status individuals may have already attained their status goals, or more likely, may have inherited their high status positions. Therefore, clothing as a symbol of success or as a means to a higher status goal is of little consequence in the social life of these people. On the other hand, those individuals of slightly lower status may not have reached their status goals. These persons are probably anxious to sever ties with peers and establish new ties with superordinates. In order to be identified as a higher status member, it is necessary to manipulate and incorporate the symbols which differentiate this strata. In this respect, clothing is an important manipulative device which can be employed in impressing one's social worth upon others.

3) The mass production of clothing has probably decreased its value as a status symbol for persons of high status, and that more emphasis has been placed upon such symbols as birth, inheritance, and "culture" for communicating their status to others.

The second hypothesis, that personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to vertical social mobility, was then considered. Social mobility was defined in terms of a single dimension--occupational mobility. A chi square

test was employed to determine the statistical significance between occupational mobility and our prime indicator of status, the Index of Status Characteristics.

The over-all relationship between occupational mobility and the Index was positive and the variables demonstrated a T of .28 ($p < .01$). The hypothesis that those who have been upwardly mobile will demonstrate a higher degree of clothing importance than those who have either been non-mobile or downwardly mobile was corroborated.

The third hypothesis, that personal estimates of clothing importance will be related to social participation, was considered next. Four social participation factors--membership in associations, officerships in voluntary organizations, church attendance, and church activity--and their relationship to the clothing importance scale were examined.

In our findings, all of the social participation factors employed demonstrated a positive relationship with the clothing importance scale. Number of officerships in voluntary organizations exhibited the greatest degree of association with the clothing importance scale ($r = .27$, $p < .05$). Frequency of church attendance demonstrated a slightly lower degree of association with the clothing importance scale ($T = .22$, $p < .05$). Extent of church activity demonstrated a T of .20 ($p < .10$) with clothing importance, and number of organizational memberships exhibited a low r of .08 ($p < .50$).

We observed that there was a tendency for persons of very high status to avoid prominence in respect to community activity. On the other hand, the strivers, those with slightly less status seemed to "pursue" active officerships. We observed also that these medium-high status persons tended to receive high clothing importance scores, while those with the highest status ratings received medium or even low clothing importance scores. We decided, therefore, that a lower degree of relationship between number of organizational memberships and clothing importance could have been anticipated than that between number of officerships in voluntary organizations and clothing importance. The hypothesis, that those who demonstrate a greater degree of social participation will also demonstrate a higher degree of clothing importance, was accepted.

The three focal hypotheses mentioned above were treated individually to facilitate testing and presentation. They were not meant to be considered mutually independent, since we have demonstrated that both social participation and social mobility are related to social status and actually might be considered aspects of social status. Since the first hypothesis that personal estimates of clothing importance would be related to social status was corroborated, we might have anticipated the positive relationship of clothing importance to social mobility and social participation.

The fact that social mobility and social participation did demonstrate an empiric relationship to clothing importance reinforces the finding that clothing importance is positively related to social status.

LITERATURE CITED

LITERATURE CITED

Books

Anderson, D. and Davidson, P. E.
1943 Ballots and the Democratic Class Struggle, Palo Alto: Stanford University Press.

Bernard, L. L.
1926 An Introduction to Social Psychology, New York: Henry Holt and Company.

Bogardus, E. S.
1924 Fundamentals of Social Psychology, New York and London: The Century Company.

Chapin, F. Stuart
1947 Experimental Designs in Sociological Research, New York: Harper and Brothers.

Cooley, C. H.
1909 Social Organization, New York: C. Scribner and Sons.

Davis, A., Gardner, B. B., and Gardner, M. R.
1941 Deep South: A Social Anthropological Study of Caste and Class. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Dearborn, George Van Ness
1918 The Psychology of Clothes, Princeton, New Jersey and Lancaster, Pennsylvania: Psychological Review Company.

Edwards, Allen L.
1948 Statistical Analysis for Students in Psychology and Education, New York: Rinehart and Company.

Hagood, M. J. and Price
1952 Statistics for Sociologists, New York: Henry Holt and Company, Revised.

Linton, Ralph
1936 The Study of Man, New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.

Miller, D. C. and Form, W. H.
1951 Industrial Sociology, New York: Harper and Brothers.

Parsons, Talcott
1949 Essays in Sociological Theory Pure and Applied, Glencoe, Illinois: The Free Press.

Ross, E. A.
1929 Social Psychology, New York: The Macmillan Company.

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

Snedecor, George W.
1946 Statistical Methods: Applied to Experiments in Agriculture and Biology, Ames: Iowa State College Press, 4th ed.

Spencer, Herbert
1895 The Principles of Sociology, New York: D. Appleton and Company, Vol. II, Part IV "Ceremonial Institutions".

Stouffer, Samuel A., et al.
1949-50 Measurement and Prediction, Vol. IV of Studies in Social Psychology in World War II, ed. Frederick Osborn et al., 4 vols., Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Veblen, Thorstein
1934 The Theory of the Leisure Class, New York: The Modern Library, Inc.

Warner, W. Lloyd and Lunt, Paul S.
1941 The Social Life of a Modern Community, New Haven: Yale University Press.

_____
1942 The Status System of a Modern Community, New Haven, Yale University Press.

_____, Meeker, M., and Eells, L.
1949 Social Class In America, Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Warner, W. Lloyd and Associates
1949 Democracy in Jonesville, New York: Harper and Brothers.

Yule, G. Udny and Kendall, M. G.
1949 An Introduction to the Theory of Statistics, London: Charles Griffin and Company, Limited, thirteenth Ed. Revised.

Articles

Barber, B. and Lobel, L. S.
1952 "'Fashion' in Women's Clothes and the American Social System," Social Forces, Vol. XXXI, No. 6, December, 1952, pp. 124-131.

Barr, E. D.
1934 "A Psychological Analysis of Fashion Motivation," Archives of Psychology, Vol. XXVI, No. 171, June,

Dickins, Dorothy
1944 "Social Participation as a Criterion For Determining Scientific Minimum Standards in Clothing," Rural Sociology, Vol. IX, December, pp. 341-349.

Ellis, Evelyn
1952 "Social Psychological Correlates of Upward Social Mobility Among Unmarried Career Women," American Sociological Review, Vol. XVII, No. 5, October, pp. 558-563.

Festinger, Leon
1947 "The Treatment of Qualitative Data by Scale Analysis," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. XLIV

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

Goffman, Erving
1951 "Symbols of Class Status," British Journal of Sociology, Vol. II, December, pp. 294-304.

Gordon, Milton M.
1947 "Kitty Foyle and the Concept of Class as Culture," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LIII, November, pp. 210-217.

Guttman, Louis
1944 "A Basis for Scaling Qualitative Data," American Sociological Review, Vol. IX, pp. 139-150.

1944 "The Cornell Technique for Scale and Intensity Analysis," Educational and Psychological Measurement, Vol. XII, pp. 247-279

Hall, G. Stanley
1897-98 "Some Aspects of the Early Sense of Self," American Journal of Psychology, Vol. IX, pp. 351-395.

Hatt, Paul K.
1950 "Stratification in Mass Society," American Sociological Review, Vol. XV, April, 1950, pp. 216-227.

1950 "Occupation and Social Stratification," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. LV, No. 6, May.

Hurlock, Elizabeth B.
1929 "Motivation in Fashion," Archives of Psychology, No. 111.

North, C. C. and Hatt, P. K.
1949 "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," in L. Wilson and W. A. Kolb, Sociological Analysis, New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company.

Parsons, Talcott
1944 "An Analytical Approach to the Theory of Sociological Stratification," American Journal of Sociology Vol. XLV, No. 6, May, pp. 841-862.

Peters, Charles C.
1933-34 "Note on a Misconception of Statistical Significance," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. XXXIX, July-May, pp. 231-236.

Pfautz, H. W. and Duncan, O. D.
1950 "A Critical Evaluation of Warner's Work in Community Stratification," American Sociological Review, Vol. XV, April, pp. 205-215.

Sapir, E.
1937 "Fashion," Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences, Vol. V and VI combined, pp. 139-144.

Stone, G. P. and Form, W. H.
1953 "Instabilities in Status; The Problem of Hierarchy in the Community Study of Status Arrangements," American Sociological Review, Vol. XVIII, April, pp. 149-162.

Public Documents

Edwards, Alba M.
1937 Alphabetical Index of Occupations, Washington: United States Government Printing Office.

Unpublished Material

Rosencranz, Mary Lou
1948 "A Study of Interest in Clothing Among Selected Groups of Married and Unmarried Young Women," Unpublished Master's Thesis, Department of Textiles, Clothing, and Related Arts, Michigan State College.

Stone, Gregory P.
1953 "Clothing and Social Structure: A Study of Expressive Symbols in Community Life," Unpublished Manuscript, Department of Sociology and Anthropology, Michigan State College.

APPENDIX

TABLES REFERRED TO,
BUT NOT INCLUDED, IN TEXT

TABLE XIX

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN RATINGS ON THE INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS AND OCCUPATIONAL MOBILITY

Occupational Mobility	Ratings on the Index of Status Characteristics[a]							
	16 24	25 33	34 42	43 51	52 60	61 69	70 78	Totals
Upward Mobile	5	7	12	12	12	5	..	53
No Mobility	1	1	..	2	9	9	5	27
Downward Mobile	..	..	..	2	..	2	3	7
Totals	6	8	12	16	21	16	8	87[b]

$\chi^2 = 20.93$ $p < .001$ $T = .49$

[a] The second and third rows, and the first four columns and the last three columns were collapsed in the computation of the chi square.

[b] One individual's occupational history was incomplete.

TABLE XX

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN RATINGS ON THE INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS AND MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATIONS

Number of Organizational Memberships	Ratings on the Index of Status Characteristics							
	16 24	25 33	34 42	43 51	52 60	61 69	70 78	Totals
0	..	1	2	3	9	7	1	23
1	..	..	..	3	6	8	4	21
2	..	1	4	4	3	..	2	14
3	1	2	2	2	2	2	..	11
4	..	1	3	2	..	..	..	6
5	1	3	..	1	..	..	1	6
6	..	..	1	..	1	..	..	2
7	2	..	..	1	..	..	..	3
8	2	..	..	..	..	..	..	2
Totals	6	8	12	16	21	17	8	88
r = .59					p $\angle$ .001			

TABLE XXI

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN RATINGS ON THE INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS AND OFFICERSHIPS IN VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS

Number of Officerships	Ratings on the Index of Status Characteristics							Totals
	16 24	25 33	34 42	43 51	52 60	61 69	70 78	
0	4	4	4	7	10	11	6	46
1	1	1	4	3	2	..	..	11
2	1	2	1	2	..	..	1	7
3	..	..	1	1	..	..	..	2
Not a member*	..	1	2	3	9	6	1	22
Totals	6	8	12	16	21	17	8	88
r = .47				p < .001				

* This row was not included in the computation of the product-moment coefficient.

TABLE XXII

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN RATINGS ON THE INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS AND CHURCH ATTENDANCE

Church Attendance	Ratings on the Index of Status Characteristics[a]							
	16 24	25 33	34 42	43 51	52 60	61 69	70 78	Totals
None	1	2	6	6	12	13	5	45
Occasional	4	2	3	7	4	2	..	22
Regular	1	4	3	3	5	2	2	20
Totals	6	8	12	16	21	17	7	87[b]

$\chi^2 = 9.64$ $p < .01$ $T = .28$

[a] In the computation of the chi square, the first four columns and the last three columns were collapsed.

[b] One individual failed to respond to the church attendance item.

TABLE XXIII

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN RATINGS ON THE INDEX OF STATUS CHARACTERISTICS AND EXTENT OF CHURCH ACTIVITY

Extent of Church Activity	Ratings on the Index of Status Characteristics[a]							
	16 24	25 33	34 42	43 51	52 60	61 69	70 78	Totals
No Church Activity	..	..	4	5	10	11	5	35
Nominal Activity	5	4	4	8	6	4	..	31
Active	1	4	4	3	5	2	2	21
Totals	6	8	12	16	21	17	7	87[b]
$\chi^2 = 12.51$				$p < .01$				$T = .32$

[a] In the computation of the chi square, the first four columns and the last three columns were collapsed.

[b] One individual failed to respond to the church activity item.

TABLE XXIV

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AND SOURCE OF INCOME

Occupational Ratings	Ratings on Source of Income								
	2	2.5	3	3.5	4	4.5	5	5.5	Totals
1	1	3	1	2	..	..	..	..	7
2	2	..	3	2	3	..	..	..	10
3	2	..	2	..	4	..	..	..	8
4	1	..	3	1	10	..	5	..	20
5	..	..	..	1	5	1	16	..	23
6	..	..	..	..	1	..	10	..	11
7	..	..	..	..	1	..	6	2	9
Totals	6	3	9	6	24	1	37	2	88

$r = .76$ $p < .001$

TABLE XXV

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN OCCUPATIONAL STATUS AND AMOUNT OF INCOME

Occupational Ratings	Amount of Income						
	plus $10,000	$9,999 $5,000	$4,999 $3,000	$2,999 $2,000	$1,999 $1,000	$999 less	Totals
1	5	..	2	..	..	..	7
2	4	3	2	..	..	1	10
3	..	2	6	..	..	..	8
4	..	3	10	5	2	..	20
5	..	4	14	4	1	..	23
6	..	..	5	2	4	..	11
7	..	..	..	6	2	1	9
Totals	9	12	39	17	9	2	88

$r = .64$ $p < .001$

TABLE XXVI

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN SOURCE OF INCOME AND AMOUNT OF INCOME

Source of Income Ratings	Amount of Income						
	plus $10,000	$9,999 $5,000	$4,999 $3,000	$2,999 $2,000	$1,999 $1,000	$999 less	Totals
2	3	2	..	..	1	..	6
2.5	3	..	..	..	..	..	3
3	2	2	3	1	1	..	9
3.5	1	1	4	..	..	..	6
4	..	3	15	5	..	1	24
4.5	..	1	..	..	..	..	1
5	..	3	17	11	6	..	37
5.5	..	..	..	..	1	1	2
Totals	9	12	39	17	9	2	88

$r = .58$ $p < .001$