

STYLE SPEAKS: CLOTHING JUDGMENTS, GENDER
STEREOTYPES AND EXPECTANCY VIOLATIONS OF
PROFESSIONAL WOMEN

by:

JAMIE LOWER
M.A. University of Central Florida, 2018

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Nicholson School of Communication
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Spring Term
2018

Major Professor: Harry Weger

ABSTRACT

Clothing is a powerful nonverbal communicative tool and form of self-expression that provides others with clues about our personality, mood, education, culture, financial status, and social ranking, amongst numerous other impression cues. Research shows that physical appearance plays a prominent role in the formation of initial judgments and is significant in shaping a person's overall impression on others (Richmond, McCroskey, & Payne, 1991). The present study sought to quantitatively explore the effect that different styles of dress have on initial judgments formed about women in workplace settings. Using expectancy violation theory, the study investigates workplace gender bias and whether or not certain styles of women's dress garner different initial reactions. Results showed that models in feminine attire are perceived to be lower in ratings of dominance and expertise, and models in more masculine attire are perceived to be lower in ratings of kindness and friendliness.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES	iv
LIST OF TABLES	v
INTRODUCTION	1
LITERATURE REVIEW	3
Nonverbal Communication.....	3
Functions of Nonverbal Communication	4
Clothing as Nonverbal Communication	4
Clothing as a Social Marker	5
Clothing as an Extension of the Wearer’s Personality and Mood.....	6
Clothing as a Group Indicator	7
Clothing and First Impressions.....	8
Expectancy Violation Theory	10
Gendered Clothing.....	12
Functionality Versus Decoration in Gendered Clothing	12
Women’s Clothing as Violations of Expectations.....	15
Conclusion.....	16
HYPOTHESES	17
METHODOLOGY	18
Research Design and Procedure	18
Participants and Procedures	18
Dependent Variables	19
Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Social Dominance	19
Attractiveness, Likability, and Friendliness	20
Experimental Stimuli.....	20
RESULTS	22
Preliminary Analysis	22
Hypothesis Testing	24
DICUSSION	27
Limitations and Future Research.....	29
APPENDIX A: PHOTOS	31
Feminine Clothing Photos	32
Neutral Clothing Photos	33
Masculine Clothing Photos.....	33
APPENDIX B: SURVEY INSTRUMENT	34
Questionnaire.....	35
APPENDIX C: IRB HUMAN SUBJECTS PERMISSION	41
REFERENCES	43

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Feminine	15
Figure 2: Masculine	15

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Tests of Sex Differences in Dependent Variables	22
Table 2: Shapiro-Wilk Test of Normality	23
Table 3: Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances	24
Table 4: One-Way ANOVA Tests	25
Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for All Variables in the Analysis	26
Table 6: Contrast Analysis.....	26

INTRODUCTION

Physical appearance can reveal a great deal of information about an individual without one having any prior background knowledge of the person (Knapp, Hall, & Horgan, 2013). Impressions of personality traits, culture, social status, and mood are just a few of the qualities that people can infer from looking at someone. For these reasons, clothing is an important and influential factor in first impressions and initial judgments (Lennon, 1986). The area of research is in need of an updated investigation into the ways gender, clothing, and first impressions intersect for two reasons. First, fashion changes from decade-to-decade and year-to-year. Older studies may not be relevant now, as culturally accepted styles of female dress and representation may have changed. A more current study is also needed because societal views on gender stereotypes are shifting, creating new perspectives on the meanings and implications of female dress and women in the workplace.

The social climate of 2018 is significantly different from that of the 80's or 90's, which emphasizes the importance of a modern study. For instance, there is a growing acceptance of those not identifying with a binary gender or as straight (Steinmetz, 2017; Cummings, 2017). This may have implications on contemporary perceptions of traditionally feminine or masculine styles of dress, as the range of acceptance for what represents certain gender identities has become more relaxed. Moreover, there is an increasing casual nature in American style of dress (Peltz 2016; Clemente, 2017), which may also impact opinions on what is perceived as an acceptable representation of office-wear. For example, a formal business suit may no longer be the most recognized representation of professionally powerful dress, because fewer people are wearing them. In this study, I plan to examine people's impressions of personality traits of

women wearing more feminine or more masculine workplace clothing. I will review the relevant literature, describe my research methods and procedure, present the results of the experiments, and discuss the implications of the results and suggested future research. My study is distinct because it is a modern investigation conducted in a more gender fluid, non-conforming, and female empowered society than that of older research.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Nonverbal Communication

Nonverbal communication can be defined as, “all those nonverbal stimuli in a communication setting that are generated by both the source and his or her use of the environment and that have potential message value for the source and/or receiver” (Samovar, Porter, McDaniel, & Roy, p. 288, 2017). It allows for the sending and receiving of messages without the use of verbal or written language and can be intentional or unintentional. For example, a person can intentionally choose to stand in a “power stance”, sending a message of confidence and dominance in order to gain respect from others. On the other hand, a person might sweat when they are nervous, unintentionally sending a message of uneasiness to those around them. Body language is a commonly referenced subtype of nonverbal communication, as characteristics such as facial expressions and posture can send distinct and recognizable messages to others.

However, nonverbal communication is comprised of much more than body language. For instance, one’s physical appearance, position in a room, scent, and even distance when conversing with another person are all forms of nonverbal communication (Matsumoto, Frank, and Hwang, 2013). In addition, studies show that nonverbal communication can have an even larger impact on first impressions than verbal communication (Raines, Hechtman, & Rosenthal, 1990). Moreover, although nonverbal messages are mostly culturally determined, some, such as facial expressions of emotion, are to some extent universal in their displays (Ekman & Friesen, 1969; Tracy, Shariff, Zhao, & Henrich, 2013).

Functions of Nonverbal Communication

There are several different functions of nonverbal communication. Burgoon, Guerrero, and Floyd (2016), outline four functions of nonverbal communication as follows: “redundancy (duplicating the verbal message), substitution (replacing the verbal message), complementing (amplifying the verbal message) and contradiction (sending opposite messages of the meaning of the verbal message)” (p. 21). Through these functions, nonverbal communication can be a form of self-expression and identity. For example, a person can choose to wear their hair in a specific hairstyle in order to duplicate, replace, compliment, or ironically present their personality (Rapoport, 1982). In addition, nonverbal communication can be used to persuade or deceive people (Higdon, 2009). For instance, Higdon describes nonverbal cues that attorneys can utilize in court, such as a physical position in the courtroom, to persuade a judge and jury in their favor. Lastly, nonverbal communication can also be a message in and of itself, with no verbal communication necessary. For instance, a smile can be used to indicate joy or a frown to denote sadness or disappointment (Matsumoto, Frank, & Hwang, 2013).

Clothing as Nonverbal Communication

Of most interest to this study is clothing. Clothing communicates nonverbally by providing others with artifactual cues to a person’s personality, social status, and so forth (Damhorst, 1985). Styles of dress and artifactual cues have the ability to send a wide array of messages to others (Kaiser, 1985). As described by Damhorst (1990), “Underlying the present quest for form and pattern is the basic assumption that dress is a systematic means of transmission of information about the wearer” (p. 1). Johnson, Schofield, and Yurchisin (2002) add that information is conveyed from an individual’s style of dress and is translated by others into meanings, whether the wearer intended to send a message or not. What the wearer chooses

to display on their body consciously and subconsciously communicates to others how they want to be perceived. Through the perception of others, clothing also helps an individual solidify their sense of self (Knapp, Hall, & Horgan, 2013). Therefore, clothing also helps to develop and project a person's unique identity (Stone, 1962).

Studying clothing as communication is multifaceted because clothing has several different components in a single presentation. For example, color, texture, patterns, and silhouette have all individually been found to have an effect on the clothing message and its perception (Damhorst, 1990). Adding to the complexity, nonverbal communication is more ambiguous and open to interpretation than verbal communication. For this reason, the messages clothing sends are not always explicitly clear. Sometimes, they are challenging to decode due to the aesthetic, creative, and abstract nature of dress (Davis, 1985).

Clothing as a Social Marker

Clothing can send a wide variety of messages to those around us (Johnson, et al., 2002). First, scholars hold that clothing is a social marker and can convey where a person ranks in their culture, revealing clues about their income, class, power, and social ranking (Ruesche & Kees, 1982). Scholars interpret clothing as a way to differentiate oneself from other members of society and create class distinctions (Bourdieu, 1984). For example, certain assumptions may be made about a person wearing a tailored business suit versus a person wearing a tattered casual outfit. Lasswell and Parshall (1961) found that social class could be inferred from photographs based on the clothes the subjects were wearing. Compton explored the same topic, finding that there were relationships between clothing style preferences and occupational interests, implying a relationship between style of dress and social class (1962). A modern study on the consumer

market's growing desire for luxury goods supports the continued role of clothing as a status symbol and communicator of social ranking (Millan & Mittal, 2017). Due to clothing's role in social status identification, it can be used to deceive others into believing a person's social status is higher or lower than it really is. Through conspicuous consumption, people use clothing to intentionally influence people's opinions about their economic wealth (Corneo & Jeanne, 1997).

Formal dress is often associated with higher levels of intelligence, authority, and upper class social standing (Behling & Williams, 1999). In addition, numerous studies hold that formal and high status attire results in more successful compliance-gaining attempts (Bickman, 1971; Chaikin, Derlega, Yoder, & Phillips, 1974; Giles & Chavasse, 1975; Lambert, 1972). For instance, Bushman (1984) found that participants dressed as authority figures like fire fighters or security guards were able to easily gain compliance from their targets, compared to participants in less authoritative dress.

Clothing as an Extension of the Wearer's Personality and Mood

Moreover, clothing can communicate information about a person's personality traits and mood. As investigated by Aiken (1963) and detailed by Rosenfeld and Plax (2006),

Decoration in dress correlated positively with such traits as conformity, sociability, and non-intellectualism; comfort in dress correlated positively with self-control and extroversion; interest in dress correlated positively with compliance, stereotypic thinking, social conscientiousness, and insecurity; conformity in dress correlated positively with social conformity, restraint, and submissiveness; and, last, economy in dress was found to correlate positively with responsibility, alertness, efficiency, and precision. (p. 24)

Rosenfeld and Plax used Aiken's findings to create an instrument to determine personality differences in those who use clothing to communicate, and suggest that clothing is an extension of the psychological state of its wearer. This is echoed by the work of Fiore and De Long (1984), who found clothing as a cue in perception of personality to be statistically significant. Kwon's (1991) study on the influence of mood on the selection of clothing, as well as the research of Moody, Kingerman, and Sinha (2010), bolster the notion that there are strong relationships between mood, personality, and dress. Kwon found that, "females were more sensitive to different mood states than males and that this affected their choice of clothing" and "as compared to males, females' private self-consciousness and perceived moods, especially negative moods, affected their selection of clothing to a greater extent" (p. 41). Moody, Kingerman, and Sinha likewise found strong relationships existing between their participant's moods and clothing preferences.

Clothing as a Group Indicator

There is also a common theme in research on clothing that conceptualizes style of dress as an indicator of a wearer's membership, position, or identity in a cultural group. As stated by Hamilton (1987), "As a cultural sub-system, dress is a dynamic, interacting system, unbounded by time and space, that articulates directly with the larger cultural system in which dress operates" (p. 1). Bogatyrev's (1971) research set the foundation for this theme, in a seminal study that explored Moravian folk costumes and their correspondence with different groups in society. As reiterated by McCracken (1990), "Clothing reveals both the themes and the formal relationships which serve a culture as orienting ideas and the real or imagined basis according to which cultural categories are organized" (p. 59).

Modern scholars echo the connection between fashion and culture, highlighting the function of fashion in subculture groups (Crane & Boyone, 2006; Hebdige, 1995). Contemporary examples of subcultural groups defined by their style of dress are the “hipster”, “cosplay” and “prep” cultures. People use style of dress and physical appearance to communicate their membership within those groups. In addition, clothing is often cited as a key component in a person’s ethnic and racial group identity (Craig, 2003; Forney & Rabolt, 1986; Tarlo & Moors, 2014). For example, Kness (1983) found that different ethnic groups placed value on different items in their wardrobes, revealing a relationship between ethnic identities and clothing choice.

Group affiliation through dress can have both positive and negative impacts on individuals. Sometimes, harm can come to a person if they affiliate themselves through clothing and are associated with an outgroup. For example, a person at a sporting event wearing the opposing team’s jersey may be subject to negative consequences like that of a California man in 2011 who was physically threatened and beaten by an opposing team’s fans after they saw his rival jersey (Duke, 2011). Wearing clothing indicating one’s political group affiliation can also bring about positive or negative consequences, such as public shaming or being denied service. For instance, a reporter in 2017 wore a hat with a political slogan on it and recorded the responses he got from those around him, revealing largely negative reactions from those associated with different political groups (Eriksen, 2017).

Clothing and First Impressions

People often rely on stereotypes based on outer appearances to make initial assumptions about others. Research continually supports the notion that clothing, as a specific component of someone’s overall physical appearance, has an impact on first impressions (Burns & Lennon, 1993; Connor, Peters, Nagasawa, 1975; Lennon, 1986;). As described by Oliviola and Todorov

(2010), “We often form opinions about the characteristics of others from single, static samples of their appearance – the very first thing we see when, or even before, we meet them” (p. 315). Even minor changes in clothing appearance, like the tailoring, color, and cut of an outfit can impact a person’s first impression. For instance, Howelett, Pine, and Fletcher (2013) found that men were perceived as most trustworthy in a bespoke formal suit that was well-tailored and dark in color. Next, Fiore and Delong (1984) found that different personality assessments resulted from varying styles of sweaters. Additionally, an outfit that shows a lot of skin, such as a blouse with a low neckline or a short skirt may cause the wearer, especially if female, to be sexually objectified (Johnson, Lennon & Rudd, 2014). Outer appearance is so impactful in judgment formation that voters in political elections can be swayed by a candidate’s appearance (Olivola & Todorov, 2010), and a job candidate’s interview outfit may influence their chances of getting the position (Rucker, Taber & Harrison, 1981).

In addition, the literature also implies that physical appearance plays an even more important role in first impression formation and reputation for women than it does for men (Jackson, 1992). As Jackson notes, “The sociobiological perspective argues that physical appearance is more important for females than males because appearance is more strongly related to reproductive potential for females than for males” and “according to the sociocultural perspective, physical appearance is more important for females than for males because the culture values an attractive appearance more in females than in males” (p. 8). These perspectives are exemplified in the fact that male politicians are less likely to be criticized or judged for their appearance than female politicians in the media (Olivola & Todorov, 2010).

Expectancy Violation Theory

One theoretical approach to studying nonverbal communication and impression formation is expectancy violation theory. Expectancy violation theory is a theory of communication that examines and predicts how people react to unexpected violations of social norms and expectations (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). The theory initially revolved around personal space violations, and was called “nonverbal expectancy violation theory” (Burgoon & Jones, 1976), but as the theory progressed, other behaviors in addition to nonverbal behaviors were studied, changing the name to *expectancy violation theory* (Bachman & Guerrero, 2008).

Rooted in uncertainty reduction theory, “expectancy” refers to someone’s anticipation about the way in which someone should behave or something should happen, and a “violation” is a breach of that anticipation (Burgoon, 1978). Violations of expectancies cause arousal, which can either increase or decrease the individual’s attraction (Floyd & Voloudakis, 1999). The theory holds that positive violations produce favorable communication outcomes and negative violations produce less favorable communication outcomes (Burgoon & Hale, 1988). The communication outcomes are also mediated and influenced by the quality of the existing relationship with the individual and the individual’s elicited social status (Burgoon, 1983). When expectations are violated, they draw attention and illicit stronger judgments about the violator than if the person followed culturally prescribed norms. This is why people often do not notice how another person is dressed when the person is dressed in a way consistent with expectations.

Moreover, “expectancies” are made up of two components. As described by Burgoon and Hubbard (2005),

There are actually two different senses of “expected.” One reflects the regularity with which a behavioral pattern occurs, that is, its central tendency. Expectancy in this sense

refers to communicative acts that are modal (most typical) in a given culture or subculture. The other meaning of expectancy reflects the degree to which a behavior is regarded as appropriate, desired, or preferred. It refers to idealized standards of conduct rather than actual communicative practice. (p. 151)

In the context of the present study, clothing, as a form of nonverbal communication, has the ability to violate social norms and cultural expectancies both positively and negatively. Many people expect a female in an office setting to dress in ways deemed to be culturally appropriate and professional (Heathfield, 2017). If they are dressed in a way that is deemed culturally inappropriate, they are violating other people's cultural expectations negatively. By violating expectations negatively, they are influencing communicative outcomes and potentially impacting their relationships with their coworkers, professional reputations, and careers.

Another key component of expectancy violation theory is the communicator reward valence, which is an evaluation someone makes about the person who committed an expectancy violation (Griffin, 2012). During an encounter, a person will weigh the positives and negatives that an individual brings to their interaction from the perspective of the context of the interaction, the relationship with the other person, and the communicator factors. A person's reward value is influenced by these factors, which Burgoon and Hubbard further describe as, "physical attractiveness, task expertise and knowledge, socioeconomic status, giving positive or negative feedback, possession of appealing personal attributes, similarity to the perceiver, familiarity, and status equality with the perceiver" (Burgoon & Hubbard, 2005, p. 155). In the context of the present study, women in the workplace may have lower reward valence to begin with because of their perceived lower social status. A lower reward valence would mean that violations are

perceived even more negatively, narrowing the range of positive first impression inducing styles of dress.

Gendered Clothing

Clothing expectations for men and women are often based on enduring stereotypes. Historically, women are often expected to wear what is deemed traditionally feminine, while men are often expected to wear what is deemed traditionally masculine (Whisner, 1982). As explained by Eicher and Roach, “dress is both a repository of meanings regarding gender roles and a vehicle for perpetuating or rendering changes in gender roles” (Eicher & Roach, 1992, p. 12). Several scholars have researched and written about the way in which clothing establishes, reinforces, and communicates gender roles (Cordwell, 1979; Hamilton & Hamilton, 1989; Schwarz, 1979). While nontraditional and nonconforming gender roles and representations are gaining awareness and acceptance, there is still evidence that the media largely portrays women in stereotypically feminine styles of dress and conforming gender roles (Browne, 1998; Linder, 2004).

Functionality Versus Decoration in Gendered Clothing

Historically, female clothing has been designed to be more decorative than functional (Presley, 1998; Burman & Denbo, 2006). This concept is rooted in time periods when women did not work, and the purpose of their dress was to appeal to men. Modern popular female fashion is also driven by design rather than practicality, and the focus is often on making the wearer appear more attractive, rather than serving a purpose or feeling comfortable. This can be exemplified in the absence of pockets or inclusion of “fake pockets” in women’s clothing (Summers, 2016). Historically, pockets were absent from women’s clothing because their

husbands were expected to carry money and belongings. During World War II, when women re-entered the workforce while men were on the front lines, pockets reemerged in female fashion. After World War II, pockets began to disappear again as women returned to representations of traditional femininity (Victoria and Albert Museum, 2014). In contemporary times, as detailed by Basu (2014), “Women's slacks, dresses, and blazers often have “fake” pockets that serve no utilitarian purpose besides sartorially leading the wearer on” (para. 10). Another example of non-functional female clothing is the high-heeled shoe. High-heeled shoes are not practical and often painful, but they are associated with femininity and sensuality, and can increase perceptions of female attractiveness (Guéguen, 2015). As stated by Morris, White, Morrison and Fisher (2013), women might wear them to attract men because “high heels exaggerate sex specific aspects of female gait” (p. 176).

Gender Stereotypes in the Workplace

Gender stereotypes have long been attributed to women’s setbacks in the workplace. According to Heilman and Parks (2007), gender stereotypes are an obstacle in women’s career progress due to organizational conditions that promote sex biases and create norms that when not followed, induce punishments for women. Stereotypical expectations for women can “result in devaluation of their performance, denial of credit to them for their successes, or their penalization for being competent” (Heilman, 2001, p. 657). For example, violating the stereotypical expectation that women remain agreeable and soft-spoken in the workplace may result in negative outcomes. These biases are reinforced by the fact that leadership has historically been male dominated in all sectors of society, and elite female leadership continues to be sparse in comparison (Geiger & Kent, 2017; Ignatius, 2014)

Workplace gender discrimination towards women can occur when female gender stereotypes are mismatched with work roles. Gender stereotypes stem from perceived notions of traditional femininity and masculinity. As detailed by Kachel, Steffens and Niedlich (2016), “We define ‘traditional masculinity’ and ‘traditional femininity’ as relatively enduring characteristics encompassing traits, appearances, interests, and behaviors that have traditionally been considered relatively more typical of women and men, respectively” (p. 7). Eagly and Karau (2002) detail this mismatch of gender roles in their role of incongruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. They note that the perception of incongruity between female gender roles and professional leadership roles can lead to prejudice. In addition, research shows that stereotypical female personality attributes, such as kindness and gentleness are inconsistent with attributes believed to be required for successful leadership positions. Leadership roles are instead associated with masculine attributes (Schein, 2001). Although female leadership and management in the workplace has increased over the years, research still shows that a good manager is perceived as traditionally masculine (Gupta, Turban, Wasti & Sikdar, 2009).

Research by Craik (2003), Bolich (2007), Eicher and Roach (1992), Davis (1994), Forsyth (1987) and Paolettit (2013) who detail colors, textures, styles, and fits that are associated with femininity and masculinity, was used to conceptualize feminine and masculine styles of women’s workplace clothing for the present study. Traditionally feminine outfits incorporate some of the following elements: dresses, skirts, high heels, light colors, busy patterns, form fitting cuts, exposed skin, soft fabric, ruffles, and lace. See Figure 1 as an example. Figure 2 depicts traditionally masculine outfits which often incorporate long trousers, flat shoes, neutral or dark colors, thick fabrics, ties, suit jackets, simple patterns, and looser, boxier cuts.



Figure 1: Feminine



Figure 2: Masculine

Women's Clothing as Violations of Expectations

Social stereotypes in the workplace and cultural expectations for female dress potentially put women in a no-win situation in the organizational setting. The expectation for leadership in

an organization is associated with masculine cultural norms, so women dressed in masculine clothing should be rated more highly in masculine leadership qualities such as dominance and credibility. However, masculine clothing violates cultural norms for women that create the expectation that women portray more feminine virtues of friendliness, attractiveness, and likeability. Therefore, I predict that when women violate the masculine norm of organizational leadership by wearing feminine clothing, they will be rated as less dominant, credible, and trustworthy. My second prediction is that women who violate the femininity norm by wearing more masculine clothing will be rated as less friendly, attractive, and likable.

Conclusion

The current research presents a paradox, because traditionally feminine clothing violates organizational norms, leading women to be perceived as weak and submissive, but traditionally masculine clothing violates cultural norms, also leading negative first impressions. It would seem that women who desire to succeed and rise to leadership roles are unable to have it all; they can either be powerful or liked, dominant or friendly. Because the literature suggests that physical appearance plays such a prominent role in first impression formation, understanding this phenomenon is crucial for women learning to navigate the workplace. Through my research, I hope to unpack some of these difficulties, look at them through the lens of our modern social climate, and discuss the future of fair and equal treatment of women in the workplace, regardless of their choice of dress.

HYPOTHESES

H1: Participants will perceive women in the most traditionally feminine clothing to be lower in expertise, trustworthiness, and dominance than women in the most traditionally masculine clothing.

H2: Participants will perceive women in the most traditionally masculine clothing to be lower in attractiveness, likability, and friendliness than women in the most traditionally feminine clothing.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design and Procedure

Participants and Procedures

Participants in the United States were contacted for this study. The link to the survey was posted to Facebook and LinkedIn pages by the author and the research advisor. Participants were also gathered through the use of Amazon's Mechanical Turk (Mturk) who were paid 50 cents to complete the survey. The Mturk participants were required to be "masters" (e.g., experienced and reliable workers) and to have a LinkedIn profile. Then, an online survey was conducted with university-licensed survey tool Qualtrics (See Appendix B). Once participants accessed the survey, they were asked to read and acknowledge the informed consent prior to completing the survey. The participants filled out demographics information regarding sex, race, and age. Out of the 18 feminine, masculine, and neutral outfit photo examples chosen from the pilot survey, the participants were randomly assigned to view only one photo. The participants saw the photo of a female model in an outfit and were then asked to rate their perceptions of attributes of the model based on their first impression of her in the photo. This created a sample of 162 participants. 56 participants identified as male and 105 identified as female. 63.2% of participants identified as White, 8% as Black or African American, 2.5% as American Indian or Alaska Native, 14.4% as Asian, .5% as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, 7% as Hispanic or Latino, 1.5% as Caribbean Islander, and 3% as Other. 20.9% of participants were between 18-24 years old, 40.3% between 25-34 years old, 13.4% between 35-44 years old, 11% between 45-54 years of, 11% between 55-64 years, 1% between 65-74 years, and 2.5% 75 years or older.

Dependent Variables

Participants' perceptions of the model's expertise, trustworthiness, social dominance, attractiveness, likability, and friendliness served as the dependent variables. The participants were asked to rate their perceptions of six attributes of the model after viewing the outfit photo. The first three attributes were perceived expertise ($\alpha = .95$), trustworthiness ($\alpha = .95$), and social dominance ($\alpha = .95$). These attributes were chosen because they are associated with masculinity, leadership, and good management (Gupta, Turban, Wasti & Sikdar, 2009; Powell, Butterfield & Parent, 2002; Schein, 2001). The next three attributes were attractiveness ($\alpha = .80$), likability ($\alpha = .90$), and friendliness ($\alpha = .89$). These were chosen because they represent attributes traditionally associated with femininity (Thomas, 2001; Vetterling-Braggin, 1982; Worrell, 2001).

Expertise, Trustworthiness, and Social Dominance

To measure expertise, I used a scale adapted from Ohanian's (1990) measure of perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness of celebrities. The methodology of Ohanian's study was similar to this study in that Ohanian had participants rating photos of celebrities. This measure includes five semantic differential items, with sample items including "*qualified-unqualified*". The items were rated on a 7-point scale. To measure trustworthiness, I also used the scale adapted from Ohanian (1990). This measure includes five semantic differential items, such as "*dependable-undependable*". The items were rated on a 7-point scale. Lastly, perceived social dominance was evaluated with a scale adapted from Bryan's physical, social, and financial dominance scale (2011). This measure includes 15 semantic differential items, such as "*passive-assertive*". These items were rated on a 7-point scale.

Attractiveness, Likability, and Friendliness

To measure attractiveness, I used the scale from Ohanian (1990). This measure includes five semantic differential items, such as “*beautiful-ugly*”. The items were rated on a 7-point scale. Next, perceived likability was evaluated using the Reysen likability scale (Reysen, 2005). The Reysen likability scale measures the perceived likability of a target individual and can be applied to numerous research settings. This measure includes 11 statements, such as “*this person is warm*”. The items were rated on 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Lastly, perceived friendliness was evaluated using the perceived friendliness scale from Dovidio et al. (2002). Dovidio was interested in assessing perceived friendliness based off of physical appearance inferences, which is similar to the objective of my research. This measure includes five items, such as “*This person is pleasant*” and the items were rated on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree.

Experimental Stimuli

Photographs of women wearing traditionally masculine, feminine, or more neutral clothing served as the independent variable in the analysis. The photographs were selected from the Macys.com clothes shopping website. A search for women’s work attire was conducted to find photographs of women wearing clothing appropriate for the workplace. From the photographs on the website, 8 outfits were selected that represented for each category (feminine, masculine, and neutral). In order to both narrow down the total number of photograph stimuli and to ensure that the stimuli were indeed perceived as feminine, masculine, or neutral, a manipulation check was conducted.

Manipulation Check

The manipulation check included 121 of the total 162 participants who were solicited through Mturk and were paid 50 cents to participate. An online survey was conducted with university-licensed survey tool Qualtrics (See Appendix B). The participants filled out demographics information regarding sex, race, and age. Participants saw (order was randomized) all 24 feminine, masculine, and neutral outfit photo examples and were then asked to rate their perceptions of the masculinity and femininity of each photo on a 7 point scale (“not feminine at all” to “very feminine” and “not masculine at all” to “very masculine”). The overall masculinity scale was used to rank order the photographs. The 8 photographs originally classified as least masculine all scored in the bottom 8 of the ranking while the opposite was true of the 8 photographs originally classified as the most masculine. All of the neutral classified photos were in between. Ranking photographs on the femininity scores produced a mirror image with all feminine outfits scoring the highest and all masculine outfits scoring the lowest. The six photographs with the highest masculinity scores, the lowest masculinity scores, and the six photographs around the median score were retained for the main analysis (See Appendix A for photographs). A repeated measures ANOVA comparing the most, least, and neutral masculinity scores indicate the three groups differ significantly, $F(2,242)=286.52, p<.001, h^2=.70$. Follow up within-subjects contrasts indicated most feminine outfits are less masculine than the neutral outfits, $F(1,121)=211.80, p<.001, h^2=.64$, and the neutral outfits were less masculine than the photographs in the most masculine group, $F(1,121)=327.02, p<.001, h^2=.73$. The pilot study indicated that the experimental stimuli were correctly classified as being perceived as more masculine, less masculine, or neutral.

RESULTS

Preliminary Analysis

Before commencing hypothesis testing, differences between males and females in perceptions of expertise, trustworthiness, dominance, attractiveness, likeability, and friendliness were tested. There were no differences between male and female participants in their perceptions of the models' traits (See Table 1).

Table 1: Tests of Sex Differences in Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	Sex	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Expertise	Male	65	25.15	6.45	0.01	.99
	Female	110	25.16	6.61		
Trustworthiness	Male	65	26.50	5.46	1.26	.210
	Female	109	25.33	6.17		
Dominance	Male	65	73.43	15.13	0.38	.69
	Female	108	72.40	17.76		
Attractiveness	Male	65	26.52	5.54	0.92	.361
	Female	108	25.74	5.89		
Likability	Male	65	56.30	10.49	0.62	.534
	Female	108	55.22	11.43		
Friendliness	Male	65	26.15	5.78	1.28	.201
	Female	107	24.94	6.11		

The first hypothesis predicted that participants would perceive women in the most traditionally feminine clothing to be lower in expertise, trustworthiness, and dominance than women in the most traditionally masculine clothing. Starting with perceived expertise, a one-way ANOVA was conducted to determine if the mean ratings of the dependent variables differed based on the condition of femininity or masculinity of the clothing on the model. Random assignment of individuals to groups helped ensure that the assumption of independence was met. The assumption of normality was tested via examination of the residuals. Review of the Shapiro

Wilk (see Table 2) test for normality suggested a few violations of normality; however, the ANOVA is considered a robust test against the normality assumption and tolerates violations. According to Levene's test, the homogeneity of variance assumption was satisfied for each dependent variable but dominance and likability (see Table 3), and this was taken into account when reporting further test statistics by reporting results for tests not assuming normality. The means and standard deviations of the attribute ratings can be found in Table 5.

Table 2: Shapiro-Wilk Test of Normality

Residual Dependent Variable	Condition	Statistic	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Expertise	Feminine	.960	51	.086
	Neutral	.962	56	.075
	Masculine	.931	52	.005
Trustworthiness	Feminine	.956	51	.058
	Neutral	.938	56	.007
	Masculine	.953	52	.040
Dominance	Feminine	.947	51	.023
	Neutral	.970	56	.178
	Masculine	.980	52	.537
Attractiveness	Feminine	.938	51	.010
	Neutral	.960	56	.061
	Masculine	.958	52	.064
Likability	Feminine	.933	51	.007
	Neutral	.970	56	.178
	Masculine	.973	52	.283
Friendliness	Feminine	.922	51	.002
	Neutral	.968	56	.141
	Masculine	.969	52	.200

Table 3: Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dependent Variable	<i>F</i>	df1	df2	<i>p</i>
Expertise	1.341	2	156	.265
Trustworthiness	.079	2	156	.924
Dominance	4.196	2	156	.017
Attractiveness	2.456	2	156	.089
Likability	4.636	2	156	.011
Friendliness	1.192	2	156	.306

Hypothesis Testing

From Table 4, we see that the one-way ANOVA for expertise was statistically significant, $F(2, 156) = 5.178, p = .007$ and the effect size was medium ($\eta^2 = .062$). The one-way ANOVA for trustworthiness was not statistically significant, $F(2, 156) = 1.319, p = .270$, and the effect size was small ($\eta^2 = .017$). The one-way ANOVA for dominance was statistically significant $F(2, 156) = 4.291, p = .015$ and the effect size was small ($\eta^2 = .052$). To further probe the test for Hypothesis 1, a contrast analysis was computed (see Table 6) to determine whether the most feminine attire would be perceived lower in dominance, trustworthiness, and expertise than the most masculine attire. Contrast analyses indicated that the models in the more feminine attire were perceived lower in dominance $t(95.979) = 2.159, p = .033$ and expertise $t(158) = 2.971, p = .003$ than the models in the more masculine attire. Therefore, H1 was partially supported.

The second hypothesis predicted that participants would perceive women in the most traditionally masculine attire to be lower in attractiveness, likability, and friendliness than the women in the most traditionally feminine attire. The one-way ANOVA for attractiveness was statistically significant $F(2, 156) = 3.167, p = .045$ and the effect size was small ($\eta^2 = .039$). The one-way ANOVA for likability was statistically significant $F(2, 156) = 3.671, p = .045$ and the

effect size was small ($\eta^2 = .045$). The one-way ANOVA for friendliness was statistically significant $F(2, 156) = 3.400, p = .042$ and the effect size was small ($\eta^2 = .042$). To further probe the test for hypothesis 2, a contrast analysis was computed to determine whether the models in the most masculine attire would be perceived to be lower in attractiveness, likability, and friendliness. Contrasted analyses indicated that the models in the more masculine attire were indeed perceived lower in likability $t(94.470) = -2.169, p = .033$ and friendliness $t(156) = -2.493, p = .014$ than the models in the more feminine attire. Therefore, H2 was partially supported.

Table 4: One-Way ANOVA Tests

Dependent Variable	Df Numerator	df Denominator	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η^2
Expertise	2	155	5.178	.007	.062
Trustworthiness	2	155	1.319	.270	.017
Dominance	2	155	4.291	.015	.052
Attractiveness	2	155	3.167	.045	.039
Likability	2	155	3.671	.028	.045
Friendliness	2	155	3.400	.036	.042

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics for All Variables in the Analysis

Dependent Variable	Condition	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Expertise	Feminine	22.7255	7.11921	51
	Neutral	25.8571	5.96178	56
	Masculine	26.5000	6.62881	52
	Total	25.0629	6.72769	159
Trustworthiness	Feminine	25.2157	6.31289	51
	Neutral	26.8036	5.97699	56
	Masculine	25.1538	6.34123	52
	Total	25.7547	6.21525	159
Dominance	Feminine	67.6863	19.23693	51
	Neutral	76.5714	15.04642	56
	Masculine	75.1346	15.55134	52
	Total	73.2516	17.00148	159
Attractiveness	Feminine	25.7647	6.77817	51
	Neutral	27.3929	5.02604	56
	Masculine	24.5385	5.90600	52
	Total	25.9371	5.99967	159
Likability	Feminine	57.5294	13.45712	51
	Neutral	57.3750	9.10257	56
	Masculine	52.3654	10.49188	52
	Total	55.7862	11.28759	159
Friendliness	Feminine	26.6078	6.34690	51
	Neutral	25.8750	5.46747	56
	Masculine	23.6346	6.34631	52
	Total	25.3774	6.14248	159

Table 6: Contrast Analysis

Dependent Variable	df	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Expertise	158	2.971	.003
Trustworthiness	157	0.032	.975
Dominance	95.979	2.159	.033
Attractiveness	156	-1.051	.295
Likability	94.470	-2.169	.033
Friendliness	156	-2.493	.014

Note. Contrast weights for all tests are as follows: Feminine attire condition = -1; Neutral attire = 0; Masculine attire = 1

DICUSSION

With regard to the first hypothesis, participants rated models in the most feminine attire lower in dominance and expertise. This result supports previous literature on gendered clothing and gender bias in the workplace. Since dominance and expertise are traits associated with masculinity, people tend to be less likely to perceive women in feminine work attire as possessing these traits. Existing sexism and social bias regarding women in the workplace may have contributed to low ratings of dominance and expertise. As detailed in the literature and exemplified throughout history, men and women are not always treated equally or given the same respect in professional settings. The overtly feminine clothing draws attention to and highlights differences in the sexes, which may have strengthened perceptions of inequality, further adding to the lower ratings of these traits. The first hypothesis also predicted that participants would rate models in the most feminine attire lower in trustworthiness as well, but this was not supported. Trustworthiness may not be as strongly associated with masculinity as the other two traits. In addition, trustworthiness may not be as easy to garner from a first impression based on a person's clothing as the other two traits. There is little previous research on the trait of trustworthiness and first impressions based on dress, so to expand the understanding of this trait, more research is needed.

My second hypothesis was also partially supported. The models in the more masculine attire were rated lower in likability and friendliness. The literature on expectancy violations supports this finding. Overtly masculine dress on a woman may have negatively violated participant's social expectancies. Seeing a woman in a masculine pantsuit, rather than more socially accepted feminine attire may have led participants to rate the models lower in the

feminine traits of likability and friendliness. The literature on gendered traits also supports this finding, because it suggests that there is a dichotomy amongst traits of power. A person associated with dominance and power, like a woman in a masculine pantsuit, is therefore unassociated with softer, feminine traits like likability and friendliness.

The results of this study present a paradox for modern professional women. They suggest that women and their clothing can either be perceived as powerful but unlikable, or weak but pleasant. Feminine clothing on women may not cause negative cultural expectancy violations, but it may cause negative organizational expectancy violations when that woman is in a position of power. On the opposite end of the spectrum, masculine clothing on women is associated with leadership traits, but may negatively violate cultural expectancies, leading to adverse impressions on other traits. Because the literature implies that physical appearance plays an even more important role in first impression formation and reputation for women than it does for men, the position women are in is even more difficult. The question is then raised: is there hope for women who aren't willing to compromise their personal style for their reputations and positions of power? With feminism being a worldwide societal and cultural topic of conversation and issues like female empowerment and gender equality becoming more mainstream and actively championed, the future may be brighter. Although the literature indicates that physical appearances will likely always play a role in first impression formation, should the conversation about gender equality continue, people might not assign the same meanings to clothing during first impressions as they do now. In addition, even though the study suggests that traditional gender stereotypes largely still exist, the growing acceptance, awareness, and activism for those not identifying with binary genders or breaking conventional gender or sexuality norms also suggests a shift away from a rigid and traditionally gendered culture. This could mean a more

relaxed view and interpretation of clothing in regards to its impact on a woman's abilities and qualifications in the workplace and beyond.

Limitations and Future Research

The study contained a few limitations, the foremost being the representativeness of the sample. First, only 56 out of the sample size of 162 participants identified as male. Because men, women, and other gender identities may react differently to different styles of clothing, the study results may not be fully generalizable to the entire population. In addition, the sample was made up of predominately white participants. The lack of racial diversity in my sample also hinders the study's generalizability. Moreover, the heads of the models in the photos were obscured, so that the participant would only focus on the clothing she was wearing. This may have dehumanized the model, making it more difficult for participants to rate her on personality traits if they could not envision her as a real person.

Future research might seek to explore other variables that impact a person's first impression on someone in connection to their clothing. For instance, all of the models presented in this study were of the same race (white) and body type (tall and thin). These factors were controlled so that participants would judge only the model's clothing. However, it would be interesting in future research to use models of a different background and body type. Participants might interpret clothing differently on other representations of women. Another idea for future research would be to repeat a similar study with participants in different cities within the United States. Cultural meanings assigned to clothing differ based on the culture of the city the participants are located in. Next, it would be worth exploring further to what extent the gender of the participant themselves impacts the ratings of the model. The literature indicates that men and women are attracted to different qualities in a person's physical makeup. Men and women also

bring different viewpoints and biases to physical judgments of women, making this topic a worthy point of inquiry. Had my sample included more participants identifying as male, I would have explored this further. Finally, manipulating other physical attributes that make up a women's sense of style, such as hair or makeup, would also be a useful contribution to this topic of study.

APPENDIX A: PHOTOS

Feminine Clothing Photos



Neutral Clothing Photos



Masculine Clothing Photos



APPENDIX B: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Questionnaire

1. Thinking about photo you just saw, please rate your impression of the person in the photo.

Click the circle between the pair of words that best represents your impression. Numbers 1 or 7 indicate very strong feelings, 2 or 6 indicate strong feelings, 3 or 5 indicate weak feelings, and 4 indicates a neutral impression.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Expert	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Not an expert
Experienced	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Inexperienced
Knowledgeable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Unknowledgeable
Qualified	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Unqualified
Skilled	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Unskilled

2. Thinking about photo you just saw, please rate your impression of the person in the photo.

Click the circle between the pair of words that best represents your impression. Numbers 1 or 7 indicate very strong feelings, 2 or 6 indicate strong feelings, 3 or 5 indicate weak feelings, and 4 indicates a neutral impression.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Dependable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Undependable
Honest	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Dishonest
Reliable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Unreliable
Sincere	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Insincere
Trustworthy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Untrustworthy

3. Thinking about photo you just saw, please rate your impression of the person in the photo.

Click the circle between the pair of words that best represents your impression. Numbers 1 or 7 indicate very strong feelings, 2 or 6 indicate strong feelings, 3 or 5 indicate weak feelings, and 4 indicates a neutral impression.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not powerful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Powerful
Submissive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Dominant
Doesn't tend to take charge	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Tends to take charge
Follower	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Leader
Passive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Assertive
Boring	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Exciting
Not Intelligent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Intelligent
Not respected by others	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Respected by others
Introverted	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Extroverted
Not confident	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Confident
Weak-willed	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Strong-willed
Voices conflict	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Faces conflict

Low social status	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	High social status
Cooperative	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Competitive
Politically weak	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Politically powerful

4. Thinking about photo you just saw, please rate your impression of the person in the photo.

Click the circle between the pair of words that best represents your impression. Numbers 1 or 7 indicate very strong feelings, 2 or 6 indicate strong feelings, 3 or 5 indicate weak feelings, and 4 indicates a neutral impression.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Attractive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Unattractive
Classy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Not classy
Beautiful	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Ugly
Elegant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Plain
Sexy	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	Not sexy

5. Thinking about photo you just saw, please rate your impression of the person in the photo on the following attributes by indicating your level of agreement with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
This person is friendly	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This person is likable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This person is warm	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This person is approachable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would ask this person for advice	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would like this person as a coworker	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would like this person as a roommate	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I make my own shoes and clothing.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
I would like to be friends with this person	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This person is physically attractive	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This person is similar to me	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

This person is knowledgeable

6. Thinking about photo you just saw, please rate your impression of the person in the photo by indicating your level of agreement with each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Somewhat agree	Agree	Strongly agree
This person is pleasant	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This person is cruel	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This person is unfriendly	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This person is unlikable	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
This person is cold	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

APPENDIX C: IRB HUMAN SUBJECTS PERMISSION



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
 Office of Research & Commercialization
 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
 Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
 Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Determination of Exempt Human Research

From: UCF Institutional Review Board #1
 FWA00000351, IRB00001138
 To: Jamie M. Lower
 Date: November 27, 2017

Dear Researcher:

On 11/27/2017, the IRB reviewed the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination
 Project Title: STYLE SPEAKS: CLOTHING JUDGEMENTS, GENDER STEREOTYPES AND EXPECTANCY VIOLATIONS OF WORKING WOMEN
 Investigator: Jamie M. Lower
 IRB Number: SBE-17-13557
 Funding Agency:
 Grant Title:
 Research ID: n/a

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in IRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the [Investigator Manual](#).

This letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Kamille Chaparro on 11/27/2017 05:22:16 PM EST

Designated Reviewer

REFERENCES

- Aiken Jr., L. R. (1963). The relationship of dress to selected measures of personality in undergraduate women. *Journal Of Social Psychology, 59(1)*, 119-128.
- Bachman, G., & Guerrero, L. (2008). Relational quality and communicative responses following hurtful events in dating relationships: An expectancy violations analysis. *Journal Of Social And Personal Relationships, 23(6)*, 943-963.
- Basu, T. (2014, September 30). *The Gender Politics of Pockets*. Retrieved November 08, 2017, from <https://www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2014/09/the-gender-politics-of-pockets/380935/>
- Behling, D. U., & Williams, E. A. (1991). Influence of dress on perception of intelligence and expectations of scholastic achievement. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal, 9(4)*, 1-7.
- Bickman, L. (1971). The effect of social status on the honesty of others. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 85(1)*, 87-92.
- Bogatyrev, Petr (1971), *The functions of folk costume in Moravian Slovakia*, (translated by Richard G. Crum), The Hague: Mouton.
- Bolich, G. G. (2007). *Conversing on Gender*. Gardners Books. p. 315. ISBN 0615156703.
- Bourdieu, P., 1984. *Distinction: A social critique of the judgment of taste*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA
- Brooks, J. (2017, May 02). *A New Generation Overthrows Gender*. Retrieved November 08, 2017, from <https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2017/05/02/526067768/a-new-generation-overthrows-gende>

- Browne, B. A. (1998). Gender stereotypes in advertising on children's television in the 1990s: A cross-national analysis. *Journal of advertising*, 27(1), 83-96.
- Bryan, A. D., Webster, G. D., & Mahaffey, A. L. (2011). The big, the rich, and the powerful: Physical, financial, and social dimensions of dominance in mating and attraction. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, (3), 365.
- Burgoon, J. K. (1978). A communicating model of personal space violations: Explication and an initial test. *Human Communication Research*, 4(2), 129. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.1978.tb00603.x
- Burgoon, J. K., & Hale, J. L. (1988). Nonverbal expectancy violations: Model elaboration and application to immediacy behaviors. *Communication Monographs*, 55(1), 58.
- Burgoon, J. K., & Hubbard, A. E. (2005). Cross-cultural and intercultural applications of expectancy violations theory and interaction adaptation theory. *Theorizing about intercultural communication*, 149-171.
- Burgoon, J. K., & Jones, S. B. (1976). Toward a theory of personal space expectations and their violations. *Human Communication Research*, 2(2), 131. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2958.1976.tb00706.x
- Burgoon, J. K., Guerrero, L. K., & Floyd, K. (2016). *Nonverbal communication*. [electronic resource]. London: Routledge, 2016.
- Burgoon, J.K. (1983). "Nonverbal Violations of Expectations". In J.M. Wiemann & R.R. Harrison. *Nonverbal Interaction*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. pp. 11–77.
- Burman, B., & Denbo, S. (2006). *Pockets of history: the secret life of an everyday object*. Bath: Museum of Costume in association with the Arts and Humanities Research Council and the University of Southampton.

- Burns, L. D., & Lennon, S. J. (1993). Effect of clothing on the use of person information categories in first impressions. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 12(1), 9-15.
- Bushman, B. J. (1984). Perceived symbols of authority and their influence on compliance. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 14(6), 501-508.
- Chaikin, A. L., Derlega, V. J., Yoder, J., & Phillips, D. (1974). The effects of appearance on compliance. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 92(2), 199-200.
- Clemente, D. (2017, May 22). *Why American workers now dress so casually*. Retrieved November 08, 2017, from <https://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2017/05/history-of-business-casual/526014/>
- Compton, N. H. (1962). Personal attributes of color and design preferences in clothing fabrics. *The Journal of Psychology*, 54(1), 191-195.
- Conner, B. H., Peters, K., & Nagasawa, R. H. (1975). Person and costume: Effects on the formation of first impressions. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 4(1), 32-41.
- Cordwell, J. M. (1979). The very human arts of transformation. *The Fabrics of Culture* (47-75), The Hague, Paris, New York: Mouton.
- Corneo, G., & Jeanne, O. (1997). Conspicuous consumption, snobbism and conformism. *The Journal Of Public Economics*, (1), 55.
- Craik, J. (2003). *The face of fashion: Cultural studies in fashion*. Routledge.
- Craik, J. (2003). *The face of fashion: Cultural studies in fashion*. Routledge.
- Crane, D., & Bovone, L. (2006). Approaches to material culture: The sociology of fashion and clothing. *Poetics*, 34, 319-333. doi:10.1016/j.poetic.2006.10.002

- Cummings, W. (2017, June 27). *When asked their sex, some are going with option 'X'*. Retrieved November 08, 2017, from <https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/2017/06/21/third-gender-option-non-binary/359260001/>
- Damhorst, M. L. (1985). Meanings of clothing cues in social context. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 3(2), 39-48.
- Damhorst, M. L. (1990). In search of a common thread: Classification of information communicated through dress. *Clothing & Textiles Research Journal*, 8(2), 1-12.
doi:10.1177/0887302X9000800201
- Davis, F. (1985). Clothing and fashion as communication. *The psychology of fashion*, 15-27.
- Davis, F. (1994). *Fashion, culture, and identity*. University of Chicago Press.
- Dovidio, J., Kawakami, K., Johnson, C., Johnson, B., Howard, A., Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L. (2002). Perceived friendliness scale. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 8262-68.
- Duke, A. (2011, May 23). LA police: 'Primary aggressor' in Giants fan's beating arrested. *CNN*. Retrieved October 03, 2017, from <http://www.cnn.com/2011/CRIME/05/22/california.fan.beating.arrest/index.html>
- Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological review*, 109(3), 573.
- Eicher, J. B., & Roach, M. E. H. (1992). *Definition and classification of dress: Implications for analysis of gender roles*. Berg Publishers, Inc..
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W. V. (1969). The repertoire of nonverbal behavior: Categories, origins, usage, and coding. *semiotica*, 1(1), 49-98.

- Eriksen, A. (2017, March 19). Here's what happens if you walk around wearing a 'Make America Great Again' hat in NYC. Retrieved October 03, 2017, from <https://www.yahoo.com/news/heres-what-happens-if-you-walk-around-wearing-a-make-america-great-again-hat-in-nyc-223445748.html>
- Fiore, A. M., & De Long, M. (1984). Use of apparel as cues to perception of personality. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 59(2), 267-274.
- Floyd, K., & Voloudakis, M. (1999). Affectionate behavior in adult platonic friendships - Interpreting and evaluating expectancy violations. *Human Communication Research*, 25(3), 341-369.
- Forney, J. C., & Rabolt, N. J. (1986). Ethnic identity: Its relationship to ethnic and contemporary dress. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 4(2), 1-8.
- Forsythe, S. M. (1987). Effect of clothing on perception of masculine and feminine managerial traits. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 65(2), 531-534.
- Geiger, A., & Kent, L. (2017, March 08). *Number of women leaders around the world has grown, but they're still a small group*. Retrieved November 08, 2017, from <http://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2017/03/08/women-leaders-around-the-world/>
- Giles, H., & Chavasse, W. (1975). Communication length as a function of dress style and social status. *Perceptual and Motor skills*, 40(3), 961-962.
- Griffin, E. (2012). *A first look at communication theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Guéguen, N. (2015). High heels increase women's attractiveness. *Archives of sexual behavior*, 44(8), 2227-2235.

- Gupta, V. K., Turban, D. B., Wasti, S. A., & Sikdar, A. (2009). The role of gender stereotypes in perceptions of entrepreneurs and intentions to become an entrepreneur. *Entrepreneurship theory and practice*, 33(2), 397-417.
- Hamilton, J. A. (1987). Dress as a cultural sub-system: A unifying metatheory for clothing and textiles. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 6(1), 1-7.
- Hamilton, J. A., & Hamilton, J. W. (1989). Dress as a reflection and sustainer of social reality: A cross-cultural perspective. *Clothing and Textiles research journal*, 7(2), 16-22.
- Heathfield, S. M. (2017). What Are the Degrees of Formality in Business Attire? Retrieved March 05, 2018, from <https://www.thebalance.com/what-is-business-attire-1918075>
- Hebdige, D. (1995). Subculture: The meaning of style. *Critical Quarterly*, 37(2), 120-124.
- Heilman, M. E. (2001). Description and prescription: How gender stereotypes prevent women's ascent up the organizational ladder. *Journal of social issues*, 57(4), 657-674.
- Heilman, M. E., & Parks-Stamm, E. J. (2007). Gender stereotypes in the workplace: Obstacles to women's career progress. *In Social Psychology of Gender* (pp. 47-77). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Higdon, M. J. (2009). Oral argument and impression management: harnessing the power of nonverbal persuasion for a judicial audience. *University Of Kansas Law Review*, (3), 631.
- Ignatius, A. (2014, October 01). *Where Are the Female Leaders?* Retrieved November 08, 2017, from <https://hbr.org/2013/09/where-are-the-female-leaders>
- Jackson, L. A. (1992). *Physical appearance and gender: Sociobiological and sociocultural perspectives*. Albany, NY, US: State University of New York Press.

- Johnson, K. P., Schofield, N. A., & Yurchisin, J. (2002). Appearance and dress as a source of information: A qualitative approach to data collection. *Clothing & Textiles Research Journal*, 20(3), 125-137.
- Johnson, K., Lennon, S. J., & Rudd, N. (2014). Dress, body and self: Research in the social psychology of dress. *Fashion and Textiles*, 1(1), 20.
- Kachel, S., Steffens, M. C., & Niedlich, C. (2016). Traditional masculinity and femininity: Validation of a new scale assessing gender roles. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 956.
<http://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00956>
- Kaiser, S. B. (1985). *Social psychology of clothing and personal adornment*. Macmillan; Collier Macmillan.
- Knapp, M. L. (1972). Toward an understanding of nonverbal communication systems. *Journal Of Communication*, 22339-352.
- Knapp, M. L., Hall, J. A., & Horgan, T. G. (2013). *Nonverbal communication in human interaction*. Cengage Learning.
- Kness, D. (1983). Clothing deprivation feelings of three adolescent ethnic groups. *Adolescence*, 18(71), 659.
- Kwon, Y. H. (1991). The influence of the perception of mood and self-consciousness on the selection of clothing. *Clothing and Textiles Research Journal*, 9(4), 41-46.
- Lambert, S. (1972). Reactions to a stranger as a function of style of dress. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 35(3), 711-712.
- Lasswell, T. E., & Parshall, P. F. (1961). The perception of social class from photographers. *Sociology & Social Research*, 45(4), 407-414.

- Lennon, S. J. (1986). Additivity of clothing cues in first impressions. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, 14(1), 15-22.
- Lindner, K. (2004). Images of women in general interest and fashion magazine advertisements from 1955 to 2002. *Sex roles*, 51(7), 409-421.
- Matsumoto, D., Frank, M. G., & Hwang, H. S. (Eds.). (2013). *Nonverbal communication: Science and applications: Science and applications*. Sage.
- McCracken, G. D. (1990). *Culture and consumption: New approaches to the symbolic character of consumer goods and activities* (Vol. 1). Indiana University Press.
- Mehrabian, A., & Ferris, S. R. (1967). Inference of attitudes from nonverbal communication in two channels. *Journal of consulting psychology*, 31(3), 248.
- Mehrabian, A., & Wiener, M. (1967). Decoding of inconsistent communications. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 6(1), 109.
- Millan, E., & Mittal, B. (2017). Consumer preference for status symbolism of clothing: The case of the Czech Republic. *Psychology & Marketing*, 34(3), 309-322.
- Moody, W., Kinderman, P., & Sinha, P. (2010). An exploratory study: Relationships between trying on clothing, mood, emotion, personality and clothing preference. *Journal of Fashion Marketing and Management: An International Journal*, 14(1), 161-179.
- Morris, P. H., White, J., Morrison, E. R., & Fisher, K. (2013). High heels as supernormal stimuli: How wearing high heels affects judgements of female attractiveness. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 34(3), 176-181.
- Ohanian, R. (1990). Construction and validation of a scale to measure celebrity endorsers' perceived expertise, trustworthiness, and attractiveness. *Journal of advertising*, 19(3), 39-52.

- Olivola, C. Y., & Todorov, A. (2010). Elected in 100 milliseconds: Appearance-based trait inferences and voting. *Journal Of Nonverbal Behavior*, *34*(2), 83-110.
doi:10.1007/s10919-009-0082-1
- Olivola, C. Y., & Todorov, A. (2010). Fooled by first impressions? Reexamining the diagnostic value of appearance-based inferences. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *46*(2), 315-324.
- Paoletti, J. B. (2012). *Pink and blue: Telling the boys from the girls in America*. Indiana University Press.
- Peltz, J. (2016). *Why office dress codes keep getting more casual*. Retrieved November 08, 2017, from <http://beta.latimes.com/business/la-fi-qa-dress-codes-20160616-snap-story.html>
- Presley, A. B. (1998). Fifty years of change: Societal attitudes and women's fashions, 1900–1950. *Historian*, *60*(2), 307-324.
- Raines, R. S., Hechtman, S. B., & Rosenthal, R. (1990). Nonverbal behavior and gender as determinants of physical attractiveness. *Journal Of Nonverbal Behavior*, *(4)*, 253.
- Rapoport, A. (1982). *The meaning of the built environment: A nonverbal communication approach*. University of Arizona Press.
- Reysen, S. (2005). Construction of a new scale: The Reysen likability scale. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal*, *33*(2), 201-208.
- Richmond, V. P., McCroskey, J. C., & Payne, S. K. (1991). *Nonverbal behavior in interpersonal relations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Rosenfeld, L. & Plax, T. (2006). Clothing as Communication. *Journal of Communication*. *27*. 24 - 31. 10.1111/j.1460-2466.1977.tb01823.x.

- Rucker, M., Taber, D., & Harrison, A. (1981). The effect of clothing variation on first impressions of female job applicants: What to wear when. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 9(1), 53.
- Ruesch, J., & Kees, W. (1982). *Nonverbal communication* (Vol. 139). Univ of California Press.
- Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., McDaniel, E. R., & Roy, C. S. (2017). *Communication between cultures*. Boston, MA: Cengage Learning
- Schein, V. E. (2001). A global look at psychological barriers to women's progress in management. *Journal of Social issues*, 57(4), 675-688.
- Schwarz, R. A. (1979). Uncovering the secret vice: Toward an anthropology of clothing and adornment. *The Fabrics of Culture: The Anthropology of Clothing and Adornment*, 23-45.
- Steinmetz, K. (2017, March 16). Beyond 'He' or 'She': The changing meaning of gender and sexuality. *Time*.
- Summers, C. G. (2016, September 19). The sexist, political history of pockets. Retrieved February 20, 2018, from <https://www.racked.com/2016/9/19/12865560/politics-of-pockets-suffragettes-women>
- Tarlo, E., & Moors, A. (Eds.). (2013). *Islamic fashion and anti-fashion: new perspectives from Europe and North America*. A&C Black.
- Thomas, R. M. (2001). *Recent theories of human development*. Sage.
- Tracy, J. L., Shariff, A. F., Zhao, W., & Henrich, J. (2013). Cross-cultural evidence that the nonverbal expression of pride is an automatic status signal. *Journal Of Experimental Psychology: General*, 142(1), 163-180. doi:10.1037/a0028412

Vetterling-Braggin, M. (Ed.). (1982). " *Femininity, " masculinity, " and " androgyny": A modern philosophical discussion*. Rowman & Littlefield.

Victoria and Albert Museum, Online Museum. (2013, February 08). *Wearing Pockets*. Retrieved November 08, 2017, from <http://www.vam.ac.uk/content/articles/a/history-of-pockets/>

Warner, R. M., & Sugarman, D. B. (1986). Attributions of personality based on physical appearance, speech, and handwriting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50(4), 792.

Whisner, M. (1982). Gender-Specific Clothing Regulation: A Study in Patriarchy. *Harv. Women's LJ*, 5, 73.

Worell, J. (Ed.). (2001). *Encyclopedia of women and gender: sex similarities and differences and the impact of society on gender (Vol. 1)*. Academic Press.